U.S. Congress:

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTIETH CONGRESS

OF

THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

VOLUME LXIX—PART 1

DECEMBER 5, 1927, TO JANUARY 7, 1928

(Pages 1 to 1150)



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON
1928

2d. set

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

J11
.R5
2d.set

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
RECEIVED
APR 21 1928
DOCUMENTS DIVISION

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SEVENTIETH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, *December 5, 1927*

The first Monday of December being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Seventieth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

CHARLES G. DAWES, of Illinois, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

Rev. Dr. ZeBarney Thorne Phillips, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, our Heavenly Father, the Maker and Ruler of all men, who hast made all things for man and man for Thy glory, we commend to Thy gracious keeping the people of these United States. Especially we pray Thy blessing upon the President of these United States, that in his life, his ideals, his wisdom, and discretion he may do only that which is well pleasing unto Thee.

Upon the Vice President, the Presiding Officer of this House, may the especial benediction of Thy grace and guidance of Thy spirit descend. Upon all in authority we invoke Thine especial blessing, especially upon this House, met in solemn assembly at this hour to rededicate anew unto Thee on the altar of their country all that they are and all that they have and all that they hope to be. Enlarge their vision, deepen their sense of righteousness, and may they see that in all they do they are acting in Thy stead and for the safety, honor, and welfare of this Thy people.

May the benediction of the spirit of him who has offered unto Thee the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving in this House descend upon us. Guide us, guard us, make us more meet and fit for service not only to our country but in the kingdom of God.

We ask it in the name and for the sake of Him who went about doing good and who taught us when we pray to say:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily break. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. This being the day designated by the Constitution of the United States for the assembling of Congress, the Senate, pursuant thereto, is now in session. The Chief Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (John C. Crockett) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	McKellar	Sackett
Bayard	Gillett	McLean	Schall
Blease	Glass	McMaster	Sheppard
Borah	Goff	McNary	Shipstead
Bratton	Gould	Mayfield	Simmons
Bruce	Greene	Metcalf	Steck
Capper	Hale	Neely	Stephens
Copeland	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Couzens	Harrison	Phipps	Trammell
Deneen	Heflin	Pine	Tyson
Dill	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Johnson	Ransdell	Warren
Edwards	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	
Fess	King	Robinson, Ark.	
Frazier	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. WHEELER. My colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is confined to his home by serious illness.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] is detained at his home on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO NEW SENATORS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Next in order is the administering of the oath to Senators elect whose credentials have been previously received and filed. The clerk will call the roll in blocks of four, and as their names are called the Senators elect will present themselves at the Vice President's desk to take the oath of office.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLACK, and Mr. BLAINE.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SACKETT, Mr. MCLEAN, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. BROOKHART, Mr. BROUSSARD, Mr. CARAWAY, and Mr. CURTIS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, and Mr. CAPPER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. DALE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. GOODING.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. GREENE, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BORAH, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. HAWES, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. MOSES.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. REED of Missouri, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. DILL, and Mr. KEYES, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. NORBECK, Mr. NYE, Mr. ODDIE, and Mr. OVERMAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MCMASTER, Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. SIMMONS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. SHORTRIDGE and Mr. SMITH of Illinois.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of the highest senatorial privilege in regard to the taking of the oath of office by Mr. SMITH of Illinois, and I send to the Vice President's desk a privileged resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 1), as follows:

Whereas, on the 17th day of May, 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election;

Whereas said committee in the discharge of its duties notified FRANK L. SMITH of Illinois, then a candidate for the United States Senate from that State, of its proceeding, and the said FRANK L. SMITH appeared in person and was permitted to counsel with and be represented by his attorneys and agents;

Whereas the said committee has reported—

That the evidence without substantial dispute shows that there was expended directly or indirectly for and on behalf of the candidacy of the said FRANK L. SMITH for the United States Senate the sum of $458,782; that all of the above sums except $171,500 was contributed directly to and received by the personal agent and representative of the said FRANK L. SMITH with his full knowledge and consent, and that of the total sum aforesaid there was contributed by officers of large public-service institutions doing business in the State of Illinois or by said institutions the sum of $203,000, a substantial part of which sum was contributed by men who were nonresidents of Illinois but who were officers of Illinois public-service corporations;

That at all of the times aforesaid the said FRANK L. SMITH was chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, and that said public-service corporations commonly and generally had business before said commission, and said commission was, among other things, empowered to regulate the rates, charges, and business of said corporations;

That by the statutes of Illinois it is made a misdemeanor for any officer or agent of such public-service corporations to contribute any money to any member of said commission or for any member of said commission to accept such moneys upon penalty of removal from office;

That said SMITH has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts, although full and complete opportunity was given to him not only to present evidence but arguments in his behalf; and

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence is now and for many months has been on file with the Senate, and all of the said facts appears without substantial dispute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the acceptance and expenditure of the various sums of money aforesaid in behalf of the candidacy of the said FRANK L. SMITH is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of free government, and taints with fraud and corruption the credentials for a seat in the Senate presented by the said FRANK L. SMITH; and be it further

Resolved, That the said FRANK L. SMITH is not entitled to take the oath of office and is not entitled to membership in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator elect from Illinois may stand aside until the oath shall have been administered to those against whom there are no objections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will lie over and the Senator elect from Illinois will stand aside.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. SHORTRIDGE, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. STEIWER.

These Senators escorted, respectively, by Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BLEASE, Mr. KING, and Mr. MCNARY, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. VARE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, again I rise to a question of senatorial privilege in regard to the swearing in of Mr. VARE, and send to the clerk's desk a privileged resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 2), as follows:

Whereas on the 17th day of May, 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate, and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election; and

Whereas said committee, in the discharge of its duties, notified WILLIAM S. VARE, of Pennsylvania, then a candidate for the United States Senate from that State, of its proceedings, and the said WILLIAM S. VARE appeared in person and by attorney before said committee while it was engaged in making such investigation; and

Whereas the said committee has reported that the evidence without substantial dispute shows that at the primary election at which the said WILLIAM S. VARE is alleged to have been nominated as a candidate for the United States Senate there were numerous and various instances of fraud and corruption in behalf of the candidacy of the said WILLIAM S. VARE, and that there was spent in behalf of the said WILLIAM S. VARE in said primary election, by the said WILLIAM S. VARE and his friends, a sum of money exceeding $785,000; and

Whereas the said WILLIAM S. VARE has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts, although full and complete opportunity was given him not only to present evidence but arguments in his behalf; and

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence taken by said committee is now and for many months has been on file in the Senate, and all of the said facts appear without substantial dispute; and

Whereas on the 10th day of January, 1927, there was filed in the Senate an official communication from the then Governor of Pennsylvania, made and delivered to the Senate in pursuance of law, the following certificate:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, January 8, 1927.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the returns of the election of United States Senator, held on November 2, 1926, as the law of this Commonwealth directs.

I have the honor also to inform you that I have to-day signed and by registered mail delivered to Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, a certificate which is as follows:

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the face of the returns filed in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth of the election held on the 2d day of November, 1926, WILLIAM S. VARE appears to have been chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1927."

The form of words customarily used for such certificates by the governors of this Commonwealth and the form recommended by the Senate of the United States both include certification that the candidate in question has been "duly chosen by the qualified electors" of the Commonwealth.

I can not so certify, because I do not believe that Mr. VARE has been duly chosen. On the contrary, I am convinced, and have repeatedly declared, that his nomination was partly bought and partly stolen, and that frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election. But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated can not be honestly entitled to a seat.

The stealing of votes for Mr. VARE and the amount and the sources of the money spent in his behalf make it clear to me that the election returns do not in fact correctly represent the will of the sovereign voters of Pennsylvania.

Therefore I have so worded the certificate required by law that I can sign it without distorting the truth.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Very respectfully yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT, *Governor.*

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the expenditure of such a large sum of money to secure the nomination of the said WILLIAM S. VARE as a candidate for the United States Senate is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, and, together with the charges of corruption and fraud made in the report of said committee and substantiated by the evidence taken by said committee, and the charges of corruption and fraud officially made by the Governor of Pennsylvania, taints with fraud and corruption the credentials of the said WILLIAM S. VARE for a seat in the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the said WILLIAM S. VARE is not entitled to take the oath of office and is not entitled to membership in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the Senator elect from Pennsylvania may stand aside until the oath shall have been administered to the Senators elect against whom there are no objections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will lie over, and the Senator elect from Pennsylvania will stand aside.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. WATERMAN, Mr. WATSON, and Mr. WILLIS.

These Senators, escorted, respectively, by Mr. PINE, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. COPELAND, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana, and Mr. FESS, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to them.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—J. Thomas Heflin and Hugo L. Black.
Arizona.—Henry F. Ashurst and Carl Hayden.
Arkansas.—Joseph T. Robinson and T. H. Caraway.
California.—Hiram W. Johnson and Samuel M. Shortridge.
Colorado.—Lawrence C. Phipps and Charles W. Waterman.
Connecticut.—George P. McLean and Hiram Bingham.
Delaware.—Thomas F. Bayard and T. Coleman du Pont.
Florida.—Duncan U. Fletcher and Park Trammell.
Georgia.—William J. Harris and Walter F. George.
Idaho.—William E. Borah and Frank R. Gooding.
Illinois.—Charles S. Deneen and *Frank L. Smith.*[1]
Indiana.—James E. Watson and Arthur R. Robinson.
Iowa.—Daniel F. Steck and Smith W. Brookhart.
Kansas.—Charles Curtis and Arthur Capper.
Kentucky.—Frederic M. Sackett and Alben W. Barkley.
Louisiana.—Joseph E. Ransdell and Edwin S. Broussard.
Maine.—Frederick Hale and Arthur R. Gould.
Maryland.—William Cabell Bruce and Millard E. Tydings.
Massachusetts.—Frederick H. Gillett and David I. Walsh.
Michigan.—Woodbridge N. Ferris and James Couzens.
Minnesota.—Henrik Shipstead and Thomas D. Schall.
Mississippi.—Pat Harrison and Hubert D. Stephens.
Missouri.—James A. Reed and Harry B. Hawes.
Montana.—Thomas J. Walsh and Burton K. Wheeler.
Nebraska.—George W. Norris and Robert B. Howell.
Nevada.—Key Pittman and Tasker L. Oddie.
New Hampshire.—George H. Moses and Henry W. Keyes.

[1] Oath not administered.

New Jersey.—Walter E. Edge and Edward I. Edwards.
New Mexico.—Andrieus A. Jones and Sam G. Bratton.
New York.—Royal S. Copeland and Robert F. Wagner.
North Carolina.—F. M. Simmons and Lee S. Overman.
North Dakota.—Lynn J. Frazier and Gerald P. Nye.
Ohio.—Frank B. Willis and S. D. Fess.
Oklahoma.—W. B. Pine and Elmer Thomas.
Oregon.—Charles L. McNary and Frederick Steiwer.
Pennsylvania.—David I. Reed and *William S. Vare.*[1]
Rhode Island.—Peter G. Gerry and Jesse H. Metcalf.
South Carolina.—Ellison D. Smith and Cole L. Blease.
South Dakota.—Peter Norbeck and Wm. H. McMaster.
Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and L. D. Tyson.
Texas.—Morris Sheppard and Earle B. Mayfield.
Utah.—Reed Smoot and William H. King.
Vermont.—Frank L. Greene and Porter H. Dale.
Virginia.—Claude A. Swanson and Carter Glass.
Washington.—Wesley L. Jones and C. C. Dill.
West Virginia.—M. M. Neely and Guy D. Goff.
Wisconsin.—Robert M. La Follette, jr., and John J. Blaine.
Wyoming.—Francis E. Warren and John B. Kendrick.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that further consideration of the credentials of the Senators elect, Mr. SMITH of Illinois and Mr. VARE, of Pennsylvania, be postponed without change or prejudice of their rights until after the reading of the President's message Tuesday, December 6; that during the remainder of to-day's session the only questions to be taken up shall be a resolution notifying the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is ready to proceed to business, a resolution fixing the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate, a resolution appointing a committee of two Senators to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, and the election of a Chaplain of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think there is no objection to the order asked by the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the agreement is entered into.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CURTIS and Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas as the committee.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 4), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 5), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 6), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That Rev. ZeBarney Thorne Phillips, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

[1] Oath not administered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn, the adjournment being until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 6, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, *December 5, 1927*

This day, in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, the Members elect of the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress assembled in their hall and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by William Tyler Page, Clerk of the last House.

The CLERK. The Chaplain of the last House will lead in prayer.

The Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the last House, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whose presence there is fullness of joy and at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore, we humbly acknowledge Thee to be the only true God. Our praise and gratitude rise to Thee and our restraining meekness would say: "Glory be to Thee, O Lord, most high, Thy will be done." In the light of Thy love the valleys of our experience have been exalted and the deep things have been illuminated. At the very front door of this Congress may we realize the sancity of our commission and know that the measure of our power shall be the measure of our virile, manly virtues. O Holy Spirit shine upon our weakness and press upon our deepest beings; diffuse them through and through with a consuming energy and devotion for our whole beloved land. We pause again and in this solemn stillness breathe an earnest prayer for our Speaker, the Members and officers of this Chamber. Do Thou inspire us with the might of Thy wisdom, the majesty of Thy sacrifices, and the glory of Thy shame. May we not be forced in our labors by the cold motive of duty, but by the urgency of love—love of God, love for the Republic, and an appreciation for all humanity. At the last may we hear the music break on the eternal shores. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The CLERK. Representatives elect: This is the day fixed by the Constitution of the United States for the meeting of the Seventieth Congress of the United States of America. The Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-ninth Congress will call the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, Representatives elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The roll was called, showing the presence of the following-named Members:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

John McDuffie.
Henry B. Steagall.
Lamar Jeffers.
William B. Bowling.
W. B. Oliver
M. C. Allgood.
Ed. B. Almon.
George Huddleston.
W. B. Bankhead.

ARIZONA

Lewis W. Douglas.

ARKANSAS

W. J. Driver.
W. A. Oldfield.
John N. Tillman.
Otis Wingo
Heartsil Ragon.
J. B. Reed.
Tilman B. Parks.

CALIFORNIA

Clarence F. Lea.
Harry L. Englebright.
C. F. Curry.
Florence P. Kahn.
Richard J. Welch.
Albert E. Carter.
Henry E. Barbour.
W. E. Evans.
Joe Crail.
Phil D. Swing.

COLORADO

S. Harrison White.
Charles B. Timberlake.
Guy U. Hardy.
Edward T. Taylor.

CONNECTICUT

E. Hart Fenn.
Richard P. Freeman.
John Q. Tilson.
Schuyler Merritt.
James P. Glynn.

DELAWARE

Robert G. Houston.

FLORIDA

Herbert J. Drane.
R. A. Green.
Tom A. Yon.
W. J. Sears.

Charles G. Edwards.
E. E. Cox.
Charles R. Crisp.
Leslie J. Steele.
Samuel Rutherford.
Malcolm C. Tarver.

Burton L. French.

Martin B. Madden.
Morton D. Hull.
Elliott W. Sproul.
Thomas A. Doyle.
Adolph J. Sabath.
James T. Igoe.
M. A. Michaelson.
Stanley Henry Kunz.
Fred A. Britten.
Carl R. Chindblom.
Frank R. Reid.
John T. Buckbee.
William R. Johnson.
John C. Allen.

Harry E. Rowbottom.
Arthur H. Greenwood.
Frank Gardner.
Harry C. Canfield.
Noble J. Johnson.
Richard N. Elliott.
Ralph E. Updike.

W. F. Kopp.
F. D. Letts.
T. J. B. Robinson.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
Cyrenus Cole.
C. W. Ramseyer.

D. R. Anthony, jr.
U. S. Guyer.
Homer Hoch.
James G. Strong.

W. Voris Gregory.
David H. Kincheloe.
John W. Moore.
Henry DeHaven Moorman.
Maurice H. Thatcher.
Orie S. Ware.

James O'Connor.
J. Zach Spearing.
Whitmell P. Martin.
John N. Sandlin.

Carroll L. Beedy.
Wallace H. White, jr.

T. Alan Goldsborough.
Vincent L. Palmisano.
J. Charles Linthicum.

Allen T. Treadway.
Henry L. Bowles.
George R. Stobbs.
Edith Nourse Rogers.
A. Piatt Andrew.
William P. Connery, jr.
Frederick W. Dallinger.
Charles L. Underhill.

Robert H. Clancy.
Earl C. Michener.
Joseph L. Hooper.
John C. Ketcham.
Carl E. Mapes.
Grant M. Hudson.

Allen J. Furlow.
Frank Clague.
August H. Andresen.
Melvin J. Maas.
Walter H. Newton.

John E. Rankin.
B. G. Lowrey.
W. M. Whittington.
Jeff Busby.

M. A. Romjue.
Ralph F. Lozier.
Jacob L. Milligan.
Charles L. Faust.
George H. Combs, jr.
Clement C. Dickinson.
Samuel C. Major.
William L. Nelson.

John M. Evans.

John H. Morehead.
Willis G. Sears.
Edgar Howard.

GEORGIA

Charles H. Brand.
Thomas M. Bell.
Carl Vinson.
William C. Lankford.
William W. Larsen.

IDAHO

Addison T. Smith.

ILLINOIS

Edward J. King.
William E. Hull.
Homer W. Hall.
William P. Holaday.
Charles Adkins.
Henry T. Rainey.
J. Earl Major.
Ed. M. Irwin.
William W. Arnold.
Thomas S. Williams.
Edward E. Denison.
Richard Yates.
Henry R. Rathbone.

INDIANA

Albert H. Vestal.
Fred S. Purnell.
William R. Wood.
Albert R. Hall.
David Hogg.
Andrew J. Hickey.

IOWA

Cassius C. Dowell.
Lloyd Thurston.
William R. Green.
L. J. Dickinson.
William D. Boies.

KANSAS

Hays B. White.
Clifford R. Hope.
W. A. Ayres.

KENTUCKY

Virgil Chapman.
Ralph Gilbert.
Fred M. Vinson.
Mrs. John W. Langley.
John M. Robsion.

LOUISIANA

Riley J. Wilson.
Bolivar E. Kemp.
Rene L. De Rouen.
James B. Aswell.

MAINE

John E. Nelson.
Ira G. Hersey.

MARYLAND

Stephen W. Gambrill.
Frederick N. Zihlman.

MASSACHUSETTS

John J. Douglass.
George Holden Tinkham.
James A. Gallivan.
Robert Luce.
Louis A. Frothingham.
Joseph W. Martin, jr.
Charles L. Gifford.

MICHIGAN

Louis C. Cramton.
Bird J. Vincent.
James C. McLaughlin.
Frank P. Bohn.
W. Frank James.
Clarence J. McLeod.

MINNESOTA

Harold Knutson.
O. J. Kvale.
William L. Carss.
C. G. Selvig.
Godfrey G. Goodwin.

MISSISSIPPI

Ross A. Collins.
T. Webber Wilson.
Percy E. Quin.
J. W. Collier.

MISSOURI

Clarence Cannon.
Henry F. Niedringhaus.
John J. Cochran.
L. C. Dyer.
Clyde Williams.
James F. Fullbright.
Thomas L. Rubey.

MONTANA

Scott Leavitt.

NEBRASKA

J. N. Norton.
Ashton C. Shallenberger.
Robert G. Simmons.

NEVADA

Samuel S. Arentz.

Fletcher Hale.

Charles A. Wolverton.
Isaac Bacharach.
Harold G. Hoffman.
Charles A. Eaton.
Ernest R. Ackerman.
Randolph Perkins.

Robert L. Bacon.
John J. Kindred.
George W. Lindsay.
Thomas H. Cullen.
Loring M. Black, jr.
Andrew L. Somers.
John F. Quayle.
Patrick J. Carley.
David J. O'Connell.
Emanuel Celler.
Anning S. Prall.
Samuel Dickstein.
Christopher D. Sullivan.
William Irving Sirovich.
John J. Boylan.
John J. O'Connor.
William W. Cohen.
John F. Carew.
Sol Bloom
Fiorello H. LaGuardia.
Royal H. Weller.

Lindsay C. Warren.
John H. Kerr.
Charles L. Abernethy.
Edward W. Pou.
Charles M. Stedman.

O. B. Burtness.
Thomas Hall.

Nicholas Longworth.
Charles Tatgenhorst, jr.
Roy G. Fitzgerald.
W. T. Fitzgerald.
Charles J. Thompson.
Charles C. Kearns.
Charles Brand.
Brooks Fletcher.
W. W. Chalmers.
Thomas A. Jenkins.
Mell G. Underwood.

E. B. Howard.
W. W. Hastings.
Wilburn Cartwright.
Tom D. McKeown.

W. C. Hawley.
N. J. Sinnott.

James M. Beck.
Harry C. Ransley.
Benjamin M. Golder.
James J. Connolly.
George A. Welsh.
George P. Darrow.
Thomas S. Butler.
Henry W. Watson.
William W. Griest.
Laurence H. Watres.
Cyrus M. Palmer.
Robert Grey Bushong.
Louis T. McFadden.
Edgar R. Kiess.
Frederick W. Magrady.
Edward M. Beers.
I. H. Doutrich.

Clark Burdick.
Richard S. Aldrich.

Thomas S. McMillan.
B. B. Hare.
F. H. Dominick.

C. A. Christopherson.

B. Carroll Reece.
J. Will Taylor.
Sam D. McReynolds.
Cordell Hull.
Ewin L. Davis.

Eugene Black
John C. Box
Morgan G. Sanders
Sam Rayburn
Hatton W. Sumners
Luther A. Johnson
Clay Stone Briggs
Daniel E. Garrett
J. J. Mansfield

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edward H. Wason.

NEW JERSEY

George N. Seger.
Paul J. Moore.
Franklin W. Fort.
Frederick R. Lehlbach.
Oscar L. Auf der Heide.
Mary T. Norton.

NEW MEXICO

John Morrow

NEW YORK

Anthony J. Griffin.
Frank Oliver.
James M. Fitzpatrick.
J. Mayhew Wainwright.
Hamilton Fish, jr.
Harcourt J. Pratt.
Parker Corning.
James S. Parker.
Frank Crowther.
Bertrand H. Snell.
Thaddeus C. Sweet.
Frederick M. Davenport.
John D. Clarke.
Clarence E. Hancock.
John Taber.
Gale H. Stalker.
Meyer Jacobstein.
Archie D. Sanders.
S. Wallace Dempsey.
Clarence MacGregor.
Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

Homer L. Lyon.
William C. Hammer.
Robert L. Doughton.
A. L. Bulwinkle.
Zebulon Weaver.

NORTH DAKOTA

J. H. Sinclair.

OHIO

John C. Speaks.
James T. Begg.
Martin L. Davey.
C. Ellis Moore.
John McSweeney.
William M. Morgan.
Frank Murphy.
John G. Cooper.
Charles A. Mooney.
Robert Crosser.
Theodore E. Burton.

OKLAHOMA

F. B. Swank.
Jed Johnson.
James V. McClintic.
M. C. Garber.

OREGON

Franklin F. Korell.

PENNSYLVANIA

J. Russell Leech.
Franklin Menges.
J. Mitchell Chase.
Samuel Austin Kendall.
Henry W. Temple.
J. Howard Swick.
Nathan L. Strong.
Thomas C. Cochran.
Milton W. Shreve.
Everett Kent.
Adam M. Wyant.
Stephen G. Porter.
Clyde Kelly.
John M. Morin.
Harry A. Estep.
Guy E. Campbell.

RHODE ISLAND

Louis Monast.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John J. McSwain.
A. H. Gasque.
H. P. Fulmer.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William Williamson.

TENNESSEE

Joseph W. Byrns.
E. E. Eslick.
Gordon Browning.
Finis J. Garrett.
Hubert F. Fisher.

TEXAS

J. P. Buchanan
Tom Connally
Fritz G. Lanham
Guinn Williams
Harry M. Wurzbach
John N. Garner
Claude B. Hudspeth
Thomas L. Blanton
Marvin Jones

UTAH

Don B. Colton

VERMONT

Elbert S. Brigham — Ernest W. Gibson

VIRGINIA

S. Otis Bland — Clifton A. Woodrum
J. T. Deal — T. W. Harrison
Andrew Jackson Montague — R. Walton Moore
P. H. Drewry — George C. Peery
Joseph Whitehead — Henry St. George Tucker

WASHINGTON

John F. Miller — John W. Summers
Lindley H. Hadley — Sam B. Hill
Albert Johnson

WEST VIRGINIA

Carl G. Bachmann — James A. Hughes
Frank L. Bowman — James French Strother
William S. O'Brien — E. T. England

WISCONSIN

Henry Allen Cooper — Florian Lampert
Charles A. Kading — Edward E. Browne
John M. Nelson — George J. Schneider
John C. Schafer — James A. Frear
Victor L. Berger — Hubert H. Peavey

WYOMING

Charles E. Winter

The Clerk will present for information a statement showing changes that have occurred since the regular election of Representatives to the Seventieth Congress. And if there be no objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Representatives to the Seventieth Congress who have died or resigned, and their successors

Representatives	Died	Resigned	Successor
A. E. B. Stephens, second Ohio.	Feb. 12, 1927		Charles Tatgenhorst, jr.
Ladislas Lazaro, seventh Louisiana.	Mar. 30, 1927		Rene L. De Rouen.
Walter W. Magee, thirty-fifth New York.	May 25, 1927		Clarence E. Hancock.
William N. Vaile, first Colorado.	July 2, 1927		S. Harrison White.
M. E. Crumpacker, third Oregon.	July 24, 1927		Franklin F. Korell.
James M. Hazlett, first Pennsylvania.		Oct. 20, 1927	James M. Beck.

The CLERK. The calling of the roll discloses the presence of 417 Members. A quorum is present.

The Clerk will state that credentials regular in form have been filed showing the election of VICTOR S. K. HOUSTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii, and of DAN A. SUTHERLAND as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska.

Two Resident Commissioners to the United States from the Philippine Islands are elected by the Philippine Legislature triennially. Certificates of election of ISAURO GABALDON and of PEDRO GUEVARA are on file, showing their election as Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands for the term of three years commencing March 4, 1926.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next business in order is the election of a Speaker. Nominations will now be received.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Clerk, by the unanimous direction and authority of the Republican caucus, representing the majority of the membership of the House of Representatives, I have the honor to place in nomination for Speaker during the continuance of the Seventieth Congress the Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Clerk, by the unanimous action of the Democratic caucus and by its authority, I have the honor to present as a candidate for Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Seventieth Congress the name of FINIS J. GARRETT, of Tennessee.

The CLERK. Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, a Representative elect from the State of Ohio, and Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT, a Representative elect from the State of Tennessee, have been placed in nomination.

If there are no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. STOBBS; the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. KORELL; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL; and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. COMBS, to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called, and Members will indicate by name the candidate of their choice.

The Clerk called the roll.

The following is the vote in detail:

[Roll No. 2]

FOR MR. LONGWORTH—225

Ackerman	Eaton	Kelly	Schafer
Adkins	Elliott	Kendall	Schneider
Aldrich	England	Ketcham	Sears, Nebr.
Allen	Englebright	Kiess	Seger
Andresen	Estep	King	Selvig
Andrew	Evans, Calif.	Knutson	Shreve
Anthony	Faust	Kopp	Simmons
Arentz	Fenn	Korell	Sinclair
Bacharach	Fish	LaGuardia	Sinnott
Bachmann	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Lampert	Smith
Bacon	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Langley	Snell
Barbour	Fort	Leavitt	Speaks
Beck, Pa.	Frear	Leech	Sproul, Ill.
Beedy	Freeman	Lehlbach	Stalker
Beers	French	Letts	Stobbs
Begg	Frothingham	Luce	Strong, Kans.
Bohn	Furlow	McFadden	Strong, Pa.
Boies	Garber	McLaughlin	Strother
Bowles	Gibson	McLeod	Summers, Wash.
Bowman	Gifford	MacGregor	Sweet
Brand, Ohio	Glynn	Maas	Swick
Brigham	Golder	Madden	Swing
Britten	Goodwin	Magrady	Taber
Browne	Green, Iowa	Mapes	Tatgenhorst
Buckbee	Griest	Martin, Mass.	Taylor, Tenn.
Burdick	Guyer	Menges	Temple
Burtness	Hadley	Merritt	Thatcher
Burton	Hale	Michaelson	Thompson
Bushong	Hall, Ill.	Michener	Thurston
Butler	Hall, Ind.	Miller	Tilson
Campbell	Hall, N. Dak.	Monast	Timberlake
Carter	Hancock	Moore, Ohio	Tinkham
Chalmers	Hardy	Morgan	Treadway
Chase	Haugen	Morin	Underhill
Chindblom	Hawley	Murphy	Updike
Christopherson	Hersey	Nelson, Me.	Vestal
Clancy	Hickey	Nelson, Wis.	Vincent, Mich.
Clarke	Hoch	Newton	Wainwright
Cochran, Pa.	Hoffman	Niedringhaus	Wason
Cole, Iowa	Hogg	Palmer	Watres
Colton	Holaday	Parker	Watson
Connolly, Pa.	Hooper	Peavey	Welch, Calif.
Cooper, Ohio	Hope	Perkins	Welsh, Pa.
Cooper, Wis.	Houston	Porter	White, Kans.
Crail	Hudson	Pratt	White, Me.
Cramton	Hughes	Purnell	Williams, Ill.
Crowther	Hull, Morton D.	Ramseyer	Williamson
Curry	Hull, Wm. E.	Ransley	Winter
Dallinger	Irwin	Rathbone	Wolverton
Darrow	James	Reece	Wood
Davenport	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.	Wurzbach
Dempsey	Johnson, Ill.	Reid, Ill.	Wyant
Denison	Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Iowa	Yates
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, Wash.	Robsion, Ky.	Zihlman
Doutrich	Kading	Rogers	
Dowell	Kahn	Rowbottom	
Dyer	Kearns	Sanders, N. Y.	

FOR MR. GARRETT—187

Abernethy	Dickstein	Kerr	Prall
Allgood	Dominick	Kincheloe	Quayle
Almon	Doughton	Kindred	Quin
Arnold	Douglas, Ariz.	Kunz	Ragon
Aswell	Douglass, Mass.	Lanham	Rainey
Auf der Heide	Doyle	Lankford	Rankin
Ayres	Drane	Larsen	Rayburn
Bankhead	Drewry	Lea	Reed, Ark.
Bell	Driver	Lindsay	Romjue
Black, N. Y.	Edwards	Linthicum	Rubey
Black, Tex.	Eslick	Lowrey	Rutherford
Bland	Evans, Mont.	Lozier	Sabath
Blanton	Fisher	Lyon	Sanders, Tex.
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	McClintic	Sandlin
Bowling	Fletcher	McDuffie	Sears, Fla.
Box	Fulbright	McKeown	Shallenberger
Boylan	Fulmer	McMillan	Sirovich
Brand, Ga.	Gallivan	McReynolds	Somers, N. Y.
Briggs	Gambrill	McSwain	Spearing
Browning	Gardner, Ind.	McSweeney	Steagall
Bucahanan	Garner, Tex.	Major, Ill.	Stedman
Bulwinkle	Garrett, Tex.	Major, Mo.	Steele
Busby	Gasque	Mansfield	Sullivan
Byrns	Gilbert	Martin, La.	Sumners, Tex.
Canfield	Goldsborough	Milligan	Swank
Cannon	Gregory	Montague	Tarver
Carew	Green, Fla.	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Carley	Greenwood	Moore, Ky.	Tillman
Cartwright	Griffin	Moore, N. J.	Tucker
Celler	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Underwood
Chapman	Hare	Moorman	Vinson, Ga.
Cochran, Mo.	Harrison	Morehead	Vinson, Ky.
Cohen	Hastings	Morrow	Ware
Collier	Hill, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Warren
Collins	Howard, Nebr.	Norton, Nebr.	Weaver
Combs	Howard, Okla.	Norton, N. J.	Weller
Connally, Tex.	Huddleston	O'Brien	White, Colo.
Connery	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Whitehead
Corning	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor, La.	Whittington
Cox	Igoe	O'Connor, N. Y.	Williams, Mo.
Crisp	Jacobstein	Oldfield	Williams, Tex.
Crosser	Jeffers	Oliver, Ala.	Wilson, La.
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Oliver, N. Y.	Wilson, Miss.
Davis	Johnson, Tex.	Palmisano	Wingo
Deal	Jones	Parks	Woodrum
De Rouen	Kemp	Peery	Yon
Dickinson, Mo.	Kent	Pou	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Berger	Garrett, Tenn.	Kvale	Longworth
Carss			

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 417, of which Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH has received 225 and Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT has received 187; answering "present," 5. Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, a Representative elect from the State of Ohio, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT; and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GARNER, will please escort the Speaker elect to the chair, and the Clerk designates the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTLER, the Member longest in continuous service in the House, to administer to the Speaker elect the oath of office prescribed by law.

The committee appointed by the Clerk escorted Mr. LONGWORTH to the Speaker's chair.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My colleagues of the House of Representatives, it is again my privilege formally to present the Speaker elect of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

This I do gladly because of personal friendship and with pleasure because in the school of experience we have learned that the predictions of two years agone have been vindicated and verified. His ability, firmness, and fairness were demonstrated during the Sixty-ninth Congress. [Applause.] His proven fitness for this distinguished honor—one of the greatest that can come to man—gives us entire confidence in the rectitude of his parliamentary convictions, and makes us rest secure in the assurance that as we labor here together we shall have in this great place one thoroughly equipped by intellect, by character, and by training for the high and arduous labors which he has been chosen to perform.

My colleagues, the Speaker that has been and the Speaker that is to be, Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, of Ohio. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER elect. Gentlewomen and gentlemen of the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress, for the second time by your voices I have been chosen to be your presiding officer.

The Speakership of the House of Representatives is one of the great governmental offices of the world. It is, I think, generally agreed that it is second in dignity and importance, together with power and influence upon the future of America, potential at least, only to the Presidency itself.

My study of history and my experience of two years in this office have convinced me, however, that no man, no matter of how great ability, can be a successful Speaker unless he gains and retains during his term the respect and confidence of his colleagues. That I have been in a measure successful, as your reception would seem to indicate, is due in major part to the fact that I have succeeded in these two respects.

To you of my party, to-day the great majority party of the United States, who have with unanimity cast your votes for my reelection to this high office, I tender my most profound and heartfelt thanks, not so much for the office itself as for the evidence of your conception of my worthiness to fill it.

I am particularly pleased to have received the votes of gentlemen who have been seated on my party's side of the aisle for the past four years, but who on two previous occasions have preferred to vote for a candidate for Speaker other than the one proposed by the Republican majority. I welcome your return to the Republican Party, where you rightfully belong. [Applause on the Republican side.] I like to row in the same boat with that fine old veteran of a hundred political battles, HENRY ALLEN COOPER, and with NELSON and FREAR and all of you. [Applause.]

To you seated upon the present minority side of the aisle, who cast your votes, as you were in honor bound to do, for your chosen leader, I am no less indebted, because of the expression of esteem and confidence you gave me at the close of the session of the last Congress, and have repeated this morning.

If there is one cloud upon my happiness to-day it is the thought that from the next Congress, of which I hope and expect to be a Member, the leader of the minority, on his own motion and by his own will, will be absent. During the more than 25 years that I have held public office I have known, often intimately, all of the outstanding public men of the period, but among them all I have never known a finer character than FINIS GARRETT—student, scholar, debater of the first order, orator, a master unexcelled in the use of the English language, patriot, a gentleman in all that fine old English word implies—he possesses all the qualities that make for my ideal of what an American statesman ought to be. [Applause, the Members rising.]

We are entering upon a session during which grave problems will confront us. I hope most sincerely that we may be able to meet and solve them with as little bitterness and partisanship as possible. I hope that while we may be widely divided in our opinions upon what is best for the country, our differences may always be based upon fundamental economic principles and never upon questions of geography, race, or, above all, of religion. [Applause.] Thus we shall continue upon the path laid out by the fathers of the Constitution, which has brought us to a condition of happiness, prosperity, and world influence undreamt of by them, and in the future, as generations succeed each other, will lead us onward and upward to heights that no other country has ever attained or ever will attain.

But whatever may eventuate of this, be well assured that, so far as it lies in the power of the Speaker, the honor and dignity of this House will be at all times upheld, and the rights of the minority and of each individual Member of full and free debate and of making record upon all important questions will be fully protected. [Applause.]

And now one word before I take the solemn oath of office. In the circumstances and conditions with which I find myself surrounded, possessing, as I believe I do, the esteem and good will of all my colleagues in the proportion which I similarly entertain for each one of them, I say, and I say it with the utmost sincerity, that I had rather be Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States than hold any other office in the gift of the American people. Need I say more to evidence my happiness at again being called upon to serve you?

I am prepared to take the oath.

Mr. BUTLER administered the oath of office to the Speaker.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER administered the oath of office to the Members and Delegates, the Members and Delegates presenting themselves as their names were called by States and Territories, in the area in front of the Speaker's desk, taking the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. BUTLER and Mr. GRIEST qualified by affirmation.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT JAMES M. BECK

While the Speaker was administering the oath of office to the various Members and Delegates, when the State of Pennsylvania was called, the following occurred:

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object to the oath at this time being administered to Mr. JAMES M. BECK, a Representative elect from the State of Pennsylvania, upon the ground that there is a question as to his eligibility under the Constitution of the United States, there being a question as to whether he was an inhabitant of the State of Pennsylvania at the time of his election, as is required by the Constitution. Later I shall present a resolution upon the subject.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, we do not object to Mr. BECK temporarily standing aside, but it is definitely understood that it in no way prejudices his position before this House. We maintain that no Member, not even the Speaker himself, has the power to deny the right to take the oath of office to a man who presents his credentials from the State from which he comes. With that understanding we are perfectly willing that he shall temporarily step aside.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] to temporarily step aside.

Mr. BECK stepped aside, and the oath of office was administered to the other Members elect from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I request the oath be now administered to the Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object, and offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is charged that JAMES M. BECK, a Representative elect to the Seventieth Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives for the reason that he was not at the time of his election an inhabitant of the State of Pennsylvania in the sense of the provision of the Constitution of the United States (par. 5 of sec. 2, Art. I) prescribing the qualifications for Members thereof; and whereas such charge is made through a Member of the House and on his responsibility as such Member, upon the basis, as he asserts, of records and papers evidencing such ineligibility:

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of JAMES M. BECK to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania of the Seventieth Congress, as well as of his final right to a seat therein as such Representative, be referred to Committee on Elections

No. 2; and until such committee shall report upon and the House decide such question and right, the said JAMES M. BECK shall not be sworn in nor be entitled to the privileges of the floor; and said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath relative to the subject matter of this resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the information which has come to me that led to this resolution is, of course, a matter that will require proof. The statement briefly is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was for long an inhabitant of New York, of New Jersey, and of the District of Columbia, having no residence of any kind or character in the State of Pennsylvania. That on the 6th of September last, or about that time, the gentleman registered in the city of Philadelphia; and that he at about that time caused himself to be assessed for some kind of taxes, he not having theretofore paid any taxes at that point; and at some time, the time being wholly indefinite, a lease was taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania upon an apartment in the city of Philadelphia, which apartment has been but seldom, if ever, occupied by him; that it is not in fact the place of his domicile or his residence; that he has not been and was not at the time of his election in November an inhabitant in a constitutional sense of the State from which elected. That is a matter which requires investigation by a committee in order that the privileges of the House as well as the rights of the district and the individual may be properly protected. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move the previous question upon the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Before the gentleman moves the previous question will he yield——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to debate this question at this time, because I fully appreciate that the real facts in the investigation must come before an Elections Committee, which is the proper procedure in the House. I simply desire at this time to say that there is no Elections Committee No. 2, and it would be better if his resolution were referred to one of the Elections Committees, and I also desire to ask the gentleman if he will not permit me to offer this substitute for his resolution, not that I want debate, but in order that vote may come upon a direct affirmative proposition. My resolution is simply that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] be now permitted to take the oath of office.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say I do not think I should yield to the gentleman to offer that substitute, because we can vote upon this resolution which I have offered without there being the necessity of even a preliminary investigation. The question of whether the gentleman is entitled to his seat, as the substitute implies, is a matter of doubt raised by the Constitution itself and can only be properly determined by an investigation, and therefore I can not yield for that purpose.

Now, just a word about the committee to which the gentleman from New York referred. I looked over the personnel of the Committees on Elections, assuming that they would be substantially as they have been, and the reason I selected Committee No. 2 was because there was no member upon that committee from the State of Pennsylvania. Rare, indeed, it is when you find any committee of importance in this House upon which there is not from one to three gentlemen from Pennsylvania as members. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a short statement of about two minutes?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with the same question that has arisen two or three times during my membership of the House. Some Member has arisen and questioned the right of another Member to take the oath of office. I maintain that in this preliminary stage of the proceedings that no man has that right. Every one of us with accredited credentials from the several States started on the same footing as far as the right to take the oath of office is concerned. Now let us see just what the actual facts are.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has presented uncontested credentials from the sovereign State of Pennsylvania, and no man denies that. That is all any Member has at the present time, and is all the Constitution requires up to this stage of the proceedings. If we had the time, I would like to have them read and placed in evidence before the House. I deny that any Member, or even the Speaker himself, has the power during the preliminary organization of this House, by a resolution such as the gentleman from Tennessee has read to us, to prevent any man from taking this oath. [Applause.] What few precedents I have been able to examine in the short time allowed since this matter has been called to my attention lead me to think that there has been no direct precedent up to this time for refusing the right to take the oath, and I see no reason why any Member of this House should desire to deprive the gentleman from Pennsylvania from exercising his accredited right, and I trust the motion for the previous question will be voted down. [Applause.]

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield for a brief statement.

Mr. BERGER. I would like to state that eight or nine years ago I presented a certificate of election duly signed by the secretary of state of Wisconsin, but I was not permitted to take my oath. This has happened to me twice. [Laughter.] I wish to add just one more word. This evidently is one of the chickens that has come home to roost. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNELL. The vote on the Republican side is against the previous question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is very fortunate for gentlemen on that side that the gentleman from New York is there to inform them. [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to order the previous question on the resolution presented by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of ordering the previous question on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 245, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—159

Abernethy	Cullen	Kindred	Pou
Allgood	Davey	Kunz	Prall
Almon	Davis	Kvale	Quayle
Arnold	Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Quin
Aswell	Dickstein	Lankford	Ragon
Auf der Heide	Douglass, Mass.	Larsen	Rainey
Ayres	Doyle	Lindsay	Rankin
Bankhead	Drewry	Linthicum	Rayburn
Bell	Edwards	Lowrey	Reed, Ark.
Black, N. Y.	Eslick	Lozier	Romjue
Black, Tex.	Evans, Mont.	Lyon	Rubey
Bland	Fisher	McClintic	Rutherford
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	McDuffie	Sanders, Tex.
Box	Fletcher	McKeown	Sandlin
Boylan	Fulbright	McReynolds	Shallenberger
Brand, Ga.	Gambrill	McSweeney	Sirovich
Briggs	Gardner, Ind.	Major, Ill.	Somers
Browning	Garner, Tex.	Major, Mo.	Spearing
Buchanan	Garrett, Ten.	Mansfield	Steagall
Bulwinkle	Garrett, Tex.	Martin, La.	Stedman
Busby	Goldsborough	Milligan	Steele
Byrns	Gregory	Mooney	Sullivan
Canfield	Green, Fla.	Moore, Ky.	Swank
Cannon	Greenwood	Moore, N. J.	Tarver
Carew	Hammer	Moorman	Taylor, Colo.
Carley	Harrison	Morehead	Tillman
Carss	Hastings	Morrow	Underwood
Cartwright	Hill, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Vinson, Ky.
Celler	Howard, Okla.	Norton, Nebr.	Ware
Chapman	Huddleston	Norton, N. J.	Weaver
Cochran, Mo.	Hull, Tenn.	O'Brien	Weller
Cohen	Igoe	O'Connell	White, Colo.
Collier	Jacobstein	O'Connor, La.	Williams, Mo.
Collins	Jeffers	O'Connor, N.Y.	Williams, Tex.
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Okla.	Oldfield	Wilson, La.
Connery	Johnson, Tex.	Oliver, Ala.	Wilson, Miss.
Corning	Jones	Oliver, N. Y.	Wingo
Cox	Kemp.	Palmisano	Woodrum
Crisp	Kent	Parks	Yon
Crosser	Kincheloe	Peery	

NAYS—245

Ackerman	Burtness	Deal	Fulmer
Adkins	Burton	Dempsey	Furlow
Aldrich	Bushong	Denison	Gallivan
Allen	Butler	Dickinson, Iowa	Garber
Andresen	Campbell	Dominick	Gasque
Andrew	Carter	Doughton	Gibson
Anthony	Chalmers	Douglas, Ariz	Gifford
Arentz	Chase	Doutrich	Gilbert
Bacharach	Chindblom	Dowell	Glynn
Bachmann	Christopherson	Dyer	Golder
Bacon	Clague	Eaton	Goodwin
Barbour	Clancy	Elliott	Green, Iowa
Beedy	Clarke	England	Griest
Beers	Cochran, Pa.	Englebright	Guyer
Begg	Cole, Iowa	Estep	Hadley
Berger	Colton	Evans, Calif.	Hale
Blanton	Connolly, Pa.	Faust	Hall, Ill.
Bohn	Cooper, Ohio	Fenn	Hall, Ind.
Bowles	Cooper, Wis.	Fish	Hall, N. Dak.
Bowman	Crail	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Hancock
Brand, Ohio	Cramton	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Hardy
Brigham	Crowther	Fort	Hare
Britten	Curry	Frear	Haugen
Browne	Dallinger	Freeman	Hawley
Buckbee	Darrow	French	Hersey
Burdick	Davenport	Frothingham	Hickey

Hoch	Luce	Ransley	Temple
Hoffman	McFadden	Rathbone	Thatcher
Hogg	McLaughlin	Reece	Thompson
Holaday	McLeod	Reed, N. Y.	Thurston
Hooper	McMillan	Reid, Ill.	Tilson
Hope	McSwain	Robinson, Iowa	Timberlake
Howard, Nebr.	MacGregor	Robsion, Ky.	Tinkham
Hudson	Maas	Rogers	Treadway
Hughes	Madden	Rowbottom	Tucker
Hull, Morton D.	Magrady	Sabath	Underhill
Hull, Wm. E.	Mapes	Sanders, N. Y.	Updike
Irwin	Martin, Mass.	Schafer	Vestal
James	Menges	Schneider	Vincent, Mich.
Jenkins	Merritt	Sears, Nebr.	Vinson, Ga.
Johnson, Ill.	Michaelson	Seger	Wainwright
Johnson, Ind.	Michener	Selvig	Warren
Johnson, Wash.	Miller	Shreve	Wason
Kading	Monast	Simmons	Watres
Kahn	Montague	Sinclair	Watson
Kearns	Moore, Ohio	Sinnott	Welch, Calif.
Kelly	Moore, Va.	Smith	Welsh, Pa.
Kendall	Morgan	Snell	White, Kans.
Kerr	Morin	Speaks	White, Me.
Ketcham	Murphy	Sproul, Ill.	Whittington
Kiess	Nelson, Me.	Stalker	Williams, Ill.
Knutson	Nelson, Wis.	Stobbs	Williamson
Kopp	Newton	Strong, Kans.	Winter
Korell	Niedringhaus	Strong, Pa.	Wolverton
LaGuardia	Palmer	Summers, Wash.	Wood
Lampert	Parker	Sumners, Tex.	Wurzbach
Langley	Peavey	Sweet	Wyant
Lea	Perkins	Swick	Yates
Leavitt	Porter	Swing	Zihlman
Leech	Pratt	Taber	
Lehlbach	Purnell	Tatgenhorst	
Letts	Ramseyer	Taylor, Tenn.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bowling

NOT VOTING—29

Beck, Pa.	Driver	Johnson, S. Dak.	Stevenson
Beck, Wis.	Foss	King	Strother
Boies	Free	Kurtz	Whitehead
Casey	Graham	Leatherwood	Woodruff
Cole, Md.	Griffin	Manlove	Wright
Combs	Hill, Ala.	Mead	
De Rouen	Houston	Sears, Fla.	
Drane	Hudspeth	Sproul, Kans.	

So the previous question was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Houston with Mr. Driver.
Mr. King with Mr. Whitehead.
Mr. Boies with Mr. Sears of Florida.
Mr. Strother with Mr. Combs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. LETTS, of the second district of the State of Iowa, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT JAMES M. BECK

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and move the previous question on the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers a substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BECK, be now permitted to take the oath of office.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the resolution as amended by the substitute.

The resolution was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Hall when the oath was administered to Representatives elect from the State of Illinois, and I would like to take the oath now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will administer the oath now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BECK, of the first district of the State of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRITTEN, of the ninth district of the State of Illinois, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT JAMES M. BECK

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 1

Resolved, That the right of JAMES M. BECK to a seat in the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress be referred to the Committee on Elections No. 2, which committee shall report thereon so soon as practicable, and said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath relative to the subject matter of this resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there are some whereases in the resolution that I do not care to have reported in connection with it because they are precisely the same as the whereases contained in the other resolution, but they should be printed in connection with the resolution.

The SPEAKER. They will be ordered printed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me a question of order should be interposed. Is this matter in order until the rules are adopted? There are no rules existing for the appointment of committees, therefore it seems to me that a question of order ought to be raised now rather than allow the matter to go by default and thereby establish a precedent.

I wish to say that I have no objection to a resolution providing for an investigation of any facts in connection with the right of this Member to retain his seat.

Mr. SNELL. And I suggest that the gentleman withhold his resolution and offer it later in the day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is immaterial to me when the matter is presented. Of course, in fact, there will be no committees to-day, but I do want to present the resolution.

Mr. TILSON. The rules will be adopted soon I hope, and then the gentleman can have a reference of his resolution to the proper committee when raised.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I may say again that the Committee on Elections No. 2 was selected simply because, upon glancing at the directory, I found there was no one from Pennsylvania a member of that committee in the past Congress.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will yield, I will state that there are in contemplation some changes in the committees of the House. This may possibly be one of those committees, though I do not think it will be. However, that is possible, so I suggest to the gentleman that he withhold his resolution until the rules are adopted and there is such a committee. Then it will be in order to consider his resolution.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me ask the gentleman from Connecticut is it not going to be possible to find one major committee of this House on which a Pennsylvanian will not have to go? [Laughter.]

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will have to consult the list of committees when they are appointed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman from Connecticut agree that as soon as the rule is adopted, the gentleman from Tennessee can be recognized and that the resolution may then be acted upon?

Mr. TILSON. Certainly; I agree to that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] withdraw the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I withhold the resolution.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 3

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 4

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 5

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF CLERK AND OTHER OFFICERS

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican caucus, I wish to announce to the House the election of Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON, of Connecticut, as majority leader for the Seventieth Congress. [Applause.]

I offer, Mr. Speaker, the following resolution for the election of officers of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 2

Resolved, That William Tyler Page, of the State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph G. Rogers, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Bert W. Kennedy, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Frank W. Collier, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Rev. James Shera Montgomery, of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I wish to announce that the caucus has selected FINIS J. GARRETT, of Tennessee, as minority leader for the Seventieth Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute for the resolution just offered by the gentleman from Oregon, and upon that I ask for a separation of the resolution just read in order that the name of Rev. James Shera Montgomery as Chaplain may be voted upon separately.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the resolution be so separated that the office of Chaplain may be voted on separately. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That South Trimble, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That C. R. Evans, of the State of Nevada, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph J. Sinnott, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; and

That F. E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the latter part of the resolution, with reference to the election of Chaplain.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The officers elected, mentioned in the resolution, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION OF THE SENATE

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 3

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives is assembled; that NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, a Representative from the State of Ohio, has been elected Speaker; that William Tyler Page, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk; and that the House is ready for business.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 4

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON; the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GREEN; and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, to serve on the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 5

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, a Representative from the State of Ohio, as Speaker and William Tyler Page, a citizen of the State of Maryland, as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 6

Resolved (until otherwise ordered), That Joseph J. Sinnott be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives and receive compensation at the rate of $2,500 per annum; that John O. Snyder be authorized to act as pair clerk and receive compensation at the rate of $2,500 per annum; that L. M. Overstreet be authorized to act as special messenger and assistant pair clerk and receive compensation at the rate of $2,500 per annum; that Truman Ward, Ralph E. Roberts, and Hunter Osborne be authorized to act as special messengers and receive each compensation at the rate of $2,500 per annum; such employees to be at all times under the control of the Speaker of the House and subject to change at any time by the House, as provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE RULES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 7, by Mr. SNELL

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives in force at the close of the Sixty-ninth Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress, with the following amendments:

1. Rule X, clause 4, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "23," so that as amended the clause shall read: "On the Judiciary, to consist of 23 members."
2. Rule X, clause 7, strike out "21" and insert "23."
3. Rule X, clause 17, strike out "17" and insert "21."
4. Rule X, clause 19, strike out entire clause.
5. Rule X, clause 22, strike out "15" and insert "21."
6. Rule X, clause 23, strike out "15" and insert "21."
7. Rule X, clause 24, strike out "14" and insert "21."
8. Rule X, clause 25, strike out "16" and insert "21."
9. Rule X, clause 26, strike out "15" and insert "21."
10. Rule X, clause 27, strike out "16" and insert "21."
11. Rule X, clause 28, strike out "15" and insert "21."
12. Rule X, clause 31, strike out "13" and insert "21."
13. Rule X, clause 33, strike out entire clause.
14. Rule X, clause 35, strike out "17" and insert "21."
15. Rule X, strike out clauses 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 45a, 46 and insert "On Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 21 members."
16. Rule X, clause 49, strike out entire clause.
17. Rule X, clause 50, strike out "17" and insert "21."
18. Rule X, clause 51, strike out entire clause.
19. Rule X, clause 51b, strike out entire clause.
20. Rule X, clause 54a, strike out "15" and insert "21."
21. Rule XI, clause 19, strike out entire clause.
22. Rule XI, clause 33, strike out entire clause.
23. Rule XI, clause 36, after the semicolon, line 12, strike out the balance of the section and insert "shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments."
24. Rule XI, strike out clauses 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 45a, 46.

25. Rule XI, clause 48, after the word "House," line 4, insert ", the ascertaining of the travel of Members of the House and the reporting the same to the Sergeant at Arms."

26. Rule XI, clause 49, strike out entire clause.

27. Rule XI, clause 51, strike out entire clause.

28. Rule XI, clause 51b, strike out entire clause.

29. Renumber clauses in Rules X and XI.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the first part of the resolution that was read at the desk needs no explanation at this time. It simply adopts the rules as they existed at the close of the Sixty-ninth Congress.

For several years there has been a good deal of discussion among Members about abolishing certain committees that have no real work to do in the House. During the latter part of the last session the Rules Committee considered this proposition for a considerable time, but we were unable at that time to make a definite arrangement or agreement. I will appreciate the fact that you can not do anything as radical as abolishing certain standing committees of the House, changing others, and creating new ones without practically a unanimous agreement. And in this case we have that, or at least as far as the Rules Committee is concerned. I think there is no one on either side but that will agree that it is foolish and ridiculous for us to carry from year to year 16 committees that have practically no work to do in connection with the work of the House and are only deadwood, used simply to furnish assignments to Members. The majority of the committees that we are abolishing have not met in several years and there is no probability that there will be any work for them in the immediate future.

Now, if I may have your attention, I will explain in detail what we are proposing to do at this time. We are abolishing the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic Committee, the Committee on Railways and Canals, the Committee on Woman Suffrage, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, and 11 expenditure committees and the Mileage Committee. We are creating in place of the 11 expenditure committees one expenditure committee of 21 members that will have jurisdiction of expenditures for all executive departments and do all the work the whole 11 could have done. This committee will be provided with a room, a clerk, and everything that is necessary to do certain work that is desired to be done in connection with the work of the Appropriations Committee, and also along other various lines.

It is also proposed to change the work done by the Mileage Committee to the Committee on Accounts. That committee has all of the equipment, clerks, and so forth, to do it without added expense.

Now we propose to increase the membership of the Interstate Commerce Committee from 21 to 23 members; the membership of the Judiciary Committee from 21 members to 23 members; the Committee on Civil Service from 13 members to 21 members; the Committee on Claims from 15 members to 21 members; the Committee on Flood Control from 15 members to 21 members; the Committee on Invalid Pensions from 15 members to 21 members; the Committee on Pensions from 15 members to 21 members; the Committee on War Claims from 15 members to 21 members; the Committee on Patents from 17 members to 21 members; the Committee on Labor from 15 members to 21 members; Immigration Committee from 17 members to 21 members; Committee on Education from 15 members to 21 members; Census Committee 15 members to 21 members; Committee on Territories from 15 members to 21 members.

As a general summing up of what we have done in regard to the total number of committee assignments in the House, we have eliminated 129 assignments, but of those 129 assignments there were 17 in the last Congress that never were filled, so that we are really eliminating only 112, and in lieu of those that we have eliminated we are creating 86 definite committee assignments—assignments on active working committees of the House. Therefore every Member who receives assignment under the present plan will be assigned to a committee that has something to do with the everyday work and progress of the House. Further, of the Members who are affected by this elimination of assignments 54 had over four or more committee assignments and there were 79 Members in the last Congress who had over four assignments.

Considerable thought and attention have been given to this, and we believe that these recommendations will tend toward more efficient work in the House, and certainly the new Members should be very much interested in this change, because it assures every one of them being appointed on some committee that has real, definite work to do.

I would be very glad to answer any questions that anyone cares to ask.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Do the Committees on Expenditures referred to by the gentleman cover the independent offices expenditure committee?

Mr. SNELL. It is intended to cover all of them.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. I am quite in sympathy with the effort to reduce the number of committees and to eliminate some that are useless, but one or two of those committees have some functions and are called upon occasionally to meet and take some action with reference to some bills introduced into the House. What will be the procedure with reference to the change of jurisdiction of these committees? Where will the jurisdiction be transferred?

Mr. SNELL. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Mileage is transferred to the Committee on Accounts. At the present time there is nothing definite in mind beyond what has already been taken care of.

Mr. LANHAM. I call to mind one committee which has had occasional meetings and which has had some business before it in the last few sessions of Congress. I refer to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions. While it is not anticipated that anything will arise with reference to that particular committee in the near future, yet something may. Should not the jurisdiction of that committee be transferred to the jurisdiction of some other committee of the House?

Mr. SNELL. That question has been discussed somewhat, and if in the future we find that there is need to transfer its jurisdiction to some other committee, that will be done.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. How have the committee assignments been divided with respect to the majority and minority committees—the 23 and the 21 Members?

Mr. SNELL. I suppose exactly the same as they always have been divided. The Committee on Rules has nothing to do with that; that is a matter for the Committee on Committees.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the committee given any attention to the consolidation of the Election Committees?

Mr. SNELL. Our original program was to consolidate them; but the one remaining chairman—that is, the chairman of Elections No. 1, that was not to be abolished—made such a good case for retaining all of them for them that we finally decided it was better to keep the whole three.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, if any such question arises as that suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the Speaker will always refer the bills to the committee which he believes has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bills. The Speaker can determine the question when the question is presented.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the reason for abolishing the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, of which I had the honor to be a member, based on the fact that the Committee on Rules is convinced that there is no more traffic in liquor?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know that we looked for any reason for abolishing it, for everyone knows it has nothing to do now.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Sixty-ninth Congress the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] introduced a rule to abolish the 11 committees on expenditures. That rule was pending before the Committee on Rules for two years. I congratulate the Committee on Rules and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] on finally adopting the suggestions made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] to abolish these 11 useless committees.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If I understood the gentleman correctly this committee has increased only two committees from 21 members—the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is there any specific reason why that was done?

Mr. SNELL. It is hard for me to give a specific reason, but I might say that we did it primarily because we were requested by our friends on the Democratic side of the House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York permit me to offer an amendment to his resolution?

Mr. SNELL. I do not believe that I could open this to amendment at the present time. If I did, there would be several others who would desire to offer amendments.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit me to state what I wish to propose?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is to strike out the words "Sixty-ninth," where they appear before the word "Congress," and insert the words "Sixty-eighth." Those rules were very highly complimented by the distinguished Speaker at the conclusion of that session.

Mr. SNELL. He is not entirely responsible for the rules, as you know. Mr. Speaker, this has been unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Rules; also the Committee on Accounts have done a great amount of work on this subject and are earnestly in favor of its adoption.

I am sure the whole proposition is in the interest of better efficiency in the House and will meet the whole-hearted approval of the American people.

I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 8

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. JOHN M. NELSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., OF MARYLAND

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., of the second Maryland district, would have been here to-day at the organization and have taken the oath of office had he not been ill at this time.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES M. BECK

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote now upon the privileged resolution which I have sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 9

Whereas it is charged that JAMES M. BECK, a Representative elect to the Seventieth Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives for the reason that he was not at the time of his election an inhabitant of the State of Pennsylvania in the sense of the provision of the Constitution of the United States (par. 5 of sec. 2, Art. I) prescribing the qualifications for Members thereof; and

Whereas such charge is made through a Member of the House, and on his responsibility as such Member, upon the basis, as he asserts, of records and papers evidencing such ineligibility:

Resolved, That the right of JAMES M. BECK to a seat in the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress be referred to the Committee on Elections No. 2, which committee shall report thereon so soon as practicable; and such committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath relative to the subject matter of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR COMMITTEES

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Cleark read as follows:

House Resolution 10

Resolved, That the standing committee of the House of Representatives and the floor leader and the chairman of the conference minority are hereby authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be actually necessary for the transaction of their official business during the Seventieth Congress.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE WALTER W. MAGEE

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 11

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WALTER W. MAGEE, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE LADISLAS LAZARO

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 12

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LADISLAS LAZARO, a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE M. E. CRUMPACKER

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 13

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. E. CRUMPACKER, a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM N. VAILE

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration for the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 14

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM N. VAILE, a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE HON. GORDON LEE

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, with genuine sorrow I announce to the House that on November 7 Hon. Gordon Lee, who for 22 years honored Georgia as a Member of this House, passed away at his home in Chickamauga, Ga.

Mr. Lee was one of nature's noblemen, and he loved his fellow man and in return was loved by all who knew him. For the last two years of his life he was practically bedridden; therefore he was not a candidate for reelection to the Seventieth Congress. During his long illness he was bright and cheerful and displayed his usual good fellowship, and was an inspiration to those friends who had the privilege of seeing him.

The citizens of the seventh congressional district always desired to honor him for they knew his worth and character, and they never withheld from him any honor he sought. During his life he served his people lovingly and faithfully, and like Cæsar of old his love for them was such that he remembered them in his will. It will undoubtedly interest you, his colleagues who knew and loved him, to know that Mr. Lee left practically his entire fortune of over a million dollars for the founding of a high school in Chickamauga, Ga., for the education of mountain boys and girls. Under the provisions of the will a trust fund was created for the purpose of lending money to them to enable them to obtain an education to equip themselves for citizenship. Thus, while his physical day of earthly usefulness is ended, his loving act will for many years to come go on. Verily, "The good men do lives after them."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LEATHERWOOD, by unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. COLTON), was granted leave of absence for five days on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect for our late deceased colleagues, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 6, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting detailed statement concerning the publications issued by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1927, required to be transmitted to Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

2. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill "To provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses"; to the Committee on the Census.

3. A letter from the secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting statement showing the typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4. A letter from the secretary of Hawaii, transmitting copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1927; to the Committee on the Territories.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the American Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of Adjutant General of the Army, dated September 28, 1927, relative to the financial and other affairs of the United States Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the Pacific branch thereof, situated on Alcatraz Island, Calif., and the Atlantic branch on Governors Island, N. Y., together with reports from the commandants of the barracks and its branches, all for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7. A letter from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting report of the Public Utilities Commission for the year ended December 31, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8. A letter from the Public Printer of the United States Government Printing Office, transmitting a statement showing the exchange of typewriters and adding machines during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting part 2 of the annual report of the Commissioner of Lighthouses for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report showing papers disposed of through the office of Public Buildings and Public Parks, as recommended in House Report No. 2300, Sixty-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

11. A letter from the secretary of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, transmitting report of the board for 1927; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

12. A letter from the vice chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting the first annual report of the Federal Radio Commission, covering the period, March 15 to June 30, 1927, in accordance with the law of the radio act of 1927; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

13. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting general rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, Steamboat Inspection Service, at the meeting of January, 1927, which regulations have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

14. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, advising that field officers of the Steamboat Inspection Service have reported the sale of useless papers listed in House Report No. 2300, Sixty-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

15. A letter from the chairman of the United States Board of Tax Appeals, transmitting an itemized statement of travel expenses incurred by officers and employees of the United States Board of Tax Appeals during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

16. A letter from the executive officer of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, transmitting specifications for superstructure of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, contract No. 16; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

17. A letter from the president of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting detailed classified statement of the expenditures made from the appropriation for contingent expenditures of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

18. A letter from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting statement of travel performed by the officers and employees of the United States Shipping Board during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

19. A letter from the Secretary of State, requesting permission to dispose of a lot of useless papers in the executive department under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," approved February 16, 1889; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

20. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 1860 of the Revised Statutes as amended"; to the Committee on the Territories.

21. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and the United States Marine Corps Reserve who were released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than their homes or places of enrollment"; to the Committee on Claims.

22. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To permit certain officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

23. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To extend commissary privileges to the widows of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps and also to diplomatic and consular officers at isolated foreign stations"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

24. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Miguel Pascual, a Spanish subject and resident of San Pedro de Macoris, Santo Domingo"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

25. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to class as secret or confidential certain material, apparatus, or equipment for military and naval use, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

26. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To enable an enlisted man in the naval service to make good time lost in excess of one day under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

27. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

28. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend an act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes,' approved July 12, 1921"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

29. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend the provision contained in the act approved August 29, 1916, relating to the assignment to duty of certain officers of the United States Navy as fleet and squadron engineers"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

30. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To authorize certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

31. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To authorize certain equipage, supplies, and materials to be sold to foreign governments"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

32. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To authorize the admission to naval hospitals of dependents of officers and enlisted men of the naval service in need of hospital care"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

33. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

34. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 6 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled, 'An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Re-

serve and a Marine Corps Reserve'"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

35. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend section 1571 of the Revised Statutes to permit officers of the Navy to count duty on airships as sea duty"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

36. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To repeal the provision in the act approved June 10, 1896, prohibiting the employment of officers of the Navy or Marine Corps on the active or retired list by persons or companies furnishing naval supplies or war material to the Government"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

37. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To enable electricians, radio electricians, chief electricians, and chief radio electricians to be appointed to the grade of ensign"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

38. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To facilitate the awards of contracts for the purchase of motor vehicles for the naval establishment"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

39. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

40. A letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting copy of a proposed bill for the relief of A. N. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting statement showing the number of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged by the Federal Trade Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

42. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting printed copy of the report of the First Pan Pacific Conference on Education, Rehabilitation, Reclamation, and Recreation, held at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, April 11 to 16, 1927; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

43. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from Dr. W. A. Warfield, surgeon in chief of Freedmen's Hospital, containing a statement of receipts and expenditures on account of pay patients received into the hospital during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

44. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from Dr. W. A. Warfield, surgeon in chief of Freedmen's Hospital, containing a detailed statement of the appropriation for salaries and other services for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

45. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, from the appropriation "Industrial work and care of timber, 1927"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

46. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, of money carried on the books of this department under the caption "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

47. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures for the purpose of encouraging industry and support among the Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

48. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior. transmitting detailed report of expenditures for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, from the appropriation "Industry among Indians, 1927"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

49. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

50. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

51. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplement and deficiency estimates of appropriations under the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1928 and for prior years in the sum of $1,150,246.85 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

52. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates for the payment of claims amounting to $166,604.75, allowed by the General Accounting Office, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

53. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates for the payment of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in the sum of $7,467,953.57, which have been submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury, and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

54. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property and for damages by collision with naval vessels, in the sum of $43,685.91, and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

55. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates for the payment of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts, in the sum of $237,325.30, as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

56. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property and damages by collision with naval vessels, in the sum of $37,299.88, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the several acts relating thereto, and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

57. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Executive office, departments, and establishments, for the fiscal year 1928, $187,375,587.39; and for prior fiscal years, $7,227,918.92; total, $194,603,506.31, together with proposed drafts of legislation affecting existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of the cost of all survey and allotment work on Indian reservations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

59. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed report of expenditures from the $100,000 authorized from the funds of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

60. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

61. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed report of expenditures from tribal funds of the Confederated Bands of Utes during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

62. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, for the construction of hospitals from the appropriation "Relieving distress and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, 1927"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

63. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, for the sum of $17,203.96, as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury, which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

64. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgment rendered against the Government by the United States district courts in special cases, for $71,587.30, as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury, and which require an appropriation (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

65. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting schedule covering certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, as shown by certificates of settlement transmitted to the Treasury Department for payment, in the sum of $3,955.42, and which requires an appropriation (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

66. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting list of judgments rendered by the Court of

Claims, which have been submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury for the sum of $655,526.76, and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

67. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts, under the public vessel act, as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury, for the sum of $26,651.94, and requires an appropriation (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

68. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting schedules of claims amounting to $1,094,609.95, allowed by various divisions of the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement, and which requires an appropriation (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

69. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

70. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of all moneys collected and deposited during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1927"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

71. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from Hon. W. R. Farrington, Governor of Hawaii, submitting for consideration a copy of Joint Resolution 4, passed by the Territory of Hawaii at its fourteenth biennial session and signed by the governor April 20, 1927, in relation to the claim of the Territory of Hawaii on behalf of the University of Hawaii for recognition by the Federal Government of its right to share in the benefits of certain acts of Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

72. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, dated September 12, 1927, in sextuplet a detailed report of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

73. A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

74. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing the receipts from rentals, extension of Capitol Grounds, for the period from December 1, 1926, to May 1, 1927, aggregating $1,812.50; also a list of all the reports that have been made to Congress under this activity as well as the total amount of money received up to April 30, 1927; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

75. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, showing exchanges made by this department and its several bureaus and offices of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices in part payment for new machines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

76. A letter from the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting tabulated statement showing the paper and printing cost and the total cost of all publications issued by the United States Veterans' Bureau during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

77. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend the act entitled 'An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service'"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

78. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Luc Mathias"; to the Committee on Claims.

79. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

80. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To provide for date of precedence of certain officers of the staff corps of the Navy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

81. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statements showing exchanges made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices by the Navy Department and Naval Establishment, including the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

82. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the Navy Department traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

83. A letter from Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, transmitting report of travel performed by the employees of the office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

84. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees (other than special agents, inspectors, or employees who in the discharge of their official duties are required to constantly travel) have traveled on official business for the department from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

85. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of the fiscal affairs of all Indian tribes for whose benefit expenditures from public or tribal funds were made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

86. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, relating to the appropriation "Indian schools, support, 1927"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

87. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting reports for the fiscal year 1927, showing the amounts expended at each Indian school and agency from the appropriations for construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

88. A letter from the chairman of the United States Board of Mediation, transmitting copy of the first annual report of the Board of Mediation, 1927; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

89. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend section 357 of the penal code of the Canal Zone, regarding joy riding"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

90. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on survey of Waccamaw River, between Conway and Red Bluff, S. C. (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

91. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting detailed statement showing the aggregate number of publications issued during the fiscal year 1927, the number distributed, the cost of paper used for such publications, the cost of printing, and the cost of preparation; to the Committee on Printing.

92. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

93. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To authorize the appraisal of certain Government property, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

94. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, recommending that on the first day of each regular session of Congress the head of each department shall submit a written report to Congress giving the number of the various publications it has issued during the preceding year; also the cost of paper used for such publications, the cost of printing, the cost of preparation of each publication, and the number of each which has been distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

95. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept such decorations, orders, and medals as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

96. A letter from the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting various reports as to the administration of the United States Veterans' Bureau during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

97. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting report of a special contract entered into with the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad for carrying the mails on its road on route No. 102891, between Hudson Terminal Station, New York, N. Y., and Journal Square, Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

98. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement of appropriations, expenditures, and balances unexpended on account of the Postal Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

99. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report of the public property in the Post Office Department on December 1, 1927; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

100. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting list of claims on account of loss by fire, burglary, etc., acted upon by the Postmaster General from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

101. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, the destination, business, and total expense to the United States charged in each case; to the Committee on Appropriations.

102. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting statement showing the required information regarding typewriters and adding machines exchanged by the Post Office Department during the period from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

103. A letter from the quartermaster general of the Spanish War Veterans, transmitting proceedings of the Twenty-ninth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held at Detroit, Mich., August 28 to 31, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

104. A letter from the vice chairman national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the Ninth National Convention of the American Legion, held at Paris, France, September 19 to 22, 1927, and at New York City October 18, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

105. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting original copy of a report with related papers of the board designated to appraise damages on the Yuma project as a result of the flood of August 2, 1926; to the Committee on Claims.

106. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting schedule showing the exchange of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor devices in part payment for new machines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

107. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, explaining the distribution to the several State highway departments for use in road building surplus war materials approximating $224,800,000 in value; also a surplus approximating $27,000,000 in value has been transferred to Government agencies, and explosives to the value of $8,700,000 have been distributed to farmers for land clearing; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

108. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting list of reports to be made to Congress by public officers during the Seventieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

109. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting report for the period from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensation, including clerks to Members; the expenditure from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; the amounts drawn from the Treasury; the stationery accounts, and unexpended balances (H. Doc. No. 2); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

110. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed statement embodying the number of documents received and distributed during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

111. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed statement embodying the aggregate number of the various publications issued during the fiscal year 1927, the cost of paper used for such publications, the cost of printing, cost of preparation of copy, and the number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

112. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two tables showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects as compiled to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

113. A letter from the Librarian of the Library of Congress, transmitting the number of publications issued by the Library of Congress during the fiscal year 1926–27, the cost of paper used, the cost of printing, the cost of preparation, and the number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

114. A letter from the Librarian of the Library of Congress, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees of the Library of Congress have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

115. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting statement of travel performed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, by officers and employees of the Department of Labor (other than those who in the discharge of their regular duties to constantly travel) on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

116. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting detailed statement of the expenditures from the appropriations "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor, 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor.

117. A letter from the president of National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting report of the Board of Directors of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

118. A letter from the chairman of United States Shipping Board, transmitting annual report of the United States Shipping Board covering the period July 1, 1926, to and including June 30, 1927; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

119. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an itemized statement of expenditures made by this department and charged to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1927," fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

120. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting estimate of receipts of Indian tribal funds, expenditures recommended therefrom for the benefit of Indians, and amounts required to be expended under treaty stipulations and agreements in support of the estimates for the Indian Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior.

121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1927, with recommendations for legislation deemed necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning other matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

122. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report showing the expenditures of that agency during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, from the "Appropriation for the support and civilization of Indians"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of papers or documents now in the files of the General Accounting Office not needed for the transaction of public business and without permanent value or historic interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

124. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement concerning disposition of War Department surplus property during the period November 16, 1926, to November 15, 1927, inclusive; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

125. A letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting annual report of the United States Tariff Commission (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

126. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of the number of publications ordered, received, and distributed by the General Accounting Office during the fiscal year 1927, and the cost thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

127. A letter from the chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement of moneys appropriated for the valuation of carriers and expenditures thereunder to December 1, 1927, for the fiscal years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce.

128. A letter from the chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement of labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

129. A letter from the chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the travel expenses of all officials and employees who have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

130. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1927, together with the appendix thereto; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

131. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting various reports of the Department of Agriculture covering the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

132. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of the disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, made in the States and Territories of the increase in the annual appropriation for the colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

133. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of the General Accounting Office showing the number of typewriters, bookkeeping machines, and calculating machines exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

134. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the General Accounting Office traveled outside the District of Columbia on official business during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

135. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting photostat copies of 2 general reports and 34 separate reports made by an inspector on the 36 entries affected by the act; also copies of the statements and affidavits submitted by 19 entrymen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 2) to promote, encourage, and develop an American merchant marine in connection with the agricultural and industrial commerce of the United States, provide for the national defense, the transportation of foreign mails, the establishment of a merchant marine training school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4) to incorporate the Federal reserve retirement fund, to define its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLGOOD: A bill (H. R. 5) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in Marshall County, Ala., at or near Guntersville; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6) to prohibit the importation of jute and products made or manufactured from jute into the United States or any of its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 7) to create a department of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 8) providing for the examination and survey of the Minnesota River, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9) to amend sections 11 and 12 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10) to repeal the act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 11) to protect trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 12) to amend section 7 of the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13) to amend sections 401, 507, 601, and 603 of the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14) granting pensions to certain blind children over the age of 16 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 15) authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the provisions of the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 655), to make additions to the Absaroka and Gallatin National Forests, and to improve and extend the winter feed facilities of the elk, antelope, and other game animals of Yellowstone National Park and adjacent land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16) to regulate the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 17) to revise the boundary of the Yellowstone National Park in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 18) to permit the granting of Federal aid in respect of certain roads and highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) to regulate interstate commerce by motor vehicles operating as common carriers of persons on the public highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20) to prevent the use of the United States mails and other agencies of interstate commerce for transporting and for promoting or procuring the sale of securities contrary to the laws of the States, and for other purposes, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 21) to provide for date of precedence of certain officers of the staff corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 22) for the protection and control of anadromous and shore fishes and other aquatic forms of any State or Territory, and authorizing the Department of Commerce to define the seasons and regulate the manner and conditions under which they may be taken or destroyed; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Wildwood, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 25) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and the acts in amendment thereof, approved July 3, 1926; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 26) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Pleasantville, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 27) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress amongst the several States under the Fourteenth Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 28) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29) to amend section 4826 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 30) to suspend all immigration to the United States until January 1, 1935; to deport certain aliens who withdrew their declaration to become citizens to evade military service during the World War; to provide for the registration and Americanization of all aliens lawfully within the United States; to permit emergency farm and ranch labor to be imported from Canada and Mexico for temporary periods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 31) to amend certain laws of the District of Columbia, to provide a complete code of insurance laws regulating all kinds and forms of insurance business of every nature whatsoever now and hereafter to be transacted in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 32) for the erection of a public building at the city of Alturas, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) for the erection of a public building at the city of Jackson, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 34) for the erection of a public building at the city of Angels Camp, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 35) for the erection of a public building at the city of Quincy, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 36) for the erection of a public building at the city of Susanville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 37) for the erection of a building at the city of Nevada, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 38) for the erection of a public building at the city of Yreka, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 39) to establish a national military park at Middlebrook Heights, near Bound Brook, N. J., commemorating the spot where George Washington was in camp at the time of the adoption of the United States flag by Congress, June 14, 1777; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 40) authorizing the erection of a sanitary, fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Dayton, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 41) to add certain lands to the Idaho National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 42) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 43) to amend the act entitled "An act to standardize lime barrels," approved August 23, 1916; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 44) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with Air Nitrates Corporation and American Cyanamid Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 45) to eliminate the renewal of the oath of office of Government employees under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 46) fixing the rates of assessment for laying or constructing water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 47) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," approved March 4, 1923, and the act amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 48) to erect a tablet or a marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 49) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia in relation to descent and distribution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 50) to amend the first paragraph of section 29, title 2, chapter 85, of the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, found in volume 41, part 1, page 361 of the United States Statutes at Large, relating to punishment for the illegal manufacture and sale of liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 51) to regulate the admissibility of evidence in certain actions in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 52) to regulate the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases and to improve the administration of justice in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 53) to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 54) to authorize a maximum balance of $5,000 to the credit of any one person in a postal savings depository, by amending section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1918 (40 Stat. L. 754); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 55) authorizing the Postmaster General to pay the actual and necessary expenses for moving the household goods of officers and regular clerks in the Railway Mail Service when arbitrarily transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 56) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue receipts to senders for ordinary mail of any character, domestic or international, and to fix the fees chargeable therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 57) to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 58) to authorize the assignment of railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks to temporary employment as substitute sea post clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 59) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 60) to enable the Postmaster General to purchase and erect community mail boxes on rural routes and to rent compartments of such boxes to patrons of rural delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 61) to establish fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the States of Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Illinois, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Oklahoma, Texas, South Carolina, Massachusetts and Washington; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 62) to establish a fish-cultural station on Long Island Sound at Montauk Point; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 63) to create a negro industrial commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 64) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish a firing squad to fire the customary salute for any ex-service man; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 65) to establish a Federal farm board in the Department of Agriculture to aid the industry of agriculture to organize effectively for the orderly marketing and for the control and disposition of the surplus of agriculture commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 66) granting the consent of Congress to B. L. Hendrix, G. C. Trammel, and C. S. Miller, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 67) for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the sixth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 68) to provide for the disposition of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 69) authorizing the establishment of migratory-bird refuge at Bear River Bay, Great Salt Lake, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 70) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to execute an agreement with the middle Rio Grande conservancy district providing for conservation, irrigation, drainage, and flood control for the Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 71) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 72) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain

soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 73) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 74) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Lancaster and York, in the State of Pennsylvania, to jointly construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the Borough of Wrightville in York County, Pa., and the Borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 75) to authorize the construction of buildings for post-office purposes in any town or city with $5,000 or more annual postal receipts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 76) to reduce the parcel-post rate on certain farm products under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 77) to create a farmers' finance corporation, provide a system of loans on farm products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 78) to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 79) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment in the sale of food and food products of the farm directly from producer to consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 80) to prevent the handling in the United States mail or interstate commerce of any newspaper, magazine, or periodical which contains the name of a girl or woman as the individual upon which it is alleged or contended was committed a rape or an assault with an attempt to rape; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 81) to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands by Capt. James Cook, and for the purpose of aiding in establishing a Capt. James Cook memorial collection in the archives of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) to amend the Hawaiian homes commission act, 1920, approved July 9, 1921, as amended by the act of February 3, 1923; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 83) to approve Act No. 24 of the session laws of 1927 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within Hanapepe, in the district of Waimea, island and county of Kauai; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 84) to approve Act 25 of the session laws of 1927 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within Waimea and Kekaha, in the district of Waimea, on the island and in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 85) to extend the provisions of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 86) authorizing the sale of surplus War Department real estate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 87) to amend section 2 of the pension act approved July 3, 1926, so as to increase the pensions of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 88) to reduce night work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 89) to declare the future policy of the Post Office establishment of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 90) to transfer to the classified civil service postmasters in charge of the post offices of the first, second, and third class; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 91) to provide that the principal officer of each executive department shall attend certain sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 92) to authorize the President to deal with a national emergency in the mining of anthracite and bituminous coal by appointment of temporary board or boards and fuel administrator; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails by airplanes to foreign countries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 94) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of Congress approved May 16, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) to supplement and amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary" (act of March 3, 1911, ch. 231), and known as the Judicial Code, and to limit the jurisdiction of district and circuit courts in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 96) to prohibit the transportation, sale, and reception of stolen property in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 97) to provide adequate compensation and treatment for veterans having a tubercular disease; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 98) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 99) providing a trial by jury for acts constituting contempt of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 100) authorizing an appropriation for a road to the Point Reyes Lighthouse station, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 101) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 102) to amend the merchant marine act of 1920, approved June 5, 1920, by insuring the exemption from income taxes during the 10-year period there provided of profits on the sale of certain vessels when the proceeds of such sales are invested in new American vessels approved by the Shipping Board; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 103) to amend an act approved February 8, 1895, regulating the navigation of all public and private vessels of the United States upon the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 104) providing for the calling of adverse parties for cross-examination in action at law or equity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 105) to require the labeling of flour in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 106) to amend the United States grain standards act by inserting a new section providing for licensing and establishing laboratories for making determinations of protein in wheat and oil in flax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 107) to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 108) granting the consent of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River of the North; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 109) requiring all pensioners to reside within the territorial limits of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 110) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Fourteenth Census, reducing the number from 435 to 300; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 111) to limit mileage to actual expenses; to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 112) to prevent breaches of the public peace in the District of Columbia caused by picketing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 113) to return to the South certain of the "cotton tax" wrongfully collected from citizens of the South during the period from 1863 to 1868 by paying to each living Confederate soldier and each living widow of a Confederate soldier, as proper representatives of the South, the sum of $1,000 and a further sum of $50 per month during the remainder of their lives, and authorizing the appropriation of money therefor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) to safeguard the transmission of interstate traffic and United States mails, to punish unlawful conspiracies, to protect citizens in their rights to labor and to punish unlawful interference therewith, and to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States, and to prohibit the use of mails in furtherance

of such acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 115) amending the act of February 28, 1925, reclassifying the salaries of postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 116) to divide the northern judicial district of the State of California into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 117) to modify the project for the control of floods in the Sacramento River, Calif., adopted by section 2 of the act approved March 1, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) for the erection of a public building at Vallejo, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 119) for the erection of a public building at Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) for the erection of a public building at Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 121) granting the consent of Congress to the Cairo and Kentucky Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 122) to amend the immigration act of 1924 by the repeal of the national-origin method of establishing immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 123) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington Road in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 124) to stabilize the buying power of money; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESTEP: A bill (H. R. 125) to adjust the salaries of criers and bailiffs of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 126) to add certain lands to the Missoula National Forest, Mont.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 127) to add certain lands to the Blackfeet National Forest in Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) to add certain lands to the Kootenai National Forest in Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) amending section 11 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, providing for the construction of primary or interstate highways in certain public-land States, and also amending paragraph 4, section 4, of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," and prescribing limitations on the payment of Federal funds in the construction of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 130) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 131) creating the District of Columbia insurance fund for the benefit of employees injured and the dependents of employees killed in employment, providing for the administration of such fund by the United States Employees Compensation Commission, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) authorizing the erection of a sanitary fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Dayton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 133) amending so much of the sundry civil act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 730), as relates to dispositions of moneys belonging to the deceased inmates of St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) to provide compensation for members of the civilian military training camps who are injured in line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 135) to provide for the enlargement of the Federal building at Hamilton, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) to relieve persons in the military and naval services of the United States during the war emergency period from claims for overpayment at that time not involving fraud; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) to require national banks to maintain armed guards for the prevention of robberies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) to carry out the provisions of Article I of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 139) to amend section 149 of title 26 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) to establish a division for the investigation of handicapped children in the schools; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 141) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and Army nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 142) to add certain lands to the Idaho National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 143) to establish fish hatcheries within the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 144) to add certain lands to the Challis and Sawtooth National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 145) to prevent deceit and unfair prices that result from the unrevealed presence of substitutes for virgin wool in woven fabrics purporting to contain wool and in garments or articles of apparel made therefrom, manufactured in any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 146) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 147) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 148) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 150) to provide for the enforcement of laws upon Indian reservations and superintendencies; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 151) to enlarge the fish-cultural station at Orangeburg, S. C.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 152) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, land in the city of St. Matthews, S. C., as may be necessary for a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building in said city, to cause said building to be erected, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 153) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land in the city of Sumter, S. C., as may be necessary for the extension and remodeling of the post-office building of said city, to cause said building to be extended and remodeled, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 154) to amend and reenact section 105, chapter 5, of the Judicial Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 155) to regulate interstate shipments of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 156) to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 157) to provide for the widening of the present Defence Highway from Bladensburg, Md., to Parole, Md.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 158) to amend chapter 137 of volume 39 of the United States Statutes at Large, Sixty-

fourth Congress, first session; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 159) to amend and supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 160) to authorize the erection in South Bend, Ind., of a statue of Schuyler Colfox; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 161) to provide for agricultural and horticultural experimentation and demonstration on restricted or trust allotted and inherited lands of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 162) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 163) to repeal the excise tax on automobiles and motor cycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 164) to authorize appropriations for construction at the Pacific Branch, Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 165) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 166) to provide for the reduction of immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 167) to amend the act of February 12, 1925 (Public, No. 402, 68th Cong.), so as to permit the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians to file suit in the Court of Claims under said act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 168) to define and delimit American citizenship and nationality, to establish a uniform system for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vehicles used in violation of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) to provide for the care of certain insane citizens of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 171) to provide for the revenue of the Government and to protect and maintain the cedar-shingle industry of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 172) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant and convey to the city of Vancouver a perpetual easement for public highway purposes over and upon a portion of the Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 173) to provide funds for the upkeep of the Puyallup Indian cemetery at Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 174) releasing and granting to the State of Washington any right, title, and interest of the United States in an island near the mouth of the Columbia River, commonly known as Sand Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 175) granting increase of pensions to certain widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINDRED: A bill (H. R. 176) to provide for handling and rate of pay for storage of closed-pouch mail on express cars, baggage cars, and express-baggage cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 177) to establish a laboratory for the study of the abnormal classes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 178) to promote temperance in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 179) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 180) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish a firing squad to fire the customary salute for any ex-service man; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 181) to provide for regulating traffic in certain clinical thermometers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 182) to create a national police bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 183) to establish a fish-cultural station in Lake of the Woods, Minn.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 184) providing for the appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in Samoa; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 185) to amend the revenue act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 186) authorizing the Pillager Bands of Chippewa Indians residing in the State of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 187) to withdraw and reserve certain lands for the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 188) to set aside certain lands for the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indain Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 189) to authorize an investigation of the annuity or membership rolls of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota for the purpose of purifying said rolls; to the Committe on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 190) to provide for more expeditious settlement of money claims against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 191) to authorize the appropriation of not more than $375,000 for the payment of drainage charges due on the public lands within the counties of Beltrami, Koochiching, and Lake of the Woods, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 192) authorizing the disposition of certain lands in Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Morrison, State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the southeast corner of lot 3, section 34, township 41 north, range 32 west; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 195) prohibiting the use of the words "Army" or "Navy," or both, in the name of a store or company engaged in mercantile business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 196) to extend the benefits of certain pension laws to the officers, sailors, and marines on board the U. S. S. *Maine* when that vessel was wrecked in the harbor of Habana February 15, 1898, and to their widows and dependent relatives; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) accepting the cession to the United States of certain of the Samoan Islands and to provide for a temporary government therefor; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 198) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wadena, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Monticello, on trunk highway No. 25; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 200) creating the District of Columbia insurance fund for the benefit of the employees injured and the dependents of the employees killed in employment, providing for the administration of such fund by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 201) permitting landowners who have suffered damages on account of prosecution and maintenance of the improvement of the Wisconsin and Fox Rivers, in the State of Wisconsin, to institute action in the Court of Claims or the United States district court for the recovery of such damages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 202) granting officers of the United States Navy permission to accept medals from Republic of Ecuador; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 203) authorizing the payment of claims of men of the Army and Marine Corps while in training for commissions in the combatant branches of the Army and Marine Corps, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 204) to authorize an additional appropriation for Fort McHenry, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 205) to provide for an examination and survey of the harbor of Baltimore and the entrance channel thereto through the Chesapeake Bay and Patapsco River, with a view to deepening the same to a depth of 40 feet; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) to make "The Star-Spangled Banner" the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 207) relating to the quality of domestic anthracite coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 208) to amend the second paragraph of section 4 of the Federal farm loan act, as amended, extending the provisions of the act to the Virgin Islands of the United States and the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 209) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) authorizing a national referendum on the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) to amend and supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) to amend section 4 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 213) to abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 214) to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States and to prohibit the use of the mails for the purpose of promoting such acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) to prohibit the prosecution under laws of the United States of a person for an act in respect of which he has previously been put in jeopardy under State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) to prohibit the admission of evidence obtained by unreasonable search and seizure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 217) to provide governmental aid in commercializing aviation in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 218) declaring armistice day to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 219) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cameron, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 220) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Richmond, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 221) for the erection of a public building at Russellville, Logan County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 222) for the erection of a public building at Scottsville, Allen County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) for the erection of a public building at Franklin, Simpson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) for the erection of a public building at Central City, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 225) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 226) to amend section 12 of the Federal farm loan act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 227) to regulate the appointment and duties of the superintendent of the Antietam battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) to prohibit a railroad upon any right of way leading to a national cemetery and to limit repairs to roadways leading to national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) to authorize the erection of monuments or memorials to commemorate the encampments of Spanish War organizations at Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) to authorize an appropriation for the recovery of bodies of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 231) to authorize the Secretary of War to withhold pay or allowances of any person in the military service to cover indebtedness due the United States or its military agencies, or instrumentalities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 232) to amend the act of June 7, 1924, prescribing the persons entitled to the benefits of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and the method of their admission thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 233) to provide for the purchase of land in connection with the Fort Monmouth Military Reservation, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 234) to amend section 47d of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize an allowance of 1 cent a mile for subsistence of candidates in going to and returning from camp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) to authorize the payment of travel expenses from appropriations for investigations and surveys of battle fields; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 236) to amend section 12 of the act approved June 10, 1922, entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," as amended by the act of June 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 680), so as to authorize an allowance of 3 cents per mile, in lieu of transportation in kind, for persons using privately owned conveyances while traveling under competent orders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 237) to authorize the collection in monthly installments of indebtedness due the United States from enlisted men, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct," approved December 17, 1919, so as to include nurses of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 239) to amend section 110 of the national defense act by repealing and striking therefrom certain provisions prescribing additional qualifications for the National Guard State staff officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 240) to amend the act approved June 1, 1926 (44 Stat. L. p. 680), authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange deteriorated and unserviceable ammunition and components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) to amend section 2 of the act approved June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 470), entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 242) to amend section 90 of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize employment of additional civilian caretakers for the National Guard organizations, under certain circumstances, in lieu of enlisted caretakers heretofore authorized; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 243) to amend the second paragraph of section 5 of the national defense act, as amended by the act of September 22, 1922, by adding thereto a provision that will authorize the names of certain graduates of the general service schools and of the Army War College, not at present eligible for selection to the General Staff Corps eligible list, to be added to that list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 244) to enable members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who have interrupted the course of training prescribed in the act of June 4, 1920, to resume such training, and amending accordingly section 47c of that act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 245) to continue the establishment of a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 246) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer or loan aeronautical equipment to museums and educational institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 247) to authorize the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy to class as secret certain material, apparatus, or equipment for military and naval use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 248) to authorize appropriations to be made for the disposition of remains of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 249) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act; section 7 (sec. 602, subsec. C) of such act as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 251) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 252) to amend the Judicial Code, being the act approved March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to modify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," by inserting therein a new section, to be numbered 24a, in relation to the original jurisdiction of district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 253) to amend an act entitled "An act to modify, revise, and amend the laws relating to naturalization, being the act of June 29, 1906"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 254) to amend an act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 255) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the war with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 256) to amend an act entitled "An act to modify, revise, and amend the law relating to naturalization, being the act of June 29, 1906"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 257) to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 258) granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 259) granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 260) granting holidays to postal employees in States where holidays are a State law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 261) granting hospital treatment to postal employees suffering from tuberculosis, nervous diseases, or kindred occupational ailments in Government-owned hospitals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 262) to create a board of industrial adjustments and to define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) to promote temperance in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 264) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the section of the Borough of Queens, city of New York, N. Y., known and designated as South Ozone Park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 265) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the section of the Borough of Queens, city of New York, N. Y., known and designated as Woodhaven; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 266) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the section of the Borough of Queens, city of New York, N. Y., known and designated as Richmond Hill; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 267) to permit rural letter carriers to act as agents or solicitors or engage in any other gainful occupation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 268) defining cooperative nonprofit life benefit associations, with representative form of government, providing the terms on which such associations may do business in the District of Columbia, providing for the incorporation of such associations, providing for manner of taxation, suits, and service of process, regulation and control of the business of such associations doing business in said District, and providing the conditions under which such foreign associations may become incorporated in said District, and providing how such associations otherwise qualified may become legal reserve life-insurance companies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 269) relating to labor of certain watchmen and building guards; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) to amend section 200 of the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 271) amending Title II, section 1, of the national prohibition act by permitting the manufacture, production, use, sale, and transportation for beverage and other purposes of beer and wine with such alcoholic content by volume as is nonintoxicating in fact in such States as shall so determine by referendum vote of the people, with certain provisos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 274) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 275) to create a board of industrial adjustments and to define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 276) relating to the sinking fund for bonds and notes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 277) for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the sixth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 278) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 279) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 280) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 281) to provide for the disposition of abandoned lighthouse, life-saving, and Coast Guard reservations in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 282) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Greater Daytona Beach, Volusia County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 283) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Fort Pierce, St. Lucie County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 284) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 285) providing for a site and erection thereon of a Federal building at Jacksonville, Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 286) to provide for the disposition of abandoned military reservations in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 287) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Florida at or in vicinity of Lake Worth Inlet; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 288) for the erection of a Federal building at Key West, Monroe County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 289) for the erection of a Federal building at Kissimmee, Osceola County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 290) providing for a site and public building for a post office at West Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 291) for the erection of a Federal building at St. Augustine, St. Johns County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 292) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes," approved May 26, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Detroit Lakes, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 294) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Thief River Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 295) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Hallock, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 296) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Noyes, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 297) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Warroad, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 298) to establish the Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 299) to establish the Killdeer Mountain National Park in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 300) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act of December 11, 1919, amending the act of March 26, 1908, entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public land laws"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 301) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to investigate and report to Congress a general system for the cooperative marketing of all farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) to amend the United States grain standards act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 303) to promote and encourage agriculture by divesting grains of their interstate character in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make protein tests of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 305) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 306) to provide for the protection and development of the Umatilla Rapids in the Columbia River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 307) to provide for the construction of the Deschutes project in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 308) authorizing an appropriation for the survey and investigation of the placing of water on the Michaud division and other lands in Fort Hall Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 310) authorizing an addition to the Cache National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 311) to provide for the extension of the Federal building at Pocatello, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) to provide for the enlargement of the Federal building at Boise, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KVALE: A bill (H. R. 313) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 314) to abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) to assist by loans any person holding an honorable discharge from the military forces of the United States of America during the period of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) to amend sections 11 and 12 of an act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes, approved May 26, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 317) to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of pamphlets containing a biographical sketch of George Washington; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 318) providing for the issuance of patent to Fred Seeds for lots 182, 183, and 202, town site of Heyburn, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 319) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 320) providing for the conveyance of land embraced in the Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho, to the United States Veterans' Bureau, and to the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 321) granting consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 322) to establish a Federal jail and penitentiary within the first or second judicial circuit of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 323) to provide for the reincorporation of the Delta Alpha Sorority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) to amend an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 325) repealing existing law requiring the Postmaster General to report action taken on claims of postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 326) authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for group life insurance for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 327) for the establishment of a land district in southeastern Alaska, and for the appointment of a register and receiver of a land office at Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 328) to relieve the Territory of Alaska from the necessity of filing bonds or security in legal proceedings in which such Territory is interested; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) to provide for the election of the Governor of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) to amend the organic act of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) to extend the operation of the laws of the United States relating to the development and disposition of minerals to lands on Annette Island, Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 332) validating homestead entry of Englehard Sperstad for certain public land in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) authorizing the sale of certain lands near Seward, Alaska, for use in connection with the Jesse Lee Home; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 334) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire a herd of musk oxen for introduction into Alaska, for experimentation with a view to their domestication and utilization in the Territory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 335) to amend the Alaska game law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 336) authorizing the Postmaster General to establish a uniform system of registration of mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) to increase tariff duties on certain salted and dried fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) to amend section 8 of chapter 3547, Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large, part 1, entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," approved June 26, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) to increase the effectiveness of expenditures for roads, bridges, and trails in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 340) to authorize the incorporated town of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of an additional school building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 341) to authorize appeals in all criminal proceedings in Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) to fix the salaries of United States marshals in Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) to amend section 128, subdivision (b), paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code as amended February 13, 1925, relating to appeals from district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 344) to provide that the United States of America shall build warehouses in conjunction

with the several States, and in cooperation with duly and legally organized farmers' cooperative associations in said States, for the storage of farm products not perishable, for the insurance of said products while in storage, for Government loans on warehouse receipts, providing penalties for the violation of this act, making an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 345) to amend the act of May 27, 1908, entitled "An act for the removal of restrictions upon part of the lands of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes" (35 Stat. 312); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 346) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to examine a certain Senate report on Indian traders and to take certain action in respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 347) to amend section 205 of the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 348) to pension Confederate soldiers and sailors and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 349) to supplement the naturaliaztion laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 350) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 351) to prohibit the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails; to the Committe on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 352) to establish a national conservatory of music for the education of pupils in music in all of its branches, vocal and instrumental, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 353) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homestead, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 354) to provide for the establishment of a dairy experiment and demonstration station at Wichita Falls, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 355) to provide for aided and directed settlement on Government land in irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 356) to amend section 2 of the act of March 3, 1905, entitled "An act to ratify and amend an agreement with the Indians residing on the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, and to make appropriations to carry the same into effect"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 357) authorizing an appropriation to be expended under the provisions of section 7 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 358) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 359) authorizing the presentation of the iron gates in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of State, War, and Navy Building and the White House to the Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society for the Memorial Gateways into the Spiegel Grove State Park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 360) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to compensate veterans of the Civil War for time served in Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 361) to prevent fraudulent transactions respecting real estate; to create a real estate commission for the District of Columbia; to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers and real-estate salesmen; to provide a penalty for a violation of the provisions hereof; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 362) to transfer the United States park police force to the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, to confer additional functions upon the Metropolitan police, and to repeal the provision of law requiring street-railway companies to pay the salaries of certain policemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 363) to amend section 5197, Revised Statutes of the United States, regulating the rate of interest which may be charged by national banking associations and providing a penalty for violations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 364) to increase the pay of the officers and members of the fire department, and of the Metropolitan police department, of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 365) to extend the same rates of postage to semiweekly newspapers at city letter-carrier offices in county of publication as is now charged to weekly newspapers for such service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 366) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 367) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 368) to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) for the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and the United States Marine Corps Reserve who were erroneously released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than their homes or places of enrollment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 370) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) to amend paragraph 1674 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 372) extending the time for awarding medals of honor, distinguished-service crosses, and distinguished-service medals, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 374) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 375) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to provide additional hospital facilities at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 376) providing for the repeal of "An act to prohibit the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 377) authorizing the sale of public buildings and sites in St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 378) to amend paragraph 502 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 379) to create a department of national defense, defining the powers and duties of the secretary thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 380) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Windsor, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 381) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Pleasant Hill, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 382) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at El Dorado Springs, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 383) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 384) fixing the salaries of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) for the admission of nonquota immigrants of certain alien veterans of the World War and their wives and children; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 386) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare a medal, with appropriate emblems and inscriptions commemorative of the service, sacrifices, and patriotism of the American women of all wars in which the United States has participated, which was the inspiration of their sons and daughters in carrying on their part of the various conflicts; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 387) to punish the unlawful transmission in interstate commerce or through the mails of gambling machines and fraudulent devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 388) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 389) to amend section 503 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) providing for a reclassification of watchmen, messengers, and laborers in the Postal and Railway Mail Service of the United States in three grades, with increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 391) to regulate the use of the Capitol Building and Grounds; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 392) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Montana as an auxiliary to the Bozeman, Mont., fisheries station; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 393) to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 395) to standardize bales of cotton intended for use in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 396) to provide for the construction of a stadium in the Potomac Park in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) to create a board of industrial adjustments and to define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 398) to repeal certain nuisance taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) providing for a site and public building for the United States post office, United States courts, collector of internal revenue, and other Federal purposes at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) to amend the national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 401) to increase the rate of pension to widows and remarried widows of the Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) granting to the State of Oklahoma 210,000 acres of unappropriated nonmineral land for the benefit of its agricultural and mechanical colleges, according to the provisions of the acts of July 2, 1862, and July 23, 1866, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the Secretary of the Interior certifying the number of acres available and that there are not sufficient lands in the State of Oklahoma to comply with the provisions of this act, to pay to the State of Oklahoma in lieu thereof the sum of $1.25 per acre for the number of acres due said State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 403) for the appointment of an additional judge for the sixth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 404) to repeal section 9 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 405) providing for horticultural experiment and demonstration work in the southern Great Plains area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 406) providing for additional demonstration and experimental work in livestock department of the experiment station located at Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 407) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements among the several States or any of them in respect of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 408) to authorize intermediate-credit banks to assist agriculture cooperative associations in acquiring storage facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 409) authorizing an appropriation to reimburse the State of Oklahoma for moneys paid by it for the education of Indian children in the public schools of the said State; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 410) providing for the payments in lieu of transportation in kind and subsistence en route to certain veterans of the war with Spain and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 411) providing for reimbursement of the Ponca Indian tribal fund for sums expended by the Ponca Indian Agency at Ponca City, Okla., and prohibiting further expenditures without the consent of the tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) authorizing an appropriation for the development and maintenance of the Panhandle Agriculture and Mechanical College at Goodwell, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 413) to authorize the award of distinguished-service crosses to certain veterans or relatives of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) to provide for the acquisition by the city of Alva, Okla., of lot 19, block 41, the original town site of Alva, Okla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 415) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Newkirk, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Blackwell, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 417) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Cherokee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Fairview, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 419) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Medford, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 420) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Ponca City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) providing for the erection of a public building at Alva, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 422) providing for the erection and completion of a public building in the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 423) to define and regulate lobbying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 424) providing for a medal of honor and awards to Government employees for distinguished work in science; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 425) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Orono, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Dover-Foxcroft, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Dexter, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 428) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Presque Isle, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 429) to provide for enlarging the United States building at Houlton, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 430) to provide for the establishment of the Mount Katahdin National Park in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 431) to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Okanogan County, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 432) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 433) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of

the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to widows of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and Army nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 434) providing for the construction of a sanatorium and hospital at Claremore, Okla., and providing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 435) to increase the salaries of the United States customs guards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 436) to provide retirement for licensed officers of the United States Army transport service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 437) granting the consent of Congress to the Maysville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 438) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 439) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Marquette County, State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce in foreign countries, and to encourage the industries in the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 441) to authorize an appropriation to pay half the cost of a bridge and road on the Hoopa Valley Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 442) placing first, second, and third class postmasters in the competitive classified service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 443) to amend section 202, paragraph No. 10, of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the laws affecting the establishment of the United States Veterans' Bureau and the administration of the war risk insurance act, as amended, and the vocational rehabilitation act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 444) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 445) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement or agreements with the State of Montana and private owners of lands within the State of Montana for grazing and range development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 446) to reimburse officers, nurses, and civilian employees of the United States Public Health Service and inmates of the United States Public Health Service hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex., for losses sustained as the result of a storm which occurred in Texas upon September 14, 1919; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 447) to provide for the creation of the Pan American peoples great highway commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 448) making eligible to citizenship North American Indians born in Canada; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 449) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Atchafalaya River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 450) to amend section 5a of the national defense act, approved June 4, 1920, providing for placing educational orders for equipment, etc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 451) to increase the minimum rate of invalid pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 452) to authorize the transfer of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) authorizing all retired enlisted men who were on active duty status during the period of war with Germany and who did not serve as commissioned officers to be returned to the retired list and to receive the full pay and allowances of the grade they held during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 454) regulating the pay of reserve and National Guard officers when called to active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 455) to provide further for the national security and defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 456) to aid the department memorial committee in the observance of Memorial Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 457) to create a board of local inspectors, Steamboat Inspection Service, at Hoquiam, Wash.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 458) relating to investigation of new uses of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 459) for the relief of agriculture and providing for the preparation and distribution of explosives to settlers for clearing and reclaiming cut-over forest land areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 460) to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to audit post funds of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its branches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 461) authorizing the classification of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 462) providing for a per capita payment of $100 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 463) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Belleville, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 464) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Herington, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 465) to authorize the city of Oklahoma City, Okla., to sell certain public squares situated therein; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 466) to establish in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the Army and Navy medal of honor roll, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 467) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Longmont, Boulder County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 468) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Loveland, Larimer County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 469) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Littleton, Arapahoe County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 470) to authorize the admission of equipment or material free of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 471) to provide for an aircraft procurement board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 472) granting the consent of Congress to Dwight P. Robinson & Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 473) granting the consent of Congress to the Ashland Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 474) to amend chapter 9, Thirty-ninth Statutes, Part I (Public, No. 290), approved December 29, 1916, an act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 475) to amend certain laws relating to the submission of proof on entries within reclamation projects; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 476) granting a portion of the rents, royalties, and bonuses received from lands within naval petroleum reserves to the States within the boundaries of which said reserves are located; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) to cede unreserved public lands to the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 478) to provide for the enlargement of the winter elk refuge in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 479) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 480) for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 481) to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 482) to provide relief for the victims of the airplane accident at Langin Field, Moundsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 484) to amend section 10 of the plant quarantine act, approved August 20, 1912; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 485) to authorize the designation of deputy fiscal or disbursing agents in the Department of Agriculture stationed outside of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 486) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Department of Agriculture in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 487) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 488) to authorize the erection of a Federal building at Oelwein, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Osage, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 490) to amend the packers and stockyards act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 491) authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 492) to amend an act entitled "The classification act of 1923," approved March 4, 1923; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 493) to authorize certain proposed improvements at the United States marine hospital, Fort Stanton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 494) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 495) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Armstrong, a county of the State of Pennsylvania, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Kittanning, in the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 496) authorizing an appropriation for the development of potash jointly by the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Commerce by improved methods of recovering potash from deposits in the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 497) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection and completion of a building thereon, or the purchase of a site and building, for a post office at Riverton, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 498) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Green River, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 499) to appropriate funds for the construction of a flood-relief vessel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 500) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers and former officers of the World War, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in the line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 501) granting an increase of pension to Rose A. Patten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) for the relief of Florence Herben; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 503) granting a pension to Hattie White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) granting a pension to Ida Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 505) granting a pension to Homer W. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 506) granting a pension to Nettie J. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 507) granting a pension to Emma C. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 508) granting a pension to Mary E. Baughman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) granting an increase of pension to Fermon L. Botkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 511) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Engler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Freelove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 514) granting an increase of pension to Naomi Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) granting an increase of pension to Addie Pipes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 516) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) granting an increase of pension to Clarence West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 518) for the relief of William H. Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 519) for the relief of Joseph F. Ritcherdson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 520) granting an increase of pension to Hulda A. Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 521) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 522) granting an increase of pension to Martha W. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 523) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Bondy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 524) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Gebhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Giffen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 528) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Muldrew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) granting an increase of pension to Mahala C. Lydick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 530) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Shaferman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 531) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Pelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) granting an increase of pension to Margaretta Lock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) granting an increase of pension to Barara Bray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 534) granting an increase of penstion to Ruhama Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 535) granting an increase of pension to Margaret D. Archey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) granting an increase of pension to Sebina L. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 537) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 538) granting an increase of pension to Margaretta C. Feay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Heston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) granting an increase of pension to Mary Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 541) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Nuzum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 542) granting an increase of pension to Melissa Kimberland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 543) granting an increase of pension to Elcie Been; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 544) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 545) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 546) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. L. De Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 547) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 548)) for the relief of Fayette L. Froemke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 549) for the relief of Mimie Bergh Ericksen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 550) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Neidhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 551) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Pelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 552) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bell Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 553) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Helen Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 554) granting a pension to Jacob Allstott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 555) granting an increase of pension to Gurtrude Wiedebusch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 556) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Sauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 557) granting an increase of pension to Ary Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 558) granting an increase of pension to Nora L. Ott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 559) granting an increase of pension to Sivilla C. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 560) granting an increase of pension to Sarah V. Mererfeld; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 561) granting an increase of pension to Alcinda Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 562) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda McEldowney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 563) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. McIlvain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 564) granting a pension to Samantha J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 565) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hohmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 566) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Geldbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 567) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 568) granting an increase of pension to Eva Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 569) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Serig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) granting an increase of pension to Malvina Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 573) granting an increase of pension to Julia Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 574) granting an increase of pension to Lester L. Coffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 575) granting a pension to Noah Greenwalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 576) granting a pension to George Hovatter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 577) granting a pension to James W. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUSBY: A bill (H. R. 578) granting a pension to Missouri L. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 579) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Schweitzer; to the Committee no Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 580) granting an increase of pension to Melara C. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) granting an increase of pension to Theresa Bingaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 582) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Aunsbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Redcay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 584) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 585) granting an increase of pension to Annie Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Reifsnyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Ermentrout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 588) granting an increase of pension to Sarah McCauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 589) granting an increase of pension to Catharine McCloskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 590) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Kramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) granting an increase of pension to Susie C. Risheil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Yoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 594) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 595) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) granting an increase of pension to May A. McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 597) granting an increase of pension to Susan Dubson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Leas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Spear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 601) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Calvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Hock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Berkheiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 605) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Beyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 606) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Rhoads; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 607) granting an increase of pension to Emily V. Ressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 608) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Butterweck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) granting an increase of pension to Susan R. Rhoads; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 610) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Rode; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 611) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ulrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 612) granting an increase of pension to Mary Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Brittain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth P. Weidner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Sauerwine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 616) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting an increase of pension to Tamsen A. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Grosscup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting an increase of pension to Kate Grommis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Kern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Kern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 622) granting an increase of pension to Anna Reyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) granting an increase of pension to Emma S. De Gour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an increase of pension to Arabella Brouch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Helen Schaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 626) granting an increase of pension to Mary Seamen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 628) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Seiders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 629) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Betz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Cleaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Cleaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 632) granting an increase of pension to Annie Downs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) granting an increase of pension to Lavina Strohecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 637) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Yerger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) granting an increase of pension to Susan Dry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) granting an increase of pension to Emma Foreman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Flaig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Schweimler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to Anna Saul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) granting an increase of pension to Caroline C. Fehr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 644) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 645) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Fesig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Derr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) granting an increase of pension to Mary Dethample; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 648) granting an increase of pension to Mary Platz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Buch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 651) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Ann Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 652) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Schlegel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) granting an increase of pension to Annie J. Peiffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 654) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 656) granting an increase of pension to Harriett R. Enochs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 657) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Hain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Maurer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 659) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Swavely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 660) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Rauch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) granting an increase of pension to Jennie S. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lotz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Helms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Michael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 667) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Wisner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth P. Graeff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Reber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) granting an increase of pension to Ida V. Hain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Hassler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Hartline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 676) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hinnershitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Yeager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) granting an increase of pension to Elmira Staudt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Stamm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 680) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Foos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 681) granting an increase of pension to Lavina Angstadt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 682) granting an increase of pension to Lovina S. Knoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Orner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Fries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Aulenbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) granting an increase of pension to Clara Geiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 688) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Flanagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 689) granting an increase of pension to Susan Achenbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) granting an increase of pension to Agnes F. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Gery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 695) granting an increase of pension to Susan Catharine Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Garnet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) granting an increase of pension to Amanda R. Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) granting an increase of pension to Ellen W. Frescoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie H. Graul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) granting an increase of pension to Annie Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 702) granting an increase of pension to Haneefa Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Reeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) granting an increase of pension to Susan Gehret; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Geiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Steinberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Heffelfinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 708) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 709) granting an increase of pension to Martha Beamersderfer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 710) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Rumford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) granting an increase of pension to Susan Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 712) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Kinch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 713) granting an increase of pension to Kittie A. Miltower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 714) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. J. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gaul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Ebbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 717) granting an increase of pension to Kate Winter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 718) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 719) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Graf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 720) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Reeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Klaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) granting an increase of pension to Sarah H. Cleaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 726) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Slichter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 727) granting an increase of pension to Hannah F. Hauck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Briner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) granting an increase of pension to Anna J. Bright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) granting an increase of pension to Maria Roth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sheidy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) granting an increase of pension to Susan Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) granting an increase of pension to Rachel L. Shultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) granting an increase of pension to Catherine L. Woodburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) granting an increase of pension to Annie Snayberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 738) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Mozingo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) granting a pension to Lewis Fultz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) granting a pension to Gladys R. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) granting a pension to Albert L. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) granting a pension to Emma G. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 745) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 746) granting a pension to Alice Block; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) granting a pension to Hannah Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 748) granting a pension to Mary Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 749) granting a pension to Lucinda Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 750) granting a pension to Joe Scrogum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 751) granting a pension to Nettie Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 752) granting a pension to Sarah J. Rea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 753) granting a pension to Mary J. McNew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 754) granting a pension to Minnie Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 755) granting a pension to Sarah Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 756) granting a pension to Samantha A. Mehinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 757) granting an increase of pension to Fidelia E. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 758) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 759) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 760) granting an increase of pension to Mary McKee Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) granting an increase of pension to Fannie H. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 762) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Dorrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 764) granting an increase of pension to Eva B. Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) granting an increase of pension to Isabella A. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 766) for the relief of Ida F. Baum; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 767) for the relief of Salvatore Nuzzareno; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 768) granting a pension to Myra Dobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 769) granting a pension to Rosa S. Weston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 770) granting an increase of pension to James E. Embury; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 771) granting a pension to Mary A. Weston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) granting an increase of pension to Abbie J. Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) granting a pension to Mary Sephrona Woolman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 774) granting a pension to Addie Ream; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 775) granting an increase of pension to Ellen V. Archambeault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 776) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Bame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie S. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) granting an increase of pension to Alice Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 780) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Gunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 781) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hadcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) granting an increase of pension to Melissa J. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Hio; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Huckans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) granting a pension to Michael Hopkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) granting a pension to Mary A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) granting an increase of pension to Althear Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 788) granting an increase of pension to Maria McGinniss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 789) granting an increase of pension to Verona E. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 790) granting an increase of pension to Rose Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 791) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Putman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) granting an increase of pension to Susana Reiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia Safford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) granting an increase of pension to Jane Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) granting a pension to Mattie Steiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 796) granting a pension to Mary A. Van Vechten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) granting a pension to Nettie York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 799) granting a pension to Leanna L. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) granting a pension to Alice Frances Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 801) granting a pension to Laura A. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 802) to correct the military record of Curtis P. Wise; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 803) granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Yates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 804) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 805) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McBride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 806) granting an increase of pension to Fredonia A. Lauder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 807) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) granting an increase of pension to Anna Fetsch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 809) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Leary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 811) for the relief of G. W. Bauserman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 812) for the relief of Kratzer Carriage Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to James T. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 814) granting a pension to Sadie Snell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) granting a pension to Mary A. Worden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 816) granting a pension to Margaret Donaldson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 817) granting a pension to Flora Carl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 818) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 819) granting a pension to Catherine Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to Nettie Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 821) granting a pension to Jennie E. Keown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 822) granting a pension to Emma S. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 823) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 824) granting an increase of pension to Emily R. Askren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 825) granting an increase of pension to Martha Moorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 826) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 827) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Thornburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 828) granting an increase of pension to Emma Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 829) granting an increase of pension to Anna Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 830) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Hargis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) granting an increase of pension to Susan D. Ralph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) granting an increase of pension to Bridget E. Lovejoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 833) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Jellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 834) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 835) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. McFarlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Brownfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 837) granting an increase of pension to Melissa L. Spader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 838) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Warnock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 839) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Scofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 840) granting an increase of pension to Jeanette M. Sheldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 841) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Orange; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) granting an increase of pension to Alice Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 843) granting an increase of pension to Fannie J. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 844) granting an increase of pension to Geaean J. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Battels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 846) granting an increase of pension to Beatries Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 847) granting a pension to Luella E. Heath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 848) granting a pension to Thirza St. Clair Gandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 849) granting a pension to Emma N. Evey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 850) granting a pension to William O. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Alfred Chapleau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 852) authorizing the issuance of a certain patent; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 853) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McCartney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) for the relief of Charles R. Stevens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 855) for the relief of Maj. Arthur A. Padmore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) granting a pension to Fredlena Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 857) granting a pension to Selma H. Cheney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 858) granting a pension to Isabel L. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 859) granting a pension to Jacob Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 860) granting a pension to Benjamin Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 861) granting an increase of pension to Dollie Cosens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 862) for the relief of Miriam Hathaway; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 863) for the relief of George A. Robertson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 864) for the relief of Margie R. Ashbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 865) for the relief of Katherine MacDonald; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 866) for the relief of William Boyer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 867) for the relief of J. A. Lemire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 868) granting a pension to Hugh Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 869) granting an increase of pension to Mamie E. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 870) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia Havlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) for the relief of William Earhart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) granting a pension to Anna G. Boner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) granting an increase of pension to Christina Stein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 875) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Courtney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 876) granting an increase of pension to Mary Malone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 877) granting an increase of pension to Serena Swift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 878) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Frame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 879) granting an increase of pension to Angie Moran; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 880) granting an increase of pension to Emma Harding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 881) granting an increase of pension to Jeannette Stokes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 882) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 883) granting an increase of pension to Letitia Gannaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 884) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 885) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Uphoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 886) granting a pension to Cleopatra Kerns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 887) granting a pension to William Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 888) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 889) granting an increase of pension to Edith King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 890) granting an increase of pension to Susan Oglesby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 891) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Trampe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 892) granting an increase of pension to Emma Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) granting an increase of pension to Judith Ann Hay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) granting an increase of pension to Nancy T. Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 895) granting an increase of pension to Belle Ruhl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 896) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 897) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 898) granting an increase of pension to Cora Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 899) granting a pension to Mary F. June; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 900) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 901) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Herring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 902) granting an increase of pension to Lidy Shaul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 903) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 904) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) granting a pension to William M. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 906) granting a pension to Julia Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 907) for the relief of Thomas T. Gessler; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 908) granting a pension to Frank Nacod; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 909) granting a pension to Ernest W. Raper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 910) granting a pension to Lafayette Bronson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 911) granting a pension to Andrew C. Buker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 912) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Haslett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 913) granting a pension to Edith Hampel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 914) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 915) granting a pension to Samuel L. Fiste; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 916) granting a pension to Thomas Hanna; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 917) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barnaclo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) granting a pension to George L. Van Arsdale; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 919) granting a pension to George Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 920) for the relief of Simonas Razauskas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 921) for the relief of the estate of Elijah Abbott, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 922) for the relief of Mildren Van Ausdal Morse; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 923) for the relief of Bernard Joseph Maley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 924) for the relief of Joe D. Donisi; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) granting an award of compensation under the United States employees' compensation act to Eugene De Ment; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Jennie Roll; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Louis U. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 928) for the relief of Thomas J. Sutton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Michael Patrick Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 930) to correct the military record of Patrick H. H. Snodgrass; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) for the relief of Robert G. Smith, alias Robert James Smith; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 932) for the relief of Elmer White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of George King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) for the relief of Maurice J. Keegan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of Charles Meyer, alias George Morris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 936) for the relief of Garrett M. Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) for the relief of William F. Hatten, alias William Hadden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) granting relief to James J. Haley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) for the relief of Charles Gallagher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) for the relief of Michael J. Fraher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) for the relief of Warren R. Cusick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) for the relief of Lewis Corfman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) for the relief of Thomas Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 944) for the relief of Harry Burton-Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) for the relief of certain members of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Southern Branch, Hampton, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of Luke Merrick and Charles J. Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 947) for the relief of Edward E. Harbin and B. Power; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) for the relief of Thomas Higgins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 949) granting an increase of pension to Martha Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 950) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 951) granting a pension to Mina Parlette Guckes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Annie S. Haller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 953) granting an increase of pension to Almira A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 954) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Morrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 955) granting a pension to Hannah E. Lore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 956) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 957) granting an increase of pension to Olive W. Cartmell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 958) granting an increase of pension to Mary Elizabeth Doner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Brandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 960) granting a pension to Hester Pritchett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 961) granting a pension to Bertha T. Solomon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 962) granting a pension to Mary Jane Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 963) granting a pension to Katherine Wert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 964) for the relief of Rudolph Nehring; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 965) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 966) granting a pension to Grace I. Scoville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of George J. Illichevsky; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 968) for the relief of Francis Jenkins; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 969) granting pensions to members of Capt. Thomas C. Galloway's Company E, First Regiment Idaho Volunteers, Weiser Home Guards, Nez Perce Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 970) granting pensions to members of Captain Greenstreet's company, Washington Volunteers, Nez Perce Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of James K. P. Welch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 972) for the relief of James C. Simmons, alias James C. Whitlock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of the estate of Katherine Heinrich (Charles Grieser and others, executors); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 974) granting an increase of pension to Grant Noble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 975) granting a pension to Arthur L. Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) granting a pension to Aaron L. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) granting a pension to Martha S. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 978) granting a pension to Charles B. Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 979) for the relief of J. W. Zornes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of George E. Lord; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 981) granting a pension to Algie M. Philbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 982) granting a pension to Emma J. Tirrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette F. Cushing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 984) for the relief of Frances Macdonald; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) granting a pension to Lydia Blumenkranz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) for the relief of Lydia Blumenkranz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 987) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 988) granting an increase of pension to Caroline B. Spainhower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 989) granting an increase of pension to Sabina Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 990) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Pace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 991) granting an increase of pension to Susan V. Faucett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 992) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Richeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Peek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to James Atha; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 996) granting a pension to Elmyra E. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 997) granting an increase of pension to Ada Whitson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 999) granting a pension to Kiziah E. Brookshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1000) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1001) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brickert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1002) granting an increase of pension to Florence C. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 1003) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Follett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1004) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1005) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Curtiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1006) granting an increase of pension to Ozias D. Hogue; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 1007) granting a pension to Mary Jane Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) granting a pension to Susan A. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) granting a pension to Wilmore A. Quimby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1010) granting a pension to Georgia E. Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1011) for the relief of James P. Davis, alias James Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1013) granting an increase of pension to Demerise Cyr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Annie Ritchie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1017) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Tarbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1018) granting an increase of pension to Susan Ingalls Nason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) granting an increase of pension to Victoire Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Isabell Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1021) granting an increase of pension to Almeda H. Tilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 1022) granting a pension to Amanda A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1023) to correct the military record of Charles Ebin Campbell, alias Ebin Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1024) granting a pension to James C. Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) granting a pension to Margaret Piatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1026) granting a pension to Delila Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1027) granting a pension to Carrie M. Southerland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) granting a pension to Dora Krill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) granting a pension to James Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) for the relief of the Rochester Country Club, Rochester, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) granting an increase of pension to Mary Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Wehrly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) granting an increase of pension to Fany Vernon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Tiedeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1036) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. J. Mifflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1037) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Misener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1038) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Manco; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1040) granting an increase of pension to Jennie H. Lockard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Knott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Agnes M. Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1043) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1044) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 1045) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1046) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Callaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Agatha E. Dick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1048) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Criswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) granting a pension to Ida M. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1050) granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Alpha Dutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Van Pelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) for the relief of George G. Waldrop; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) granting an increase of pension to Mary Teegardin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) granting a pension to Martha J. Treesh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Shaffstall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) granting an increase of pension to Lucy J. Shore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1059) granting an increase of pension to Betty E. Rowsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060), granting an increase of pension to Harriett Runion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1061) granting an increase of pension to Mary Pritchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1062) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Pumphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1063) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Misner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1064) granting an increase of pension to Magdalene Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Hatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1066) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) granting a pension to Catherine Herdner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1068) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1069) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1070) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1071) for the relief of Clyde Calvin Rhodenbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1072) for the relief of George Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) for the relief of Richard Brannan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Nancy L. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1075) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Daub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1077) granting a pension to Anna M. Hyde; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Augusta Gladbach; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1079) for the relief of Lewis Deems; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1080) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. DeVault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1081) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Tranbarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) granting an increase of pension to John Nighswander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) granting a pension to Martha E. Maxfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 1086) granting a pension to Emma C. Alton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1087) granting a pension to Thomas Branch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1088) granting a pension to Florence Christie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) granting a pension to Mary A. Eberley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1090) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1091) granting an increase of pension to Esther E. Carr Lazelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1092) granting a pension to Esther Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1093) granting an increase of pension to Mary Van Wormer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of Harold P. Foote; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Eveline Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1096) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Ansell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) granting a pension to Catherine M. Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1098) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Baty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) granting an increase of pension to Isabella C. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1101) granting an increase of pension to Annie H. Bills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1102) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Boerodaile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1103) granting an increase of pension to Eva E. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) granting an increase of pension to Alice L. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1106) granting an increase of pension to Ella V. Cazeau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) granting an increase of pension to Edwina C. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) granting an increase of pension to Alberta V. Coughnet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Coyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) granting an increase of pension to Mary Crelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte V. Cruser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1114) granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. H. Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1115) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1116) granting an increase of pension to Frances Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1117) granting an increase of pension to Celia Dee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1118) granting an increase of pension to Mary Denno; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1120) granting an increase of pension to Oriana M. Farnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1121) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Fogarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1122) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Forest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) granting an increase of pension to Della E. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1124) granting an increase of pension to Ann Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1125) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Gamble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) granting a pension to Clara B. Greek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Hayt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1129) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Heinold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1130) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hulbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) granting an increase of pension to Abagail D. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hunting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) granting an increase of pension to Josephine C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) granting an increase of pension to Jane Gardner Joslyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1136) granting an increase of pension to Anna Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1137) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Klein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1139) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor E. Kramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1140) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Lisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1141) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. MacAuty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1143) granting an increase of pension to Susie Mahoney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Melvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) granting an increase of pension to Ida Milan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1146) granting an increase of pension to Alice Montondo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Neef; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) granting an increase of pension to Mary Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) granting an increase of pension to Margreet O'Leary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) granting an increase of pension to Mary O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) granting a pension to Grace M. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) granting a pension to Mary Parmele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) granting an increase of pension to Anne Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) granting an increase of pension to Mary Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) granting an increase of pension to Julia Ragon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1157) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rauber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Regan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) granting an increase of pension to Louise Sauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) granting an increase of pension to Mary Seiford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sheahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Sherwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Siebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1167) granting an increase of pension to Louise A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1169) granting an increase of pension to Ida H. Stokes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1171) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Florence Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1173) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Vahue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) granting a pension to Josephine Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Whittleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1179) granting an increase of pension to Theoda I. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) granting an increase of pension to Minerva A. Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1182) for the relief of John Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1183) for the relief of Thomas Conlon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) granting an increase of pension to Sophia M. Barth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Julia Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1186) granting a pension to Minnie L. Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) granting a pension to Samuel L. Bostic; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1188) granting a pension to Dora Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1189) granting a pension to Mary Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1190) granting a pension to Allie Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1191) granting a pension to Nancy S. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1192) granting a pension to Jane Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1193) granting a pension to Mary E. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1194) granting a pension to Belle Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1195) granting a pension to Liddie Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1196) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Hover; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1197) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1198) granting a pension to Emma Laughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1199) granting a pension to Alonzo P. Lowry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1200) granting a pension to Isaac Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1201) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ann Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1202) granting an increase of pension to Pearl Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1203) granting a pension to Arrieanna Sites; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1204) granting a pension to Malissa Steed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1205) granting a pension to Lincoln Z. Story; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1206) granting a pension to Anna Topping; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1207) granting a pension to Stella M. Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1208) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Aleshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1209) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Angel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1210) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Bachor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1211) granting an increase of pension to Frances Bicknell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1212) granting an increase of pension to Annie Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1213) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Carlton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Ella A. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. B. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Doran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1217) granting a pension to Martha Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1218) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Lamborn Grosvenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1219) granting an increase of pension to Irene Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1220) granting an increase of pension to Annie Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) granting an increase of pension to Luceta Icenhower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1224) granting an increase of pension to Hannah King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1225) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1226) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Male; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1227) granting an increase of pension to Drusilla Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) granting an increase of pension to Arvilla Ours; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1229) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) granting an increase of pension to Adaline J. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1231) granting an increase of pension to Delia D. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1232) granting an increase of pension to Axcie K. Rathburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1233) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1234) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1235) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1236) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ann Rouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1237) granting an increase of pension to Missouri F. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1238) granting an increase of pension to Mary Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Adaline B. Shiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1240) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Small; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stobert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1243) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Swisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1244) granting an increase of pension to Josephine V. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1245) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Wild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1246) granting an increase of pension to Malissa Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1247) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1248) granting an increase of pension to Jennie W. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1249) granting a pension to Phoebe Ann Allbright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1250) granting an increase of pension to Hellen L. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1251) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1252) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. McDougall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1253) granting an increase of pension to Victorena Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1254) for the relief of Mary J. Murray; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1255) granting a pension to Robert H. Pitts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 1256) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Neugebauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1257) granting an increase of pension to Jeannie Manwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 1258) granting a pension to Sallie Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1259) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Eppert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1260) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1261) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Kinker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1262) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1263) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) granting an increase of pension to Jennie McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1265) granting a pension to Martha A. Charles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1266) granting an increase of pension to Nancy S. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1267) granting an increase of pension to Edith V. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1268) granting an increase of pension to Dully A. Chain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Emily D. Monk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1270) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1271) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Sheppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1272) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Zercher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1273) granting an increase of pension to Nannie J. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1274) granting an increase of pension to Mary Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1275) granting an increase of pension to Almira R. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1276) granting an increase of pension to Lewvina Hoffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) granting an increase of pension to Mary Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Apgear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) granting an increase of pension to Janet Hiett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1280) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe A. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1281) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1282) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Julian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1283) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1284) granting an increase of pension to Effie Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Mary Pumpelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1286) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1287) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Shiveley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1288) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth South; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1289) granting a pension to Charles Guthridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1290) granting a pension to Edward Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1291) granting a pension to John P. Chain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1292) granting a pension to Carrie B. Gaddis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) granting a pension to William G. Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) granting a pension to Mollie Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1295) granting a pension to Cora A. Games; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 1296) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1297) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor E. Hugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1298) granting an increase of pension to Belle Hickle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1299) granting an increase of pension to Kate S. Hyatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1300) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Inks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1301) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1302) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Keener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Kennison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1304) granting an increase of pension to Edith P. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1305) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Keslar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1306) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kremer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1307) granting an increase of pension to Mary Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1308) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Ludy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Sadie McEwen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1312) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1313) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1314) granting an increase of pension to Mary Mostoller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1315) granting an increase of pension to Donna M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1316) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Pastorius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) granting an increase of pension to Emma Piles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1318) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Provance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1319) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1320) for the relief of James W. Pringle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1321) granting an increase of pension to Theresa Rhoades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1322) granting an increase of pension to Carrie S. Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1323) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Rininger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1324) granting a pension to Helena Abel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1325) granting an increase of pension to Annie Arrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1326) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Artis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1327) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1328) granting an increase of pension to Mollie M. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) granting an increase of pension to Laura Bixler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1330) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Buttermore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1331) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1332) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Clouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1333) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1335) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Dively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Ann Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1337) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1338) granting an increase of pension to Christiana Firestone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Fogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1340) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Gaumer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) granting an increase of pension to Susan Handlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1342) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Emma Herring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1344) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Rummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) granting an increase of pension to Rachel J. Schock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1347) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Swaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1348) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia P. Swaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1350) granting an increase of pension to Annette J. Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) granting a pension to Hanna Melissa Underwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1354) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1355) granting an increase of pension to Annie V. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1356) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Zinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINDRED: A bill (H. R. 1357) for the relief of Mary McCarthy, Vincent Iarrobino, John Halpin, and others, for the payment of claims for pay, personal injuries, loss of property, and other purposes, incident to the blasting of Hell Gate Channel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of William C. Schmitt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1359) granting a pension to Elizabeth Lutters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of Harlan Bergen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Paulinus G. Huhn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) granting a pension to Henry Henstorf; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1363) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) granting a pension to John M. Brown, alias John Bender; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) granting a pension to Vonny A. McClaren; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Streit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) granting an increase of pension to Luella E. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1368) granting a pension to Bentley A. Worden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1369) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Mandigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1371) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1372) granting a pension to Martha Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1373) granting an increase of pension to Clemania Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1374) granting an increase of pension to Helen S. Glidden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1375) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Schutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1376) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Gubtail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) granting an increase of pension to Albina D. Thom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) granting an increase of pension to Helen Van Zile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 1380) granting a pension to Sarah Hilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) granting a pension to Mary Ricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1382) granting a pension to Nancy E. Sayler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) granting a pension to Thaddeus O. Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1384) granting an increase of pension to Mary Meade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) granting a pension to Emma J. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) granting a pension to Ida Dewey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) granting a pension to Mattie M. Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) for the relief of Theresa Scherer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) granting an increase of pension to George Corneille; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) for the relief of Maj. Lester L. Lampert; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) for the relief of the late George W. Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) for the relief of Paine Lumber Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) to correct the military record of Frank Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Marchant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) granting an increase of pension to Emelia Retzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1396) granting an increase of pension to Elenore Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) granting a pension to Minnie Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) granting an increase of pension to Almira J. Mosely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1399) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia M. Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1400) granting a pension to Mary E. Halsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) granting an increase of pension to Augusta M. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) granting an increase of pension to Cora I. Cromwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 1403) for the relief of Philip T. Post; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) for the relief of Banard F. Kroeger, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) granting six months' pay to Maria J. McShane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) granting six months' pay to Lucy B. Knox; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1407) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Nicholson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) granting a pension to Emma E. Woodward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Bedell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) granting a pension to Katherine H. Norwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) granting a pension to Virginia M. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) granting a pension to Addie L. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 1413) granting a pension to Ella P. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) granting an increase of pension to Nannie L. Brand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Weltner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) granting an increase of pension to Annie Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) granting a pension to John Street; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Snowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) granting a pension to William Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) granting an increase of pension to Jane Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) granting an increase of pension to Emily Raber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Nordyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. McCombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Hannah V. Medlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1428) granting a pension to Samuel Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hubler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1433) granting a pension to Amanda Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) granting an increase of pension to Vina Herron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1435) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Haven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1436) granting a pension to Anna Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Fleetwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1439) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) granting an increase of pension to Mariah Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1441) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Doolin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) granting an increase of pension to Fetney J. De Vore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1443) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Delay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) granting a pension to Agnes L. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1445) granting an increase of pension to George Ann Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) granting an increase of pension to Pauline E. Beals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) granting an increase of pension to Anna Blue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1448) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Brann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Cary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1450) granting an increase of pension to Christena J. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1451) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Colliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1452) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1453) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1454) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1455) granting a pension to John W. Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1456) granting an increase of pension to Maud M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) granting a pension to George W. Dooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Crouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1459) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) granting a pension to Mary Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 1461) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) granting an increase of pension to Rowena R. Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Hyde; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1464) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) for the relief of James Henry Payne; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1466) for the relief of Laban H. Davies; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) for the relief of William Mark Noble, jr.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1468) to correct the military record of John J. O'Connor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) granting a pension to John J. Duffy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) granting a pension to Thomas Whaling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 1471) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) granting an increase of pension to Sally Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1473) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Vanzant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1476) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1477) granting an increase of pension to Ellen E. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1478) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) granting an increase of pension to George T. Reid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) granting an increase of pension to Filen Whalin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) granting an increase of pension to Henry Y. Slaton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) granting an increase of pension to Robert Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Blanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) granting an increase of pension to James W. Bird; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Belk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1487) granting an increase of pension to Sarah T. Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas C. Tinsley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1490) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to the survivors of certain battalions of Kentucky Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert A. Bragg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Dr. John H. Blackburn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) for the relief of the county court of Allen County, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of John H. Wingfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph B. Harris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1496) for the relief of Dr. W. M. Ewing; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) granting a pension to Lucy Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1498) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) granting a pension to Louisa Sanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) granting a pension to Mary Ann Newkirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) granting a pension to Harry Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) granting a pension to Decatur D. Kinser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) granting a pension to Lona Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) granting a pension to Ellen Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) granting a pension to Rosaline Coots; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) granting a pension to Lottie Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) granting a pension to Emma G. Casebier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) granting a pension to Caroline Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) granting a pension to Margaret A. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) granting a pension to Nannie Austin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) granting a pension to Joe Merideth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1512) granting a pension to Willie Cassady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 1513) granting an increase of pension to Margarett E. Laux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) granting an increase of pension to Amelia C. Burrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Woodhull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Conlon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1518) to invest the United States Court of Claims with jurisdiction to ascertain, hear, try, determine, and adjust the claims of certain New York Seneca Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) granting an increase of pension to Mary Elseser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide H. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1521) granting an increase of pension to Kate Congdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) granting an increase of pension to Magdalena Emrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) granting a pension to Mary A. Gallup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hanour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1525) granting a pension to Mary McAndrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) granting a pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) granting an increase of pension to Alice F. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) granting a pension to William R. Gillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1529) for the relief of the heirs of John Eimers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) to amend the military record of William F. Wheeler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1531) for the relief of Edward Camp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) for the relief of Charlotte Martin, widow of Norman B. Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1533) for the relief of Theodore Herbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) to correct the military record of John Dewitt Marvin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1535) for the appointment of William Joseph Martin as a captain in the Judge Advocate General's office, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) for the relief of Charles E. MacDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) for the relief of William R. Connolly; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) to amend the naval record of Walter Joseph Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1539) for the relief of Edward J. Costello; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1540) granting an increase of pension to Harvey C. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1541) granting a pension to Ada E. Wainscott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) granting a pension to Linsey Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) granting an increase of pension to Helen D. Mayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) granting an increase of pension to Eliza C. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) granting an increase of pension to Isabel R. Mayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) granting an increase of pension to Fay Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) granting a pension to Martha Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) granting a pension to Mary J. Replogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1549) granting a pension to William Maze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1550) granting a pension to Hattie Gideon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) granting a pension to George M. Vaughan, alias George M. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1552) granting a pension to Absalom B. Dempsey, alias Absalon B. Dempsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) granting a pension to Carrie Bohon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) granting a pension to Thomas H. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) granting a pension to Richard P. Gwinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) granting a pension to Mahala Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) granting a pension to William T. Lessley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) granting an increase of pension to Carrie E. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) granting a pension to Sinia E. Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1561) granting a pension to Nancy M. Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) granting a pension to Edith T. Bass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) granting a pension to Charles W. Earnest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) granting a pension to Irene Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1565) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Gochey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1566) granting an increase of pension to Frances Somerville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) granting an increase of pension to Mariel M. Masters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) granting an increase of pension to Georgie A. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) granting an increase of pension to Bettie Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1570) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Drohan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Hope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Gott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Free; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 1575) granting an increase of pension to Carrie L. Douck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte L. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Fairchild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) granting a pension to Emma Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1579) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lawton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1581) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Rosenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1582) granting a pension to Matilda Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) granting a pension to Ella A. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1585) granting a pension to Mary Vick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1587) granting an increase of pension to Mary Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1588) for the relief of Louis H. Harmon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1589) for the relief of John J. Waters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker and Calton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 1591) providing for the examination and survey of Snake River, Idaho, from Pittsburg Landing to Johnson's Bar; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1592) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Whiting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Fannie B. Melvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1595) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1596) for the relief of William H. Connors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) for the relief of Gaston M. Janson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1598) to provide for the retirement of August Wolters as a first sergeant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 1599) granting an increase of pension to Harriet N. Crabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1600) granting a pension to Mary A. Wing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1601) granting an increase of pension to Ella W. Dauchy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Charlietta A. Bloxsom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1603) granting an increase of pension to Evelyn Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) granting an increase of pension to Katy J. Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1605) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Vining; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1606) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1607) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Elizabeth Purdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1608) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1609) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. V. Pepper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1610) granting an increase of pension to Ella S. Boomer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) granting an increase of pension to Ellen S. Manchester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1612) granting an increase of pension to Ella C. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) granting an increase of pension to Sara M. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of George Rutherford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) for the relief of Carl C. Back; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 1617) granting a pension to Ettie E. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1618) for the relief of First Lieut. John R. Bailey, Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1619) granting a pension to Stephen L. Crandall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1620) granting a pension to Lucinda Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1621) granting a pension to Emma L. Hoisington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1622) granting a pension to John Wayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1623) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1624) for the relief of Abraham M. Auten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1625) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Myron C. Bond, Guy M. Caflin, and Edwin A. Wells; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1626) for the relief of Carl B. De Forest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1627) for the relief of Abram H. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1628) granting a pension to Stella B. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) for the relief of Ralph W. Neelands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) for the relief of Second Lieut. Charles C. Sessions; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) for the relief of Vanrenslear VanderCook, alias William Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 1632) granting a pension to George W. Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) granting a pension to Nancy Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) granting a pension to Mary Jane Judd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1635) granting a pension to John Ozenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1636) granting a pension to Mary E. Piburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) granting a pension to Sela Ann Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) granting a pension to Rena M. Weddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) granting a pension to Emulus G. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) granting a pension to Lucinda Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1641) granting a pension to James M. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1642) granting a pension to Martha Kerns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) granting a pension to Mary M. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) granting a pension to Virgil E. Halcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) granting a pension to Frances E. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) granting a pension to Emma Bays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1647) granting a pension to Matilda Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) for the relief of James F. Alexander; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) for the relief of Sidney F. Foree; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) granting an increase of pension to William B. Hampshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1652) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Snow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1653) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Orth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1654) granting an increase of pension to Rachel R. Monnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) granting an increase of pension to Huldah A. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1656) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Driskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Dinsmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Mudgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) granting an increase of pension to Minty E. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Nordyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1661) granting an increase of pension to Margret A. Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1663) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McCaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1665) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Griffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) granting an increase of pension to Caroline S. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Katherine Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1668) granting a pension to Isabell Childers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1669) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1670) granting a pension to Ellen Florence Ida Bell Juneau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1672) granting an increase of pension to Lelia E. Benham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1673) granting a pension to Lillian Bigelow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1674) granting a pension to Anna L. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1675) granting a pension to Etta Hortvet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1676) granting a pension to Priscilla F. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1677) granting a pension to Flora Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1678) granting a pension to Annie C. Winter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 1679) granting an increase of pension to Clara Canham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1680) granting a pension to Mary A. Pickrel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cypher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1682) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1683) granting an increase of pension to Mary Catherine Staley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1684) granting an increase of pension to Maggie De Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1685) granting an increase of pension to Martha W. Cassell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 1686) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) granting a pension to Lee H. Pipes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) granting a pension to Rebecca Tackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) for the relief of W. H. Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1690) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1691) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Insell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of Reva N. Newcomb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1693) granting a pension to George W. Holloway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 1694) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. Coughanour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1695) granting a pension to Maria Bensinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1696) granting a pension to John E. Reber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 1697) granting a pension to Ida M. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1698) granting a pension to Annie Craft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1699) granting an increase of pension to Theresa L. McCleary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1700) granting an increase of pension to Delia Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1701) granting an increase of pension to Hattie T. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1702) granting an increase of pension to Fannie L. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1703) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Leffingwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1704) granting an increase of pension to Christella B. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1705) granting an increase of pension to Valina Larose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1706) granting an increase of pension to Mary La Port; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1707) granting an increase of pension to Ladora V. Lapham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1708) granting an increase of pension to Julia Lackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1709) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1710) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Ingraham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1711) granting an increase of pension to Addie L. Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1712) granting an increase of pension to Mary Emly Hulet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1713) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Hoag; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1714) granting an increase of pension to Emma W. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) granting an increase of pension to Abby M. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1716) granting an increase of pension to Abbie Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1717) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Haak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1718) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1719) granting a pension to Mary M. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1720) granting an increase of pension to Julia D. Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1721) granting an increase of pension to Ida S. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Godett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1723) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Gleesettle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Evelina C. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1725) granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1726) granting an increase of pension to Damie Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1727) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1728) granting an increase of pension to Harriet S. Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Faist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Vanderwarker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1732) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Warden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1734) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Welden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Whiting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Flora L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1737) granting an increase of pension to Harriet L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1738) granting an increase of pension to Flora L. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1739) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Patten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1740) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Pateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1741) granting an increase of pension to Celestia Parrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1742) granting an increase of pension to Irena Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1743) granting an increase of pension to Mary Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1744) granting a pension to Martha Provo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) granting an increase of pension to Helen Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1746) granting an increase of pension to Minnie F. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1747) granting an increase of pension to Jane Pelletier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1748) granting an increase of pension to Phoeby Pecue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1749) granting an increase of pension to Lottie R. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) granting an increase of pension to Philomen Marion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1751) granting an increase of pension to Mahala J. Millias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1752) granting an increase of pension to Aceneath E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1753) granting an increase of pension to Lucina Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1754) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Moulten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) granting an increase of pension to Georgianna Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1756) granting a pension to Margaret Mallery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1757) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1758) granting an increase of pension to George Barker Niles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Trumble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) granting an increase of pension to Hannah McGuyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1762) granting an increase of pension to Ellen McKinty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Schermerhorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) granting an increase of pension to Emma Rebhun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1765) granting an increase of pension to Celina P. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Sheffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) granting an increase of pension to Annie Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1768) granting an increase of pension to Marie Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to Helen P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) granting an increase of pension to Jane L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Stillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) granting an increase of pension to Amelia H. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) granting a pension to Julia A. Stimpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Taffe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) granting an increase of pension to Katherine E. Tarbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting an increase of pension to Marcella Tetro; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1779) granting an increase of pension to Louise T. Thomson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Tipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle Ellsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. Dwyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Durkee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Barron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Mallery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Ashman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) granting an increase of pension to Electa J. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) granting a pension to Mary Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) granting an increase of pension to Anna Dunkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1791) granting an increase of pension to Ida Annette Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) granting an increase of pension to Julia Deridder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1793) granting an increase of pension to Susan Denison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Cushing; to the Committee to Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) granting an increase of pension to Marie L. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Cull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1797) granting an increase of pension to Edith Crandall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Coughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Mary Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta Connelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Cilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Fredericks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1804) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia M. Byron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1805) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Bullock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1806) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Bugbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1808) granting an increase of pension to Annie Brazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Barron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1810) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1811) granting a pension to Catharine Kinmouth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) granting a pension to John Charles Inglee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) granting a pension to Maria Groat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 1814) granting a pension to Mary E. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Lovelace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Rappleyea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) granting an increase of pension to Malvina Ritch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1819) granting a pension to Anna M. Lybolt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) granting an increase of pension to Sara E. Terwilliger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Dolen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Mary Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bogart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1824) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lohnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1825) granting a pension to Mary E. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Ollie Fye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Mount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1828) granting an increase of pension to Anna Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1829) granting an increase of pension to Permelia Gorham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1830) granting a pension to Irene Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions..

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) granting a pension to Elizabeth Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1835) granting an increase of pension to Jane Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1836) granting an increase of pension to Anna W. Overbey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) granting an increase of pension to Permelia J. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) granting a pension to Susannah Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) granting an increase of pension to Melissa A. Anthony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) granting an increase of pension to Lovina Wort; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) granting a pension to Louisa McArdle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) granting a pension to Jennie Dye Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1844) granting a pension to Lottie Remster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Harrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1846) granting an increase of pension to Amanda A. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1847) granting an increase of pension to Harriett M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) granting an increase of pension to Salina Wilt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) granting an increase of pension to Dora Coddington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) granting an increase of pension to Eva Bless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Daves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Flanigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda Curles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) granting an increase of pension to Anna Ambrose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) granting an increase of pension to Liddy J. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) granting an increase of pension to Fostina Hatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) granting an increase of pension to Emma Stonebraker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) granting an increase of pension to Abbie C. Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) granting an increase of pension to Eliza McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) granting an increase of pension to Adeline McCorkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. McClelland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) granting an increase of pension to Lucy J. Swearingen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) granting an increase of pension to Sarah I. Osburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1866) granting a pension to James L. Pierson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) granting a pension to Rosalia M. Barrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1868) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) granting a pension to Laura Ocheltree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) granting an increase of pension to Ida V. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1871) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Drynan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) granting a pension to Harriett T. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) granting an increase of pension to Lydia E. Chappelear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1874) granting an increase of pension to Olive R. Chance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) granting an increase of pension to Louvisa E. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) granting a pension to Eliza J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) granting an increase of pension to Louisa McMurtrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) authorizing the award of the distinguished-service cross to First Lieut. Stewart M. Grayson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 1880) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Blood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) granting an increase of pension to Emily Casselman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) granting an increase of pension to Helen Kellsy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) granting an increase of pension to Emma D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1885) granting an increase of pension to Emma Kingman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Lamper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1888) granting an increase of pension to Huldah E. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1889) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Lutes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Maidel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 1891) granting an increase of pension to Eva H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) granting an increase of pension to Laura Nutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) granting an increase of pension to Lovina Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Rockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ruch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sickinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) granting an increase of pension to Louise Spade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Steval; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) granting an increase of pension to Emily Roxanna Swart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) granting an increase of pension to Jeannette L. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Ida A. Tuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) granting an increase of pension to Mariam Peck West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) granting an increase of pension to Martha Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Appleby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Emma B. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Calkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) granting an increase of pension to Carrie W. Christy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) granting an increase of pension to Sadie A. Coburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1917) granting an increase of pension to Annie Donley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 1918) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ellsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1919) granting an increase of pension to Marcia E. Garey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) granting an increase of pension to Phebe H. B. Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1921) granting an increase of pension to Martha I. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) granting an increase of pension to Jenettie E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) granting an increase of pension to Emma Greeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Tinker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Switzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) granting an increase of pension to Emily C. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1928) granting a pension to Mary A. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1929) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Burd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) granting a pension to Charles E. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1931) for the relief of Daniel Mangan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1932) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Hemenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 1934) for the relief of Rebecca E. Olmsted; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1935) granting a pension to Sarah E. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) granting a pension to Catherine Sansom; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1937) granting a pension to Mary A. Story; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) granting a pension to Alice M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1939) for the relief of James M. Thomas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Tobin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) granting a pension to Prime Turcotte; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1942) granting an increase of pension to Mae Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) for the relief of William H. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Ora A. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1945) granting a pension to Gertrude I. Morrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1946) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Meloy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1947) for the relief of Ahmed Hussein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) granting a pension to Sarah A. Hallett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1949) granting an increase of pension to Carrie C. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1950) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) granting six months' pay to Frank A. Grab; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) granting six months' pay to Alexander Gingras, father of Louis W. Gingras, deceased private, United States Marine Corps, in active service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1953) granting an increase of pension to Peter Breen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude E. Blodgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) granting a pension to Josephine A. Bihler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1956) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie M. Aspinwall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) for the relief of Wendell M. Saunders; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1958) renewing and extending patent No. 977139; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 1959) granting a pension to J. W. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) granting a pension to General M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) granting a pension to Sarah M. Brasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1962) granting a pension to Mary Margeret Binkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) granting a pension to Sarah Dallas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) granting a pension to Theodore F. Dugan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) granting a pension to Benjamin Ferrier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1966) granting a pension to George N. Chasteen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) granting a pension to Archibald Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1968) granting a pension to Thomas McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) granting a pension to Marshall H. Messimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1970) for the relief of Dennis W. Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 1971) granting an increase of pension to Martha Bosley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1972) for the relief of Florence M. Becksted; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of the Columbia Steam Laundry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) for the relief of George Frau; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1975) for the relief of the State hospital of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1976) to correct the military record of Ellsworth Haggard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) for the relief of Walter W. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1978) granting a pension to Martin Padgett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) for the relief of Margaret W. Pearson and John Reed Pearson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) for the relief of E. R. Whitmarsh & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1981) granting an increase of pension to Sophia E. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) granting a pension to Andrea T. Bracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Cressey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1985) granting a pension to Susan E. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1987) granting a pension to Emma E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1988) granting a pension to Anna M. Tidyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) granting a pension to Esmerelda Vreeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1991) granting a pension to Ella J. Raymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1993) to correct the naval record of William E. Adams; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) to correct the military record of Charles C. Taylor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) to correct the military record of Major M. Reynolds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) for the relief of certain property owners in Orange County, Fla.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 1997) for the relief of Clifford J. Turner; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 1998) for the relief of Joseph A. Hanley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) granting a pension to Mary J. Millett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2000) granting a pension to Jane L. Jack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2001) granting a pension to Emma T. Fidler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2002) granting a pension to Clara E. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2003) granting a pension to Nettie J. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting an increase of pension to Morilla T. Alwens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2006) granting a pension to Rose M. Mehleck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) granting a pension to Cora C. McCutchen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) granting a pension to Nellie Barnard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of James M. Pierce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 2010) for the relief of Milburn Knapp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Sperling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) granting an increase of pension to Laura Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) granting an increase of pension to Margaret White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2014) granting a pension to Cassie S. Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) granting a pension to Frances E. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2016) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Badger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2017) granting an increase of pension to Marie Bertrand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) granting an increase of pension to Rose Bertrand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Bloss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) granting an increase of pension to Ida S. Braisted; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) granting a pension to Rose Emma Broderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bullick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) granting an increase of pension to Esther A. Capell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2024) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) granting a pension to Mary Cravate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Achsa C. Donaldson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Eggleson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. Eldredge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Flack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) granting a pension to Mary E. Floyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Fannie P. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to Major Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) granting an increase of pension to Myra B. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Mildred Hamlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) granting an increase of pension to Susan Holliday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) granting an increase of pension to Zeruah F. Hyde; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) granting an increase of pension to Alice Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Mary Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) granting an increase of pension to Louisa La Bounty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Langlois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Rosilla Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Murkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Mary Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) granting an increase of pension to Emma Allen Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Jemima A. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting an increase of pension to Rosella Paukett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Dellie Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia L. Piercy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Platt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) granting a pension to Cordelia Remington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Rounds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Saber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Selleck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Shampine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) granting an increase of pension to Olive Surrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Tebo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) granting an increase of pension to Janet Tenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) granting a pension to Elizabeth Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle D. Vrooman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Wait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Wolcott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Mary Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2069) to correct the military record of Squire J. Holly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of John J. Beattie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Nellie Hickey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) for the relief of Raymond D. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to James A. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting an increase of pension to George Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 2075) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Amberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Wesley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting an increase of pension to Noah E. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting an increase of pension to Edward Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) granting an increase of pension to Oren F. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) granting a pension to Amanda Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) granting a pension to Joseph A. Branstetter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) granting a pension to Sallie E. Luke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) granting a pension to F. M. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) granting a pension to Emma Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) granting a pension to James A. McGuire; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) granting a pension to Orlena Chisholm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) granting a pension to Adeline Raines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) granting a pension to David C. Woodring; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) granting a pension to Cora Irvin; to to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) granting a pension to Winnie Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) granting a pension to Emily Donahoo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) for the relief of Zoe A. Tilghman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) for the relief of John E. Lamar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) for the relief of Seth A. Welch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) for the relief of Mary Whalen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) for the relief of Ruthie J. Nance, widow of Isaac N. Nance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) for the relief of John Mehan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) for the relief of Alonzo Northrup; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) for the relief of Ada M. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Brisendine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) for the relief of J. B. O'Harro; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of J. C. McConnell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) for the relief of Pleasant H. Sells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) for the relief of George B. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) for the relief of Beryl M. McHam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) for the relief of W. J. Berry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 2107) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Waters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Cranston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) granting an increase of pension to Florence J. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Helen Lyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) granting an increase of pension to Abbie Cory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Beeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Louise D. Henley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) granting an increase of pension to Almena C. Carrier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Taggart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) granting an increase of pension to Emma Griswold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) granting a pension to Emma J. Van Brocklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) granting a pension to Henry Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) granting an increase of pension to Vina B. Acker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide E. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Denno; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Mack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Rosa A. Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda C. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) granting an increase of pension to Helena Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Shaughnessy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) granting a pension to Mary Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting an increase of pension to Famie H. Branian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) granting an increase of pension to Poppie H. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 2133) providing for the advancement to a higher grade on the retired list of Col. Wilds P. Richardson, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) to extend the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 22, 1920, entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," to Lon Snepp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) to extend the provisions of the act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to Albert Trana; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) to extend the provisions of the act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to William J. Casey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) for the relief of Ed. Snyder, William Paddock, Ed. Strike, and A. S. Heydeck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Sentinel;* to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) for the relief of Arthur Shonbeck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) for the relief of Julia Haley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) for the relief of Thomas H. Deal; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) for the relief of Ragnor Dahl; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) for the relief of Daniel Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) for the relief of Albert E. Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) for the relief of Albert J. Zyvolski; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 2146) granting a pension to Mary C. Quivey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dickie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Christopher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Wiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) for the relief of J. B. Orndoff; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) to authorize Dr. Adam Boving, of the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, to accept certain decoration from the Danish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) to authorize Aistin H. Clark, of the United States National Museum, to accept certain decoration from the Danish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2154) to authorize Dr. L. O. Howard, former Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, to accept certain decorations from the French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 2155) granting a pension to Sarah J. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) granting a pension to Emma Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) granting a pension to Nannie Ludy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) granting an increase of pension to Sallie A. Puthuff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) granting an increase of pension to Kate R. Forrester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) granting an increase of pension to Martha L. Shade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) granting an increase of pension to Lyte R. Buxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2162) for the relief of Christine Brenzinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) for the relief of Eugene Floyd Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs of Ralph K. Warrington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) for the relief of the legal representatives of Lyman Randall, J. E. Sarrazin, and James Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of the Sunny Brook Distillery Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of the legal heirs of Mildred Eberlein, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) granting a pension to Angeline Quillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Frances McGaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Anselena Huffine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) granting an increase of pension to Ann Eliza Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) granting a pension to Maybelle Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) for the relief of Edward Gibbs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 2175) granting a pension to Clara S. Woffenden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 2176) granting an increase of pension to Ida Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Ida Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hinman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) granting an increase of pension to Hettie A. Overmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Holzworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) granting an increase of pension to Anna J. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gerber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Thornbrough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) granting a pension to Louisa English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) granting a pension to Ada M. Wrighthouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting a pension to Melissa A. Trulock Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) granting a pension to Jessie S. Erle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) granting a pension to Flora A. Haymaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) granting a pension to Elizabeth Redding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) granting an honorable discharge to J. H. Hulse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) granting an honorable discharge to Augustus H. Ryman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) granting an honorable discharge to George Fling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) granting an honorable discharge to W. G. Burress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 2194) granting an increase of pension to Ida May Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Knox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Smelser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) granting an increase of pension to Hattie E. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Thaney Thompson Blain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) granting an increase of pension to Attilia J. Ritcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting an increase of pension to Armilda Swinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting an increase of pension to Pheby Houck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) granting an increase of pension to Amelia J. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) granting an increase of pension to Hester A. Delp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Ferry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Bozell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting a pension to Henretta Stigall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) granting an increase of pension to Tamer Ann Halloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) granting a pension to Perry L. Barkhurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) granting a pension to Ida E. Hawthorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Latt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) granting an increase of pension to Parmelia C. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) granting a pension to Webner M. Harter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 2218) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) granting an increase of pension to Esther A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) granting a pension to Cora Dell Barger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting a pension to Burton Homer Barger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting a pension to Melissa Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) granting a pension to Mary L. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Susan Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) granting a pension to Alice Corl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) granting a pension to Diadema Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) granting a pension to Helen M. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) granting a pension to Leona Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) granting a pension to Emily Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) granting a pension to Ada M. Hanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) granting an increase of pension to Florence Hadrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 2234) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Skean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) granting an increase of pension to Emily H. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) granting an increase of pension to Iminild I. Colburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) granting an increase of pension to Catherine F. Heffelfinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia D. Haslet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) to provide for the appointment from civil life of John Hafner to the grade of warrant officer, United States Army, and immediate retirement from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) granting an increase of pension to Ella May Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 2243) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bruno; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2244) granting a pension to James V. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) granting a pension to James M. Warde, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting a pension to Ollie T. Summears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 2247) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Dupes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) granting an increase of pension to Mary Stanfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Wirick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) granting an increase of pension to Louise E. Phagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) granting an increase of pension to Anna C. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) granting a pension to Ada Rollins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) granting a pension to Charles W. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) for the relief of Joseph Franklin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 2256) granting an increase of pension to Lucy H. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting an increase of pension to Catherine McNeal Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) granting an increase of pension to Agnes A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting an increase of pension to Alice Wolff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) granting an increase of pension to Emeretta Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting an increase of pension to Alida E. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Swainston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) granting an increase of pension to Anna Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting an increase of pension to Clara Stalker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting an increase of pension to Edith Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting an increase of pension to Madge Quinlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Fanny C. Nauman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) for the relief of William Morin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting an increase of pension to Ella Mix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting an increase of pension to Emma Lezotte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) granting an increase of pension to Almina Letts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting a pension to Jennette Le Roy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Kuhn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting an increase of pension to Susan L. Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. E. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Barclay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Rundell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) for the relief of Lucius Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Boisvert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Bushey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting a pension to Bert E. Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting a pension to May Bell Crowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Donahue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Fitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Francisco; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to Ernestene Friebe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) for the relief of George H. Gilbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting a pension to Jennette Le Roy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 2296) to amend the military record of Robert Zink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) granting an increase of pension to Kate E. Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Coultis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) granting an increase of pension to John M. Barrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Tewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jane Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) granting a pension to Mary A. Wylie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) granting a pension to Mary Belle Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) granting a pension to Anna B. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) granting an increase of pension to Hester Lynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Mamie Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2308) granting an increase of pension to Nianna M. Ruckel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) granting a pension to Robert Zink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) granting a pension to Laura C. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 2312) granting an increase of pension to Ellen K. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) to provide for a survey of Old Warwick Cove, town of Warwick, Kent County, R. I., with a view to its improvement for navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 2315) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Allyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) granting a pension to Karl E. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) granting an increase of pension to Orinda Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) granting an increase of pension to Lou Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) granting an increase of pension to Susann Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Briles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Bandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) granting a pension to Elizabeth L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) granting a pension to Stephen R. Branstetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 2325) granting a pension to Anderson B. Corbin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Harbison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 2328) granting a pension to John Ritner Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2329) granting a pension to Margaret Annie Hurrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) granting a pension to Annie Mansbarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) granting a pension to Lodemma Right; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) granting a pension to Ellen Wurl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) granting a pension to Ada A. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) granting a pension to Alva Runk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) granting a pension to Minta Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) granting a pension to Jacob Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2337) granting a pension to Anna P. Beyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Nevin Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting a pension to Samuel Fissel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting an increase of pension to Ada L. Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Berkheimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) granting an increase of pension to Margaret D. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Kann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Landis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) granting an increase of pension to Matilda V. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Roth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Swartz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) granting an increase of pension to Orley A. Vawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Yingling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Leff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Swope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting an increase of pension to Elmira B. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) granting an increase of pension to Evaline Andrew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) granting an increase of pension to Louana Bumbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) granting an increase of pension to Ellen S. Dalby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Daughenbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) granting an increase of pension to Margie C. Easter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Fike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) granting an increase of pension to Barbara F. Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) granting an increase of pension to Amelia A. Haiston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Kendig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) granting an increase of pension to Annie Longabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. McMahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) granting an increase of pension to Mary Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Rohrback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Roush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) granting an increase of pension to Luticia Seibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting an increase of pension to Belle C. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Marion E. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Margaret Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2380) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. F. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Mark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 2382) for the relief of W. G. Gentry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) granting a pension to Mrs. M. J. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 2384) granting a pension to W. A. Elliott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) granting a pension to William A. Medley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2386) granting a pension to James M. Haywood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2387) granting a pension to William Connally; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) granting a pension to J. S. McIntyre; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Andrew T. Bailey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) to correct the military record of Sidney J. Lock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 2391) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte A. Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Acton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stratton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Ruth E. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) granting an increase of pension to Amelia B. Glendening; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Bernice McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting a pension to William Camp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) for the relief of the Van Dorn Iron Works Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of Anna B. Mariner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) for the relief of Emanuel Lieberman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) for the relief of Frederick G. Barker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) for the relief of Silas McElroy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) for the relief of Ephraim A. Schwarzenberg; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) for the relief of Beatrice I. Manges; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) for the relief of Jesse G. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) for the relief of the city of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) to correct the military record of Oscar P. Quiggle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) to correct the military record of Gustave Mendel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) to pay the Pioneer Steamship Co. the sum of $3,100.50 money paid as duty for repairs in foreign ports; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of Grier P. Mobley on the list of retired second lieutenants of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 2413) for the relief of the Carbon Slate Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) for the relief of Peter Weitzel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) for the relief of Catharine L. Kline; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting an increase of pension to Emma B. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Gahrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting an increase of pension to Aravina M. Koons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Chester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) granting a pension to Thomas Yeager; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Wells Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) to correct the military record of Jordan Kidwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2423) for the relief of Joseph W. Skill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of James Moffitt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of Annie McColgan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of Francis A. Grennen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Morris Dietrich; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) for the relief of John C. Cantwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of Banks College; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of Walter R. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 2431) authorizing the accounting officers of the General Accounting Office to settle the accounts of C. M. Omohundro; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the extension by the Commissioner of Patents of the patent granted to Frederick G. Ransford and Peter Low as assignees of Marcus P. Norton, No. 25036, August 9, 1859; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of Max Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of William McDonnell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) for the relief of Hugh O'Riley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) for the relief of Harvey H. Goyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) for the relief of the State of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) for the relief of William S. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) for the relief of John J. Gillick; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of Ollie Keeley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) for the relief of William P. Brady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) granting a pension to George Francis Kilburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Slingerland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Van Kleeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Craigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) granting an increase of pension to Hannah S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) granting an increase of pension to Mary Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia B. Bacon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) granting an increase of pension to Ella Mandigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Dubos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2452) granting an increase of pension to Mary Kearsing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) granting an increase of pension to Sarah V. Adriance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kissell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2455) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Powley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Latch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) granting an increase of pension to Laura R. Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Heinmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) granting an increase of pension to Julia Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2461) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2462) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Van Vorst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Parke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Mainster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Feily; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2468) granting an increase of pension to Elsie C. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Watt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Vrooman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 2471) for the relief of A. L. Hedding; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) for the relief of Emile Genireux; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) for the relief of Louie June; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) for the relief of the San Francisco, Napa & Calistoga Railway; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Martha M. Flood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 2476) authorizing surveys and construction of flood-control works along the Kootenai River in Idaho; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 2477) for the relief of Joseph S. Carroll; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of Maclane Cawood; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2480) for the relief of Clarence C. Cadell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of Oliver C. Macey and Marguarite Macey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) for the relief of John Jakes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of William B. Warder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2484) for the relief of W. S. Smallwood; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) for the relief of Lewis Beauregard Whittington; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) for the relief of Andrew Jackson Seward (deceased); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of William R. Taylor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2490) for the relief of John H. Gonderman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) for the relief of Cora E. Plummer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) to extend the benefits of the employer's liability act of September 7, 1916, to John L. Jenifer, a former employee of the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) to extend the provisions of the retirement laws for the Lighthouse Service to include James L. Weems, a former employee of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2494) granting six months' pay to Vincentia V. Irwin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2495) granting a pension to Mary E. Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) granting a pension to Frances Jane Schrader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) granting a pension to Esther Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) granting a pension to Gertrude Brown Sigsbey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) granting a pension to Cora B. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) granting a pension to Kittie King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) granting an increase of pension to Hester E. Judd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) granting an increase of pension to Joanna C. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) granting an increase of pension to Mary Coggeshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) granting an increase of pension to Mary McGrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) granting an increase of pension to Levicy Sidner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Wornum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) granting an increase of pension to Emilie Wacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 2511) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Abbey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) granting an increase of pension to Martha S. Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Bickett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) granting an increase of pension to Thirza E. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Litchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) granting an increase of pension to Hattie McKeehen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Mow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) granting an increase of pension to Julia B. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) granting a pension to Sophy Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) granting a pension to Rena C. Otto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) granting a pension to Rose Tunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2522) for the relief of Lincoln County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) for the relief of Harvey Dunkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of Mary M. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) for the relief of William Henry Judson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) for the relief of William Perkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) for the relief of William Porter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of J. W. La Bare; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) for the relief of Rezin Franklin Neves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) for the relief of William H. Nightingale; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) for the relief of Marion Francis Wade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) granting a pension to Margaret E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) granting a pension to Emma Rossell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) granting a pension to Iona Radabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) granting a pension to Ruth Heston Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) granting a pension to Mina Barden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) granting a pension to Jeannette Twomey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) granting a pension to George S. Fuqua; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) granting a pension to Howard E. Craven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda A. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) granting an increase of pension to Emeline B. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Rosa I. Post; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Kinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Himes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Fuqua; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Splawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Brandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) granting an increase of pension to Amelia A. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2552) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Coffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) granting an increase of pension to Amyetta Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Price Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie M. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 2557) granting a pension to Maggie Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2558) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 2559) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) granting an increase of pension to Sarah H. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) granting an increase of pension to Amy Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) granting an increase of pension to Lucia Furguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2564) granting an increase of pension to Albert Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) granting an increase of pension to Etta E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) granting an increase of pension to M. Melissa Canfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) granting an increase of pension to Maria C. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) granting a pension to Francellia Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) granting a pension to Lurah J. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) granting a pension to Adell B. Lowery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) granting a pension to Henrietta W. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) granting a pension to Ruth M. Forker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) granting a pension to Elizabeth Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) granting a pension to Samuel Jacob Freed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) granting a pension to Isaac Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2576) granting a pension to Emma J. Rutty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2577) granting a pension to Evvah A. Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of John W. Barnum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 2579) granting a pension to Amanda Adeline Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2580) granting a pension to Sarah E. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) granting a pension to Sarah A. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) granting a pension to Mattie J. Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2583) granting a pension to Anzonetta Hooker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) granting a pension to Basha Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2585) granting a pension to John Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2586) granting a pension to Luella Blakely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) granting a pension to Caroline Bartz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2588) granting a pension to Juanita M., Roy C., and Dot Bandhauer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2589) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Weidner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2592) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Tullis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2593) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2594) granting an increase of pension to Edna L. Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2595) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2596) granting an increase of pension to Melissa A. Schneck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) granting an increase of pension to Theressa P. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2598) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Gothard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2599) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Eagy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) granting an increase of pension to Ally Dice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Corey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2602) granting an increase of pension to Margie Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2603) granting an increase of pension to Esther Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2604) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lawhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) granting an increase of pension to Grace Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 2607) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2608) granting an increase of pension to Malinda J. Hollopeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2609) granting a pension to Ollive Dooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) granting a pension to John L. Fitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) granting a pension to Ernest Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) granting a pension to Guy B. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) granting a pension to Elizabeth Lawler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2614) granting a pension to Annie Hinsey Lanagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2615) granting a pension to Nancy A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) granting a pension to Sarah J. Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) granting a pension to Almira Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) granting a pension to Clark Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) granting a pension to Mary L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2620) granting a pension to Nancy C. Whitesell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) granting a pension to Martha Mankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2622) granting a pension to Ida Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) granting a pension to Ellen M. Besser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2624) granting a pension to Lillie M. Ashton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2625) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) granting an increase of pension to Alice Holderman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2627) granting an increase of pension to Thursey F. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2628) granting an increase of pension to William D. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) granting an increase of pension to George A. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Rardin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) granting an increase of pension to Alicia Ralston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2632) granting an increase of pension to John Stringer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2633) granting an increase of pension to Martha Stockley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) granting an increase of pension to Orphy E. Oldham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2635) granting an increase of pension to Catherine H. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) granting an increase of pension to Lella J. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) granting an increase of pension to Carrie J. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2638) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. McNeill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2639) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2640) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Keylon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Lindley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) granting an increase of pension to Lacey Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia J. Deeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) granting an increase of pension to Hannah E. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2646) granting an increase of pension to Frances Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2647) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Grays Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2648) to reimburse David J. Williams for cash shortage due to theft of public funds; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2649) authorizing the President to reappoint John P. Pence formerly an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army, an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2650) for the relief of Augustus Sipple; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2651) for the relief of David F. Richards, alias David Richards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) for the relief of Carroll C. Humber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2653) for the relief of Letitia Spence; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) for the relief of Anton Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) for the relief of George Charles Walthers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) for the relief of Mrs. Frank G. Sanford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) for the relief of Thomas Huggins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2658) for the relief of Finch R. Archer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) for the relief of Annie M. Lizenby; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2660) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Swift; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) granting a pension to Agnes O'Neill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2662) granting a pension to Anna Z. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2663) granting a pension to Hilaire Nallette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2664) granting a pension to James F. Conner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2665) granting an increase of pension to Mabel F. Coen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2666) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Burnham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2667) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia E. Endicott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paul; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2669) granting a pension to Bettie Brackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2670) granting a pension to Laura B. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2671) granting a pension to William Rowlings Hoge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2672) granting a pension to Ellen M. Polson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 2673) granting an increase of pension to Emma Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2674) granting an increase of pension to Berintha Hancock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) granting a pension to Lola I. Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) granting a pension to Susan Whittemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) granting a pension to Margaret G. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) granting a pension to Anna McPharlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) granting a pension to Estella Cowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2680) granting a pension to William McCauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 2681) granting an increase of pension to Mollie M. Struble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Rupert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2683) granting an increase of pension to Fanny T. Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) granting an increase of pension to Kate R. Law; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2686) granting an increase of pension to Mary Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2687) granting an increase of pension to Adaline F. Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2688) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Askey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. Weimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2691) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Burkhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Kocher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2693) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Rodkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2694) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Graffius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2695) granting an increase of pension to Angelina Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2696) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2697) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2698) granting an increase of pension to Julia Dieffenbacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2699) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Eckard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2700) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Slick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2701) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Hite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2702) granting an increase of pension to Rachel E. Heuston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Nicholson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2704) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Crofts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2705) granting an increase of pension to Susan Nevitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2706) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Smyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2707) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Vallance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2708) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2709) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2710) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Lower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2711) granting an increase of pension to Alice Kiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2712) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Kenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2713) granting an increase of pension to Gretta G. Litton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2714) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. Blackstone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2715) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Burchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2716) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cameron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2717) granting an increase of pension to Catharine S. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2718) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Gibboney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2719) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Gifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2720) granting an increase of pension to Linda B. Fouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2721) granting an increase of pension to Emma Akers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2722) granting an increase of pension to Abigail Anne England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2723) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Over; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2724) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Ellenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2725) granting an increase of pension to Martha Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Laura Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2727) granting an increase of pension to Juniata E. S. Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2728) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2729) granting an increase of pension to Clara M. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2730) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Mosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2731) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Lytle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2732) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2733) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Corbin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2734) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2736) granting an increase of pension to Mary McKee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2737) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Mahoney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2738) granting an increase of pension to Anna Maria Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2739) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2740) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2741) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Sarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2742) granting an increase of pension to Telitha Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2743) granting an increase of pension to Emma Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2745) granting an increase of pension to Lillie D. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2746) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Kissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Swisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2749) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Bare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2750) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2751) granting an increase of pension to Hannah B. Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2752) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2753) granting an increase of pension to Helen McCord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2754) granting an increase of pension to Christena Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2755) granting an increase of pension to Annah E. Hains; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2756) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Hook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2757) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2758) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Hainley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2759) granting an increase of pension to Mary List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2760) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Burkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2761) granting an increase of pension to Susannah M. Lynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2762) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Hummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2763) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2764) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Turnbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2765) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Prunkard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2766) granting an increase of pension to Annie I. Latherow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2767) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lindley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2768) granting an increase of pension to Bertha H. Lafner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2769) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) granting an increase of pension to Leah D. Barger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2771) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lehman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2772) granting an increase of pension to Alice Plunket; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ella Feay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2775) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2776) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Gracey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2777) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2778) granting an increase of pension to Betty S. Satterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2779) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2780) granting an increase of pension to Leana Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2781) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie S. Hight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2782) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Rosebury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2783) granting an increase of pension to Laura V. Perdew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2784) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Foor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2785) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Fouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2787) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Malaghan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2788) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Malone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2789) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Mechen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2790) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2791) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2792) granting an increase of pension to Hannah O. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2793) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hausman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2794) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Clossin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) granting a pension to Eva Paul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2796) granting a pension to Charles J. Lichty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to Irene G. Plummer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2798) granting a pension to Clara May Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2799) granting a pension to Jennie Larimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Elda M. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2801) granting a pension to Anna Maud Hogmire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2802) granting a pension to Daisy M. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2803) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 2804) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Selden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2805) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. W. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2806) granting an increase of pension to Cora I. Cromwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEECH: A bill (H. R. 2807) granting an increase of pension to Josiah A. Hollen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 2808) for the relief of Ella G. Richter, daughter of Henry W. Richter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2810) granting a pension to Katherine Hearst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) granting a pension to Amy H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2812) granting a pension to Dollie S. Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2813) granting an increase of pension to Annie Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 2814) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Dorr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2815) granting a pension to Lovila S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2816) granting a pension to Mary A. Langmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 2817) for the relief of Michael J. Bauman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2818) for the relief of George Evans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2819) for the relief of Samuel F. Freiert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) for the relief of John L. Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2821) for the relief of John Heinzenberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2822) for the relief of Charles Schreiber; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2823) for the relief of William J. Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2824) granting an increase of pension to Frederike Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2825) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2826) granting an increase of pension to Amanda T. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2827) granting an increase of pension to Margarite Schmall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2828) granting an increase of pension to Mary Racklyeft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2829) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2830) granting an increase of pension to Emma Moran; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2831) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla Pinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2832) granting an increase of pension to Pauline Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Engelhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2835) granting an increase of pension to Mary Corcoran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) granting a pension to Mary A. Lawhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2837) granting a pension to Carrie E. Block; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Timlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2839) granting a pension to Mary L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 2840) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Heriford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2841) to authorize a preliminary survey of Mud River in Kentucky with a view to the control of its flood; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2842) granting a pension to Mrs. I. E. Embry; to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 2843) granting a pension to Harry Eoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2844) granting a pension to Susan Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2845) granting a pension to Mary A. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2846) granting a pension to Mary E. Packer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) granting a pension to William Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2848) granting an increase of pension to Lib E. Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2849) granting an increase of pension to Margaret F. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2850) granting an increase of pension to Delia A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2851) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Isenhood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2852) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Deiters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2854) granting an increase of pension to Julia Ann Dyson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2855) granting an increase of pension to Telitha Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2856) granting an increase of pension to Julia R. Burris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2857) granting an increase of pension to John W. Beckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2858) granting an increase of pension to William McKeown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2859) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2860) granting an increase of pension to Mattie R. Way; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2861) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Tullis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) granting an increase of pension to Manerva Wears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2863) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Stookesberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2864) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Six; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2866) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2867) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2868) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Nickerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2869) granting an increase of pension to Mary Nicholson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2871) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2872) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Mealy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2873) granting an increase of pension to Verlinda McGillivary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2874) granting an increase of pension to Anna McCaffrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2875) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2876) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Giffen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) granting an increase of pension to Minerva F. Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Findley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Clunk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) granting an increase of pension to Clara Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. Cale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2883) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2884) granting an increase of pension to Mary Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Y. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2886) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2887) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Agler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) granting an increase of pension to Robert Petritz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2890) for the relief of John R. Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 2891) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Bolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) granting an increase of pension to Catherine M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2893) granting an increase of pension to Nellie L. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2894) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Chamberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2895) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Emily Colcord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2896) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie B. Crandlemire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2897) granting an increase of pension to Delia J. Dearborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2898) granting an increase of pension to Augusta M. Dolloff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Dudley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2900) granting an increase of pension to Olive J. M. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2901) granting an increase of pension to Ettie Mae Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Flye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2903) granting an increase of pension to Lucy R. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2904) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Hassell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2905) granting an increase of pension to Florence M. Jewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2906) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Judkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2907) granting an increase of pension to Annie F. Kirkwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2909) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Litchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2910) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Meader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2911) granting an increase of pension to Harriett M. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2912) granting an increase of pension to Lottie L. Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2913) granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2914) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2915) granting an increase of pension to Abbie J. Over; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Purinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2917) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2918) granting an increase of pension to Rose A. Stacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2919) granting an increase of pension to Emma P. Stephenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2920) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2921) granting an increase of pension to Wallace W. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2922) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. Sturdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2923) granting an increase of pension to Annette B. Thorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2924) granting an increase of pension to Celina Wedge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2925) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Whitcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2926) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2927) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Whitten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) granting an increase of pension to Flora Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2929) granting an increase of pension to Eliza F. Withee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) granting an increase of pension to Louise M. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) granting a pension to Sarah L. Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) granting a pension to Jesse C. Cambridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2933) granting a pension to Sarah J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2934) granting a pension to Mary E. Edes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2935) granting a pension to George H. Fortier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2936) granting a pension to Hattie E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) granting a pension to Orinda L. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) granting a pension to Sidney Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2939) granting a pension to George E. Spear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) granting a pension to Jennie A. Witham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2941) granting a pension to Levi S. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 2942) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Warthen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 2943) for the relief of the African-American Importing Co. (Inc.), of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2944) for the relief of Frances E. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2945) for the relief of Anna Balch; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2946) for the relief of Stephen Schmeiser, sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2947) for the relief of Hernando de Soto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2948) for the relief of Charles J. Eisenhauer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2949) granting a pension to James Cash; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2950) granting a pension to Minnie Klingel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2951) granting an increase of pension to Eliza King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2952) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Osmun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2953) granting an increase of pension to Julia V. Crowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2954) granting an increase of pension to Herman Henry Wendt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 2955) for the relief of Dudley M. Winthrop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2956) for the relief of George Boiko & Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2957) for the relief of Ralph Riesler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2958) for the relief of Rebecca Adler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2959) for the relief of John J. McArdle; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2960) to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claim of Harden F. Taylor for services rendered to the Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2961) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2962) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2963) granting an increase of pension to Elvina C. Eberhard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 2964) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Hazelwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2965) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2966) granting a pension to Sarah Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2967) granting a pension to Mary E. Drew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2968) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Arie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2969) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2970) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2971) granting an increase of pension to Almira Lennter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2972) granting a pension to Elizabeth Parrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 2973) granting an increase of pension to Almira Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2974) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda Hamlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2975) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Inman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2976) granting an increase of pension to Loueasy Kerby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ailes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2978) granting an increase of pension to Emeliza Barnhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2979) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2980) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Belcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2981) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Brittain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2982) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Burkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2983) granting an increase of pension to Celia J. Cromer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2984) granting an increase of pension to Susana Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2985) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Frogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2986) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Tye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2987) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Lovett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2988) granting an increase of pension to Edward Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2989) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Littrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2990) granting an increase of pension to William R. Neal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Provence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensons.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2992) granting an increase of pension to Emily Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2993) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2994) granting a pension to Elizabeth Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) granting a pension to Marion M. Woolum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2996) granting a pension to James Couch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2997) granting a pension to Cappa King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) granting a pension to Ewell King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2999) granting a pension to Martha A. Dicken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3000) granting a pension to William Hibbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3001) granting a pension to William Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3002) granting a pension to Dan Hibbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3004) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Peace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3005) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Reeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3006) granting a pension to Delia M. Nuckols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) granting a pension to Nanie Peace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) granting a pension to Mary Jane Haggard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) granting a pension to Remmy Beason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3010) granting a pension to Anna M. Peckham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3011) granting a pension to Emma C. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3012) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hargrave; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3013) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 3014) granting a pension to Emeline C. Best; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3015) granting a pension to Matilda G. Blain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3016) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Mead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3017) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3018) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3019) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3021) granting a pension to Mary E. Youngman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3022) granting an increase of pension to Martha L. Petet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3023) granting a pension to Nancy V. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3024) granting a pension to Victoria E. Jacox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3025) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3026) granting a pension to Catherine E. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3027) granting a pension to Etta McOwen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3028) granting an increase of pension to Matilda J. Kellar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 3029) for the relief of Vern E. Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3030) for the relief of Charles W. Hoffman; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) granting a pension to Emma Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 3032) for the relief of First National Bank of Mountain Home, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3033) for the relief of Lawrence J. Kessinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of Mary H. Mosier; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Brassfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3036) granting a pension to Charles L. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3037) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Garthwait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3038) granting an increase of pension to Belle Greenslate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3039) granting an increase of pension to Jessie M. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 3041) for the relief of Alfred Saint Dennis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) granting insurance to Lydia C. Spry; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3043) for the relief of Robert Petross; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3044) for the relief of Leon Freidman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3045) for the relief of Cornelius Harrigan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of the Burt Wool & Leather Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) for the relief of J. Edward Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3048) for the relief of Nellie McConnell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) for the relief of Alexander Ashbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) granting an increase of pension to Laura W. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) granting an increase of pension to Jennie S. Dinsmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) granting an increase of pension to Pauline G. Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) granting an increase of pension to Mary McKendree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3055) granting an increase of pension to Margaretta T. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3056) granting an increase of pension to Lydia E. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Pollock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) granting an increase of pension to Fayetta Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Speedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3061) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Truitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia E. VanGiesen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) granting a pension to John Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3064) granting a pension to Sara E. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) granting a pension to Tillie Sutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) granting a pension to Margaret C. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) granting a pension to Frank Bernard O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) granting a pension to Dolly O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) granting a pension to Kizzia McNabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) granting a pension to Nancy A. Keating; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3071) granting a pension to Charlotte Gamble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3072) granting a pension to Catharine Dunmire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3073) granting a pension to Harry S. Beyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 3074) granting a pension to Veretta Irish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3075) granting a pension to Commodore Perry Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Basore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 3077) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. DeWitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) granting an increase of pension to Clara Elizabeth LeForge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3080) granting an increase of pension to Christina M. Bunz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3081) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Latta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) granting a pension to Lillian I. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) granting a pension to Laura E. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3084) granting a pension to Margaret Starkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3085) granting a pension to Margaret Stought; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) granting a pension to Matilda Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) granting a pension to Caroline Hankison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) granting a pension to Adaline A. Lawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) granting a pension to Hannah Maffit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) granting a pension to Ann Spurback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) granting a pension to Mary E. Sherrard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) granting a pension to Anna M. Sale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3093) granting a pension to Jennie McCrady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) granting a pension to Nancy Jane Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) granting a pension to Catherine Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3096) granting a pension to Laura P. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) granting a pension to Eliza A. Slatzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) granting a pension to Laura A. McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) granting a pension to Mary Groff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) granting a pension to Mary H. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) granting a pension to Matilda Baumaster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) granting a pension to Lydia Bock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) granting a pension to Margaret J. Cutright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) granting a pension to Catherine Lenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) granting a pension to Catherine Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Nihiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Mundell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) granting an increase of pension to Parthena Shepperd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) granting a pension to Matilda Larimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) granting a pension to Almeda Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Mary A. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) granting a pension to Josephine Woodrum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Lehman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) granting a pension to Mary E. Vore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Falles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Moritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Adcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 3121) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3122) granting a pension to Eunice Tishue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) granting a pension to Tina L. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3124) granting a pension to Emma Jane Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) granting a pension to Carrie E. Pickering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) granting a pension to Rachel W. T. Kuntzelman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boon, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3130) granting a pension to Mary H. Maclay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) granting an increase of pension to Alverato (Esther) Shear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3132) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Harley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 3133) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 3134) granting a pension to Emily Saint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 3135) granting a pension to Minerva Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3136) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 3137) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3138) granting an increase of pension to Jennie P. McClanahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) granting an increase of pension to Adelia A. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda M. Lippy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 3142) granting an increase of pension to Amelia D. Warhurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3143) granting a pension to Mattie Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3144) to remove cloud on military discharge of Augustus C. Turner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of Willis B. Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3146) granting an increase of pension to Maria Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Bascomb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Phalen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 3150) granting an increase of pension to Johana Kurz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 3151) granting an increase of pension to Anna Marie Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Koch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) granting an increase of pension to Kate C. Levan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Emery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Lorah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3156) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3157) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Billings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) granting an increase of pension to Johanna C. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) granting an increase of pension to Etta M. McNeil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) granting an increase of pension to Ella R. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) granting an increase of pension to Norman Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) for the relief of Robert Bryan Somerville; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) for the relief of William W. Terry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) for the relief of Lena Noonan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) for the relief of Carl Holm; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) for the relief of Bert H. Libbey, alias Burt H. Libbey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) for the relief of the University of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) for the relief of Douglas B. Espy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) granting a pension to Henry R. Browne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) for the relief of Franklin B. Morse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 3171) granting a pension to Richard F. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Blakely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) granting an increase of pension to Isabella M. Mahaffie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) granting an increase of pension to Clotilda Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) granting an increase of pension to Edith B. Burchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3176) granting an increase of pension to Melinda A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Girrel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) granting an increase of pension to Claude W. Swartwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3179) granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Pollyard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Klinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) granting an increase of pension to Bertha C. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Mary Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Lauth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) granting an increase of pension to Mary Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3186) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Robb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) granting an increase of pension to Diana C. Alters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3189) providing for the promotion of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, United States Army Air Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) to change the military record of William M. Sherman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) for the relief of John Costigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of William Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) for the relief of Mary Neaf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to Ammy Le Roy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Juengst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting a pension to Hattie Geske; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) granting a pension to Lillie Geske; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) granting a pension to Thomas Joseph Keegan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) granting a pension to Marie Higgins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) granting a pension to Ida S. Ketterer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3202) for the relief of Elizabeth Hunt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting a pension to Mary A. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting a pension to Alta V. Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting a pension to Alia Meek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) granting a pension to Lillian A. Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Bauman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3208) granting an increase of pension to Lavina Beatty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3209) granting an increase of pension to Anna C. Broeker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3210) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) granting an increase of pension to Lonada Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Wayne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) granting an increase of pension to Parmelia Mackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of Mary Martin Harrison, mother of the late Henry Hartwell Harrison, ensign, United States Navy, Aviation Service; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) for the relief of Dean Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) for the relief of Margaret T. Head, administratrix; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) for the relief of Michael F. Calnan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting a pension to Rose M. Ham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) granting a pension to Delia Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) granting an increase of pension to Nellie McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3221) for the relief of Ross F. Collins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) for the relief of John M. King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) for the relief of Minor H. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) for the relief of Ichabod J. Woodard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to Nannie S. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) granting a pension to Ewing E. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) granting a pension to Mary S. Bayless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) granting a pension to Sarah M. Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) granting a pension to Lou Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) granting a pension to Ella Starke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) granting a pension to James S. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) granting a pension to Alice A. Hussey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3233) granting a pension to Amanda B. Halcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Slavens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3235) granting an increase of pension to Adell I. McKelvey Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 3236) granting a pension to Mary E. Eckert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting a pension to Mary J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3238) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) for the relief of Charles D. Shay; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) for the relief of William H. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) for the relief of Seymour Buckley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) for the relief of George J. Covert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) for the relief of Sterrit Keefe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) for the relief of Paul J. Francis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) for the relief of Joseph McCloy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) for the relief of John G. Pavek; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) for the relief of James Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) for the relief of Nicholas Amoroso; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of William McCormack; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) for the relief of John J. Torpey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) for the relief of A. R. Free; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) for the relief of Thomas Braxton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) for the relief of Lizzie C. Ferris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) granting an increase of pension to Marilla Couse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. McCauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) granting an increase of pension to Susan W. Depew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) granting an increase of pension to Ellen E. Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3258) granting an increase of pension to Jane L. Terbush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Sheak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) granting an increase of pension to Frances Evaline Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) granting an increase of pension to Eliza K. D. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Lindsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3263) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) granting an increase of pension to Hattie E. Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3265) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3266) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Croshier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. Conklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of John G. DeCamp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3269) granting a pension to Catherine Spielman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) granting a pension to Martha A. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3271) granting an increase of pension to Matilda K. Streiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) granting an increase of pension to George W. Rathman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to Henry Fields; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3274) granting an increase of pension to Jess Musgrave; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 3275) granting an increase of pension to Columbus J. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) granting an increase of pension to Rose R. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3277) providing for the examination and survey of Weymouth Back River, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 3278) for the relief of Richard A. Chavis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3279) for the relief of Hattie Long Padgette, widow of Curtis D. Padgette; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of James Earl Briggman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) for the relief of Caughman-Kaminer Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 3282) for the relief of Frank Fanning; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) granting a pension to Ardilla D. Rigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) granting a pension to Mary F. McComber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3285) granting a pension to Margaret J. Easterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) granting a pension to Katherine Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) granting a pension to Mary E. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) granting an increase of pension to Clara G. Burtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia E. Dillard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Hailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) granting an increase of pension to Theodosia Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3292) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Larabee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3295) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. McQuary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) granting an increase of pension to Barbara E. Matheny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) granting an increase of pension to Hattie M. Pay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Stucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) granting an increase of pension to Ida S. Beauchamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Branson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3303) granting an increase of pension to Ritty A. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) granting an increase of pension to Lumira Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Greek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Grotts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Gustin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) granting an increase of pension to Abbeline Mathis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) granting an increase of pension to Louisa J. Skidmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to Edie E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Stites; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3315) for the relief of Charles A. Black, alias Angus Black; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting a pension to Edwin G. Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) granting an increase of pension to Prudence M. Grover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) granting an increase of pension to Jeanette Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Hescock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) granting an increase of pension to Jane S. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) granting an increase of pension to Nora I. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) granting an increase of pension to Jane S. Mehuron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) granting an increase of pension to Florence R. Shufelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Brigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Julia Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3330) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta V. Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3331) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3332) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) granting an increase of pension to Ellen H. Gile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Sprague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3335) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude G. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) granting an increase of pension to Juliette Sturges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3338) granting a pension to Lucy E. O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3339) granting a pension to Charles B. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3340) granting a pension to Elizabeth L. Traver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) granting a pension to Lester A. Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Snagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3345) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3346) granting an increase of pension to Ann Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) granting an increase of pension to Amanda C. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3348) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Dudley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) granting an increase of pension to Flora I. Eggleston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3350) granting an increase of pension to Myra Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3352) for the relief of Estle David; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) for the relief of William F. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) granting a pension to Irene Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) granting a pension to Minerva Pence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) granting a pension to Mary C. Benton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Brumfiel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) granting a pension to Susan Dill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) granting a pension to Sarah Catherine Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) granting a pension to Charles W. Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3362) granting a pension to John Stradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3363) granting a pension to Frances M. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3364) granting a pension to Maggie Smithson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3365) granting a pension to Mary Shanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) granting a pension to Eliza J. Saxon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) granting a pension to Lucinda A. Pitzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) granting a pension to Christiana Minnich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 3369) granting an increase of pension to Harold P. Waldo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Watts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Lysinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3372) for the relief of George M. Browder and F. N. Browder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Almira M. Wren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Tweed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Rees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Cunning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Hemphill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Allie Truesdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 3379) granting a pension to Elisha Frazer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) granting a pension to Catherine Howerton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) granting a pension to Madora F. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) granting a pension to Emma T. Neel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) granting a pension to Ida Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) granting a pension to Bruce Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. De Vore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) granting an increase of pension to George Richard Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 3389) granting a pension to Alice V. Schmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 3390) granting a pension to Robert L. Zell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) granting a pension to Reuben J. Franklin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. Baggett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3393) for the relief of Charles C. Webster; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3394) for the relief of W. P. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) for the relief of George W. Woodall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) for the relief of Benjamin S. Bailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) to correct the military record of John W. Gulley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) to correct the military record of Henry L. Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) to correct the military record of Henry T. Phillips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3400) to correct the military record of Andrew B. Ritter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) to correct the military record of Frederick Urban; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 3402) granting a pension to Mary A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) granting a pension to Hooker Ashton DeLand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) granting a pension to Catherine Schuey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3405) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Cooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3406) granting an increase of pension to Jane Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) granting an increase of pension to Elisabeth Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) granting an increase of pension to Louise B. Otis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) granting an increase of pension to Margarite Scholand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Whisker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3413) granting an increase of pension to Anne J. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Eccles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) granting an increase of pension to Martha Giles Witman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) granting an increase of pension to Jane Cick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Grof; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 3418) granting a pension to Edith J. May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) granting a pension to Mary C. Wertley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) granting an increase of pension to Amy Lampman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) granting an increase of pension to Sellie Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Searle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3425) granting an increase of pension to Mary Belford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3426) granting an increase of pension to Satilla Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to Catharine T. M. Bachman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) granting an increase of pension to Julia L. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) granting an increase of pension to Harriett E. Bubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 3431) granting a pension to Dell E. Lyons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) granting a pension to Charles Sabins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) granting a pension to Louis Head; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3434) granting a pension to Susan K. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) granting a pension to Jonah Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3436) granting an increase of pension to Kate Garrity; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3437) granting an increase of pension to Martha Spraker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3438) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Houghton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) granting an increase of pension to Evelcen Lonnen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 3440) for the relief of Alvin H. Tinker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) for the relief of John W. McCulloch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3442) for the relief of Clifford J. Sanghove; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) for the relief of Alfred O. Huestis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) granting a pension to Eliza D. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) granting an increase of pension to Alma M. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) granting an increase of pension to Charles George Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Shatto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) granting an increase of pension to Bertha W. Weego; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 3451) for the relief of Nicola Valerio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) to reimburse Dominic Fracapane for injuries sustained in an accident with a Government-owned motor truck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 3453) granting a pension to Mathilda H. Byrnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Henry F. Clement; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Churchill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 3456) granting an increase of pension to Flora E. Tyler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) granting an increase of pension to Flora Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3458) for the relief of Charles Beretta, Isidore J. Proulx, and John J. West; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) for the relief of Chico-Westwood-Susanville Auto Stage Co., Chico, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) for the relief of First Lieut. Frank Z. Pirkey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) for the relief of Joseph A. Stevenson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of Paul Jelna; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) for the relief of William S. Keary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of Levi Rodenberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 3465) for the restitution of employees at the post office at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3466) for the relief of George A. Winslow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3467) for the relief of Giles Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3468) granting an increase of pension to Kate V. Scheyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 3469) granting an increase of pension to Alice Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3470) granting relief to Havert S. Sealy and Porteus R. Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3471) for the relief of Mabel Lane Beck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 3472) granting a pension to Sarah E. Foose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) granting a pension to Kate Gemmill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3474) granting a pension to Sarah Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) granting a pension to Virginia Jefferson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) granting a pension to Barbara E. Null; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) granting an increase of pension to Mary McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Roth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3480) granting a pension to Alice R. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting a pension to Emma Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) granting a pension to Adelaide A. Ryerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) granting a pension to Susan B. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) granting a pension to Josephine P. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca B. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Adrianna Lowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) granting an increase of pension to Josephine H. Wardwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) granting an increase of pension to Achsah E. Purinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) granting an increase of pension to Hattie G. Lunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 3493) granting a pension to Eva Stump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 3494) for the relief of Sidney F. Foree; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONAST: A bill (H. R. 3495) granting an increase of pension to Louise Lavender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3497) granting an increase of pension to Marcel H. Poirier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 3498) granting a pension to James G. Pearl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) granting an increase of pension to Susan Fortney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3500) granting a pension to Sarah E. Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to Elizabeth Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting a pension to Clara A. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) granting a pension to Cora L. Kraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Mankins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wharton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia M. De Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) granting an increase of pension to William A. Pfaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Capt. George E. Kraul a captain of Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 3511) granting a pension to Mary Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) granting a pension to Anna C. Vogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) granting a pension to Homer Sheeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3514) granting a pension to Mary M. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Linton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. B. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to Harriet L. Faulk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) granting an increase of pension to Iona Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Zeiher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting an increase of pension to Jane B. Faithful; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) granting an increase of pension to Victoria L. Haverty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3526) granting a pension to Mary D. Sanborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3528) granting a pension to Jefferson D. Flowers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to Oscar Watkins Holloway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 3531) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to place the name of Charles Allen, formerly lieutenant, United States Navy, on the retired list with proper rating; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain moneys to James McCann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PALMISANO: A bill (H. R. 3533) for the relief of Stanislaus Siemek; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) to correct the naval record of Frank Mackin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting a pension to Mary Kotwall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 3536) granting an increase of pension to Laura Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 3537) for the relief of William F. Goode; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Herman A. Krueger, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3539) for the relief of Frank Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) for the relief of John Kreamer, E. H. Schweppe, Richard Kiessling, and William Claviter, bondsmen of Hugo Stamm; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 3541) for the relief of James Cantlin, alias James Cantlion, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 3542) for the relief of certain seamen who are judgment creditors of the Black Star Line (Inc.) for wages earned; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to David Gregory; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3544) granting a pension to Green Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting a pension to William H. Hensley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting a pension to Joseph W. Rickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) granting a pension to James F. McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3548) granting a pension to Burl F. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) granting a pension to David D. Lay; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) granting a pension to Allen Nantz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) granting a pension to Flora Fuson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 3552) granting an increase of pension to Christina Flint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 3553) granting a pension to Elizabeth Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting a pension to John Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) granting a pension to John W. Duckworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) granting a pension to Clarence W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) granting a pension to Martha J. Dukate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) granting a pension to Nancy J. Becker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting a pension to Frank Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) granting a pension to Lawrence E. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) granting a pension to Andrew S. Deeds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) granting a pension to Maude I. Lowrance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) granting a pension to Dora Alice Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) granting a pension to Elmer G. McAllister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) granting a pension to Levi C. Posey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) granting a pension to Alonzo Lawrance Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) granting a pension to James Rumble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) granting a pension to Lula Fluhrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) granting a pension to Anna J. Wandel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) granting a pension to Millie Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting an increase of pension to Mollie S. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3572) granting an increase of pension to Dorothea Leimenstoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Medcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) granting an increase of pension to Isabell Critser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3578) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Houghland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) granting an increase of pension to Florence P. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Beiling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) granting an increase of pension to Celina J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) granting an increase of pension to Mary Susan Houghland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Weigert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) granting an increase of pension to Anna Hay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) granting an increase of pension to Kate Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) granting an increase of pension to Anna Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Dentinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bottles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) granting an increase of pension to Verena Pfeffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) granting an increase of pension to Emma Parcell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) granting an increase of pension to Julia Pfeifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3595) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Romans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3596) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Roesner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Richeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) granting an increase of pension to Clara L. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3600) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) granting an increase of pension to Matilda A. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Shook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) granting an increase of pension to Mary Skaggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3607) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) granting an increase of pension to George Ann Tadlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda Tuley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3610) granting an increase of pension to Magdalena Toelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) granting an increase of pension to Christiana Tichenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Utley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Ulen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) granting an increase of pension to Ida Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) granting an increase of pension to Emily Woolridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) granting an increase of pension to Parazetta Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) granting an increase of pension to Louisa L. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) granting an increase of pension to Lorinda Wester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) granting an increase of pension to Sophonia A. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) granting an increase of pension to Ollie Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia Niehaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) granting an increase of pension to Katharina Maas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) granting an increase of pension to Maria M. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3627) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Kretchmar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) granting an increase of pension to Katharina Korp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3630) granting an increase of pension to Theodocia Kell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) granting an increase of pension to Izella E. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) granting an increase of pension to Emer Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Kerilla Hedgspeth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Henrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Heidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Hedden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) granting an increase of pension to Lelia Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Hebb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Maria Hile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Gehlhausen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) granting an increase of pension to Phillis Gilchrist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Greenlees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3646) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3648) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fortune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) granting an increase of pension to Percilla Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Everly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Drummond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3653) granting an increase of pension to America A. Donaldson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) granting an increase of pension to Lydia C. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3655) granting an increase of pension to Sarrah E. Carrigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3656) granting an increase of pension to Minerva L. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) granting an increase of pension to Alice Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Behagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Bredenkamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting an increase of pension to Euphema Beasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Archer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) for the relief of Louis Bender; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) authorizing the payment of compensation to Laura Roush for the death of her husband, William C. Roush; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 3666) granting an increase of pension to Kate Zehler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) granting an increase of pension to Annette E. Calkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) granting an increase of pension to Cinda A. Ruggles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 3670) granting a pension to Anna P. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) granting an increase of pension to Leroy Palmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) for the relief of Maj. F. Ellis Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) granting an increase of pension to Martin O. Larsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of Paul Wallerstein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) for the relief of Lieut. Henry C. Weber, Medical Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) for the relief of F. M. Gray, jr., Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) for the relief of Howard Emmett Tallmadge; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Abe Cohen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680) granting a pension to Edward H. Van Epps; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) for the relief of Charles F. Reilly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3682) for the relief of Lawrence P. Morris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) for the relief of Leroy Overpeck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 3684) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Pickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 3686) authorizing a survey for the control of the excess flood waters of the Mouse River, N. Dak., for the construction and maintenance of retention dams and reservoirs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 3687) granting a pension to Catherine Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 3688) granting a pension to Cora S. Brightman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) granting a pension to Alsada A. Cone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Jennie Berrey Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) granting a pension to Mary Jane Enos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3692) granting a pension to Edgar C. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting a pension to Henrietta W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting a pension to Arthur E. Madison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) granting a pension to Mary J. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) granting a pension to Mary E. H. Remick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) granting a pension to Levi P. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) granting a pension to Emma D. Tenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) granting an increase of pension to Aurel Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) granting an increase of pension to Maud Sisley Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3701) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Brush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) granting an increase of pension to Julia Hackney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Hosack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3704) granting an increase of pension to Mary Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3705) granting an increase of pension to Della V. Kelsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) granting an increase of pension to Florence C. Moor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Peel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) granting an increase of pension to Agnes A. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) granting an increase of pension to Dorothea C. Wicke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Stryker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Sackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) granting an increase of pension to Ernestine Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) granting a pension to William C. Daustin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) granting a pension to Anna S. J. Llewys; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) granting an increase of pension to Emily F. Squires; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) granting an increase of pension to Laura Liming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) for the relief of Arthur L. Hecykell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Robert C. Osborne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) for the relief of John M. Andrews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3724) for the relief of George Caldwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of John H. Morse; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) for the relief of Alva L. H. Mitchell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) for the relief of William Fredericks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3728) for the relief of Rossetta Laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) for the relief of George Copeland; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) for the relief of Rebecca R. Sevier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3731) to authorize the appointment of Helmer H. Koppang a passed assistant paymaster with the rank of lieutenant in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 3732) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Scott Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 3733) granting an increase of pension to Maria Mellinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3734) granting an increase of pension to Catherine M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Sheats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3736) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Vanvlerah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 3737) for the relief of John T. O'Neil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) for the relief of Mary Murnane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 3739) for the relief of Wellington Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3740) for the relief of Homer J. Williamson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) for the relief of Mary R. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 3742) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) granting an increase of pension to Claudie O. Neff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Needham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3745) granting an increase of pension to Susan B. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) granting an increase of pension to Harriett J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3747) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Cope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Roark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3749) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Tolbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3750) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. F. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3751) granting an increase of pension to Leander J. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) granting an increase of pension to Mamie Hailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3755) granting an increase of pension to Miles W. Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3756) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3757) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) granting a pension to Harriet L. Garret; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) granting a pension to Lucy Ann Tinsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) granting a pension to Casey Mandrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) granting a pension to Mary Emmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) granting a pension to Robert L. Meadows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) granting a pension to Sherman H. Wharton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) granting a pension to Ada Hopson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 3765) granting an increase of pension to Jane Stockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) granting an increase of pension to Julianna Bouchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 3767) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3768) granting an increase of pension to Jennie A. Clifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) granting an increase of pension to Sadie R. Byerly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Barcley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Beamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Buttermore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) granting an increase of pension to Hannah F. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Lydia I. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to John H. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3777) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Blakely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Eleanora B. Beatty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3780) granting an increase of pension to Lidy Atcheson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3781) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Akins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3782) granting an increase of pension to Christena Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3783) granting an increase of pension to Sadie C. Ackerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3785) granting an increase of pension to Clara Ziegler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3786) granting an increase of pension to Martha B. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3787) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Wirsing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) granting an increase of pension to Ella N. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3789) granting an increase of pension to Evaline Wiant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Agnes Wirsing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3791) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Tillery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Tittle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) granting an increase of pension to Letitia Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3794) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3795) granting an increase of pension to Settia I. Steiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Sager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) granting an increase of pension to Emma Stehler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) granting an increase of pension to Pearl Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) granting an increase of pension to Isabel A. Story; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Starrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3803) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Swank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3804) granting an increase of pension to Dollie Shaner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Jane Shaner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stimel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) granting an increase of pension to Euphemia J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3808) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Schachte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Rorabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Ressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3813) granting an increase of pension to Kate Piper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Otte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3815) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Newill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3816) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Nedrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3817) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Neighly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Rachael R. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3819) granting an increase of pension to Mary Metzger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Mock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Ada F. Machesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) granting an increase of pension to Eliza B. McCauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. McNelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McElwee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) granting an increase of pension to Lydia E. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) granting an increase of pension to Marie Lenhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3828) granting an increase of pension to Mary Leffler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Kittell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Huston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3832) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) granting an increase of pension to Irene W. Halferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Harbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) granting an increase of pension to Rachel E. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3837) granting an increase of pension to Emma Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Glunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3839) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. France; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3840) granting an increase of pension to Stattira Y. Eicher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3841) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Deemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 3842) granting an increase of pension to Jane Rannebarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 3843) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Archer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of Myra Madry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 3845) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3846) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Biles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) granting an increase of pension to America Pilchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3850) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Heath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3851) granting an increase of pension to Elvira J. Bartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3852) granting an increase of pension to Samantha A. Brougher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3853) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3854) granting an increase of pension to Washington Badgely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Dinnel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Collensworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) granting an increase of pension to Jane Timmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Foerster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3859) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3860) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Hardwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Ingram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3863) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3864) granting an increase of pension to Dora Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) granting a pension to Martha Stewart Roderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) granting a pension to Theodore F. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) granting a pension to John T. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) granting a pension to Fannie Boswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Annie W. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) granting a pension to Adortha S. Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3871) granting a pension to Lizzie B. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) granting a pension to Della Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3873) granting a pension to Margaret B. Mondon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) granting a pension to Caroline Marlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) granting a pension to Robert McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) granting a pension to Katie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) granting a pension to Polly Stonecipher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) granting a pension to Jennie Rosebraugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) granting a pension to Martha Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3880) granting a pension to Julia A. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3881) granting an increase of pension to Margaret York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Royer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) granting a pension to Effy J. Pressley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3884) granting an increase of pension to Kate E. Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) granting an increase of pension to Chanie A. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 3886) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. McCray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 3887) granting an increase of pension to George Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia E. Hanes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3890) granting a pension to Virginia McCombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) for the relief of Lillian Cornish; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) for the relief of George W. Sampson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) for the relief of Francis L. Sexton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) for the relief of Charles Palmer Cornwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of W. E. Sturgeon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 3896) granting a pension to Elizabeth Wirth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3897) granting a pension to George F. Wiggins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) granting an increase of pension to George E. Coombs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Page; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 3901) granting an increase of pension to Louisa B. Courtright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) granting an increase of pension to Rosellia Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3903) granting an increase of pension to Antonia Haller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Alter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3905) granting an increase of pension to Marilda A. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Gilkesson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3907) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Hazen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3908) granting an increase of pension to Anna Lowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3909) granting an increase of pension to Daphne R. Irvine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3910) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3911) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Littleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3912) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Pease; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3913) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Wiesner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3914) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Simon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3915) granting an increase of pension to Mattie L. Breckenridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3916) granting an increase of pension to Celicia E. Feaga; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3917) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3918) granting an increase of pension to Mina E. Steckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3919) granting an increase of pension to Florence V. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3920) granting an increase of pension to Euphemia A. Feasel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3921) granting an increase of pension to Jean L. H. Denig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3922) granting an increase of pension to Anna Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Boetticher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3924) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) for the relief of Joseph Jameson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) for the relief of Charles G. Bartlett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) for the relief of David C. Van Voorhis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3929) for the relief of Hermie Frederick; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) granting a pension to Ida M. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) granting a pension to Edward J. Bundschu; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) granting a pension to Edward W. Lautsbaugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 3933) granting a pension to Anna L. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) granting a pension to Carl Johan Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) granting an increase of pension to Virginia D. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) for the relief of M. M. Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Wright; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3938) for the relief of the Virginia Engineering Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) to correct the military record of T. Abraham Hetrick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) to provide for an examination and survey of Urbanna Creek, Middlesex County, Va., and of the channel connecting said creek with Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3941) to provide for an examination and survey of Mosquito Creek, Lancaster County, Va., and of the channel connecting said creek with the Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3942) granting a pension to Mrs. John Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) for the relief of W. G. Gentry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3944) for the relief of Hiram T. Duncan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3945) for the relief of Compere & Wyatt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3946) for the relief of Hugo Koehn; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3947) for the relief of Agnes McManus and George J. McManus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 3948) granting an increase of pension to Herbert B. Halloway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 3949) for the relief of Frank F. Moore; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 3950) granting a pension to Elizabeth Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3951) granting a pension to Anna Maria Luth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3952) granting an increase of pension to Alice Bullock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3953) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3954) to reimburse Dr. Philip Suriani; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3955) for the relief of the C. Tisdall Co.; Herbert W. Smith; Newman Brothers; Thomas J. Murphy Co., formerly Edward A. Brown Co.; and Giles P. Dunn, jr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3956) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Edwin D. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3957) granting an increase of pension to Theresa S. Doane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of Frank L. Muller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3959) for the relief of John James Kirwin Koughan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3960) for the relief of William Downing Prideaux; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 3961) for the relief of Thomas Steenworth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) for the relief of Theresa M. Shea; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) for the relief of Margaret B. Knapp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of Jay Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) for the relief of the estate of James A. McErlain; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of Esther Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3967) for the relief of the next of kin of Edgar C. Bryon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) for the relief of Leon Schulman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) for the relief of James E. Westcott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3970) for the relief of Herman M. Bernelot Moens; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3971) for the relief of the owners of the schooner William Melbourne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3972) for the relief of the heirs of Harris Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3973) for the relief of Max Hartenstein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of the estate of Alvin C. Laupheimer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3975) granting an increase of pension to John F. Kilbride; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3976) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hillbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3977) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Groht; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3978) granting an increase of pension to Harriette Celler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3979) to provide a means of recognizing the heroic conduct and devotion to duty of Matthew A. Hensen, one of the survivors of the polar expedition of Admiral Peary; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 3980) granting a pension to David D. Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 3981) granting an increase of pension to Mary Glasgow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3982) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Hausmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 3983) granting a pension to Myron Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) granting a pension to Sarah Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3985) granting a pension to Martha Roepke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3986) granting a pension to Catherine Lansinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) granting a pension to Emma Kehr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3988) granting a pension to Sarah J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3989) granting an increase of pension to Elvira A. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3990) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3991) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3992) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) for the relief of Adam B. Ackerman, alias Aunkerman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3994) to correct the military record of Charles N. Middleton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 3995) granting a pension to Mary Cavanah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3996) granting an increase of pension to Saphrona A. Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3997) granting an increase of pension to Jennie B. McPheron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 3998) granting an increase of pension to Mabel D. Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3999) for the relief of Sallie Grossenbacher; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4000) for the relief of John H. Rhinelander; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4001) for the relief of Lang Gee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4002) granting an increase of pension to Louise Steffan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4003) granting a pension to Carrie Ohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4004) granting a pension to Jeffie B. L. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4005) granting a pension to Dora L. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4008) granting an increase of pension to Naomi Fiedler; the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4009) granting an increase of pension to Lavina Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 4010) granting an increase of pension to Carrie L. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4011) granting a pension to James W. Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) for the relief of Charles R. Sies; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) for the relief of Charles R. Stevens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) for the relief of Kenneth M. Orr; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of Joe Petran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4016) granting a pension to Alice Wheelden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 4017) granting an increase of pension to Agnes R. Goodnow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) granting an increase of pension to Maryette Vaill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4020) granting an increase of pension to Annie W. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4021) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jamison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4022) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. B. Clary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) granting a pension to William J. Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4024) granting a pension to Charlotte W. Sibley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) granting a pension to Isabel C. Copp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4026) granting a pension to Aurelia Gauthier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4027) for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) for the relief of Lewis C. Hopkins & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4029) for the relief of Maude A. Sanger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) for the relief and reimbursement of the Central New England Sanatorium (Inc.) in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 4031) granting a pension to Hannah Frances Hiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) granting an increase of pension to Mary K. Slocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) for the relief of Gustav Schmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 4036) granting a pension to Lillian Bromley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Emeline Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) granting an increase of pension to Amanda W. Kegwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Brayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4043) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Baton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4044) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Ripley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4045) for the relief of the Alaska Products Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) for the relief of Thomas F. Kenny; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia Knoblock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) granting an increase of pension to Anna Maria Buhler; to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4049) granting a pension to Emma E. Mudge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) granting an increase of pension to Josephine C. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 4051) granting a pension to Lou Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4052) granting a pension to Marie Appel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) granting a pension to Vicenie Roan Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) granting a pension to Mary E. Shepherd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) granting an increase of pension to Rosine Bigger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Alice Bosworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Albright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4058) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Pinquard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4060) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4061) for the relief of Harry Hume Ainsworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 4062) granting a pension to Sophia Sutcliffe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) granting an increase of pension to Alfaretta S. Quimby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) for the relief of Veranus D. Drew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) for the relief of George W. Edgerly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4066) to place John P. Holland on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4067) for the relief of John G. Dwyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4068) for the relief of Majestic Hotel, Lake Charles, La., and of Lieut. R. T. Cronau, United States Army; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 4069) granting a pension to Annie Gouldy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) granting a pension to John Harrison Lang; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4071) granting an increase of pension to Loretta Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) granting an increase of pension to Rose Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4073) granting an increase of pension to Margaret H. Suydam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of William K. Gelsinon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4075) for the relief of Commander U. R. Webb, United States Navy, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4076) granting a pension to James K. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) granting a pension to Daniel S. Stockton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) granting a pension to William R. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) for the relief of William A. Hynes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) for the relief of William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4081) granting a pension to Dora B. Karnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4083) authorizing Porter Bros. & Biffle et al. to bring suit against the United States for loss and damage sustained through erroneous certification by the Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) for the relief of the persons suffering loss on account of the Lawton fire, 1917; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4085) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Besancon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) for the relief of John DeMarrias; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4087) for the relief of Rose Jones Gifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4088) granting a pension to Joseph P. McGreal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Minnie A. Colbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) granting a pension to Emil Jantson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) granting a pension to Isadora Durbrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Manning; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4093) granting an increase of pension to Melena Gertrude Jeffery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4094) granting an increase of pension to Richard Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4095) granting an increase of pension to Norman Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) for the relief of Otto F. Schroder; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4097) for the relief of McGilvray-Raymond Granite Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) for the relief of James Walsh; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4099) for the relief of Joseph A. McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4100) for the relief of William Eckman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) for the relief of U. R. Webb; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) for the relief of Augustus W. R. Berr; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of John Bulotti; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4104) to correct the military record of James William Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) to correct the military record of William J. Murphy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Maj. Andrew Summers Rowan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) to correct the military record of Thomas Jensen (Johnsen); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) to correct the military record of Alfred G. V. Meldahl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) to correct the military record of Fred Peterson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4110) to correct the military record of Thomas Mahoney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4111) to correct the naval record of Peter Hansen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4112) for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4113) to make an award of $10,000 and grant a pension to Michael A. Donaldson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 4114) granting a pension to John A. Stucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 4115) for the relief of Winfield Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) for the relief of W. Laurence Hazard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Harriet K. Carey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 4118) for the relief of Everett L. Foster; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 4119) granting a pension to Rebecca B. Tooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4120) granting a pension to Rose A. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4121) granting a pension to Mertie Elery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) granting a pension to John N. Chestnutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4123) for the relief of Rolla Duncan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) for the relief of William F. Brockschmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) for the relief of Holger M. Trandum; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Katie Cassiday for a certain tract of land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) for the relief of Joel T. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 4128) for the relief of Barber-Hoppen Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) for the relief of the Passaic Valley sewerage commissioners; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4130) for the relief of Carl Ullmann & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) for the relief of John N. Bassin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Hann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) granting an increase of pension to Hannah E. Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Blauvelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 4135) granting a pension to Nannie Colley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) granting a pension to Mary J. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4137) granting a pension to Emma Jane Hanners; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4138) granting a pension to Elizabeth Pickens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Sutliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4140) granting a pension to Martha S. Smart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4141) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Alderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Sizemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4143) granting an increase of pension to Manerva E. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4144) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Vance; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4145) granting an increase of pension to Annie Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4146) granting an increase of pension to Pearl L. Keeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4147) granting an increase of pension to Hattie R. S. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Samson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4149) granting an increase of pension to Josephene A. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4150) granting an increase of pension to Olive E. Hinds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4151) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4152) granting an increase of pension to Amelia M. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4153) granting an increase of pension to Elsie Woodin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4154) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4155) granting an increase of pension to Amy Ann Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4156) granting an increase of pension to Martha Jane Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. (4157) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McMahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4158) granting an increase of pension to Julia Squires; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4159) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Rockefellow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4160) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Fitzwater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4161) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Ayres; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4162) granting an increase of pension to Clarisa Markham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4163) granting an increase of pension to Jane R. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4164) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Waldron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4165) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) granting an increase of pension to Leon P. Chesley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) granting a pension to Fred C. Vanderpool; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4168) for the relief of John Strevy, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4169) to correct the military record of Edward M. Pierce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4170) to correct the military record of Lemuel Horton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 4171) granting a pension to Arthur S. Hurlburt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4172) granting a pension to Marie M. Bruso; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 4173) granting a pension to Mary A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4174) granting a pension to Mollie F. Stinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4175) granting a pension to Mariah E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4176) granting a pension to Lydia A. Whitehead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4177) granting a pension to Kate Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4178) granting a pension to Thomas Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4179) granting a pension to John T. Ruffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4180) granting a pension to Quintilla Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4181) granting a pension to Roy Paschal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4182) granting a pension to Sarah A. Neece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4183) granting a pension to Ella Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) granting a pension to Ellen Baget; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4185) granting a pension to William P. Trimble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4186) granting a pension to Mary A. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4187) granting a pension to Sarah Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4188) granting a pension to Mary B. Lett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4189) granting an increase of pension to Sophoronia Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4190) granting an increase of pension to Meda Ann Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4191) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4192) granting an increase of pension to Olive Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4193) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Garrott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. De Groat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4195) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Tappana; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) granting an increase of pension to Asenath Priest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4197) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 4198) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4199) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. McCandless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4200) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Machesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4201) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Kepple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4202) granting an increase of pension to Cassandra E. Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4203) for the relief of A. S. Guffey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) for the relief of Thomas M. Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4205) to reimburse Michael F. Callaghan for injuries sustained in an accident with a Government-owned motor truck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Gilbert B. Perkins"; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 4207) granting a pension to Tomas B. Gallegos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4208) granting a pension to Ina Rathbun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4209) granting a pension to William Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) granting a pension to Victor Pineda; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4211) for the relief of John McIntyre; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4212) for the relief of Theophilus Lacy Keen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4213) for the relief of Sadie Klauber; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4214) for the relief of Maud S. Grossetete; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4215) for the relief of Frank L. Merrifield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) for the relief of John Deacy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4217) granting an increase of pension to Lottie A. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4218) granting an increase of pension to Estefana Deacy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONAST: A bill (H. R. 4219) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Estes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4220) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4221) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Zepernick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4222) granting a pension to Sarah Elizabeth Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4223) granting a pension to Mary V. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 4224) granting a pension to Nathaniel Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4225) granting a pension to Perry Talbott, alias Tolbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4226) granting a pension to William Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4227) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4228) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Parrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4229) for the relief of Jennie Wyant and others; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4230) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Huffine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 4231) for the relief of Harry E. Craven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4232) granting an increase of pension to Buster Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4233) granting an increase of pension to Annie Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4234) granting an increase of pension to Charlie Eliton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4235) granting a pension to Leander Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4236) granting a pension to William C. Croley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4237) granting a pension to Lawrence Waldroup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 4238) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4239) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4240) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Philhower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4241) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Ramsdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4243) for the relief of John Houck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 4244) for the relief of Joseph Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 4245) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Frasier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 4246) granting a pension to Cora A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Julia H. Quinnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 4248) granting a pension to Lydia Breard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4249) granting a pension to Charlotte Underwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4250) granting a pension to Julia Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4251) granting a pension to Vianna R. Densmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4252) granting a pension to Ellen M. Winn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4253) granting a pension to Ellen M. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4254) granting a pension to Harriet L. Mero; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4255) granting a pension to Abbie J. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) granting a pension to Ella M. Spooner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4257) for the validation of the acquisition of Canadian properties by the War Department and for the relief of certain disbursing officers for payments made thereon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4258) to authorize credit in the disbursing accounts of certain officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4259) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Smith; to the Committee on Invaid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4260) granting a pension to Mary E. Kipper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4261) granting a pension to Mary Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4262) granting a pension to Siaria N. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) for the relief of Albert L. Loban; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) for the relief of Philip V. Sullivan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4266) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4267) for the relief of Ernest J. Hiscock; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4268) for the relief of Charles Caudwell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4269) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. B. Callahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4270) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Dibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) granting an increase of pension to Minnie E. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) granting an increase of pension to Mina Rinck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Alstrum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4274) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Weidle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4275) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Roelf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to Laura H. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4277) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Condray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) granting an increase of pension to Ollie E. Carnaghan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4280) to correct the military record of John W. Cleavenger, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4281) granting a pension to John Swigart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 4282) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4283) granting an increase of pension to Esther J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4284) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 4285) granting a pension to Christian Madsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) granting an increase of pension to Louis Winbray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 4287) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4288) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 4289) granting an increase of pension to Bridget C. McGinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4290) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Swigart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4291) granting an increase of pension to Fiana Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4292) granting an increase of pension to Addie Sour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 4293) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4294) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4295) granting an increase of pension to Catharine E. Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 4296) granting an increase of pension to William M. Noel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4297) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Snodgress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4298) granting a pension to Anna M. E. Spotts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4299) granting a pension to Martha E. Blough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4300) granting a pension to Ruth Pettit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4301) granting a pension to Julia A. McCluskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4302) for the relief of Russell H. Lindsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 4303) for the relief of the Smith Tablet Co., of Holyoke, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4304) granting an increase of pension to Nettie A. Packard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4305) granting an increase of pension to Ida F. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4306) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4307) granting an increase of pension to Ellen R. Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4308) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia M. Jandro; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4309) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4310) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4311) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4312) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4313) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Gohring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4314) granting an increase of pension to Myra A. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4315) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Tredo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 4316) granting a pension to Amelia G. Ballou; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) granting a pension to Hattie Clayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4318) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Cupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4319) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4320) granting an increase of pension to Mira O. McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4321) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4322) granting an increase of pension to Abia McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4323) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Gaskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) granting an increase of pension to Sedona Beezley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4325) granting an increase of pension to Jean Duckworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 4327) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4328) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Armer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4329) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte E. Fitch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4331) granting an increase of pension to Mariah A. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4332) granting an honorable discharge to Ira Roach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4333) for the relief of Rosetta Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4334) for the relief of Charles G. Keiser; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 4335) granting an increase of pension to Fred G. Pettigrew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4336) granting a pension to Isabel Chalfant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4337) granting an increase of pension to Alizira Smithers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4338) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4339) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4340) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4341) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ridgway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4342) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Gee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4343) granting an increase of pension to Marsolete Caskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4344) granting an increase of pension to Martha McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4345) granting an increase of pension to Minervina J. Triplett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4346) granting an increase of pension to Perry Anne Waldeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4347) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Thom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4348) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Bonta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4349) granting a pension to Annie Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4350) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Blankenship; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4351) granting a pension to Mary E. Meade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4352) granting a pension to Josie Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4353) granting a pension to Cassie Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) granting a pension to Armina Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4355) granting a pension to Manda McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4356) granting a pension to Eliza Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4357) for the relief of William Childers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4358) for the relief of Benton W. Landrum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4359) granting a pension to Lucy A. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 4360) granting a pension to John S. Jarrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4361) granting a pension to Nancy Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4362) granting a pension to Cannabesta C. Prine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4363) for the relief of Daniel Godsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4364) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) for the relief of John L. Coy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4366) for the relief of Charles C. Bell; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4367) for the relief of the estates of Asa Faulkner, deceased; Lewis L. Faulkner, deceased; and S. B. Spurlock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of Claude Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 4369) to make valid and payable the insurance of Ray L. Stockstill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 4370) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Fasmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) granting an increase of pension to Anna W. Hawk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 4373) granting a pension to Mary Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) granting a pension to Julia L. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4375) granting an increase of pension to Annie C. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4376) for the relief of J. W. Braxton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4377) to correct the military record of James Russell Davis, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4378) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose by sale of certain public land in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLGOOD: A bill (H. R. 4379) for the relief of heirs of James W. Fennell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4380) for the relief of Martha Andrew Virginia Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 4381) granting a pension to Eliza Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 4382) providing for the examination and survey of Biddle Creek, Cape May County, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4383) providing for the examination and survey of the Great Egg Harbor River at Mays Landing, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4384) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Kretschmar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4385) granting an increase of pension to Ellen N. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4386) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Charlton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4387) for the relief of Ida E. Godfrey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4388) for the relief of Frederick W. Peter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4389) for the relief of Lee C. Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4390) for the relief of Thomas N. Emley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) for the relief of Robert Turner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4392) for the relief of Harry Best; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4393) for the relief of Howard V. Sloan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4394) for the relief of William K. Lovett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) for the relief of Elizabeth T. Cloud; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) for the relief of Jesse R. Shivers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 4397) for the relief of Francis Hollingsworth Armstrong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) granting a pension to Rebecca Mauger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) granting an increase of pension to Ellie Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4400) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4401) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4402) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Nighswander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4403) granting an increase of pensions to Harriet A. Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 4404) for the relief of W. H. Derby; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) to provide for the erection of a post-office and customhouse building at Cape Charles, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Phoebus, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire by condemnation or otherwise such additional land in the city of Newport News, Va., as may be necessary for the extension and remodeling of the post-office building in said city, to cause said building to be extended and remodeled, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 4408) granting an increase of pension to David W. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Haywood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 4412) for the relief of Arthur Richter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of Harry Russell Renner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4414) granting a pension to Elizabeth Wynn Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) granting a pension to Huldah Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) granting an increase of pension to Don I. Littell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 4417) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Robb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 4418) for the relief of Delos Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) granting a pension to Ella J. Duygan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) granting a pension to Nettie D. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) granting a pension to Jesse E. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) granting a pension to Julia R. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4424) granting an increase of pension to Tillie C. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4426) granting an increase of pension to Exie L. Stebbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) granting an increase of pension to Alice G. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4428) granting an increase of pension to Adelia L. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4430) granting an increase of pension to Mary Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4431) granting an increase of pension to Eliza G. Carr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 4432) for the relief of Anner Chase Roundy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4433) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Brick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4435) granting a pension to Charles B. Travis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 4436) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Healy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 4437) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Furlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 4438) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Quirk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4439) for the relief of Florence E. Bulley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4440) for the relief of Lieut. Frederick O. Goldsmith; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 4441) granting a pension to Harriet E. Beckwith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4442) granting a pension to Margaret Ludwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) granting a pension to Clara M. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4444) granting a pension to Eliza J. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4445) to refund to Kramp & Gaskill income tax erroneously and illegally collected; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) for the relief of G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) for the relief of John W. Stockett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 4448) granting a pension to Mary M. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 4449) for the relief of William Sulem; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4450) granting a pension to Mary Osmond Rousseau; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) granting a pension to Sara E. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Parson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) granting a pension to Mary A. Herbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4454) granting a pension to Mary I. Shennard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4455) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Kolb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) granting an increase of pension to Kate W. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4457) granting an increase of pension to Mary McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4458) granting an increase of pension to Washington Sprague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4459) granting an increase of pension to Annora Josephine Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. O'Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McDavitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Cheeseman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Stackhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4465) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Van Ness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) granting an increase of pension to Antha Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 4467) granting an increase of pension to Julia O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4468) granting an increase of pension to Annie Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) granting an increase of pension to Pauline Rosine Konietzko; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4470) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Brunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4471) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4472) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Carsner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4473) granting an increase of pension to Hannah E. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4474) granting an increase of pension to Deborah Gaskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4475) granting an increase of pension to Ann Eliza Danberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4476) granting an increase of pension to Mary Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4477) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe A. Dungan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4478) granting an increase of pension to Helen A. Ackerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4479) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Knowles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4480) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Nutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4481) granting an increase of pension to Alice T. Cantwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4482) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4483) granting a pension to Mabel Helen Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4484) granting a pension to Tolbert Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) granting a pension to Ellen E. Greenfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4486) granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of F. G. Baum; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) for the relief of Ellen M. Gholson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of J. A. Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4490) to correct the military record of William Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4491) for the relief of Andrew M. Dunlop; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4492) for the relief of Milton S. Merrill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 4493) for the relief of Hugh S. Gibson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 4494) granting an increase of pension to Caroline N. Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4495) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Carlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4496) for the relief of David Steers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4497) for the relief of Frank M. Carn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) granting a pension to Lillie B. Braxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4499) granting a pension to John Norton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4500) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Shrider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) granting an increase of pension to Maria McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) granting an increase of pension to Minerva R. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4503) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Fike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 4505) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Millard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 4506) granting a pension to Antoinette A. Ripley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4507) granting an increase of pension to Theresa A. Charter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) granting an increase of pension to Alice Bence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) granting an increase of pension to Susan Nevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4511) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Stillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) granting an increase of pension to Nettie P. Slate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4513) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Ripley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4514) granting an increase of pension to Happy M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 4515) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 4516) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Stanford, Lincoln County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Nicholasville, Jessamine County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 4518) granting a pension to Mary Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Appolt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. McKain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) granting an increase of pension to Annie Light; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) granting an increase of pension to Annie Buckius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 4526) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hagar Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) granting a pension to Emma J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) granting a pension to Orilla J. Luyster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4529) granting a pension to Naunie V. Devin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Lautzenheiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) granting an increase of pension to John L. Daries; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hurlburt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) granting an increase of pension to Emma Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) granting an increase of pension to Mary Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 4535) granting an increase of pension to Alvira A. Finley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of Fred R. Nugent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4537) granting a pension to Lizzie Koffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 4538) to reimburse William C. Reese for injuries sustained from kick of a mule; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) granting a pension to Addie Penrod; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4540) granting a pension to James Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4541) granting a pension to Mary Coughlan, George Coughlan, Martha Coughlan, Thomas Coughlan, and Mary Anna Coughlan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4542) granting a pension to Isabella Powell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4543) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Roush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4544) granting an increase of pension to Anna Susemihl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 4545) granting a pension to Mary J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) granting a pension to Jennie B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) granting a pension to Vinnie Horne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) granting a pension to Margaret J. Sickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4549) granting a pension to Artilissa A. Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) granting a pension to Mary E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4551) granting a pension to M. R. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4552) granting a pension to Mary Murray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4553) granting a pension to Laura A. Yingling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4554) granting a pension to Mary L. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4555) granting a pension to Clara E. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) granting a pension to James H. Riffle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4557) granting an increase of pension to August H. List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Walter Brandon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Ann Boord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) for the relief of L. A. Levin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) for the relief of Charlotte Lamby; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) for the relief of John Buchanan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) for the relief of Mary S. Neel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting an increase of pension to Rose M. Painter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) for the relief of Edna Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) for the relief of Walter P. King; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4567) for the relief of James A. Davidson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4568) for the relief of Barton H. Newell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4569) for the relief of Irma S. Haller; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4570) for the relief of L. D. Tracy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of Mary A. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) for the relief of Emerson P. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) to correct the military record of A. G. Vincent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) to define promotion status of J. Earl McNanamy, lieutenant (junior grade), Chaplain Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 4575) for the relief of Charles A. Holder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) for the relief of Lucien Gautreau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4577) for the appointment and retirement of John Elmer Wright as a first lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Fred George Bruhl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) granting a pension to Clifford S. Lideen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Whitson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) for the relief of Clifford S. Lideen; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 4583) for the relief of the Ralph Ackley Land Co. (Inc.) and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 4584) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Pensyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) granting a pension to Grant Edmondson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Charles J. Hunter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting an increase of pension to Clara I. Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 4588) authorizing an appropriation for the repair and resurfacing of roads on the Fort Baker Military Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 4589) to authorize the granting of certain privileges in the Lewis and Clark National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 4590) granting a pension to Belle Frink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) for the relief of Ann Arbor Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4592) for the relief of H. L. Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) for the relief of the Cudahy Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 4594) granting an increase of pension to Ella Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 4595) granting a pension to Adelaide C. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Drury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) granting an increase of pension to Laura H. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4598) for the relief of Robert Stanley Robertson, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) for the relief of George C. Maynard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of Raphael Levy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of A. L. Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) for the relief of John Worthington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4603) for the relief of Lieut. James Floyd Terrell, Medical Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) for the relief of Stuart Circle Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) authorizing the President to issue an appropriate commission and honorable discharge to Landon Randolph Mason; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4606) for the relief of the Virginia Machinery & Well Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) for the relief of Claude S. Betts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) for the relief of M. L. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) to extend the benefits of the World War veterans' act, 1924, and acts amendatory thereof, to Thomas Beverly Campbell; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Marion M. Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 4612) granting a pension to Monica J. Boultrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) granting an increase of pension to Olympia T. Meena and three minor children; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4614) granting a pension to Larkin B. Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4615) granting a pension to Minnie Broderick; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) granting an increase of pension to Grace B. West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4617) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Page; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) for the relief of Frank L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) for the relief of E. A. Clatterbuck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) for the relief of J. W. Anderson; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) for the relief of Mary E. MacGregor; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of Mrs. C. L. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) granting a certificate of merit to George D. Powell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4624) to correct the military record of Thomas Finley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 4626) for the relief of Maj. Arthur A. Padmore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Emma J. Ashton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4628) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) granting an increase of pension to Robert Braum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia Engler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stockmar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Beardsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) granting an increase of pension to Francis Mary Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Longran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) granting an increase of pension to Margery Kuntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4636) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) for the relief of Elizabeth Lynn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) for the relief of James O'Malley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) granting a pension to Caroline E. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) granting a pension to Isabelle E. Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4641) granting a pension to William Cummings; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) granting a pension to Charles B. Mullin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) granting an increase of pension to Chathrine J. McGregor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 4646) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bunker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Ryon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Sabina Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) granting a pension to John Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 4650) for the relief of Leslie W. Arthur; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of Dewey Tipton Jones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) for the relief of Charlie R. Pate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of Virgil W. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) for the relief of Kennedy F. Foster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) for the relief of David E. Goodwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) for the relief of John E. Dolan; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of Glenn S. Fortner; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4658) for the relief of M. F. Powers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) for the relief of Alice Hackney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4660) to correct the military record of Charles E. Lowe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4661) to correct the military record of William Mullins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4662) to correct the military record of George Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4663) authorizing the President to appoint J. H. S. Morison to the position and rank of major, Medical Corps, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) for the relief of Capt. George R. Armstrong, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4665) granting a pension to Lee Street; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4666) granting a pension to William M. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) granting a pension to Wallace S. Hodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) granting a pension to Cordelia Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) granting a pension to Minnie Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) granting a pension to Elizabeth Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) granting a pension to Rebecca Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) granting a pension to Callie Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) granting a pension to Nancy Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) granting a pension to Mattie N. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) granting a pension to Hannah Paul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) granting an increase of pension to Rosa B. Sloop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) granting an increase of pension to William Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 4680) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Osler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) for the relief of David Steers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4682) granting a pension to Mary K. Kruse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) for the relief of Fred Andler, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4684) granting a pension to Catherine Frampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 4685) granting a pension to Floyd Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4686) granting an increase of pension to Harry D. Frasier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4687) to correct the military record of Albert Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4688) granting a pension to Henry Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4689) granting a pension to Ella McWayne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4690) granting an increase of pension to Martha Magie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 4691) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4692) for the relief of Mary Ellen Tiefenthaler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 4693) for the relief of George Stoll and the heirs of Charles P. Regan, Marshall Turley, Edward Lannigan, James Manley, and John Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4694) for the relief of John F. White and Mary L. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 4695) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Spear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YATES: A bill (H. R. 4696) granting a pension to Cora Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4697) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Finney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 4698) for the relief of O. A. Alfson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 4699) for the relief of William H. Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4700) granting a pension to Louise F. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4701) for the relief of Alfred S. Jewell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 4702) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin S. McHenry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4703) granting a pension to Eliza A. Hallock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 4704) granting a pension to Glenn E. Koehler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4705) granting a pension to Laura Eva Ehrenfeld; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4706) granting permission to Capt. Thomas L. Johnson, United States Navy, to accept a brevet and medal of the French Legion of Honor, tendered by the President of the French Republic; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4707) for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 4708) granting a pension to Lottie M. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 4709) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) granting an increase of pension to Rachel States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 4711) granting an increase of pension to Louise A. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4712) granting a pension to Mary E. Loose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 4713) granting an increase of pension to Levarah A. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to Mollie B. Gore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4715) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Coulson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4716) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Northcutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4717) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4718) granting an increase of pension to Maud Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4719) granting a pension to Elizabeth Wycuff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4720) granting a pension to Emma L. Bragg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) granting an increase of pension to Jennie P. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4722) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4723) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4724) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Worrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4726) granting an increase of pension to Minnie R. Goldsberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4727) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4728) granting an increase of pension to Martha Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4729) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Tobin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Effie Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4732) granting an increase of pension to S. Catharine Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) granting an increase of pension to Caroline L. Winter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bradeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4735) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ellen West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Mendenhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4737) granting a pension to Nancy Jane Snodgrass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4738) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Godfrey Brandabery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4741) granting an increase of pension to Lena Saxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Ream; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4743) granting an increase of pension to Scioto Barry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Beckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4745) granting a pension to Mary Emmer Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4746) granting a pension to Emma L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4747) granting a pension to Flossie M. Blauvelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) granting a pension to Mary A. Yauch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) granting a pension to Lydia A. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) granting a pension to Salina J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Grubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4752) granting an increase of pension to Sue E. Doner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4753) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Griswold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) granting an increase of pension to Laura Haynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Patton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Hargrave; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Thomison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Loving; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4759) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Elizabeth Niuffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4760) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4761) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 4762) granting a pension to Julia Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) granting a pension to Emma C. Rounds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4764) granting a pension to Adelia C. Dwinell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4765) granting a pension to Ella Raymo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 4766) for the relief of Charles James Anderson, former commander, United States Naval Reserve Force; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4767) for the relief of Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 4768) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of Luc Mathias; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4770) for the relief of Lieut. Timothy J. Mulcahy, Supply Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of Davidson County, Tenn., and the city of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4772) granting a pension to Tennie Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4773) granting a pension to James W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4774) granting a pension to Julia Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4775) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Newsom; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of Dr. Stanley R. Teachout; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) to compensate Robert F. Yeaman for the loss of certain carpenter tools which was incurred by reason

of a fire in the Government area at Old Hickory ordnance depot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4778) granting a pension to Caroline Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) granting a pension to Lafayette Derringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) granting an increase of pension to Harriet S. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) for the relief of the legal representatives of Cobb Blasdell & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4782) granting a pension to Elizabeth Orff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) granting a pension to Austa Venable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4784) granting a pension to Laura A. Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) granting a pension to Sallie A. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) granting a pension to Lindsey Grey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) granting a pension to Martha M. Luttrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4788) granting a pension to Jesse S. Trower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) granting a pension to Albert Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4790) granting a pension to David Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4791) granting a pension to Sarah C. Gourley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) granting an increase of pension to Annie W. Bricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) granting an increase of pension to Almira M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 4795) granting an increase of pension to Edwina B. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Trotter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) granting an increase of pension to Louise E. Ort; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4798) granting a pension to Harriett A. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 4799) granting a pension to Omar Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4800) granting a pension to Robert Edward Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) granting an increase of pension to Annie Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4802) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stigers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4803) granting an increase of pension to Ella Hardin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4804) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Swigert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4805) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Hager; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Henry C. Davidson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) for the relief of the legal representatives of James H. Holaday; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) for the relief of Clyde Cornish; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) for the relief of Kate W. Milward; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) granting a reward to Cora Walden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) to reinstate Frank W. Simpson, formerly lieutenant, Coast Artillery, United States Army, as a first lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 4812) for the relief of Thomas A. Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) for the relief of Clara Thurnes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4814) granting the distinguished-service cross to Roswell Hays Fuller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) for the relief of Johns-Manville Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4816) granting an increase of pension to Maria Ahrens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) for the relief of Leo J. Byrne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) for the relief of Anna Lohbeck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) granting a pension to Emilia Rueppel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 4821) granting a pension to Sarah G. Graveline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 4822) for the relief of Raymond Kleinberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) for the relief of Walter Perry Story; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) for the relief of Arthur W. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 4825) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Fowler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4826) for the relief of Thomas J. Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 4827) providing for the promotion of Chief Pharmacist Laurence Oliphant Schetky, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant, Medical Corps, on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 4828) granting a pension to William A. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4829) granting an increase of pension to Janie R. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4830) granting a pension to Walter Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) granting an increase of pension to Susan Beaty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4833) granting a pension to Michael T. Scanlon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4834) granting a pension to Jennie Scholes Archer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) placing the name of Michael T. Scanlon on the rolls and rosters of Company I, Sixtieth New York Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 4836) for the relief of Joseph Birchel, alias Joseph Williford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) for the relief of James B. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of Ella H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) for the relief of the Press Publishing Co., Marianna, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 4840) for the relief of James E. Van Horne; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 4841) granting a pension to Claude A. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) granting a pension to Martha Jane Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) granting a pension to William O. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) to advance Maj. Clarence Edward Lauderdale on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of William Earhart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) for the relief of George W. Heath; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4847) granting an increase of pension to Bert Sabins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 4848) to correct the military record of Andrew M. Jeffrey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) granting an increase of pension to William H. Webb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4850) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Converse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) granting an increase of pension to Fannie M. Allsheskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Kittredge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Griffith; to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) granting an increase of pension to Kate Sloane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4858) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Lantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) granting an increase of pension to M. Jennie Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 4863) for the relief of the Near East Relief (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4864) for the relief of William Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of Dock Leach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4866) granting a pension to Eliza J. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4867) granting a pension to Sarah Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) granting a pension to Mary Alice Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) granting a pension to John Sherman Corwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) granting a pension to Cecelia A. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) granting an increase of pension to Ella Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) granting an increase of pension to Odessa Beall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) granting an increase of pension to Matilda M. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) granting an increase of pension to Bethenia A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) granting an increase of pension to Anna Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4877) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Benn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) granting an increase of pension to Jane Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) granting an increase of pension to Mary Schreel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Meeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4885) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Josie Ranes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4887) to correct the military record of Joseph W. Stroud; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4888) granting a pension to John F. Keeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4889) granting a pension to John H. Inlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) granting a pension to Anderson Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) granting a pension to Freddie A. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4892) granting a pension to Henry Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) granting a pension to Andrew J. Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4894) granting a pension to Isaac A. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4895) granting a pension to Jacob Sigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) granting a pension to Elizabeth Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) granting a pension to Ada Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) granting a pension to Nancy Ellen Bloomfelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4900) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4901) granting a pension to Lavinnia Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) to correct the military record of Charles Robertson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4903) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rogier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4904) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Hyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) granting an increase of pension to Alice Eckert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Louisa Kanady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4907) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bottorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Leming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4909) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Nix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Clegg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Wyant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Batch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) granting an increase of pension to Susan Waller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4914) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Reck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Adkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Nolot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4917) granting a pension to Hubert W. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) granting a pension to Mary A. Waller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) for the relief of Mrs. Millen McCoy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) to authorize the Secretary of War to award a Nicaraguan campaign badge to Capt. James P. Williams in recognition of his services to the United States in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1912 and 1913; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 4921) for the relief of T. O. Flowers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) for the relief of W. A. Frink; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 4923) for the relief of Moises Silva; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) for the relief of Elsie M. Sears; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) for the relief of John M. Savery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4926) for the relief of Pocahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4927) for the relief of Francis Sweeney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) for the relief of James Jorgenson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) for the relief of Sarah A. Cassin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) for the relief of Fred F. Soule; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of Frederick D. W. Baldwin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Barnard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4933) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) granting a pension to Charles Henry Mosher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) to authorize the appointment of First Lieut. Clarence E. Burt, retired, to the grade of major, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) granting an increase of pension to Phebe W. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) granting an increase of pension to Emily Beausolell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. C. Vanderhoop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Jenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Haskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) granting a pension to Phoebe Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 4942) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the city of Richmond, State of Kentucky, the sum of $1,581.66, expended by the said city in construction of streets and gutters fronting the Government building in the said city; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 4943) to amend the military record of James M. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) for the relief of Charles A. Moore; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4945) granting a pension to Rebecca Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) granting a pension to Candis Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) granting a pension to Zorado B. Merrill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) granting a pension to Jane Bell Orndorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Pride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hedrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting an increase of pension to Judith Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting an increase of pension to William D. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) for the relief of Homer C. Rayhill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) for the relief of Thomas Purdell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 4955) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Nelson; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4956) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4957) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4958) granting an increase of pension to Abbie E. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 4960) to erect a monument to the memory of Gen. Daniel Morgan at Winchester, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) to erect a monument to the memory of Gen. Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg at Woodstock, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) to erect a monument to the memory of Joseph Bowman in Shenandoah County, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) for the relief of Randolph-Macon Academy, Front Royal, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 4964) to authorize the city of Muskogee, Okla., to remove and retain title to the boilers from the Municipal Hospital Building recently conveyed by the city to the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Okmulgee, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting a pension to Peggy Shade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4967) granting a pension to Sarah E. McHolland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Ratlinggourd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) granting an increase of pension to Arrena M. Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of First Lieut. Lawrence G. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4971) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4972) for the relief of C. H. Reynolds, assignee of the Bitu-Mass Paving Co., of Spokane, Wash.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4973) granting a pension to Cornelia Worker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) granting a pension to Alexander Dunten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Paniska; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) granting an increase of pension to Antonette J. Pethick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) granting an increase of pension to Annie Wirick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) granting an increase of pension to Abegail Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) granting an increase of pension to Sophia C. Hickok; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4986) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Pinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) granting an increase of pension to Jorgine Nielson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 4989) granting a pension to Amos G. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4990) granting a pension to Laura J. Bond; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to Annie C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) granting an increase of pension to Georgonia Gaskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) for the relief of William Thurman Enoch; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of Ellen Kline; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) for the relief of Sabino Apodaca; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 4996) granting a pension to Mary Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) granting a pension to Harriet Lounsbery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) granting a pension to Jennie Sheets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) granting a pension to Lillian B. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5000) granting a pension to Thomas K. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) granting a pension to Grant Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) granting an increase of pension to Sarah P. Deem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) granting an increase of pension to Alice L. Self; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) granting an increase of pension to Laura Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) granting an increase of pension to Martha Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Burries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Burnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) granting an increase of pension to John N. Geer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) granting an increase of pension to James A. Chalfant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) granting an increase of pension to Alice Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) for the relief of James Monroe Caplinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) for the relief of Mrs. Gill I. Wilson; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5015) granting a pension to Melda N. Jennings; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) granting a pension to Mattie Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sergt. Alvin C. York as a captain in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 5018) for the relief of Fred B. Bartsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 5019) for the relief of T. G. Roberts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5021) granting a pension to Elizabeth Laland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) granting a pension to Jennie Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McCune Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) granting an increase of pension to Marge M. Bear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5025) granting an increase of pension to Minnie A. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Eyster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5027) granting an increase of pension to Luana Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kundinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5029) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5030) granting an increase of pension to Ella I. Rodearmel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) granting an increase of pension to Melvina A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5032) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5033) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Close; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5034) granting a pension to Allie C. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5035) granting a pension to Minnie P. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5037) granting a pension to Mary Van Etten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5038) granting a pension to Charles E. Grayson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 5039) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Wiese; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 5040) granting a pension to James H. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) granting a pension to Sarah A. Cheesman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) granting a pension to Eleanor G. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) granting an increase of pension to Evaline Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) granting an increase of pension to Martha Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) granting an increase of pension to Celia Sroufe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) granting an increase of pension to Laura R. Markley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Crabtree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5050) granting an increase of pension to John Dudley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Warner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 5052) granting a pension to John Schiek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) granting a pension to Samuel Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting a pension to Charlotta Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 5056) granting a pension to Augusta Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) granting a pension to Grace Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) granting a pension to Mary J. Stark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) granting a pension to Mary A. Maul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) granting a pension to Joseph Houser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) granting a pension to J. H. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to Margaret L. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) granting a pension to Mary E. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) for the relief of John M. Wallace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) for the relief of James M. Winston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) for the relief of Abraham Lincoln Harper; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) to award a medal of honor to John Leventis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) to correct the military record of John H. Fesenmeyer, alias John Wills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 5069) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Herman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) granting an increase of pension to James McDonough; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) to correct the military record of Daniel D. Dorsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) to correct the naval record of Walter Joseph Shanski; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWLES: A bill (H. R. 5074) granting a pension to Alice F. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 5075) for the relief of W. J. Bryson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 5076) granting a pension to Philip Pierson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) for the relief of Lieut. S. Jacobs, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) to refund excess taxes to the Charleston Dry Dock & Machine Co., the Valk & Murdock Co., and shareholders of the last-mentioned corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 5079) granting a pension to Sarah D. Munro; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5080) granting a pension to Charles G. W. Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) granting an increase of pension to Sarah B. Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) granting an increase of pension to Abbie E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5083) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Peru decoration and diploma of the Order of the Sun, and from the Republic of Ecuador decoration and diploma of the Estralla Abdon Calderon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to Jennie Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of J. H. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 5086) granting an increase of pension to Clarina Hammons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) granting a pension to Grace I. Playter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 5090) granting an increase of pension to Susan Zeigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5091) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Zeigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Ann Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) granting an increase of pension to Hannah R. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5094) granting an increase of pension to Annie Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5095) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Tarbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) granting an increase of pension to Christie Annie Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Schlund; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Laura R. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Shildt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) granting an increase of pension to Christine Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5104) granting an increase of pension to Harriett E. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) granting an increase of pension to Catharine B. Swartz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Smyser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Strasbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Steinour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Smuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. Rupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Raffensperger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Rickroad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5117) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) granting an increase of pension to Millie C. Plowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5119) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Poff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5120) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Poleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting an increase of pension to Emma Noel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) granting an increase of pension to Martha Metz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) granting an increase of pension to Mercy K. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5124) granting an increase of pension to Mary Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5125) granting an increase of pension to Margaret N. McAllister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) granting a pension to Jessie L. Kugler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5127) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Markley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) granting an increase of pension to Frances Elizabeth Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Malehorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Lauck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Lapham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Liggit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5135) granting an increase of pension to Marggret A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5136) granting an increase of pension to Sarranda J. Ilgenfritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5137) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Hikes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5138) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5139) granting an increase of pension to Adaline R. Elcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Ernst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5141) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Drawbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) granting an increase of pension to Catharine D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) granting an increase of pension to Mary Dorsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5145) granting an increase of pension to Jane Grim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Henze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5148) granting an increase of pension to Susan Horting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5149) granting an increase of pension to Maggie A. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) granting an increase of pension to Susan Herbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Herr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5152) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Englebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Laura V. Elcholtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5154) granting an increase of pension to M. Lizzie Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Anges M. Dinsmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Dellinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5159) granting an increase of pension to Genevieve Foreman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) granting an increase of pension to Emma Wilhelm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) granting an increase of pension to Kate Low; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5163) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Copp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5166) granting an increase of pension to Emily E. Cassel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) granting an increase of pension to Ann Jane Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5168) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Billmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Basey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5170) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Biesecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Baughman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) granting an increase of pension to Susy A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5173) granting an increase of pension to Eliza C. Matthias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5174) granting an increase of pension to Annie Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5175) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Harbolt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) granting an increase of pension to Anna Maria Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Burger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) granting an increase of pension to Mary Dorsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Beitzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting an increase of pension to Emma Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting an increase of pension to Margareth Rebel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Clingan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Douse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5188) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5189) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5190) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5193) granting an increase of pension to Mary Shewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5194) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. McCleary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Knudsen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 5196) granting a pension to Catherine LeDoux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5197) granting an increase of pension to Alice Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Olmstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHAELSON: A bill (H. R. 5199) for the relief of D. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) for the relief of John C. Carlson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5201) for the relief of E. A. Bergstrom; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) for the relief of Frederick Schroeder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) for the relief of William J. Platka; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) for the relief of G. W. Halleman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5205) granting a pension to Alice E. Deitrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5206) granting an increase of pension to James H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5207) granting an increase of pension to William C. Donlevy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 5208) granting an increase of pension to Ann Browning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Clara M. Prentice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5210) for the construction of a wharf and a walk at Jamestown, Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5211) granting an increase of pension to Alcindia G. Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5212) granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Wake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) for the relief of Fairbury Lodge, No. 1203, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5214) for the relief of Early Phifer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 5215) for the relief of Frida Steen and Ingebright Steen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRALL: A bill (H. R. 5216) for the relief of the New York Marine Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5217) for the relief of John Panza and Rose Panza; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5218) for the relief of William H. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5219) for the relief of Regine Porges Zimmerman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5220) for the relief of the Church of the Holy Comforter, Eltingville, Richmond County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5221) for the relief of the father of Catharine Kearney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5222) for the relief of Robinson Newbold; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5223) for the relief of Michael Marley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5224) for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of Frank W. Tucker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 5226) granting a pension to Carl W. Rollow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5227) granting a pension to Alice E. Howsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5228) for the relief of Finas M. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5229) for the relief of Eugene Henderson, widow of Marion H. Henderson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) to correct the military record of Pleasant R. W. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) to correct the military record of James Shook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) to correct the military record of Owen J. Owen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the Regular Army, Capt. Oliver A. Barber, an officer of the United States Army during the World War, who incurred physical disability in line of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 5234) granting a pension to Emma B. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5236) granting a pension to Sarah Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) granting a pension to Emma J. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) granting a pension to Luella Goings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5239) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Brake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5240) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5241) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) granting an increase of pension to Milley Vaniter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Tabitha E. Van Winkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5244) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Regenhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) granting an increase of pension to Ella J. Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5246) granting an increase of pension to Kate E. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) granting an increase of pension to Martha P. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5248) granting an increase of pension to John H. Crim; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5249) for the relief of John A. McClure; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5250) for the relief of Henry C. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 5251) granting an increase of pension to Clara L. Biddleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 5252) granting a pension to Georgia Mutchler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5253) granting a pension to Hattie Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5255) for the relief of Jacob F. Webb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 5256) granting a pension to Albert Henry Edge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5257) granting a pension to Isaac Trent; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5258) granting a pension to Robert Hopson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 5259) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5260) granting an increase of pension to Alvira Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5261) granting an increase of pension to Flora Blydenburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: A bill (H. R. 5262) for the relief of Guy L. Hartman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5263) granting a pension to Ora E. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) for the relief of James P. Cornes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) granting a pension to Alice A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 5266) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob A. Wolfson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SEGER: A bill (H. R. 5267) granting an increase of pension to John H. Doremus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 5268) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Schlaudecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 5269) granting an increase of pension to Emma DeForest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5270) granting a pension to Henrietta Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) granting a pension to Ellen Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5272) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5273) granting a pension to Rachel Heizerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5274) granting a pension to Julia Ann Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5275) granting a pension to Margaret C. Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5276) granting a pension to Eliza B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5277) granting a pension to Mary Jane Beatty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5278) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5279) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5280) granting a pension to William McKee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Nettleship; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5282) granting an increase of pension to Laura T. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5283) granting a pension to Edith M. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 5284) granting a pension to Sophia A. Remondino; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5285) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Austeel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5286) for the relief of J. H. Sanborn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5287) for the relief of Etta C. Sanborn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5288) for the relief of William F. Kallweit; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5289) for the relief of Loretta Kallweit; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of Emmett W. Southwick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 5291) granting a pension to Thomas A. McEntire, alias Thomas Ingalls; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5292) for the relief of Mattie Holcomb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5293) for the relief of Horton B. Herrin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5294) for the relief of Seth J. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the Sunny Brook Distillery Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5296) for the relief of Eugene Floyd Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5297) for the relief of Christine Brenzinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5298) for the relief of the legal heirs of Mildred Eberlein, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5299) for the relief of the legal representatives of Lyman Randall, J. E. Sarrazin, and James Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5300) for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs of Ralph K. Warrington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 5301) granting a pension to Annie E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5302) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5303) granting a pension to W. E. Sharp, a regularly commissioned United States deputy marshal of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) granting a pension to James Sharp, a regularly commissioned United States deputy marshal of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) granting a pension to Catherine Patton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) granting a pension to Mary J. Quattlebaum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) granting an increase of pension to Arminta McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5309) granting an increase of pension to Katy Neale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5310) granting an increase of pension to Frances H. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5311) granting an increase of pension to Charity Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5312) granting an increase of pension to Ida Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5313) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Walters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5314) granting an increase of pension to Austin L. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) granting an increase of pension to Floyd J. Gaines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5316) for the relief of J. V. Crain; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) for the relief of Addie Belle Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5318) for the relief of Tom Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5319) for the relief of Porter Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) for the relief of Robert M. Angus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5321) for the relief of John I. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5322) for the relief of John P. Stafford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) for the relief of Vivian Cady; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5324) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Samuel S. Meeks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5325) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of A. G. Kirby, deceased, to wit, Albert Kirby, H. L. Kirby, and Alonzo Kirby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5326) to place the heirs of Wiley L. Downum, deceased, on the rolls as Mississippi Choctaw Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) to remove the charge of desertion and granting an honorable discharge to W. H. Mulkey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5328) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Charles P. Phillips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Wilhoit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5330) to pay $5,000 to Perry Lee, C. A. Boen, and C. A. Monroe Meadows, of Newton County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5331) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Breiner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Bull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Marsters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5334) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. Tobin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5335) for the relief of Margaret Sloane; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5336) for the relief of John J. Corcoran; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) for the relief of Capt. Asa G. Ayer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) for the relief of Roland M. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 5339) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Tower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 5340) granting permission to Lieut. Col. Harry N. Cootes, United States Army, to accept certain decorations tendered him; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5341) for the relief of Staunton Brick Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5342) for the relief of J. J. Creslein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5343) for the relief of the Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5344) granting a pension to Elem Cason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5345) granting a pension to Thomas Sherman Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 5346) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5347) for the relief of Ernestine McBride; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 5348) for the relief of Cook Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5349) granting an increase of pension to Emma Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5351) granting an increase of pension to Maria Jane Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5352) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5353) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5354) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Loshier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5355) granting an increase of pension to Emmer Gilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5356) granting an increase of pension to Walburga Fassnacht; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5357) granting an increase of pension to Helen Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5358) granting an increase of pension to Bridget O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5359) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Schell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5360) granting an increase of pension to Isabel W. Siler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5361) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) granting an increase of pension to Sophia C. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) granting an increase of pension to Laura Comingore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. McLean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) granting an increase of pension to Everett Sears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) granting an increase of pension to Edward Baker McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5367) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Wilcoxan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5368) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Crigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5369) granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5370) granting an increase of pension to Deborah A. Toliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5371) granting an increase of pension to Mary N. Zufall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5373) granting an increase of pension to Richie A. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5375) granting an increase of pension to Charity Ann Utter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5376) for the relief of Alfred A. Winslow; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) for the relief of Crawford Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of John D. Eldred; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) to correct the military record of Patterson Mehaffie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5380) to correct the military record of G. W. Gilkison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5381) to correct the military record of Thomas Spurrier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5382) to correct the military record of Francis B. Cornell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5383) to correct the military record of John W. Siple; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5384) authorizing the treasurer of the United States to pay Hattie McKelvey $1,786; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5385) to authorize the appointment of Maj. Warner A. Ross, retired, to the grade of major, retired, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) for the relief of Catherine C. Schilling; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5387) providing for the payment of the finding reported by the Court of Claims in favor of Timothy C. Harrington for extra time; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) for the relief of Johan Kotora; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5389) to authorize the appointment of First Lieut. John W. Scott, resigned, to the grade of first lieutenant, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5390) authorizing the Secretary of War to confer a medal of honor upon Maj. Gen. Omar Bundy, of the United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 5391) authorizing the appointment of Joseph H. Hyman as air officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5392) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Harry L. Collins a major in the Quartermaster Corps of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) for the relief of R. H. Keene; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) for the relief of Adolph Morales; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) for the relief of John Harvey Miers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) for the relief of Marcos Rodriguez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Alexander Boynton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5398) for the relief of the heirs of the late Dr. Thomas C. Longino; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5399) for the relief of George Heitkamp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) for the relief of Joseph R. Gallagher; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) for the relief of Fritz Zoller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5402) for the relief of Joske Bros. Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5403) for the relief of Karim Joseph Mery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) for the relief of David A. Trousdale; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of L. Dromgoole; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) for the relief of P. M. Nigro; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5407) for the relief of Rene Hooge, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) granting a pension to Worth Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5409) granting an increase of pension to Dama J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5410) granting an increase of pension to Maria P. Flugge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5411) granting a pension to Minnie Kuhle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) granting a pension to George Tuley Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5413) granting a pension to Thornton C. Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) granting a pension to Edward W. Reichelt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) granting an increase of pension to Ida Anz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5416) granting an increase of pension to James Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Laura O'Dwyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Northup; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) granting an increase of pension to Lillie Ford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5420) granting an increase of pension to Emilie Kutzer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5421) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5422) granting an increase of pension to Oliver T. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5423) for the relief of William H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5424) for the relief of Anthony Schwartzenberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5425) granting a pension to Alice A. McKenzie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5426) granting a pension to Nellie Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5427) granting a pension to George B. McIntyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) granting a pension to Irwin Robert Rowe Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) granting a pension to George W. Gassman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) granting a pension to William A. Wilburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) granting a pension to Emily E. Weiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) granting a pension to Mary E. English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) granting a pension to Mary Etta Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) granting a pension to Cassander Twigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) granting a pension to John M. Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) granting a pension to William R. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Matheney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) granting an increase of pension to Anastasia Elizabeth Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Fawver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) granting an increase of pension to Jane F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5442) granting an increase of pension to Jessie M. Gaither; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5443) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Butt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) granting an increase of pension to Susan V. Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5446) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Crabtree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5447) granting an increase of pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5448) granting an increase of pension to Scottie E. Scofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5449) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Humbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5450) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kidwiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5451) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5452) granting an increase of pension to Martha Cherry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5453) granting an increase of pension to Catherine McDermitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5454) granting an increase of pension to Laney M. Darkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Shilt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5456) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Closterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5457) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5458) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Sunberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Hemming, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5461) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5462) granting an increase of pension to Ella Lowdermilk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 5464) to amend section 315 of the tariff act of 1922 and extend to articles on the free list the power of the President over import duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5465) to amend section 1571 of the Revised Statutes to permit officers of the Navy to count duty on airships as sea duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) to amend paragraph 1 of section 22 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, by providing for the carrying of officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services while on leave of absence or furlough at own expense at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 5467) to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservation for the adequate protection of such birds; and by providing funds for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5468) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890 (as amended by the act of May 9, 1900), granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, or dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the war with Mexico, and the act of May 1, 1920, and the act of July 3, 1926, to revise and equalize rates of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the war with Mexico, to certain widows, including widows of the War of 1812, former widows, dependent parents, and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and certain Army nurses, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 5469) for the erection of a Federal building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5470) for the erection of a Federal building at Leesville, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5471) for the erection of a Federal building at Winnfield, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) for the erection of a Federal building at Bunkie, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5473) to provide for the registration of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5474) to establish a fish-cultural station at some point in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 5475) granting the consent of Congress to the R. V. Reger Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5476) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. a tract of land situate in the city of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 5477) to extend from January 1, 1925, to September 1, 1928, the time within which tuberculosis contracted by World War veterans is presumed to be of service origin, to constitute social diseases contracted while in the service an incident and casualty thereof, and to repeal existing law denominating same willful misconduct, and permitting the mother or the father of a deceased World War veteran to receive his insurance or adjusted compensation without showing dependency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 5478) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) to provide for the purchase of land, livestock, and agricultural equipment for the Alabama and Coushatta Indians in Polk County, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) for the erection of a Federal building at Crockett, Tex., with an appropriation of $100,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5481) for the investigation of feasible water-storage sites within the basin of the Trinity River, Tex., and tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5482) to provide facilities in different localities in the United States for a more comprehensive cooperative study of the best-known methods for the improvement of the potato; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 5483) to authorize certain equipage, supplies, and materials to be sold to foreign governments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5484) to provide for date of precedence of certain officers of the staff corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5485) to repeal the provision in the act approved June 10, 1896, prohibiting the employment of officers of the Navy or Marine Corps on the active or retired list by persons or companies furnishing naval supplies or war material to the Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5486) for the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and the United States Marine Corps Reserve who were released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than their homes or places of enrollment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5487) to amend section 6 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 5488) to provide for the conduct of scientific investigations by the Forest Service to discover economically practical methods of the disposal of the waste materials of pulp and paper mills without polluting streams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 5489) providing for the erection of a public building at Mendota, Ill., on a site heretofore provided for the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5490) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Morris, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 5491) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," approved July 12, 1921; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5492) to amend section 1860 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5493) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5494) to enable the mothers and unmarried widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 5495) to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5496) providing for a President's plaza and memorial in the city of Nashville, State of Tennessee, to Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson, former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) to amend section 8 of an act of Congress approved April 26, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5498) to amend section 4874 of the Revised Statutes of the United States providing for the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5499) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the sixth congressional district of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5500) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Fort Donelson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5501) granting the consent of Congress to the Hermann Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5502) granting the consent of Congress to the Washington Missouri River Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5503) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Vandalia, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5504) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Wellsville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5505) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bowling Green, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Union, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and subsequent acts amendatory thereof to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5508) to amend section 2 of the pension act approved July 3, 1926, so as to increase the pensions of widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars to $50 a month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5509) to amend section 2 of the pension act, approved July 3, 1926, so as to increase the pension of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars to $90 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARSS: A bill (H. R. 5510) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Duluth Ship Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 5511) to enlarge, extend, and remodel the post-office building at Lexington, Ky., and to acquire additional land therefor, if necessary; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 5512) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Winnetka, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5513) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to amend, in his discretion, contracts for the erection of the Edward Hines Junior Hospital; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the

United States, and for other purposes," approved May 26, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5515) to amend section 523 of the tariff act of 1922: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 5516) to repeal the excise tax on automobiles and motor cycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5517) relating to the investigation of new uses of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 5518) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 5519) for constitutional reapportionment of Representatives in Congress and providing for 435 Representatives under the census of 1920, 435 Representatives under the census of 1930, and 300 Representatives under the census of 1940 and each decennial census thereafter; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) authorizing the erection of a sanitary, fireproof barrack and infirmary at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Santa Monica, Calif., to be used for the housing, maintenance, and treatment of disabled women veterans only; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) authorizing the erection of a sanitary, fireproof mess hall at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Santa Monica, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5522) authorizing the erection of 15 sanitary, fireproof barracks at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Santa Monica, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5523) authorizing the erection of a sanitary, fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Santa Monica, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 5524) to authorize attendance of nonresident pupils in public schools of the District of Columbia upon payment of tuition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5525) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5526) to fix the amount to be contributed by the United States toward defraying expenses of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5527) to prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 5528) to enable electricians, radioelectricians, chief electricians, and chief radioelectricians to be appointed to the grade of ensign; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) to equalize the pay of certain officers of the Marine Corps with that of officers with corresponding service in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 5530) to admit free of duty and for remission of duty on certain bells for carillon purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 5531) to amend the provision contained in the act approved August 29, 1916, relating to the assignment to duty of certain officers of the United States Navy as fleet and squadron engineers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 5532) to provide for the establishment of a dairying and livestock experiment station at Paragould, Ark.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5533) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wynne, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5534) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Blytheville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) for the erection of a public building at Forrest City, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5536) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Rector, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) providing for the extension of the public building at Jonesboro, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5538) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Earle, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 5539) to amend section 552 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5540) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5541) for the erection of a public building at the city of Placerville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5542) to provide for the protection of timberlands within the Shasta National Forest; for the protection of the McCloud River as a salmon-propagating stream; for the protection of the domestic water supply of the city of Redding, Calif.; for the protection of the Anderson irrigation district; and for the protection of the navigable channel of the Sacramento River, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5543) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop an ammunition depot on Government lands at or near Secret Valley or Honey Lake, in Lassen County, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5544) to consolidate or acquire alienated lands in national parks by exchange; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5545) granting certain lands to the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5546) to exempt from taxation income derived from the mining of gold; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 5547) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, or its assigns, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Missouri and Kansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 5548) to authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 5549) to provide for the election of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5550) for the erection of a public building at Kingstree, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5551) for the erection of a public building at Dillon, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5552) for the erection of a public building at Conway, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 5553) authorizing repayment of moneys paid by purchasers of certain lots in the town site of Bowdoin, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 5554) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Monticello, in Wright County, on the Trunk Highway No. 25; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 5555) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5556) providing for the punishment of persons escaping from Federal penal or correctional institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5557) to authorize the town of Alderson, W. Va., to maintain a public highway upon the premises occupied by the Federal Industrial Institution for Women, at Alderson, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5558) to authorize the Attorney General to regulate the wearing, manufacture, and sale of badges used by certain Government officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5559) to authorize the appointment of stenographers in the courts of the United States and to fix their duties and compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5560) to amend section 224 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5561) to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5562) to amend section 1112 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5563) to further protect interstate and foreign commerce against bribery and other corrupt trade practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5564) to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section to be numbered 274D; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5565) providing a fee to clerks of court in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5566) to amend section 176 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 5567) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility, and to ascertain and report the cost, of erecting a memorial shrine at or near the Kansas-Missouri State line on the grounds of the Lincoln and Lee University, Kansas City, and of removing thereto for reburial the remains of a Union and of a Confederate unknown soldier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) to extend the provisions and benefits of the act approved May 1, 1926, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes; to include surgeons who served under contract, their widows and children; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) relative to the dam across the Kansas (Kaw) River at Lawrence, in Douglas County, Kans.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5570) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility and to ascertain and report the cost of establishing a military road connecting Fort Leavenworth and the city of Kansas City, Kans., and of establishing a national military park adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 5571) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 5572) to provide for the furnishing of bonds by national and State banks and trust companies, which are members of the Federal reserve system, for the protection of depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5573) to authorize the creation of game, bird, and fish refuges in the Kaniksu National Forest, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5574) authorizing the lower Spokane and the lower Pend o'Reille or Lower Kalispell Tribes or Bands of Indians of the State of Washington, or any of them, to present their claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 5575) to amend the Hawaiian organic act, as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5576) to guarantee the payment of deposits in national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5577) to provide for a joint reunion of the surviving veterans of both sides of the war of 1861–1865 in the city of Washington in the year 1928; to authorize the appropriation of sufficient money from the United States Treasury to pay the expenses of such joint reunion, and to provide for a commission to carry into effect the provisions of this act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 5578) to amend sections 4692 and 4693 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to accept the official report from the War and Navy Departments as "in line of duty" for pensionable purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 5579) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Texas at Del Rio, Val Verde County; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5580) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Texas, at San Angelo, Tom Green County; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5581) to prevent gambling in cotton futures and make it unlawful for any person, corporation, or association of persons to sell any contract for future delivery of any cotton within the United States unless such seller is actually the legitimate owner of the cotton so contracted for future delivery at the time said sale or contract of sale is made; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5582) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street in the city of El Paso crosses the Rio Grande, in the county of El Paso, State of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5583) granting the consent of Congress to the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. of Texas and the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. to construct, maintain and operate a railroad bridge across the Rio Grande River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 5584) granting the consent of Congress to the T. W. Arnette Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5585) to provide for the purchase of a site for a Federal building at St. Marys, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5586) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Spencer, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5587) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Parkersburg, W. Va., and remodel present building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5588) amending section 1 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 5589) to grant to the village of Broadview, Cook County, Ill., an easement over certain Government property; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 5590) to authorize appropriations for the construction of culverts and trestles in connection with the camp railroad at Camp McClellan, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5591) for the relief of certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps who were discharged because of misrepresentation of age; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 5592) making appropriation for the improvement of Quincy (Ill.) Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5593) to provide for the independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5594) for the erection of a public building at Abingdon, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5595) for the erection of a public building at Galva, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5596) for the erection of a public building at Lewistown, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5597) for the erection of a public building at Rushville, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 5598) for the purposes of protecting officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who are called by committees of the House and Senate to testify concerning matters before such committees; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5599) establishing transmission and carrying of mail by airplanes and flying machines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 5600) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in the amendment thereof," approved July 3, 1926, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5601) placing service postmasters in the classified service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5602) extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5603) to authorize members of the Civil Service Commission and its duly authorized representatives to administer oaths of office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 5604) to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 5606) relating to contracts entered into by the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5607) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to require reports from persons, partnerships, or corporations who offer for sale stocks, bonds, and securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 5608) to authorize the appointment of special United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 5609) to amend subdivision A, paragraph 1, of section 6 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5610) to provide for the performance of the duties of the offices of Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster of the House of Representatives, respectively, in case of the death or resignation of the incumbent during the interim between sessions of Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5611) to amend section 72 of chapter 4 of title 2, United States Code of Laws; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5612) to amend section 127a of the national defense act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 5613) to provide for a deep waterway for ocean-going vessels from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean by way of the St. Lawrence River and the Welland Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5614) for the improvement of Holland Harbor and Black Lake, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 5615) to authorize the registration of judgments, decrees, and orders rendered by any court of record of any State or of the United States, in any other such court of record and to prescribe the effect thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5616) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the manner in which property shall be sold under orders and decrees of any United States courts," approved March 3, 1893; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5617) to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5618) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Williamsburg, Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5619) for the erection of a public building at West Point, Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5620) to provide for the enlargement of the present post-office building at Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5621) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to make and publish rules in common-law actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5622) to authorize the transfer of a portion of the Dutch Gap Lighthouse Reservation to the Colonial Dames of America in Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5623) to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section, to be No. 274D; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) for the extension and completion of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5625) to provide that the heads of the executive departments may occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5626) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to publish the names of the heads of families as returned by each Federal census from 1800 to 1840, inclusive; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 5627) granting privilege of the floor and right to participate in debate to heads of executive departments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5628) to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5629) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Falls Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5630) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a fireproof office building or buildings for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5631) for the relief of certain field employees of the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5632) to revise and equalize the rate of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to certain widows, former widows, children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 5633) to amend section 9 of the national defense act approved June 4, 1920, so as to facilitate procurement of military supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5634) providing retirement for licensed officers and officers of the engineering staff of the Army transport service who have reached the age of 64 years and who have served at least 25 years in the service of the United States Government, or who may suffer total disability in line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5635) to amend the act approved June 7, 1924, authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of the Carlisle Barracks Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 5636) to amend section 1 under Title II of the national prohibition act entitled "An act to prohibit intoxicating beverages, etc." by increasing the amount of alcohol which may be used in liquors and beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 5637) to repeal the law prohibiting the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5638) granting the consent of Congress to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River at Epes, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 5639) to regulate the marking of platinum imported into the United States or transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5640) to regulate interstate commerce by motor vehicles operating as common carriers on the public highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5641) to promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 5642) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Red River at Fulton, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRALL: A bill (H. R. 5643) granting increased gratuity and pensions to the widows or beneficiaries of officers and enlisted men who are killed or disabled in time of peace while engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 5644) to enable an enlisted man in the naval service to make good time lost in excess of one day under certain conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 5645) for the incorporation of the National American Veteran and Allied Patriotic Organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5646) authorizing the appropriation of $50,000 for the establishment of a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station, or for the extension of the same, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5647) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5648) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Morrillton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5649) for erection of a public building at Conway, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) for the erection of a public building at North Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5651) providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Spadra, Ark.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5652) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to provide additional hospital facilities at the United States veterans' hospital at North Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 5653) for the improvement of commerce and navigation in the Illinois River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5654) providing for the erection of a public building at Carrollton, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. 5655) providing for erection of a public building at Havana, Ill., on a site heretofore provided for the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 5656) for the improvement of the Federal building at Aberdeen, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5657) granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5658) allowing the rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army, to the medical officer assigned to duty as personal physician to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 5660) to amend an act entitled "World War veterans' act, 1924," as amended, approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5661) to amend an act entitled "World War veterans' act, 1924," as amended, approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5662) to amend the national defense act, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5663) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5664) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5665) authorizing appropriations for purchase of land at military post; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5666) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new post-office building at Methuen, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5667) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new post-office building at Ayer, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 5668) for the erection of a Federal building at Lebanon, Laclede County, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5669) for the erection of a Federal building at Mountain Grove, Wright County, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: A bill (H. R. 5670) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Thomaston, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 5671) to amend the national prohibition act, as supplemented, in respect of the definition of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5672) amending sections 4, 6, and 11 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5673) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5674) to authorize certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5675) to amend section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5676) to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SANDLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5677) providing for the purchase and sale of cotton by net weight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 5678) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5679) granting the consent of Congress to the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Corporation, a Delaware corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEGER: A bill (H. R. 5680) to provide for the erection of a public building at Passaic, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5681) to amend the act of February 28, 1925, fixing the compensation of employees in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) to enable the Postmaster General to contract for group life insurance for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5683) amending section 4031 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to enable postmasters to designate one or more employees to perform duties for them during their absence, including the signing of checks in the name of the postmaster; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 5684) to amend the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5685) authorizing and directing the Inland Waterways Corporation to initiate water carriage upon the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 5686) granting a right of way to the county of Imperial, State of California, over certain public lands for highway purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands to the Cabazon Water Co., issue patent therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 5688) extending the provisions of existing laws for deportation of aliens and defining the manufacture or sale of intoxicants as a crime involving moral turpitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 5689) to authorize the construction of a George Rogers Clark memorial lighthouse on the Ohio River at, or adjacent to, the city of Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) to amend sections 116 and 118 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) to increase the compensation and regulate leave of absence of storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5692) to pay to Confederate soldiers and to the widows of Confederate soldiers $1,000 and $50 per month during the remainder of their lives; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5693) to create a department of education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5694) to authorize the payment of 50 per cent of the proceeds arising from the sales of timber from the national forest reserves in the State of Arkansas to the promotion of agriculture, domestic economy, animal husbandry, and dairying within the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 5695) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to equitably adjust disputes and claims of settlers and others against the United States and between each other arising from incomplete or faulty surveys in township 19

south, range 26 east, Tallahassee meridian, Lake County, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5696) to provide for the further development of agriculture, home economics, and industry in America; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5697) granting relief to veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) authorizing an appropriation to improve and maintain Field Kindley Park in the town of Gravette, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) to establish a national military park at and near Pea Ridge, Ark., and to mark and preserve historical points connected with the Battle of Pea Ridge, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) to amend the Federal farm loan act and the agriculture act of 1923; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) to create a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture; to provide for the acquisition and dissemination of information pertaining to cooperation; to promote the knowledge of cooperative principles and practices; to provide for calling advisers to counsel with the Secretary of Agriculture on cooperative activities; to authorize cooperative associations to acquire, interpret, and disseminate crop and market information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) limiting penalty for violation of the ninety-sixth article of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5703) to appropriate the sum of $25,000 out of the United States Treasury to lay and construct a substantial concrete hard-surface pavement for a distance of two blocks through the United States Government property and adjacent to the national cemetery in the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) to establish a fish hatchery in the third congressional district of the State or Arkansas; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5705) to create the national board of rural industrial schools for mountain children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5706) to improve and assist in maintaining the park now established at the Prairie Grove battle field in Washington County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) to appoint a commission of five citizens to ascertain the persons responsible for the Mountain Meadow massacre, to ascertain the amount of property loss, and by whom sustained because of said massacre, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5708) providing for hospitalization, medical treatment, nursing, and all necessary care of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5709) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) to recognize commissioned service in the Philippine Constabulary in determining rights of officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 5711) relating to assuring compensation for accidental injuries or death of employees in certain occupations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 5712) to extend commisary privileges to the widows of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps and also to diplomatic and consular officers at isolated foreign stations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5713) to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5714) to prohibit certain cotton-price predictions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5715) to transfer calcium arsenate from dutiable to the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) to decrease rates, fares, and charges of railroads and carriers subject to the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5717) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semimonthly cotton crop reports and providing for their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5718) to amend the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5719) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Sandersville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5720) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Thomson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5721) granting the consent of Congress to E. M. Elliott and Associates (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5722) granting the consent of Congress to the Rogers Bros. Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at Ashland, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5723) providing for the biennial appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5724) to prevent desecration of the flag and insignia of the United States and to provide punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5725) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5726) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Black River at or near Jonesville, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5727) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Harrisonburg, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5728) granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Morehouse Parish, La., or the State Highway Commission of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at or near Point Pleasant, in Morehouse Parish; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 5729) to establish the Ouachita National Park in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) to provide for the erection of a public building at Nashville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ashdown, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) to provide for the erection of a public building at Paris, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5733) to provide for the erection of a public building at Van Buren, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) to provide for the erection of a public building at De Queen, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) to provide for the erection of a public building at Booneville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5736) for the improvement of the post office and Federal court building at Texarkana, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 5737) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection and completion of a building thereon for a post office at Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5738) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Greybull, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) authorizing surveys and investigations to determine feasibility of irrigation project on Powder

River in Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) to cede unreserved public lands to the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) to provide for clearing, leveling, and preparing land for irrigation on Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of the Saratoga reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of the Casper-Alcova reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5744) to authorize the reconstruction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5745) to give military status and discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps, organized by the War Department under authority of the President of the United States for service during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 5746) to authorize the appraisal of certain Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5747) to authorize the admission to naval hospitals of dependents of officers and enlisted men of the naval service in need of hospital care; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 5748) for additional construction and for improvements at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) to authorize appropriations for construction at San Antonio, Tex., for a new primary flying school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5750) for the acquisition of additional ground and the erection thereon of a public building or an addition to the present public building in San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) to provide for the filling of certain limited vacancies in the grade of warrant officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5752) for the development of the training plant for the Air Service of the United States Army at San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Kenedy, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5754) for the erection of a Federal building at Seguin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5755) to authorize the payment of subsistence expenses to disabled veterans while necessarily absent from home to obtain artificial limbs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) providing for the appointment of certain civil-service clerks, warrant officers, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5757) to enable the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to cooperate with the States of Maryland or Virginia in acquiring land for extension of the National Capital park and parkway system in these States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) amending the act approved May 4, 1926, providing for the construction and maintenance of bathing pools or beaches in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5759) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise and settle certain suits at law resulting from the subsidence of First Street east, in the District of Columbia, occasioned by the construction of a railroad tunnel under said street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5760) providing for preservation of the Great Falls of the Potomac and the establishment there of a public park with connecting parkways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5761) to prevent fraud respecting securities offered for sale within the District of Columbia, to provide a summary proceeding therefor, to license persons selling securities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1119), as amended by section 2 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 812), so as to provide operators' permits free of cost to enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard operating Government-owned vehicles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) to regulate the practice of chiropractic, to create a board of chiropractic examiners of the District of Columbia, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) providing for acquisition by the United States of America, by purchase or condemnation, of land within the District of Columbia for erection of buildings or for parks, parkways, playgrounds, or other public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. A bill (H. R. 5765) to create a waterways and water resources commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 5766) to provide for the coordination of the public health activities of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 5767) to establish uniform requirements affecting Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5768) to fix the amount to be contributed by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5769) to authorize the consolidation and coordination of Government purchases, to enlarge the functions of the General Supply Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 5770) to improve the navigability of the Colorado River by securing regularity of flow, by protecting and developing the lower Colorado River Basin, by providing flood control, and by protecting the Colorado River in its present or future channel; also to aid in the reclamation of the public lands of the United States, to prevent controversy between the States in the Colorado Basin, and creating the Colorado River authority, with powers and duties enumerated herein, as a means or instrumentality for carrying out such purposes and effectuating such ends and making such improvements self-sustaining and self-paying; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 5771) to promote interstate commerce, agriculture, and the general welfare by providing for the development and control of waterways and water resources, for water conservation, for flood control, prevention, and protection; for the application of flood waters to beneficial uses, and for cooperation in such work with States and other agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 5772) to regulate, control, and safeguard the disbursement of Federal funds expended for the creation, construction, extension repair, or ornamentation of any public building, highway, levee, dam, excavation, dredging, drainage, or other construction project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 5773) to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BURTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to prohibit the exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, and filling vacancies in the offices thereof, and the terms of such officers and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ANDREW: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) directing and providing for the assembly, inventory, classification, preparation for publication, and publication of the official records and maps relating to the participation of the military and naval forces of the United States in the World War, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 4) for the relief of flood-stricken farm areas in southern United States, with special reference to aid in the employment of county agents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) for the appointment of Harry H. Holt, of Virginia, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) authorizing and directing the President to use and employ the Army and Navy, the militia of the several States, and the resources of the Government in suppressing all smuggling into the United States of intoxicating liquors, narcotics, and aliens, and to suppress the insubordinate rebellion now being waged by those in authority in several States and large cities of the United States against the fundamental laws of the Republic, to the end that the President may obey the Constitution of the United States, by faithfully executing the laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) constituting it cause for impeachment and removal from office, and dishonorable discharge from the service, and discharge from Government employment, respectively, for any executive officer, member of the judiciary, Senator, Representative in Congress, officer or enlisted man in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or any employee of the Government of the United States, to purchase intoxicating liquors from a "bootlegger" (as that term is commonly understood), or to manufacture, sell, or transport intoxicating liquors within, or to import the same into, the United States, for beverage purposes, or to conspire with any person to violate the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States and laws passed in enforcement thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) to prohibit the Federal Reserve Board, its member banks, and all other governmental banking institutions from discounting any obligation, or directly or indirectly handling any banking transaction for, and from receiving, handling, or discounting any money, credits, or securities of or for any nation, or the nationals thereof, that has defaulted in obligations due the Government of the United States, and failed and refused to fund such obligations in violation of their understanding had with this Government at the time it advanced such loans; and to discourage American citizens and private banking institutions from rendering such banking facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 9) prohibiting officials of the United States from issuing permits to any diplomatic representative, secretary of embassy or legation, counselor of embassy or legation, military attaché, naval attaché, commercial attaché, consul, agent, commissioner, or special envoy of any foreign country accredited to and residing in the United States that would authorize any of them, or any member of their official family, to import into, transport within, possess, or dispense in the United States any intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in violation of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and enforcement laws thereof; and to recall and cancel any driver's permit for operating motor vehicles of such of them who willfully violate traffic laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 10) relating to the establishment of commodity quantity units for general use in merchandising after 1935; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) to adopt an official flag code of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 12) proposing the adoption of the Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) authorizing the selection of sites and the erection of pedestals for statues of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Albert Gallatin in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) providing that the United States pay her proportionate share of the expenses incurred at any official conference, interchange, or committee held under the auspices of the League of Nations, its council or assembly, to which conferences, committee, or interchange the United States shall send her duly accredited representative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) for the appointment of Jay B. Sessions, of South Dakota, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for a referendum on war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) providing for a national referendum upon the modification of the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARBER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) to provide for a national agricultural day; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property located in Hernando County, Fla., known as the Brooksville Plant Introduction Garden, no longer required for plant-introduction purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HICKEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) providing for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski and establishing a commission to be known as the United States Pulaski sesquicentennial commission; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) authorizing and directing the Public Printer to print and mail copies of the daily issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to all public and parochial high schools in the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KINDRED: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) authorizing the Postmaster General of the United States to set aside Christmas Day as a national full holiday for rural carriers, letter carriers, and all postal employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) providing for the return of Governors Island, New York Harbor, to the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) for the purpose of outlawing war and to establish permanent peace in the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) to relieve Elizabeth Robins Pennell from the necessity of providing a surety on her bond for the benefit of the United States as residuary legatee and remainderman under the will of Joseph Pennell; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McLEOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) to award recognition in the name of Congress to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States," etc., approved February 8, 1918; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) relating to the appointment of certain Cabinet officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) creating a commission to investigate the subject of civil-service retirement and the operation and administration of the law relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two Chinese subjects, to be designated hereafter by the Government of China; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two Siamese subjects, to be designated hereafter by the Government of Siam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) to provide for the erection at Washington, D. C., of a monument to the memory of Haym Salomon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) designating the columbine as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) to provide for the refund of certain taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) authorizing the President to call an international conference of representatives of agricultural and farmers' organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 47) for the relief of Mary M. Tilghman, former widow of Sergt. Frederick Coleman, deceased, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) authorizing the improvement of the system of overland communications on the Seward Peninsula, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 49) to authorize the Secretary of War to expend not to exceed $ for the protection of the Federal highway and property in the town of Hyder, adjacent to Salmon River, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 50) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Kodiak Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of isthmus south of Wedge Cape on Nagai Island, Shumagin Group, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of the Tanana River at or near its confluence with the Yukon River, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 53) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Wrangell Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Keku Straits, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 55) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Petersburg Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of the Stikine River, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Kake Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Egegik River, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SWEET: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) directing the Comptroller General of the United States to correct an error made in the adjustment of the account between the State of New York and the United States, adjusted under the authority contained in the act of February 24, 1905 (33 Stat. 777), and appropriated for in the deficiency act of February 27, 1906; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) to create a commission to secure plans and designs for and to erect a memorial building for the National Memorial Association (Inc.), in the city of Washington, as a tribute to the negro's contribution to the achievements of America; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) providing for the erection of a public historical museum on the site of Fort Defiance, Defiance, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration in 1929 and 1930 of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the conquest of the Northwest Territory by Gen. George Rogers Clark and his army, and authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a permanent memorial of the Revolutionary War in the West and of the accession of the old Northwest to the United States on the site of Fort Sackville, which was captured by George Rogers Clark and his men February 25, 1779; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WINTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) authorizing the making of surveys, plans, and estimates for the irrigation of certain lands in the State of Wyoming, under the terms of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the apportionment of the Representatives and direct taxes among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) to repeal subdivisions (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 2 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) extending the privileges of compensation and hospitalization to Herman Lincoln Chatkoff; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) proposing an amendment to section 7, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, permitting the President of the United States to disapprove any item or appropriation of any bill passed by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) to provide for the appointment to commissioned grades and honorable discharge of certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) to appoint a joint commission to investigate the subject of crop insurance; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) requesting the President to propose the calling of a third Hague conference for the codification of international law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3) extending the thanks of Congress to the State of Georgia for the statue of Alexander H. Stephens; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ASWELL: Resolution (H. Res. 15) to print 2,500 copies of the soil survey of Winn Parish, La.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BLANTON: Resolution (H. Res. 16) of inquiry to obtain certain information from the United States Bureau of Efficiency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution (H. Res. 17) appointing a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to make an investigation and report for the information and guidance

of the Congress into the conditions under which Federal prisoners are confined in Federal, State, county, and municipal prisons and jails; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER: Resolution (H. Res. 18) providing for an investigation of labor conditions affecting employees rendering domestic service on railroads; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 19) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRENCH: Resolution (H. Res. 20) amending the rules of the House of Representatives and providing for the appointment of a committee on memorials and defining the duties of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 21) fixing an annual memorial day for the House of Representatives and providing for the appointment of a committee on memorials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARBER: Resolution (H. Res. 22) directing the Tariff Commission to make immediate investigation of the differences in cost of production of farm products in this country and in competing countries with a view to curtailing importation of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Resolution (H. Res. 23) authorizing the appointment of a janitor to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 24) empowering the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives to print additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 4474) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KENDALL: Resolution (H. Res. 25) to pay out of the contingent fund of the House an amount equal to six months' salary of the late Emanuel M. Lichty and $250 to defray the funeral expenses of said Emanuel M. Lichty; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution (H. Res. 26) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the production, distribution, and sale of flour, bread, etc., and the control of the baking and milling industries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP: Resolution (H. Res. 27) providing for the printing of 2,000 copies of the soil survey of Tangipahoa Parish, La.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LETTS (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 28) for adopting the Decalogue and Jesus' rule as standard measure for laws and regulations of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCE: Resolution (H. Res. 29) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 30) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McLEOD: Resolution (H. Res. 31) electing a standing committee on aeronautics; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Resolution (H. Res. 32) authorizing payment of one year's salary and funeral expenses to Annie L. Grayson on account of the death of Joel Grayson, late employee of the document room, House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 33) authorizing printing of soil surveys of Orange County, Fla.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 34) authorizing the Committee on the Census or any subcommittee thereof, to make diligent inquiry respecting the extent to which the right to vote is denied or abridged to citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON: Resolution (H. Res. 35) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in favor of the negotiation of treaties with Mexico or any Republic of Central and South America for the establishment of air mail service with the United States and the construction of an international highway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging Federal aid in the construction of a breakwater in Monterey Bay at or near the city of Monterey; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii declaring the project of rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race a success, requesting the Secretary of the Interior to approve the extension of the commission under the act, and urging Congress to extend the provisions thereof to all the Island of Hawaii, and recommending certain amendments thereto; to the Committee on the Territories.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii urging Congress to exempt all officials and employees of the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions from the payment of Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona for the enactment into law legislation for the retirement of emergency Army officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging legislation be passed giving disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges accorded by Congress to other classes of officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California for Federal aid in the construction of a breakwater in Monterey Bay at or near the city of Monterey; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to the congressional reapportionment of the United States; to the Committee on the Census.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to establish by proper legislation a bureau or department of publicity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin relating to the outlawry of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin requesting the National Government to submit to arbitration the Mexican and Nicaraguan controversies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin to provide more adequate support for forest research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin providing for earlier seating of Senators and Representatives elect; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin to grant Federal aid in the construction of interstate bridges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin to provide for a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin for the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, relating to "dollar diplomacy"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii requesting the amendment of an act, so as to provide the placing in Statuary Hall of the Capitol of the United States the statutes of Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole and Sanford Ballard Dole; to the Committee on the Library.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to increase the salary of the Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to extend the provisions of the reclamation act of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to amend section 82 of the organic act in order that women may serve on juries; to the Committee on the Territories.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to amend section 320 of the penal laws of the United States, so as not to apply to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, recommending the extension of the Nome-Shelton tramway; to the Committee on the Territories.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, granting reparation and compensation to any person suffering injuries or any financial loss by reason of the operation of said railroad, or by reason of any accident arising out of the operation thereof, on the same basis as if the United States were a common carrier; to the Committee on the Territories.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, praying for abrogation of the present contract for caring for Alaska

insane, and the establishment of an institution in Alaska for the caring of the Alaska insane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting that section 520 of title 18 of the Code of the United States, so far as the same relates to boxing, be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that the Bureau of Education, Alaska Division, now located at Seattle, Wash., be removed to some convenient location in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting appropriation for carrying out a program of stock lands of Alaska with valuable fur and game animals, and, further, to the obtaining of needed transportation equipment to carry on adequate wild life protective work in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska petitioning the completion of the Skagway highway to the summit of White Pass, and be completed by the Alaska Road Commission out of funds appropriated by Congress for the construction of roads, trails, and bridges in Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois requesting the changing of the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois requesting appropriate legislation, authorizing the United States Veterans' Bureau to use the funds under the control of said bureau for the making of loans direct to the veterans of the World War, upon their adjusted service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho to make an appropriation sufficient for the opening up of the Snake River for safe navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho petitioning Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the several States which would provide that Members of Congress should take their seats within a short time after their election; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington to pass legislation making provision for the construction of permanent and adequate buildings at Tulalip, Wash., for an Indian high school; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland providing that all amendments to the Constitution shall be submitted to a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland requesting the repeal of title 3 of the revenue act of 1926, known as "Estate tax law"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland for the removal of explosives stored in the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, Curtis Bay, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland requesting legislation be enacted making provisions for loans to ex-soldiers on their bonus papers or certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, granting additional Federal aid to Ohio in reference to the completion of the improvement of the Ohio River Road; to the Committee on Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, to make appropriations for roads over Indian reservations; to the Committee on Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, to grant Federal aid in the construction of interstate bridges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, requesting the Federal Power Commission of the United States to suspend action upon applications for power licenses for proposed power plants of the lower Colorado River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, to establish the Roosevelt National Park in Billings County, N. Dak., and to provide for the substitution of public lands of the United States for the State school lands located within the proposed park area; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, protesting against the enactment of House Calendar No. 204, S. 204 (Rept. No. 911), commonly known as the "corn-sugar bill"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, rejecting the purposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States contained in House Joint Resolution No. 184 of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging the Congress of the United States to reapportion the National House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of a Federal law regulating the shipment of machine guns, revolvers, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons, and the ammunition adapted thereto, in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, proposing an application to Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, creating a commission to make recommendations as to the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. Petition of National Wholesale Druggists Association, New York, relative to resale price legislation adopted at its annual convention, Atlantic City, 1927, urging Congress enact legislation for relief to the industry of this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2. Petition of the International Parliamentary Conference of Commerce, Brussels, inviting Congress to send representation to its general assembly at Paris, France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3. Petition of John A. Logan Council, No. 6, Maspeth, N. Y., Junior Order United American Mechanics, urging the passage of alien deportation laws and the registration of all aliens in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4. Memorial of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, urging Congress to make possible an increase in the personnel and resources of the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5. Petition of the Spokane Bank's board of directors, containing charges against the administration of the Federal farm loan system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6. Petition of Quarry Workers International Union of North America urging the use of granite in the construction of Government buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7. Petition of the officers of the Air Corps Reserve of the United States Army who trained at the airdrome, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., from July 31 to August 13, 1927, urging that a department of national defense be created with three coequal branches, namely, (a) Air, (b) Army, and (c) Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8. Petition of the city council of Chicago, urging Congress and the Department of the Navy to name one of the new cruisers now under construction *Chicago;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

9. Petition of the Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, supporting House Resolutions 4789, 11617, and 16925, and any other legislation necessary to uphold the honor and dignity of these United States in any of its overseas possessions; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

10. Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, for the establishment of a commercial airport on Governors Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

11. Petition of the council of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

12. Petition of the Monmouth County Bankers Association, stating that taxes on estates or the transfer of property by inheritance belongs to the State governments and that the Federal Government should withdraw from this field; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

13. Petition of the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of California, going on record as urging the Seventieth Congress to enact a necessary law providing the retirement privileges for the disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

14. Protest against every payment to Hamburg-Amerika Linie, Hamburg (Ballin with his directors, Cuno, Gross, Haller, Kahl, etc.) who "have made the World War as shown by his book 'Flasko,' registered Washington, Congress Library, 'A foreign

32,845' to kill United States and English trade and navigation and kill Monroe doctrine," etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Petition of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, adopting resolutions at their thirty-third annual convention held at Rio Grande Valley, Tex., 1927, favoring the construction of an inland waterway from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

16. Petition of Branch 74 of the Quarry Workers International Union of Stenington, Me., urging the use of granite as the material from which Government buildings shall be constructed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

17. Petition of the American Legion, Department of California, at its ninth annual convention, urging the construction of a high dam near Boulder Canyon and the construction of an all-American canal; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

18. Petition of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, Wilmington, Calif., regarding flood control of the Mississippi River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

19. Petition of the city of Chicago, requesting sufficient appropriations so that the great Mississippi River can be held in control in flood time; to the Committee on Flood Control.

20. Petition of the city and county of San Francisco, appealing to the Congress of the United States to prevent floods in the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

21. Petition of the port of Philadelphia Ocean Traffic Bureau, against the Inland Waterways Corporation being granted an additional expansion of capital in the amount of $50,000,000 to extend and enlarge its operation upon inland waterways; to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. Petition of the city council of the city of Milwaukee, petitioning Congress to transfer back to the city certain property in the twelfth ward deeded to the United States Government for turning basin purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

23. Petition that the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to amend the law to provide for the regulation and licensing of all pleasure boats for hire, regardless of the size or capacity of said pleasure vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

24. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of members of Post Office Department, Post No. 930, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, urging Congress to make November 11 a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

25. Also, resolution of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, indorsing the proposals of the American Cyanamid Co. for the lease of the Government properties at Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

26. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the residents of Quinlan, Okla., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

27. Also, resolution of the National Livestock Exchange of Chicago, Ill., in support of legislation "to protect the integrity of the open competitive livestock markets of the United States as posted by the Secretary of Agriculture for the benefits of producers of livestock"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

28. Also, resolution of the Oklahoma Pharmaceutical Association, of Oklahoma City, Okla., stating why the Capper-Kelly fair price bill should become a law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

29. Also, resolution of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association of New York City, in support of resale price legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

30. Also, resolution from C. D. Denniston, president of the National Builders' Supply Association, in support of the concurrent resolution by Congressman Woon, of Indiana, expressing the sense of Congress "that American materials should be specified in calling for bids on Government construction"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

31. Also, resolution of the National Coal Association, Washington, D. C., in support of the following: (1) A material reduction in the corporation-tax rate; (2) to abandon the Federal estate tax, unless as a war measure; (3) Mississippi Valley flood relief; (4) that National, State, and city officials should discountenance the use of public moneys for the purchase of foreign construction materials which come into competition with American construction materials; to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

32. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition in form of certain resolutions adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Knox, Nebr., in behalf of immediate action by the Congress to protect certain lands and other property from overflow and damage by the waters of the Missouri River at and near the mouth of the Niobrara River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

33. Also, petition in form of certain resolutions adopted by the village of Niobrara, Nebr., in behalf of immediate action by the Congress to protect certain lands and other property from overflow and damage by the waters of the Missouri River at and near the village of Niobrara, Nebr.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

34. Also, petition from the Nebraska Bankers' Association, Nebraska, in behalf of a 50 per cent increase in the existing tariff on importations of corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

35. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of citizens of Del Rio, Tex., praying for reduction of income tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

36. Also, petition from the Del Rio (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, praying for a reduction of the income tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

37. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of the New York Academy of Medicine, recording its opinion that section 7 of the Volstead Act is a serious infringement upon the legitimate practice of medicine, and that the council of the academy is hereby authorized to take such steps as it may deem necessary to secure a modification of this section so that there will be no limitation in the time during which 1 pint of spirituous liquor may be administered under due regulations to prevent the bootlegging doctor from plying his illegal trade, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

38. Also, resolution by the Military Order of the World War, in seventh annual convention assembled at Baltimore, Md., October 5–7, 1927, reiterating their firm and unqualified support of the present program of the United States Government, providing for military training in schools and colleges, as well as reserve officers and citizens military training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

39. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of residents of Alma, Rudyard, and Selma, Mont., favoring increases of pensions for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

40. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of Meta Lerch and 24 other members of the Round Table Club, of Davenport, Iowa, protesting against the apparent inequality and injustice of the present Federal income tax law as it applies to the personal exemption granted to single persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

41. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the American Legion, Department of New York, favoring the passage of legislation for the retirement of emergency Army officers disabled in the line of duty during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

42. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of New York, favoring adequate appropriations and measures as shall be sufficient to provide for the future adequate protection against a repetition of such flood disasters, and to provide for the relief and rehabilitation of the people and areas affected; to the Committee on Flood Control.

43. Also, petition of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

44. Also, petition of the Mississippi Valley Association, with reference to rivers and harbors work and American merchant marine; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

45. Also, petition of the William R. Compton Co., of New York City, favoring the return of postal rates on third and fourth class matter prior to 1924; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

46. Also, petition of the Bremerton Chapter, No. 5, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Washington, urging a special protection employment act, which will require all Government agencies employing disabled American veterans to give the first preference in all employment where found qualified; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

47. Also, petition of the International Seamen's Union of America, headquarters Chicago, Ill., for the development and support of the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

48. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the basic provisions of the 1924 immigration act, and urging the extension of the quota restrictions to Mexico, the West Indies, and the countries of Central and South America, and also the total quota to the maximum of 80,000 per annum; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

49. Also, petition of the National Livestock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., urging the Congress to enact legislation to remove

the burden from the farmers of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

50. Also, petition of Patriotic Council, No. 70, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the basic provisions of the 1924 immigration act and urging the extension of the quota restrictions to Mexico, the West Indies, and the countries of Central and South America, and also the total quota to the maximum of 80,000 per annum; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

51. Also, petition of the Robert Gair Co., of New York City, favoring a reduction of the corporation tax to 10 per cent or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

52. Also, petition of the White Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the elimination of the tax on motor-bus chassis and bodies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

53. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution adopted by the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of New York, held at Troy, N. Y., on August 4, 5, and 6, 1927, urging enactment of legislation providing for the relief of and rehabilitation of the people and areas affected by floods and to provide adequate protection against repetition of like disasters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

54. Also, resolution adopted by the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of New York, held at Troy, N. Y., on August 4, 5, and 6, 1927, urging enactment of laws for the retirement of emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

55. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of Morgan-Hills Camp, No. 201, Sons of Union Veterans, Friendship, N. Y., for the purchase of the old Ford Theater at Washington, D. C., to be used in storing the Lincoln relics and to be known as the Lincoln Museum; to the Committee on the Library.

56. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of the International Association of Y's Men's Club (Inc.) advocating flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

57. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition signed by 44 members of Colonel Lytle Relief Corps, No. 7, Albion, Pa., against the use of the yellow border on United States flags; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, *December 6, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in the former time didst lead our fathers forth into a wealthy place, give Thy grace, we humbly beseech Thee, to us their children, that we may always approve ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land, defend our liberties, preserve our unity. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those with whom we intrust in Thy name the authority of governance. In our prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a resolution (H. Res. 3) informing the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, a Representative from the State of Ohio, had been elected Speaker; that William Tyler Page, a citizen of the State of Maryland, had been elected Clerk; and that the House was ready to proceed to business.

The message also announced that the House had passed a resolution (H. Res. 4) providing for the appointment of three Members on the part of the House to join a similar committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WALTER W. MAGEE, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. LADISLAS LAZARO, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. M. E. CRUMPACKER, late a Representative from the State of Oregon, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM N. VAILE, late a Representative from the State of Colorado, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas advanced in the center aisle and

Mr. CURTIS said: Mr. President, the committee of the Senate, appointed to join a similar committee of the House to wait upon the President and advise him that a majority of the two bodies had assembled and are ready to receive any communication he may have to make, performed its duty as directed, and begs to report that the President stated he would immediately communicate with the Congress by a message in writing.

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. Latta, one of the secretaries of the President, was announced and said:

Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The message was received by the Assistant Doorkeeper [C. A. Loeffler] and handed to the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the message, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS: It is gratifying to report that for the fourth consecutive year the state of the Union in general is good. We are at peace. The country as a whole has had a prosperity never exceeded. Wages are at their highest range, employment is plentiful. Some parts of agriculture and industry have lagged; some localities have suffered from storm and flood. But such losses have been absorbed without serious detriment to our great economic structure. Stocks of goods are moderate and a wholesome caution is prevalent. Rates of interest for industry, agriculture, and government have been reduced. Savers and investors are providing capital for new construction in industry and public works. The purchasing power of agriculture has increased. If the people maintain that confidence which they are entitled to have in themselves, in each other, and in America, a comfortable prosperity will continue.

CONSTRUCTIVE ECONOMY

Without constructive economy in Government expenditures we should not now be enjoying these results or these prospects. Because we are not now physically at war, some people are disposed to forget that our war debt still remains. The Nation must make financial sacrifices, accompanied by a stern self-denial in public expenditures, until we have conquered the disabilities of our public finance. While our obligation to veterans and dependents is large and continuing, the heavier burden of the national debt is being steadily eliminated. At the end of this fiscal year it will be reduced from about $26,600,000,000 to about $17,975,000,000. Annual interest, including war savings, will have been reduced from $1,055,000,000 to $670,000,000. The sacrifices of the people, the economy of the Government, are showing remarkable results. They should be continued for the purpose of relieving the Nation of the burden of interest and debt and releasing revenue for internal improvements and national development.

Not only the amount but the rate of Government interest has been reduced. Callable bonds have been refunded and paid, so that during this year the average rate of interest on the present public debt for the first time fell below 4 per cent. Keeping the credit of the Nation high is a tremendously profitable operation.

TAX REDUCTION

The immediate fruit of economy and the retirement of the public debt is tax reduction. The annual saving in interest between 1925 and 1929 is $212,000,000. Without this no bill to relieve the taxpayers would be worth proposing. The three measures already enacted leave our Government revenues where they are not oppressive. Exemptions have been increased until 115,000,000 people make but 2,500,000 individual taxable returns, so that further reduction should be mainly for the purpose of

removing inequalities. The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended a measure which would give us a much better balanced system of taxation and without oppression produce sufficient revenue. It has my complete support.

Unforeseen contingencies requiring money are always arising. Our probable surplus for June 30, 1929, is small. A slight depression in business would greatly reduce our revenue because of our present method of taxation. The people ought to take no selfish attitude of pressing for removing moderate and fair taxes which might produce a deficit. We must keep our budget balanced for each year. That is the corner stone of our national credit, the trifling price we pay to command the lowest rate of interest of any great power in the world. Any surplus can be applied to debt reduction, and debt reduction is tax reduction. Under the present circumstances it would be far better to leave the rates as they are than to enact a bill carrying the peril of a deficit. This is not a problem to be approached in a narrow or partisan spirit. All of those who participate in finding a reasonable solution will be entitled to participate in any credit that accrues from it without regard to party. The Congress has already demonstrated that tax legislation can be removed from purely political consideration into the realm of patriotic business principles.

Any bill for tax reduction should be written by those who are responsible for raising, managing, and expending the finances of the Government. If special interests, too often selfish, always uninformed of the national needs as a whole, with hired agents using their proposed beneficiaries as engines of propaganda, are permitted to influence the withdrawal of their property from taxation, we shall have a law that is unbalanced and unjust, bad for business, bad for the country, probably resulting in a deficit, with disastrous financial consequences. The Constitution has given the Members of the Congress sole authority to decide what tax measures shall be presented for approval. While welcoming information from any quarter, the Congress should continue to exercise its own judgment in a matter so vital and important to all the interests of the country as taxation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Being a nation relying not on force, but on fair dealing and good will, to maintain peace with others, we have provided a moderate military force in a form adapted solely to defense. It should be continued with a very generous supply of officers and with the present base of personnel, subject to fluctuations which may be temporarily desirable.

The five-year program for our air forces is in keeping with this same policy and commensurate with the notable contributions of America to the science of aeronautics. The provisions of the law lately enacted are being executed as fast as the practical difficulties of an orderly and stable development permit.

While our Army is small, prudence requires that it should be kept in a high state of efficiency and provided with such supplies as would permit of its immediate expansion. The garrison ration has lately been increased. Recommendations for an appropriation of $6,166,000 for new housing made to the previous Congress failed to pass. While most of the Army is well housed, some of it which is quartered in war-time training camps is becoming poorly housed. In the past three years $12,533,000 have been appropriated for reconstruction and repairs, and an authorization has been approved of $22,301,000 for new housing, under which $8,070,000 has already been appropriated. A law has also been passed, complying with the request of the War Department, allocating funds received from the sale of buildings and land for housing purposes. The work, however, is not completed, so that other appropriations are being recommended.

Our Navy is likewise a weapon of defense. We have a foreign commerce and ocean lines of trade unsurpassed by any other country. We have outlying territory in the two great oceans and long stretches of seacoast studded with the richest cities in the world. We are responsible for the protection of a large population and the greatest treasure ever bestowed upon any people. We are charged with an international duty of defending the Panama Canal. To meet these responsibilities we need a very substantial sea armament. It needs aircraft development, which is being provided under the five-year program. It needs submarines as soon as the department decides upon the best type of construction. It needs airplane carriers and a material addition to its force of cruisers. We can plan for the future and begin a moderate building program.

This country has put away the Old World policy of competitive armaments. It can never be relieved of the responsibility of adequate national defense. We have one treaty secured by an unprecedented attitude of generosity on our part for a limitation in naval armament. After most careful preparation, extending over months, we recently made every effort to secure a three-power treaty to the same end. We were granted much cooperation by Japan, but we were unable to come to an agreement with Great Britain. While the results of the conference were of considerable value, they were mostly of a negative character. We know now that no agreement can be reached which will be inconsistent with a considerable building program on our part. We are ready and willing to continue the preparatory investigations on the general subject of limitation of armaments which have been started under the auspices of the League of Nations.

We have a considerable cruiser tonnage, but a part of it is obsolete. Everyone knew that had a three-power agreement been reached it would have left us with the necessity of continuing our building program. The failure to agree should not cause us to build either more or less than we otherwise should. Any future treaty of limitation will call on us for more ships. We should enter on no competition. We should refrain from no needful program. It should be made clear to all the world that lacking a definite agreement, the attitude of any other country is not to be permitted to alter our own policy. It should especially be demonstrated that propaganda will not cause us to change our course. Where there is no treaty limitation, the size of the Navy which America is to have will be solely for America to determine. No outside influence should enlarge it or diminish it. But it should be known to all that our military power holds no threat of aggrandizement. It is a guaranty of peace and security at home, and when it goes abroad it is an instrument for the protection of the legal rights of our citizens under international law, a refuge in time of disorder, and always the servant of world peace. Wherever our flag goes the rights of humanity increase.

MERCHANT MARINE

The United States Government fleet is transporting a large amount of freight and reducing its drain on the Treasury. The Shipping Board is constantly under pressure, to which it too often yields, to protect private interests, rather than serve the public welfare. More attention should be given to merchant ships as an auxiliary of the Navy. The possibility of including their masters and crews in the Naval Reserve, with some reasonable compensation, should be thoroughly explored as a method of encouraging private operation of shipping. Public operation is not a success. No investigation, of which I have caused several to be made, has failed to report that it could not succeed or to recommend speedy transfer to private ownership. Our exporters and importers are both indifferent about using American ships. It should be our policy to keep our present vessels in repair and dispose of them as rapidly as possible, rather than undertake any new construction. Their operation is a burden on the National Treasury, for which we are not receiving sufficient benefits.

COMMERCIAL AVIATION

A rapid growth is taking place in aeronautics. The Department of Commerce has charge of the inspection and licensing system and the construction of national airways. Almost 8,000 miles are already completed and about 4,000 miles more contemplated. Nearly 4,400 miles are now equipped and over 3,000 miles more will have lighting and emergency landing fields by next July. Air mail contracts are expected to cover 24 of these lines. Daily airway flying is nearly 15,000 miles and is expected to reach 25,000 miles early next year.

Flights for other purposes exceed 22,000 miles each day. Over 900 airports, completed and uncompleted, have been laid out. The demand for aircraft has greatly increased. The policy already adopted by the Congress is producing the sound development of this coming industry.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE AIR MAIL

Private enterprise is showing much interest in opening up aviation service to Mexico and Central and South America. We are particularly solicitous to have the United States take a leading part in this development. It is understood that the governments of our sister countries would be willing to cooperate. Their physical features, the undeveloped state of their transportation, make an air service especially adaptable to their usage. The Post Office Department should be granted power to make liberal long-term contracts for carrying our mail, and authority should be given to the Army and the Navy to detail aviators and planes to cooperate with private enterprise in establishing such mail service with the consent of the countries concerned. A committee of the Cabinet will later present a report on this subject.

GOOD ROADS

The importance and benefit of good roads is more and more coming to be appreciated. The National Government has been making liberal contributions to encourage their construction.

The results and benefits have been very gratifying. National participation, however, should be confined to trunk-line systems. The national tax on automobiles is now nearly sufficient to meet this outlay. This tax is very small, and on low-priced cars is not more than $2 or $3 each year.

While the advantage of having good roads is very large, the desire for improved highways is not limited to our own country. It should and does include all the Western Hemisphere. The principal points in Canada are already accessible. We ought to lend our encouragement in any way we can for more good roads to all the principal points in this hemisphere south of the Rio Grande. It has been our practice to supply these countries with military and naval advisers, when they have requested it, to assist them in national defense. The arts of peace are even more important to them and to us. Authority should be given by law to provide them at their request with engineering advisers for the construction of roads and bridges. In some of these countries already wonderful progress is being made in road building, but the engineering features are often very exacting and the financing difficult. Private interests should look with favor on all reasonable loans sought by these countries to open such main lines of travel.

This general subject has been promoted by the Pan American Congress of Highways, which will convene again at Rio de Janeiro in July, 1928. It is desirable that the Congress should provide for the appointment of delegates to represent the Government of the United States.

CUBAN PARCEL POST

We have a temporary parcel-post convention with Cuba. The advantage of it is all on our side. During 1926 we shipped twelve times as many parcels, weighing twenty-four times as much, as we received. This convention was made on the understanding that we would repeal an old law prohibiting the importation of cigars and cigarettes in quantities less than 3,000 enacted in 1866 to discourage smuggling, for which it has long been unnecessary. This law unjustly discriminates against an important industry of Cuba. Its repeal has been recommended by the Treasury and Post Office Departments. Unless this is done our merchants and railroads will find themselves deprived of this large parcel-post business after the 1st of next March, the date of the expiration of the convention, which has been extended upon the specific understanding that it would expire at that time unless this legislation was enacted. We purchase large quantities of tobacco made in Cuba. It is not probable that our purchases would be any larger if this law was repealed, while it would be an advantage to many other industries in the United States.

INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Conditions in the Philippine Islands have been steadily improved. Contentment and good order prevail. Roads, irrigation works, harbor improvements, and public buildings are being constructed. Public education and sanitation have been advanced. The Government is in a sound financial condition. These immediate results were especially due to the administration of Gov. Gen. Leonard Wood. The six years of his governorship marked a distinct improvement in the islands and rank as one of the outstanding accomplishments of this distinguished man. His death is a loss to the Nation and the islands.

Greater progress could be made, more efficiency could be put into administration, if the Congress would undertake to expend, through its appropriating power, all or a part of the customs revenues which are now turned over to the Philippine treasury. The powers of the auditor of the islands also need revision and clarification. The government of the islands is about 98 per cent in the hands of the Filipinos. An extension of the policy of self-government will be hastened by the demonstration on their part of their desire and their ability to carry out cordially and efficiently the provisions of the organic law enacted by the Congress for the government of the islands. It would be well for a committee of the Congress to visit the islands every two years.

A fair degree of progress is being made in Porto Rico. Its agricultural products are increasing; its treasury position, which has given much concern, shows improvement. I am advised by the governor that educational facilities are still lacking. Roads are being constructed, which he represents are the first requisite for building schoolhouses. The loyalty of the island to the United States is exceedingly gratifying. A memorial will be presented to you requesting authority to have the governor elected by the people of Porto Rico. This was never done in the case of our own Territories. It is admitted that education outside of the towns is as yet very deficient. Until it has progressed further the efficiency of the government and the happiness of the people may need the guiding hand of an appointed governor. As it is not contemplated that any change should be made immediately, the general subject may well have the thoughtful study of the Congress.

PANAMA CANAL

The number of commercial ships passing through the Panama Canal has increased from 3,967 in 1923 to 5,475 in 1927. The total amount of tolls turned into the Treasury is over $166,000,000, while all the operations of the canal have yielded a surplus of about $80,000,000. In order to provide additional storage of water and give some control over the floods of the Chagres River, it is proposed to erect a dam to cost about $12,000,000 at Alhajuela. It will take some five years to complete this work.

AGRICULTURE

The past year has seen a marked improvement in the general condition of agriculture. Production is better balanced and without acute shortage or heavy surplus. Costs have been reduced and the average output of the worker increased. The level of farm prices has risen, while others have fallen, so that the purchasing power of the farmer is approaching a normal figure. The individual farmer is entitled to great credit for the progress made since 1921. He has adjusted his production and through cooperative organizations and other methods improved his marketing. He is using authenticated facts and employing sound methods which other industries are obliged to use to secure stability and prosperity. The old-fashioned haphazard system is being abandoned, economics are being applied to ascertain the best adapted unit of land, diversification is being promoted, and scientific methods are being used in production, and business principles in marketing.

Agriculture has not fully recovered from postwar depression. The fact is that economic progress never marches forward in a straight line. It goes in waves. One part goes ahead, while another halts and another recedes. Everybody wishes agriculture to prosper. Any sound and workable proposal to help the farmer will have the earnest support of the Government. Their interests are not all identical. Legislation should assist as many producers in as many regions as possible. It should be the aim to assist the farmer to work out his own salvation socially and economically. No plan will be of any permanent value to him which does not leave him standing on his own foundation.

In the past the Government has spent vast sums to bring land under cultivation. It is apparent that this has reached temporarily the saturation point. We have had a surplus of production and a poor market for land, which has only lately shown signs of improvement. The main problem which is presented for solution is one of dealing with a surplus of production. It is useless to propose a temporary expedient. What is needed is permanency and stability. Government price fixing is known to be unsound and bound to result in disaster. A Government subsidy would work out in the same way. It can not be sound for all of the people to hire some of the people to produce a crop which neither the producers nor the rest of the people want.

Price fixing and subsidy will both increase the surplus, instead of diminishing it. Putting the Government directly into business is merely a combination of subsidy and price fixing aggravated by political pressure. These expedients would lead logically to telling the farmer by law what and how much he should plant and where he should plant it, and what and how much he should sell and where he should sell it. The most effective means of dealing with surplus crops is to reduce the surplus acreage. While this can not be done by the individual farmer, it can be done through the organizations already in existence, through the information published by the Department of Agriculture, and especially through banks and others who supply credit refusing to finance an acreage manifestly too large.

It is impossible to provide by law for an assured success and prosperity for all those who engage in farming. If acreage becomes overextended, the Government can not assume responsibility for it. The Government can, however, assist cooperative associations and other organizations in orderly marketing and handling a surplus clearly due to weather and seasonal conditions, in order to save the producer from preventable loss. While it is probably impossible to secure this result at a single step, and much will have to be worked out by trial and rejection, a beginning could be made by setting up a Federal board or commission of able and experienced men in marketing, granting equal advantages under this board to the various agricultural commodities and sections of the country, giving encouragement to the cooperative movement in agriculture, and providing a revolving loan fund at a moderate rate of interest for the necessary financing. Such legislation

would lay the foundation for a permanent solution of the surplus problem.

This is not a proposal to lend more money to the farmer, who is already fairly well financed, but to lend money temporarily to experimental marketing associations which will no doubt ultimately be financed by the regularly established banks, as were the temporary operations of the War Finance Corporation. Cooperative marketing especially would be provided with means of buying or building physical properties.

The National Government has almost entirely relieved the farmer from income taxes by successive tax reductions, but State and local taxes have increased, putting on him a grievous burden. A policy of rigid economy should be applied to State and local expenditures. This is clearly within the legislative domain of the States. The Federal Government has also improved our banking structure and system of agricultural credits. The farmer will be greatly benefited by similar action in many States. The Department of Agriculture is undergoing changes in organization in order more completely to separate the research and regulatory divisions, that each may be better administered. More emphasis is being placed on the research program, not only by enlarging the appropriations for State experiment stations but by providing funds for expanding the research work of the department. It is in this direction that much future progress can be expected.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF

The present tariff rates supply the National Treasury with well over $600,000,000 of annual revenue. Yet, about 65 per cent of our imports come in duty free. Of the remaining 35 per cent of imports on which duties are laid about 23 per cent consists of luxuries and agricultural products, and the balance of about 12 per cent, amounting to around $560,000,000, is made up of manufactures and merchandise. As no one is advocating any material reduction in the rates on agriculture or luxuries, it is only the comparatively small amount of about $560,000,000 of other imports that are really considered in any discussion of reducing tariff rates. While this amount, duty free, would be large enough seriously to depress many lines of business in our own country, it is of small importance when spread over the rest of the world.

It is often stated that a reduction of tariff rates on industry would benefit agriculture. It would be interesting to know to what commodities it is thought this could be applied. Everything the farmer uses in farming is already on the free list. Nearly everything he sells is protected. It would seem to be obvious that it is better for the country to have the farmer raise food to supply the domestic manufacturer than the foreign manufacturer. In one case our country would have only the farmer; in the other it would have the farmer and the manufacturer. Assuming that Europe would have more money if it sold us larger amounts of merchandise, it is not certain it would consume more food, or, if it did, that its purchases would be made in this country. Undoubtedly it would resort to the cheapest market, which is by no means ours. The largest and best and most profitable market for the farmer in the world is our own domestic market. Any great increase in manufactured imports means the closing of our own plants. Nothing could be worse for agriculture.

Probably no one expects a material reduction in the rates on manufactures while maintaining the rates on agriculture. A material reduction in either would be disastrous to the farmer. It would mean a general shrinkage of values, a deflation of prices, a reduction of wages, a general depression carrying our people down to the low standard of living in our competing countries. It is obvious that this would not improve but destroy our market for imports, which is best served by maintaining our present high purchasing power under which in the past five years imports have increased 63 per cent.

FARM LOAN SYSTEM

It is exceedingly important that the Federal land and joint-stock land banks should furnish the best possible service for agriculture. Certain joint-stock banks have fallen into improper and unsound practices, resulting in the indictment of the officials of three of them. More money has been provided for examinations, and at the instance of the Treasury rules and regulations of the Federal Farm Board have been revised. Early last May three of its members resigned. Their places were filled with men connected with the War Finance Corporation, Eugene Meyer being designated as Farm Loan Commissioner. The new members have demonstrated their ability in the field of agricultural finance in the extensive operations of the War Finance Corporation. Three joint-stock banks have gone into receivership. It is necessary to preserve the public confidence in this system in order to find a market for their bonds. A recent flotation was made at a record low rate of 4 per cent. Careful supervision is absolutely necessary to protect the investor and enable these banks to exercise their chief function in serving agriculture.

MUSCLE SHOALS

The last year has seen considerable changes in the problem of Muscle Shoals. Development of other methods shows that nitrates can probably be produced at less cost than by the use of hydroelectric power. Extensive investigation made by the Department of War indicates that the nitrate plants on this project are of little value for national defense and can probably be disposed of within two years. The oxidation part of the plants, however, should be retained indefinitely. This leaves this project mostly concerned with power. It should, nevertheless, continue to be dedicated to agriculture. It is probable that this desire can be best served by disposing of the plant and applying the revenues received from it to research for methods of more economical production of concentrated fertilizer and to demonstrations and other methods of stimulating its use on the farm. But in disposing of the property preference should be given to proposals to use all or part of it for nitrate production and fertilizer manufacturing.

FLOOD CONTROL

For many years the Federal Government has been building a system of dikes along the Mississippi River for protection against high water. During the past season the lower States were overcome by a most disastrous flood. Many thousands of square miles were inundated, a great many lives were lost, much livestock was drowned, and a very heavy destruction of property was inflicted upon the inhabitants. The American Red Cross at once went to the relief of the stricken communities. Appeals for contributions have brought in over $17,000,000. The Federal Government has provided services, equipment, and supplies probably amounting to about $7,000,000 more. Between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000 in addition have been provided by local railroads, the States, and their political units. Credits have been arranged by the Farm Loan Board, and three emergency finance corporations with a total capital of $3,000,000 have insured additional resources to the extent of $12,000,000. Through these means the 700,000 people in the flooded areas have been adequately supported. Provision has been made to care for those in need until after the 1st of January.

The Engineer Corps of the Army has contracted to close all breaks in the dike system before the next season of high water. A most thorough and elaborate survey of the whole situation has been made and embodied in a report with recommendations for future flood control, which will be presented to the Congress. The carrying out of their plans will necessarily extend over a series of years. They will call for a raising and strengthening of the dike system with provision for emergency spillways and improvements for the benefit of navigation.

Under the present law the land adjacent to the dikes has paid one-third of the cost of their construction. This has been a most extraordinary concession from the plan adopted in relation to irrigation, where the general rule has been that the land benefited should bear the entire expense. It is true, of course, that the troublesome waters do not originate on the land to be reclaimed, but it is also true that such waters have a right of way through that section of the country, and the land there is charged with that easement. It is the land of this region that is to be benefited. To say that it is unable to bear any expense of reclamation is the same thing as saying that it is not worth reclaiming. Because of expenses incurred and charges already held against this land, it seems probable that some revision will have to be made concerning the proportion of cost which it should bear. But it is extremely important that it should pay enough so that those requesting improvements will be charged with some responsibility for their cost, and the neighborhoods where works are constructed have a pecuniary interest in preventing waste and extravagance and securing a wise and economical expenditure of public funds.

It is necessary to look upon this emergency as a national disaster. It has been so treated from its inception. Our whole people have provided with great generosity for its relief. Most of the departments of the Federal Government have been engaged in the same effort. The governments of the afflicted areas, both State and municipal, can not be given too high praise for the courageous and helpful way in which they have come to the rescue of the people. If the sources directly chargeable can not meet the demand, the National Government should not fail to provide generous relief. This, however, does not mean restora-

tion. The Government is not an insurer of its citizens against the hazard of the elements. We shall always have flood and drought, heat and cold, earthquake and wind, lightning and tidal wave, which are all too constant in their afflictions. The Government does not undertake to reimburse its citizens for loss and damage incurred under such circumstances. It is chargeable, however, with the rebuilding of public works and the humanitarian duty of relieving its citizens from distress.

The people in the flooded area and their representatives have approached this problem in the most generous and broad-minded way. They should be met with a like spirit on the part of the National Government. This is all one country. The public needs of each part must be provided for by the public at large. No required relief should be refused. An adequate plan should be adopted to prevent a recurrence of this disaster in order that the people may restore to productivity and comfort their fields and their towns.

Legislation by this Congress should be confined to our principal and most pressing problem, the lower Mississippi, considering tributaries only so far as they materially affect the main flood problem. A definite Federal program relating to our waterways was proposed when the last Congress authorized a comprehensive survey of all the important streams of the country in order to provide for their improvement, including flood control, navigation, power, and irrigation. Other legislation should wait pending a report on this survey. The recognized needs of the Mississippi should not be made a vehicle for carrying other projects. All proposals for development should stand on their own merits. Any other method would result in ill-advised conclusions, great waste of money, and instead of promoting would delay the orderly and certain utilization of our water resources.

Very recently several of the New England States have suffered somewhat similarly from heavy rainfall and high water. No reliable estimate of damage has yet been computed, but it is very large to private and public property. The Red Cross is generously undertaking what is needed for immediate relief, repair and reconstruction of houses, restocking of domestic animals, and food, clothing, and shelter. A considerable sum of money will be available through the regular channels in the Department of Agriculture for reconstruction of highways. It may be necessary to grant special aid for this purpose. Complete reports of what is required will undoubtedly be available early in the session.

INLAND NAVIGATION

The Congress in its last session authorized the general improvements necessary to provide the Mississippi waterway system with better transportation. Stabilization of the levels of the Great Lakes and their opening to the sea by an effective shipway remain to be considered. Since the last session the Board of Engineers of the War Department has made a report on the proposal for a canal through the State of New York, and the Joint Board of Engineers, representing Canada and the United States, has finished a report on the St. Lawrence River. Both of these boards conclude that the St. Lawrence project is cheaper, affords a more expeditious method of placing western products in European markets, and will cost less to operate. The State Department has requested the Canadian Government to negotiate treaties necessary to provide for this improvement. It will also be necessary to secure an agreement with Canada to put in works necessary to prevent fluctuation in the levels of the Great Lakes.

Legislation is desirable for the construction of a dam at Boulder Canyon on the Colorado River, primarily as a method of flood control and irrigation. A secondary result would be a considerable power development and a source of domestic water supply for southern California. Flood control is clearly a national problem, and water supply is a Government problem, but every other possibility should be exhausted before the Federal Government becomes engaged in the power business. The States which are interested ought to reach mutual agreement. This project is in reality their work. If they wish the Federal Government to undertake it, they should not hesitate to make the necessary concessions to each other. This subject is fully discussed in the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior. The Columbia River Basin project is being studied and will be one to be considered at some future time.

The Inland Waterways Corporation is proving successful and especially beneficial to agriculture. A survey is being made to determine its future needs. It has never been contemplated that if inland rivers were opened to navigation it would then be necessary for the Federal Government to provide the navigation. Such a request is very nearly the equivalent of a declaration that their navigation is not profitable, that the commodities which they are to carry can be taken at a cheaper rate by some other method, in which case the hundreds of millions of dollars proposed to be expended for opening rivers to navigation would be not only wasted, but would entail further constant expenditures to carry the commodities of private persons for less than cost.

The policy is well established that the Government should open public highways on land and on water, but for use of the public in their private capacity. It has put on some demonstration barge lines, but always with the expectation that if they prove profitable they would pass into private hands and if they do not prove profitable they will be withdrawn. The problems of transportation over inland waterways should be taken up by private enterprise, so that the public will have the advantage of competition in service. It is expected that some of our lines can be sold, some more demonstration work done, and that with the completion of the Ohio project a policy of private operation can be fully developed.

PROHIBITION

After more than two generations of constant debate, our country adopted a system of national prohibition under all the solemnities involved in an amendment to the Federal Constitution. In obedience to this mandate the Congress and the States, with one or two notable exceptions, have passed required laws for its administration and enforcement. This imposes upon the citizenship of the country, and especially on all public officers, not only the duty to enforce but the obligation to observe the sanctions of this constitutional provision and its resulting laws. If this condition could be secured, all question concerning prohibition would cease. The Federal Government is making every effort to accomplish these results through careful organization, large appropriations, and administrative effort. Smuggling has been greatly cut down, the larger sources of supply for illegal sale have been checked, and by means of injunction and criminal prosecution the process of enforcement is being applied. The same vigilance on the part of local governments would render these efforts much more successful. The Federal authorities propose to discharge their obligation for enforcement to the full extent of their ability.

THE NEGRO

History does not anywhere record so much progress made in the same length of time as that which has been accomplished by the Negro race in the United States since the Emancipation Proclamation. They have come up from slavery to be prominent in education, the professions, art, science, agriculture, banking, and commerce. It is estimated that 50,000 of them are on the Government pay rolls, drawing about $50,000,000 each year. They have been the recipients of presidential appointments and their professional ability has arisen to a sufficiently high plane so that they have been intrusted with the entire management and control of the great veterans' hospital at Tuskegee, where their conduct has taken high rank. They have shown that they have been worthy of all the encouragement which they have received. Nevertheless, they are too often subjected to thoughtless and inconsiderate treatment, unworthy alike of the white or colored races. They have especially been made the target of the foul crime of lynching. For several years these acts of unlawful violence has been diminishing. In the last year they have shown an increase. Every principle of order and law and liberty is opposed to this crime. The Congress should enact any legislation it can under the Constitution to provide for its elimination.

AMERICAN INDIAN

The condition of the American Indian has much improved in recent years. Full citizenship was bestowed upon them on June 2, 1924, and appropriations for their care and advancement have been increased. Still there remains much to be done.

Notable increases in appropriations for the several major functions performed by the Department of the Interior on behalf of the Indians have marked the last five years. In that time, successive annual increases in appropriations for their education total $1,804,325; for medical care, $578,000; and for industrial advancement, $205,000; or $2,582,325 more than would have been spent in the same period on the basis of appropriations for 1923 and the preceding years.

The needs along health, educational, industrial, and social lines, however, are great, and the Budget estimates for 1929 include still further increases for Indian administration.

To advance the time when the Indians may become self-sustaining, it is my belief that the Federal Government should continue to improve the facilities for their care, and as rapidly as possible turn its responsibility over to the States.

COAL

Legislation authorizing a system of fuel administration and the appointment by the President of a Board of Mediation

and Conciliation in case of actual or threatened interruption of production is needed. The miners themselves are now seeking information and action from the Government, which could readily be secured through such a board. It is believed that a thorough investigation and reconsideration of this proposed policy by the Congress will demonstrate that this recommendation is sound and should be adopted.

PETROLEUM CONSERVATION

The National Government is undertaking to join in the formation of a cooperative committee of lawyers, engineers, and public officers, to consider what legislation by the States or by the Congress can be adopted for the preservation and conservation of our supply of petroleum. This has come to be one of the main dependencies for transportation and power so necessary to our agricultural and industrial life. It is expected the report of this committee will be available for later congressional action. Meantime, the requirement that the Secretary of the Interior should make certain leases of land belonging to the Osage Indians, in accordance with the act of March 3, 1921, should be repealed. The authority to lease should be discretionary in order that the property of the Indians may not be wasted and the public suffer a future lack of supply.

ALIEN PROPERTY

Under treaty the property held by the Alien Property Custodian was to be retained until suitable provision had been made for the satisfaction of American claims. While still protecting the American claimants, in order to afford every possible accommodation to the nationals of the countries whose property was held, the Congress has made liberal provision for the return of a large part of the property. All trusts under $10,000 were returned in full, and partial returns were made on the others. The total returned was approximately $350,000,000.

There is still retained, however, about $250,000,000. The Mixed Claims Commission has made such progress in the adjudication of claims that legislation can now be enacted providing for the return of the property, which should be done under conditions which will protect our Government and our claimants. Such a measure will be proposed, and I recommend its enactment.

RAILROAD CONSOLIDATION

In order to increase the efficiency of transportation and decrease its cost to the shipper, railroad consolidation must be secured. Legislation is needed to simplify the necessary procedure to secure such agreements and arrangements for consolidation, always under the control and with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Pending this, no adequate or permanent reorganization can be made of the freight-rate structure. Meantime, both agriculture and industry are compelled to wait for needed relief. This is purely a business question, which should be stripped of all local and partisan bias and decided on broad principles and its merits in order to promote the public welfare. A large amount of new construction and equipment, which will furnish employment for labor and markets for commodities of both factory and farm, wait on the decision of this important question. Delay is holding back the progress of our country.

Many of the same arguments are applicable to the consolidation of the Washington traction companies.

VETERANS

The care which this country has lavished on its veterans is known of all men. The yearly outlay for this purpose is about $750,000,000, or about the cost of running the Federal Government, outside of the Post Office Department, before the World War. The Congress will have before it recommendations of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other like organizations, which should receive candid consideration. We should continue to foster our system of compensation and rehabilitation, and provide hospitals and insurance. The magnitude of the undertaking is already so large that all requests calling for further expenditure should have the most searching scrutiny. Our present system of pensions is already sufficiently liberal. It was increased by the last Congress for Civil and Spanish War veterans and widows and for some dependents.

It has been suggested that the various governmental agencies now dealing with veterans' relief be consolidated. This would bring many advantages. It is recommended that the proper committees of the Congress made a thorough survey of this subject in order to determine if legislation to secure such consolidation is desirable.

EDUCATION

For many years it has been the policy of the Federal Government to encourage and foster the cause of education. Large sums of money are annually appropriated to carry on vocational training. Many millions go into agricultural schools. The general subject is under the immediate direction of a Commissioner of Education. While this subject is strictly a State and local function, it should continue to have the encouragement of the National Government. I am still of the opinion that much good could be accomplished through the establishment of a department of education and relief, into which would be gathered all of these functions under one directing member of the Cabinet.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Industrial relations have never been more peaceful. In recent months they have suffered from only one serious controversy. In all others, difficulties have been adjusted, both management and labor wishing to settle controversies by friendly agreement rather than by compulsion. The welfare of women and children is being especially guarded by our Department of Labor. Its Children's Bureau is in cooperation with 26 State boards and 80 juvenile courts.

Through its Bureau of Immigration it has been found that medical examination abroad has saved prospective immigrants from much hardship. Some further legislation to provide for reuniting families when either the husband or the wife is in this country, and granting more freedom for the migration of the North American Indian tribes, is desirable.

The United States Employment Service has enabled about 2,000,000 men and women to gain paying positions in the last fiscal year. Particular attention has been given to assisting men past middle life and in providing field labor for harvesting agricultural crops. This has been made possible in part through the service of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, which is cooperating with the States in a program to increase the technical knowledge and skill of the wage earner.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Construction is under way in the country and ground has been broken for carrying out a public-building program for Washington. We have reached a time when not only the conveniences but the architectural beauty of the public buildings of the Capital City should be given much attention. It will be necessary to purchase further land and provide the required continuing appropriations.

HISTORICAL CELEBRATIONS

Provision is being made to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington. Suggestion has been made for the construction of a memorial road leading from the Capital to Mount Vernon, which may well have the consideration of the Congress, and the commission intrusted with preparations for the celebration will undoubtedly recommend publication of the complete writings of Washington and a series of writings by different authors relating to him.

February 25, 1929, is the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the capture of Fort Sackville, at Vincennes, in the State of Indiana. This eventually brought into the Union what was known as the Northwest Territory, embracing the region north of the Ohio River between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi River. This expedition was led by George Rogers Clark. His heroic character and the importance of his victory are too little known and understood. They gave us not only this Northwest Territory but by means of that the prospect of reaching the Pacific. The State of Indiana is proposing to dedicate the site of Fort Sackville as a national shrine. The Federal Government may well make some provision for the erection under its own management of a fitting memorial at that point.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

It is the policy of the United States to promote peace. We are a peaceful people and committed to the settling of disputes by amicable adjustment rather than by force. We have believed that peace can best be secured by a faithful observance on our part of the principles of international law, accompanied by patience and conciliation, and requiring of others a like treatment for ourselves. We have lately had some difference with Mexico relative to the injuries inflicted upon our nationals and their property within that country. A firm adherence to our rights and a scrupulous respect for the sovereignity of Mexico, both in accordance with the law of nations, coupled with patience and forbearance, it is hoped will resolve all our differences without interfering with the friendly relationship between the two Governments.

We have been compelled to send naval and marine forces to China to protect the lives and property of our citizens. Fortunately their simple presence there has been sufficient to prevent any material loss of life. But there has been considerable loss of property. That unhappy country is torn by factions and revolutions which bid fair to last for an indefinite period. Meanwhile we are protecting our citizens and stand ready to

cooperate with any government which may emerge in promoting the welfare of the people of China. They have always had our friendship, and they should especially merit our consideration in these days of their distraction and distress.

We were confronted by similar condition on a small scale in Nicaragua. Our marine and naval forces protected our citizens and their property and prevented a heavy sacrifice of life and the destruction of that country by a reversion to a state of revolution. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, was sent there to cooperate with our diplomatic and military officers in effecting a settlement between the contending parties. This was done on the assurance that we would cooperate in restoring a state of peace where our rights would be protected by giving our assistance in the conduct of the next presidential election, which occurs in a few months. With this assurance the population returned to their peace-time pursuits, with the exception of some small roving bands of outlaws.

In general, our relations with other countries can be said to have improved within the year. While having a due regard for our own affairs, the protection of our own rights, and the advancement of our own people, we can afford to be liberal toward others. Our example has become of great importance in the world. It is recognized that we are independent, detached, and can and do take a disinterested position in relation to international affairs. Our charity embraces the earth. Our trade is far flung. Our financial favors are widespread. Those who are peaceful and law-abiding realize that not only have they nothing to fear from us, but that they can rely on our moral support. Proposals for promoting the peace of the world will have careful consideration. But we are not a people who are always seeking for a sign. We know that peace comes from honesty and fair dealing, from moderation, and a generous regard for the rights of others. The heart of the Nation is more important than treaties. A spirit of generous consideration is a more certain defense than great armaments. We should continue to promote peace by our example, and fortify it by such international covenants against war as we are permitted under our Constitution to make.

AMERICAN PROGRESS

Our country has made much progress. But it has taken, and will continue to take, much effort. Competition will be keen, the temptation to selfishness and arrogance will be severe, the provocations to deal harshly with weaker peoples will be many. All of these are embraced in the opportunity for true greatness. They will be overbalanced by cooperation, by generosity, and a spirit of neighborly kindness. The forces of the universe are taking humanity in that direction. In doing good, in walking humbly, in sustaining its own people, in ministering to other nations, America will work out its own mighty destiny.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1927.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will lie on the table. Senate Resolution No. 1 is before the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Barkley	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Bayard	George	McNary	Simmons
Bingham	Gerry	Mayfield	Smith
Black	Gillett	Metcalf	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	Moses	Steck
Blease	Goff	Neely	Steiwer
Borah	Gould	Norbeck	Stephens
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Swanson
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Thomas
Bronssard	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Bruce	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Hawes	Phipps	Tyson
Caraway	Hayden	Pine	Wagner
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Howell	Ransdell	Warren
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Waterman
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Edge	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Edwards	King	Sackett	
Ferris	La Follette	Schall	
Fess	McKellar	Sheppard	

Mr. BRATTON. My colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is detained from the Chamber on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the first resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Nebraska, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will state his inquiry.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Under the rules of the Senate private bills may be introduced by handing them to the clerks at the desk, and other bills, under the rules, should be introduced in another way. The parliamentary inquiry I wish to submit to the Chair is whether it is in order to introduce either private or public bills while the present matter is pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may be done only by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Public bills may only be introduced by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May private bills be introduced without unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Private bills may be handed to the clerks at the desk after the morning hour.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1) for the relief of C. H. Reynolds, assignee of the Bitu-Mass Paving Co., of Spokane, Wash.; and

A bill (S. 2) for the relief of Heimo Sarkkinen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3) for the relief of Kate Mathews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4) granting a pension to Orilla J. Luyster;

A bill (S. 5) granting a pension to Belle Walker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Maria Brim (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Himes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8) granting an increase of pension to Samantha J. Stewart (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 9) granting an increase of pension to Rosella A. Lawton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 10) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Query (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 11) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Saylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 12) granting a pension to Isabel Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to Emma Elderkin Billings (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 14) granting a pension to William F. Bell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 15) granting a pension to Augusta Ziesenis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 16) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Herne (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 17) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Powell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 18) granting a pension to Rena Shaw (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 19) for the relief of Frank Topping and others;

A bill (S. 20) for the relief of William Schick; and

A bill (S. 21) for the relief of G. W. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 22) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Roby;

A bill (S. 23) granting a pension to John W. Wood;

A bill (S. 24) granting a pension to Rufus Cooper;

A bill (S. 25) granting a pension to James W. Ashby;

A bill (S. 26) granting a pension to Kate Bee;

A bill (S. 27) granting a pension to Olive May Cooley;

A bill (S. 28) granting a pension to Martha E. Crites;

A bill (S. 29) granting a pension to Martha Ellen Pierpoint Jenks;

A bill (S. 30) granting a pension to James Miller;
A bill (S. 31) granting a pension to John R. Moore;
A bill (S. 32) granting a pension to Melvina Nestor;
A bill (S. 33) granting a pension to John B. Simons;
A bill (S. 34) granting a pension to William J. Smith;
A bill (S. 35) granting a pension to John B. Turner;
A bill (S. 36) granting a pension to Arthur E. Wilcox;
A bill (S. 37) granting an increase of pension to Charles Adkins;
A bill (S. 38) granting an increase of pension to Olive J. Chidester;
A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Conley;
A bill (S. 40) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Crane;
A bill (S. 41) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Kennedy; and
A bill (S. 42) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta V. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 43) for the relief of Frederick N. Carr (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 44) for the relief of Benjamin F. Helmick;
A bill (S. 45) for the relief of Samuel Pelfrey; and
A bill (S. 46) for the relief of Daniel F. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 47) for the relief of John B. Canter; and
A bill (S. 48) for the relief of Henry T. Hill; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 49) for the relief of Mrs. Gill I. Wilson; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. THOMAS:
A bill (S. 50) for the benefit of the Security National Bank, of Lawton, Okla.; and
A bill (S. 51) for the relief of persons suffering loss on account of the Lawton fire, 1917; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 52) granting a pension to Frank Rupert;
A bill (S. 53) granting an increase of pension to Malissa J. McCombs;
A bill (S. 54) granting a pension to Elisha H. Long;
A bill (S. 55) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Kelly;
A bill (S. 56) granting a pension to James P. Huitt;
A bill (S. 57) granting an increase of pension to Eliza L. Hastings;
A bill (S. 58) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Campbell; and
A bill (S. 59) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Schneider; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. GILLETT:
A bill (S. 60) for the relief of Fukumatsu Hayashi; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 61) granting an increase of pension to Louise A. Wood; and
A bill (S. 62) granting an increase of pension to Esmeralda C. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 63) to authorize Capt. Clarence A. Abele, United States Navy, to accept the Order of Polonia Restituta, grade of chevalier, from the Government of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
By Mr. DALE:
A bill (S. 64) granting an increase of pension to Laura D. Johnson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 65) granting a pension to Elmer G. Goodell (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 66) granting a pension to Mary Dudley (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 67) granting an increase of pension to Lisy Flynn (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 68) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Rickey (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 69) granting a pension to Mary G. Hanrahan (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 70) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. O'Brien (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 71) granting an increase of pension to Laura N. Works (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 72) granting an increase of pension to Sophie D. Smith (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 73) granting an increase of pension to Anna Sheridan (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 74) granting an increase of pension to Serena A. Martell (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 75) granting an increase of pension to Annie Griffiths (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 76) granting an increase of pension to Zoa L. Waid Hughes (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 77) granting an increase of pension to Sarepta A. Guyette (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 78) granting an increase of pension to Dora J. Felt (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 79) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Curreen (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 80) granting an increase of pension to Agnes L. Brown (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 81) granting an increase of pension to Estelle C. Kent (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. McLEAN:
A bill (S. 82) granting the distinguished-service medal to Sergt. Donald Ralph Green;
A bill (S. 83) declaring David Hayes to have been a member of the Quartermaster's Volunteers, United States Volunteers, and directing the Secretary of War to issue a certificate of discharge from same to his heir;
A bill (S. 84) to correct the military record of George H. Jackson;
A bill (S. 85) to correct the military record of Jarvis M. Richards;
A bill (S. 86) to correct the military record of Charles K. Bond, alias Kimball W. Rollins; and
A bill (S. 87) to correct the military record of Walter H. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 88) for the relief of James Gilfillan;
A bill (S. 89) for the relief of the heirs of Paul Noyes;
A bill (S. 90) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown;
A bill (S. 91) for the relief of Leonard W. Clark;
A bill (S. 92) for the relief of Capt. Charles M. Shailer;
A bill (S. 93) for the relief of the estate of Philip Halsey Remington; and
A bill (S. 94) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Charles H. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 95) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Tysoe;
A bill (S. 96) granting a pension to William H. Webb;
A bill (S. 97) granting a pension to Mary Strong;
A bill (S. 98) granting a pension to Eliza W. Berrien;
A bill (S. 99) granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll;
A bill (S. 100) granting a pension to Maria J. Reynolds;
A bill (S. 101) granting a pension to Sarah B. Torrey;
A bill (S. 102) granting a pension to Nicholas Muccino;
A bill (S. 103) granting a pension to James J. Sullivan;
A bill (S. 104) granting a pension to George F. Smith;
A bill (S. 105) granting a pension to Herschel C. Young;
A bill (S. 106) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta George Dickson;
A bill (S. 107) granting a pension to Mary E. Griffith (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 108) granting a pension to Katie J. Hill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:
A bill (S. 109) to provide for the refund of taxes to the Bank of Italy, San Francisco, Calif.;
A bill (S. 110) to extend the provisions of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to James E. Dethlefsen;
A bill (S. 111) for the relief of William Eckman;
A bill (S. 112) for the relief of Timothy Fennessy;
A bill (S. 113) for the relief of W. P. Fuller & Co.;
A bill (S. 114) for the relief of N. B. Harrison;
A bill (S. 115) for the relief of Estella Howard;
A bill (S. 116) for the relief of R. S. Howard Co.;
A bill (S. 117) for the relief of the Los Angeles Building & Contracting Co.;
A bill (S. 118) for the relief of Nina MacDonald;
A bill (S. 119) for the relief of C. C. Moore & Co., engineers;
A bill (S. 120) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Clara E. Nichols;
A bill (S. 121) to reimburse the members of Company B, California Engineers, in the aggregate amount personally expended by them for United States Army equipment;
A bill (S. 122) for the relief of Lena Noonan;
A bill (S. 123) for the relief of Robert C. Osborne;
A bill (S. 124) for the relief of Maj. Arthur A. Padmore;
A bill (S. 125) for the relief of J. A. Perry;
A bill (S. 126) for the relief of May Gordon Rodes and Sara Louise Rodes, heirs at law of Tyree Rodes, deceased;
A bill (S. 127) for the relief of N. H. Thibodeaux;

A bill (S. 128) authorizing the payment of a claim to Alexander J. Thompson; and

A bill (S. 129) for the relief of the estate of Gualupe Zazueta, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 130) for the relief of Florence Sullivan;

A bill (S. 131) for the relief of Thomas M. Ross;

A bill (S. 132) to authorize the President to appoint LeRoy K. Pemberton a first lieutenant, Officers' Reserve Corps, United States Army;

A bill (S. 133) for the relief of Kenneth B. Turner;

A bill (S. 134) for the relief of Francis Mooney;

A bill (S. 135) to authorize the appointment of Capt. M. M. Cloud, retired, to the grade of major, retired, in the United States Army;

A bill (S. 136) to correct the military record of John W. Howard;

A bill (S. 137) for the relief of Frank Christ;

A bill (S. 138) for the relief of Thomas Johnsen;

A bill (S. 139) for the relief of Walter W. Newcomer;

A bill (S. 140) for the relief of Alpha Newell; and

A bill (S. 141) for the relief of Felix Medler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 142) for the relief of Vinal S. Terry;

A bill (S. 143) for the relief of Frank L. Muller;

A bill (S. 144) for the relief of George H. Koerner;

A bill (S. 145) for the relief of Michael Kelly;

A bill (S. 146) for the relief of James E. Hughes;

A bill (S. 147) for the relief of Lieut. Nicholas S. Duggan, Dental Corps, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Mary A. Brown;

A bill (S. 149) for the relief of Capt. DeWitt Blamer, United States Navy, retired;

A bill (S. 150) for the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and the United States Marine Corps Reserve who were erroneously released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than their homes or places of enrollment; and

A bill (S. 151) for the relief of Charles R. Sies; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 152) granting an increase of pension to Max Blank;

A bill (S. 153) granting a pension to Patrick Francis Flynn;

A bill (S. 154) granting a pension to Katie M. Gale;

A bill (S. 155) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Haggerty;

A bill (S. 156) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Martin;

A bill (S. 157) granting a pension to Josephine G. Meyers;

A bill (S. 158) granting an increase of pension to Estelle H. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 159) granting a pension to Austin T. Rogers; and

A bill (S. 160) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Blake; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 161) awarding a Congressional Medal of Honor to Charles A. Lindbergh; and

A bill (S. 162) to change the military record of William M. Sherman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 163) for the relief of the Walter A. Zelnicker Supply Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 164) granting an increase of pension to Hester Ann Heck (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 165) granting an increase of pension to Nettie Morgan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 166) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Harriett Howe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 167) granting an increase of pension to Amy E. Clark (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 168) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Haskins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 169) granting an increase of pension to Mary Risser (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 170) granting an increase of pension to Cora L Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 171) granting an increase of pension to Christiann O'Banion (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 172) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Jane Lofton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 173) granting an increase of pension to Christopher S. Alvord (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 174) granting a pension to John R. Kramer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 175) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Adams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 176) granting a pension to Eliza B. Neal (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 177) granting a pension to Martha C. Taylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 178) granting an increase of pension to Adele G. Grosser (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 179) granting a pension to Hampton H. Stratin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 180) granting a pension to George H. Stevens (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 181) granting a pension to Walter Hawkins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Phebe M. Bird (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 183) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Churns (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 184) granting an increase of pension to Selena E. Smith (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 185) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Carver (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 186) for the relief of Charles H. Weyant;

A bill (S. 187) for the relief of Jacob F. Webb;

A bill (S. 188) for the relief of Ferdinand A. Roy;

A bill (S. 189) to authorize the President of the United States to promote Charles Augustus Pfeffer to the grade of major in the Medical Corps of the Army of the United States, and for the relief of said Charles Augustus Pfeffer;

A bill (S. 190) to correct the military record of J. W. Metler;

A bill (S. 191) for the relief of Theodore W. Goldin;

A bill (S. 192) to provide posthumous promotion to First Lieut. William T. Fitzsimmons;

A bill (S. 193) for the relief of Capt. W. B. Finney; and

A bill (S. 194) for the relief of Northrop Banks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 195) for the relief of Ross F. Collins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 196) to reimburse Latimer & Benning for losses sustained in erecting a United States post office and courthouse at Las Cruces, N. Mex.;

A bill (S. 197) for the relief of Capt. George M. Thompson;

A bill (S. 198) for the relief of St. Ludgers Catholic Church of Germantown, Henry County, Mo.;

A bill (S. 199) for the relief of Esther M. Roebken;

A bill (S. 200) for the relief of Mary L. Roebken;

A bill (S. 201) for the relief of J. B. Porter;

A bill (S. 202) for the relief of the heirs of Patrick McIntyre, deceased;

A bill (S. 203) for the relief of Albert von Hoffmann;

A bill (S. 204) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of city of Glasgow, Mo.;

A bill (S. 205) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claim of Mary Clerkin;

A bill (S. 206) for the relief of Busch-Sulzer Bros.-Diesel Engine Co.; and

A bill (S. 207) to reimburse Martin Carroll for additional facework on walls of officers' quarters over the price named in the contract for the United States noncommissioned officers' quarters at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 208) granting a pension to Harry Wright;

A bill (S. 209) granting a pension to Daniel Wootan;

A bill (S. 210) granting a pension to John Woldridge;

A bill (S. 211) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Ward;

A bill (S. 212) granting a pension to Fannie Wagner;

A bill (S. 213) granting a pension to Mrs. C. A. Thomas;

A bill (S. 214) granting a pension to Melissa F. Tate;

A bill (S. 215) granting a pension to Mary E. Stafford;

A bill (S. 216) granting a pension to Mrs. William M. Spann;

A bill (S. 217) granting a pension to Joseph F. Shoemaker;

A bill (S. 218) granting a pension to Peter Rost;

A bill (S. 219) granting a pension to Catherine L. Nixon Rogers;

A bill (S. 220) granting an increase of pension to Leonidas Recob;

A bill (S. 221) granting a pension to Sarah E. Raymond;

A bill (S. 222) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Ragner;

A bill (S. 223) granting a pension to Amelia Perry;

A bill (S. 224) granting an increase of pension to Sallie E. Patrick;

A bill (S. 225) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Norman;
A bill (S. 226) granting a pension to William F. Murray;
A bill (S. 227) granting a pension to Hugh B. Mitchell;
A bill (S. 228) granting a pension to Nannie Martin;
A bill (S. 229) granting a pension to Julia Lamb;
A bill (S. 230) granting a pension to John H. Isiley;
A bill (S. 231) granting a pension to John M. Hensley;
A bill (S. 232) granting a pension to Gallant Hays;
A bill (S. 233) granting a pension to Emily Harty;
A bill (S. 234) granting an increase of pension to James Hanners;
A bill (S. 235) granting a pension to James Grogan;
A bill (S. 236) granting a pension to Lacy L. Garrison;
A bill (S. 237) granting a pension to Louise E. Gardner;
A bill (S. 238) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Fogle;
A bill (S. 239) granting an increase of pension to James W. Fisher;
A bill (S. 240) granting a pension to John F. Ellis;
A bill (S. 241) granting a pension to Daniel Donohoe;
A bill (S. 242) granting a pension to Emilie Deetz;
A bill (S. 243) granting a pension to Ella Coffman;
A bill (S. 244) granting a pension to Lucinda Boos;
A bill (S. 245) granting a pension to Emily A. Botts;
A bill (S. 246) granting an increase of pension to Ella R. Brown;
A bill (S. 247) granting an increase of pension to Allen N. Bundy; and
A bill (S. 248) granting a pension to Rhoda Button; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 249) awarding to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh a Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 250) for the relief of Mary R. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 251) for the relief of Charles G. Keiser; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 252) granting a pension to Alice Gertrude Hamilton (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 253) granting an increase of pension to Vandalia Young (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 254) granting a pension to Marietta Kelley (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 255) granting a pension to Martha J. Annas (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 256) granting a pension to Forrest W. Luro (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 257) granting an increase of pensions to Lizzie A. Wayland (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 258) granting an increase of pension to Flora A. Winchester (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 259) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Giles (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 260) granting an increase of pension to John J. Mahoney (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 261) granting a pension to Maud D. Davis; and
A bill (S. 262) granting an increase of pension to Emily E. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 263) to correct the military record of Alexander W. Goodreau; and

A bill (S. 264) for the relief of Margaret I. Varnum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a request?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, pertinent to the question we are about to discuss is an argument on the law involved, which was prepared by Mr. Price Wickersham, a distinguished lawyer of Missouri. It is so complete and sound an argument, and is so filled with research and learning, that I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD, and that whatever number of copies are necessary may be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, may I ask for a similar privilege for briefs and arguments which seem sound to us on the other side of the question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I certainly shall not object to that.

Mr. MOSES. May I ask the Senator from Missouri if the document which he now desires to have printed is the same document the printing of which was provided the other day for the use of the committee?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; it is.

Mr. NORRIS. Before the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is passed upon, I should like to say that I do not want to consent to a blanket request such as he has made. I shall, however, make no objection when he offers any particular document.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have not asked unanimous consent for any privilege for myself. I merely gave notice that I expect to ask a similar privilege when the time comes.

Mr. NORRIS. There will be no objection to that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, then the Senator from Pennsylvania will present a request to the Senate so that leave may be granted?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Of course.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, as I understand the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, it is to have permission to print arguments on his side of this question by those who might not be in the Senate. Such a request is a little indefinite; I think it is pretty broad. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] merely asked to have a specific document printed, and the Senator from Pennsylvania stated that he should like to have certain briefs and arguments printed. I do not think we ought to grant a request to print anything and everything that anyone on the other side may desire to have printed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not submitting any request now; he merely asked the Senator from Missouri whether he would object if a similar request should be made by him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. May I say that the brief which I have desired printed is merely a legal argument and does not discuss the particular cases at all? It is the presentation of an argument touching the rights and powers of the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is exactly the same character of documents which I expect to include in my request when I make it. I do not, however, make the request now.

Mr. MOSES. It was the request of the Senator from Missouri to have the matter printed as a Senate document.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; and also to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE RIGHT OF THE SENATE TO DETERMINE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ITS MEMBERS

[Price Wickersham, of the Kansas City (Mo.) Bar]

HAS THE UNITED STATES SENATE PLENARY POWER TO REJECT A SENATOR ELECT?

I. CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

1. Pertinent clauses.

2. The language is in the negative; in preliminary drafts of the Constitution the language was in the affirmative.

3. The requirements of age, citizenship, and residence are not "qualifications" but "disqualifications."

Section 2, Article I, of the United States Constitution provides:

"No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of 25 years and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

Section 3, Article I, provides that Senators shall be chosen by the legislature of each State, and that—

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Section 5, Article I, provides:

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members." * * *

And further:

"Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member."

The above are all of the pertinent provisions of the Federal Constitution.

It will be noted that section 5, Article I, is a grant of power without limitation in the section itself, and unless section 3 can be construed as a limitation of the grant of power, then it follows that the grant of power contained in section 5 is unlimited in the Constitution.

It will be noted that the language of section 3 is in the negative. This is an important fact. In the original drafts of the Constitution the language of this section was in the affirmative and was purposely changed to the negative. Congressman Taylor, of Ohio, on January 23,

1900 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1075), in discussing this very issue said:

"It is a notable fact that in the first draft of this constitutional provision which provided for qualification of Representatives in Congress the language was affirmative and positive, and that when it was finally presented for adoption it appeared in the form in which we now find it.

"The slight contemporaneous discussion in the Constitutional Convention was upon the provision in the affirmative form. Why was it changed to the negative? Surely not for the sake of euphony. And certainly not to make it more explicitly exclusive.

"In the report of the committee on detail, submitting the first draft of the Constitution, this section read in the affirmative as follows:

"'Every Member of the House of Representatives shall be of the age of 25 years at least, shall have been a citizen of the United States for at least three years before his election, and shall be at the time of his election a resident of the State in which he shall be chosen.'

"In the discussion, Mr. Dickinson opposed the section altogether, expressly because it would be held exclusive, saying he was—

"'Against any recitals of qualifications in the Constitution. It was impossible to make a complete one, and a practical one would, by implication, tie up the hands of the Legislature from supplying omissions.'

"Mr. Wilson took the same view, saying:

"'Besides a partial enumeration of cases will disable the Legislature from disqualifying odious and dangerous characters.'

The requirements of section 3 as to age, citizenship, and residence are not "qualifications"; they are "disqualifications." This very question was discussed by John Randolph in Congress in 1807, and he said:

"If the Constitution had meant (as was contended) to have settled the qualification of Members, its words would have naturally ran thus: 'Every person who has attained the age of 25 years and been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State from which he shall be chosen, shall be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives.'

"But so far from fixing the qualifications of Members of that House the Constitution merely enumerated a few disqualifications with which the States were left to act."

The same view was taken by Mr. Quincy and Mr. Key in the famous Maryland contested-election case reported in the Annual of Congress, volume 1808, at page 908.

Sections 5 and 3, taken together and properly paraphrased to get the true meaning, would read:

"The Senate shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, but no person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years and has been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

This construction of "negative" clauses is upheld by the courts. The case of Darrow *v.* The People (8 Colo. 417) is in point. A statute of Colorado made the payment of taxes a necessary qualification for membership in a board of aldermen. There was a provision of the Colorado constitution that "no person except a qualified elector shall be elected or appointed to any civil or military office in the State." The court said:

"It is argued that this provision by implication inhibits the legislature from adding the property qualifications under consideration. There is nothing in the constitution which expressly designates the qualifications of councilmen in a city or town, and this section contains the only language that can possibly be construed as applicable thereto. But it will be observed that the language used is negative in form—that it simply prohibits the election or appointment to office of one not a qualified elector. There is no conflict between it and the statute."

There is no conflict between section 5, which is a full grant of power to the Senate, and section 3, which simply prohibits the seating of a person who has not the three requisites of age, citizenship, and residence.

II. CONSIDERATION OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

1. Pertinent features of Randolph, Pinckney, and Hamilton plans.

2. Proceedings in Committee on the Whole, August 10, 1787.

It is submitted that the above analysis of the language of the Constitution itself is determinative of the question under discussion. However, a brief survey of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention may serve to make plain the intent of the framers of the Constitution, and this requires a brief analysis of the three major plans for a Federal Constitution that were under consideration. It is necessary to know these plans, so far as this issue is concerned, in order to understand the proceedings which occurred when the clauses in question were under consideration. It is evident to the student of constitutional government that the Constitutional Convention used the structure of Parliament as a guide, in so far as this particular subject is concerned; it is likewise clear that the practice and proceedings of the House of Commons were, to say the least, a guide. Burdick in his excellent work, The Law of the American Constitution, page 168, says:

"In confining to the Houses of Congress the right to judge the elections and qualifications of their own Members the framers of the Constitution were following the practice of the English House of Commons."

The three plans were submitted by Edmund Randolph, Alexander Hamilton, and Charles Pinckney, which plans will be discussed in their reverse order because Randolph's plan was the one that was in the main followed.

Charles Pinckney's plan:

"ART. 5. Each State shall prescribe the time and manner of holding elections by the people for the House of Delegates, and the House of Delegates shall be the judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their members."

Under Pinckney's plan the Senate was to be elected by the House of Delegates. Pinckney was unqualifiedly in favor of removing the election of the Senators as far as possible from the people.

Hamilton's plan:

The convention met on May 11, 1787, and concluded its deliberations September 17 following. About two weeks prior to the close of the convention Hamilton prepared his plan and furnished it to Mr. Madison, frankly saying that he did not expect that his plan would be adopted but that he had prepared it in order that it might serve as an ideal toward which the United States might eventually work. His plan provided:

"ART. 2. The Assembly shall consist of persons called Representatives, who shall be chosen, except in the first instance, by the free male citizens and inhabitants of the several States comprehended in the Union, all of whom of the age of 21 years and upward shall be entitled to an equal vote."

The plan also provided that the Senate was to be chosen by electors elected by citizens of the several States, who shall have certain property qualifications, and also:

"The Senate shall choose its President and other officers; shall be judge of the qualifications and elections of its Members, etc."

No qualifications of any kind were prescribed in his plan for Senators and the only qualifications for Members of the House of Delegates was that as to age above quoted in article 2.

It will be noted that the Senate, under Hamilton's plan, was given the power to "judge of the qualifications" of its Members without limitation as to any qualifications in the plan itself. Hamilton had sat all through the convention and heard all of the arguments that were advanced upon this subject, and it is significant that in the plan which he prepared toward the very close of the convention he in no manner limited the right of the Senate to judge of the qualifications of its Members.

Randolph's plan:

Article 2 provided for a House of Delegates and Senate; article 4 provided that—

"The Senate shall be elected and chosen by the House of Delegates."

Article 7 provided that the Senate shall have the sole and exclusive power to declare war. This article and the one providing for the election of the Senate by the House of Delegates is cited to show that Randolph intended that the Senate should have extraordinary powers and that it should be far removed from the people themselves.

Article 5 provided:

"And the House of Delegates shall be the judges of the election, returns, and qualifications of their Members."

When the question under his plan as to whether the House of Delegates should be chosen by the people direct was first voted on it carried by a vote of 5 to 2, two States being divided. There was much discussion during the convention as to the "qualifications" or "prerequisites" as to age, citizenship, and residence in the several States, but there is very little reported as to the debate concerning the question at issue. It appears that shortly prior to August 10 the convention had directed the committee on detail to prepare a draft of a provision concerning property qualifications of Members of the Legislature, and accordingly, the committee reported the following draft:

"SEC. 2. The Legislature of the United States shall have authority to establish such uniform qualifications of the Members of each House, with regard to property, as to the said Legislature shall seem expedient.

"SEC. 4. Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members."

On Friday, August 10, the following debate took place:

"Mr. PINCKNEY. The committee, as he had considered, were instructed to report the proper qualifications of property for the Members of the National Legislature, instead of which they have referred the task to the National Legislature itself."

He thereupon argued for a property qualification.

Mr. Rutledge seconded the motion. Upon a viva voce vote the proposition was overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. Madison then argued against the section.

Mr. Ellsworth agreed that the power given by the section was exceptional, but contended that it was not dangerous.

Thereupon Mr. Morris moved to strike out the words "with regard to property," in order to leave the Legislature entirely at large.

"Mr. WILLIAMSON. This would surely never be admitted should a majority of the Legislature be composed of any particular description of men—of lawyers, for example, which is no improbable supposition—the future election might be secured to their own body."

On motion to strike out "with regard to property," the vote was ayes 4, noes 7, Delaware not voting.

Mr. Rutledge opposed leaving the power to the Legislature, arguing that the qualifications for the Senate should be similar to qualifications for the State legislatures.

Mr. Wilson thought—

"It would be best, on the whole, to let the section go out. A uniform rule would probably never be fixed by the Legislature, and this particular power would constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications."

On agreeing to Article VI, section 2, the vote was ayes 3, noes 7, Delaware not voting.

The above quotations are taken from Madison's report of the debates and are very illuminating. It will be noted that the convention, according to Mr. Pinckney, had directed that the committee prepare a clause prescribing the property qualifications in the Constitution itself, but that the committee had left such power to the Legislature; that Mr. Pinckney's motion for a property qualification in the Constitution was defeated overwhelmingly; that the motion to strike out the words "with regard to property" was defeated 7 to 4; that then Mr. Wilson pointed out that if the clause "with regard to property" was left in the Constitution that such clause would "constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications."

It was evidently the intention and opinion of the convention that the power should not be so limited. The Constitution already had a provision in it that "each House shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," and it is evident that the convention thought that such clause was sufficient to give to each House plenary power to judge qualifications, and consequently when a vote was taken as to whether section 2 of Article VI should remain in the Constitution it was voted down 7 to 3.

It appears that nothing further was said on this subject during the convention.

III. PROVISIONS OF STATE CONSTITUTIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

1. Origin of "judge * * * qualifications" clause.
2. Case of John Breckinridge, of Virginia.

It will be noted that Randolph, Pinckney, and Hamilton in their plans submitted to the convention all used the phrase "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," or words of the same import. The coincidence of the use of the phrase by the three is indicative of the fact that it was not original with any one of them. What is the origin of the clause? It, of course, did not originate in England, because they had no written constitutions. We, therefore, must examine the constitutions of the States prior to 1789.

The Virginia constitution of 1776 provided for a house of delegates and a senate. The house of delegates was to be composed of—

"Such men as actually resided in and are freeholders of the same, and are qualified according to law."

And the senate requirements were the same as those of the house, except that members of the senate must be "upward of 25 years of age." The constitution further provided:

"And each house shall choose its own speakers, appoint its own officers, settle its own rules of procedure, and direct writs of election for the supply of intermediate vacancies."

And—

"Officeholders or ministers of the gospel of every denomination being incapable of being elected members of either house."

The above are the only pertinent provisions of the Virginia constitution. Nothing is said about the right of the house to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

An interesting case arose in 1780. John Breckinridge, a youth of 19, was elected to the house of delegates, which refused him admission upon the ground that he was too young to be intrusted with a decision of matters which were thought to be of such gravity to the State; thereupon his constituents reelected him to the house; the house again refused him admission upon the same ground; thereupon he was elected the third time and the house permitted him to sit. In analyzing this case it is clear that the constitution itself did not prescribe any qualifications except residence and freeholdership. There was no provision in the Virginia constitution specifically giving the house the right to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members.

A search of the records of the Virginia Historical Society fails to reveal the preservation of any debates upon this subject, but it is evident that the house of delegates assumed that it had the inherent power to judge of the qualifications of its members, regardless of the absence of a constitutional provision giving it such power. There were precedents for its action in the history of the English House of Commons and particularly in the case of Henry Downs which arose in the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1742, which is hereinafter commented upon.

The constitution of North Carolina of 1776 contains no such provision.

The first draft for a constitution for Massachusetts was defeated on March 4, 1778, and a second draft was submitted and adopted in 1780, which, so far as its senate is concerned, required a residence of five years and certain property qualifications—but no religious qualifications—and further provided—

"The senate shall be final judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their members, as pointed out in this constitution."

The constitution of New Hampshire of 1784 provided for a residence, property, and religious qualification, and contained the same words as above quoted from the Massachusetts constitution.

The Georgia constitutions of 1777 and of 1789 and 1798 contained provisions that—

"Each house shall be the final judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their members."

It will be noted that the Georgia constitutions did not incorporate the words "as pointed out in this constitution" contained in the Massachusetts and New Hampshire constitutions.

It will thus be seen that the first written constitution which contained the clause in question was the Georgia constitution of 1777. It is clear that the members of the constitutional convention were familiar with the constitutions of Georgia, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. The convention, and particularly the committee on detail, had the choice of adopting the language of the Massachusetts constitution or the language of the Georgia constitution and they chose the language of the Georgia constitution, which contained no limitation of the grant of power. This fact is important in view of the contention made by Mr. BECK in his book, The Vanishing Rights of the States, that the John Wilkes case, hereinafter discussed, was "the great constitutional landmark of the eighteenth century and determined for all time the right of Englishmen to be represented in Parliament by members of their own choice." If the colonies, or later the States, or the Constitutional Convention placed any interpretation upon the Wilkes case, as contended for by Mr. BECK, it is truly remarkable that Georgia should have conferred upon each house of its legislature the right to be "the final judges of elections, returns, and qualifications of their members" without any limitation of the power whatsoever, and it is equally remarkable that the Federal convention should have done likewise.

IV. THE COLONIES PRIOR TO 1776 CONSIDERED THE RIGHT OF REJECTION AND EXPULSION AN INHERENT POWER OF LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Case of Henry Downs, Virginia House of Burgesses, 1742

Of course there were no constitutions of the Colonies which contained clauses similar to the one under discussion. Some of the Colonies were proprietary and some of the charters of the Colonies contained provisions for the functioning of their legislative bodies, and little information is available as to the exercise of the right by such legislative bodies to reject or expel their members. However, an interesting case arose in Virginia in 1742 in the house of burgesses. The journals of the house of burgesses (assembly, 1742–1747) contain the following account of the case of Henry Downs (p. 11):

Mr. Conway, from the committee of privileges and elections, reported that they had—

"Had under their consideration the information against Mr. Henry Downs, a sitting member, to them referred; and had examined the matter thereof, and heard the said Mr. Downs; whereupon it appeared to the committee from the transcript of a record of the court of Prince Georges County, in Maryland, produced to the committee, duly attested by the clerk, and certified under the public seal of the said county, that at a county court of the right honorable the lord proprietary of that Province, held at Marlborough Town, in and for the county aforesaid, on the 27th day of June, 1721, Henry Downs, together with Edward Brown and James Jones, all of the said county, were indicted of felony, in stealing one sheep, of a white color, of the price of 10 shillings, the property of a certain person unknown, on the 29th day of August then last past, at a place called the Chapel, in that county; and that the said Downs, upon his arraignment, the same 27th day of June aforesaid, did confess himself guilty of the felony and theft, so as aforesaid laid to his charge, and put himself upon the grace and mercy of the court. And thereupon it was considered by that court that the same Henry Downs, by the sheriff of that county, from the bar to the whipping post should be taken, and there being stripped naked from the waist upward, receive on his bare back 15 lashes well laid on by the sheriff aforesaid, so that the blood appear; and that after the whipping aforesaid, the said Henry Downs, by the sheriff aforesaid, be put on the pillory for and during the space of half an hour. And afterwards the said Henry Downs, the same 27th day of June aforesaid, was, with the consent of one Jacob Henderson, clerk (his master), sold by the court aforesaid, for one year and nine months, to one John Middleton, planter,

to discharge the fees of the conviction aforesaid. But the said Henry Downs, the sitting member, denied before the committee that he was the same Henry Downs mentioned in the said record. But it appeared to the committee from the testimony of several gentlemen, members of this house, that the said Henry Downs, the sitting member, had lately confessed himself to be the same Henry Downs mentioned in the record aforesaid. Thereupon, upon the whole, the committee had come to several resolutions, which he read in his place and afterwards delivered in at the table, where the same were read.

"And the said Mr. Henry Downs was heard in his place, and withdrew.

"Then the resolutions of the said committee were again read, and agreed to by the house nemine contradicente, as follows:

"'*Resolved*, That the said Henry Downs having been convicted of felony and theft, and punished, as aforesaid, is unworthy to sit as a member in this house.

"'*Resolved*, That the said Henry Downs, for the causes aforesaid, be expelled this house.

"'*Resolved*, That the said Henry Downs be disabled to sit and vote as a member of this house during this present general assembly.'

"Mr. Downs was thereupon expelled the house."

It will be noted that the felony complained of was committed 21 years before Downs was elected, and that there was then no constitution of Virginia giving the right to the house of burgesses to judge of the qualifications of its members. Such right was assumed by the house to be an inherent power of legislative bodies.

V. GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF POWER OF "JUDGING QUALIFICATIONS" IN ENGLAND

1. Beginnings of right in Elizabeth's reign.
2. Political and constitutional situation upon accession of George III.
3. The John Wilkes case.
   (a) Statement of facts and crux and chronology of content.
   (b) Denial of conclusions reached by Hon. JAMES M. BECK in The Vanishing Rights of the States.

Hon. JAMES M. BECK, who is counsel for Senator-elect VARE, of Pennsylvania, in his book The Vanishing Rights of the States discusses at great length the case of John Wilkes, which arose during the reign of George III, and says:

"The Middlesex election was the great constitutional landmark of the eighteenth century. It determined for all time the right of Englishmen to be represented in Parliament by members of their own choice." * * *

A study of the history of those times and an examination of all of the facts involved in the Wilkes case makes it plain that Mr. BECK's statement is a gross exaggeration. There are many histories of English constitutional government that place very little stress upon this case; Macaulay, for example, barely mentions it. It is true, undoubtedly, that it was an important case and did have some effect upon American constitutional law and the attitude of the Colonies toward the King, but saying that it was the great constitutional landmark of the eighteenth century is to exaggerate the case out of all proportion. The whole trend of Mr. BECK's discussion of the case is that it was a death struggle between the electorate of Middlesex as such and Parliament as such; that it was a titanic struggle to determine whether the electorate should have a free and unlimited right to choose a member of the House of Commons and whether the house had any right at all to pass upon the qualifications of its members; that the contest presented a plain constitutional question, which was settled for all time in favor of the electorate as against the right of Parliament to pass upon the qualifications of its members. I contend that the conclusions drawn by Mr. Beck from this case are exaggerated and unwarranted.

In the first place, Mr. BECK permits his readers to believe that the Wilkes case was the first instance in the history of the House of Commons where the house had passed upon the qualifications of its members. He fails—and his failure arouses one's suspicion as to his impartiality—to advise the readers of his little book that there were precedents for the action of the house in expelling and rejecting Wilkes. Nowhere does Mr. BECK even intimate that the house had ever before attempted to pass upon the qualifications of its members, but the inference is left that the Wilkes case was the first case of its kind. Let us see what the facts are.

In May's Constitutional History of England, volume 1, page 374, in discussing the Wilkes case, the author says:

"The election [of Wilkes] was declared void, and there were precedents for this course. Citing May's Law of Parliament, fourth edition, page 59; Townsend Mem. II, 100; Cavendish Deb. I, 352."

Mr. BECK quotes from the argument of George Grenville and as an appendix to his book publishes the full text of the speech, but nowhere does he mention Lord Mansfield, who argued just as strenuously and ably to support the rights of the house to pass upon the qualifications of its members, nor any precedents cited by Lord Mansfield. Grenville was overwhelmingly defeated. To quote Grenville is like quoting from a dissenting opinion or a minority report.

In order to understand the Wilkes case and its influence, if any, upon our Constitution in this regard it is necessary to take a brief survey of English consitutional government and the status of Parliament prior to 1763.

Originally Parliament was but a creature of the King; gradually Parliament grew in power, its strength and influence being more or less dependent upon the character, personality, and power of the King and his ministers. At an early date the House of Commons assumed the right to judge of the elections and returns of its members. Taylor, in his Origin and Growth of the English Constitution, Volume II, page 202, says:

"Among the parliamentary privileges belonging either to the house as a whole, or to its individual members, which were thus asserted during the reign of Elizabeth should be noted here: (1) The right of the house to determine contested elections."

And at page 530, volume 1, he says:

"In the reign of Elizabeth this right was for the first time distinctly asserted in a case in which the lower house ventured to examine into the circumstances attending an irregular election that had occurred in the county of Norfolk."

Such was the beginning of the exercise of the right of the legislative body to determine election contests. A study of the growth of this right is instructive, particularly in view of the fact that our Constitutional Convention used the structure of Parliament as a guide in such matters.

In order to understand the Wilkes case it is necessary to briefly review the political situation at the time it arose, because Mr. BECK in his book leaves the plain inference that the electorate had, in the main, the same right that an electorate has to-day. A brief examination of English histories and particularly those devoted to English constitutional government will immediately dispel this impression. In 1760 Parliament was practically the pawn of the rich landlords; the owners of pocket boroughs and the rich and powerful dominated the house.

Gneist, in his English Parliament, page 304, says:

"The practice of parliamentary government in the eighteenth century could not, for that very reason, harmonize in any degree with the ideas entertained by theorists on constitutional law."

Pollard, in his Evolution of Parliament, page 339, says:

"The revolution had transferred power from the Crown to Parliament, but not from Parliament to the people * * *; elections simply meant a change of masters. Only twice in the eighteenth century was a general election held to settle a public question. Once in 1701 when William III appealed to the country against a Tory House of Commons; and, secondly, in 1784 when the younger Pitt appealed to it against Whig domination. For the rest ministers were changed, policies adopted and discarded, war declared, and peace made without the least reference to the electors. A member did what he liked in Parliament, subject to the whim of the owner of the borough for which he sat. * * * George III interrupted this comfortable state of affairs and turned against parliamentary magnates their own political arts. Their lack of public support facilitated George's operations. He could never have bribed and cajoled a really representative House of Commons."

George I and George II were Hanoverians who could not speak the English language. When George III succeeded to the throne his mother said to him, "Now, George, be a King," and he immediately started out to regain the ancient prerogatives of the King by wholesale purchase and bribery of Parliament, maintaining regular paymasters for such purpose, and he succeeded so well that he became an autocrat in fact.

The great majority of parliamentary seats at that time were owned by rich and powerful landlords, who sold the seats in Parliament to aspiring statesmen for large sums of money, the occupants doing the bidding of their masters. The King, seeing this situation, simply outbid the lords. It was but a contest between the King and the oligarchy of the nobility.

In Cheyney's Readings in English History, page 644, appears the following extract from the memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly, which graphically reveals to us the situation as it existed:

"I shall procure myself a seat in Parliament unless I find that it will cost so large a sum as, in the state of my family, it would be very imprudent for me to devote to such an object, which I find is very likely to be the case. Tierney, who manages this business for the friends of the late administration, assures me that he can hear of no seats to be disposed of. * * * Tierney tells me he has offered £10,000 for the two seats of Westbury * * *; £6,000 and £5,500 have been given for seats with no stipulation as to time, or against the event of a speedy dissolution by the King's death or by any change of administration. * * * The truth is that the new administration has bought up all the seats that were to be disposed of and at any prices. Amongst others, Sir C. H. ———, the great dealer in boroughs, has sold all he had to the ministers. With what money all this is done I know not, but it is supposed that the King, who has greatly at heart to preserve this new administration, the favorite objects of his choice, has advanced a very large sum out of his privy purse. The buying of seats is detestable and yet it is almost the only way in which one in my situation, who is resolved to be an independent man, can get into Parliament. To come in by a popular election in the present state of the representation is quite impossible."

He later purchased a seat from the Duke of Norfolk, whose right to the borough was contested by Lady Irwin.

Romilly then wrote Piggott as follows:

"If I keep the seat either by decision upon petition or by a compromise, I am to pay £2,000; if upon a petition I lose the seat, I am not to be at any expense."

By the purchase of Parliament the King had become the master of the situation. And in order to maintain his prestige he started a newspaper called the Briton, which was edited by Lord Bute; and George immediately instituted a campaign against the press; he forbade the publishment of proceedings of Parliament; prohibited the admission of strangers during sessions of Parliament, and put a padlock upon its proceedings; George's high-handed conduct aroused great antagonism. John Wilkes, who was a rather brilliant but dissolute fellow, started another newspaper called the North Briton, in which he vigorously attacked the policies of the King.

During Bute's ministry the North Briton flourished, but upon Bute's resignation and the accession of George Grenville as Prime Minister, Wilkes published a supplementary number of the North Briton, No. 45, on the 23d of April, 1763, which contained a criticism of the King's speech to Parliament; thereupon Lord Halifax, the leading Secretary of State, issued a general warrant "to search for authors, printers, and publishers," and to bring them before him for an examination. Under this warrant Wilkes was arrested and thrown into the Tower. A week later he was released upon a writ of habeas corpus, having asserted his immunity from arrest by reason of his privilege as a member of Parliament. The warrants were afterwards declared illegal and Halifax was assessed with heavy damages. A little later Wilkes republished No. 45 and also 13 copies of an obscene Essay on Women, a parody on Pope's Essay on Man. Wilkes was afterwards served with a subpœna on information against him in the Court of King's Bench, to which, on the ground of privilege, he had not entered an appearance. "On the meeting of Parliament, however, in November, 1763, he lost no time in stating that if his privilege should be affirmed he was ready to waive it and to put himself upon a jury of his countrymen." "The only exceptions to the privilege of freedom from arrest which had ever been recognized by Parliament were 'treason, felony, and breach of the peace, or refusal to give surety of the peace.'" (May's Constitutional History of England, vol. 1, p. 365.) Notwithstanding that such was the law, the House of Commons voted No. 45 "a false, scandalous, and malicious libel" and "ordered it burned by the hands of the common hangman," and then, in defiance of their own previous resolutions, they resolved that "privilege of Parliament does not extend to the case of writing and publishing seditious libels nor ought not to be allowed to obstruct the ordinary course of law in the speedy and effective prosecution of so heinous and dangerous offense."

As to this resolution, May says:

"To the principle of the latter part of this resolution there can be little exception; but here it is applied ex post facto to a particular case, and used to justify a judicial decision contrary to law and usage."

Pitt remonstrated against the abridgement of the privileges of Parliament. The House of Lords, however, agreed to the resolution, but 17 lords signed a protest against the surrender of the privileges of Parliament "to serve a particular purpose, ex post facto, et pendente lite, in the courts below."

It was strenuously argued that the seditious character of the alleged libel could only be determined by the courts and that the resolution was a prejudgment of such fact, and the burning of No. 45 was execution before conviction. These arguments made a great appeal to the people. When the papers were attempted to be burned a large part of them was rescued by a mob from the hangman and removed to Temple Bar outside of the jurisdiction of the city, where a boot and a petticoat were burned in effigy of Lord Bute and the Princess.

Wilkes was then ordered before the house, but before appearing he fought a duel, was injured, and, beset with spies, he fled to Paris and remained there for a number of years.

In contempt of the house the proceedings were no longer stayed and he was expelled the house for these libels. The House of Lords immediately found the Essay on Woman, which Wilkes had really published for private circulation, to be an impious libel because it mentioned a spiritual member of the House of Lords, which constituted a breach of privilege. The lords addressed the King to prosecute. Wilkes was ordered into custody, but he had escaped and was therefore held an outlaw.

At the dissolution of Parliament in 1768 Wilkes, who had remained in Paris—an exile and an outlaw—offered himself as a candidate for the city of London. He was defeated. He then ran from Middlesex and was elected. There was great exultation among a certain class in London and there was great revelry and all the doors were marked with the number "45," and a great cry of "Wilkes and liberty" went up.

On the first day of the ensuing session, having appeared before the King's Bench on his outlawry, Wilkes was committed on a capias utlagatus. He was rescued by a mob, but surrendered, and the outlawry charge was reversed on a technical ground, but he was sentenced to 22 months in the Tower for the libels. During the first session Wilkes, being incarcerated in the Tower, was unable to take his seat, hence no proceedings were started. At the opening of the second session Wilkes, in a petition to the house, accused Lord Mansfield of having altered the record of the trial, and Mr. Webb, the solicitor, with having bribed a printer to testify falsely. "Thereupon his charges were found groundless and he was brought before the house to prove his charges. He perplexed the house by submitting whether, being a member, he could stand at the bar, without having taken the oaths and delivered in his qualifications. But he soon received the obvious answer that being in custody at the bar, an action affecting a member sitting in the house did not apply to his case." Wilkes was also charged with libeling Lord Weymouth by publishing certain articles which the house voted were "insolent, scandalous, and seditious libels." The motion which was made for Wilkes's expulsion was founded upon several distinct grounds, to wit: First, the Weymouth letter; second, "No. 45 North Briton" of five years before, for which he was already serving sentence and for which he had been expelled was libelous; third, the Essay on Woman was an impious libel; and, fourth, Wilkes was under sentence which disqualified him.

It was clearly demonstrated that these charges were cumulative and contrary to all English precedent—see Grenville's argument. Burke, Pitt, Dowdeswell, Beckford, Cornwall, and George Grenville argued powerfully against the cumulative nature of the charges; that the resolution of the house of five years before was ex post facto and illegal; that Wilkes had already been punished for grounds 2 and 3; and that punishment by expulsion was violative of the English constitution. However, the expulsion was voted by a large majority—it should be borne in mind that Wilkes had not presented his credentials nor had he been sworn in for that session. The histories discuss this case as one of expulsion, when as a matter of fact it is a case of rejection. He could not be expelled until he was sworn in and became a member.

Wilkes upon being rejected was immediately reelected without opposition (February 3, 1769). The following day Lord Strange moved:

"Resolved, That Mr. Wilkes having been, in this session of Parliament, expelled the house, was and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament" (February 17, 1769).

The motion carried, the election was declared void, and a new writ was issued.

On March 16, 1769, he was again reelected and again was rejected. A fourth election then followed—13th of April—when Colonel Luttrell, a member, vacated his seat and offered himself as a candidate against Wilkes. Upon the returns Wilkes received 1,143 votes and Luttrell 296; two days later the house declared that Wilkes being disqualified to sit, Luttrell had been duly elected. Wilkes was still in prison. Volume 28, Encyclopedia Britannica, eleventh edition, page 643, says:

"His prison cell was thronged daily by the chiefs of the Whigs, and large sums of money were subscribed for his support. So great was the popular sympathy in his favor, that a keen judge of contemporary politics declared that had George III possessed a bad and Wilkes a good character, the King would have been an outcast from his dominions."

That this was a contest primarily between the King and a subject and not between the House of Commons and the electorate is plainly indicated by the above quotation. Moreover, Sir Thomas Erskin May, K. C. B., in his The Constitutional History of England Since the Accession of George III, Volume II, chapter 9, contends vigorously that the prosecution of Wilkes was really an attack by the King upon newspapers and the liberty of opinion rather than a contest between Parliament and the electorate. In Volume I of May's Constitutional History, page 47, he says:

"(1767.) Parties had been broken up and prerogative triumphed. The leaders of parties had been reduced to insignificance, while the King had directed business affairs to his own will and upon principles dangerous to public liberty."

And at page 42 says:

"The King continued personally to direct the measures of the ministers, more particularly in the dispute with the American Colonies, which, in his opinion, involved the right and honor of the Crown. He was resolutely opposed to the repeal of the stamp act, which the ministers thought necessary for the conciliation of the Colonies."

Having been the personal instigator of the stamp act and having mistreated the Colonies in many ways, and having attempted to crush newspapers and prevent the freedom of expression of opinion upon public matters, and having resorted to illegal arrests and prosecutions of Wilkes and incurred the enmity of the Colonies, is there any wonder that South Carolina voted £1,500 to aid Wilkes in paying his debts?

The assertion that South Carolina voted this sum to aid the electorate of Middlesex in any contest with Parliament as such is not supported by history. South Carolina voted this sum as a contribution to help fight the King. The King had bought Parliament outright and usurped the power of the dukes and barons. Is it any wonder that many of them espoused the cause of Wilkes in order to fight the King?

They did not espouse the cause of the electorate, which up to that time never possessed any rights as such.

By the election of Luttrell, Wilkes was effectually excluded from Parliament, but the King's opponents many times thereafter used the case to continue the fight against the King. On January 9, 1770, Lord Chatham moved an amendment to the address denouncing the late proceedings in the House of Commons as—

"refusing by resolution of one branch of the legislature to the subject his common right, and deprive the electors of Middlesex of their free choice of a representative."

In opposition to the motion, Lord Mansfield argued that—

"in matters of election the Commons had a complete jurisdiction, without appeal; that their decision could only be reversed by themselves or by an act of Parliament." (May, vol. 1, p. 376.)

Lord Chatham's motion was defeated, and thereby the House of Commons again asserted its right to pass upon the qualifications of a member.

On January 25, 1770, Mr. Dowdeswell offered the following resolution:

"That the house in its judicature in matters of election is bound to judge according to the law of the land and the known and established law and custom of Parliament, which is part thereof."

Thereupon Lord North adroitly followed it out by a conclusion:

"That the judgment of the house was agreeable to the said law of the land and fully authorized by the law and custom of Parliament."

Dowdeswell's motion was defeated, and on the 31st of January he repeated his attack in another form, but with no better success. (May, vol. 1, p. 378.)

On February 2, 1770, Lord Rockingham offered in the House of Lords a resolution similar to that of Mr. Dowdeswell, which was defeated. Thus the House of Lords upheld the House of Commons. Shortly thereafter motion was made in the House of Commons for a "bill to regulate the consequences of the expulsion of members." The opposition to this was so great the bill was withdrawn. On May 1 Lord Chatham presented a bill for reversing the several adjudicates of the House of Commons in the Wilkes case. Lord Mansfield deprecated any interference with the privileges of the Commons, and the bill was rejected by a large majority. On December 5, 1770, at the next session of Parliament, Lord Chatham moved another resolution, which was defeated. On April 30, 1771, the Duke of Richmond moved to expunge from the journals of the house the resolution of 2d of February, 1770, in which they had deprecated any interference with the jurisdiction of the Commons as constitutional.

The motion was lost. A few days afterwards Lord Chatham moved an address for dissolution, on the ground of the violation of the law for the commons in the Middlesex election and the contest which had later arisen between them and the city magistry, but found not more than 23 supporters. Again the House of Commons went on record as to its rights. In 1772 Sir George Savile, keeping up the fight against the King, moved for a bill to secure the right of electors with respect to the eligibility of persons to serve in Parliament. Lord North declared that the proceedings of the commons had—

"been consonate with justice and the law of the land, and that to his dying day he should continue to approve of them."

The motion was defeated.

A similar motion was defeated again in 1773, and in 1774 Savile renewed his motion, which was defeated.

"The Parliament, which had been in continued conflict with Wilkes for five years and was now dissolved and Wilkes was again returned for Middlesex. According to the resolution of the Commons, his incapacity had been limited to the return Parliament, and he now took his seat without further molestation. Before the matter of Parliament Wilkes had also attained the highest civic honor, being elected lord mayor of London."

Now being a member, he sought to have the record of his incapacity expunged from the journals. Motion was lost; he secured only 171 votes. In 1776, in 1777, and 1779, and in 1781 he renewed his motion and was defeated each time. At last, on the 3d of May, 1782, his motion was carried and the record expunged.

CHRONOLOGY OF CASE OF JOHN WILKES

July, 1757. Wilkes elected for Aylesbury (by arrangement with Potter and the first William Pitt).

March, 1761. Wilkes reelected.

April 23, 1763. Published No. 45, North Briton.

April 30, 1763. Thrown into the Tower.

May 6, 1763. Released on habeas corpus.

November 15, 1763. No. 45 declared seditious libel by house.

November 15, 1763. Essay on Woman declared impious libel by House of Lords.

December, 1763. Wilkes escaped to Paris.

January 19, 1764. Wilkes expelled by house.

February 3, 1769. Rejected by house.

February 16, 1769. Rejected and pronounced ineligible for that session.

March 18, 1769. Rejected.

April 13, 1769. Election held void and Luttrell declared elected.

May 8, 1769. Luttrell election confirmed.

January 9, 1770. House of Lords votes down Chatham motion denouncing action of house.

January 25, 1770. House defeated Dowdeswell motion.

January 31, 1770. House defeated Dowdeswell motion.

February 2, 1770. House of Lords defeats Rockingham motion.

May 1, 1770. Herbert's motion defeated in house.

May 4, 1770. House of Lords defeated Chatham motion.

May 14, 1770. House of Lords defeated Chatham motion.

December 5, 1770. House of Lords defeated Chatham motion.

April 30, 1771. Duke of Richmond's motion defeated by house.

April 7, 1771. Lord Chatham's motion defeated by Lords.

April, 1772. Savile's bill to fix eligibility defeated by House of Commons.

April, 1773. Savile's bill to fix eligibility defeated by House of Commons.

April, 1774. Savile's bill to fix eligibility defeated by House of Commons.

February 22, 1775. Wilkes motion to expunge defeated.

1776. Wilkes motion to expunge defeated.

1777. Wilkes motion to expunge defeated.

1779. Wilkes motion to expunge defeated.

1781. Wilkes motion to expunge defeated.

May 3, 1782. Wilkes motion to expunge carried.

Over a period of 19 years, from 1763 to 1782, Parliament voted twenty-five times against Wilkes and one time for him, and the one time that they voted for him in 1782 the house merely voted to expunge from the records the proceedings which declared his incapacity. It will be borne in mind that the resolution which was expunged was that of February 17, 1769, as follows:

"Mr. Wilkes having been, in this session of Parliament, expelled the house, was and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament."

In order to understand why this resolution of 1769 was expunged in 1782 it must be borne in mind that the power of the King at that time had waned; that the King's stubbornness had lost to England its American Colonies; that Wilkes had served as Lord Mayor of London and had been a Member of Parliament for eight years and had become powerful politically; that in 1779 Wilkes had been elected chamberlain of the city of London and the office had become his freehold for life; that in truth and in fact the 19-year contest had been primarily between himself and the press on the one hand, and the King on the other; that it was not a contest primarily between the electorate and Parliament. Under all these circumstances it was evidently deemed wise by the House of Commons in 1782 to expunge the record and let the matter drop. It is an exaggeration to say that the vote of 1782 which expunged this record was the culmination of a great constitutional contest.

Macaulay's History of England, Volume II, page 344:

"While seven administrations were raised to power and hurled from it in consequence of court intrigues or of changes in the sentiments of the higher class of society, the profligate Wilkes retained his hold on the affections of a rabble whom he pillaged and ridiculed."

It is remarkable that the above is the only mention Macaulay makes of the Wilkes case. If it was "the great constitutional epoch of the eighteenth century," it is unthinkable that Macaulay, of all English historians, would have so slighted it.

History of England (Andrews):

"But in the eyes of the people his [Wilkes's] persecution by Parliament was an attack on the liberty of the subject and the freedom of the press, and the expressions of popular disapproval showed how little sympathy existed on the part of the people, for the men who were supposed to represent them."

Mr. BECK, in his The Vanishing Rights of the States, says that the Middlesex election "nerved the Americans for the long struggle which led through Brandywine, Valley Forge, and Yorktown to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, where the right of electors to be represented by persons of their choice was, as it was thought, indestructibly written into the charter of our Government." When one considers the history of the Wilkes case and the political circumstances involved, and the constitutions of our States prior to the Federal Convention, one can not but be amazed at the intemperate and exaggerated language of the author. If the Wilkes case had the effect upon the American mind asserted by Mr. BECK—that it was a titanic struggle between Parliament and the electorate—is it not wondrous strange that Georgia, for instance, in 1777 adopted a constitution that conferred the unlimited right upon its senate to "judge the qualifications" of its members? Is it not amazing that not one word was said about the Wilkes case in the Federal Convention when the clause in question was debated and adopted? The answer is: History refutes Mr. BECK—

That the Wilkes case was not a contest between the electorate and Parliament, but was a fight against the King, and that the American Colonies so understood the matter, is evidenced by the Declaration of Independence itself. Has Mr. BECK forgotten the language and purport of that immortal instrument which says:

"The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world."

The declaration then enumerates 27 charges against the King personally, and the declaration then says:

"A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people."

VI. THE RIGHT OF THE SENATE TO REFUSE ADMISSION TO SENATORS ELECT BEFORE INVESTIGATION OF ANY CHARGES TOUCHING QUALIFICATIONS

Charges touching the elections, returns, and qualifications of Senators elect have heretofore been made in 46 cases. Twenty-nine times the Senate has accepted the credentials of such Senators elect and investigated the charges afterwards, and sixteen times the Senate has refused to seat the Senators elect until the charges were investigated. Such practice has definitely established the right of the Senate to exercise its discretion as to whether it will seat before investigating or investigate before seating.

VII. CASES OF WHITTEMORE, ROBERTS, AND CANNON IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The case of Whittemore, elected to Congress from North Carolina in 1870, is perhaps the most interesting and illuminating case in the history of Congress, so far as this question is concerned. Whittemore was elected in November and was to take his seat 13 months thereafter. His credentials in due form were presented to the House. It was charged that after his election he had sold a cadetship for $500. The charges were referred by the House to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which investigated the charges and reported that the charges were true, and recommended that Whittemore be not seated. Thereupon Whittemore resigned and went back to North Carolina, and notwithstanding the fact that his district knew all about the charges that were against him, he was reelected and he returned to Washington with credentials for his second election in perfect order. The House declined to seat him, but referred the matter again to the committee, which again reported that the charges were true and that he be not seated, and the recommendation of the committee was adopted by a vote of 130 to 24.

Gen. John A. Logan was a Member of the House at the time, and he made a powerful speech against the admission of Whittemore in which he said:

"It is said that the constituency had the right to elect such a Member as they may think proper. I say no. We can not say that he shall be of a certain politics, or of a certain religion, or anything of that kind; but, sir, we have the right to say that he shall not be a man of infamous character. He is not merely a representative of the constituents who elected him, but his vote in the House is a vote for the whole country. It is a vote for the people of the whole country, and every district in the United States has the same interest in his vote that his own district has.

"Hence, if Congress shall not have the power or authority, or shall not have the right to exclude a man of that kind, then the rights of the people of the whole country may be destroyed by a district sending a Representative who may be obtained to vote in a manner which may be destructive of the rights of the people. Are we to be told that Congress has no right to prevent anything of this kind because of the right of any constituents to send whomsoever they please? * * *

"It is not that the people shall not be represented. Not at all. It is this: That the people of the country have no right to destroy their own liberty by filling Congress with men who, from their conduct, show themselves capable of the destruction of their Government. * * *

"Congress, being the representative of the whole people, are entitled to say that the right of the whole country shall not be destroyed by one or more districts directing in here a man or set of men capable of their destruction; and they, having knowledge of the facts and the power to prevent the mischief by exercising the rights of exclusion, they having right to exercise that power and thereby protect the interest of the country, and to preserve instead of destroy the right of representation * * *."

In considering the Whittemore case and in weighing its value as a precedent it should be borne in mind that the charge complained of was an offense punishable by law but for which, under the Constitution, he was presumed to be innocent until proven guilty, and the offense was committed prior to the last election and the facts concerning the charge were known by the electorate prior to the election. It was not a case where the charges arose after the election nor after he had been sworn in. The Whittemore case is, therefore, a powerful precedent to establish the right of either House of Congress to reject a Member elect.

The facts in the cases of Cannon and Roberts elected to Congress from Utah are so well known as not to need more than passing comment. The case of Roberts is typical of both. He was elected to Congress and presented his credentials in due form. The House declined to seat him and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections the charges against him that he had been living in open polygamy. The committee reported to the House the fact that Roberts had three wives, giving the dates of marriage and the fact that he lived with them openly and recommended that he be not seated. The House by an overwhelming vote adopted the recommendation of the committee and such action of the House met with the full approval of the Nation. There was nothing in the Constitution making polygamy a disqualification for office, yet Congress exercising its constitutional and inherent rights as a legislative body refused Roberts and Cannon admission to the House. If it be said that polygamy is repugnant to our institutions and our sense of morality, may it not be claimed with equal justness and propriety that the expenditure of millions to secure a nomination for the Senate is repugnant to our institutions and our sense of political morality? If the House has a right to reject for such an offense the Senate has for the other. The majority report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the Roberts case is a very able brief supporting the right of rejection.

VIII. OPINIONS OF AUTHORITIES ON CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

The authorities on constitutional law have not devoted much space in their text to a discussion of this question. It seems to be taken for granted that the House and Senate possess such power as an inherent prerogative of legislative bodies, the courts having no power to pass upon the action of the House or Senate in such matters.

That a legislature has the power to enact statutes increasing the qualifications for office holding prescribed in a constitution is admitted. Throop on Public Offices, section 73, says:

"The general rule is that the legislature has full power to prescribe qualifications for holding office in addition to those prescribed in the Constitution; provided, that they are reasonable and not opposed to the constitutional provisions or to the spirit of the Constitution."

Perhaps the best expression by an authority on constitutional law so far as this question is concerned is contained in Pomeroy's Constitutional Law, third edition, page 138, to wit:

"The power given to the Senate and to the House of Representatives each to pass upon the validity of the elections of its own Members and upon their personal qualifications seems to be unbounded. But I am very strongly of the opinion that the two Houses together, as one House, can not pass any statute containing a general rule by which the qualifications of Members as described in the Constitution are either added to or lessened.

"Such a statute would not seem to be a judgment of each House upon the qualifications of its own Members, but a judgment upon the qualifications of the Members of the other branch. The power is sufficiently broad as it stands. Indeed, there is absolutely no restraint upon its exercise except the responsibility of the Representatives to their constituents."

Also see reasoning of Judge Story in Point IX following:

IX. THE RIGHT OF THE SENATE TO JUDGE QUALIFICATIONS OF ITS MEMBERS IS NOT IN DEROGATION OF ANY INHERENT OR RETAINED POWER OF THE STATES

It was contended in the debate upon the motion to reject Roberts in 1900 that a Senator or Congressman was a representative of the State—a sort of ambassador to represent the State in the Legislature of the Union—and that the right of the State or district to name and select whomsoever it choose was one of the rights retained by the States when they entered the Union, and Articles IX and X of the Constitution were cited, to wit:

"ART. IX. Rights retained by the people. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"ART. X. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Article X was construed in the case of Collector *v.* Day (11 Wall. 124), in which the court said:

"This clause does not contain a new grant of power to the States or people, but is simply declaratory of a preexisting condition."

Judge Story, in his memorable work On the Constitution, volume 1, section 627, says:

"The truth is that the States can exercise no powers whatsoever, which exclusively spring out of the existence of the National Government, which the Constitution does not delegate to them. They have just as much right, and no more, to prescribe new qualifications for a Representative as they have for a President. Each is an officer of the Union, deriving his powers and qualifications from the Constitution, and neither created by, dependent upon, nor controllable by the States. It is no original prerogative of States power to appoint a Representative, a Senator, or President for the Union.

"These officers owe their existence and functions to the united voice of the whole, not a portion, of the people. Before a State can assert the right it must show that the Constitution has delegated and recognized it. No State can say that it has reserved what it never possessed."

The title of Mr. BECK'S book, The Vanishing Rights of the States is thus seen to be a misnomer. No right of a State can "vanish" that never existed.

X. CONCLUSION. THE CONSTITUTION EXPRESSLY CONFERS THE POWER WITHOUT LIMITATION UPON THE SENATE; THE INTENT OF THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION IS PLAIN; HISTORY SUPPORTS THE POWER, THE PRACTICE OF COLONIES, STATES, AND CONGRESS UPHOLDS THE POWER, AND THE BEST GOVERNMENTAL POLICY DEMANDS THAT THE SENATE EXERCISE THE POWER

We have seen that the Constitution expressly confers the power to "judge qualifications of its own members" without limitation; that the debates in the Constitutional Convention show that such was the plain intent of the framers of the Constitution; that the authors of the plans submitted to the Constitutional Convention all agreed that such powers should be conferred without limitation; that Georgia first conferred this unlimited power upon its senate in 1777; that the house of delegates of the State of Virginia in 1780 exercised this power without any constitutional provision and assumed that it was an inherent legislative power; that the Colony of Virginia in 1742 recognized and exercised this right as an inherent legislative power; that the House of Commons and the House of Lords recognized and exercised this right twenty-five times in the Wilkes case, and that such power was the growth of hundreds of years; that since the adoption of our Federal Constitution Congress has repeatedly exercised such power; that the profoundest students and authorities upon constitutional law declare that the power is absolute.

If there were no precedents to guide this Government, if there was no constitutional provision upon the subject, if the matter were to arise now for the first time, what would be the best governmental policy? Would the delegation of such a power to the Senate be fraught with danger to the Republic? It must be remembered that Senators are officials of the United States Government and not of the States. They legislate not for the States alone but for all the people of the Union. The vote of a Senator affects every State of the Union as much as it does the one from which he is elected. His vote may mean peace or war for the Union. Should not the Union have the right to protect itself against corruption in one of its parts? Should the whole suffer from the dereliction of a part? If it be said that one political party may corruptly and wrongfully decline to seat a Senator elect of another party, it must be admitted that such a contingency might arise, but it would not destroy the right of the State to represenation; another could be elected in his place. Other possibilities readily suggest themselves. For instance, the President might be a Republican and the Senate Republican and the House Democratic, and the House might refuse to pass any appropriation legislation in order to embarrass the administration. This is a contingency that might arise, but what sensible American believes it probable?

Exaggerated illustrations mean nothing; they are futile. As Senator DAVID REED, of Pennsylvania, in discussing this question in the Senate last spring, said:

"Illustrations can be drawn that make both sides of this question seem silly. We must be guided by reason and not by fancy."

Under our Constitution momentous questions are submitted to the decision of nine Supreme Court judges appointed by the President and not elected by the people. Generally speaking, these judges come from one class—those identified with large interests—and not from the masses; yet the people recognize that ours is a constitutional Government and that such procedure is in accordance with law. There is no real danger in submitting to 95 Senators elected by the people the question whether a particular Senator elect possesses sufficient moral or intellectual qualifications to sit in the greatest deliberative body in the world. We submit to the decision of the Supreme Court when it decides some vital matter by a vote of 5 to 4. May we not intrust the decision of the qualifications of a Senator elect to the judgment of a majority of 95 Senators elected by the people and responsible to them for their acts? Never in the past has a Senator or Congressman been denied a seat unjustly. History has proven the wisdom of the Constitution in conferring this power upon the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Chair has stated the question as being "on the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska." The Senator from Nebraska has introduced two resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on Senate Resolution No. 1, introduced by the Senator from Nebraska.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. No. 1) submitted yesterday by Mr. NORRIS, as follows:

Whereas on the 17th day of May, 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election;

Whereas said committee in the discharge of its duties notified FRANK L. SMITH of Illinois, then a candidate for the United States Senate from that State, of its proceeding, and the said FRANK L. SMITH appeared in person and was permitted to counsel with and be represented by his attorneys and agents;

Whereas the said committee has reported—

That the evidence without substantial dispute shows that there was expended directly or indirectly for and on behalf of the candidacy of the said FRANK L. SMITH for the United States Senate the sum of $458,782; that all of the above sums except $171,500 was contributed directly to and received by the personal agent and representative of the said FRANK L. SMITH with his full knowledge and consent, and that of the total sum aforesaid there was contributed by officers of large public-service institutions doing business in the State of Illinois or by said institutions the sum of $203,000, a substantial part of which sum was contributed by men who were nonresidents of Illinois but who were officers of Illinois public-service corporations;

That at all of the times aforesaid the said FRANK L. SMITH was chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, and that said public-service corporations commonly and generally had business before said commission, and said commission was, among other things, empowered to regulate the rates, charges, and business of said corporations;

That by the statutes of Illinois it is made a misdemeanor for any officer or agent of such public-service corporations to contribute any money to any member of said commission or for any member of said commission to accept such moneys upon penalty or removal from office;

That said SMITH has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts, although full and complete opportunity was given to him not only to present evidence but arguments in his behalf; and

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence is now and for many months has been on file with the Senate, and all of the said facts appear without substantial dispute: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the acceptance and expenditure of the various sums of money aforesaid in behalf of the candidacy of the said FRANK L. SMITH is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of free government, and taints with fraud and corruption the credentials for a seat in the Senate presented by the said FRANK L. SMITH; and be it further

Resolved, That the said FRANK L. SMITH is not entitled to take the oath of office and is not entitled to membership in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is not a pleasant task that is before me to-day. I realize that in a contest over the right to a seat in this body on the part of an individual our personal feelings sometimes are contrary to what we believe to be our duty. I know, so far as I am concerned—and I think it is true of every other Senator here—that in these two cases, affecting the Senatorships from Illinois and Pennsylvania, there is no personal feeling, no prejudice, and no ill will, and I would not be asking the attention of the Senate if I did not feel that involved in these two cases are fundamental questions of government which are so important that personalities sink into insignificance and fade away.

Mr. President, there is practically no dispute about what happened in the Illinois and Pennsylvania primaries in the spring of 1926.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I merely wish to suggest that we think that practically every statement of fact in the preamble of the resolution relating to the Pennsylvania case is untrue.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, perhaps it is not so important at this stage of the proceedings, but, since the Senator has made that statement, I wish to say that I believe every statement of fact in the preambles of both resolutions is true and that the evidence taken by the committee and now officially in possession of the Senate demonstrates that proposition.

As I have said, there is practically no dispute about what happened in the Illinois and Pennsylvania primaries in the spring of 1926. It was a battle royal of the millionaires. As to most of the candidates, it was not a contest in which the principles of government were involved. The tactics show that the fiercest part of the struggle was waged on the theory that a senatorial toga was on the auction block and that the highest bidder would get the coveted prize.

It stands undisputed that there were spent in the Illinois and Pennsylvania primaries several millions of dollars in an effort simply to obtain the nomination of candidates. In Pennsylvania more than $3,000,000 were spent by the various contestants. Of this amount, practically $800,000 were spent for the nomination of Mr. VARE, the successful nominee; and in Illinois, for Mr. SMITH'S nomination, in round numbers, more

than $450,000 were spent simply for the nomination on the Republican ticket. These stupendous amounts stagger the imagination of the ordinary citizen. It was a race where the entrance fee debarred every man of modest means unless he was willing to mortgage his birthright to special interests that were interested in favorable legislation in our National Government.

In Illinois it is exceedingly interesting to consider the sources from which came the bulk of these great contributions. Of the enormous sum that was spent in Mr. SMITH'S behalf, more than $200,000 of it were contributed by representatives of large public-service corporations doing business in the State of Illinois. Not all of the contributions came from men who were voters or residents of Illinois. Some of it came from outside of the State, but it came from people who were part owners and directly interested in public-service corporations inside of the State of Illinois. The largest contributions from representatives of this kind came from Mr. Insull. The country knows that he is interested in gas companies, electric-light companies, and street-car companies in many parts of the United States. His interests extend from Maine to the State of Illinois. Does anybody believe that he made these contributions, or that through him his various corporations made them, because of a patriotic interest in the welfare of his country? Does anyone doubt that, in making these contributions, he had in mind the welfare of these public-service corporations in different parts of the United States in which he has a direct interest? Is there any doubt that he had in view his financial interests with the electric-light corporations scattered all over the country and does anyone think that, in his judgment, he was making a donation? Does anyone believe that he was doing anything except making an investment from which he expected ample returns in due time? He is the same man who defied the authority of the Senate and who to-day stands in contempt of this body by refusing to answer questions propounded to him by the Senate committee. It is quite apparent that his interest in the Senate of the United States is a financial one. He is interested in what he can get out of it. He is interested in making money and in nothing else. His contributions made in the campaign to the candidacy of Mr. SMITH were, at least in spirit, a direct violation of the statute of Illinois, because at the time he made these contributions Mr. SMITH was chairman of the Illinois commerce commission, a governmental institution that had direct charge of street-car companies, gas companies, and electric-light companies, both as to the service of such companies and as to the prices charged the consumers. It is quite apparent that his contributions in this primary were simply an investment.

And what explanation can be given to the contribution made in this campaign by Mr. Studebaker, a resident of Indiana? Why should he be interested in the Illinois primary? The only interest, at least so far as the record disclosed, is that he was interested in public-service corporations in Illinois. He, like Mr. Insull, was making an investment from which he expected returns in the way of favorable national legislation for his purposes and his investments.

Can any citizen of the United States look upon conditions such as these except with a feeling of regret, of horror, and even with shame?

In Pennsylvania, the sources of the contributions in behalf of Mr. VARE, which, in the aggregate, amounted to about $800,000, were not so clearly traced, but the evidence of fraud in the actual election, such as the absolute control of voters, the marking of ballots, the handling of ballot boxes, and other evidence indicating fraudulent voting and fraudulent counting and fraudulent registration were much more apparent than in Illinois.

For more than 20 years the Republican machine in Philadelphia has controlled elections in the great State of Pennsylvania without regard to the will or the wish of the voters—without regard to law or honesty—to such an extent that it is common knowledge in the State of Pennsylvania that the machine in Philadelphia and to some extent in Pittsburgh is able to secure results absolutely without regard to the wish or the will of the intelligent, patriotic people of the State. It is common belief and common knowledge in Pennsylvania that this machine can and does control the elections at its own sweet will and is able to put up a paper majority of any size that may be necessary to overcome any opposition in the remainder of the State.

Mr. VARE, the successful nominee at this primary, holds the city of Philadelphia in the hollow of his hand. He can give orders to his subordinates in advance of the election as to just what vote is desirable or necessary, and his willing political slaves will obey and bring in the required majority. His control is not confined to the Republican Party, but in the great city of Philadelphia he controls the Democratic machine as well. He deals out to them what offices may be necessary to secure their adherence to his will and his wish. His Democratic machine in Philadelphia is simply a small cogwheel in the greater Republican machine.

Nobody believes that there was an honest primary election in Philadelphia at the time of Mr. VARE'S nomination. His control over the situation in Philadelphia is well illustrated by what happened in the choosing of his successor in the House of Representatives when he became a candidate for the Senate. He selected a relative to succeed himself in the House. He had him nominated and elected; but before the 4th of March, when the man elected to take his place in the House was to be sworn into office, for some reason, he changed his mind about his successor. He desired, it appears, to have his attorney, JAMES M. BECK, to represent his old congressional district in the House of Representatives, and so he had his relative, who had been elected, resign before he had even been sworn in. He had his attorney, Mr. BECK, nominated and elected to his place in the House of Representatives. In this case he selected a man who, if the facts were known and shown, it would very likely appear is constitutionally ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives from any district in the State of Pennsylvania. But Mr. BECK has done great service in behalf of Mr. VARE. He has taken an active part in trying to convince the country that Mr. VARE must be seated by the Senate. He has been devoting a great deal of his time and energy in his effort to influence public opinion. He has written a book upon the subject. He has variously circulated it and to a great extent free to those who desire to read it. Copies of the book have been sent not only to Members of the Senate who will pass upon the case but also to the leading daily newspapers of the country. He has written articles which have appeared in the public press in advocacy of the seating of Mr. VARE. He has appeared as Mr. VARE'S attorney before a committee of the Senate. Obviously it would be of some advantage to Mr. VARE to select an attorney who would have the right to come into the Senate Chamber while his case is pending there; and so he has Mr. BECK elected to the House of Representatives so as to give him this great advantage.

From 1916 to 1921 Mr. BECK himself gave his residence as 100 East Sixty-fifth Street, New York City. From 1921 to 1924 he gave his residence as 1624 Twenty-first Street, Washington, D. C. He also gave Monmouth, N. J., as his legal residence when appointed Solicitor General in July, 1921. September 6, 1927, he registered for the first time in Pennsylvania as a voter from the eleventh election division of the seventh ward in Philadelphia. At that time he gave his last registration as Seabright, N. J., 1924. His family still lives in Washington, although he claims to have an apartment at 1414 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, and to have an established residence there. Any one who knows Mr. BECK, knows his social standing and his financial connections, and will take the pains to go to the apartment at 1414 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, will not for a moment believe that this is his residence. It is doubtful whether it would be found that his family has ever inhabited this place.

In the consideration of Mr. VARE'S case in the Senate it is not important as to where his attorney may live; but it is important as showing the absolute and supreme control of Mr. VARE over the city of Philadelphia in the selection of public officials, whether it be a justice of the peace or some other magistrate, a judge, or a Member of the House of Representatives. It is only one illustration of thousands that can be given showing that Mr. VARE and his machine control with an iron hand everything in the way of public office in the great City of Brotherly Love.

The amount of money expended in behalf of Mr. VARE'S candidacy simply staggers the imagination of the ordinary person; but, in my judgment, the iron rule of the Vare machine in Philadelphia is a greater menace to the fundamental principles of our Government than any other one thing connected with the contest for a seat in the Senate or elsewhere that has ever been waged in the history of our country.

In the primary, in the sixteenth division of the fourth ward, there were 404 names on the voting list, and the record there shows that 401 of them voted at this primary. Such a thing is possible, it is true; but every one familiar with voting anywhere knows that it is extremely improbable. A campaign that would bring out the entire vote as thus indicated would have to be one striking at the very roots of the Government, one in which every citizen took a deep interest. It is known that in this particular voting precinct there was no such interest. There was no reason why every one of these 404 voters, except 3, should come to the polls and vote. It is contrary to human

experience. It is contrary to our knowledge as to what happens in all elections, and no one believes that it actually happened there.

But that is not the end of this peculiar condition. Of these 401 voters, every single one of them, it appears, voted for Mr. VARE. We all know what happened. It is common knowledge in Philadelphia and all over Pennsylvania as to just what took place. There is really no dispute in regard to it. The history of crookedness in our voting machinery is sufficiently well understood so that everybody knows what happened in this particular precinct. No one believes that out of 404 voters in that precinct 401 of them voted, and no one believes that 401 of them voted for Mr. VARE. But they were counted that way.

This precinct is not an isolated case. It is only an illustration of what happened all over the controlled districts in Philadelphia. Dead men were voted. Absent men and women were voted. Numerous officials have been indicted, some of them tried, and some have plead guilty to the illegal and underhanded means that were taken to give Mr. VARE this huge majority in Philadelphia. These methods have been carried on so long in that great State that the people of Pennsylvania expect it to occur in every election, and they are very seldom disappointed.

The election laws provide for a minority or Democratic representative on the various boards; but the fact that the Democratic nominee in these controlled precincts received no votes is only another illustration of VARE'S control, a control that extends over the Democratic Party as well as over the Republican Party.

Hundreds of similar instances could be given. The committee never completed its investigation in Pennsylvania, and it was precluded from doing so by the filibuster that took place in the Senate, carried on and engineered by those who were then and are now demanding that Mr. VARE be sworn in as a Member of this body.

In the fourteenth division of the twelfth ward in Philadelphia in 1924, the last presidential election, the registration totaled 250; but in the Vare election, when there was no presidential election or campaign, the registration went up to 469. Of those 469 all but 8 are recorded as having voted in the VARE primary, and of these 447 were recorded as having voted for Mr. VARE. A canvass that was made by a Philadelphia newspaper after this election was unable to locate 120 of the names on the registration list. Nineteen voters had vanished from one house, and another place, from which 14 were registered and voted, was found to be absolutely vacant.

In another division in the thirty-ninth ward there were 445 voters registered, and in that division 450 votes were actually cast.

When arrests were made after this primary election it was always the Vare men who furnished the bond and furnished the attorneys.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator said there were 450 votes cast in the division to which he referred. Were they all cast for Mr. VARE?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know.

In another division a committee of citizens who made an investigation reported that there were 540 registered names, and every one of them, the record shows, had voted. Upon investigation it was found that four of these voters were dead; some were minors and not entitled to vote; some were registered in other divisions; and more than 50 had moved from this division more than five months prior to the election. Thirty-nine of them, by their own testimony, had not registered, and 136 were disqualified for other reasons, showing that out of the 540 registered and voting about 400 were illegally cast.

It is useless to follow through the record in these various divisions. It is always the same story over and over again. It is an illustration—yes, a demonstration—of the absolute and complete control of the election machinery in these controlled divisions by the Vare machine, and that such a thing as securing an expression of the people at an election is unknown and unheard of.

The expenditure of such huge sums of money for seats in the United States Senate can not be justified unless we desire to turn the Senate over to the multimillionaires of the country, who are willing to buy seats in this body the same as they buy merchandise across the counter. If this practice is to be followed, if the Senate is to condone this practice, then we have placed the seats in the highest legislative body in our land upon the auction block, and we have by indirection defeated every fundamental principle that underlies our governmental fabric.

If, under the circumstances, we seat Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE, we have taken a step toward the nullification of every effort made by our forefathers when they laid the foundations of the Republic and have established a Government not based upon the consent of the governed, but dependent on the power of those who have the money to buy and the will of those who are ready to sell. If we are to seat these men and establish this precedent, then, to be consistent, we must haul down the flag from over the Senate and raise the dollar sign instead. If we are to seat these men, we take a step that, if followed to its logical conclusion, will make it impossible for any citizen of the United States to become a candidate for the Senate unless he himself is many times a millionaire, or unless he sells out in advance to those who are millionaires and who are willing to put up their money in order to secure a Senate that will legislate in favor of the interests of those who have bought the membership. Every assertion of the Declaration of Independence will have been attacked and destroyed. Every principle of democracy enunciated in the Constitution will be overthrown. Every sacrifice of our forefathers will have been in vain. An autocracy will have been established under the supreme and unlimited power of gold. No one will deny—no honest man can deny—that if our offices are sold for cash the Government must become corrupt and in the end must fail.

All honest men must admit that if, through the manipulation of machine politics and political bosses, by the use of money or the purchase of votes, elections are controlled, the result is the same in the end as though it were done by military force at the point of the bayonet. Self-government depends upon the free and untrammelled exercise of the elective franchise by its citizens. If senatorial offices are bought and sold, if the election is corrupted, either by the use of money or any other illegal means of coercion, the result is the same as though our Government were overthrown by military force.

Every republican form of democracy is founded upon the right of the free exercise of citizenship in the casting of the ballot. If this is destroyed or taken away, whatever be the means, the government fails; Bolshevism follows, and monarchy is in sight. There can be no dispute of this assertion. No student of political history will say that our Government can live if offices like seats in the United States Senate are bought and sold like chattels. It follows as night follows the day that the Government must fail because the very fundamental principle of its establishment is violated and taken away.

A primary election is just as important as a general election. As a rule, it is more important. This is particularly true in Pennsylvania, where, under any ordinary circumstances, no one but a Republican can be elected to the United States Senate. If the candidates of all parties are placed in nomination by illegal and corrupt use of money, then the citizen has only a choice between evils. He is deprived of the right of the expression of his choice at the ballot box as fully and as completely as though he were prohibited from voting by constitutional provision.

Does any man in his right mind believe that those who are willing to expend millions to gain a seat in the Senate do not expect a return for the money they have thus invested? If the money were spent by the candidate himself it might be said—and there might be some truth in the statement—that he spent the money simply for the honor that would come to him as a Senator. But the bulk of this money is not spent by the person nominated. It has been spent by contributors who are interested in national legislation—men who have waxed wealthy and have made their millions by national legislation favorable to their special interests.

Does anybody believe that these contributors care anything about the honor attached to the office or that they have any particular personal friendship for the candidates that they thus nominate? They consider it in a cold, businesslike manner. They consider the money spent as an investment from which they expect to get returns—not only returns that will pay a reasonable interest on the investment, but will return the principal many times over before the senatorial terms have expired.

Can such conduct be harmonized with the idea of a free government? Can it be said that anyone—except he be a citizen from Illinois or Pennsylvania—is not interested in this contest? The citizens of our country outside of Pennsylvania and Illinois have the same interests that those in Illinois and Pennsylvania have. We, like the great bulk of the citizens of Illinois and Pennsylvania, are unselfish in our desire that our National Government shall function according to the original conception of Washington and his followers and shall square with the ideas of Lincoln, who later preserved the Republic. Anxiety as to the result is shared by all the patriotic citizens of our entire country.

This issue is fundamental. It affects every part of our country equally. It bears directly upon the corner stone of our Government. All questions of legislation, such as the tariff, banking, the financial and temperance questions, and all others, fade into insignificance when compared with the one question as to whether seats in the Senate shall be put upon the auction block.

And are we helpless? Is there no way under our Constitution by which the Senate can maintain its standards pure and undefiled as the representative law-making body of a free and patriotic people?

It is boldly proclaimed by those who would seat Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE that the Senate is helpless; that it must accept these men, and in the future accept similar men who boldly and brazenly acknowledge that their nominations were secured by the expenditure of unconscionable sums of money.

Fortunately, when our forefathers framed the Constitution they provided that the Senate should be the sole judge of the qualifications and the election of its Members. It made the Senate in such instances the supreme and final arbiter. From its decree there is no appeal, and no court or other body of men can withhold its arm by injunction or other process. It has the right under the Constitution and, in the proper case, it is its duty to hold that such vast sums of money spent for a nomination disqualifies the beneficiary from becoming a Member of this body. It has, as a matter of fact, already established a precedent that should control us in these cases. It has solemnly decreed that the expenditure of such sums of money is a species of corruption and disqualifies the beneficiary from a seat in this body. In the Newberry case, where $195,000 was spent to secure a nomination, the Senate declared that such expenditure was—

contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate, and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government.

In the face of this record, can the Senate seat either SMITH or VARE? If it does, it will stultify itself and make itself the laughing stock of the country.

Who has ever contended that this declaration, so solemnly made by the Senate in the Newberry case, is either untrue or unjustified? Who has ever contradicted the solemn declaration that the expenditure of such sums of money is destructive of human liberty and will break down every barrier of protection to the rights and the liberties of the ordinary citizen? Who says now that the expenditure of such sums, if condoned, will not eventually bring destruction to the Government? There is no thinking man anywhere under the protection of our flag who does not know that such results must and will follow the debauchery of the electorate by such disreputable means. It follows, therefore, that the question involved is one that strikes at the very root of free government. It is one in which every citizen of the Republic has a direct interest. It is one where the rights of those who believe in freedom and self-government are directly affected.

It is clear also that the Constitution has given to the Senate the right to declare, as it has already done, that the expenditure of such sums of money to secure a nomination disqualifies the recipient from a seat in this body. If the Senate believes, therefore, what it has already declared, it follows, as night follows day, that its duty in the case of SMITH and VARE is to exclude them.

It is argued by those who contend that the Senate is helpless, and must seat these men regardless of the money spent to obtain their nominations, that the word "qualifications" in the Constitution refers only to the technical validity of the credentials of a Senator elect. If "qualifications" does not mean qualifications except in a limited sense, and if that limited sense and meaning is to be defined by those who desire to have Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE admitted, then the Senate is helpless. Unfortunately for those who thus argue, there is no legal or justifiable reason for putting this limitation on the word. There is no language anywhere in the Constitution, either direct or implied, that would justify such an interpretation. And again, the Senate is the sole judge of what the word means, and is under no compulsion, either of reason or logic, to accept the limited definition given by those who would take away from the Senate its right to perform its constitutional functions.

The Constitution, in section 5, Article I, in speaking of the House and the Senate, declares that—

each House shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

There is no limitation on this power. The Senate, under this language, is the only body in our Government that has a right to pass upon the qualifications of those who seek admission here as Members.

If, in the judgment of the Senate, the facts reported by this special committee, which stand practically undisputed, disqualify Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE, or either of them, then it is its duty, of course, to vote accordingly. Neither is there anything in the argument that is made by those who claim the Senate is helpless, that if we can keep out of the Senate one who has spent, in its judgment, too much money in order to get in, we might abuse this power; that we might keep a man out because he was a Protestant, or because he was a Catholic, or because he was a pauper, or a railroad president.

The fact is that no power is delegated by the Constitution of the United States to any body or to any court which is not susceptible of abuse. It is impossible to frame a government and delegate any powers to any official without there being a possibility of the danger that such official will abuse the powers given to him. The power to pass on the qualifications of Senators must be given to somebody. Our forefathers, it is true, might have given it to the courts. They might have conferred this power upon some other tribunal instead of the Senate, and, if they had, the Senate would have to abide by the judgment of whatever official or tribunal had jurisdiction. But the truth is that our forefathers, in drafting our Constitution, gave this power to the Senate. It is not only a power but it is a responsibility—a responsibility that can not be shifted. It becomes our duty, under the Constitution of the United States, to pass upon the question presented, and we are required to pass on it because the Constitution of the United States says we shall pass on it. If the Senate should be deprived of this power because of a fear that we might abuse it, and the same doctrine were applied to all our tribunals, it would be an impossibility to give jurisdiction or power to anyone. For instance, for the same reason and with the same justification, it might be said that the Supreme Court of the United States might abuse the power confided in it, or that the President might abuse the power confided to him. This power must be lodged somewhere. Some official or some tribunal must have the right to pass on the disputed question of the right of any claimant to a seat in the Senate.

The same objection could be made to any other power that is given to the Senate. The Senate, for instance, is one of the bodies that passes on appropriations. We might say that if the Senate were so minded it could hold up the appropriations; it could refuse to appropriate for the salaries of judges, of the courts, the marshals, and thus strike the arm of law enforcement dead. It could, by refusing to appropriate money, stop the mails. It could cripple the hand of the President. It could do a thousand things that would bring about even the destruction of the Government. We might, with equal logic, say that it would be possible for the Supreme Court to render decisions that would bring the governmental temple tumbling down in ruins. And in all of these cases, the same as in the passing upon the qualifications of Senators, there would be no appeal.

There must be somewhere some tribunal that has the final say upon the proposition. In this case it is the Senate, and it is not only the Senate's right but it is the Senate's duty to meet the question fairly and decide it in accordance with its best judgment.

The Senate could be unreasonable. It has had that right from the very beginning and foundation of the Government. It has possessed this power for 150 years—and the Government still lives. There has never been a time when it might not have been possible for the Senate or some other governmental tribunal or official to have brought about the destruction of the Government. There never will be a government—there never has been a government—where those in control do not have this very power. It is inherent in every government and in every tribunal in every government

If those who are opposed to this power had been in the Constitutional Convention, they would have opposed the establishment of the Supreme Court because it could have been said that it might become radical, unreasonable, unpatriotic, and eventually bring destruction. They would have opposed the establishment of the office of President of the United States because he might use the Army and the Navy for the destruction of his own country. If the people who believe in this theory had been in the Constitutional Convention, they would have opposed the establishment of the House of Representatives and the Senate because if any power were given to them they might abuse it, and this abuse might be to such an extent as to bring about the destruction of the Government and there would, in the end, be nothing left but to do away with the Government entirely.

The question as to whether Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE should be seated pending the decision of the question as to whether

they will be allowed to remain here permanently is another point involved. It is true that in ordinary cases a Senator is sworn in upon the presentation of his certificate of election and, if his right to a seat here is then contested, he remains in the Senate as a Member until that question is finally determined by the Senate. That procedure is followed because, in the ordinary case, the only official evidence that the Senate has of the election or the qualifications of one claiming the right to be a Member of the Senate is the certificate of election. No other evidence of an official kind is ordinarily in the possession of the Senate, and hence, when the Senate is called upon to act, either to permit or to refuse to permit the applicant to take the oath of office, there is no evidence except the certificate of election. It, as everyone knows, is only prima facie evidence of the facts which it purports to state.

In the case of Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE an entirely different proposition confronts the Senate. The Senate has appointed its committee and directed it to make an investigation, and in obedience to the commands of the Senate, the committee has gone into Illinois and Pennsylvania and made an investigation.

The committee has reported the results of its investigation to the Senate. It has submitted to the Senate the sworn testimony taken in this investigation and, therefore, the Senate is now, and has been for many months, in possession of the official information contained in the report of the committee and the evidence which it has taken. Therefore at the very threshold the certificates of election of these men are challenged by this report and this evidence. It is worthy of note, also, that both Mr. VARE and Mr. SMITH appeared in person before this committee and testified, and that the facts reported by the committee stand practically uncontradicted.

Taking this evidence and the report of the committee upon its face value, it absolutely annihilates the presumption in favor of the certificates of election. It brings both cases clearly within the rule laid down by the Senate in the Newberry case, and if the Senate still adheres to that rule and desires to enforce the principle of government therein enunciated it will refuse to permit either of these gentlemen to be seated.

Mr. DENEEN obtained the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a brief statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DENEEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The subject under discussion is Senate Resolution No. 1, which pertains solely to the case of Senator-elect SMITH, of Illinois. In discussing the resolution the Senator from Nebraska has made many references to the facts in the Pennsylvania case of Senator-elect VARE. I do not want to discuss those facts now, because I do not want to interfere with the consideration of the case from Illinois; but I do want the Senate to understand that we are not allowing those assertions to pass unchallenged, and particularly those assertions which began with such phrases as "No one denies," or "Everybody knows," or "There is no controversy about the facts," and such statements as that, because, as I expect to show the Senate, practically nothing in the preamble of the Pennsylvania resolution—that is, Senate Resolution No. 2—and in many of the statements which have been made by my esteemed friend from Nebraska, seem to us to be sustained by the record in the Pennsylvania case, although, of course, I know he made the statements in good faith and because he believes them to be true.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, the certificate of the Governor of the State of Illinois that on the 2d day of November, 1926, FRANK L. SMITH was chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois as Senator from Illinois, to represent that State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1927, lies upon the table. It was referred in the last session to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and on the 4th of March last the committee reported that the certificate is in due and correct form.

The provisions in the Constitution relating to the qualifications for Senator are:

(a) The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. * * * (Seventeenth amendment.)

(b) No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State from which he shall be chosen. (Article I, sec. 3, par. 3.)

(c) No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress * * * who, having previously taken an oath * * * to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. * * * (Fourteenth amendment, sec. 3, par. 3.)

(d) No person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office. (Article I, sec. 6, par. 2.)

Senator SMITH possesses the qualifications prescribed in the Constitution for the office of United States Senator. He is more than 30 years of age, has been a citizen of the United States for more than 9 years last past, is a native of Illinois, and has been an inhabitant of that State during his lifetime. He is not disqualified by reason of any inhibition in the fourteenth amendment. He does not hold any other office under the United States.

At the election on November 2, 1926, there were three candidates for United States Senator in Illinois. FRANK L. SMITH received 842,273 votes; George E. Brennan, 774,943 votes; Hugh Magill, 156,245 votes.

The Constitution provides also:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business. * * * (Art. I, sec. 5, par. 1.) * * *

There is no dispute about the election of FRANK L. SMITH or the returns, and no contest has been filed against him by either of his opponents. It is sought, however, to add to the term "qualifications" meanings not expressed in the Constitution itself. As the Senate has the authority to judge the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, it sits as a high court of justice in rendering its judgment in this case. It is therefore of the greatest importance that we fix in our minds the constitutional definition of the term "qualifications."

On the meaning of the term "qualifications" I shall quote from several authorities.

Madison, in the Debates on the Constitution, said:

The qualifications of elector and elected are funamental articles in a republican government and ought to be fixed by the Constitution. If the legislature could regulate those of either, it can by degrees subvert the Constitution.

A republic may be converted into an aristocracy or oligarchy as well by limiting the number capable of being elected as the number authorized to elect. * * *

Madison further said:

The British Parliament possessed the power of regulating the qualifications, both of the electors and the elected, and the abuse they had made of it was a lesson worthy of our attention. They had made changes in both cases subservient to their own views of political or religious parties. (Madison's Papers, etc., p. 404.)

It will be remembered that in 1782 in the case of John Wilkes the House of Commons, on the motion of Wilkes himself, adopted this resolution:

That the said resolution [that of February 17, 1769, declaring him incapable of being elected] be expunged from the journals of the house as being subversive of the rights of the whole body of electors of this kingdom. (Hansard, vol. 22, p. 1409.)

Doubtless Madison had this resolution in mind when he made the foregoing statement.

In No. 62 of the Federalist, Hamilton said:

The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature. The term "Legislature" is used in the Federalist as synonymous with "Congress."

Justice Story, in section 625 of Story on the Constitution, states:

It would seem but fair reasoning upon the plainest principles of interpretation that when the Constitution established certain qualifications as necessary for office it meant to exclude all others as prerequisites. From the very nature of such a provision the affirmation of these qualifications would seem to imply a negative of all others.

Judge Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Limitations, page 78, states:

Another rule of construction is that where the Constitution defines the circumstances under which a right may be exercised or a penalty imposed, the specification is an implied prohibition against legislative interference, to add to the condition, or to extend the penalty to other cases. On this ground it has been held by the Supreme Court of Maryland that where the Constitution defined the qualifications of an officer, it was not in the power of the legislature to change or superadd to

them, unless the power to do so was expressly or by necessary implication conferred by the Constitution.

In Cushing on Law and Practices of Legislative Assemblies, second edition, page 27, section 75, the author states:

The Constitution of the United States having prescribed the qualifications required of Representatives in Congress, the principal of which is inhabitancy within the State in which they shall be respectively chosen, leaving it to the States only to prescribe the time, place, and manner of holding the election, it is a general principle that neither Congress nor the States can impose any additional qualifications. It has therefore been held, in the first place, that it is not competent for Congress to prescribe any further qualifications or to pass any law which shall operate as such.

In Foster on the Constitution, page 367, the author says:

The principle that each House has the right to impose a qualification upon its membership which is not prescribed in the Constitution, if established, might be of great danger to the Republic. It was on this excuse that the French Directory procured an annulment of elections to the Council of Five Hundred, and then maintained themselves in power against the will of the people, who gladly accepted the despotism of Napoleon as a relief.

Senator Crittenden, of Kentucky, in the Trumbull case, on March 3, 1856, said:

According to the plain meaning of the Federal Constitution, every inhabitant of a State, 30 years of age, who has been nine years a citizen of the United States, is eligible to the office of Senator. What more can be said about it? It is now supposed by those who contend that Mr. Trumbull is not entitled to his seat that it is competent for a State, by its constitution—and I suppose they would equally contend by any law which the legislature might from time to time pass—to superadd additional qualifications. The Constitution of the United States, they say, has only in part regulated the subject, and therefore it is no interference with that Constitution to make additional regulations.

This, I think will be plain to all, is a mere sophism, when you come to consider it. If it was a power within the regulation of, and proper to be regulated by, the Constitution of the United States, and if that Constitution has qualified it, as I have stated, prescribing the citizenship, was there anything more intended? If so, the framers of the Constitution would have said so. The very enumeration of these qualifications excludes the idea that they intended any other qualifications. That is the plain rule of ordinary construction; but, for a reason above all technical considerations, it is applicable here. The object of the Federal Constitution was to have a body framed by a uniform rule throughout the United States, coming here to constitute this great council of the country; coming here by the agency of the same elective power, the State legislatures; coming here under the same requirements and with the same qualifications; standing here upon a perfect and exact equality in all respects to represent the Nation justly and equally and with a sole regard to the common welfare of the Republic.

I quote from the speech of the Hon. Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania, delivered in the Senate on February 14, 1907, on the Reed Smoot case:

Anyone who takes the trouble to examine the history of the clause of the Constitution as to the qualification of Senators must admit that it was the result of a compromise. The contention that the States should be the sole judges of the qualifications and character of their representatives in the Senate was acceded to with the limitation: A Senator must be 30 years of age, nine years a citizen of the United States, and an inhabitant of the State from which he is chosen. Subject to these limitations imposed by the Constitution, the States are left untrammeled in their right to choose their Senators. The constitutional provision secures a measure of maturity in counsel, and at least a presumption of interest in the welfare of the Nation and State.

By another provision—namely, that relating to expulsion—the Constitution enables the Senate to protect itself against improper characters by expelling them by a two-thirds vote if they are guilty of crime, offensive immorality, disloyalty, or gross impropriety during their term of service.

* * * * * * *

If I were asked to state concisely the true theory of the Constitution upon this important point, I would unhesitatingly say:

First. That the Constitution undertakes to prescribe no moral or mental qualification, and in respect to such qualifications as it does prescribe the Senate by a majority vote shall judge of their existence in each case, whether the question is raised before or after the Senator has taken his seat.

Second. That as to all matters affecting a man's moral or mental fitness the States are to be the judges in the first instance, subject, however, to the power of the Senate to reverse their judgment by a two-thirds vote of expulsion when an offense or an offensive status extends into the period of senatorial service, and such a question can only be made after the Senator has taken his seat.

If to this it is objected that it contemplates admitting a man who may be immediately expelled, I reply that it is hardly proper to adopt a rule of constitutional construction and senatorial action based upon the theory that the States will send criminals or idiots to the Senate. Besides, it does not seem to me to be conceding much to a State after it has deliberately and solemnly elected a Senator after the fullest consideration of his merits to concede on the first blush of the business the States' intelligent and honorable conduct, by allowing its chosen representative admission to the body to which he is accredited.

Mr. President, in a speech which I delivered in the Senate on the 19th of January last on the subject matter of the credentials of FRANK L. SMITH as Senator designate I discussed his right to take the oath of office and reviewed precedents in the Senate as far back as the case of Gen. James Shields in 1849. Thirty-nine cases were reviewed. In 23 of these cases the oath was administered to the Senator elect or designate and their cases referred to appropriate committees for investigation and report. In 16 of the precedents the Senate refused to permit the oath to be administered and referred the cases to the appropriate committees for investigation and report.

In these 16 cases, the grounds for contest in 6 related to the loyalty of the Senator elect; in 7 the question related to irregularity of elections; in the case of Adelbert Ames of Mississippi in 1870, the contest related to inhabitancy; and in the case of General Shields in Minnesota and in the Louisiana cases, the objection was that there was no constitutionally organized State government.

It appears, therefore, that in these 16 cases where the oath was denied until charges were heard by committees, the grounds of the contest were the lack of the qualifications defined in section 3 of Article I of the Constitution—relating to age, citizenship in the United States, and inhabitancy—the inhibitions in the fourteenth amendment, and the organization of the State itself.

The precedents cited establish that since the case of General Shields in 1849, the Senate has in no case denied the right of a Senator elect or designate to take the oath of office before the hearing of his case, except where the qualifications specifically defined in the Constitution were involved.

I shall quote some opinions expressed by Senators in various cases upholding the right of a Senator elect or designate to have the oath of office administered:

Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, in the case of Senator SMOOT, said:

The chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Burrows], is obliged to be absent. He desired me to state on his behalf that he understands the orderly and constitutional method of procedure in regard to administering the oath to newly elected Senators to be that when any gentleman brings with him or presents credentials consisting of the certificate of his due election from the executive of his State, he is entitled to be sworn in, and all questions relating to his qualifications should be postponed and acted upon by the Senate afterwards.

If there were any other procedure the result would be that a third of the Senate might be kept out of their seats for an indefinite time on the presenting of objections without responsibility and never established before the Senate by any judicial inquiry. The result of that might be that a change in the political power of this Government which the people desired to accomplish would be indefinitely postponed.

Senator REED of Missouri, in the case of Senator MOSES, in November, 1918, said:

It is not, as I understand, the custom of Congress, when a man presents himself in either House with a certificate in proper form, to deny him his seat pending the contest. If, then, we were to refer this matter to the committee, what is to be gained by it? The certificate is in proper form; that is admitted. Do we propose to keep this man from his seat while the Committee on Privileges and Elections institutes an inquiry as to whether or not an election contest ought to be started, and then to keep him from his seat during all of the contest, for all the weeks or months that that contest might proceed? If that course is to be followed in this case, then it can be followed in all other cases. As was so well said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood], one-third of the Senate might be kept from their seats, and business of the greatest importance might be transacted while the representatives of one-third of the States of the Union were deprived of the opportunity to sit in this Chamber.

It seems to me, therefore, that the better practice is at once to permit the swearing in of any man who comes here with a certificate, the regularity of which is not challenged, and then, if a contest is instituted, let that question be tried; but in the meantime the State should not be deprived of its representation.

And in the case of Senator Newberry, in February, 1919, Senator REED of Missouri said:

After the primary in Michigan, and before the election, an effort was made to cause an investigation of the Michigan case. A great deal of talk and comment was had in the newspapers with regard to the large expenditure of money in that State. I took the position against having an investigation at that time because it seems to me that while clearly within the jurisdiction of the Senate under some of its powers, such an investigation would have the inevitable effect of influencing the election.

After the election was held, I took the position, and I still take the position, that, assuming that the credentials of Mr. Newberry are in proper and legal form, upon being filed here with the Senate he is entitled at any time after the 4th of March to take his oath of office and take his seat and to retain that seat until and unless the Senate of the United States upon proper proceedings shall oust him therefrom.

In the case of Major General Shields in 1849 Senator Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, made an illuminating speech, from which I quote and which I adopt:

Mr. President, I again rise to a question of privilege. I do it without any concert with my colleague, whom I desire to be sworn. I do it as the only representative present from the State of Illinois, which is entitled to two Senators on this floor. It appears from the credentials now on your table that James Shields was elected a Senator of the United States by the Legislature of Illinois for six years from the 4th instant. His credentials are in due form, and therefore those credentials entitle him to a seat in this body. He stands in precisely the same position in which other Senators stood who were yesterday admitted to seats, and if there is any objection on the ground of ineligibility it must arise after he has been sworn and taken his seat. This body has not jurisdiction over him or this matter until he has been admitted to his seat as one of its Members, for then alone can the question of eligibility arise. At present he has a right to a seat here and to a vote on any question that may arise until the Senate shall adjudge him ineligible. * * *

If, sir, in this case the ineligibility was shown on the face of the credentials, I would not ask that General Shields should be sworn; but if the credentials are in the usual form, and that is not doubted, the presumption is in his favor and he has a right to a seat here until the Senate shall adjudge him ineligible. All I ask, sir, is that the State of Illinois may be treated as other States are treated.

* * * * * * *

If there is no ineligibility on the face of the credentials to deprive him of the right conferred upon him by his State, this will furnish the first instance of the rejection of a Senator when his credentials are in due form. And why, sir, should there be such an exception now made in this case? I speak not, sir, on behalf of the claimant of this seat but I speak on behalf of the State of Illinois, which I in part represent. I insist, sir, that if you were now engaged in calling the yeas and nays, and his credentials had not been presented, it would be my right and my duty to present his credentials, and it would be his right to be sworn and vote on the pending question.

I call upon the Senate to pause and examine this question. The Senate is not yet organized. No business can be done until the constitutional rights of Members to their seats have been acceded to. I do not say that General Shields is eligible to a seat on this floor. I know nothing of the facts, sir, but I do know, from the credentials on your table, that he has been duly elected by the Legislature of the State of Illinois. His credentials are in due form. They are in such form as to make it a matter of right that he shall take his seat. I know also that yesterday you swore other Members who presented credentials identically the same. And I likewise know that hitherto you have never refused the right to a seat to any gentleman coming with like credentials. After General Shields shall have been sworn and admitted to his seat I shall throw no impediment in the way of any examination that the Senate may desire to make of the facts of the case. It is the right of this body then to institute an investigation, when objections are made; but—and I say it with great respect—this body has no right to reject without examination a Senator when he presents his credentials in due form showing that he has a right to a seat here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois insist on his question of privilege?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, sir; on the ground that the State of Illinois is entitled to two votes in this Senate. * * *

My motion is not made at the request, nor even with the knowledge, of General Shields. It is made by me, as a Senator from Illinois, insisting on the rights of that State. I have no objection to the Senator from Wisconsin making any statement he chooses at the proper time, but if he is to go on and make statements of facts with respect to the question at issue, thus superseding my motion, I contend that his course will be wholly irregular. I insist that the proper mode is to allow General Shields to be sworn and then to proceed with the investigation of the testimony in the case regularly. As regards the facts in the case, I do not know what they are myself, and am therefore not prepared at present to make any statement as to the legality or nonlegality of the election.

Mr. President, Article VI of the Constitution provides that a Senator shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution. Senator SMITH is in the Chamber ready to take oath to support the Constitution.

Mr. President, Article V of the Constitution provides, among other things:

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The State of Illinois has not consented to be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate; and, on the contrary, its general assembly has passed resolutions which I shall submit to the Senate and ask to have read at the close of my speech.

Regarding the resolution of the senior Senator from Nebraska, I have to state that at the hearing of the special committee of the Senate, under authority of a resolution passed on the 17th day of May, 1926, Senator SMITH was not represented by counsel, nor did he consult consul, so he informs me, regarding his testimony or the testimony of the other witnesses.

On the contrary, as is well known in the State of Illinois, Senator SMITH had been seriously ill in the spring and summer of this year. He had been a patient at the Mayo Hospital at Rochester, Minn., and later underwent two major operations at the Henrotin Memorial Hospital in Chicago, and was a patient at that hospital for 35 days. He returned to his home at Dwight, Ill., on July 10 and was endeavoring to regain his health and strength there when he was subpœnaed to appear before the special committee on the 26th of July last.

Part 2 of the hearings before the special committee at Chicago, from July 26 to August 5, inclusive, contains his testimony, and any Senator can readily ascertain the fact that no lawyer participated in his behalf in his examination. The record also shows that Senator SMITH did not attend or participate in any of the hearings of the committee except when he was under examination, nor did any attorney for him participate in the proceedings before the committee; and it is a significant fact that the chairman of the special committee, the senior Senator from Missouri, on the 19th day of January of this year, introduced the following substitute for the resolution offered by me (S. Res. 328):

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of FRANK L. SMITH to be sworn in as a Senator from the State of Illinois, as well as his final right to a seat as such Senator, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and until such committee shall report upon and the Senate decide such question and right the said FRANK L. SMITH shall not be sworn in or be permitted to occupy a seat in the Senate.

The said committee shall proceed promptly and report to the Senate at the earliest possible moment (p. 1923 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2d sess. 69th Cong.).

And in support of this resolution the chairman of the special committee, the senior Senator from Missouri, said:

I want Mr. SMITH to have the fullest opportunity to appear by counsel, to try his entire case before a committee which can not be said to have in any manner prejudged the merits of the controversy. He may have evidence and he may be able to make a showing to that committee which was not submitted to the select committee. I would like to see that course taken, Mr. President, because I recognize the gravity of the question involved.

The substitute was adopted.

FRANK L. SMITH had been appointed Senator by the Governor of Illinois to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the Hon. William B. McKinley. There was no question about his credentials or qualifications, and the only point raised against him then, as now, was the testimony submitted to the special committee.

If the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who conducted the investigations for the special committee, felt that FRANK L. SMITH should have an opportunity to present his case before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I am at a loss to know why other Senators who did not participate in the hearings should endeavor to deny him that right, against all precedents in courts or legislative bodies. The senior Senator from Missouri, an eminent lawyer, knew that the Senate in judging the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members sits as a court, and that the principles which apply to the trial of cases in courts and the traditions of the courts should be observed.

On the 19th day of January last I submitted to the Senate Senate Resolution 328, which reads as follows:

Whereas FRANK L. SMITH, claiming to be a Senator from the State of Illinois, has presented his credentials, which are regular and in due form, and there being no contestant for the seat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the oath of office be now administered to the said FRANK L. SMITH; be it further

Resolved, That his credentials and all charges which may be filed against him and all objections that may be raised as to his right to a seat in the Senate be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that committee is hereby directed to hear and determine all charges and objections which may be submitted and to report to the Senate after due inquiry and as early as convenient.

It will be observed that in the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Missouri and that by myself there was this difference only, that in the resolution of the Senator from Missouri provision was made that FRANK L. SMITH should not be sworn in or permitted to occupy a seat in the Senate until the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections had been made, while that introduced by me provided that the oath should be administered and all matters affecting his credentials, and all charges which may be filed against him, and all objections that may be raised to his right to a seat in the Senate should then be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for trial.

It is obvious, therefore, that those who voted for or against the resolution of Senator REED as a substitute for that which I offered had in mind a trial of FRANK L. SMITH before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and later in the Senate, should objections be made to his credentials or to his right to a seat in the Senate.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections on March 4 reported that the certificate of the Governor of Illinois appointing FRANK L. SMITH as Senator designate was in due form; and further, that the committee—

was directed by resolution to report upon the prima facie right and also upon the final right of the said SMITH to a seat in the Senate. Owing to the illness of Mr. SMITH, the committee was unable to complete its hearings and the matter is now pending before your committee. (Rept. No. 1717, 69th Cong., 2d sess.)

Senator SMITH was ill during the debates in the Senate on January 19 and 20 of this year, and also at the hearings of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as stated in its report. No witnesses were called before the committee. It appears, therefore, that Senator SMITH has not had his day in court; and in view of this record I can not believe that the Senate, sitting as a high court of justice to judge the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members, is willing to act upon the record before it and refuse him a trial.

FRANK L. SMITH is entitled to have the oath of office administered to him because he was elected Senator from Illinois on November 2, 1926. The State of Illinois is entitled to have the oath of office administered to him because the vote which he received has not been questioned. On objections to his right to a seat in the Senate he is entitled to be tried according to the rules of law, and to defend himself and in his own proper person. He asks for nothing unusual in this matter, but he has the right to insist that the provisions of the Constitution and the precedents of the Senate be applied in judging his right to take the oath of office, and later, on objections to his right to a seat in the Senate, to have the same determined according to the rules of law.

Mr. President, I submit to the Senate copies of resolutions passed by the General Assembly of Illinois on the date appearing in the certified copy of the resolutions, and wish that they may lie on the table and be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolutions, and they will lie on the table.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Certificate No. 31953

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of House Joint Resolution 45, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois.

Done at the city of Springfield this 23d day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution 45

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein)—

Whereas the seventeenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States make mandatory that "the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years," and by reason of this constitutional provision the State of Illinois is entitled to and guaranteed two Senators in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas on or about the 7th day of December, A. D. 1926, the Hon. William B. McKinley, one of the United States Senators representing the State of Illinois in the United States Senate, departed this life, and thereupon, by reason of this vacancy, the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH was, in accordance with the Constitution and statutes, appointed to fill the unexpired term of said William B. McKinley as United States Senator from Illinois, and the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH presented the credentials in proper form under the great seal of the State of Illinois to the United States Senate, and the United States Senate, without questioning the legal form and force of said credentials, nor questioning the constitutional qualifications of the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH, nor the guaranteed right under the Constitution of the United States for full representation to membership in the United States Senate by the State of Illinois, refused to administer the oath of office to the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH, and by that act denied to the State of Illinois equal representation in the said Senate of the United States; and

Whereas for a period of nearly 140 years, since the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and the amendment recited above, the rights of a sovereign State to equal representation in the Senate of the United States, wherein the credentials and constitutional qualifications were unquestioned, has never before been denied by the Senate of the United States refusing to administer the constitutional oath of office; and

Whereas this same question on an objection to the right of a Senator elect to take the prescribed constitutional oath of office was once before raised against the State of Illinois, but upon the able representation of the constitutional rights of the State of Illinois by Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, senior Senator from Illinois, in the matter of the credentials of Gen. James Shields, a Senator elect from Illinois, the United States Senate finally declared that the guaranteed constitutional rights of a sovereign State should not be abridged by a denial of the right of a Senator elect to take the oath, and by this action established a historic precedent; and

Whereas one of the early proposed amendments to the Constitution, making it possible for United States Senators to be elected by a direct vote of the people, was advocated by Senator John M. Palmer, of Illinois, and subsequently became a part of the fundamental law of the land; and

Whereas the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH has been by majority of the people of the State of Illinois, after a full presentation, discussion, and consideration of all issues involved, elected as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois, and no contest has issued against said election, and credentials have been accepted by the United States Senate as being in due form, and the qualifications of the said United States Senator elect are in full compliance with all constitutional and statute requirements; and

Whereas the only test provided in the Constitution of the United States as to the qualifications of a Member of the Senate of the United States is as follows:

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen"; and

Whereas Amendment XVII of the Constitution of the United States provides that—

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures"; and

Whereas Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides—

"* * * That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate"; and

Whereas Article I, Section 5, of the United States Constitution provides that—

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business";

"Each House may determine the rules of its procedure, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member"; and

Whereas reference to the above article and section of the Constitution provides: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," etc.; and

Whereas the uniform construction of this provision has been accepted that "qualification of its own Members" can not be construed otherwise, that in order to be a "Member" it is obvious that the taking of the required oath constitutes membership, and that previous to the taking of the required oath the Senate has no jurisdiction on another than a "Member," and the Senate shall, subsequent to the taking of the oath, be the judge of the qualification of the member; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States further provides by amendment X that—

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people"; and

Whereas the foregoing are all of the relevant provisions in the Constitution with respect to the power of the Senate over the election of Senators; and

Whereas the credentials of the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH hereinbefore recited constitute a mandate of the choice of a majority of the people of the State of Illinois, at a general election, and which selection and choice by a majority of the people of the State of Illinois is uncontested, and that said election is for a period of six years, and that the continued refusal of the Senate of the United States to administer the oath of office to the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH as United States Senator from Illinois will result in depriving the State of Illinois of the full representation in the Senate of the United States for a period of six years, to which it is by the Constitution of the United States entitled and guaranteed: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the people of the State of Illinois represented in the general assembly, That in view of the foregoing it be respectfully presented to the Senate of the United States of the Seventieth Congress that the people of the State of Illinois are clearly within their rights in the expectation that the credentials of the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH, now on file in the Senate of the United States, entitle the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH to take the oath of office to which he has been elected as a United States Senator from the State of Illinois; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be directed to the Vice President of the United States, the constitutional Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Hon. CHARLES S. DENEEN, senior United States Senator from Illinois, with the request and direction that these resolutions be presented to the Senate of the United States, to the end that the sovereign State of Illinois shall not be deprived of the rights of full representation in the Senate of the United States, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, That a delegation on the constitutional rights of the State of Illinois be, and the same is hereby, created, the said delegation to consist of the speaker of the house of representatives, the president of the Senate, and two members of the house of representatives, to be appointed by the speaker thereof, and two members of the senate, to be appointed by the president of the senate on the nomination of the executive committee, and it shall be the duty of said delegation on the constitutional rights of the State of Illinois to appear before the Senate of the United States, or any of its committees or subcommittees, upon the convening of said Senate and at any time thereafter, and to present to said Senate and its committees a consideration of the constitutional rights of this State, and on behalf of the people of this State respectfully to insist upon the recognition by the Senate of the United States of the constitutional right of this State to be represented in the Senate of the United States by two Senators, and that said constitutional right be recognized by the administration of the oath to the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH as United States Senator from this State.

Adopted by the house June 16, 1927.

(Signed) ROBERT SCHOLES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
(Signed) B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate June 21, 1927.

(Signed) FRED E. STERLING,
President of the Senate.
JAMES H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have at my office, but not here at my desk, a letter from a member of the Illinois Legislature describing just how those resolutions were passed. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of inserting the letter at this point in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, STATE OF ILLINOIS,
House of Representatives, November 16, 1927.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In this morning's Chicago Tribune appears an article under a Washington date line to the effect that Cornelius J. Doyle, of Springfield, Ill., personal attorney for Senator-elect FRANK L. SMITH of Illinois arrived in Washington yesterday to arrange the preliminary details of the latter's fight for admission to the Senate when Congress convenes on December 5.

Among other things, this article states that Mr. SMITH's insistence upon his right to take the oath of office will be seconded by a joint committee of the Illinois State Legislature specially appointed for the purpose, consisting of Lieutenant Governor Sterling, State Senators Richard Barr and John Daily, of the senate, and Speaker Robert Scholes and Representatives Reed Cutler and Gus J. Johnson, of the house of representatives, and that the resolution will be formally presented to the Senate by Senator DENEEN, and, in the event that Mr. SMITH's credentials are referred to the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee, the legislative group will demand to be heard in his behalf.

I take it that you and all other Members of the Senate who will be called upon to vote upon this most important question would like to be fully informed concerning the resolution to be presented by the joint committee of our general assembly, and with that thought in mind I am giving you the facts with reference thereto.

On June 8 there was introduced by Representative Cutler a bill (H. B. 757) almost identical in its terms with the resolution above referred to, which instead of being referred to a committee, as is our usual practice, was read a first time and ordered to a second reading without reference. On the following day, when the bill was called up on second reading, Representative O'Grady moved to amend the bill by striking therefrom the enacting clause. After a short debate a motion to table the amendment carried by a vote of 74 to 51. Among the 51 opposed to the bill were 11 of the best-known Republicans in the house, including Homer J. Tice, one of the veteran members, and Roger F. Little, former Republican floor leader; also M. L. Igoe, present Democratic floor leader, and John F. Devine, former minority leader.

Between June 9 and June 16 Representative Cutler, the sponsor of the bill, came to my desk and asked me if I could not see my way clear to refrain from speaking against the bill on third reading (I having spoken against it on second reading). This I declined to do. The bill was never called up on third reading but on June 16 was tabled. On the same day, however, he introduced the resolution, which, as before stated, was almost identical with the tabled house bill and, as originally introduced, provided for the creation of a delegation consisting of six members from the house and senate, representing the two major parties. Prominent Democratic members immediately objected to any representation of their party, and the resolution was accordingly amended so as to leave out any provision for appointment of Democrats on the delegation, which explains why all of the members of the joint committee who will appear at Washington are Republicans.

The resolution as thus changed was passed by a viva voce vote, no record being made of the members voting for and against it. Indeed, as I recall it, the speaker, as was his habit in the handling of resolutions, did not even call for the negative vote.

This, then, is the resolution which Senator DENEEN, according to the Tribune article, will be asked to present to the Senate or which will be presented to your Committee on Privileges and Elections by Mr. SMITH'S attorney as evidence, I suppose, that our general assembly is unanimously in favor of the admission to the United States Senate of Mr. SMITH. Rather, I think, the roll call of 74 to 51 represented the sentiment of the house members, even after Representative Cutler, Republican floor leader, with the State administration behind him, had done what he could to "line up" members for his bill.

I am writing similar letters to a number of your colleagues.

Have met you at Waupaca.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD P. CASTLE,
112 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 7, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, *December 6, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, Thou art a great and gentle Father; One who forgives our sins and sustains us with undying hope. For these unspeakable mercies we thank Thee. Do Thou set us free from all evil desire; cleanse our hearts from all inordinate affections, and may our love for the pure and good grow with each succeeding day. O blend Thy heart with ours and grant us the sympathy that takes its impressions from the duties that pass our way. Raise us to the height of a fine aspiration and lift us to the summit of a compelling faith. Teach us the

courage of patience, the strength of endurance, and the real power and value of self-restraint. Bless and guard our native land and may the spirit of truth be incarnated in all our fellow citizens and in all our institutions. We pray in the name of the Great Teacher. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BOIES, of the eleventh district of the State of Iowa, and Mr. MEAD, of the forty-second district of the State of New York, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PRINTING AND BINDING

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BEERS], if he is on the floor. In the printing resolution which was presented yesterday by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BEERS] I notice it provides:

That the standing committee of the House of Representatives, and the floor leader and the chairman of the conference minority are hereby authorized;

And so forth. That was the old designation, but that has been changed by law and it stands now just simply minority leader under the statutes. I think such change ought to be made in the resolution because some question might arise in the comptroller's office.

Mr. SNELL. I do not see the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the floor, but I think it would be perfectly agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have that change made.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania simply followed the form as it has been used heretofore, and that he would have no objection to this change being made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that the best method of accomplishing the result would be to request that the proceedings incident to the adoption of the resolution be vacated and that the resolution be adopted with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will make that motion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. RATHBONE, Representative at Large from the State of Illinois, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed on the part of the House to join with a similar committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, has performed that duty and has been informed by the President that he will communicate with Congress forthwith by a message in writing.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AND THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a resolution for the election of members of two committees—the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations. I therefore send to the Clerk's desk a resolution providing for the election of members of the Committee on Ways and Means and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 37

Resolved, That the following Members be elected as members of the Committee on Ways and Means:

William R. Green, of Iowa; Willis C. Hawley, of Oregon; Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts; Isaac Bacharach, of New Jersey; Lindley H. Hadley, of Washington; Charles B. Timberlake, of Colorado; Henry W. Watson, of Pennsylvania; James C. McLaughlin, of Michigan; Charles C. Kearns, of Ohio; Carl R. Chindblom, of Illinois; Frank Crowther, of New York; Charles L. Faust, of Missouri; Richard S. Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Thaddeus C. Sweet, of New York; and Harry A. Estep of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 38

Resolved, That the following-named Representatives be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House on Ways and Means:

John N. Garner, of Texas; James W. Collier, of Mississippi; William A. Oldfield, of Arkansas; Charles R. Crisp, of Georgia; John F. Carew, of New York; Whitmell P. Martin, of Louisiana; Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois; Cordell Hull, of Tennessee; Clement C. Dickinson, of Missouri; and Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution providing for the election of members of the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 39

Resolved, That the following Members be elected to membership on the Committee on Appropriations:

Martin B. Madden, of Illinois; Daniel R. Anthony, jr., of Kansas; William R. Wood, of Indiana; Louis C. Cramton, of Michigan; Edward H. Wason, of New Hampshire; George Holden Tinkham, of Massachusetts; Burton L. French, of Idaho; Milton W. Shreve, of Pennsylvania; L. J. Dickinson, of Iowa; Frank Murphy, of Ohio; John W. Summers, of Washington; Henry E. Barbour, of California; Ernest R. Ackerman, of New Jersey; Guy U. Hardy, of Colorado; John Taber, of New York; Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky; Frank Clague, of Minnesota; Robert G. Simmons, of Nebraska; William P. Holaday, of Illinois; Robert L. Bacon, of New York; and George A. Welsh, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am not ready at this moment to nominate the Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations. I was talking to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] a moment ago, and we thought we could possibly do this, so as to facilitate the action of this committee in reporting the emergency deficiency bill: Nominate the Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations in the Sixty-ninth Congress who were reelected to the Seventieth Congress as members of the Committee on Appropriations. We are not at this moment prepared to report to our caucus, because under our organization on this side of the House we must report to the caucus for confirmation of the action taken, and we have not yet had that caucus.

Mr. TILSON. I trust the gentleman will move to elect the Members who were members of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I nominate for membership on the Committee on Appropriations such members of that committee in the Sixty-ninth Congress as were reelected to the Seventieth Congress, and move their election.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the Appropriations Committee as now selected report the deficiency appropriation bill without the new Members that are to be selected from the Democratic side?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; they will report with such members as were elected to-day or those that have already been elected by the House.

Mr. McCLINTIC. If the House takes such action, will it not deny the new Members that go on the Committee on Appropriations the right to have a voice in any matter with respect to the deficiency appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there were a number of committees of the last Congress whose membership was not actually filled.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I understand, Mr. Speaker; but the Committee on Appropriations is going to report a bill and that committee is not complete.

The SPEAKER. A majority, of course, can report a bill.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two committees just named—Ways and Means and Appropriations—may have leave of the House to sit during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have the right to report the deficiency bill any time up to midnight to-night, if the House is not in session.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to couple with that request a reservation of all points of order on the bill when reported.

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

The SPEAKER. All points of order are reserved by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. This bill will be reported to-night before 12 o'clock and then printed——

Mr. MADDEN. It will be reported this afternoon before adjournment, if the House does not adjourn too soon.

Mr. BLANTON. But the point I am making is this: Does not the gentleman from Illinois, who used to work hard on these bills and who used to want to study a copy of them before they were debated, when he was not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, think the membership of the House ought to have access to such bills before they are called up for debate? This bill will be called up to-morrow for debate.

Mr. MADDEN. For general debate, but not for consideration otherwise.

Mr. BLANTON. There will not be any extensive debate on it?

Mr. MADDEN. And we will report it before the House adjourns, if the House does not adjourn too soon.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any way of getting copies of the bill now?

Mr. MADDEN. No; because we have not passed on it.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object. But these bills should be printed and should be available to Members for at least one day before they are called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk.

[See Senate proceedings for message of the President, page 103.]

On motion of Mr. TILSON, the message was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

STATUE OF ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 3, which I send to the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Alexander H. Stephens, presented by the State of Georgia, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his distinguished humanitarian service.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, is this the usual resolution which is always presented under similar circumstances when a statue is to be placed in the Hall?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman from New York this is in the usual form.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, only for the purpose of asking a question, I reserve the right to object. There is in the basement of this Capitol the statue of three renowned women of America, which was formally accepted, as I distinctly remember, by a former Speaker of this House, Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT, for I heard his eloquent speech of acceptance, and I am wondering why it is not taken out of the dusty basement and given some suitable place in this Capitol.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is the gentleman addressing his question to me or to the Speaker?

Mr. BLANTON. I am addressing the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman is addressing the question to me, I can not answer it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think I can tell the gentleman why.

Mr. BLANTON. Why is it not given a proper placement?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Statuary Hall is set aside especially for the use of the States. Only the States are permitted to send statues there. The statue to which the gentleman refers was not presented by a State, but by a private organization. I think that is the explanation, although I am not absolutely sure.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state to the Democratic leader and to the Republican leader that in this tremendous building there ought to be some suitable place found for this very important statue other than the dusty basement of this building. I hope the majority leader and the minority leader will find some way to properly place the statue before the session ends.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas does not want us to build a place for it?

Mr. BLANTON. There are plenty of proper places in this Capitol for it already, if the Congress will only choose one and officially designate it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMIRAL MAGRUDER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House that I may insert in the RECORD the reply of the Government made through the Navy Department on some criticisms made by Admiral Magruder. This statement includes the criticisms made by Admiral Magruder as well as the reply thereto. The reason that I ask to have it inserted—and it is the only request that I have made of the kind for 25 years—is that I think it is well that the membership of the House should be acquainted with what the controversy is about. The matter may arise hereafter, and I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD so that gentlemen may have an opportunity to read it.

Mr. TILSON. How large a document is it?

Mr. BUTLER. It is longer than I would have made it if I had had the preparation of it—it is 15 or 20 pages.

Mr. TILSON. Would it not be well to have it printed as a separate document and not place it in the RECORD?

Mr. BUTLER. I think it ought to be printed in the RECORD so that Members may read it. I did not write it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does it contain all of Admiral Magruder's statement?

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that it does. If Admiral Magruder has any economies in mind we propose to hear them.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of the fairest men in the House. Does he think it fair to publish the criticisms of the Secretary of the Navy without at the same time giving Admiral Magruder's side of it?

Mr. BUTLER. It is all here.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I disagree with the gentleman about that. I have read Secretary Wilbur's censure of Admiral Magruder published in the press, and it only takes up certain parts of the statements of Admiral Magruder and feebly attempts to answer them.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall object unless all of Admiral Magruder's statements go in with it. If they go in together, I shall not object to printing same either in the RECORD or as a public document.

Mr. BUTLER. It is all in here.

Mr. BLANTON. I object for the present.

Mr. BLANTON subsequently withdrew his objection and Mr. BLACK of Texas renewed it.

JOEL GRAYSON

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 41

Resolved, That the House has heard with deep regret of the death of Joel Grayson, special employee in the document room of the House of Representatives, which occurred at his home in Fairfax County, Va., on November 1, 1927, and it now records its appreciation of his able, loyal, and useful service to the House during the long period of 52 years, in which he filled various positions so acceptably as to win the distinction of being mentioned by name in legislation enacted by the Fifty-sixth Congress and in similar legislation enacted by every subsequent Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES T. BEGG

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech made in my home city of Chicago by my colleague, Hon. JAMES T. BEGG, of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JAMES T. BEGG before the Executives' Club of Chicago, Ill., Friday, September 30, 1927:

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS AND THEIR EFFECT ON BUSINESS

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, members of the Executives' Club of Chicago, it has been my privilege to have a good many different types of introductions, and I have learned to wait and see what the chairman would say about me before even thinking what I might say in reply, and I will say, Mr. Chairman, you are a real toastmaster and presenter of a speaker.

I am indeed happy to be privileged to come to Chicago to-day and address your group, for various reasons, not least of which is that it furnished me a most excellent excuse and opportunity to visit my old friend, your member, and one of your directors, Lucius Wilson, as well as a number of other good friends, and my colleague, CARL R. CHINDBLOM.

A GREAT PROBLEM AHEAD OF US

I am to talk to you this afternoon for a few minutes on the foreign policy of the United States and its effect on business. I will say to you business men very frankly that it is my humble judgment that within the next 10 or 15 years the American business man will see the keenest competition he ever imagined anybody could see and survive. Now, we produce in America to-day one and one-fourth times as much as we can consume. When we take production en masse that statement is true. Stated in another way, the man-power production in America is one and one-fourth times the man-power consumption.

That being true, there is only one of three ways for America to go—either produce less, consume more, or find a market for the surplus. Let us examine each of those propositions very briefly. Can America produce less with safety to herself? You may be surprised, possibly not, but last spring I came in contact with one of my friends, the editorial writer of one of the best and biggest newspapers in the United States, who said, "Jim, your theory of foreign commerce is bound to run the United States into trouble." I said to him, "Well, what would you do?" His reply was this: "I have about concluded the wisest policy for America would be to produce only that which we can consume and build a tariff wall around us high enough to keep everything out of America that is or might be produced here." Well, being an advocate of a high protective tariff, you might think that policy would have somewhat of an appeal to me, but I was astounded to find that a man in a position of such importance and influence as this gentleman is would advocate such a doctrine, and I asked him where he got the idea. His reply to me was, the head of the political-science department in one of our best schools in America was teaching that kind of economic-political theory to his students—your boy and mine.

Well, I don't know how you feel on that kind of a policy. So far as I am personally concerned, I am unalterably opposed to a national policy that aims self-preservation alone. I would hate to think, gentlemen, that the only purpose of my life was to earn enough money to buy food, clothing, and shelter for myself and my family. I would hate much worse to think that the only purpose of America was to make a living for the American citizenship and provide shelter and clothing for them. I believe there is a work to be done by America in the world. Whether or not she will accept the responsibility for that work, I can not say, but I will say this: In my judgment, the only way that America can survive as she is to-day is to have a responsibility broader than the confines of her own boundary lines. [Applause.]

RESULTS OF CURTAILING PRODUCTION

Now, let us see what would happen were we to undertake to produce only just what we consume. If we have a surplus of 25 per cent, then to reduce production to meet the consumption it would be absolutely necessary to keep one-fourth the people idle all the time or all the people idle one-fourth of the time. Either one of those methods would mean an earning power in America of 25 per cent less. That would mean a spending power or a buying power 25 per cent less, which of itself would reduce the standard of living in America by about 25 per cent. And there is not a man or woman in our great country who would be advocating that kind of a procedure for the next 10 or 20 years in America. There is no one who says the standard of living in America is too high.

But if you reduce the earning power in America you must reduce the buying power, and the standard of living must go down.

CAN CONSUMPTION BE INCREASED?

Now, then, if we can not with safety in America adopt the policy of restricted production to meet the demands of the American people, we will discard that idea and go to the other. Is it possible in this country to consume more, to take up the slack between production and consumption? Well, having been privileged to travel about the United States, in every State but two, coming in rather intimate contact with the American people, I am frank to say to you that I do not believe it is possible to increase the consumption of foodstuffs any in America. Seeing you here as I do, I feel sure of it. In other words, I believe America is just as well fed as it is possible to be fed. Why, gentlemen, I will go so far as to say there is no plausible reason why any able-bodied man in this country needs to go to bed to-night hungry. You can not make that statement about any other country in the world. I have seen half the peoples of the world, and I know whereof I speak. It is not hearsay, and I didn't read it out of a book.

Again, I think the American people can not consume more in the way of wearing apparel. I think we have reached almost the maximum in consumption along that line. I am well aware, if this were an audience made up of ladies, I would never dare make that kind of a statement, because I doubt if there is a lady living that would not admit that she could consume more clothing than her husband furnishes, but on the whole, I think, the average American is as well dressed as any people desire to be dressed.

I remember as a lad out on the farm, when I went into the city, or the village, the chances were about 10 to 1 that some boy in the city or myself would end the day with a black eye, because I was taunted with the comment, "You are a rube," or a country-jake, or something of that kind. Those terms have gone out of the vocabularies of the young folks to-day. Why were they applied to the country boy and the son of the laboring man 25 years ago? Simply because our clothing was of a coarser quality than that worn by the children of the better-fixed people. Not so to-day. I will challenge any man in this room to go into any schoolroom outside of your neighborhood in your own fair city this afternoon, and walk down the aisle of that school, put your hand on the desk of a boy or a girl, and say, "Your father is a banker," or "Your father is a farmer," or "Your father is a laboring man in the factory." You can't do it, because the masses and the classes in America dress alike. And again I say, America is the only spot in the world where that statement will hold true.

I think I am safe when I say to you that the occupants of the charitable institutions in this country, the poorhouses, are better fed, better housed, and better clothed than the masses of the people in any other country in all the world save two or three little nations.

If I am right in that statement, then let me propound to you a question: Whenever the rest of the world learns the art of mass production like we know it, how do you expect to sell your surplus in competition with their surplus, or with the same article in the rest of the world, when your surplus was manufactured by labor receiving from five to eight to ten dollars a day and your competitors' product was manufactured with labor a maximum wage of which is $2.56 a day? In other words, how can we maintain the standard of living on the plane we now have it and sell a surplus to the rest of a world that lives on a plane away beneath America's?

Let me put the question in another way. Of the 35,000,000, approximately, American laboring people, less than 5,000,000 live in homes without modern conveniences—water and toilet, electric lights, etc. I will challenge any man, if he will stay out of the Dominion of Canada, New Zealand, Sweden, Denmark, and Switzerland, to find me a laboring man that lives in a house with any modern conveniences. I ask you, how are you going to meet competition in 10 or 20 years, when the rest of the world learns the art of mass production?

Oh, you say, they won't. I say they will. American business is going to foreign countries to-day. Some of it is even going where it can hire able-bodied labor for from 8 to 15 cents a day for 10 hours. And they are manufacturing products. What for? Not to bring into America and sell to America, but to meet competition in the rest of the world with the articles produced by cheap labor.

In the automotive industry outside the United States it takes three men to put one automobile into the hands of the ultimate consumer. in the United States one man in the automotive trade puts 10 automobiles into the hands of the ultimate consumer. If you believe the rest of the world won't learn how to teach the one man and equip him with machinery to put the 10 automobiles, you do not have the same

confidence in the American industrialist that I have. He is going to the rest of the world and building his industry. So I do not see any relief there.

RAISING LIVING STANDARDS STILL HIGHER

There is one other way. Can we add any more of the list of luxuries to the list of necessities? Sixty per cent of the items that 15 years ago were on the luxury list are now on the necessity list. Dare we go any further and speed up consumption in that direction? Traveling about the country, as I have done, I make it a point to ask the business man, wherever I meet him, "How is business?" For the past eight months I have been met quite too frequently with this reply: "Well, business in my line is slow." I ask you, what made it slow? The political laws, the economic laws, the economic conditions are even better in the world than 16 or 18 months ago. Then, why has American business slowed up, if it has? Well, I have a theory that I will give you by way of illustration.

Let us assume that I am the earning power for all America. In other words, on Saturday night this week there will be in my pay envelope the mass wage of America. I would have approximately $1,000,000,000. If that were true, what might I buy with my billion dollars? Why, I can buy $52,000,000,000 worth of merchandise, anything from a house and lot to the highest luxury that you can find on the list. If I buy $52,000,000,000 worth with my $1,000,000,000 of earnings, of course industry is bound to spurt up to satisfy the demands for this week's purchases. Yet the maximum that I can pay for, is my week's earning power, or $1,000,000,000. The thing I am trying to say to you is, that we have gone as far as we dare go, with safety to American business, in the expansion of credit, or the installment plan of buying.

We must have an elastic credit in America, which means we must have some installment buying. That same theory, carried to an excess, will bring ruin as truly as it came on agriculture. Why, that's all that was the matter with agriculture. Speculative expansion of credit was all at once curtailed by the Government, or a Government agency, and the financial depression for agriculture came on. We have not entirely eliminated it yet, and that class of people are demanding compensation for their losses out of the Federal Treasury, and they are basing that demand solely on the grounds that a governmental agency set the peg on the expansion of credit.

Now, the Government can not fix the point at which credit shall stop. Who will? It must be done by the combined thinking of American business, if done at all, before there is a financial breakdown in the scheme of business. It is not safe to experiment in that direction any more. In other words, I do not believe it is possible in America to very materially increase the consumption of American products, take them as a whole. That is not pessimism. It is pride. It is boasting of his superior condition to that of the rest of the world.

That being true, we are face to face with the only alternative left—to find a market outside the territory of the United States, and if the market is not there, create a market by and through the leadership of the United States, by elevating the standard of living of other people so that their demands will be increased and there will be our market. [Applause.]

CONSUMING POSSIBILITIES OF CHINA

To illustrate: I visited China a couple of years ago. Nobody knows how many people are over there, but the estimate runs from 500,000,000 to 700,000,000. Now, if there are 500,000,000 of them, I have no hesitancy at all in saying that there are 450,000,000 of them go to bed every night of their lives hungry. If through the wise, intelligent leadership of America we could restore some kind of a stable government in China and thereby increase the demands of the citizenship just for the commonest kind of necessities of life, so that they could go to bed at night satisfied as to hunger alone, instead of there being a surplus of agricultural products in the world, there would be an actual shortage to-day in every kind of a foodstuff that is grown.

Suppose that were possible. You say, "Well, that is a theory you are talking about. You are idealistic." No; I am not. We shot the commerce of western civilization right out of the mouth of an American cannon into Japan, and Japan to-day, per capita, consumes more of the products of western civilization, by a thousand times, than does China. But supposing we could elevate the standard of living in China through our leadership and help to the point where we could get those people off of wooden cleats, off of bare feet, elevate them in their standard of living to the point where they would require just a single pair of coarse shoes per annum, what kind of a stimulant would it be to the agriculture of the world to produce the hides to manufacture 500,000,000 additional pairs of shoes annually. Would it be any stimulant to commerce to carry the raw and the finished products to and fro? Would it be any inspiration to industry to manufacture not only the machinery with which to make the finished product, but the finished product itself?

I think without consuming too much time you get what I mean. The United States has an opportunity through a wise, aggressive, and firm but fair foreign policy to help elevate the standard of living of the rest of the world, and thereby furnish America with a market for all she can produce, even under competition.

I can not but make the statement that there is more unrest in the world to-day, so far as stability of government is concerned, than was present during the World War. Each of those countries will need an adjustment, and the attitude taken by America toward the adjustment that must be made in every instance will have more to do with the welfare of the individual American 10 years from to-day than any other single question that confronts us.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICIES

Now, with that statement made rather badly, and not discussed at all, I want to call your attention to America. Last spring just before Congress adjourned we began to get letters and telegrams—myself and my colleagues. Mine were all of this tenor: "Please, Congressman Begg, do everything you can to keep the United States from going to war with Nicaragua." Why, there never was a bigger hoax foisted on an innocent people than that. We could not go to war with Nicaragua if we wanted to. The soldiery in Chicago alone, if sent down there, equipped and supported by the United States Government, would conquer the whole Nicaraguan country in, perhaps, 90 days, or 6 months at the most; so it was an absolute impossibility for the United States to go to war with Nicaragua.

Then what was all the fuss about? Why, we sent a thousand marines down there. What for? To protect American lives, threatened by the revolutions that were going on, each party seeking control of the Government. American, English, and Italian people appealed to the Government of the United States for protection of lives and property. You notice I do not soft pedal the property. Why, gentlemen, if the sovereignty of my United States does not mean protection for my property wherever I am in the world, there is no sovereignty. The sovereignty of my great State of Ohio will protect my property, whether I am in Ohio or China, and the sovereignty of the State of Illinois guarantees you protection to your property.

Now, unless the sovereignty of the United States extends beyond the boundary line, where is there sovereignty? The littlest, tiniest nation in the world, and incidentally, about the youngest, Latvia—I dare say not 2 per cent of the people in this audience could even name the countries around it, it is so new and so unimportant in the scheme of things nationally—the sovereignty of Latvia goes far enough, so that if you were to injure by accident a national of that little country, in Chicago, next winter some Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress would receive a recommendation from the President of the United States that we pay to the heirs, if the man were killed—if not, to him direct—a specified sum of money. Who fixes the amount? Why, the Government of Latvia represents to the United States that "One of our nationals was damaged to that amount," and in my nine years experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have yet to hear a single man, either on the committee or in the Congress question the wisdom of the amount of money that was demanded by any country in the world for injury received by one of her nationals.

Well, if a little country like Latvia has a sovereignty that goes beyond its boundary, there must be something radically wrong with the thinking in America that begins to criticize the United States for insisting that her sovereignty extends wherever her nationals happen to be. [Applause.] Lest I be misunderstood, let me say the critics were not all Democrats by a long sight; some of the worst were on my own political side of the fence.

But let us reason this out fairly. I almost forgot, I do frequently forget, to mention the fact that we had marines down in Nicaragua for 20 years almost, until 1925, when Mr. Harding brought them out, because the Central American countries agreed to quit having revolutions. The customary way of holding an election in Central America was to have a revolution. Of course, if you can kill off the fellow in power, then you can be the head of the government. One of the representatives of a Central American government for 18 years told me that every ancestor he had died with his boots on at election time. I sometimes think, to arouse the spirit of responsibility among the electorate in America, evidenced by the small percentage of those going to the polls and voting, that it might be a good thing perhaps in America to occasionally have a revolution about election time to stir up a little interest. [Laughter.] But President Harding thought it was a bad thing. He got them to agree not to do it; then one of them that signed the agreement, General Chammora, went right home and did it. We sent the marines out, but we brought them back.

The critics would say, "The United States is getting imperialistic. We want to grab off territory. We are imposing on a little nation." And repeatedly they would say, "Give us the name of a single man that lost his life." Well, let's suppose a little riot started out in one end of Chicago and kept getting worse. You telephone down to the police station and say, "There is a riot started out here, it has been going on about an hour and doesn't seem to be breaking up." What would you say to the officer if he would ask you this question: "Has anybody been hurt or killed yet?" "No; but we are afraid they will be." "Has any property been destroyed?" "No; not yet; but we are afraid it

will be." What would you say if he would tell you, "We are sorry, but we can not send the police until somebody has been killed or some property has been destroyed"?

ORIGIN OF MONROE DOCTRINE

Now, gentlemen, that was exactly the position taken by the critics toward sending the marines, or the international police, down to Nicaragua to protect life and property. There is another angle to it and let's hurry over this: In 1815 the crowned heads of Europe became alarmed at the spread of democracy. Three of them got together and formed what was known as the holy alliance, the purpose of which was to restore the crown on the throne in Spain, and then Spain, to pay for that restoration, was to come over into the Central and South American republics and set up in their stead monarchies. About 1823 the holy alliance had performed its part of the bargain and Spain was about ready to perform her part, namely, to stop the creation of republics in America and set up in their stead monarchies. Thank God, we had a man in the President's chair that had a spinal column that was made out of bone instead of gristle, by the name of Monroe, and when he sent his message to Congress that winter he made a little speech to the rest of the world, not to the Congress, not to the American people. And here is what he said, in our language: "Any attempt by any European country to interfere with the destiny of any American will be interpreted by the United States as an unfriendly act."

Now, gentlemen, whether you know it or not, that is exactly the language used by one nation to another preceding a declaration of war in case the nation spoken to does the thing she is told not to do. Wasn't it peculiar that James Monroe had the courage to speak to all Europe combined, when the population of this country was perhaps only four and a half or five million American citizens? But Europe respected it. Monroe didn't ask for any more men for the Army or Navy or Marine Corps. He didn't ask for enlistment or another single sailor. He didn't ask for a single nickel additional for national defense; yet his pronouncement, the Monroe doctrine, was respected by all Europe, and it is my judgment it was respected because Europe heard the silent support of America.

I will say to you, gentlemen, there is not anything that is heard as distinctly in any nation or country when there is a delicate question up between this country and that as the silence of the American people. Under Grover Cleveland England, the mistress of the seas, undertook to interfere just a little bit in a little matter over in this country that she thought was her business. Put baldly and in plain English, Cleveland said to England, "Stay on your own side of the Atlantic in your interfering in the affairs of nations." England, the mistress of the seas! Cleveland, with a fleet not even a good fleet of tubs, spoke to the sea king and was respected and obeyed. Why? Simply because again Grover Cleveland had the silent support of about seventy-five or eighty million American citizens.

Then under Theodore Roosevelt Germany, the nation that builded the biggest war machine that any single nation ever built, sent part of her fleet down into Venezuelan waters on a boundary dispute, as a pretext, and in our language Roosevelt said—of course, he wouldn't say it quite as raw as I am saying it—in our language he said to the German ambassador, "We will give you just 24 hours to withdraw your fleet from the Venezuelan harbor." The German ambassador said, "Mr. President, it is physically impossible to do that."

What did Roosevelt say in reply? What would Cleveland have said in reply? What would James Monroe have said in reply? Well, he might have said, "If you can't do it in 24 hours, think it over and come back in a few days and let me know how soon you can do it." That wasn't Roosevelt's or Cleveland's or Monroe's way of talking. Here is what Roosevelt said in substance: "Unless the German Fleet is on its way out of the harbor in 24 hours the American Fleet will be on its way in." And what happened? Why, the German Fleet was on its way out. There was the biggest war machine that any single nation ever put together. Roosevelt said of it just a few years later, "Give me that kind of an armed troop, that many trained men, and I can conquer the world." Yet Roosevelt, with an army of less than 125,000, dared reiterate and restate the Monroe doctrine that had been stated by Cleveland and Monroe, and he was respected by that war machine. Why? Because, at the time of an international crisis, Roosevelt had 100,000,000 American souls that spoke to the world by their silence.

But this spring, in the puny little Nicaraguan affair, that any company of militia in a county in the United States could handle, the voice of the critic and of the demagogue was heard over in Europe so plainly that Great Britain said to us this year—and I will say to you this is not a proud thing to tell—Great Britain said to us this year, "If you don't want to protect the English nationals in Nicaragua, we will dispatch a man-of-war, fully armed and fully equipped," and it gave its name, "down into the Caribbean waters and we will protect our own."

Why, gentlemen, I will leave it to you, I don't care how bitterly partisan you may be, we either in honor were compelled to say to the nationals of the world, "We will protect yours in Nicaragua," or "You may protect your own." In other words, we were face to face with upholding the Monroe doctrine, a hundred years old, practically, or else abandoning it; and, so far as I am concerned, if the time comes to abandon the Monroe doctrine, I propose to abandon it honorably, like gentlemen, and with our heads up. We chose to maintain the Monroe doctrine. We sent the marines. Why? If we had not, if we had said, "We won't, and you can't," we would have been guilty of murder every time a national of any other country in the world had been killed.

Supposing, instead of saying, "We will protect your nationals," we had said, "You may," what would have happened? England did threaten to send her men-of-war. She would have sent them if we had granted the permission. The rattle of the anchor chain of the English men-of-war would not have been stilled before, 200 yards on the side of her, would have been an Italian man-of-war throwing out anchor, and that anchor would never have touched the bottom of the Caribbean Sea before there would have been a French man-of-war 200 yards over on the other side of her, and none of the three would have been settled in their berth before there would have been a Jap man-of-war lined up right alongside of her.

Gentlemen, to see the war powers of the world congregated in a harbor is a spectacularly beautiful sight. I have seen it. But when the war powers of the world congregate in any harbor, each being sent there to protect his own interests, there is a greater possibility of starting war than started the World War in 1914.

CONTROL OF PANAMA CANAL

Then, again, there is a bigger prize down in that country for which to fight than was the contemplated prize of the World War. What is it, you say? Why, it is the Panama Canal, and the control of the only other available route, the Nicaraguan Canal, the bottle neck through which the commerce of the world between the Atlantic and the Pacific must flow, certainly the bottle neck through which the major portion of the commerce for the Orient will flow when—you understand, I do not say "if" I say "when"—China adopts the western civilization and establishes a permanent government in a few years.

We control the Panama Canal. We control the only other available route, the Nicaraguan, and so far as I am concerned personally, what little influence I may be able to exercise, either in public or private life, the United States is the only nation that will have any influence north of the Panama Canal on any country that happens to intervene. [Applause.] And it seems to me that is the only way of maintaining the standard of life in America on the high plane that we now have it. If the United States will adopt, if the people of the country will adopt, a foreign policy along the lines I have described, firm and aggressive, but fair to the other nations—and we have never been unfair in our dealings—and have that foreign policy a permanent policy, that policy shall be too big and too sacred to be demagogued by any politician seeking his own aggrandizement.

It ought to be the policy of America, the policy of a Democratic administration and of a Republican administration, on foreign questions. Certainly the destiny of America is too sacred to be swayed and switched to meet the fortunes of political parties.

Now, if we will do that, it is my prophecy that the United States will emerge out of every one of these international complications that now exist in the world with all the honor and glory necessary to satisfy the cravings of the most enthusiastic, patriotic, and loyal American, and, what I think is of more importance, with the confidence and the respect of the nations with which we have dealings. Nothing more than that has any man a right to demand of his country. Nothing less than that ought to satisfy the least of us. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE HOOVER

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by Secretary Hoover in St. Louis on the development of Mid-West waterways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the RECORD I present the following address by Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., Monday evening, November 14, 1927:

MID-WEST WATERWAYS

Secretary HOOVER. In the past three years I have addressed many of you in support of further development of our inland waterways. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce is enjoined by the organic act creating that office to foster and promote the development of transportation. It is a subject that can interest only the serious minded, for any contribution to public thought must be by economic reasoning, not by oratory.

I am concerned with this improvement because it will contribute to the wealth and economic progress of every section of the Union. It will contribute to the unity of the Nation. It is of concern to every one of our millions of farms and homes. Your association, representing all parts of the Mid West, has been long devoted to the promotion of flood control and inland waterways; it has a record of great accomplishment. But the work is far from complete, and your work and

mine requires that we should formulate and support plans not only for to-morrow but with vision of the distant future, for the day is here when we must look to the welfare of not alone 115,000,000 Americans of our generation, but we have a responsibility toward the 150,000,000 Americans who will be living in our children.

MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL

The most important event in our national life during the past year has been one which bears directly upon the development and control of our great rivers; that is, the Mississippi flood. Sad and heart-rending as it has been in its human aspects, severe and discouraging as have been the economic losses, it at least serves to bring home to the American people the increasing dangers to a growing population which lurk in our great streams if they be not adequately controlled.

I had the honor to be chosen by President Coolidge to organize and direct the relief activities which were supported so generously by our Government and the people at large through the Red Cross. No man could occupy that responsibility and have witnessed its scenes without being deeply moved to the human necessity of immediate and final prevention of it ever recurring again.

I have little need to dwell upon the causes of the great flood and its destruction. But there is an aspect of the flood that has, perhaps, not been sufficiently emphasized. The destructivity of this flood was partly due to the rapidly increasing settlement of the flood area. This increase will continue and such dangers to our country will increase as years go on unless we establish adequate controls. The great Delta of the Mississippi River, which in reality extends from Cairo to the Gulf, has been for untold centuries the spillway for our interior rivers. They spread their annual floods over these richest of alluvial lands for a thousand miles long and from 20 to 150 miles wide. With the pressure of population our people have, more especially in the past quarter of a century, invaded the flood region. With courage and resolution they have overcome the swamp and forest; they have converted it into homes and productive farms. And in so doing they have of necessity crowded out the annual floods with peace until finally they have forced the river in flood time to confine itself to its own channel.

I need not recount to you that with the unprecedented volume of water of this year these barriers crumpled up and the river spread itself again over its old flood area. Some 750,000 of our people were compelled to flee their homes in jeopardy of their lives. Damage to their farms and villages amounted to hundreds of millions.

Such a flood 25 years ago would have wrought far less destruction simply because there were fewer people and less property in its track. If we look into the future but a quarter of a century, we can envisage even far greater dangers than those past. We may not have so great a flood again for many years to come. But the richness of these soils and the pressure of our growing people will some day see five or ten million of them settled under these levees. No one can contemplate these millions of our fellow citizens living in such jeopardy without adequate and final protection.

I believe the whole of the United States is unanimous in that we must undertake such engineering works as will give security, not only now but for the future. Our people have arrived at this conclusion because of their warm sympathy for the welfare of their fellow citizens. But, viewed from the more narrow point of view, the destruction of property is the loss of the entire Nation—it is not solely the loss of the individual sufferers. The loss of several millions of acres of crops in this flood deprived the American people of just that much goods which they might have otherwise consumed or exported, and again, every worker and every farmer in our country to some degree was a loser through the decreased buying power of flood sufferers themselves. Every investor in railways and industry of the South lost something.

Our able engineering staff under the leadership of General Jadwin will in a few weeks have consummated their plans by which these floods can be controlled. And it devolves upon my colleague and your capable townsman, Secretary Davis, to present them to Congress as the basis for legislation.

I am confident of the outcome that we shall as a Nation within the next few months have taken such action as will not only give assurance of safety to the whole of our fellow citizens in the flood territory, but that will give such security as will guarantee the continued development of this great region.

INLAND WATERWAYS

But in our necessity to remake and energetically construct such flood control works as will guarantee protection against these calamities, we must not be diverted from our march to the improvement of our inland waterways. That is as important to the suffering flood States as it is to our people elsewhere. Indeed, we have made great progress in the past year in this great improvement of our national estate, both in actual construction and in advancement of public support.

It is perhaps unnecessary to recount that every great national development in transportation must pass through many stages. There must be a situation to be remedied, there must be compelling cause for action; there must be a determination of the remedies that are available; there must be a definite plan conceived; the works must be constructed; and finally they must be used.

THE SITUATION TO REMEDY

The urgency of the situation to be remedied to a large degree grows from the economic shifts due to the war, which have brought a new setting to all our mid-continent. The necessarily large advance in our railroad rates as a result of higher wages and cost of materials since the war serves to set a row of tollgates around the Middle West. There is thus a charge, new with the war, against all goods coming into the Mid West and all goods going out. It is not as if all parts of the country and all parts of the world had been placed under a similar tax, for that is not the case.

You will find that ocean rates have returned to a pre-war basis, and thus the folks of seaboard countries do not pay these additional tolls to and from market, and therefore they have to-day a greatly increased competitive advantage over their fellows in the interior. This, together with the completion of the Panama Canal, the full effect of which was not evident until after the war, all combine to distort the economic setting of this whole Mid West.

Mid-west agriculture and mid-west industry have been placed in a new relationship to different parts of our country and to the world markets as a whole. If we would restore these former relationships we must find fundamentally cheaper transportation for our grain and bulk commodities which we export and the raw materials which we import into the Mid West.

I can possibly make this problem of economic shifts more clear by example: A great part of the agriculture which competes with our farmers lies to a considerable degree in Argentina, Australia, eastern Europe, and India. Those agricultural areas are all nearer to seaboard and their ocean rates to the common markets remain the same as pre-war, while our rail rates to seaboard on wheat, for instance, have increased about 8 to 18 cents per bushel. Therefore foreign farmers reach European markets at a less cost in proportion to pre-war than can our mid-west American farmer. In actual figures, the competing farmers from the Argentine, for instance, have felt an increase in rates of only 2 cents per bushel.

I believe there is general agreement that the cost of transportation is a deduction from the price the farmer receives at the world's markets, and besides that the price at which he realizes his surplus in foreign seaboard markets makes the price of his whole product at home, so that the effect of increased transportation rates to these markets is far greater than the bare amount as applied to exports only.

It is an enormous sum when applied to our crops and is one of the contributing causes of the farmer's postwar difficulties. It is not all the farm problem, but it is a substantial part.

While the Panama Canal has carried great benefits to our people, we can not ignore the fact that it has also contributed to distort the competitive relationships of the Mid West and our seaboard business and industry. It has drawn the east and west seaboards much closer together by greatly decreasing transportion costs and therefore tends to draw an area of Pacific's business formerly enjoyed by the Mid West toward the Atlantic States. We can roughly visualize the combined effect of the canal and higher rail rates if we set up a new measuring unit in the shape of the number of cents which it takes to carry a ton of staple goods at present rates. Using that measuring rod and taking the cheapest routes, we find that before the war New York was 1,904 cents away from San Francisco, while now it is only 1,680 cents away. But a given mid-west point, which was 2,600 cents away from the Pacific coast before the war, is to-day 3,114 cents away. In effect, this mid-west point has moved 514 cents away from the Pacific coast, while New York has moved 224 closer to the Pacific coast. A similar calculation will show that in the same period the mid-west point has moved 694 cents away from the markets of the Atlantic seaboard and South America.

All this causes certain types of mid-west business to migrate to seaboard. It steadily tends to establish manufacture nearer to seaboard and farther from the heart of agriculture, to the mutual disadvantage of both. It likewise has a tendency to limit the area of mid-west wholesale distribution. Individual merchants and manufacturers in the interior can give you many instances of it all.

From all this serious shift in economic currents in its effect on agriculture and upon business we surely have something worthy of our best effort in remedy. And remedy lies, as I have said, in finding cheaper transportation in bulk products of agriculture and in raw materials.

THE REMEDY

With the higher cost of labor and materials, we can not expect any consequential reduction in our railroad rates without ruin to that vital circulating system. Our railways have reached the highest efficiency in their history and we must maintain them in that condition. We can not close the Panama Canal, nor can we raise Atlantic Ocean and other sea rates, because the standards of living in the rest of the world, unlike our own, have not increased over pre-war, and therefore the cost of operating foreign overseas shipping is not far from a pre-war basis.

In any examination of our country for remedy we have naturally turned to a consideration of the magnificent natural waterways which

Providence has blessed us with. It is therefore our conception that we should deepen our rivers to permit modern barge transportation, deepen the outlet to the Great Lakes to permit ocean-going shipping, and to connect them all together into a definite transportation system.

THE PLAN

Your association has for long years steadily fostered and forwarded the development of inland waterways. But the national mind perhaps, until in the past two or three years, has conceived waterway development as local projects of some immediate near-by improvement, instead of in the wide vision of a comprehensive system of 12,000 miles of connected inland-water transportation reaching from the Gulf to the northern frontiers and from the Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

The plan can be simply stated:

It is to deepen the 9,000 miles of the Mississippi and its tributaries to minimum depths of 6 to 9 feet so as to permit modern barge service; that is, the Mississippi system.

The construction of the St. Lawrence shipway from the Lakes to the Atlantic, thus opening every lake port to the vessels of the world over 3,000 miles of deep waterways—the Great Lakes system.

There are other important waterway improvements of less size which bear directly and indirectly upon the Mid West. The stabilization of lake levels and deepening of the channels so as to permit full ship loading within the Lakes, the intracoastal waterways, and the continuous development of our harbors are all works which must go forward some time, but are not our particular subject to-night.

During the last year we have made great steps in progress of these plans and in the consummation of some of them. Congress has authorized the remaining unfinished links in the Mississippi system. It has increased appropriations available to $20,000,000 per year for their execution. If these appropriations continue we should see the improved upper Ohio linked with the lower Mississippi in another two years. We should see the Missouri steadily deepened to Kansas City and as far above as traffic warrants. Already barge navigation has begun upon the upper Mississippi to St. Paul and Minneapolis. I am in hopes that in not more than five years we shall see Chicago connected to the Mississippi and thereby with the Gulf by a 9-foot channel. By these works and the gradual improvement of channels up the other tributaries as traffic warrants, we shall at last replace a series of disconnected segments of river improvements into a great transportation system.

Curiously enough, I find that some of the press in outlying parts of the country still have the lingering notion that we are trying to restore the romantic steamboatin' days, with gay river steamers whistling down the reaches, with possible Mark Twains aboard. I am not adverse to romance when it can be had without cost to the taxpayers. What we are trying to do lacks that color but carries much more freight. What we want is to deepen our streams so that they become unfailing channels for flocks of steel barges, shepherded by puffing tugs. It lacks splendor and the glorious adventure of the olden days, but each flock will carry at a single trip from 4,000 to 16,000 tons more, say, than 50 old-fashioned packet boats or more than 5 modern freight trains. It is no doubt the drab toil of modern commerce, but in this bulk and in this mobility of units which can be sent to different destinations do we realize modern river transportation and modern mass handling of commodities on our inland water.

Two years ago while speaking upon this subject at Kansas City I was able to promise that this traffic and these benefits would flow as soon as we had connected up the segments of this great Mississippi system. But in so short a time as two years the demands upon even the disconnected segments have grown beyond the capacity of our equipment and already we begin to see a complete confirmation of our assurances. Last year over 10,000,000 tons of commodities moved on the lower Mississippi and nearly 20,000,000 tons upon the Ohio. The present gap in the connection of these great segments is just as if a stretch of narrow-gauge line were introduced into the New York Central main line.

Recent delegations of shippers to Washington showed that there are hundreds of thousands of tons more unable to move because of insufficient equipment on the river; and we must bear in mind that we have not yet felt the effect of the fully developed system for such great centers as Kansas City, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville, and their hinterlands are not yet connected either with each other or with St. Louis, Memphis, and New Orleans.

This should settle once and for all the contention of our critics that there was no demand in goods to be moved upon the rivers.

A component part of our inland system is the Great Lakes. In them we have the mightiest inland waterway given to any continent. They bore last year over 115,000,000 tons of traffic.

But the full influence of the Great Lakes system in remedy to the economic difficulties of the Mid West is dependent on the deepening of the channel of the St. Lawrence River to permit deep-sea shipping from the Great Lakes into every port of the world. The consummation of such an undertaking would represent the final step in 150 years of battle for the removal of barriers in this great waterway to the Mid West. It would give an effective outlet for 18 of our States to the North Atlantic.

Since I spoke before your body on the last occasion the joint board of engineers have submitted to their two Governments their report upon this work. Their conclusions were that this route is the most beneficial and efficient one by large margins, the cheapest to build and operate. In accord with the compelling interpretation of the facts, our American commission, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has recommended that its construction be undertaken.

Some months ago we requested the Canadian Government to enter these negotiations. However intricate the questions may be which are involved in these international relations, I am confident that they can be solved upon the ample foundations of broad, mutual interest and good will which have signaled our two nations since our birth. We have for a century cooperated with each other in constant improvement of this great highway. It has been part of our joint endeavor in the development of the new civilization on this continent. This final step is a task worthy of the strength and purpose of the two sister countries who have in two centuries already overcome countless obstacles in implanting the most helpful civilization of history.

THE OPPOSITION TO WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

You will find three main schools of opponents of the vigorous development of our water transportation: First, those who doubt that it will yield the economic benefits which we assert; second, those who feel that it implies undue burdens upon our taxpayers; and third, those who fear that these developments might injure our magnificent railway system.

The question is whether any one of all these projects are justified. We are no longer on theoretical grounds when we assert that Mid West transportation of bulk materials will be cheapened by these means. We have the actual beginning of experience. During the past year we have seen the Government barge line operating successfully upon the St. Louis-New Orleans segment with a rate down river on wheat about 8 cents a bushel less than by rail, and a rate up river on imported commodities of as much as 10 cents per hundred pounds less than by rail. During the past few months we have seen the barge line extended to St. Paul and Minneapolis, 12 cents per bushel lower by water than by rail, and we have seen the upriver rates on coffee and sugar 16 cents per hundred pounds less than by rail.

While we can point to these benefits, we shall not come into full realization of these services even on the lower or upper Mississippi until we have completed the other segments of the system. It is only then that we shall have diversified our traffic, established reserves of equipment, felt the benefits of private enterprise, which will give us the full values of cheaper transportation costs.

I believe that the statement often made that by the modernization of the Mississippi and the Great Lakes systems of waterways we shall decrease the freight on grain to the world markets by 10 cents a bushel is not far wrong. And by so doing we should increase the price of all grain to the farmer by 10 cents per bushel, and this 10 cents is the profit end of the price. One single year of such increase to our mid-west farmers would more than equal the entire capital outlay which we propose. I doubt if since the days when we transformed transportation from the wagon to the railroad have we seen so positive an opportunity to assist the prosperity of our people.

As to those who complain of the capital cost upon our taxpayers, it may be recalled that no great engineering projects can be consummated in a year. The completion of these projects are spread over from 2 to 10 years, even if they were all authorized to-morrow. I dare say the whole of our water-transportation projects I have mentioned could be accomplished with an increase in our present annual expenditure upon rivers and harbors of twenty millions a year. That a nation with an annual income of ninety billions can undertake to spend a tenth of 1 per cent of its national income in such works requires little argument. Upon this point we can do no better than quote the most successful statesman in economy in our national history—President Coolidge—who in his last message to Congress said, in referring to these very projects: "Expenditure of this character is compatible with economy. It is in the nature of capital investment."

Another criticism to which I have given great consideration is that the opening of these great waterways would endanger the stability of our railway system. Taking the country as a whole, the railways must ever bear the major burden of our goods traffic. And there are many classes of goods which will always go by rail even parallel with the waterways. And here is an old saying that is true: "New transportation facilities create business." It is well proved by our new highways.

At one time in our history we practically abandoned the highways and waterways for the railways. The invention of the gas engine has restored our highways and multiplied their traffic ten thousandfold. Yet the total volume of passengers and goods on our railways has increased threefold in 25 years; the next quarter of a century promises even a larger addition to our population than the last 25 years. The railways must provide for the major burden of this increase, and I believe most

railway operators agree that our railways can well be supplemented in their provision for this increased traffic by fully developed waterways. I have no fear for their prosperity.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

There must lie before us constantly the necessity to so organize these projects as to accomplish them with rigid economy and high efficiency. I am convinced that we have come into an entirely new era in the development of our water resources, and therefore we should give thought to the whole basis of our governmental organization, which bears upon control and execution of these developments, if we would have economic and efficient execution; if we would confine ourselves in rotation to the works most urgently needed; and if we would do justice by private enterprise and our taxpayers. One of our difficulties in the past has been to secure well-thought-out plans and policies in the development of our multitude of different water resources. And even when plans have been adopted we have incurred unpardonable wastes of money through lack of continuity in action. We need public understanding that appropriations for these projects must go through to completion or that they should not be undertaken.

Another of our problems requiring immediate consideration is the increase of equipment upon the river. We need to develop this question in such fashion that it shall ultimately be taken over by private enterprise, because in the long run it is through private competition only that we will have efficient use of the waterways. The Government undertook to pioneer the equipment for a modernized river through the barge line. The pioneering stage is not over and may not be over for some time. We must devise ways and means of larger equipment and devise the program for its ultimate taking over by private enterprise.

A further problem presents itself in that modern invention and our increase of population have introduced many new and complex factors into the planning and construction of some of these water improvements. So long as we are concerned solely with improving navigation upon our streams, the organization and administrative problems are comparatively simple. It is a function assigned to the Federal Government and administered by one Federal agency—the Corps of Engineers. But to-day on many of our streams we have other problems besides navigation. There is flood control, reclamation, and irrigation, which will loom even more largely 20 or 30 years hence when we shall want more land. We have problems of water distribution and water rights and domestic water. Beyond this private agencies are engaged in electrical power development under Government permit.

The most casual study of this subject will show that every different river in the United States has possibilities of development in from one to five of these particulars. Often enough these different interests conflict. The unit of development must be a drainage basin if we are to secure the full values from these our noblest resources.

Now, if you will study our Federal and State governmental agencies who have authority in these questions, you will find a most appalling lack of coordinated action.

In our Federal Government relations to these problems of navigation, flood control, power, domestic water, reclamation, and irrigation lie in four separate agencies of the Government. You will find that within our State governments we deal with these questions by from two to five different agencies. You will find also that county and district organizations—many of them—have authority on these questions.

Beyond this you will find that often enough from 2 to 20 States are interested in a single drainage. In other words, I have found it possible to compute that as many as 30 different independent governmental agencies may be interested in the development of a single drainage.

There is at times bitter conflict between these agencies and between States. I could take much of your time illustrating the friction which has grown up—the litigation which fills the courts and the conversion of these technical problems into politics with all of its inability to solve what are fundamentally engineering questions. We have in many cases abandoned the pouring of cement in order to pour out our emotions.

I need cite no greater instances than the Colorado River, the Chicago drainage diversion, and even the Mississippi flood, because the sacrifice of flood control to reclamation has been one of the contributary causes of that disaster.

I am not one of those who believe that we should ruthlessly uproot institutions, services, and relations between our States and the Federal Government in order that we may attain a paper perfection in plans of organization. What we really need is that we should build within these agencies the necessary links of coordination in such manner as will maintain both our local government and national responsibility, yet secure the coordinated development of each drainage.

Two years ago I made a tentative suggestion upon which every event since that time has brought further confirmation as to its necessity. That was that we should create separately upon a half dozen of our great drainages, where multiple problems occur, advisory commissions on which not only the various branches of our Federal Government should be represented, but that the time has come when the State governments concerned should be represented and where necessary local authorities should also have a voice; that it should be the duty of these advisory commissions to determine broad policies upon which the development should take place; that they should develop lands by which the different agencies of navigation, flood control, power, reclamation, and irrigation, and domestic water should proceed; that they should determine the economic urgency of the different segments of such plans. We have already in the Mississippi and St. Lawrence commissions a start upon this basis of organization, the former having to do with flood control alone.

I am not proposing any additional engineering staff. The material already collected and the large number of surveys ordered by the last session of Congress are a long stride toward the full provision of technical data. I do not propose that the new commissions should have any administrative authority; their only task should be to present the plans they formulate to Congress, to the States, and to the public at large. Once our legislative bodies have taken action, then the task of construction and operation should be left to responsible departmental agencies or private enterprise and not to boards or commissions.

These administrative suggestions are not proposals for centralization of government but decentralization; they are not proposals to displace the authority of Congress but to assist an already overworked body; they are not proposals of more than trivial expense but safeguarding from the waste of hundreds of millions in ill-planned development and loss of our full water resources.

CONCLUSIONS

I have stated on another occasion that the consummation of these beneficent projects are the greatest engineering undertakings of our history. They are more than that—they are undertakings worthy of the effort of mighty nations. There is nothing that so lifts the spirit, the ideals, and the faith of a people as confidence in their ability at great undertakings and the proof of this ability through fine achievement. It is the sort of display of national might and greatness which advances courage of men. There is nothing that should so appeal to the imagination of our people as the rediscovery of the resources of our continent through the application of the great tools science has given us. It is a sore need of the vast inland empire whose populations have a right to every contribution that can be made to their welfare and their prosperity. In the distribution of recovery from the war, our industrial sections have been more fortunate than the agricultural sections and their situation needs be met with no narrow spirit.

The development of our waterways will enlarge the wealth and income of all our people, will make for better homes and happier lives. It will further consummate that fine promise in the Constitution "to create a more perfect Union."

And, finally, I may again recall a statement of President Washington in recounting one of his pioneering journeys to this same Mid West. He said this:

"Prompted by these actual observations, I could not help taking a more contemplative and extensive view of the vast inland navigation of these United States, and could not but be struck with the immense diffusion and importance of it, and with the goodness of that Providence, which has dealt her favors to us with so profuse a hand. Would to God we may have the wisdom to improve them."

If we in our generation have so great a vision as the Father of our Country, we shall do it.

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Association will meet here to-morrow in Washington at the New Willard Hotel. They will discuss problems of waterways, including flood control. It would seem that this is a seasonable time to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions adopted at the last Atlantic Deep-waterway Convention held at Baltimore on September 15 to 27 last, containing as they do correlated problems concerning waterways. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD the resolutions referred to.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I suppose there is not a Member of the House who has not received numerous resolutions by various organizations on various subjects, and if they are all to be printed in the RECORD it would be burdensome. If we all came in here with these resolutions asking to print them in the RECORD, the RECORD could not contain them all. Therefore I object.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

SPEECH OF UNDERSECRETARY OF THE TREASURY MILLS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an address made by Undersecretary of the Treasury Mills, upon

taxation before the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Economic Club of Worcester, Mass., on November 11. It contained some very instructive information that may be of value to Members in the consideration of the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from New York approve of the remarks?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. Ogden L. Mills:

OUR FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM

For the fourth time in seven years the state of Federal finances is such as to permit a substantial reduction of taxes. The prosperity of the country, a sound policy of debt retirement, and wise and economical management of public affairs have combined to produce this favorable situation. The causes are obvious enough, yet in their eagerness to avail themselves of the fruits some people seem inclined to overlook the facts and to create a situation which will make difficult like efficiency in the future. As I shall point out a little later, excessive or ill-advised tax reduction is not without its serious consequences.

Rather from accident than from design, our Federal tax system is, on the whole, a well balanced and equitable one. By that I mean that direct taxes—or, as I use this term, those taxes that are not, generally speaking, passed on to the consumer—and indirect taxes—or those that are passed on—are fairly well apportioned. As a consequence there is a reasonable distribution of the burden in accordance with ability to pay. We received last year in direct taxes—that is, income or estate taxes—approximately $2,320,000,000, and in indirect taxes—that is, customs and miscellaneous internal revenue—approximately $1,150,000,000.

It is obvious that the scales lean very definitely in favor of those who are not subject to direct taxes, and while such lack of balance is unquestionably proper, yet inequalities do exist that are hard to justify; inequalities that will necessarily be accentuated should some of the existing excise taxes be repealed. They are traceable, in the main, to two causes: First, the number of direct taxpayers making a real contribution to the support of government is too limited; in the second place, the rates imposed on some classes of direct taxpayers are out of line. Under the first head I classify individual income taxpayers; under the second, corporations or their stockholders.

Under the revenue act of 1926 more than 44 per cent of the individual taxpayers were relieved from income-tax payments. In 1924, 4,489,698 individuals returned taxable net income; whereas in 1925 the number had fallen to 2,501,166. For 1925, 9,560 taxpayers returning net income in excess of $100,000 returned about 49 per cent of the total tax returned; 327,018 individuals, returning net income of $10,000 and over, returned $701,497,726 out of a total of $734,555,183. In other words, of those reporting taxes due, 2,174,148 individuals returned approximately $33,000,000 of tax, while 327,018 individuals returned $701,000,000 of tax. According to these returns less than 0.3 of 1 per cent of our population returned 95½ per cent of our total income tax; about 1.9 per cent returned 4½ per cent, and the remaining 97.8 per cent of the population returned no tax whatever. For those returning taxable net income not in excess of $5,000 the rate was 0.29 of 1 per cent. For those returning taxable income in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $10,000, 0.58 of 1 per cent.

These figures make it only too clear that, in so far as individuals are concerned, the income tax has ceased to be a national tax and has become a class tax of very limited character. This is a situation which must be accepted. The water is over the dam. But, as between individual income taxpayers, some of the inequalities should be ironed out by revision of the rates applicable to the so-called intermediate brackets.

Turning now to our second group—that is to say, the corporations or their stockholders—you will have noted that I treat the corporation-income tax as a direct tax; which, according to the definition I have given, implies that it is not passed on to the consumer, and must therefore be paid by the stockholder. I know that many business men will challenge such a conclusion, but leaving asido the indirect effects of such a tax, more especially when levied at high or excessive rates, and admitting that there are exceptions to the rule, my individual opinion is that except under unusual circumstances a tax on net income can not be shifted by the person on whom it is laid in the form of an addition to price. This, I repeat, is simply my own personal conclusion, but it is supported by competent authority.

It is in agreement with the work of the committee on national debt and taxation of Great Britain, charged with the duty of investigating the incidence of income tax. That committee decided that the issue could be reduced to a question of fact subject to statistical study. Such a study was made by them for the two fiscal years 1920–21 and 1922–23, the income-tax returns of a sample of all public companies or corporations being used as a source for the necessary data. The tabulated data indicated:

(1) A significant proportion of the total sales in each industry were made at no profit or at a loss during each quarter of the two years studied.

(2) The median range of sales were made at no profit or at small profit ratios.

(3) The trend of profits during the quarter periods studied followed the trend in prices.

The conclusion of the committee was that prices are determined in the immediate market, and that the marginal producers—those making no profits—control a significant proportion of the volume of sales at any time. Under such circumstances it would be impossible to shift the tax. The committee stated, "We conclude that the broad economic argument is true over the whole field, and for approximately the whole of the time, any exceptions being local or temporary and insufficient to invalidate it."

Conditions in this country do not seem to be essentially different. Preliminary statistics of income for 1926 show that, whereas 249,000 corporations reported a profit, no less than 164,000 reported deficits aggregating over $2,000,000,000.

It seems probable, therefore, that in the main our present tax of 13½ per cent on the net income of corporations ultimately comes out of the pockets of the owners of the corporations, the stockholders. Certainly there is no economic justification for postponing the reduction of a rate admittedly out of line on the theory that the entire tax was passed on to the consumers last year and that an immediate reduction must therefore necessarily spell a bonus to the corporations.

It has been estimated that there are some 3,000,000 stockholders in the United States. There are probably more. These 3,000,000 stockholders pay more than their just share of taxes, not only as compared with other income-tax payers, but as compared with all other classes of taxpayers. In so far as the individual income-tax payers are concerned, it must be remembered that there are only 2,500,000 of them; that the average rate of tax on their income has been reduced to 4.20 per cent; that less than 9,000 pay at the rate of 13½ per cent on their taxable income; and that that rate applies only to net incomes in excess of $110,000, whereas the 3,000,000 stockholders are taxed at the rate of 13½ per cent on their proportionate share of the income of the corporation, and this irrespective of whether their individual income is sufficiently great to subject them to the individual income tax at that rate, or, for that matter, to any individual income tax at all.

Comparing the tax paid by corporations—that is, by their stockholders—with all other classes of taxpayers, it will be found that last year, exclusive of back taxes, the former as such contributed $1,125,000,000 to the Federal Government, as contrasted with $763,000,000 paid by individual income-tax payers—many of them, of course, stockholders—and with $1,150,000,000 paid through indirect taxes by our entire population of 114,000,000 people. There is no logic or justice in such a discrimination. There are, to be sure, many advantages in the corporate form of conducting business, but these certainly do not constitute sufficient justification for such a disproportionate tax burden.

Looking, then, at the whole picture, and not just selfishly at some particular part, the most important feature of any tax revision program should be a reduction of the corporation tax rate, and, from a negative standpoint, if we desire to retain some measure of balance between direct and indirect taxes there should be no further repeal at present of existing excise or indirect taxes. It must not be forgotten that, whatever the intentions of the framers of the 1926 revenue act, the results as shown by the first full year of its operation were that indirect taxes yielded $197,000,000 less and direct taxes $192,000,000 more. Automobile taxes were reduced about $72,000,000.

There are, to be sure, other desirable changes, such as the revision of rates applicable to the intermediate individual income-tax brackets and the repeal of the Federal estate tax.

In undertaking, however, this or any other tax revision, there are two outstanding factors which must be kept constantly in mind—first, the revenue needs of the Government; and, secondly, strict adherence to the sound financial practices that have hitherto prevailed. Substantial tax reduction is assured in any event, and even if it were not, after three tax revisions downward our present situation is by no means intolerable. Under these happy circumstances, there can be no conceivable excuse for abandoning the sound principle of a balanced budget, and by a balanced budget I mean that revenues shall be adequate to cover all expenditures in any given fiscal year, so that it will be unnecessary to resort to borrowing in order to meet expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts. We have been pretty critical of foreign countries when they, under most difficult circumstances, have failed to observe the principle of a balanced budget, and have prided ourselves on our strict adherence to this principle. It is surprising, therefore, to see responsible business men advising the Congress to follow a course that will almost inevitably lead to an unbalanced budget. I am referring to those gentlemen who, without detailed and careful study of either expenditures or probable receipts, are urging tax reductions that in the aggregate far exceed the figures indicated

as possible by the official estimates. They do not criticize the estimates in detail, they do not point out in what respect, if any, they err—they satisfy themselves and expect others to be satisfied with the argument that in the past surpluses have exceeded estimates, and on the strength of that argument alone they urge the Congress to reduce taxes by $400,000,000, with a continuing surplus of only $275,000,000 in sight. They would not run their own businesses on any such haphazard basis, and they should not advise public servants to run the public business along lines less conservative than they observe in protecting their private interests.

Just a word about these so-called excessive surpluses of the past few years. It is interesting to note that if we exclude back-tax collections, less internal-revenue refunds, and the receipts from the disposal of such capital assets as railroad securities, farm-loan bonds, assets of the War Finance Corporation, and surplus war material, in the year 1923 there would not have been a surplus, but a deficit of $89,000,000; in the year 1924, a surplus of but $169,000,000; in the year 1925, a deficit of $93,000,000; in the year 1926, a surplus of $162,000,000; and in 1927, of $221,000,000, instead of $635,000,000; while the surpluses of 1928 and 1929, exclusive of special receipts from the above-named sources, are estimated at $137,000,000 and $199,000,000, respectively. Of the two billion approximately of debt retired from surplus during the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1927, no less than $1,700,000,000 is accounted for by these special temporary items, and no less than $900,000,000 from the realization of capital assets. It must be conceded that there could be no better application of the proceeds of the sale of capital assets than to the reduction of the national debt. These figures present a pretty complete answer to those people who, far from rejoicing over the existence of these surpluses, and our consequent ability to reduce the burden of the national debt, deplore them as evidences of an imaginary injustice to taxpayers.

For my part, I am confident that the great body of the American people desire to see the finances of the Federal Government so conducted that a policy will be maintained which without fail will insure a balanced budget year in and year out, and at the same time permit the steady reduction of the national debt at a reasonably rapid rate.

There is no immediate danger in so far as the second policy is concerned, but the day is not far distant when, in the name of tax reduction and of relieving the present generation, we may be urged to reduce the amount applicable to sinking-fund retirements or to change the provision of law whereby the repayment of the principal of our foreign debts is applied to the reduction of our national debt. Indeed, the second proposition has already been advanced in responsible quarters.

Such suggestions do not take into consideration how heavy debt service charges are—we had paid some eight billions in interest on our war debt up to June 30 last—and how rapidly they increase with the length of the life of the debt. Thus, for instance, if we retire a debt of $25,000,000,000 uniformly over a 25-year term, and pay an average rate of interest of 4¼ per cent, the total interest cost will be $16,000,000,000. If the term is made 30 years, over three and one-half billion is added to the total interest. If 62 years is taken, as some persons have urged, total interest would be $46,272,000,000, or nearly twice the original principal. So whereas a 25-year program would cost a total of $41,000,000,000, a 62-year program would cost $71,000,000,000.

Along with tax reduction, the economic and orderly management of the public debt has been the special problem of the Treasury since the close of the war. I wish now to direct your attention to a particular phase of this problem, namely, the tax-exempt feature of Federal bonds.

As early as 1921 the Treasury favored an amendment to the Constitution permitting the United States to tax incomes derived from securities issued by the States and their political subdivisions after the ratification of the amendment, and, conversely, permitting each State to tax the income derived by its residents from securities issued under the authority of the United States. As recently as 1925 the Treasury Department has called the attention of the Congress to the evils arising from the existence of great masses of tax-exempt securities, which offered to the wealthy the means of avoiding the payment of income taxes to the Federal Government. In the Sixty-seventh Congress a resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution along the lines above indicated passed the House, but was not acted on by the Senate. In the Sixty-eighth Congress a similar resolution was defeated in the House by 41 votes. No further action looking to the submission of such an amendment to the States has been taken.

It is probable that the time when such an amendment could have been effective has passed. There are now outstanding $15,946,000,000 of wholly tax-exempt securities, of which $11,841,000,000 have been issued by the States and their political subdivisions, $145,000,000 by Territories and insular possessions, $2,165,000,000 by the United States Government, and $1,795,000,000 by the Federal farm loan system. Since these securities are being issued at the rate of over a billion dollars a year, it is apparent that so many will be in existence before the constitutional amendment in question could be submitted and accepted by the necessary number of States that it would be ineffective. Moreover, the revenue act of 1926 reduced surtax rates to such an extent that the inducement to avoid them by resort to investment in tax-exempt securities has to a very large extent disappeared. The statistics of income for 1925 show that the total amount of tax-exempt securities returned by individuals was $5,041,000,000. The income received from these securities amounted to $230,000,000. Had these securities been fully taxable, the revenue to the Government would not have been in excess of $11,000,000.

Given all these circumstances, I have reached the conclusion that the reasons which led the Treasury to urge the adoption of a constitutional amendment relating to tax-exempt securities have been so modified by time and subsequent events, including the failure of two separate Congresses to act in the matter, as to justify a reconsideration of the problem and the following conclusions:

If States and their political subdivisions are to continue to issue tax-exempt securities at the rate of a billion dollars a year, there is no logical reason why the Federal Government should continue to issue its securities under a provision of law which only permits exemption from the normal tax. This puts the Federal Government at a serious disadvantage, a disadvantage which is very considerably mitigated, however, owing to the fact that corporations are subject only to the normal tax and that United States securities held by corporations are therefore tax exempt. On the other hand, this very situation makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the United States Government to sell new issues of its securities to individual investors. United States securities are sufficiently attractive to corporations so that the latter are more than willing to take the entire block of new issues offered from time to time.

This being the case, the price which corporations are willing to pay inevitably fixes the price at which the United States is able to market its securities, and since the corporations are wholly tax exempt on their income from such securities, whereas the individual income derived from these securities is subject to the surtax, the former are in a position to pay a price which might well make the securities unattractive from the standpoint of the individual investor. Thus, for instance, the Treasury 3⅜ per cent bonds were selling on October 4 on a basis to yield 3.25 per cent. On that basis they would have yielded to a man with an income of $100,000 from other sources, after tax payment, but 2.60 per cent; to a man with an income of $50,000, 2.83 per cent; and to a man with an income of $25,000, 3.02 per cent; whereas the corporation would get the full yield of 3.25 per cent. Three and one-half per cent three to five year Treasury notes were selling on October 4 on a basis to yield 3.51 per cent; they would yield but 2.81, 3.05, and 3.26 to individual investors with incomes of $100,000, $50,000, and $25,000, respectively, as compared with a yield of 3.51 to the corporation. The corporations were thus able to obtain the full advantage of the extraordinary quality of a United States security from the standpoint of safety, and because of this tax-exempt feature obtain a return equivalent, in so far as the 3⅜ per cent Treasury bonds are concerned, to 3.76 per cent on a taxable security, and in so far as the 3½ per cent Treasury notes are concerned equivalent to 4.06 on a taxable security. But this obviously is not true of the individual investor.

The Treasury Department is sometimes criticized for not making a greater effort to distribute its securities more widely. The situation above described under which United States securities are wholly tax exempt when held by corporations, but not wholly tax exempt when held by individuals, makes it impossible to do so. Such a situation is undesirable. During the war Government securities were very widely distributed, as the result of vigorous campaigns conducted in every community, and which reached almost every home. At the time it was held, and rightly held, that it was desirable, if Government securities were to be issued in large blocks, that they should be held by as many separate individuals as possible rather than in the hands of a few large holders. Such a feeling was sound. It is still sound to-day. But under existing circumstances, as the war loans are gradually being refunded into securities bearing a lower rate of interest—and there would be no justification, of course, for not refunding them—the number of holders of United States securities tends constantly to become more limited.

How could it be otherwise when States and municipalities are in a position to issue their securities free from all taxation? The average rate of interest paid by all States on their total indebtedness during 1926 was about 4.14 per cent. New York State municipal stock with a life of 30 years sells on a basis to yield 4 per cent to the individual investor, while the man with an income of $25,000 will receive but a net yield of 3.02 per cent on a 16–20-year 3⅜ per cent United States Government bond. Moreover, even after Federal taxes, he can receive approximately 4 per cent on the highest grade of public utility bonds.

These figures make it perfectly apparent that in so far as the individual investor is concerned the United States Government is at a serious disadvantage to-day in marketing its securities because of the provision in the Liberty loan act which limits the tax-exempt privilege to the normal tax. Under these circumstances the Treasury Department believes that the Congress should give serious consideration to an amendment of the second Liberty loan act, as amended, authorizing

the Secretary of the Treasury in issuing securities in the future to make them exempt from the surtax as well as the normal tax.

The enactment of such an amendment would not in any way interfere with the adoption of an amendment permitting the taxation of so-called tax-exempt securities should Congress and the States deem this to be desirable. But, pending its adoption, there is no reason why the Treasury Department should be put at a disadvantage in the marketing of its securities as compared with States and their subdivisions, or why individual investors who desire to acquire United States Government securities should be discriminated against. Taking the long-time view of the situation, I believe that the enactment of such a constitutional amendment is desirable, for I consider it inconsistent with our principles of democratic government that our laws be so framed as to permit any class of our citizens to escape their just tax obligations.

MEMORIALS FROM THE FLORIDA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some memorials and resolutions to the Congress of the United States from the Legislature of the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert certain memorials and resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which are as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Be it resolved by the senate, the house of representatives concurring, That—

Whereas the people of Florida, by an overwhelming majority, adopted a constitutional amendment prohibiting the State from levying in the future any inheritance or income tax; and

Whereas the State's finances are in such an admirable condition that, although it has no severance tax, no corporation tax, no corporation stock transfer tax, no franchise tax, no income tax, and no inheritance tax, it has no bonded indebtedness of any kind or character, does not owe a dollar, and has, as of the 1st of April, in its treasury in excess of $11,466,280.05 in cash, thus demonstrating beyond question that the levying of an inheritance or an income tax is absolutely unnecessary in this State; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in enacting the present revenue law providing therein for a Federal inheritance tax but allowing those States that have inheritance taxes a credit to the extent of 80 per cent of the taxes so paid, the avowed purpose of which was to force the States of Florida, Alabama, and others similarly situated to levy an inheritance tax; and

Whereas taxing the dead, either by Federal legislation or State legislation, is a capital levy and should not be resorted to except in time of war or other grave emergency; and

Whereas an inheritance tax, if it is to be written into law at all, is a prerogative of the State, a political question exclusively within the province of the State; and

Whereas Congress, by giving to the respective States that have inheritance taxes credit for 80 per cent of the taxes so paid, admits and concedes that the Federal Government does not need the revenue; and

Whereas the action of Congress, in endeavoring by Federal legislation to coerce a sovereign State into enacting legislation contrary to the wishes of the people of that State in a question of purely local concern, is unprecedented, arbitrary, indefensible, and contrary to the very fundamentals of our American form of government: Be it further

Resolved, That we protest against the passage of a Federal inheritance tax, and especially one in the form of that which has been passed, and we regard such action upon the part of Congress as unnecessary, uncalled for, indefensible, without justification, and contrary to the fundamental principles upon which the Republic is founded; that we reaffirm our confidence in the wisdom of the people of Florida in adopting the constitutional amendment prohibiting the Legislature of Florida in the future from ever levying any State income or inheritance taxes; and that the State of Florida declines to be coerced into repealing the constitutional provision forbidding the levying of taxes upon the estates of dead men, but avows its intention of forever maintaining and continuing the constitutional amendment in question: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to demand the repeal of the Federal inheritance tax and that they continue to take such vigorous action as may in their judgment be deemed best to bring this about; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Members of Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, the press of this State and of the Nation.

Approved by the governor April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA, *Office Secretary of State, ss:*

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Whereas it appears from reports of the Treasury of the United States that a surplus of funds is being accumulated; and

Whereas an excessive income tax has a strong tendency to stifle trade and cause the withdrawal of capital from active business enterprises: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress use every honorable means to amend the income tax law of the United States to the end that a substantial reduction of the tax on incomes be made.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state is hereby requested to send a copy of this resolution, under the great seal of the State, to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the press of this State.

Approved by the governor April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Concurrent Resolution 8, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Memorial 6

A joint resolution proposing a memorial to Congress indorsing the support by the Government of adequate appropriations for the support of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves

Whereas there is located in Florida two separate regiments of the Florida National Guard which are maintained to a large extent by Federal appropriation of money; and

Whereas there are also located in the State of Florida various units of the Organized Reserves constituted under the provisions of the national defense act of 1920; and

Whereas the National Guard forms an essential and necessary organization for use in peace time as evidenced by its services during the recent hurricane disaster in Florida, as well as an adequate fighting organization in the event of war; and

Whereas the people of Florida desire to see the National Guard and the Organized Reserves of the United States supported by adequate appropriations reasonably sufficient to enable these organizations to accomplish the purpose of their organization, said appropriations to be as liberal as may be consistent with the welfare of the public and the general good: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Legislature of the State of Florida herein memorializes and requests its two Senators in the United States and its four Representatives in the Congress of the United States to use all honorable means in their power to prevent the handicapping or crippling of the National Guard or Organized Reserve by the withdrawal of any existing appropriations therefrom, and that they use all honorable means in their power to secure for the use of the National Guard and Organized Reserves as liberal an appropriation for the training of such National Guard and reserves as may be consistent with the welfare of the Government, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the United States Senators from Florida, and to each of the Congressmen from Florida, to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the Chief of the Militia Bureau of the War Department, all duly certified to and under the great seal of the State of Florida.

Approved by the governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 6, as passed by the Legislature of the State of

Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Joint Memorial Resolution 3

TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Whereas the Federal Government has built at Muscle Shoals, Ala., at an expense of more than $150,000,000 a vast plant designated for the manufacture of nitrates for munitions in time of war and for the production of fertilizer products in time of peace; and

Whereas this plant has lain idle for more than eight years since the close of the World War, thus disregarding one of the specific provisions of the national defense act under which the plant was authorized, which provision was intended to result in the production of nitrates at a cost that would materially reduce the price of fertilizer to the farmers of the United States; and

Whereas the nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals representing an investment of $100,000,000, instead of being operated for the manufacture of cheaper fertilizer for the farmers of the Nation are, and have been, idle for many years while the Wilson Dam development is temporarily leased to private interests; and

Whereas the farmers of the United States are using more than 7,000,000 tons of fertilizer per year, costing more than $200,000,000, and the farmers of Florida alone are spending more than $14,000,000 per year for their fertilizer; and

Whereas we have the assurance of competent authorities that the facilities of the Muscle Shoals plant are adequate for the production of ample nitrates for the needs of American agriculture: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and hereby is, memorialized to enact at its next session such legislation as will without further costly delay start the vast Muscle Shoals plant to its intended work, which was the manufacture of nitrates for the needs of our Nation's agriculture, the production of munitions for war, and other national-defense purposes, and that any power in excess of these requirements be distributed to those States within transmission distance: Be it

Resolved further, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, GREEN, and YON are hereby urgently requested to use their most vigorous effort to accomplish the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of the State of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States, to the Congress of this Nation, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Joint Memorial Resolution No. 3 as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Memorial 7

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, asking that the grave of Territorial Governor Duval be properly marked with a bronze tablet, whereon shall be given suitable credit for services rendered as Territorial Governor of Florida

Whereas W. P. Duval, Florida's first Territorial governor, serving during the years 1822–1834, departed this life on the 18th day of March, 1854; and

Whereas the remains of the said W. P. Duval were buried on the 20th day of March, 1854, in the Congressional Cemetery, range 46, site 5, Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the said W. P. Duval served his country faithfully and fearlessly as the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and was a pioneer in the settling of the State of Florida; and

Whereas the faithful service rendered by the said W. P. Duval is worthy of recognition by the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to make suitable recognition of the service rendered by W. P. Duval as the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and that a suitable bronze tablet be placed upon the grave of said W. P. Duval, and that proper inscription be made thereon, recognizing the service rendered by the said W. P. Duval as first Territorial Governor of Florida during the years 1822–1834, and that proper appropriation be made therefor.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state of Florida be requested to send a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State of Florida, to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

Approved by the governor June 6, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 7, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Memorial 5

Whereas vast annual importations of citrus fruits are made into the United States from Porto Rico, Cuba, Jamaica, and the Isle of Pines; and

Whereas much of this fruit is picked and shipped into our country while in an immature state, thus placing upon the market fruit of low quality, unpalatable, and unfit for human consumption; and

Whereas such importation of immature fruit is received into the ports of our Nation without restriction, inspection, and regulation now being imposed upon our domestic production by Federal laws; and

Whereas this practice not only places fruit of doubtful healthfulness and low food value before the consuming public of the United States but likewise imposes undue, unfair, and destructive competition upon the citrus growers of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact at its next session such legislation as will properly regulate the importation of all immature fruit in such manner as to correct and eliminate the evils of the present baneful practice; be it

Resolved further, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, GREEN, and YON are hereby urgently requested to use their most vigorous efforts to accomplish the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of the State of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Joint Memorial 5 as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

MEMORIALS FROM THE CONNECTICUT STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a memorial to the Congress from the Legislature of the State of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. TILSON. On the subject of taxation.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The inheritance tax?

Mr. TILSON. I believe it is.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does the gentleman not know that it is? [Laughter.] I do not object—I just wanted to find out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission of the House just given to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I do so by inserting here a resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates. This resolution was agreed to by both houses of the General Assembly of Connecticut at the regular session of the legislature last April. The matter referred to is as follows:

Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas by the provisions of the Federal revenue act of 1926, which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, this State is being subjected to a form of coercion in order to compel the imposition of State death taxes at rates higher than its citizens desire to impose upon themselves for their own needs and benefit; and

Whereas any form of coercion or financial inducement to States by Federal authority is in distinct conflict with the spirit of our constitutional government, is offensive to sound policy, and is destructive of the responsibility of citizens and of States with respect to the power to levy taxes, the most vital of the powers which inhere in government; and

Whereas joint levies of taxes by the Federal Government on the one hand and by the States of the Union on the other hand are unprecedented in the history of this country, and are particularly offensive when the Federal enactment operates in any way to influence or control the exercise of sovereignty by the respective States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the judgment of the general assembly that the Congress of the United States should forthwith repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, leaving this field of taxation exclusively to the States of the Union in times of peace; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States, and they are hereby requested to spread these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to select such other means as may be appropriate to apprise the Senators and Representatives of other States of the contents hereof.

Approved April 29, 1927.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Office of the Secretary, ss:

I, Francis A. Pallotti, secretary of the State of Connecticut, and keeper of the seal thereof, and of the original record of the acts and resolutions of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of the resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates, with the original record of the same now remaining in this office, and have found the said copy to be a correct and complete transcript thereof.

And I further certify that the said original record is a public record of the said State of Connecticut now remaining in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State at Hartford this 22d day of November, 1927.

[SEAL.] FRANCIS A. PALLOTTI, *Secretary.*

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FOSS, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. Foss has been prevented from taking the oath of office on account of illness. I make this statement so that it may appear in the RECORD.

CONGRESS INCONGRUOUS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks that I made myself upon the subject of General von Steuben, and also other remarks that I made upon the subject of fight films.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when Dempsey fought Tunney in Soldiers' Field, Chicago, 19 governors, 20 United States Senators, and dozens of Congressmen sat at the ring side. Besides there were scores of State legislators, mayors, and officials of all sorts. They constituted a privileged class. The mass of people over the country desired to see the fight also, but were denied the privilege. Fight films may not be transported for exhibition purposes. Yet vivid descriptions of the fight were permitted over the radio. Newspapers carried lurid tales of the encounter. But to see with the eye was taboo. It is like the lassie telling the lad, "That's all there is; there isn't any more."

Pictures of the fighters before the event took place, pictures showing how the mighty have fallen, and pictures of the champion being acclaimed to the vast throng which gathered from all parts of the United States are permitted to be screened. Yet it is considered illegal to fill in the spaces between. It is like being invited to attend a sumptuous banquet and only being served with soup and nuts—the rest being left to the imagination.

If the law was passed way back in 1912 to prevent the encouragement of the brutal instincts it has woefully failed. The radio recital gave great emphasis to the evident ferocity of the contest; yet radio transportation of the fight was not prohibited. No; it was not a sense of refinement that prompted Congress to adopt the measure. It was rather to prevent films showing Jack Johnson to be the pugilistic champion. This indication of black supremacy ruffled the feelings of persons in certain sections of the country. That cause has now been removed.

Thousands upon thousands listened in on the radio and, I do not hesitate to say, enjoyed themselves immensely. They read the papers which gave minute descriptions of every blow struck. They viewed such portions of the motion pictures as were permitted by the censors and the law. They did not just happen to do these things—they deliberately sought them out. This is proof positive that the public at large, not blessed with this world's goods enabling them to migrate to the scene of action, demands the repeal of this clause so that they might be accorded the same privileges of their more fortunate brethren—that of viewing with the eye.

The Government itself is a business partner with the fighters and promoters. In the first Tunney-Dempsey encounter at the Sesquicentennial Stadium the Government collected over a million dollars in taxes. This included the income tax of Tunney and Dempsey. The management made far less than what the Government reaped. In the second fight the Government took in far more than a million dollars.

Recent decisions of the Federal courts have shown the preposterousness of the statute. The courts have held the film may be shown but may not be transported. Yet the films can not be shown unless it is transported across the State borders. That is like the old jingle, "Hang your clothes on the mulberry bush, but don't go near the water." That statute, as now interpreted, has given rise to a new industry—bootlegging films. Colonel Forbes, a recent inmate of Atlanta, tells us that a former President and many Washington officials viewed the Dempsey-Carpentier fight film at the country home of Ned McLean and all knew the law had been broken in the transportation of the film to Washington. Forbes added, "It was amusing to see how everyone who was there joined the purity squad when the news leaked out that the film had been shown." It is high time to clean house and wipe out this statute.

For this reason I have introduced this day an act repealing the act of July 31, 1912, which prohibits the importation and the interstate transportation of fight films.

FARMERS' FINANCE CORPORATION MEASURE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon a bill which I introduced yesterday creating a farmers finance corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on yesterday, for the consideration of Congress and the country, a bill to create the farmers' finance corporation, which would advance, through the banks to the farmers, loans on basic agricultural commodities so as to enable the farmers to hold their commodities until a reasonable price, to be determined by them, can be obtained, provided the farmers themselves desire such help.

The bill provides a complete solution of the overproduction problem, meets every reasonable objection to other farm relief bills, and without equalization fees, expensive machinery, or red tape puts the farmer on an absolute parity with those engaged in other industries or enterprises. It helps the farmer directly, not indirectly, makes clear his every right, raises no mooted questions or difficult issues, makes him the master of his own problems, and assures him of the prosperity to which he is so justly entitled.

The bill has a complete referendum and recall. It would not become binding on any individual farmer unless he so desired, and would not operate as to any particular agricultural commodity unless farmers planting 75 per cent of the acreage of that commodity desired operation of the corporation as to the commodity, and then be binding only on those so desiring. If the farmers producing either or all of the basic commodities should find unsatisfactory the operations under the bill, they could in effect repeal it at any time.

The farmers' friends, not his enemies, would control his destinies. There would be no dangerous bureaucratic control of the farmers' rights and only necessary governmental agencies with well-defined duties and powers. The bill is not in the interest of any organization, corporation, or any man or set of men other than the farmer, and is drawn with his sole and only interest in view, and yet it is not unfair or unjust to anyone.

The farmer would handle his own commodities and get their full value, with no unnecessary profit going to middlemen or

absorbed by extensive, expensive marketing machinery. The farmer and his fellows would receive for their commodities the highest possible reasonable price from the manufacturers and exporters and would get all of the price without deductions for fees, commissions, or other so-called marketing costs.

It gives the farmers a chance to become masters of their own fortune and makes clear and unmistakable the plan.

The bill, in my humble judgment, is a more satisfactory farm relief measure than any heretofore written.

But may I quote from the bill, so that it may be seen whether or not my faith is well founded?

The first seven sections and the last several sections are largely taken from the War Finance Corporation act and will not be repeated here. The part of the bill included in sections 8 to 23, inclusive, makes it different from the War Finance Corporation act, is the heart of the measure, and is as follows:

SEC. 8. That the corporation shall be empowered and authorized to make advances on farm products as collateral security to any bank, banker, trust company, or farm organization in the United States which has rendered financial assistance to any farmer, group of farmers, or farm organization, provided that—

(a) Farmers receiving such financial assistance shall have entered into a contract with the corporation as set out in section 11 of this act and shall have kept and abided by all contracts so made.

(b) The bank, banker, trust company, or farm organization receiving such advance shall have made with the corporation a contract as set out in section 12 of this act and shall have kept and abided by all contracts so made.

(c) No such advance shall be made on account of or to any farmer after the passage of this act while failing and refusing to sign the contract set out in section 11, who produces two crops of the product or products herein authorized as collateral security, unless the farmers' council, hereinafter authorized and provided for, by a two-thirds vote relieves such farmer or farmers from his or their default.

(d) Farmers planting 75 per cent of the acreage in the United States, growing the particular product offered as collateral, shall have signed contracts as set out in section 11 and be bound by such contracts at the time of the advance.

(e) After the first loans are made hereunder additional farmers growing the particular product shall sign said contract, set out in section 11, so as to bring the acreage grown by producers bound by the contract up to 85 per cent of the whole grown in the United States within 1 year from first loan; 95 per cent within 2 years, and 97 per cent within 3 years and thereafter.

(f) The farmers' advisory council, hereinafter authorized, shall have declared by majority vote that it is necessary to obtain financial assistance from the corporation in the handling of the particular commodity and made written request therefor, signed by the chairman and secretary of said council.

(g) Such advances shall not be made for more than the average price of such commodity since January 1, 1927, and then only for such amount as is approved by the council for the particular product, and notice thereof given to the corporation.

(h) The advisory council for the specific basic commodity must have passed a resolution, notifying the corporation of its action, in which it shall be provided, in accordance with the contract set out in section 11 of this act, that all farmers growing said commodity in the United States, under said contract, shall reduce their acreage cultivated in said commodity for the next year, such fractional part of the crop grown for the ensuing year as the crop thus produced, together with the part of the crop carried over from the ensuing years, will probably total only so much as will be salable at or above an average price. The percentage of reduction of the acreage of the next crop must be determined definitely, stated in the resolution and notice thereof given to the corporation and to the banks, or other organizations of the United States through which the corporation is loaning money on said basic commodity. The farmer growing this specific commodity shall be notified through his bank or organization as set out in the contract with the corporation.

(i) The advisory council must have taken off the market all of said commodity grown and owned by farmers under the contract set out in section 11 and refuse to offer for sale or permit the offer of any part thereof until there is such a demand for same as will cause the commodity to sell for a sufficient amount to pay in full the loan made by the corporation, together with all interest, storage charges, insurance, inspection and grading fees, and such an additional amount to the producer as may arise from sale of the commodity at a fair and reasonable price.

(j) The conditions of durability, preparation, processing, preserving, and marketing of such commodity, or the products therefrom, shall be adaptable to the storage or future disposition of same.

(k) The commodity shall not be of such an inferior grade as to be liable to spoilage during the period of such loan by reason of its inherent nature or inferior condition.

(l) The grades and qualities of such commodity shall be desirable in the interest of the domestic consumers of the United States or for which normally a foreign market exists.

(m) The loan or advance shall be upon a commodity properly conditioned, preserved, stored, and safeguarded.

COMMODITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 9. (a) The advisory council for each basic commodity, for which loans are authorized under this act, shall be known as the farmers' ——— advisory council, using the name of the particular commodity as a part of the name of the council, and may be appointed after the passage of this act by the governors of the States growing the particular commodity as follows, to wit: Governors of States growing 10 per cent of such commodity produced in the United States may appoint one member each; governors of States growing 20 per cent or more of such commodity may appoint two each. The Secretary of Agriculture, immediately after the passage of this act, shall notify the governors of the various States growing each basic commodity of the right of such governor to appoint a member or members of the various commodity councils. The term of office of the two younger members so appointed shall be for one year, the next two older shall be for two years, the two next older for three years, and the other members shall be for four years. After the expiration of the terms of those first appointed the term shall be for four years each. All vacancies shall be filled by the governor from whose State the vacancy occurs, except as hereinafter provided. In case of death, resignation, or removal the appointment or selection shall be for the remainder of the unexpired term.

(b) Members of each commodity advisory council shall serve without salary but shall be paid by the corporation as hereinafter authorized a per diem compensation not exceeding $20 for attending meetings of the council and for time devoted to other business of the council. Each council member shall be paid by the board his necessary traveling expenses to and from meetings of the council and his expenses incurred for subsistence, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, within the limitations prescribed by law, while engaged upon the business of the council.

(c) After appointment, the respective advisory councils may be called together for the first meeting and organization by written notice, signed by three or more such members designating the time and place of the meeting, registered to each member of the particular council at least 10 days before the date of the meeting.

(d) Each commodity advisory council shall fix its place and time of meetings thereafter, and shall remain in session for such lengths of time as may be necessary in the discharge of the duties of the council.

POWERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 10. The commodity advisory councils shall be authorized to—

(a) Find, adjudicate, and declare that such an emergency exists on account of the basic commodity handled by such council selling below its real value, or the price thereof declining so as to soon drop below the real value thereof, and notify the corporation of the desire of the council and the producers to borrow money under the provisions of this act, and of the decision of such council to withdraw from market and sale all such commodity in the United States under the contract set out in section 11, and keep such commodity off the market and not expose same for sale until such time as there is a reasonable demand for it and the commodity can be sold at a price ample to protect the corporation and producers thereof as set out in subdivision (i) of section 8 of this act.

(b) Determine and notify the corporation of the amount to be advanced on each pound, bushel, or other unit of the commodity.

(c) Determine the manner of storage and safeguarding of commodities while hypothecated or withdrawn from sale and market. The council, so far as practicable and safe, shall give preference to the storage by individual farmers of their own products under sufficient and proper requirements as to insurance, protection against theft, and deterioration.

(d) Determine the amount of reduction necessary by the producers for the next year of the commodity handled by such council to prevent the existence of an unprofitable surplus at and after next harvesting season. Notice of this decision shall be given the corporation, the banks, and other parties handling discounts in connection with said commodity, and through said banks or organizations to the producers as set out in their contracts with the corporation.

(e) Investigate and determine when the council shall under this act authorize for sale all or part of said commodity so as to protect the corporation and the producer. The advisory council may authorize a sale of all or part of a commodity under contract and permit sales so long as the designated price is secured, with a proviso that no sale shall be under the price authorized and that all authority to sell shall be withdrawn in the event the price of the commodity drops below the price fixed and determined by the council. The wishes of the producers shall be followed so far as possible in determination of which farmers' commodity goes on the market first.

(f) Determine which commodity shall be sold from time to time and notify the banks handling the discount on such commodity that the commodity is to be placed on sale.

(g) Keep an accurate account of the amount and location of the commodity under contract in the United States and whether or not same is hypothecated to secure an advance from the corporation and the amount of the advance, and generally to do any and all things necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

(h) Employ and pay such help, agents, and employees as may be necessary to carry into effect this act, and require statements and data from the corporation, banks, other organizations and producers, give in detail information helpful to the council in the discharge of its duties under this act.

(i) Have printed and mailed, free of postage, such correspondence, leaflets, and printed matter as is necessary in the discharge of its official duties.

(j) Secure and pay for such office and assembly space as may be necessary in the discharge of the functions of the council.

(k) Negotiate and secure contracts with the banks, fertilizer dealers, and other farm-supply dealers whereby additional time for payment of indebtedness due by farmers will be secured in the event said advisory council finds it necessary to withdraw from the market any farm commodity under this act.

(l) Extend in every way possible the use and marketability of the farm commodity handled by the council.

SEC. 11. The contract heretofore referred to in this act, which shall be made by producers as herein provided in order for them to become eligible for loans by the corporation through bankers, trust companies, and farm organizations, shall be as follows, to wit:

We, the undersigned producers of one of the basic agricultural commodities, specifically named as such in the farmers' finance corporation act passed by the Seventieth Congress of the United States, in consideration of (a) the benefits flowing and to flow to us under the terms of said act; (b) the obligations on the part of the corporation, the various advisory councils authorized under said act, and the banks, bankers, trust companies, and farm organizations named therein to help me and my fellow farmer growers of said basic agricultural commodity or commodities finance the marketing of said products; (c) the contract and agreement of all of these by, with, and between themselves and all parties of the United States who have or may sign a contract identical to this; (d) as well as in consideration of one dollar to each in hand paid to the other, do hereby jointly and severally agree, contract, and covenant by and with said corporation, banks, bankers, trust companies, farm organizations, said advisory councils by and with each signer of this or identical contract or agreement that we and each of us will stand to and abide by and keep inviolate the decisions and rulings of the farmers' (name of commodity) advisory council authorized by this act, and furthermore specifically agree—

(a) That regardless of whether I or we secure a loan under the farmers' finance corporation act, not to sell or offer for sale contrary to the rulings of said council, any commodity on which a loan is authorized by the corporation under the act, as a result of this contract, and hereby admit that such a sale would subject me or us to 30 per cent of the sale price as liquidated damages to be due and collectible by the farmers' finance corporation for the use and benefit of the signers of this contract who do not violate same, and hereby agree to pay said damages in the event of such a breach.

(b) That, regardless of whether I or we borrow money under the provisions of this act, I or we will from year to year during the life of this contract make such curtailments of the acreage planted by me or us in the basic commodity on which a loan is authorized under this contract by said corporation as may be determined by the advisory council as fair, just, and equitable in order not to have on hand an unmarketable surplus at and after the time of harvest of said crop, and I or we agree that any surplus produced by my or our planting an acreage in excess of that authorized by said advisory council shall become the property of the farmers' finance corporation for the use and benefit of my or our fellow farmers who make the curtailment as per this contract.

(c) Any notice given to the bank, banker, trust company, or farm organization through or from which I or we secure or am or are entitled to secure advances on the commodity grown by me or us under this contract shall be construed, and is hereby accepted, as notice to me or us of any and all decisions, rulings, and orders of the said advisory council. I or we hereby accept and approve as my or our bank for this purpose the ——— of ——— County, State of ———. If for any reason I or we desire to change my or our designation of bank, I or we will do so by notifying the advisory council in writing of such change.

(d) The curtailments of acreage herein provided for by the advisory council shall be fair and the same percentage shall be required of all farmers signing this contract.

(e) The life of this contract shall be for the full end and term of two years from the date growers planting 75 per cent of said product for the ensuing year have signed this or an identical contract, and shall have no binding force or effect upon me or any of us when there is not a sufficient number of growers as parties to the same to require the corporation to make loans as set out in the farmers' finance corporation act.

Signed, sealed, and delivered this — day of ———, 192—.

(Names of signers)

——— ———

——— ———

Witnessed by:

——— ———

——— ———

SEC. 12. The contract referred to in subdivision (b) of section 8 shall be as follows, to wit:

The undersigned bank, banker, trust company, or farm organization for a valuable consideration do hereby agree by and with the farmers' finance corporation, authorized and created by Congress, that we will lend our aid and encouragement to the farmers who borrow money from us or through us from the corporation, in their efforts to obey and keep the instructions and orders of the commodity advisory councils, and to this end will loan all farmers made eligible by said act to receive loans the full amount authorized by said commodity council, charging only 1 per cent more interest than is charged us by the corporation. It being agreed that the farmers' finance corporation is to buy said loans promptly upon request by us and the same is to be transferred without recourse except that we agree to act as agents whenever required in the collection of said loans when payment is offered at our bank. We furthermore agree that all money so collected, as well as any money advanced to use to loan to the farmers under said act shall be trust funds and shall be held by us only as the agent of the corporation.

We agree to make said commodity loans only on inspections made by authority of the advisory council and to make such reports of our actings and doings in this connection as may be required from time to time by the corporation and the advisory council. We agree to keep on file for inspection all the orders, rulings, and decisions of the council and to give such publicity through the press as is required and paid for by the council. The life of this contract shall be for such time as operations continue under the farmers' finance corporation act, and loans made through our bank are outstanding and unpaid.

Signed, sealed, and delivered this — day of ———, 192—.

Signed by ——— ———

Witnessed by—

SEC. 13. The directors of the farmers' finance corporation herein provided for may not be appointed until 75 per cent of the producers of some basic commodity have either signed the contract provided for in section 11, or it is clearly evident that said percentage will sign said contract. The members of the commodity councils appointed by the governors of the basic commodity States as herein provided are authorized and empowered to carry forward the work of securing signatures of producers to the contract set out in section 11, so as to bring this act into full force and effect, make the appointment of the directors necessary, and to bring about full operation hereunder.

SEC. 14. There is hereby appropriated $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in payment to said advisory councils for their per diem allowances, expenses, office rent, and other expenses incurred by them in advising the farmers of their rights under this act and securing signatures to said contract, and generally doing the things necessary to bring this act into full force and effect, provided a sufficient number of producers approve of the plan herein authorized.

SEC. 15. The respective commodity advisory councils in their efforts to secure signatures to said contracts and thus organize the farmers so as to solve the overproduction problem are authorized to pay for such publicity in the press and otherwise as they may find necessary and make such arrangements as they may decide proper with banks, county officials, and others to hold contracts for signatures and explain the purposes of the contract and of this act.

SEC. 16. That after operations as to any particular commodity begin under this act, the farmers who have signed the contract set out in section 11 may organize themselves into an organization of producers of said commodity in which all signers of said contract may, if they wish, take part without the payment of compulsory fees or charges, except on a vote of three-fourths of the members and such organization, if consisting of 75 per cent of the signers of said contract as to any particular commodity, may select or elect the successors of the members of the advisory council as to the particular commodity, thus supplanting the selection of the same by the governors of the commodity-growing States.

SEC. 17. The rate of interest charged by the corporation shall not exceed 6 per cent per annum, and all money arising from interest and all other sources, except repayment of principal, shall be held by the corporation as a reserve fund or surplus.

SEC. 18. The corporation shall from time to time make such advances to the advisory councils as may be certified by the chairman and secretary of the council as necessary to pay per diem and other charges due members of the council and expenses, salaries, and wages incurred in the discharge of the duties of the council.

SEC. 19. Advances for said purposes shall be made by the corporation to the advisory councils as loans when there are not sufficient funds for said purposes in the reserve or surplus fund, and shall be repaid with interest at 4½ per cent per annum whenever said reserve or surplus fund is sufficient for said purpose.

SEC. 20. Cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, hogs, and cattle are hereby designated as basic agricultural commodities, and as such entitled to the benefits of this act. The corporation may, upon proper showing, determine that any other farm, orchard, grove, dairy, or timber product is a basic agricultural commodity and entitled to loans under this act.

SEC. 21. Subject to the provisions and exceptions heretofore made, the corporation shall purchase all loans on basic agricultural commodities offered and shall require no security for said loans other than a first lien on the commodity so offered, and renew and carry said loans so long as the advisory council holds said commodity off the market. Said loans shall only be collectible out of the money arising from the sale of the same.

SEC. 22. In the event a commodity should not bring enough when sold to pay the loan held by the corporation, no claim shall be held or enforced against the producer except the said balance and 4 per cent interest thereon may be collected in future loan transactions from the particular producer out of any balance that may be due him after paying off loans, interest, and other charges in connection with such future loans.

SEC. 23. The corporation shall charge all losses against the reserve or surplus fund which arises from interest, profits, and other sources other than from the collection of the principal.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for reference to the Ways and Means Committee House bill 1, the tax reduction bill. The income-tax title, as explained in the committee report, has been arranged in accordance with the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. In order that the Members may readily find the sections of the old law from which the sections of the bill have been taken and also find where the sections of the old law appear in the new bill, I have prepared two parallel reference tables containing this information and ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed at the end of the bill for the information of the Members, so that they will have that information right along with the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman to state that that was bill No. 1. If the gentleman is just introducing that bill to-day, how does it come to be numbered 1? There were some 4,000 bills introduced yesterday. Was there some sort of arrangement that this particular bill should carry that number?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think there was a sort of understanding that it should carry that number. I did not have it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is immaterial, but it occurred to me that it is not a very good practice to have a bill introduced to-day numbered 1, when as a matter of fact we know that hundreds of bills were introduced yesterday. It does not seem to me that it is good practice to have the numbers running in that way.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the Clerk of the House understood that the bill would be introduced yesterday, but as a matter of fact it turned out to be absolutely impossible to put it into the basket yesterday.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman, of course, knows that lots of bills were prepared beforehand and given to the Clerk, and arrangements were made for numbers to be given to some bills. I have no such bills myself, but I understood that such an arrangement was made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection at all to the arrangement or plan whereby this bill should carry the number 1, but it does strike me as getting us rather crisscrossed here to have this bill come in to-day and then to carry the number 1.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think there is something in what the gentleman says. The original intention was that the bill should be introduced yesterday, but unfortunately that was not possible.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. For the information of Members interested I ask the gentleman if he can tell the House when we will reach the consideration of this bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think next Friday morning.

Mr. BROWNING. When will the bill be ready for Members to have copies of it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. To-morrow morning Members can have copies of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Rather than set such a very bad precedent would not the gentleman be willing to ask that this bill be dated December 5 instead of December 6?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, that would be wrong.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think that would be a worse practice than the other.

Mr. BLANTON. Here we have a bill numbered 1, dated December 6, and a bill numbered 2 will be dated December 5. It sets a very bad precedent in my judgment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I assure the gentleman it will not happen again.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MEMBER EXCUSED FROM ATTENDANCE

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. ROYAL C. JOHNSON] is ill at a hospital, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be excused from attendance on the House while he is unable to attend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident there will be no business reported from any committee to be considered on Calendar Wednesday, to-morrow, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the business in order to-morrow be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from Connecticut to indulge me by recalling that two years ago on the second Tuesday in the session when a similar request was made I laid before the House the figures concerning the treatment of Calendar Wednesday in the previous Congress, showing that 61 committees might have been reached on Calendar Wednesday in the course of two years, and that only 23 were in fact reached. There were 35 days on which committees might have had an opportunity to be heard. Of these, only 21 were used and they by only 15 committees of the House. A colloquy followed between the gentleman from Connecticut and myself, in the course of which he said that—

> If the occasion arises when we can not consider a bill on Calendar Wednesday that properly should be considered, the Rules Committee can take care of it.

The word "properly" is the crux of the matter. Who shall decide what is proper? It gives me the basis for pointing out to the gentleman from Connecticut that there has been no substantial change in the situation. I have not refreshed my memory but, as I recall it, in the recent Congress, as in the one before, only about one-third of the committees had their day in court. This interested me as chairman of one of the tail-end committees and as a member of another of the tail-end committees, chairman of a subcommittee reporting the hospital construction bill, one of some magnitude and importance. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation under the present routine has no opportunity of exercising its own judgment as to what veterans' bills shall be considered.

When I came here eight years ago there was still some recognition of what evidently had been thought of as the sanctity of Calendar Wednesday. If the gentleman will look through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first few years after its adoption he will observe that the whole House was evidently insistent upon the observance of the principle involved in the creation of that institution. For the last few years it has fallen into, shall I say innocuous desuetude?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will yield there, I think he is mistaken. I think in the early days of this Calendar Wednesday rule it did fall almost into innocuous desuetude by the practice of one committee occupying the time for practically all of the Wednesdays of the session, and that later the rule was amended so that a committee could take only two Wednesdays.

Mr. LUCE. But the gentleman will find in the RECORD repeated statements by Speaker Clark as to what the House meant to have accomplished and thought it finally did accomplish. I am personally of the opinion that it was a wise accomplishment. The opinion of the gentleman from Connecticut differs from mine in this regard. He is of the opinion that generally, in the mass, there is too much legislation. I am of the opinion that we disappoint the country because we do not achieve the things that it desires, and I would call his attention to the fact of our failure to accomplish what the people desire in these recent years in the solution of such problems as

those of Muscle Shoals, of Boulder Dam, of the disposition of alien property, and of the French spoliation claims; and I could add largely to the list.

Mr. TILSON. None of these matters would be considered on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. LUCE. Nevertheless my point is still of importance, as I think, that Calendar Wednesday should be made to serve its useful purpose. I respect the gentleman's judgment, and I trust that he will respect mine. In ancient times there was a city whose king made provision whereby for one day in the year all the slaves should have opportunity to say and to do what they chose, so that during the rest of the year they might follow their pursuits in contentment. [Laughter.]

I do not desire to intimate that the committees on the tail end of the list are in a state of servitude, but I do hold that each might well have one day in the year on which to lay its views before the House.

Two-thirds of the committees are now never reached. I think it grossly unfair that one-third of the committees should have the opportunity to exercise their judgment as to what matters the House should consider while the other two-thirds of the committees are denied that opportunity. In other words, "what is sauce for the goose should be sauce also for the gander." Either this rule should be abolished or it should be observed. If the gentleman from Connecticut desires the abolition of the rule, we could properly consider that; but if the rule is to be maintained, I contend that the tail-end committees in the exercise of ordinary fair play ought to have their day in court, and ought not to be precluded from it by suspensions of the rule.

Now, one more statement. Of course, there is no business to-morrow. As was pointed out to the gentleman two years ago by Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, it has been repeatedly held that this request is not necessary, because if no business presents itself on Calendar Wednesday none can be brought up. However, I do not object now to the gentleman's request for unanimous consent. I have taken the floor merely to bring to the attention of the House the fact that there are gentlemen in the House who are so zealous in their committee work and so anxious that the product of the labors they perform should have opportunity for consideration that the gentleman from Connecticut must not be surprised if, in this session, objection should be made to requests for the suspension of Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman realizes that if he now makes his objection, to-morrow the Speaker will direct the Clerk to call the committees, and the list will be called through. It will also be chalked up to the effect that all the committees have been reached once at this session. Therefore I asked unanimous consent that to-morrow's Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with on that account. To carry out all that the gentleman from Massachusetts wishes us to do, it would be necessary to start a movement to revolutionize the calendar, so that there will be more Wednesdays in the week and so that most of the time should be devoted to the business of Calendar Wednesday. This would be necessary, I am sure, if we are to consider all of the bills that all of the committees of this Congress might report.

Mr. LUCE. I do not now insist in the matter. I said before that I would not object to the present request.

Mr. TILSON. I was calling attention to the inconvenience of calling the committees to-morrow.

Mr. LUCE. I realize that perfectly. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill which I introduced yesterday to provide for a department of education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that as a Member of Congress during the last nine years I have watched closely the movement for a department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet. The more I study the question the more am I convinced of the great need for the proposed department. In 1923 and again in 1925 I had the honor of introducing in this House bills providing for such a department. I am proud again to introduce the measure with slight changes as House bill 7, believing that if it should be passed the educational and economic benefits resulting therefrom would add immeasurably to the progress of our Nation.

Almost continuously since as early as 1857 there has been before our country the proposal and need for this department. We are now beginning to realize more than ever before the wastes in funds and the losses in civic betterment and in material advancement that result from failure to establish a national clearing house for education.

Changing national conditions have made education of more and more importance, so that it is now one of our greatest national interests. During the past six years, in which I have been a member of the Education Committee of the House, the need for proper national recognition of education has become increasingly apparent. From the beginning of my membership in the committee this matter has been a live issue. It has been the subject of considerable newspaper and magazine comment, it has been debated from coast to coast, and it has gained the support not only of educators but a large number of influential national organizations of more general character. At the hearings on the various educational bills that have been before Congress during my term of office, the arguments for and against the proposal for a department of education have been presented from every angle, but I have been gratified to find that the preponderance of testimony has been in favor of the new department.

RECOGNITION OF EDUCATION IS A NATIONAL NEED

The Congress of the United States never has created a Cabinet office overnight. In every case, a new department has been established only after changing events have demonstrated a national need. Only the first three Cabinet offices—those of State (first known as Foreign Affairs), War, and Treasury—were created without great discussion, and these had already been in existence for some time under the Continental Congress when the Constitution was adopted. Every subsequent addition to the Cabinet has been made only after lengthy discussion. Searching inquiry has already been made into the question of establishing a department of education, and the need for it has been strikingly evident for a long time. There is a growing conviction that we have been omitting from the President's Cabinet a division as fundamental to national prosperity as the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture.

In 1789, when the first Congress met, following the adoption of the Constitution, the ever-popular argument was begun as to the number of departments to be established. Suggestions of a "home" or Interior Department were met by the charge that the new office was unnecessary. Growing population and expanding territory, with their accompanying complications of national life, finally brought about establishment of this department in 1849, 60 years after interest was first shown in it. At this time the Cabinet included a Secretary of the Navy and the Postmaster General, in addition to the Secretaries of the three original departments. "Interior" was a rather indefinite term, though more full of meaning 80 years ago, when the prairie States were still frontier country, than to-day. Because of the uncertainty as to the exact application of "interior," the new department was assigned unwanted duties by the other overcrowded departments, which sloughed off unassimilable interests. In 1869, when the independent department of education, which had been created two years earlier under a commissioner, was reduced to a bureau, it was included within the Department of the Interior. There it remains, national recognition of this important matter of education being made only through the Department of the Interior—a department so overcrowded with a variety of unrelated matters that it is altogether improbable that a Secretary of the Interior should be chosen primarily for his interest in education.

THE EFFECT OF CHANGING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS ON EDUCATION

Even greater changes in our national life have taken place within the memory of present generations than those which led up to the creation of the Department of the Interior. Not only has our territory been developed and expanded, not only has our population grown, but our industrial life has been revolutionized.

To-day we are traveling in high-powered automobiles, on speedy trains, by steamboat, and even in airplanes; we communicate with distant points by telegraph, telephone, and radio; but only a comparatively small percentage of our schools have made equal progress. Despite the fact that the past 25 years have seen a great improvement in school practices, education is not keeping pace with the scientific developments of our age. The result is enormous waste and loss. For elimination of such loss and the preservation of our free American educational

institutions creation of a department of education has become a matter of great national concern.

Progress in industry has not been the result of a happy accident but has followed years of serious study. A recent survey lists more than 1,000 research laboratories carrying on investigations in industrial problems, in addition to the numerous research bureaus operated by National, State, or municipal governments. The work of these industrial laboratories, where of general interest and application, is compiled and disseminated by the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, just as I hope soon to see a department of education carrying on investigations of educational questions and disseminating much-needed information about the findings of progressive schools throughout the country.

In pleading for funds for the Walter Hines Page School at Johns Hopkins University in February, 1925, Owen Young, chairman of the General Electric Co., made a significant statement illustrating my point. He said in part:

> Facts can be applied in any field. Our curse is ignorance. Facts are our scarcest raw material. This is shown by the economy with which we use them. One has to dig deep for them, because they are as difficult to get as they are precious to have.

Facts are just as necessary for education as for industry. Rather than diminishing as our country grows older, our need of educational facts and our public responsibility toward the schools is constantly increasing. To-day the problems of training our 27,000,000 school children and eliminating adult illiteracy are much greater than were the educational questions faced by the Continental Congress when it passed the ordinance of 1787, declaring that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."

The influence of changing economic conditions is being felt strongly in education. Speaking before the department of superintendence of the National Education Association last year, Secretary of Commerce Hoover gave recognition to this fact when he said:

> A century of scientific discovery has vastly increased the complexities of our national life. It has given us new and more complicated tools by which we have gained enormously in productivity and in standards of living. It has vastly increased the opportunities for men and women to attain that position to which their abilities and character entitle them. It has necessitated a high degree of specialization, more education, and skill. It has greatly reduced the amount of human sweat. It has given the adult a greater leisure which should be devoted to some further education. It has prolonged the period and widened the chance for the schooling of children. And from it all your responsibilities have become infinitely greater and more complex, for you must fit each oncoming generation for this changing scene.

To meet "this changing scene" school officials need the help of scientific investigations, undertaken on a national scale.

THE BUREAU'S SERVICE IS HELPFUL BUT INADEQUATE

No one realizes more acutely the restrictions placed on the Bureau of Education by lack of funds than does Commissioner John J. Tigert. Testifying at the hearings before the Joint Congressional Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Departments in January, 1924, he predicted:

> The Bureau of Education very shortly will be of practically no service to the educational interests of the country, because of the fact that it is so neglected and has gone along so long with inadequate facilities and is such a very small, meagerly supported organization that it is not in a position to-day to attack the great problems in research that are needed to promote education in this country.

Under a commissioner the needs of education must be presented to Congress through the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Budget, and the President. While the present Secretary of the Interior has shown himself greatly interested in education, the manifold subjects that come under the direction of this official will always prevent him from giving first attention to this matter. In my opinion, there can be no remedy for this condition other than the establishment of a department of education.

Such a department would make possible more effective and more economical administration of the many educational activities now carried on by various departments of our Government. Under a provision of House bill 7 such educational work of the Federal Government as might logically be brought together would be coordinated in a department of education. This would transfer to the new department the work now carried on by the Bureau of Education, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Howard University, and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF STATE SUPERINTENDENTS AUTHORIZED

The bill would likewise make possible the correlation of other Federal educational activities, through the interdepartmental conference on education provided by the measure, and the cooperation of the National and State departments of education through the creation of a national advisory council, to include the State superintendent of education or other chief educational official of every State and Territory in the United States. This council would constitute a clearing house for educational information. Its members would present to the secretary of education the outstanding educational needs in the various States, while they, in turn, would be offered suggestions for the promotion of education, based upon the research and investigations of the department. Since the recommendations of the secretary could never be mandatory, his influence would depend upon the soundness of his advice and the strength and wisdom of his leadership.

Without in any way changing the control of education from the State and local authorities now administering the schools, the department of education would be able to serve the States by conducting research into problems common to a number of States. Many educational questions are of such magnitude that their investigation by State agencies is impossible, while, even if undertaken by individual States, the prohibitive expense and the resulting duplication of effort would make such a procedure impracticable.

The exchange of ideas made possible through the annual meeting of the council, however, represents, in my opinion, the chief benefit to be derived from the provisions of section 10 of the bill. Great surveys in the field of education now are being conducted here, there, and everywhere. All these investigations, while of varying importance, contain something of value to teachers in every section of the country, but at present means is lacking for their coordination and dissemination. A channel for the distribution of such information would be provided by the council of superintendents, while the department of education would constitute the best possible agency for compiling this data.

Above all else, a department of education would benefit from having the leadership of a Cabinet member. A Commissioner of Education may be ever so well fitted for his position, as most of the men holding this office have been, but the very fact that he is a bureau commissioner rather than a department secretary deprives him of that prestige which is required for maximum effectiveness. Leadership, such as only a secretary could exercise, is needed for the task of giving national encouragement to education. It is necessary if teachers and school authorities are to give that voluntary cooperation which is required in the collection of research findings and reports. It is just as necessary if the approval of the public is to be gained and popular interest in education stimulated.

OPPOSITION TO CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR AGRICULTURE IS RECALLED

Prior to establishment of the Department of Agriculture in 1862 and during the next 27 years until agriculture was elevated to an executive department with Cabinet ranking, the same arguments were raised as are being brought out to-day with regard to education.

When Congress first considered placing the commissioner of the independent Department of Agriculture in the President's Cabinet unthinking people were inclined to belittle Federal research and to oppose the movement on State-rights grounds. Addressing his colleagues in the Forty-seventh Congress in 1882, when the claim was advanced that States could carry on any necessary agricultural experiments, making Federal research useless, Representative D. Wyatt Aiken, of South Carolina, replied in unmistakable terms. His statement, doubly interesting to-day because of its application to the questions involved in establishment of a department of education, follows:

> I think it is a sufficiently satisfactory reply to say that no State has ever made such an effort, no State is now proposing to undertake such a task, and probably no State ever will endeavor to accomplish such results; and if each and all the States were to attempt severally to effect these purposes there would be no uniformity of results, no general diffusion of the knowledge acquired, and consequently no general welfare of the people produced. The geographical area of this country is too vast and the interests of this people are too diversified to expect any individual State to be responsible for developments that promote the general welfare of the country. The moral power of the Federal Government must be the focus whence radiates the means of securing this industrial progress. * * *
>
> Why can not a commissioner be as potent to this end as a secretary? * * * It is not simply a change of name we desire, but it is an elevation of rank and official position. * * * The forces of the North, South, East, and West demand this elevation, believing that the

enactment into law of the provisions of this bill will in no wise infringe any man's constitutional rights nor impede his progress in the business of life and the pursuit of happiness. It will inhibit no State-rights doctrine nor centralize the power of the Federal Government, but will give just recognition and promotion to our grandest industry, which requires the daily toil of more than half of our entire population. * * * It is nothing new to make a Cabinet minister or an executive department in this Government when either the needs or the interest of the country require it.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF EXISTING FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FULLY ESTABLISHED

Authorization for creation of the Department of Agriculture and later of the Departments of Commerce and Labor was found in Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides that the Federal Government may levy taxes for the general welfare, as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

This clause has given rise to much controversy, but the interpretation given to it by Story in his great work on the Constitution has been followed by Congress in practice since the Government went into operation. As Story observes, the clause should be read as follows:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, in order to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare, of the United States; the common defense and general welfare and the payment of the public debts being the ends for which the power is conferred, and taxation a means for their attainment.

This is the interpretation placed on this clause by Hamilton in 1791, in his Report on Manufactures, who stated it as his clear opinion that the phrase "general welfare"—

is as comprehensive as any that could have been used—

And that—

there seems no reason to doubt that whatever concerns the general interests of learning, of agriculture, of manufacturers, and of commerce, are within the sphere of the national councils as far as regards an application of money, the only qualification of the generality of the phrase in question which seems to be admissible is this: That the object to which an appropriation of money is to be made must be general and not local, its operation extending in fact, or by possibility, throughout the Union and not being confined to any particular spot.

President Monroe in an elaborate and cogent paper entitled, "Views of the President of the United States on the subject of material improvements," submitted with his veto in 1822 of the Cumberland road bill, took the same view. His attitude is expressed in the following sentence:

My idea is that Congress have an unlimited power to raise money, and that in its appropriation they have a discretionary power, restricted only by the duty to appropriate it to the purposes of common defense and of general, not local, national, not State, benefit.

Since the Civil War there has been no President who denied the right of Congress to raise and appropriate money for purposes of general welfare because such purposes were not within the fields in which Congress is, by other provisions of the Constitution, empowered to legislate.

The appropriations made annually since 1862 for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Bureau of Mines, and the Bureau of Fisheries can find no justification except under a power to raise and spend money for "the general welfare."

It will be noted, too, that by the Adams Act, the Smith-Lever Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, Congress has made appropriations of large sums of money raised by general taxation for the advancement of education throughout the country.

In establishing a department of education, therefore, the Congress would simply be following a long-established precedent. Besides, our Government is already engaged in education. In addition to funds for the Bureau of Education, more than 30 separate appropriations for educational activities are now made annually by the Federal Government, but many of these activities could be taken over by the new department. The policy of making land grants to the States for public schools and universities was begun by the land act of 1785, reaffirmed in 1787, and extended by the Morrill Act of 1862. This has resulted in the States receiving approximately 150,000 square miles of public lands for school purposes in addition to thousands of square miles of so-called swamp lands, the proceeds of which in many cases have been used for schools.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE DIRECTS ATTENTION TO EDUCATION

Our national responsibility toward education was given consideration in the annual message of the President at the opening of the Seventieth Congress, on December 6, 1927, when he recognized in striking terms the need for creation of a department of education and relief. Such a department was included in the proposal for the reorganization of the executive departments of the Government, first presented to Congress in 1923.

In his annual message of that year Mr. Coolidge gave his approval to the plan for a department of education and relief, and on July 4, 1924, addressing the annual convention of the National Education Association at Washington, D. C., he reiterated his opinion that such a department would be beneficial to the country. Reorganization was again recommended by the President in his annual messages of December, 1924, and 1925, but this year in his message to the Seventieth Congress, December 6, 1927, he omitted mention of general reorganization and centered attention on the reorganization of the Federal educational activities in the following words:

For many years it has been the policy of the Federal Government to encourage and foster the cause of education. Large sums of money are annually appropriated to carry on vocational training. Many millions go into agricultural schools. The general subject is under the immediate direction of a Commissioner of Education. While this subject is strictly a State and local function, it should continue to have the encouragement of the National Government. I am still of the opinion that much good could be accomplished through the establishment of a department of education and relief, into which would be gathered all of these functions under one directing member of the Cabinet.

In spite of our Government's fundamental interest in education, in spite of compulsory education laws and free tax-supported schools, we have in our country a higher percentage of illiteracy than any of the other leading nations. The census places 6 per cent of the population of the United States in this class. Even this figure does not indicate the real state of affairs, for practically everyone who has attended school, no matter for how brief a period, is listed in the census as literate. A more practical record of actual conditions was brought out by the examination of drafted men during the World War, when it was found that at least one-fourth of our young men were unable either to read a newspaper intelligently or to write a letter in English. Such a situation makes education a matter of national as well as State concern.

STATE AND LOCAL CONTROL OF SCHOOLS GUARANTEED UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

From the earliest days of our Republic education has been encouraged by our National Government, but control of the schools is a State matter, guaranteed so by the tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, which reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Nevertheless, just as was the case 60 years ago, when the department of education was first established, though only temporarily, the chief argument of the opposition is that the right of the States and local communities to administer their schools would be infringed upon by the creation of such a unit in the Government. On the contrary, a department of education, as provided in House Resolution 7, rather than interfering with the present control of either public or private schools, would result in a great stimulation of interest in education and would be of the greatest benefit to State and local school officials. Through the work of the department information regarding the best school practices developed from coast to coast would be compiled and made available for educators everywhere, whether in public or private institutions. Though expanding the work now carried on by the Bureau of Education, the new department would continue to serve the same democratic purpose for which the bureau was organized, and in so doing would preserve all of the rights of the States in educational matters and make available to all the benefits offered by the department's studies.

Distribution of information has been accepted as a national function and is now carried on successfully in agriculture, commerce, and labor, but it is greatly neglected so far as our schools are concerned—neglected in spite of the fact that a fourth of our population, either as pupils or teachers, is constantly engaged in the one enterprise of education. To give that fourth of our people deserved recognition and to insure the future welfare of our Nation, to make more effective the greatest instrument for establishing and perpetuating our democratic form of Government, to hasten the removal of illiteracy, and to bring together the most sound educational facts bearing upon our industrial, commercial, and intellectual welfare, a department of education is essential.

REPAIR OF NAVAL SHIPS

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on an item in the deficiency appropriation bill for the repair and reconditioning of ships.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there is an item in the deficiency appropriation bill for the repair and the elevation of the guns on two battleships, and in my 10 minutes' time I am going to ask the Clerk to read a resolution which I desire the membership of the House to hear.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 42

Whereas legislation has been enacted into a law authorizing the expenditure of $13,500,000 for the elevation of guns and the reconditioning of the battleships U. S. S. *Oklahoma* and U. S. S. *Nevada;* and

Whereas out of this sum it is proposed to expend $940,000 for the elevation of guns and $1,740,000 for alterations and repairs which are reported to provide new officers' quarters on said ships; and

Whereas it is claimed that such an expenditure will violate the spirit of the disarmament conference, set a precedent for the expenditure of more than $100,000,000, and cause a reconstruction program which will probably affect every ship of this type in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That before any money shall be appropriated for this purpose the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of the House a select committee of seven members for the Seventieth Congress, and which said committee is hereby authorized and directed to make a complete inspection of such ships and to obtain estimates from outside authorities as to the cost of any repairs that might be needed on said ships and such other additions as are estimated for in the schedule of items reported to the Naval Affairs Committee.

For the purpose of said inquiry the committee, or any subcommittee designated by it, shall have the power to send for persons and papers, administer oaths or affirmations, to take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House or during any recess of the House, and may hold its sessions at such places as the committee may determine.

Such committee shall have the right at any time to report to the House in one or more reports the result of its inquiry, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

That the committee shall have the right to employ such experts as may be needed in making this investigation.

The Speaker is hereby empowered to issue subpœnas to witnesses upon the request of the chairman of said committee at any time, including any recess of the House, during the inquiry of the committee; and the Sergeant at Arms is hereby empowered and directed to serve all subpœnas and other processes transferred to him by the said committee.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the resolution just read be referred to the Committee on Rules. Is there objection?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, that is not necessary. It would go to the Committee on Rules if it were dropped in the basket.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I thank the gentleman. I just wanted the House to know that since the convening of the last session of Congress the minds of the American people have undergone a great change with respect to the usefulness of battleships. The President of the United States has just called attention in his message to Congress to what is needed in the way of additions, additions to aircraft, submarines, and cruisers, but nothing was said with respect to battleships. There is no one who can successfully make the statement that the expenditure of $13,500,000 will render these two battleships any more efficient than they are at the present moment in an engagement with aircraft. Therefore, if we are going to expend huge sums of money for our national defense, let us put the money where it will do some real good and not appropriate in the deficiency bill millions of dollars to recondition a couple of old ships that can not be utilized in any modern war with any major nation, and such an authorization would establish a precedent for the expenditure of approximately $100,000,000. For that reason I am bringing it to the attention of the House at this time, and for the additional reason that the deficiency appropriation bill will probably be brought in here to-morrow with some $6,500,000 for the purpose named in my resolution. Such a waste of public money should not be countenanced by this Congress.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am not directing my remarks to the subject matter. If the gentleman does not propose to drop the resolution in the basket and have it referred in the usual way, then in order to be printed it will have to be taken out of the RECORD by the bill clerk.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I thank the gentleman. I only asked permission that when it was introduced it be referred to the Committee on Rules, where it rightfully belongs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 7, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

136. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement showing claims for refund approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

137. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To equalize the pay of certain officers of the Marine Corps with that of officers with corresponding service in the Navy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

138. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting schedule of papers and documents which are not needed on the transaction of public business and which have no permanent or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

139. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of rental collections on account of public buildings and sites, privileges, and general rents under the control of the Treasury Department outside of the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

140. A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 3, 1927, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims; to the Committee on Claims.

141. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting statement showing what officers and employees of the branches of the Government service under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures.

142. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures under the contingent appropriations for the Navy Department (civil) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

143. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of European corn-borer control campaign for the period March 14, 1927, to October 31, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

144. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the number and cost of publications issued by the Panama Canal during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

145. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement showing the detailed expenditures from the appropriation, "Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, 1927"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

146. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports on expenses of loans and expenditures from repayments of foreign loans through the fiscal year ended June 30, 1926; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

147. A letter from the office of the Attorney General, transmitting list of suits arising under the public vessel act of March 3, 1925, in which final cases were entered, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on Claims.

148. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the cumulative sinking fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

149. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting annual report of operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, of the Postal Savings System (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

150. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report in detail giving the number of the various publications issued by the Treasury Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

151. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of the proceeds of all sales of old materials, condemned stores, supplies, and other public property for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

152. A letter from the Director of the United States Botanic Garden, transmitting certain information required by section 4, act of May 22, 1908, relative to travel from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia, in connection with official business during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

153. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting list of special deposits with the Treasurer of the United States for account of the Department of Commerce, the total sum $27,364.43 on June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce.

154. A letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting statement of the distribution and cost of the publications issued by the Federal Trade Commission during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

155. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the War Department have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

156. A letter from the Chief of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, transmitting report showing the publications issued during the fiscal year 1927, the cost of preparation, printing and paper, and the total number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

157. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the annual report of the office of the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

158. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting combined statement of the receipts and expenditures, balances, etc., of the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

159. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers subject to the law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5800. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 574) granting an increase of pension to Lester L. Coffee, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 5774) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 5775) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended July 2, 1926; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Kings Mountain, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5778) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Newton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5779) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereof of a Federal building at Lincolnton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 5780) to provide for the further carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of July 31, 1918, in favor of certain employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 5781) to declare a portion of the battle field of Westport, in the State of Missouri, a national military park and to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire title to same on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 5782) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, relating to isolated tracts of public land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5783) to grant extensions of time of oil and gas permits; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5784) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 5786) defining the policy of Congress with respect to flood control, the protection and improvement of navigation, and conservation upon and along the Mississippi River, its tributaries, inlets, and outlets, consolidating certain Government activities with respect to such flood control and protection and improvement of navigation, creating the Mississippi Valley Waters Control Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 5787) to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5788) to amend an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5789) to authorize the award and supply of service medals to individual soldiers as prescribed by Army Regulations for the rendition of certain services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 5790) to create a department of public education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct and maintenance of said department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5791) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Madison, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5792) for the erection of a public building at Lake City, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Greenville, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5794) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cedar Key, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5795) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Mayo, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5796) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cross City, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Williston, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Trenton, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Starke, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide

supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 5801) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Perry, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Monticello, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 5803) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge Co., of Lansing, Iowa, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Lansing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 5804) amending the law regarding the retirement of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 5805) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay officers and Filipinos formerly enlisted as members of the National Guard of Hawaii for field and armory training during years 1924 and 1925, and to validate payments for such training heretofore made; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 5806) to authorize the purchase of real estate by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5807) for the erection of a Federal building at Jackson, Jackson County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5808) to amend section 25 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1879, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 5809) for the purchase of a site for the erection of a post-office building at Morganfield, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 5812) to provide for the erection of a public building at Everett, Bedford County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) to provide for the erection of a public building in the borough of Tyrone, Blair County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 5814) to equalize retired pay of Army officers who were over 45 years of age when originally appointed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 5815) to repeal the excise taxes upon automobile chassis and bodies and motor cycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5816) to amend the postal laws requiring bonds of assistant postmasters, cashiers, and clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 5817) to provide for the paving of the Government road extending from St. Elmo, Tenn., to Rossville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5818) granting the consent of Congress to J. H. Peacock, F. G. Bell, S. V. Taylor, E. C. Amann, and C. E. Ferris to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Prairie du Chien, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 5819) to amend section 15 a of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5820) to authorize the construction of a memorial building at or near the battle field of New Orleans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5821) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to construct and equip a light vessel for the Passes at the entrances to the Mississippi River, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5822) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to remove the quarantine station situated at Quarantine, La., and to construct a new quarantine station at or near New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5823) to amend section 563 of the act approved September 21, 1922, and known as the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5824) to create a commission to ascertain the feasibility of constructing the Nicaragua Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5825) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the State of Louisiana the property known as Jackson Barracks in the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5826) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Louisiana State Museum, of the city of New Orleans, La., the silver bell in use on the battleship *New Orleans;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5827) to repeal the laws authorizing the purchase of uniforms, accouterments, and equipment from the Government at cost; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 5828) to extend certain benefits under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to Charles A. Martell; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5829) to extend certain benefits under the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, and the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to S. S. Klauber; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5830) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Monticello, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5831) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at McGehee, Desha County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5832) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Stuttgart, Arkansas County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5833) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at England, Lonoke County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5834) to prevent the sale of cotton and grain in future markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 5835) to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy jurisdiction over oil and gas leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior on lands in naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPEARING: A bill (H. R. 5836) for the erection of a public building at Gretna, La., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5837) to increase the salaries of certain postmasters of the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5838) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Harvey, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 5839) to subject shipments of pistols in interstate commerce to the police powers of the several States and Territories upon arrival therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 5840) for the erection of a Federal building at Napoleon, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 5841) to amend section 15 of the autonomy act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands"; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5842) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOODRUM: A bill (H. R. 5843) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such land in the town of Blacksburg, Montgomery County, Va., as may be necessary for the location of a post-office building in said city, and also to construct a suitable building thereon, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5844) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such land in the city of Radford, Va., as may be necessary for the location of a post-office building in the said city, and also to con-

struct a suitable building thereon, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 5845) to authorize appropriations for the recreation, amusement, comfort, and health of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5846) to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 5847) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Jasper, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Resolution (H. Res. 42) appointing a committee of the House of Representatives to make inquiry before reconditioning battleships; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, against the passage of a Federal inheritance tax, and especially one in that form which has been passed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting the establishment of military schools or camps for the purpose of training aviators upon the present Government fields of Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia in De Soto County, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting an investigation and survey of a canal being constructed across the Peninsula of Florida, with the intention of it being taken over by the Federal Government for improvement, operation, and maintenance; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 5848) granting a pension to Mary A. Handel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5849) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 5850) granting a pension to Mary Lovell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOIES: A bill (H. R. 5851) granting a pension to Clara Daniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5852) granting a pension to Sarah Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 5853) granting a pension to Thomas McGowan Seal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5854) granting a pension to Anna H. Valer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5855) granting a pension to Edgar M. Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5856) granting a pension to Mellir Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5857) granting a pension to Burl A. Fry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5858) granting a pension to C. A. Sahms; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5859) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5860) granting an increase of pension to William E. Norton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5861) granting an increase of pension to Zenas A. Hinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5862) granting an increase of pension to Dudley J. Howell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5863) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5864) granting an increase of pension to McKinley Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 5865) for the relief of Bertha Boresom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 5866) granting a pension to Elizabeth Oswalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5867) for the relief of the legal representatives of Gallus Kerchner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5868) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5869) granting a pension to Clarence E. Phifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5870) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 5871) for the relief of Ralph C. Busser; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) for the relief of William C. Gray; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5873) granting a pension to Henrietta V. Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5874) granting a pension to Barbara Sylvester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5875) granting a pension to Joseph D. Keane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5876) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Haney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 5877) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5878) granting an increase of pension to Mary Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5879) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Voorhees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5880) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Sears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5881) granting an increase of pension to Adelia Satterly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5882) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. Gaylord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5883) granting an increase of pension to Julia Cramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5884) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Marchand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5885) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Lasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5886) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Wentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5887) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Onderdonk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5888) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Zoller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5890) granting a pension to Rosina Hammersly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5891) granting an increase of pension to Lorena Daniels Wample; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5893) granting a pension to Sarah J. M. Cotton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5894) for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co. of Fayetteville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 5895) granting a pension to Emma Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5896) for the relief of W. P. Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5897) for the relief of Mary McCormick; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 5898) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept such decoration, orders, and medals as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 5899) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the legal representatives of the West Bank of Tennessee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 5901) granting a pension to Augustus R. Hammerle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5902) granting a pension to Theodore E. Bock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 5903) granting a pension to Anna E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5904) granting an increase of pension to Elisie M. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5905) granting an increase of pension to Ralph A. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 5906) granting an increase of pension to Ellen L. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Alton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 5908) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Raymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 5909) granting a pension to Frances McLeod; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5910) for the relief of Ralph Ole Wright and Varina Belle Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 5911) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Winship, widow of Enoch L. Winship; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5912) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Blazer, widow of David Blazer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 5913) granting a pension to Earl Edward Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5914) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Abbey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 5915) granting a pension to Mary Rowe Welsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 5916) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5917) granting a pension to Charles T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 5918) granting a pension to Josephine W. Dade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5919) granting a pension to Tishia Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5920) granting a pension to Arthur Bentley Nall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5921) granting a pension to Lucy C. Ratliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5922) to reimburse Ben C. Rash for amount expended by him in developing a loading device for the Lewis machine gun to meet the urgent need in connection with the use of said gun by the War Department during the war; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 5923) for the relief of the Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 5924) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 5925) for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5926) for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 5927) granting a pension to C. S. Kerns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5928) granting a pension to William O. LaMotte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 5929) granting a pension to Frank Horn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of Jesse W. Boisseau; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5931) for the relief of Thomas Heard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5932) for the relief of Arthur Moffatt, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5933) for the relief of Mabel L. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5934) granting a pension to Frank M. Fast; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5935) for the relief of McAteer Shipbuilding Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5936) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5937) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Ollom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Burlingame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5939) granting a pension to Alice Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5940) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) granting an increase of pension to Ann Peavy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5942) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Helmenstine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 5943) granting a pension to Clara F. Randolph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5944) for the relief of Walter D. Lovell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5945) for the relief of the heirs of Henry H. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5946) for the relief of William L. Dunlop; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5947) granting a pension to Eleanor S. Bugbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5948) for the relief of George Joseph Boydell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) for the relief of Rose L. Kiefer, widow of Theodore E. Perin, now the wife of Peter E. Buell, individually, and for the use and benefit of Edna J. Perin and Olga G. Perin, her minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) for the relief of Alice Sarrazin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5951) for the relief of Frank Marcordes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5952) for the relief of Robert Michael White; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5953) for the relief of E. L. F. Auffurth and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 5954) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Gleesettle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5955) granting an increase of pension to Theresa McCleary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Sage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5957) granting an increase of pension to Maria Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5958) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Blanchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5959) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Slawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5960) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lake; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5961) granting a pension to Viola Scanlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5962) granting a pension to Sarah R. Garrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) granting a pension to Mary Chilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5964) granting a pension to Catherine Gollen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5965) granting a pension to Delila A. Lilerbridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5966) granting a pension to Anna N. Ford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 5967) granting a pension to Clarence W. Delaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5968) for the relief of Byron Brown Ralston; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5969) granting a pension to Thomas Samuel Garen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5970) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Ellsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5971) for the relief of William S. Welch, trustee of the estate of the Joliet Forge Co., of Joliet, Ill., bankrupt; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 5972) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPEARING: A bill (H. R. 5973) for the relief of Louise St. Gez, executrix of Auguste Ferré, deceased, surviving partner of Lapene & Ferré; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5974) for the relief of the Whitney Supply Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5975) for the relief of Prentice O'Rear; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) for the relief of the heirs of Gen. Dick Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) for the relief of Clifford D. Ham, collector general of customs, administrator of Corinto Wharf, Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 5979) granting an increase of pension to Mabel L. Shumway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5980) granting a pension to Joseph Serra; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5981) for the relief of Clarence Cleghorn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 5982) granting a pension to William D. Duerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5983) granting a pension to Laura Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5984) granting a pension to Nannie A. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5985) granting a pension to Phoeba L. Diggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5986) granting a pension to Mary E. Cogdill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5987) granting a pension to Lucy Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5988) granting a pension to Lucinda Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5989) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 5991) granting an increase of pension to Elvira A. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 5992) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Learned; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) for the relief of George C. Hussey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5995) for the relief of John F. O'Neil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5996) for the relief of John W. Reardon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 5997) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5999) granting an increase of pension to Minnie T. Goodhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Heffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6001) granting a pension to John E. Wyatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 6002) granting an increase of pension to Edward Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6003) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) for the relief of Nell Mullen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) for the relief of Edward J. Boyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6006) for the relief of Patrick J. Langan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) for the relief of John Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6008) granting a pension to Anthony B. Toye; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6009) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Finney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6010) granting a pension to John Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6011) granting a pension to James H. Stanfill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6012) granting a pension to Christopher Stotler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6013) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Cissell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUM: A bill (H. R. 6015) granting a pension to Richard G. Hogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6016) for the relief of the heirs of Elias Hackley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6017) for the relief of Edward W. Conway; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6018) to pay the heirs of J. H. McVeigh, deceased, the sum of $10,375; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

58. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Central Craft, Chicago, Ill., requesting action looking toward a reduction of immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

59. Also, memorial of Patriotic Sons of America, Cincinnati, Ohio, advocating passage of bill to deport undesirable aliens and other persons of foreign birth who have entered the United States illegally; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

60. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle and King County, Wash., for increase in pensions for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

61. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Joint Memorial Resolution No. 3, passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, with reference to Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

62. Also, Senate Memorial No. 3, passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, for the investigation and survey of this cross-State waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

63. By Mr. PRALL: Petition against the compulsory Sunday law, received from citizens of Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, *December 7, 1927*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 6, 1927)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

STATUE OF ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

A message from the House of Representatives was announced, when

Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, appeared and said:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that the House has passed the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3), in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Alexander H. Stephens, presented by the State of Georgia, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his distinguished humanitarian service.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. What is the request?

Mr. GEORGE. For the immediate consideration of the House concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of a statue of Alexander H. Stephens in Statuary Hall, placed there by the State of Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	La Follette	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McLean	Shortridge
Bingham	George	McMaster	Simmons
Black	Gerry	McNary	Smith
Blaine	Gillett	Mayfield	Smoot
Blease	Glass	Metcalf	Steck
Borah	Goff	Moses	Stelwer
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Stephens
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Swanson
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Thomas
Bruce	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Pine	Tyson
Couzens	Hayden	Pittman	Wagner
Curtis	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Edwards	Keyes	Sackett	Willis
Ferris	King	Schall	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITION—SERVICE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GREENE presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas under the existing conditions newly elected Members of Congress do not take their seats unless at a special session until the elapse of more than a year after their election; and

Whereas Members of Congress who are not reelected continue to serve and vote for their constituents for the duration of the short session, although their successors have been elected; and

Whereas such conditions are not in furtherance of the best interests of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That Congress be requested to submit a constitutional amendment to the several States which would provide that Members of Congress should take their seats within a short time after their election; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of State is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Vermont Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

S. HOLLISTER JACKSON,
President of the Senate.
LOREN R. PIERCE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved March 3, 1927.

JOHN E. WEEKS, *Governor.*

STATE OF VERMONT,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of joint resolution requesting Congress to submit constitutional amendment to the several States relative to the time Members of Congress take their seats, approved March 3, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Montpelier this 3d day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] RAWSON C. MYRICH,
Deputy Secretary of State.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREENE:

A bill (S. 265) granting a pension to Ada L. Nay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 266) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Sexton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 267) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Moore (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 268) granting a pension to Monica Buckley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 269) granting a pension to Sarah M. Shaw (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 270) granting a pension to Margaret De Voe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 271) granting an increase of pension to Myra O. A. Potter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 272) granting an increase of pension to Rosalia Dodge (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 273) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Bean (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 274) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Welker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 275) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Skeffington (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 276) granting an increase of pension to Betsey E. Ash (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 277) granting a pension to Emma Armstrong (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 278) granting a pension to John B. Crowell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 279) granting a pension to Molly Adams;

A bill (S. 280) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Anthony;

A bill (S. 281) granting an increase of pension to Ellanora Barr;

A bill (S. 282) granting a pension to Belle Bobbitt;

A bill (S. 283) granting a pension to Edward Bowden;

A bill (S. 284) granting a pension to John H. Briscoe;

A bill (S. 285) granting a pension to Malcolm Cameron;

A bill (S. 286) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Cotton;

A bill (S. 287) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Denton;

A bill (S. 288) granting an increase of pension to Pedro B. de G. Fernandez;

A bill (S. 289) granting an increase of pension to John W. Garner;

A bill (S. 290) granting a pension to John Hendricks;

A bill (S. 291) granting an increase of pension to Myron W. Howe;

A bill (S. 292) granting a pension to Adam McCollum;

A bill (S. 293) granting a pension to Frank X. Marks;

A bill (S. 294) granting a pension to Harmon Everett Meacham;

A bill (S. 295) granting a pension to Edith Taylor Moore;

A bill (S. 296) granting a pension to Sylvia J. Moore;

A bill (S. 297) granting a pension to Maria Morse;

A bill (S. 298) granting an increase of pension to Frank Baldwin Norris;

A bill (S. 299) granting a pension to Agnes O'Neil;

A bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Wilbert E. Parsons;

A bill (S. 301) granting an increase of pension to William F. Priest;

A bill (S. 302) granting an increase of pension to Hannah E. Russell;

A bill (S. 303) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Ryan;

A bill (S. 304) granting a pension to Henry M. Schlabach;

A bill (S. 305) granting an increase of pension to William G. Simpson;

A bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sydney Skidmore;

A bill (S. 307) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Smith;

A bill (S. 308) granting an increase of pension to Scott F. Stevens;

A bill (S. 309) granting a pension to William Swain;

A bill (S. 310) granting a pension to Prudens Trana; and

A bill (S. 311) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 312) for the relief of Charles B. Malpas; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 313) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Bethel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 314) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bliven (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to Eliza B. Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Chapman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 317) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Cox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 318) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Dunham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 319) granting an increase of pension to Mary Frances Eddy (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 320) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Ford (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 321) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Foye (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 322) granting an increase of pension to Annie Gage (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 323) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Haskins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 324) granting an increase of pension to Lena Hook (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 325) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eddy Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 326) granting an increase of pension to Ella E. Kenney (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 327) granting an increase of pension to Anna Lenau (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 328) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Lindsey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to Margaret McKenzie (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 330) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Matteson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 331) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Matteson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Amanda Hill Molten (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 333) granting a pension to Hattie Quebec (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Quebec (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Sheldon (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 336) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Staples (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 337) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Taylor (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 338) granting an increase of pension to Annie H. Thayer (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 339) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Van Amringe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAYARD:
A bill (S. 340) granting a pension to Mary E. Kinney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 341) for the refund of estate tax erroneously collected;
A bill (S. 342) for the relief of George B. Booker Co.; and
A bill (S. 343) for the relief of Sallie Stapleford, Mrs. J. C. Stuckert, Mary E. Hildebrand, Kate Wright, Mary M. Janvier, Harry L. Gray, Frank D. Carrow, Harry V. Buckson, George H. Swain, Claude N. Jester, and Charles H. Jamison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:
A bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Ida Clement; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:
A bill (S. 345) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Cunningham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:
A bill (S. 346) granting a pension to James Corcoran;
A bill (S. 347) granting a pension to Stephen Crotty;
A bill (S. 348) granting a pension to Edwin Duner;
A bill (S. 349) granting a pension to William H. Comerford;
A bill (S. 350) granting a pension to Mary E. Johnson; and
A bill (S. 351) granting a pension to John Donahue; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:
A bill (S. 352) granting a pension to Susan B. Hancock;
A bill (S. 353) granting a pension to Flora A. Hubbard;
A bill (S. 354) granting a pension to Catherine A. Miller;
A bill (S. 355) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Petigrew;
A bill (S. 356) granting an increase of pension to Ellen H. Sharp;
A bill (S. 357) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Rice; and
A bill (S. 358) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Crary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
A bill (S. 359) for the relief of William H. Brown; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 360) for the relief of John James Kirwan Koughan;
A bill (S. 361) for the relief of Douglas B. Espy; and
A bill (S. 362) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Lloyd Lafot; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 363) for the relief of Louise M. Cambouri;
A bill (S. 364) for the relief of E. J. Hendrycks; and
A bill (S. 365) to extend the provisions of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, as amended, to L. J. Turner; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 366) for the relief of Clyde Leonard; and
A bill (S. 367) to authorize the President to appoint Alonzo Edward Wheat a second lieutenant, Philippine Scouts, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 368) granting a pension to Sophronia O'Neill;
A bill (S. 369) granting a pension to Mabel Helen Bean;
A bill (S. 370) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Hart; and
A bill (S. 377) granting a pension to E. A. Holman and Geline W. Holman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:
A bill (S. 371) for the relief of D. Beatrice Selvitz;
A bill (S. 372) for the relief of Joe W. Williams; and
A bill (S. 373) for the relief of the State hospital of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLEASE:
A bill (S. 374) for the relief of Lulu Chaplin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARREN:
A bill (S. 375) granting an increase of pension to Rosa A. Morris (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 376) granting an increase of pension to Anna Kline (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDGE:
A bill (S. 378) granting an increase of pension to Matthew A. Maloney; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 379) for the relief of William R. Boyce & Son;
A bill (S. 380) for the relief of Charles H. Niehaus; and
A bill (S. 381) for the relief of George Fischer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:
A bill (S. 382) for the relief of Joseph F. Thorpe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS:
A bill (S. 383) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Hinkle (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 384) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hines (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 385) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe M. Jones (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Emma B. Menear (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 387) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Lowman (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 388) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Park (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 389) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Nicodemus (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 390) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Mills (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 391) granting an increase of pension to Irwin O. Carson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 392) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Cole (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 393) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Lime (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 394) granting an increase of pension to Marion Thacker (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 395) granting a pension to Jennie S. Weaver (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 396) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Belt (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 397) granting an increase of pension to Emily F. Capen (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 398) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Brownlee (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 399) granting an increase of pension to Carmelia T. Brandon (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 400) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Brady (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 401) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Kinsey (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 402) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ferguson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 403) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Gaunt (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 404) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Harroun (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 405) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Heckendorn (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 406) granting an increase of pension to Jerusha Hemphill (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 407) granting a pension to Mary E. Dalgarn (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 408) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Mikesell (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 409) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kelly (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 410) granting a pension to Thomas Kinney (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 411) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Cornwell Wilhelm (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 412) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Fields (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 413) granting a pension to Albert W. Dumm (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 414) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Allgower (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 415) granting a pension to Louis N. White (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 416) granting an increase of pension to Mahala J. Stoner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 417) granting an increase of pension to John F. Conrad (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 418) granting an increase of pension to Mary Costello (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 419) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Springsted (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 420) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Bagley (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 421) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Thacker (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 422) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Strohm (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 423) granting a pension to Anna L. Barnard (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 424) granting an increase of pension to Salena Blyth (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 425) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Beekman (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 426) granting an increase of pension to Susan Barnum (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 427) granting an increase of pension to Minerva R. Rigby (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 428) granting an increase of pension to Eva Ross (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 429) for the relief of Martin C. Kieffer, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 1, by Mr. NORRIS, opposing the seating of FRANK L. SMITH as a Senator from the State of Illinois.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, during the brief years of my service here I have been called upon on three different occasions to consider charges against Senators elect involving the improper use of money in elections; that is, with reference to three different Senators. It is the most unwelcome incident which can come up in the duties of a Senator. In one of those instances the Senator was finally denied his seat. In another the Senator, after a vote, retained his seat. In the last instance the Senator resigned in the face of what seemed almost certain exclusion. In one of the instances the amount expended in the primary, if I recall the figures correctly, was between $125,000 and $130,000. In the other case it was something like $195,000. I voted in each instance against the Senator retaining his seat.

What I have to say to-day is not indicative of my views upon the cases now before us when they shall be presented in the manner in which I feel they ought to be presented to the Senate; that is to say, when the course of procedure shall have been disposed of, my position upon the merits of the controversy is yet to be announced. What I have to say at this time relates alone to the rights of the parties in presenting this far-reaching controversy.

No contest with which I am familiar has raised more interesting or more important questions than the controversies now before us. Almost every question which could possibly be of concern to the Senate in discharging its duty under the Constitution arises in connection with these two controversies.

The power which the Senate has over its Members is very great. When we are acting under Article I, section 5, clause 1 of the Constitution, I do not know of any limitation on the power of the Senate save and except the judgment and the conscience of the Senate.

Not only, Mr. President, is our power great and our jurisdiction wide, but the controversy, in the way in which it must inevitably be presented, brings forward about as delicate a question as could be before the Senate under any circumstances. An individual comes here bearing the credentials of his State, and the Senate assumes and has the authority to pass upon his fitness to occupy a place in this Chamber. It assumes and has the authority to pass upon the regularity of his election. It amounts to this, that it is really a controversy between the State and the Federal Government or, in my opinion, more specifically speaking, between the people and the Senate; this is about as grave a situation as could be presented. When the Senate assumes to say that the man whom the State has chosen has not been chosen properly or that he is disqualified to sit, it is exercising a power than which there is none more hazardous for it to exert under the Constitution. When the voters have spoken by their votes, made their approval, it is a serious thing to say you have selected your Senator, but we reject him. I do not doubt our power, but in the exercise of such stupendous power there is carried a solemn admonition that it should be exercised with due regard and with due respect for the rights of all parties.

These two controversies arise out of what is claimed to have been the improper use of money in the primaries; and the first question which logically presents itself is what power, what authority, has the Senate to deal with primaries, or what authority has Congress to deal with them, and what relation does the primary bear to the election upon which we must pass under Article I, section 5 of the Constitution? It has been contended, and it is still contended, that the primary is so detached and distinct from the election that it can have no bearing upon the validity of the election; that while it might be that the conduct of a candidate in a primary would be of such immoral nature as to disqualify him to sit as a Senator, yet, as a part of the machinery of election, the primary is so dissociated from the election proper that it could not be regarded, even if corrupt, as having tainted the title growing out of the election.

With that proposition, Mr. President, I am wholly unable to agree. I think the most important question before the Senate in connection with these controversies is the power and authority of the Senate and of the Congress over primaries. There is a certain element of injustice, not to say chaos, if the Senate or if the Congress has the power to deal with primaries, for us longer to hesitate to prescribe the rule which shall govern with reference to primaries, so far as the use of money or the amount of money is concerned. I not only think that we have the power, but I think, under the fearful conditions which obtain in the country at the present time, the highest obligation rests upon the Congress to exercise that power and to define what the Congress conceives to be the proper use of money and the amount which may be lawfully expended in primaries as well as in elections.

Perhaps it is not necessary to discuss this phase of the question at great length, but it has a relevancy to the proposition which I arose particularly to discuss. I wish, therefore, to accentuate it to some extent. Article I, section 4, of the Constitution provides that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The only authority which a State has to hold a primary with reference to Senators and Representatives, the only authority which it has to provide machinery by which a candidate may be nominated, either in convention or by a primary, is derived from section 4 which I have just read. If a State has authority to provide for the nomination of Senators or Representatives, if the States, in their respective jurisdictions, have that power, it is by virtue of this provision of the Constitution. In other words, if the word "elections" here is not sufficiently broad and comprehensive to cover all the steps and to embrace all the machinery necessary from the beginning to the end to hold an election, including registration, nomination, and the final vote, then the State has no authority under the law, and it has not had under this provision of the Constitution, to provide for the nomination of Senators and Representatives. It should be borne in mind that this is not one of the powers or rights which originally belonged to the States and which they delegated to the National Government.

This is a right growing out of the organization of the National Government, a power which it created for itself and the execution of which it chose to leave to the States to a certain extent. The election of a Senator is a right growing out of the organization of the National Government. The framers saw fit to provide that in the first instance the State might prescribe the manner in which such election should be held, but the same power which the State has under this authority the National Congress has if it chooses to use it. The provision of the Constitution—"but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators"—gives the National Government the unquestioned power, if it sees fit to do so, to hold elections for Senators and Representatives. The Supreme Court has decided very explicitly that when the National Government sees fit to exercise this power it may exercise it in part, in cooperation with the State governments, or it may take complete control of the election of Senators and Representatives.

If we begin, then, with the proposition that the primaries held were legal primaries, properly arranged and provided for by the States—as I have no doubt they were—we are compelled to admit that if the National Government sees fit to deal with the subject it has the power to do so; and the Supreme Court has held that when the National Government acts upon this subject or deals with it, its rule is paramount and controls any action which the State may have seen fit to take.

The Constitution has given to the Congress the power to hold elections; that has been determined. The Constitution also provides—and we are very familiar with the rule—that Congress has the power to make all laws necessary to carry into execution the powers granted to it. If we view this from another standpoint, to wit, that the power to hold elections has been granted to the National Government, then the power necessary to the holding of a proper election is granted, because Congress has the power to pass laws to carry into execution the general powers granted. If a State should see fit to refuse to hold a primary or otherwise to nominate a Senator or to nominate a Representative, there could be no doubt, it seems to me, that the National Government could and undoubtedly would arrange for the holding of the election; and if Congress should arrange for the holding of the election, it would have the power to do all which was necessary to the holding of an orderly election. It could provide the machinery from the first step to the last. It could exercise an authority as full and complete as the States now exert.

It has been said that when the Constitution was adopted there was no such thing as a primary, and that the fathers could not have contemplated that a primary would be included in this general provision. It is true that there was then no such thing as a primary, but there was such a thing as a candidate, something with which the fathers were entirely familiar; there was such a thing as providing candidates and arranging for the registration of voters and for elections. The naming and selecting of candidates in order to have somebody to elect was likely familiar to the fathers. Undoubtedly, the particular matter of providing the candidate, whether by conventions, or by primaries, or any method which the Congress might see fit to choose, could well be included within the power to hold elections. If the Congress could provide for holding elections it could provide for all the steps and all the machinery necessary, such as nomination of candidates, registration, and the final vote.

I do not care to go further into detail. At another time, perhaps, and under somewhat different circumstances, it will be proper to discuss this phase of the subject. My contention for the present is that the Congress has the power—it is the power of self-preservation—to hold elections and to hold them properly, and I feel that the Congress ought, particularly in view of present-day conditions, to exercise the power, and, so far as the use of money and the proper conduct of primaries is concerned, to pass legislation to control them.

It is further contended, and very earnestly and by able men, judges, lawyers, and Senators, that in passing upon the qualifications of a Senator we are confined to the questions of age, inhabitancy of the State, and citizenship. It is urged that as the Constitution defines three qualifications, they are the only ones which we can consider in passing upon the qualifications of a Senator. Neither will it be necessary to discuss this contention at length, but I am clear that we have the power to pass upon the qualifications of a Senator and are not confined to the questions of age, inhabitancy, and citizenship.

The men who were delegated to put the Constitution of the United States in proper form and to give it its style have been complimented many times since then for the masterly manner in which they performed their task. It has always seemed to me that, masters of English that they were, had they had in contemplation the proposition of confining the qualifications of a Senator to the three mentioned in the Constitution, instead of saying that no one shall be a Senator unless he has reached a certain age, and so forth, they would have said that everyone who has reached the age of 30 years and has been an inhabitant of his State for the requisite time, and so forth, shall be qualified to become a Senator. They did not do that; they left the matter as it is now provided in the Constitution. It seems to me that we have the power here to pass upon the qualifications of Senators beyond the range of the three particular qualifications designated in the Constitution.

I will digress long enough to read a few paragraphs from arguments of distinguished Members of this body who have preceded us and then pass on to the main question in which I am interested.

But even without this amendment [the fourteenth amendment]—

Said Charles Sumner—

I can not doubt that the original text is sufficiently clear and explicit. It is nowhere said in the Constitution that certain specified requirements, and none other, shall be qualifications of Senators. The word "qualifications," which plays such a part in this case, occurs in another connection, where it is provided that each House shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own Members. What these qualifications may be is to be found elsewhere.

Senator Edmunds discussed this matter at some length upon a very important occasion, and he said:

Senators will observe that these are negative statements. They are exclusive, everyone of them. It is not declaring who shall be admitted into the Senate of the United States; it is declaring who shall not be eligible to election to this body; that is all. * * * We declared in our Constitution that a certain class of persons should never under any circumstances, whatever their other qualifications might be, be Senators of the United States. No alien should be a Senator. Did it, therefore, follow that every citizen, male or female, black or white, rich or poor, sane or insane, innocent or criminal, should be a Senator? Not by any means, I take it.

Under Article I, section 5, we have the power to pass upon the elections, returns, and qualifications of Senators. If there is any limit to that power save the sound judgment of this body, I am unable to find it; I do not believe it exists. As was so well said by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] yesterday, it is liable to abuse. So is almost any power that can be found in the Constitution because somewhere, at some time, somebody must render a final judgment or make final disposition of the subject. It is indeed a vast power, and when we consider that we may exercise it in contravention of the wishes expressed by a State it becomes a delicate and ominous power. All this, in my opinion, we may do by a majority vote. We may pass upon his qualifications, we may pass upon the validity of his election, and may do so by a majority of the Senate.

I conceive that we are proceeding wholly under article 1, section 5, clause 1, and not at all under article 1, section 5, clause 2, and that under that clause our power is practically without limit.

Mr. President, the question is, when we come to exercise this power, what should be the procedure here in the Senate? I speak to-day not particularly in the interest of the two cases which are before us, but I am speaking of what I conceive to be the proper procedure in all cases where a State sends a man here with a certificate of election valid upon its face.

I feel that it ought to be the established, settled procedure of the Senate, when we come to pass upon the acts of the State and review its judgment and pass upon the qualifications of its representatives, that it ought to be understood that at some time and in the proper way that State would be heard, and heard upon an equality with those who challenge its actions, heard with its full constitutional representation in the Senate, and heard through the voice of the one whom it has chosen to represent it. It is here that I find myself in the unfortunate position of disagreeing with those with whom I have thus far traveled.

I can not get my consent to deny to the State of Illinois or to the State of Pennsylvania, or to the 800,000 men who voted for the candidate in one State, and about that number in the other, the right to be heard here upon the floor of the Senate through their chosen representatives. I concede all that is claimed—that after the hearings shall have been completed, after all rights shall have been tolerated, it is absolutely not only within our power, but it is our duty if the facts warrant, to purge the Senate of corruption; but in passing upon that question the procedure becomes almost as vital as the power which we are going to exercise after the procedure has been closed. The right to be heard upon the basis of equality before the tribunal is one of the sacred principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, a dominating principle in the civilization of the English-speaking race.

This matter came to me for consideration when I first came to the Senate, I think in the very first few months of my service. A Mr. Smith had been elected from Maryland. It was in March, 1908. When Mr. Smith presented his credentials an objection was made to his taking the oath, and a motion was made to refer his credentials to the committee.

The motion was ultimately defeated. This particular case was not of transcendent moment in the sense that there was any question about the validity of Mr. Smith's certificate from the standpoint of corruption in his election; but it involved the question of what should be done with a certificate when it was presented here by a sovereign State—whether the party should be permitted to be sworn in upon the face of that certificate, or whether he should stand aside until it should be determined whether or not the certificate was in all particulars valid.

Senator Culberson said:

The issue as presented in this case is not whether Mr. Smith from Maryland was lawfully elected to the Senate, but having presented to the Senate credentials, regular in form, showing no objection to his being sworn, upon the face of the certificate, the question is: Whether that shall be done.

That was the exact proposition which, thus early, presented to me for investigation; and I had much more time to investigate those things then than I have now. I investigated in view of the particular matter before the Senate and also as a matter of general and historic interest. Upon the strength of that issue, I made the brief which in a large measure I am following to-day.

Mr. Smith was finally seated, after considerable debate. Those who voted for the seating of Mr. Smith were Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Borah, Mr. La Follette, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Piles, Mr. Smoot, Mr. Teller, and Mr. Warner, together with all the Democratic Members voting. I call attention to this case to indicate what has been my view of the matter during these years, obtained in the first instance through an investigation in which I could have no possible prejudice or bias. Time and reexamination have served to confirm the view therein entertained. In my opinion, Mr. President, that has been the practice of the Senate practically since its organization, with the exception of the precedents which were established in the reconstruction period; and no one ever goes to the reconstruction period for precedents to be followed. With the exception of those days, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the procedure of the Senate has been to admit the party to the floor to take the oath and to be heard in his own defense when the certificate was valid upon its face.

Those cases which seem to be exceptions are cases in which the validity of the certificate was really involved. Where it was in no sense involved, at any time or in any way, the procedure has been practically uniform. I do not say there has been no exception, because there have been a multitude of these cases; but I have not been able to find any exception to the rule.

One of the most noted cases, and one which I think ought to be very persuasive, was the case of L. Q. C. Lamar, the distinguished Mississippian who came here in 1877 and presented himself at the bar of the Senate to take the oath. Objection was made to his having the oath administered. At the time that the objection was made there was on file in the archives of the Congress an extensive report made by a committee of Congress. The objection was based upon the proposition that no election, in the true sense of the term, had been held in the State of Mississippi. Charges of force and fraud and misconduct and those things which were characteristic of the contentions of that time with reference to those conditions were found in this report. Those who objected to Mr. Lamar's being sworn in asked that the report be read. The position taken by Mr. Blaine, Mr. Conkling, Mr. Thurman, of Ohio, and others only less distinguished, was to the effect that, regardless of what was in the report, regardless of what bearing it might have upon the ultimate right of Mr. Lamar to hold the seat, the certificate bearing the seal of the great State of Mississippi entitled Mr. Lamar to take his oath.

When you take into consideration the standing and reputation and character of the men who took part in the debate, the intense feeling which prevailed at that time in partisan matters, and the conditions which it was asserted existed in Mississippi, it seems to me that that is a precedent which is well worthy of our consideration at this time; for, notwithstanding the awful conditions which have been portrayed in regard to these elections, notwithstanding the fact that they may be steeped in corruption, and notwithstanding the fact that their seats may ultimately be denied to these men, the right to be heard, the right of their States to be heard, the right of the voters to be heard, in my judgment, is an inherent right; and the character of the man who carries the certificate has nothing to do with that inherent right. It is a right which belongs to all, the wicked as well as the good, the unjust as well as the just.

Mr. Blaine said:

> I hope the Senate will not adjourn when a motion is pending to swear in a Senator whose credentials are entirely regular, against whom there is no contest.

That is, no contest by another Senator.

> If there is anything at all affecting his election, it is something for labored investigation in the Senate; something upon which prima facie we have no possible power to pass. This is the case of a Senator who has just the same right to be sworn in now as I had yesterday. * * * We are to determine, here now, whether the Senate of the United States will say that a Senator who has no contestant, elected by a single and undisputed legislature, his credentials bearing the broad seal of the State, and signed by the undoubted governor of the State, shall be stopped on the threshhold for an investigation. It is a dangerous thing to do.

Allen G. Thurman, of Ohio, the Old Roman, said:

> No matter what is contained in the report, nothing in it goes to the prima facie right of Lamar to a seat in this body. It may be a matter for the Committee on Privileges and Elections to consider after he has been sworn in if objection is made to his retaining his seat; but his credentials make a prime facie case entitling him to a seat here, and there is not one word in all that report which touches the action at all.

This matter was debated at some length, and Mr. Lamar was permitted to take the oath. It is a notable case. To me it is a controlling precedent.

On the next day, or a day or so thereafter, Hon. John T. Morgan, of Alabama, appeared at the bar of the Senate and asked permission to take the oath. Again objection was made, and again these reports were referred to, and again the Senate debated the matter. In this debate Hon. Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, took part; and there was no man in public life at that time who was more willing to give credence to the alleged conditions in the South at that time than Mr. Morton, and he frankly so stated; but he stated that the prima facie right of Mr. Morgan could not be challenged by that condition of affairs.

I shall not pause to read these statements at length. On March 22, 1871, Mr. Goldthwaite, of Alabama, presented his credentials. I call attention to this particularly in order to get the view, again, of Senator Thurman, of Ohio:

> That where a Member of this body is elected by a legislature competent to elect him, and presents to the body the proper credentials of his election, it is right, and such has been the uniform usage of the Senate, to admit him to his seat, and if there be ground of contest to consider that afterwards. * * * I do not know of one single instance in which that rule has been departed from. I have read every contested-election case that has happened in the Senate from the organization of the Government down to this day; * * * and I find not one single decision to the contrary.

He then calls attention to certain decisions which have been supposed to be in contravention of that rule and distinguishes them by showing that the contention was whether or not the certificate was valid; but where the certificate was unquestioned, he continued, there was no exception to the rule.

In the Lorimer case the Senator elect was permitted to be sworn.

In the Newberry case the Senator elect was permitted to be sworn.

In the Stephenson case the Senator elect was permitted to take the oath. There are many precedents to the same purport, but I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate to read them.

Mr. President, I am perfectly aware that precedents do not necessarily control the action of the Senate. We may disregard them if we think they were unwisely established; and therefore, aside from the precedents which might be cited at length, let us ask what is the fair, just, and orderly procedure in a case of this kind?

Suppose we permit Mr. SMITH to take the oath; suppose we permit him to speak in his own behalf; and suppose we permit the people of Illinois to have their full constitutional representation and to speak here upon the floor of the Senate. If we find the facts to support our conclusions, what have we lost, except, perhaps, two or three hours of time? It is within our power, when the conclusion has been reached, or when the procedure is at a close, to exercise our judgment and exclude him; and for myself, I shall feel infinitely better after I have voted, if I do vote, to unseat Mr. SMITH, if I know the people of Illinois have no reason to complain of the Senate in its procedure.

So far as this particular case is concerned, let us assume that it will make no difference in the final result. But, as has been said so often, and as was stated by the able Senator from Nebraska, this is such a stupendous power that you can easily imagine its arbitrary and unjust use under certain circumstances. If we contend that by a mere majority vote we can stop a man at the door of the Senate and say that he shall not be heard, or that his State shall not be heard, we have established a rule of procedure which may and undoubtedly will in time lead to a great wrong. There is one way in which the use of that arbitrary power, in my judgment, can be to a large extent made impossible. If a man comes here with his certificate, and the State which has sent him here is permitted to be heard upon the floor of the Senate, and permitted to state its case to the country, to use this body as a forum where they may present their cause, it will be practically impossible ever to unseat a man except on the most solid and confirmed reasons. It will be difficult to either drop into injustice or

through partisan bias or passion override the rights of the voters.

It has been said that Mr. SMITH has been before the committee. He went before the committee as a witness. He went before the committee at a time when he did not hold the certificate of his State. He was there a citizen. But there is no place in the committee room or elsewhere where he as a witness is placed upon an equality with those who challenge his right to a seat, which equality he has when he comes here and takes his oath and speaks by authority of the State of Illinois. Does anybody who holds a seat in this Chamber contend that the rights and privileges and influence of a witness is to be compared with the privileges and powers of a Senator speaking as a matter of right for a sovereign State?

If his discussion of his view of the matter modifies our view, he is entitled to that benefit and his State is entitled to it. If he fails to modify our view, we have recognized and tolerated to the fullest extent the right of a State to be heard, and there will be no regrets upon our part when we shall have acted. All will have had the fullest opportunity to be heard, one of the best assurances that full justice will be done.

As I said a moment ago, I have been called upon three different times to pass upon these questions, and I shall never be able to efface from my memory the pathos of the closing scene in one of those controversies. The Senator had spoken ably in his own defense. He sat in his seat until the vote was counted and announced, and then, alone, dishonored, disgraced, disowned and banished by his colleagues, he passed out of the door of this Chamber. Strong men wept, and everyone was moved by the scene. It is a high and honorable ambition to seek a seat in this body and to see that ambition thwarted upon the threshold of its realization, whatever may be the reason, stirs the deeper feelings of the human heart. But the Senate met its task, it met the supreme test, it fulfilled the expectations of the fathers, it justified the place of dignity and power given to it in our form of government; it tolerated a hearing and respected the rights of the parties, and then unflinchingly proceeded to the final discharge of its duty. Infinitely better, my friends, infinitely better, than to deny the man whose ambitions are wrapped up in the situation, and the State whose honor is wrapped up in the controversy, the right to be heard upon the floor of this body.

The famous case of John Wilkes has been cited many times since this controversy arose. John Wilkes was one of the most disreputable characters who ever broke into English politics. He was guilty of all kinds of offenses which the law defined, and a great number which the law did not define. While a member of the House of Commons, he published an article known as "North Briton No. 45." It was a denunciation of the King and his ministerial advisers.

For that John Wilkes was arrested, a general warrant was issued, and his house was searched, and he was finally expelled from the House of Commons. He went to Paris and remained for some three or four years, and returned. He was a candidate for reelection in the city of London district, and was defeated. He submitted himself to the voters of the Middlesex district, and was elected. When he appeared for the purpose of being sworn, he was denied the right to take the oath. Mr. Bleackley, in Life of Wilkes, says: "Wilkes appeared at the bar of the House, claimed his right to take the oath. This request was denied."

The Wilkes case has been cited here to a proposition to which it has, in my judgment, no relevancy whatever. There never was any contention, as I read that record, that the House of Commons did not have the power to exclude him or to expel him. There was never any contention, so far as I am able to read the record, that the House of Commons did not have the power to pass upon his fitness and his qualifications. But what Edmund Burke and Lord Cavandish and Grenville contended was that the power which the House of Commons had was being exercised arbitrarily and unjustly, and for that reason they made a fight—a gallant fight—for a man whom they utterly distrusted.

Lord Cavendish, in discussing this matter, said:

> Because our power is unlimited, we are peculiarly bound to be cautious in the exercise of it when we presume to control the right of our constituents. No subject can be more fatally important. Though convicted of these crimes—

He had been convicted—

> Though convicted of these crimes, the electors of Middlesex have chosen him; and you say to them, "It is true you have chosen him, but he shall not sit." Let the gentlemen consider—

Then he proceeds to the discussion of the detailed affair.

Edmund Burke, in discussing this matter, said:

> They [the people] have the right of electing; you have a right of expelling; they of choosing; you of judging, and only of judging of the choice. The question amounts to this, Whether you mean to be a legal tribunal or an arbitrary and despotic assembly.

The only relevancy that the Wilkes case has to the situation confronting us, in my judgment, is with reference to whether we are going to exercise this power in a way, speaking with the utmost respect for those who differ from me, which seems to me arbitrary and unfair; whether the tremendous power which we have shall be exercised with all due respect to the great State which is here concerned, speaking now particularly of the State of Illinois. It can not be overlooked that this is not a matter which was in the dark at the time the election took place. As I understand, there is no question about the election itself; that is, the final vote. The charges of misconduct rest upon what happened with reference to the primary. The people have voted with full knowledge, and it is their judgment we would renounce without hearing their chosen Senator. It may not be uninstructive to remember that in that long fight of a dozen years the Middlesex voters won out. The outrage aroused all England. The voters reelected Wilkes five times, and the fifth time he remained—yes, remained, and secured the adoption of a resolution expunging from the records the evidence of his exclusions. In dealing with so vital a right as the right of the people to select their own Senators, let us leave no trace of the exercise of arbitrary or unfair or unjust power.

As I said in the opening, Mr. President, what I have had to say has no relevancy whatever to what I may have to say when the matter is properly before the Senate, as I view the proceedings. But I shall be compelled, notwithstanding the probable misunderstanding, to vote against the resolution of the able Senator from Nebraska, unless prior to the time we vote upon it Mr. SMITH shall be permitted to take the oath and speak in behalf of himself and his State on this floor.

What I am asking, so far as I am concerned, is an opportunity to pass upon this record after those who are vitally concerned have had an opportunity to present it from their viewpoint.

It is a right which can not be overestimated in its importance. It is not a mere question of procedure, it is a vital right, a vital privilege, a thing which we should not deny. We can ultimately exercise our power, but until the interested party shall have been heard, until the State shall have been heard, we should not assume to pass upon the merits of this controversy.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I regret to state that my colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at his home by illness.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, yesterday, during the course of his remarks, I understood the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] to assert that the Senator designate, Mr. SMITH, had not had his day in court, that he had not had an opportunity of calling witnesses before the special committee which investigated his case and made reports to the Senate, and that the passage of the pending resolution in its present form would operate as a denial of the right of a hearing to Mr. SMITH.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who submitted this resolution, as stated by his colleague, is ill and unable to be in the Senate to-day. I desire to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he requests or desires or demands a further hearing on behalf of Mr. SMITH, or whether Mr. SMITH desires a further hearing by way of submitting evidence to the committee.

Mr. DENEEN. I have not consulted with Senator SMITH since I made my speech, but in the hearings before the Committee on Privileges and Elections last spring the request was made for a hearing and for ample time to present testimony. I take it for granted that that request stands.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of that statement, at the request of the Senator who offered the pending resolution, I ask leave to perfect the resolution for the Senator from Nebraska by amending the last clause in the resolution as follows:

Strike out the last resolve and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Be it further resolved, That the claim of the said FRANK L. SMITH to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the said special committee of the Senate, with instructions to grant such further hearing to the said FRANK L. SMITH and to take such further evidence on its own motion as shall be proper in the premises and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible date, and that until the coming in of the report of said committee and until the final action of the Senate

thereon the said FRANK L. SMITH be, and he is hereby, denied a seat in the United States Senate."

The proponents of the resolution take the position that this case is exceptional in that an investigation has been made by a committee of the Senate under special direction of the Senate and that the report of that committee shows a state of facts which not only justifies but requires the Senate to exercise its power under the Constitution to determine the qualifications of Senators designate.

The report of the committee, as has been heretofore stated, discloses that in the primary election when Mr. SMITH was nominated he received in campaign contributions very large amounts from the owners or operators of public utilities, while at the same time he was the chairman of the body which regulated those public utilities and had the power to fix the rates which they charged the public; that in addition to that a very large amount, more than twice the amount expended in the case of former Senator Newberry, was expended in encompassing his nomination; and that these facts, if uncontradicted, would not only permit or authorize the Senate to deny him a seat in this body but would make it the duty of the Senate to pursue that course.

Now, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be modified as I have indicated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to modify the resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I accept that statement, but I did not offer the resolution. The Senator offering it, of course, has the right, but he is not present. I am making the request at his suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DENEEN. I object.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was interrupted while listening to the reading of the proposed amendment. May I ask the Senator to read it again?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will not read it again, with the permission of the Senator. I will answer any question the Senator wishes to ask about it. The resolution refers the whole subject to the special committee, and pending its report and action of the report by the Senate, denies the Senator designate a seat in this body. All I ask is the privilege to present this modification for the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and in his behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the request is made in the name of the Senator from Nebraska, the right exists to modify the resolution. The question is on the resolution submitted in its modified form.

Mr. CURTIS. Let the modification be read from the desk.

Mr. BORAH. Let me read it.

Mr. CURTIS. That will be all right.

Mr. BORAH. It reads as follows:

Strike out the last resolve and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Be it further resolved*, That the claim of the said FRANK L. SMITH to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the said special committee of the Senate, with instructions to grant such further hearing to the said FRANK L. SMITH, and to take such further evidence on its own motion, as shall be proper in the premises, and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible day; that until the coming in of the report of said committee, and until the final action of the Senate thereon, the said FRANK L. SMITH be, and he is hereby, denied a seat in the United States Senate."

So far as I am individually concerned, I would have to vote against the resolution as modified. Mr. SMITH's credentials have been passed upon by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. They have been found to be in proper form and valid upon their face. This is the very question which was raised in a number of the cases to which I referred. I think Mr. SMITH is entitled to be sworn in here and now. So far as I am concerned, I do not know of any additional evidence which I would regard as relevant. My understanding is that all the evidence is in. I am more interested in the principle which I have been discussing than I am in getting some evidence which may not be very relevant.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It was also my understanding that all the evidence was in, but the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] on yesterday, to which reference was made a moment ago, indicated a desire to submit more evidence.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, I submit a substitute for the modified resolution of the senior Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the proposed substitute.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter in Senate Resolution 1 insert the following:

Whereas FRANK L. SMITH, from the State of Illinois, has presented a certificate of election in due and proper form as a Senator from said State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That without expressing any opinion as to the right or propriety of his retaining his seat in advance of any proper investigation thereof the said FRANK L. SMITH is entitled to be sworn in as a Member of this Senate upon his prima facie case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute just proposed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the merits of the case against Mr. SMITH, but to endeavor to get before the Senate two or three facts.

In the first place, the Senate appointed the special committee, consisting of three Republicans and two Democrats, or, if you want to state it differently, two Republicans, one so-called Progressive Republican, and two Democrats, to make this investigation. There has been no division of opinion among the members of the committee at any time regarding any material question of procedure. The committee tried to get at the facts and after a good deal of tribulation and labor did elicit the facts which have been reported to the Senate.

My very esteemed friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who always makes a very powerful presentation of any question, and whose record in the Senate entitles his opinion to very high respect, concedes the power of the Senate—in fact, he does not concede it; that is not a correct statement. He states that the Senate has the power, if it sees fit, to deny a seat in the Senate, but he makes the claim with great force that the Senator elect or the person presenting the credentials is entitled to a full hearing. A full hearing implies two things. The right to present evidence is the first thing, and then, if I understand the Senator from Idaho correctly, the right to be heard before his judges by argument on the floor of the Senate. Let me dispose of the first question—whether there has been a full and fair hearing in this case.

I shall not weary the Senate by reading at any length from the record. It is sufficient to say that the representatives of Mr. SMITH stated that Mr. SMITH desired to be heard, that Mr. SMITH appeared before the committee, and that the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. SMITH, you indicated that you wanted to make a statement, and the committee, in fairness, will allow you to make any statement you want to make.

Mr. SMITH. May I read it into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I want to say to the committee that I do this in all deference, there is nothing I want to evade, and that I will be glad to answer any questions, or, if the committee sees fit to recall me, come upon notice.

He then began to read a document in his defense. He had read only a few moments—and what he read will be found on pages 1546 and 1547 of the record of the committee—when it appeared that he seriously reflected directly upon a Senator for statements made by the Senator on the floor of this body. At that point I interposed, and this is what occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. Wait just a minute. The committee will permit you to make any statement pertinent to yourself and in explanation, Mr. SMITH, of anything you have said. It will allow you to state any facts which will throw any light upon this investigation, but this committee will not permit itself to be made a forum for attacks on individuals.

Thereupon, and without taking time to go into the matter in detail, the record shows that Mr. SMITH was given the opportunity of modifying his statement only to the extent that it was not a personal attack upon individuals.

Subsequently he filed his statement. Subsequently he testified and his representatives were permitted to file any paper, statement, or argument with the committee that they desired to file. Moreover, the committee called before it every witness concerning whom it had information from seemingly reliable sources that he could give any information to the committee. I have never heard any claim that there was any witness who would testify to any facts concerning the transaction which would tend to be in defense of Mr. SMITH except those called before the committee. If the committee is still in existence and were asked to-day to hear such witnesses, it would be more

than glad to hear them. So much for the question of the introduction of evidence. There were reports of other evidence inimical to Mr. SMITH regarding which the committee never was able to secure substantial testimony, and hence the witnesses were not put upon the stand. In my judgment, unless there is a desire that the matter shall be reopened for the purpose of taking testimony, and some statement is made that the testimony will be forthcoming, that meets the question. If such a statement is made the modified resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will take care of it before some committee. Whether it shall go to the special committee or some other committee will be for the Senate to determine.

To come now to the second proposition—the right to be heard upon this floor. An examination of these precedents—which was made by another, not by myself—discloses that in 18 different cases there has been a denial of the administration of the oath, and not always upon evidence already taken and laid before the body, either the House or the Senate, but upon general information or upon information gathered by committees in the investigation of some other question than the particular one under consideration. So that there are many precedents.

But there is another class of precedents to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate. It is that resolutions may be passed admitting to the floor, and giving the full privileges of the floor, to a man seeking a seat, for the purpose of being heard in his own defense without the oath having been administered.

If the resolution presented by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] shall be adopted, I shall be more than glad to offer a resolution tendering to Mr. SMITH—I am now discussing that particular case because it is before us—the right to be upon the floor of the Senate and the right to be heard fully in his own behalf. The solitary difference which is left, therefore, between the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and myself is the mere form of administering the oath.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accord to any man a full hearing in any case; but that hearing may be accorded without the Senate first administering the oath of office; it has been done many times, and plenty of precedents exist in that respect. I will say that I will prepare that sort of an amendment to the Norris resolution if the pending amendment to the resolution shall be voted down.

There is one other thought that I wish to express. It was stated by my friend from Idaho—and, perhaps, his statement was a little broader than he intended it—that this was a question between the Senate and the people of Illinois. In one sense that is correct, but I think not in the sense that it would be generally understood. The people of the State of Illinois have a right to representation in this body, but the question that we are here to determine to-day is whether the people of Illinois are being represented by the gentleman who comes here and presents a mere certificate of the governor. If that certificate is tainted with fraud, then the people of Illinois have not sent this gentleman here. I have no personal feeling in this case against Mr. SMITH—not a particle. In fact, my distinguished friend from Idaho and myself went out to that State and we thought that we poured some water on his particular political wheel. That was before the matters of which we are now hearing occurred. I have nothing but the kindliest feeling for him. Perhaps it may be we hurt him; I do not know; but we tried not to; at least, I am sure that the Senator from Idaho did not.

The question that lies back of these propositions is this: Is the man who has been sent here the representative of the State of Illinois? Is the prima facie case created by the paper that is filed here overcome by facts known to the Senate, and known officially through one of its committees, duly created and authorized to act? If he is not here properly, then to seat him would be to consummate a wrong perpetrated upon the State of Illinois.

Then there is another view. It is true the State of Illinois is entitled to send its representative here; nobody questions that; but when such a man sits in this body he does not act alone for the State of Illinois; he becomes an integral part of the Government of the United States of America. His vote is as binding upon the other 47 States as it is upon the particular State that is alleged to have sent him here. The fate of the Nation may in certain contingencies be decided by that vote.

When a man comes here with his credentials in regular form, as was the case with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], when there is no evidence before the Senate to controvert, the oath ought to be administered. The pending case is distinguishable from that case and other cases by the fact that months ago the Senate ordered an investigation. The investigation has been held. Mr. SMITH testified; every witness that was suggested was put upon the stand. The evidence is here on file officially before the Senate, and that evidence, as it stands uncontradicted, appears to many men to have overcome the prima facie case created by the credentials.

So I rose merely to say one thing—and I have said more than that—that if it is the desire that Mr. SMITH shall be accorded the floor of the Senate to make any defense he desires, or if he desires to produce evidence before a committee, whatever committee the Senate may designate, I am one who will vote to accord him the privilege of the floor, but I will not vote, in view of the present situation of the record, to administer the oath and give him a seat in this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] to the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], as modified.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Simmons
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Smith
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Smoot
Bingham	George	McNary	Steck
Black	Gillett	Mayfield	Steiwer
Blaine	Glass	Metcalf	Stephens
Blease	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Gould	Neely	Thomas
Bratton	Greene	Nye	Trammell
Brookhart	Hale	Overman	Tydings
Broussard	Harris	Phipps	Tyson
Bruce	Harrison	Pine	Wagner
Capper	Hawes	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hayden	Ransdell	Warren
Couzens	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Waterman
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Sackett	Willis
Dill	Kendrick	Schall	
Edge	Keyes	Sheppard	
Edwards	King	Shipstead	
Ferris	La Follette	Shortridge	

Mr. WHEELER. My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Montana] is detained at his home on account of illness.

Mr. HOWELL. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at his home by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, there is some confusion among Senators as to the pending question. I ask that the substitute of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] to the amended resolution. The clerk will read the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Illinois offers the following amendment:

Strike out all after the word "resolution," on page 1, and insert the following words:

Whereas FRANK L. SMITH, from the State of Illinois, has presented a certificate of election in due and proper form as a Senator from said State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That without expressing any opinion as to the right or propriety of his retaining his seat in advance of any proper investigation thereof, the said FRANK L. SMITH is entitled to be sworn in as a Member of this Senate upon his prima facie case.

Mr. REED of Missouri and Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. If present, I understand that the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). My colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. If my colleague were present and voting, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. KING (when his name was called). Upon this question I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at his home by illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. STECK (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Montana was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Montana] is absent on account of illness. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is paired on this question with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE]. As previously announced, if the Senator from Nebraska were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] is absent on official business and that the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] is absent because of illness. If present, these Senators would vote "yea" on the pending question.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—32

Bingham	Fess	Metcalf	Schall
Blease	Gillett	Moses	Shortridge
Borah	Goff	Overman	Smith
Brookhart	Gould	Phipps	Smoot
Broussard	Greene	Pine	Steiwer
Curtis	Hale	Ransdell	Warren
Deneen	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Edge	McLean	Sackett	Watson

NAYS—50

Ashurst	Ferris	Kendrick	Simmons
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Stephens
Bayard	Frazier	McKellar	Swanson
Black	George	McMaster	Thomas
Blaine	Glass	McNary	Trammell
Bratton	Harris	Mayfield	Tydings
Bruce	Harrison	Neely	Tyson
Capper	Hawes	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Dill	Johnson	Sheppard	
Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—12

Copeland	Gooding	Norbeck	Robinson, Ind.
du Pont	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Steck
Gerry	King	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.

So Mr. DENEEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the Norris resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the last line of the modification add the following proviso:

Provided, That the said FRANK L. SMITH shall be accorded the privileges of the floor of the Senate for the purpose of being heard touching his right to receive the oath of office and to membership in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENEEN. I offer the following amendment. I move to strike out the words "the said special committee of the Senate," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "the Committee on Privileges and Elections."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). I make the same announcement as before as to the absence of my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico], who is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS's name was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], is detained at his home by illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay." He is paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE].

Mr. STECK (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote the same as I shall vote on this question. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHEELER (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Montana was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Montana] is absent on account of sickness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] is detained on official business. If present and not paired, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas, 29, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bingham	Goff	Moses	Steiwer
Blease	Gould	Phipps	Warren
Curtis	Greene	Pine	Waterman
Dale	Hale	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Sackett	Willis
Edge	Keyes	Schall	
Fess	McLean	Shortridge	
Gillett	Metcalf	Smoot	

NAYS—55

Ashurst	Edwards	La Follette	Shipstead
Barkley	Ferris	McKellar	Simmons
Bayard	Fletcher	McMaster	Smith
Black	Frazier	McNary	Steck
Blaine	George	Mayfield	Stephens
Borah	Glass	Neely	Swanson
Bratton	Harris	Norbeck	Thomas
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Broussard	Hawes	Overman	Tydings
Bruce	Hayden	Pittman	Tyson
Capper	Heflin	Ransdell	Wagner
Caraway	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—10

Copeland	Gooding	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
du Pont	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie	
Gerry	King	Robinson, Ind.	

So Mr. DENEEN's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] as amended.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). I make the same announcement I made before respecting my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair as before, and withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at his home by illness. If present and not paired, he would vote "yea." He is paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], who I understand would vote "nay" on this question if he were present and permitted to vote.

Mr. STECK (when his name was called). I repeat my announcement with reference to my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHEELER (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Montana was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Montana] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN. May I ask if the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. As I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina, in his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] is detained on official business. If present and not paired, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—53

Ashurst	Edwards	Kendrick	Simmons
Barkley	Ferris	La Follette	Stephens
Bayard	Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson
Black	Frazier	McMaster	Thomas
Blaine	George	McNary	Trammell
Bratton	Glass	Mayfield	Tydings
Brookhart	Harris	Neely	Tyson
Bruce	Harrison	Norbeck	Wagner
Capper	Hawes	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	Wheeler
Couzens	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Curtis	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	
Dale	Johnson	Sheppard	
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Shipstead	

NAYS—28

Bingham	Gillett	Metcalf	Schall
Blease	Goff	Moses	Shortridge
Borah	Gould	Phipps	Smith
Broussard	Greene	Pine	Smoot
Deneen	Hale	Ransdell	Steiwer
Edge	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Fess	McLean	Sackett	Watson

NOT VOTING—13

Copeland	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Warren
du Pont	King	Robinson, Ind.	
Gerry	Norris	Steck	
Gooding	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.	

So Mr. NORRIS's resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas on the 17th day of May, 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate, and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election.

Whereas said committee in the discharge of its duties notified FRANK L. SMITH, of Illinois, then a candidate for the United States Senate from that State, of its proceeding, and the said FRANK L. SMITH appeared in person and was permitted to counsel with and be represented by his attorneys and agents.

Whereas the said committee has reported—

That the evidence without substantial dispute shows that there was expended directly or indirectly for and on behalf of the candidacy of the said FRANK L. SMITH for the United States Senate the sum of $458,782; that all of the above sum except $171,500 was contributed directly to and received by the personal agent and representative of the said FRANK L. SMITH with his full knowledge and consent; and that of the total sum aforesaid there was contributed by officers of large public-service institutions doing business in the State of Illinois or by said institutions the sum of $203,000, a substantial part of which sum was contributed by men who were nonresidents of Illinois, but who were officers of Illinois public-service corporations.

That at all of the times aforesaid the said FRANK L. SMITH was chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, and that said public-service corporations commonly and generally had business before said commission, and said commission was, among other things, empowered to regulate the rates, charges, and business of said corporations.

That by the statutes of Illinois it is made a misdemeanor for any officer or agent of such public-service corporations to contribute any money to any member of said commission, or for any member of said commission to accept such moneys upon penalty of removal from office.

That said SMITH has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts, although full and complete opportunity was given to him, not only to present evidence but arguments in his behalf; and

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence is now and for many months has been on file with the Senate, and all of the said facts appear without substantial dispute: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the acceptance and expenditure of the various sums of money aforesaid in behalf of the candidacy of the said FRANK L. SMITH is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of free government, and taints with fraud and corruption the credentials for a seat in the Senate presented by the said FRANK L. SMITH; and be it further

Resolved, That the claim of the said FRANK L. SMITH to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the said special committee of the Senate, with instructions to grant such further hearing to the said FRANK L. SMITH, and to take such further evidence on its own motion as shall be proper in the premises, and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible date; and that until the coming in of the report of said committee and until the final action of the Senate thereon the said FRANK L. SMITH be, and he is hereby, denied a seat in the United States Senate: *Provided*, That the said FRANK L. SMITH shall be accorded the privileges of the floor of the Senate for the purpose of being heard touching his right to receive the oath of office and to membership in the Senate.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] requested unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Hon. Howard P. Castle, a member of the General Assembly of Illinois. That consent was granted. I ask now unanimous consent to have an answer to that letter, which has been prepared by the legislative committee of the General Assembly of Illinois, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 7, 1927.*

In re: Constitutional rights of Illinois.

Hon. CHARLES S. DENEEN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DENEEN: At the close of the discussion on United States Senate Resolution No. 1, Senator Norris received unanimous consent to introduce in the RECORD a communication in relation to the resolutions passed by the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, said resolution requesting that Hon. FRANK L. SMITH, Senator elect, be administered the oath of office.

The delegation on the constitutional rights of Illinois, authorized by the resolution of the General Assembly of Illinois, composed of State Senator Richard J. Barr, president pro tem of the Illinois State Senate, and State Senator John Daily, representing the State senate, and Speaker Robert Scholes, of the Illinois House of Representatives, and Representative Reed F. Cutler, and Representative Gus J. Johnson are and have been present in the city of Washington since Monday morning last for the purpose of presenting to the Senate or its appropriate committee a message from the people of the State of Illinois, as embodied in the resolution passed by the last general assembly. On account of illness, Lieut. Gov. Fred E. Sterling, the third member of the State senate committee, is unable to be present.

The unanimous consent received by Senator NORRIS in placing into the RECORD a letter in connection with the resolutions adopted by the general assembly put the delegation on the constitutional rights of Illinois on notice, and this committee has ascertained that Hon. Howard P. Castle, a representative in the General Assembly of Illinois, addressed a letter to a number of United States Senators, with a copy of which you no doubt were likewise favored.

This joint committee on the constitutional rights of Illinois speak only for their representative branches, to wit, the House of Representatives of Illinois, by the representatives on the delegation of the procedure in the house, and the State senators on the procedure in the senate.

Representative Castle in his letter represents that on June 8 there was introduced by the majority floor leader, Reed F. Cutler, House bill 757 and said bill was almost identical in its terms with the joint resolution subsequently passed; that said house bill "instead of being referred to a committee, as is our usual practice, was read a first time and ordered to a second reading without reference."

That statement is substantially true, but such procedure would not have been possible had there been objection to it, and no objection under the rule having been made is evidence of the almost unanimous disposition on the part of the house of representatives of the desire to safeguard the constitutional rights of Illinois.

Mr. Castle further suggests that "On the following day, when the bill was called on the second reading, Representative O'Grady moved to amend the bill by striking therefrom the enacting clause. After a short debate, a motion to table the amendment carried by a vote of 75 to 51."

That statement is substantially true, but Representative Castle neglected to say that the bill carried an appropriation; that neither Senator-elect SMITH nor any member of his counsel had been consulted with reference to the introduction of such a bill and as soon as Senator-elect SMITH was informed that such a bill was introduced he expressed himself as being opposed to any bill which carried an appropriation.

Representative Castle also neglected to say that the original bill, hastily drawn, did not, as fully and explicitly as the constitutional rights of Illinois justified, contain a recitation of those rights. Neither did he state in his letter that the vote as indicated by him was sufficient to send the bill to the third reading, and the same vote would have assured its passage had there not been the above objections raised to it. Subsequently the joint resolution presented on yesterday to the United States Senate was passed.

The rule of the Illinois House of Representative provides that when any five members of the house of representatives desire to protest the passage of a resolution by viva voce, a roll call must be made.

Representative Castle should have been, and doubtless is, thoroughly aware of this guaranteed right under the rules. The resolution was passed with only Representative Castle speaking against it.

Representative Castle further states that Representative Cutler came to his desk to ask if he (Castle) could not see his way clear to refrain from speaking against the bill on the third reading (he, Castle, having spoken against it on the second reading), but this, Mr. Castle states, he declined to do; that the bill was never called on third reading, but on June 16 it was tabled and on the same day the resolution was offered and the resolution subsequently passed. This statement is substantially true.

Representative Cutler states he did discuss with Representative Castle and endeavored to explain that the people of the State of Illinois had elected FRANK L. SMITH as Senator, and endeavored to convince Representative Castle that the constitutional rights of Illinois to equal representation in the United States Senate were so vitally important that he hoped his personal animus toward Senator-elect FRANK L. SMITH might not militate against the constitutional rights of his State. Evidently this argument had no effect upon Representative Castle, and he spoke against the resolution.

Representative Castle omits the procedure in the senate on House Joint Resolution No. 45, but in view of his letter the United States Senate is entitled to know the procedure in the adoption of this joint resolution, not only in the house but in the senate.

When this joint resolution passed in the house, with only Representative Castle protesting against it out of a membership of 153, the joint resolution was in due course presented to the senate. It was likewise adopted in the senate, where an opportunity was given for any State senator to record his opposition.

One of the minority asked to be recorded in opposition but did not speak against the resolution, said State senator being the only one expressing a desire to be recorded in opposition out of a senate membership of 51. Thus the joint resolution authorizing a delegation on the constitutional rights of Illinois was adopted by the General Assembly of Illinois.

The membership of the Illinois General Assembly is 153 in the house; 51 in the senate. Out of the total of 204, only 2 entered protests against the passage of the resolution.

Representative Castle further omitted to state that this delegation, representing the constitutional rights of Illinois, now in Washington, are here at their own expense to present these rights to the Senate or before any of the appropriate committees if and when such opportunity be given.

In view of the unanimous consent of Senator NORRIS to read the personal letter from Representative Castle into the RECORD of the United States Senate, this legally authorized delegation on the constitutional rights of Illinois respectfully request that you, in behalf of the people of the State of Illinois, as expressed by the resolutions of the general assembly, present this communication for the RECORD.

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD J. BARR,
President pro tempore, Illinois Senate.
JOHN DAILEY,
State Senator.
ROBERT SCHOLES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
REED F. CUTLER,
Representative, House of Representatives.
GUS J. JOHNSON,
Representatice, House of Representatives.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for three-quarters of an hour, at which time the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], I understand, will be ready to proceed with the Vare case.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senate will stand in recess for three-quarters of an hour.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) a recess was taken until 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m., at which time the Senate reassembled.

THE BUDGET

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

MESSAGE TRANSMITTING THE BUDGET

To the Congress of the United States:

Herewith is transmitted the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. The receipts and expenditures shown in detail in the Budget are summarized in the following statement:

Summary (exclusive of postal revenues and postal expenditures paid from postal revenues)

	Estimated, 1929	Estimated, 1928	Actual, 1927
Receipts:			
Customs	$602,000,000.00	$602,000,000.00	$605,499,983.44
Income tax	2,065,000,000.00	2,165,000,000.00	2,224,992,800.25
Miscellaneous internal revenue	640,545,000.00	638,545,000.00	644,421,541.56
Miscellaneous receipts	501,952,314.00	670,053,091.00	654,480,115.85
Total receipts	3,809,497,314.00	4,075,598,091.00	4,129,394,441.10
Total expenditures (including reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from ordinary receipts)	3,556,957,031.00	3,621,314,285.00	3,493,584,519.40
Excess of receipts	252,540,283.00	454,283,806.00	635,809,921.70

The Budget system has now been in effect a sufficient length of time to enable us to appreciate fully its far-reaching importance. It is directly responsible for our present position of financial stability. That position has been acquired by scientific management of our business affairs. This management has resulted in improvement throughout the entire field covered by Federal operations. It seems inconceivable that such progress could have been made in so short a period after the great world conflict. Yet it has been done. It demonstrates the efficiency of our form of government. The good of all the people is our controlling consideration. And because of this, scientific management of our affairs is essential. In slightly more than six years we have had substantial reductions in taxes, and in that same period we have enhanced greatly the value of the service which we are rendering the people. We are raising money to pay our long-term commitments. We have provided for adequate national defense. Our housing problems are being cared for. All through our Government activities there have been improvement and progress. Federal activities have kept pace with a growing and progressive Nation. This has all called for orderly procedure, and we are reaping the rewards which follow that course. We can well take the experience of the past as our index to future operations. If we proceed along the orderly lines followed these last years, our continued success is assured.

TAX REDUCTION

Since 1920 there have been three reductions in taxes for the purpose of relieving the people of some of their war burdens. The act of November, 1921, lightened the tax load by a reduction of $663,000,000. The act of 1924 afforded additional relief of $519,000,000. The act of 1926 made a further reduction of $422,000,000. Taking these all together, our tax demands have been lessened by $1,604,000,000. This in itself illustrates the value of orderly procedure. The people are permanently richer because of the diminished demands made by the Federal Government. And hand in hand with these material curtailments of the amounts taken from the people the public debt has been reduced. From a peak of more than twenty-six and a half billions of dollars the debt had been reduced on June 30, 1927, by $8,084,794,716. This lowering of the debt means an annual saving in interest of approximately $320,000,000. While this tangible and extraordinary saving emphasized the importance of debt reduction as a preliminary to ultimate adequate tax reduction, we have at this time for consideration the question of further relief to those who pay Federal taxes.

In planning for a revision downward of tax rates the first question that presents itself is the amount of money that can safely be devoted to the purpose without curtailing necessary activities of the Government or threatening a deficit. The extraordinary surplus of June 30, 1927, was $635,809,000, and was made possible by receipts from nonrecurring sources of $414,000,000, only $221,000,000 coming from current and continuing sources. Of this surplus, $612,000,000 was applied to the public debt, effecting an annual interest saving of $24,000,000.

The estimated surplus for this year—which ends with June 30 next—is $454,000,000, of which $318,000,000 is from nonrecurring sources, and $136,000,000 from current and continuing sources. This is an increase of $254,000,000 over the estimate carried in the 1928 Budget, of which increase $158,000,000 is from miscellaneous receipts which include $154,000,000 in receipts from railroads. The remaining $96,000,000 of the increase is found in regular revenue returns.

The estimated surplus for 1929—the coming fiscal year—is $252,540,000, of which $75,000,000 is from nonrecurring sources. This surplus is reached by means of a fairly sanguine estimate of receipts and a carefully restricted estimate of expenditure. The expenditure estimate for 1929 of $3,557,000,000 includes nothing for flood control with the exception of the fifth-year allowance of $10,000,000 in the six-year program authorized by Congress. Other proposed major projects, not yet the subject of legislation, are not provided for in this estimate. It is reasonably certain that some of them will be enacted into law and will call for material advances from the Federal Treasury. This will doubtless have the consideration of the Congress. Careful study of all these factors points to a tax reduction of $225,000,000 as the maximum, and that amount only possible on the assumption that the estimates of expenditure for 1929 be not materially exceeded, and that additional continuing obligations be incurred only to the extent that absolute necessity from the standpoint of public need warrants. Adequate flood protection, of course, meets the requirements of absolute and urgent necessity.

Under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, I recommend to Congress that taxes be reduced by not to exceed $225,000,000.

IMPORTANCE OF A BALANCED BUDGET

Each of the three reductions in tax rates since November, 1921, has been measured on the certainty of our ability to stand such reductions. This is the only safe course. It has brought forth a balanced budget. In this we have found our

financial stability. We have been operating on the wise plan that reduction in rates of Federal taxes should be permanent. This is the only proper basis for tax reduction. In a business of the magnitude of that of the Federal Government there must be a margin of safety. The fact that this margin has grown to large proportions in the past fiscal years carries no assurance that that will continue. I am in favor of tax reduction. I am not in favor of any such reduction as will jeopardize our financial stability. The assurance that Federal expenditures will be kept within Federal receipts has bulwarked public confidence, it has contributed measurably to the prosperous condition of the country, it has ministered to the justifiable pride of our people in their Government and in its orderly and sane processes. To jeopardize our balanced budget, to do anything that in the most remote degree would threaten to interfere with the orderly processes of wise financing, to take steps in the interest of tax reduction that would necessitate either revolutionary curtailment of important Federal projects and activities or compel a later upward revision of tax rates, or both, is unthinkable. I am convinced the people of this country are overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the Budget balanced and are just as overwhelmingly opposed to any measure or measures that would make any other result even remotely possible.

I am counting on the continued prosperity of the Nation in recommending a tax reduction of $225,000,000. I am also counting on the determined continuance of the campaign for rigid Government economy. I believe that a tax reduction in the sum which I have mentioned is justified. We must, however, preserve the sanctity of a balanced budget. Under the law made by the Congress the President can not countenance a program of expenditure or approve estimates for appropriations that threaten to interfere with the annual balancing of the National Budget.

Estimated receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, as carried in the 1928 Budget totaled $4,026,780,688, and estimated expenditure was $3,643,701,593. The year closed, however, with actual receipts of $4,129,394,441.10 and actual expenditures of $3,493,584,519.40. We were fortunate in having a marked increase in receipts, while a material reduction in estimated expenditure, resulting largely from the continuing policy of economy, contributed to the creation of the largest surplus in history, $635,809,921.70.

In the Budget for 1928, transmitted to the Congress December 6, 1926, it was estimated that our receipts for that year would be $3,772,753,077 and our expenditures $3,572,049,214. The surplus indicated was $200,703,863. To-day our finances for 1928 present a more favorable outlook. It is now estimated that our receipts for the year now in progress will reach $4,075,598,091 and that our expenditures will be $3,621,314,285. This indicates a surplus of $454,283,806.

The estimates of appropriations contained in this Budget reach a total of $3,505,793,766, which is exclusive of the Postal Service payable from postal receipts. A comparison between the estimates in this Budget and those for the fiscal year 1928 should necessarily include the supplemental estimates for 1928. Many of these were presented to the Congress for consideration in the second deficiency bill, fiscal year 1927. That bill failed of enactment. There has necessarily been a change in these estimates. In the following table a comparison is made with the estimates of appropriations contained in this Budget and the appropriations for 1928 coupled with the estimates pertaining to the latter fiscal year.

	Estimates of appropriations, 1929	Appropriations, 1928 [1]	Supplemental estimates submitted for 1928	Total for 1928
Legislative establishment	$16,862,930.86	$16,554,579.56	$1,146,608.75	$17,701,188.31
Executive Office	437,180.00	438,460.00	90,000.00	528,460.00
Independent establishments:				
Alaska relief funds	15,000.00	15,000.00		15,000.00
Alien Property Custodian	7,500.00	98,000.00		98,000.00
American Battle Monuments Commission	700,000.00	600,000.00		600,000.00
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission	2,300,000.00	2,500,000.00		2,500,000.00
Board of Mediation	347,902.00	390,000.00		390,000.00
Board of Tax Appeals	720,740.00	712,780.00	9,000.00	721,780.00
Bureau of Efficiency	210,350.00	210,350.00		210,350.00
Civil Service Commission	1,098,752.00	1,007,442.00	191,500.00	1,198,942.00
Commission of Fine Arts	7,300.00	7,300.00		7,300.00
Employees' Compensation Commission	3,675,000.00	2,698,240.00	950,000.00	3,648,240.00
Federal Board of Vocational Education	8,220,000.00	8,165,230.00		8,165,230.00
Federal Power Commission	120,890.00	42,500.00		42,500.00
Federal Radio Commission	80,560.00		52,186.00	52,186.00
Federal Reserve Board	2,700,000.00	2,700,000.00		2,700,000.00
Federal Trade Commission	963,000.00	984,350.00		984,350.00
General Accounting Office	3,820,000.00	3,833,000.00	10,400.00	3,843,400.00
Housing Corporation	475,750.00	564,236.00		564,236.00
International Trade Exhibition			150,000.00	150,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	7,642,337.00	7,811,314.00	170,000.00	7,981,314.00
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	600,000.00	525,000.00	25,000.00	550,000.00
Public Buildings and Public Parks	2,584,980.00	2,422,950.00	31,520.00	2,454,470.00
Smithsonian Institution	974,761.00	939,711.00	80,000.00	1,019,711.00
Tariff Commission	749,000.00	682,000.00	39,000.00	721,000.00
U. S. Geographic Board	4,300.00	3,945.00		3,945.00
U. S. Shipping Board and Merchant Fleet Corporation	13,688,750.00	12,290,000.00		12,290,000.00
U. S. Veterans' Bureau	560,060,000.00	545,865,000.00	19,400,000.00	565,265,000.00
Claims, judgments, etc		14,000.00	7,919,489.11	7,933,489.11
Total, Executive Office and independent establishments	612,204,052.00	595,520,808.00	29,118,095.11	624,638,903.11
Department of Agriculture	142,753,229.00	139,862,989.00	3,481,560.00	143,344,549.00
Department of Commerce	37,599,460.00	36,630,450.00	838,000.00	37,468,450.00
Department of the Interior	300,190,089.00	285,810,120.00	13,199,801.20	299,009,921.20
Department of Justice	26,784,630.00	26,400,889.50	503,296.00	26,904,185.50
Department of Labor	10,735,840.00	10,159,516.00	1,000.00	10,160,516.00
Navy Department	362,167,020.00	318,131,957.00	23,803,362.55	341,935,319.55
Post Office Department, postal deficiency, payable from Treasury	15,270,042.00	[2] [3] 30,370,000.00	2,032,164.30	[2] [3] 32,402,164.30
State Department	14,015,188.14	12,155,119.41	971,000.00	13,126,119.41
Treasury Department	316,333,562.00	[4] 275,732,633.00	52,178,222.79	[4] 327,910,855.79
War Department, including Panama Canal	398,823,143.00	371,904,165.00	30,772,778.81	402,676,943.81
District of Columbia	40,431,186.00	38,824,385.00	395,795.74	39,220,180.74
Total, ordinary	2,294,170,372.00	2,158,057,611.47	[5] 158,441,685.25	2,316,499,296.72
Reduction in principal of the public debt:				
Sinking fund	369,209,093.53	354,157,085.00		354,157,085.00
Redemption of securities from Federal reserve bank and Federal intermediate credit bank franchise tax receipts	1,000,000.00	800,000.00		800,000.00
Redemption of bonds, etc., account of repayments of principal and as interest payments on obligations of foreign governments	171,214,300.00	181,963,650.00		181,963,650.00
Redemption of bonds, etc., account of forfeitures, gifts, etc	200,000.00	200,000.00		200,000.00
Principal of the public debt	541,623,393.53	[2] 537,120,735.00		[2] 537,120,735.00
Interest on the public debt	670,000,000.00	[2] 720,000,000.00		[2] 720,000,000.00
Total payable from the Treasury	3,505,793,765.53	3,415,178,346.47	[5] 158,441,685.25	3,573,620,031.72
Postal Service payable from postal revenues	753,000,000.00	[2] 724,966,200.00		[2] 724,966,200.00
Total, including Post Office Department and Postal Service	4,258,793,765.53	4,140,144,546.47	[5] 158,441,685.25	4,298,586,231.72

[1] Includes $79,664,436 permanent and indefinite appropriations not included in Budget estimates prior to 1929.
[2] Revised to date.
[3] Heretofore included in estimates of appropriation for "Postal Service payable from postal revenue."
[4] Includes $107,000,000 1927-28 supplemental appropriation for internal-revenue refunds.
[5] Exclusive of $45,233,508.02 for requirements of fiscal year 1927, including deficiencies and replacement of amounts advanced from appropriations for fiscal year 1928.

The Budget for 1929, herewith submitted, is more complete than any of its predecessors. It is the intent of the law creating a Budget system for the Federal Government that the annual Budget include estimates for all needs of the Government for the full 12 months for which Budget estimates are submitted. In our great and growing Government changes are kaleidoscopic and new needs and imperative new demands arise overnight calling for congressional help. The Chief Executive is committed by law to the policy of making each annual Budget a complete provision for a full year, appreciating the wisdom of such a policy. While actual deficits are rare, supplementals, because of the reasons cited, persist, and persist large in amount and many in number.

Estimates of this character which have already been submitted to this Congress for inclusion in the urgent deficiency bill total approximately $204,000,000. Of this amount, $106,000,000 is made necessary by new legislation. Of the balance of approximately $98,000,000, the sum of $43,000,000 is required for tax refunds, $7,000,000 for emergency flood relief, $8,000,000 for claims and judgments, while the remainder is needed for national defense or to meet demands of policies that have congressional approval. The nonenactment of the second deficiency bill during the session of Congress which closed March 4, 1927, necessarily adds to the total of these supplemental estimates which must now be presented to the Congress.

REFUNDING TAXES

I believe the time has come when our estimates of appropriations for refunding taxes illegally collected should be reflected in the appropriation items requested in the Budget. In prior years this item of expense, while reflected in Budget estimates of expenditure, has not been fully reflected in the annual estimates for appropriations. The operation has been conducted on a calendar-year basis by making the refundment of taxes an item for inclusion as a supplemental rather than Budget estimate. The Budget herewith contains an estimate of $135,000,000 for refundment of taxes for the full fiscal year 1929. This is in harmony with the plan to have the annual Budget estimates reflect the conditions for the fiscal year to which they relate. The balance of the current fiscal year will be covered by a supplemental estimate.

In the development of this plan the estimates of appropriations in this Budget carry approximately $80,000,000 more for permanent and indefinite appropriations than has appeared in preceding Budgets. This is all in the interest of having the Budget estimates reflect actual requirements. This is a step in the right direction. It narrows the margin between our estimate of appropriations and the estimate of expenditure. The latter estimate has always carried these items, but their reflection elsewhere in the Budget as estimates of appropriations is most desirable. Taking the refundment of taxes item and these additional permanent and indefinite funds together we have an increase of $230,000,000 over what would have been required under the plan of estimates heretofore followed in preparing the annual Budgets. This is not a real increase, as these items have always been included in the estimates of expenditure.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The Budget herewith contains for the first time estimates of appropriations for commencing liquidation of the liability of the Government to both the civil-service and Foreign Service retirements. The Congress wisely authorized submission of estimates for this purpose. This conforms to the principle under which we have been operating to amortize our long-term commitments. For the civil-service retirement fund the estimate is $19,950,000 and for the foreign-service retirement fund $213,000. The Government board of actuaries estimates that an annual appropriation of the former amount for 71 years and of the latter amount for 60 years will meet fully the accrued and accruing liability of the Government to these two funds. Since these estimates are based on the present pay roll, any increase in the roll will be reflected in a reduction of the time in which the liability of the Government will be fully discharged. An increase of 1 per cent annually in the pay roll of those contributing to the civil-service retirement fund would reduce the period of amortization from 71 to 42 years.

We are necessarily concerned in the Federal pay roll. This concern involves both the interests of the taxpayers and those who are on the rolls. The effort has been to do equal justice to both. The classification act of 1923, with the extension of comparable rates of compensation to those in the field service, has substantially met the situation. In 1923 the average salary of Federal employees at the seat of government was $1,674. When the classification act went into effect in 1924 it increased the average salary to $1,749. For the fiscal year 1927 the average salary had increased to $1,846. For 1928 the average salary will be about $1,886 and for 1929 will amount approximately to $1,897. Adequate provision has been made for those employees who are injured in line of duty and for those who are retired because of permanent disability or age. The allowance for annual and sick leave, the reasonable hours of daily service under favorable working conditions, and the permanency of employment are other factors which favor the Government worker. Taking all things into consideration, I feel that the Government is liberal in the treatment of its employees. If this were not so, it is hardly possible that the civil-service records would show that more than a quarter of a million persons sought Federal employment in 1927, when the number of vacancies was only 38,700. All our investigations show that in places paying less than $2,500 to $3,000 the rate of pay by the Government is higher than in comparable places in private employ.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In 1927 there was available for expenditure for defense purposes, excluding all nonmilitary items and retired pay, $576,000,000. The current year's availability will be $625,000,000, while this Budget contemplates available defense funds of approximately $645,000,000.

The estimates carry $48,000,000 for increase of the Navy. This provides for prosecution of work on all projects authorized by the Congress with the exception of 3 submarines and 12 destroyers authorized in 1916, for which no funds are desired at this time. Navy craft under construction in 1929 will comprise 2 submarines and 8 cruisers, of which 2 will be practically completed in 1929—the *Pensacola* and *Salt Lake City*. Ample funds are provided in the estimate for the modernization of the battleships *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, in accordance with the approved modernization program. Necessary funds are provided to carry out the third increment of the five-year air program. It is expected with the funds recommended, the Navy at the end of the coming fiscal year will have 696 planes of the 1,000 final total contemplated in the program approved by the Congress. Additional funds are also recommended for the lighter-than-air ship, for which Congress has already appropriated $200,000.

Army estimates contemplate a Regular Army of 118,750 men with 12,000 officers, 30,000 trainees for the Citizens' Military Training Camp, 15,725 trainees in the Organized Reserve, 125,000 cadets in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and a National Guard strength of 188,000 men.

The total availability asked for Army housing in 1929 is $7,115,000, including contract authorization. There is carried in the supplemental estimates for 1928 the sum of $6,166,000 for Army housing, that being the amount which failed of enactment in the second deficiency bill in the last Congress. This makes a total available in the two estimates of $13,281,000, and completes the authorizations so far made by Congress for this purpose. In addition thereto the amount recommended for repair and maintenance of barracks, quarters, sewers, roads, and water systems amounts to $10,440,000, an increase of $1,672,500 over available funds this current year. Included in these estimates also is an increase of $2,000,000 over the 1928 appropriation for ammunition. Estimates herewith for the Army Air Corps provide for the second year increment in the five-year program looking toward 1,800 airplanes at the end of the five years.

AIR SERVICE

We have proceeded sufficiently far in our Air Service program to show the wisdom of the legislative policy with regard to this important and developing line of Federal activity. Under this policy the needs of the Federal Government are being met with orderly stimulation of private industry. The appropriations of the past as well as the estimates now submitted are all in furtherance of this policy. Our procurement of aircraft and accessories is from private industry. This is as it should be. We have gone further than this. Private industry is now operating by contract our entire Postal Air Mail Service. We now have 13 contract mail routes in operation and 7 others under contract with a view to their early operation. We can point with pride to the Federal operation of the Postal Air Mail Service. Such operation was necessary in the beginning. We can point with equal pride to the turning of that service over to private industry for operation under contract. That has resulted largely from the policy which this Nation has been pursuing in air navigation. That policy, probably more than any one other thing, made possible the handling of this business by private enterprise. In the realm of navigation by air, I have mentioned elsewhere the provision made in these estimates for carrying on the five-year air programs for the Army and Navy. In our civil work the Coast Guard, the Prohibition Service, and the Forest Service are also operating airplanes. The Department of Commerce is also using planes in its air navigation work. Provision for all of these is made

in the estimates herewith submitted, which also carry funds for further development of our lighted airways. With regard to this latter Federal function, the end of the next fiscal year under the estimate herein submitted should see more than 10,000 miles of lighted airways.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES

I am including in this Budget an estimate of $1,108,000 for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy. I refer to this estimate for two reasons. The first is, that the authorization for this appropriation expires with the fiscal year 1929. The second is, that it marks the termination of Federal contribution to a project which is for State control and administration. The extension for two years of the provisions of the act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy was approved with the understanding that its administration during these two added years would be with a view to the discontinuance of Federal aid thereafter. Six years of experience under the able administration that has characterized the Government's policy warrants this permanent withdrawal of Federal aid, assured that the States are now or should be able to carry on this work without aid or interference from the Federal Government.

This opens up the whole subject of State aid, which despite frequent warnings continues strongly intrenched in Federal operations. While the amount of money taken annually from the Federal Treasury for subsidies to States is not inconsiderable, the dangers inherent in the policy are of far greater importance. To relieve the States of their just obligations by resort to the Federal Treasury in the final result is hurtful rather than helpful to the State, and unfair to the payers of national taxes. To tempt the States by Federal subsidies to sacrifice their vested rights is not a wholesome practice no matter how worthy the object to be attained. Federal interference in State functions can never be justified as a permanent continuing policy even if, which is doubtful, such interference is warranted by emergent conditions as a temporary expedient. As shown in the maternity and infancy act, when once the Government engages in such an enterprise it is almost impossible to terminate its connection therewith. We should not only decidedly refuse to countenance additional Federal participation in State-aid projects, but should make careful study of all our activities of that character with a view to curtailing them.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS

With a view to expediting the construction program authorized by the public buildings act of May 25, 1926, estimates of appropriations amounting to $8,131,000 will be submitted for the consideration of Congress in the first deficiency bill of this fiscal year. This amount will pertain to the projects included in the public buildings appropriation bill which failed of passage the last fiscal year and for which authority to enter into contracts has been previously authorized. The estimates submitted with this Budget provide for projects at limits of cost aggregating $53,577,000, and carry a total request for appropriation of $13,000,000. This amount, together with the appropriations already available and those requested in the urgent deficiency for this year, will provide ample funds for expenditure within the yearly limit of $25,000,000 fixed in the act.

REDUCTION IN SIZE OF PAPER CURRENCY

During the past year an exhaustive study involving the designs of the paper currency issues of the United States has been completed and definite conclusions have been reached. New designs are being prepared which will eliminate the existing confusion, and the size will be reduced about one-third.

For many years there has been a constantly growing demand for increased supplies of paper currency. Many factors have entered into the situation, among them being the growth of the country in population and wealth, and the more extended use of paper instead of coin. During the past decade the paper currency outstanding has increased from 536,600,000 pieces, in amount exceeding $4,212,000,000, to 865,300,000 pieces, in amount approximating $5,715,000,000. In order to meet the currency requirements, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 514,688,000 pieces during 1917, and 992,339,000 pieces during 1927. Constantly increasing appropriations have been required, and it was apparent should the increase continue it would be necessary to provide additional production facilities. Both of these considerations have been effectively met by the action taken.

The reduction in size will serve the public convenience, will create substantial savings in expense of manufacture, and will insure that existing manufacturing facilities will meet increased demands for many years to come.

SECOND LIBERTY LOAN

The retirement and refunding of our second Liberty loan has aided materially in lessening our interest charges. On February 28, 1927, there were outstanding $3,104,520,050 second Liberty loan bonds, practically all of which bore interest at the rate of 4¼ per cent. From February 28, 1927, to November 18, 1927, bonds to the value of $575,000,000 were retired with funds available for debt reduction. The remainder, approximately $2,500,000,000, are being refunded into securities bearing interest at the rate of 3½ per cent and under. The saving in annual interest by the debt reduction effected by retirement of these bonds amounts to over $24,000,000 and the annual saving effected by the refunding operations will amount to more than $21,000,000, making a total annual saving in interest of more than $45,000,000. The total reduction of annual interest due to refundings and payments on the national debt for the calendar year 1927 will be about $75,000,000.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1927.*

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Harvey A. Welsh) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Frazier	McLean	Shortridge
Bayard	George	McMaster	Simmons
Bingham	Gerry	McNary	Smith
Black	Gillett	Mayfield	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	Metcalf	Steck
Blease	Goff	Moses	Steiwer
Borah	Gould	Neely	Stephens
Bratton	Greene	Norbeck	Swanson
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Thomas
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Bruce	Harrison	Phipps	Tydings
Capper	Hawes	Pine	Tyson
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	Wagner
Couzens	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Edwards	Keyes	Sackett	Willis
Ferris	King	Schall	
Fess	La Follette	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Resolution No. 2, introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 2) submitted on Monday by Mr. NORRIS, as follows:

Whereas on the 17th day of May, 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate, and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election; and

Whereas said committee, in the discharge of its duties, notified WILLIAM S. VARE, of Pennsylvania, then a candidate for the United States Senate from that State, of its proceedings, and the said WILLIAM S. VARE appeared in person and by attorney before said committee while it was engaged in making such investigation; and

Whereas the said committee has reported that the evidence without substantial dispute shows that at the primary election at which the said WILLIAM S. VARE is alleged to have been nominated as a candidate for the United States Senate there were numerous and various instances of fraud and corruption in behalf of the candidacy of the said WILLIAM S. VARE, and that there was spent in behalf of the said WILLIAM S. VARE in said primary election, by the said WILLIAM S. VARE and his friends, a sum of money exceeding $785,000; and

Whereas the said WILLIAM S. VARE has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts, although full and complete opportunity was given him not only to present evidence but arguments in his behalf; and

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence taken by said committee is now and for many months has been on file in the Senate, and all of the said facts appear without substantial dispute; and

Whereas on the 10th day of January, 1927, there was filed in the Senate an official communication from the then Governor of Pennsylvania, made and delivered to the Senate in pursuance of law, the following certificate:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, January 8, 1927.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the returns of the election of United States Senator, held on November 2, 1926, as the law of this Commonwealth directs.

I have the honor also to inform you that I have to-day signed and by registered mail delivered to Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, a certificate which is as follows:

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the face of the returns filed in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth of the election held on the 2d day of November, 1926, WILLIAM S. VARE appears to have been chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1927."

The form of words customarily used for such certificates by the governors of this Commonwealth and the form recommended by the Senate of the United States both include certification that the candidate in question has been "duly chosen by the qualified electors" of the Commonwealth.

I can not so certify, because I do not believe that Mr. VARE has been duly chosen. On the contrary, I am convinced, and have repeatedly declared, that his nomination was partly bought and partly stolen, and that frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election. But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated can not be honestly entitled to a seat.

The stealing of votes for Mr. VARE and the amount and the sources of the money spent in his behalf make it clear to me that the election returns do not in fact correctly represent the will of the sovereign voters of Pennsylvania.

Therefore I have so worded the certificate required by law that I can sign it without distorting the truth.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Very respectfully yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT, *Governor.*

Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the expenditure of such a large sum of money to secure the nomination of the said WILLIAM S. VARE as a candidate for the United States Senate is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, and, together with the charges of corruption and fraud made in the report of said committee and substantiated by the evidence taken by said committee, and the charges of corruption and fraud officially made by the Governor of Pennsylvania, taints with fraud and corruption the credentials of the said WILLIAM S. VARE for a seat in the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the said WILLIAM S. VARE is not entitled to take the oath of office and is not entitled to membership in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the whereases which are involved in Senate Resolution No. 2, relating to the Senatorship from Pennsylvania, have been coupled in the public mind, I think, and, perhaps, in the minds of many Senators, with the case in regard to the Senatorship from Illinois, which has just been decided. I want, if I can, and as briefly as I can, to show the Senate that the two cases bear no resemblance one with the other.

It is true that similar legal question occur in both cases; that is, as to the matter of the immediate administration of the oath or the deferring of the oath, perhaps, what has been said in regard to the Illinois case relates equally well to the Pennsylvania case; and it is true that they come up at the same time and that they involve the question of the State's representation. But there the resemblance ceases, and there is such a marked difference in the facts that I feel it to be my duty to bring them to the attention of the Senate.

I do not expect to take the time of the Senate in the discussion again of the constitutional phases of the matter. I could not do it so well as it was done this morning by the eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and there is no necessity of doing it when what he said is still fresh in our minds. But I do join with him in the expression of hope that if the Congress has the power to regulate primary elections for Senators and Representatives, it will do so without further delay.

The situation as it stands is impossible and unfair to every candidate. No one of us knows, in advance of his campaign, what the rule is which he must not transgress. They hang him first and try him afterwards, as in old Lord Jeffrey's day, and that is true of all of us who sit here. It is true of everyone who enters the lists and tries to defeat us for election.

I doubt very much whether the Congress has the power to regulate the processes of nomination for Federal offices, but if we have, let us, in justice to ourselves, our adversaries, and our successors, regulate them so that every man may know the law that binds him and will not have to trust himself to the whim or subsequent judgment of a possibly hostile majority in the House in which he claims a seat. Therefore I agree with the expression of hope voiced by the Senator from Idaho.

I do not agree with the Senator from Idaho in his statement that our power to judge of the qualifications of Senators elect means that we have power to judge of their general fitness and desirability. I doubt very much if the framers of the Constitution could be imagined to have intended that, when the historical fact is that they rejected a proposition that the States should nominate and that the House of Representatives should elect the Members of the Senate. That was proposed in the convention and was rejected with but brief discussion. Yet that is the effect of the argument so often made that the word "qualifications" extends to the fitness in every respect of a Senator elect and not merely to his constitutional qualifications—those stated in the Constitution regarding residence, age, and citizenship. However, be that as it may, I do not mean to take the time of the Senate now to discuss it.

I want to assume, in what I say, that the judgment of the Senate expressed this afternoon is in accordance with the Constitution in its true reading, and, after all, we must assume that, because there is no appeal from the decision of the Senate, and if it has the power to decide that that is what the Constitution means—and I think it has that power—then for all practical purposes the Constitution does mean that.

I want to come immediately to the facts in the Pennsylvania primary election, the general election, and the investigation that followed, but I would not be fair either to my colleague elect or to myself if I did not say at the very beginning that to the utmost of my power I advocated the nomination of Senator Pepper in the Pennsylvania primary, and worked and spoke as hard as I could to nominate Senator Pepper and to defeat Senator VARE. After the primary I abided by the decision of my party and worked with equal vigor for the election of its nominee, Senator VARE, and now I conceive it to be my duty, and a high duty, to stand here in the Senate and in his behalf and in behalf of the people of Pennsylvania to plead for fair play for him in the decision which the Senate is about to make.

Understand me, then, that I will make no legalistic argument. I am not here to whittle out fine points of constitutional law, but I make my appeal to the Members of the Senate as believers in fair play, as men who can rise above partisanship or even their personal interests when a question of fair play is presented to them. I think it is so presented in this case.

Our primary took place in May of 1926. Senator Pepper declared his candidacy long before. When time had passed so that it came toward the last day for declaring his candidacy, Mr. Pinchot, then Governor of Pennsylvania, announced himself as a candidate, and it became obvious to all observers there that with Pinchot and Pepper in the lists there would probably be a division of the dry vote in Pennsylvania. It offered a great opportunity for some one to run for the nomination on a platform of modification of the Volstead law, and that is what Mr. VARE proceeded to do. He saw the opportunity, went promptly into the arena and declared his candidacy within a few hours after Governor Pinchot had done so, and based his candidacy squarely upon the issue of modification of the Volstead law.

It was stated by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] in his opening remarks yesterday that the election in Pennsylvania was not based on an issue, but I think he must have forgotten that not only was Mr. VARE's candidacy based on that issue but it was broadcast over Pennsylvania in his declaration of principles to the number of millions and millions of copies sent in 14 languages throughout the Commonwealth, posted on billboards, and preached on every husting. There was an issue in Pennsylvania and the opponents of his issue were divided.

Senator Pepper had the benefit of being the incumbent in the Senate, with whatever advantage that carried, having had a share in the appointment and confirmation of thousands of Federal officeholders. Mr. Pinchot had had the appointment of thousands of State employees in Pennsylvania and he had been instrumental in securing the passage of what was known as the "administration code" in Pennsylvania, which gave the governor, and a couple of the members of his cabinet working with him, the power not only to appoint but to fix the salaries of practically all the employees of the State. I do not accuse him of any improper use of that power, but the plain and natural result was that he had at his command a very large organization capable of being used in a political way.

Mr. VARE had no Federal patronage to speak of. He had no state-wide organization whatsoever, but he happened to be the leader of the Republican organization in the city of Philadelphia, and to that extent he had a very decided political asset for the campaign.

About six months before the primary election—and this is of the highest importance in connection with some of the statements made by the Senator from Nebraska and in the preamble of his resolution—Governor Pinchot, acting under the power vested in him as governor, removed all of the members of the registration board of Philadelphia County and appointed five friends of himself. That registration board, thus appointed by

the Governor of Pennsylvania, had in its employ some 30 or 40 investigators qualified to run down any suggested fraud. It had more than that. It had the power, and it exercised the power, of appointing the voting registrars, four in number in each of the 1,492 divisions into which the city of Philadelphia is divided, and it was they, the appointees of this registration board, who made up the registration voting lists in every precinct in the city of Philadelphia. It was impossible for Mr. VARE or his friends, even if they tried to do it, to pad that list by any connivance with boards of their own choosing. These election officials, under the law of Pennsylvania, had the right and did exercise the right to make up the voting check lists on which all the balloting was done throughout the city, and that was made up months before. As I said, they had a very large number of investigators ready to run down any charge of false registration. They had the same number of investigators after the primary, with the same power of investigation of any charges of fraud; and not one accusation by either Pinchot or Pepper ever was made, before or after the primary, of any fraudulent registration in the city of Philadelphia. So much for that.

When the campaign for the senatorship was well under way it became obvious that alliances would have to be made with candidates who were running for other State offices. We here in Washington, looking back at that primary election, think of nothing but the senatorship. But a far more bitter fight was under way for the nomination of the Republican candidate for governor. If the Pepper-VARE-Pinchot contest was a bitter one, I can assure you that it did not equal in bitterness the contest waged for the governorship, with all its enormous political power, with all that it meant in the welfare of the State. Our governor is elected for four years and has a very wide power in appointments of all sorts and in the determination of the policies of the State; has almost complete control of an enormous budget running into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and of spending hundreds of millions of dollars in bond money for highway improvement. He has almost as much power as had the President of the United States 25 years ago. The contest for that office was especially bitter. Similarly a lieutenant governor was to be elected, and that place was bitterly contested. Thirty-six candidates for Congress were coming up for nomination. Twenty-five candidates for State senators were coming up for nomination. Two hundred and eight representatives in the State house of representatives, the complete membership of that body, were to be nominated. Besides that were thousands and thousands of ward, county, and State committeemen, involving many places bitterly contested.

The population of Pennsylvania at that time was approximately 9,500,000. It had been 8,700,000 in 1920. The best estimates were that it was about 9,500,000 at the time of these primaries. It became obvious that conditions would become even more chaotic were there not some alliances made between candidates. There were alliances between those whose policies and natural affinities brought them together. Senator Pepper united his candidacy with that of Governor Fisher, with a candidate for lieutenant governor, and so on down the list. Senator VARE united his candidacy with a former lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Beidleman, a man of wide acquaintance and high popularity, and with Mr. James, a candidate for lieutenant governor, and Mr. Woodward, candidate for secretary of internal affairs, who were also to be nominated, and they made alliances throughout the State with candidates for Congress, for the State senate, and for the State house of representatives. A very definite slate or group of candidates was thus united and worked for by each of these two factions.

Governor Pinchot, on the other hand, made no such alliance with any candidate. He ran absolutely alone for the single office of United States Senator and took no active interest apparently in anybody's candidacy for governor or lieutenant governor or any of the other offices.

The expenditures which are mentioned here, and I will come to those in a moment, are the expenditures that were made for the entire ticket, this great throng of candidates for State and national offices. It would not be correct to say that the total spent by any group was spent for their candidate for governor any more than it would be correct to say that it was spent for their candidate for United States Senator. It is difficult to estimate the partial benefits derived by each candidate from the group expenditures. The total is all that has been reported to the Senate. But we do know that in the total of $785,000 mentioned in the preamble of the resolution, $105,000 was an expenditure by Beidleman in his own personal campaign, with which VARE had nothing whatever to do and did not even know about until it was brought out by the investigating committee of the Senate. So that it is obviously unfair to include such items as that in the total from which he is claimed to have received a partial benefit. I will come to that a little more in detail in a moment.

As I have said Mr. VARE's issue was the future of the Volstead Act. When he started out he found the newspapers of the State practically unanimous against him. Their editorial pages were closed to him except in denunciation. Their news pages he found were closed to the political news that he tried to get them to print. Everywhere in the State he found the press, with very few exceptions, opposed to his candidacy. They still would take advertisements that he paid for, but they would not print his news and they would not give him what he considered a fair deal.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. MOSES]. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to ask the Senator why it was that the press, which is supposed to be an honest and enlightened press, was opposed to VARE?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Senator Pepper had been in the field earlier and many of the newspapers had given him their support. It may be that they disagreed with Mr. VARE in his views on the Volstead Act. It may be that they disagreed with him politically. I do not know. I can not analyze their motives and I will not undertake to do so. But the fact remains that the press of Pennsylvania as a whole was bitterly opposed to Mr. VARE's candidacy and he could not get one favorable word into those papers unless he paid for it.

He sent out incredible quantities of political advertising matter, the sort of printing that political managers call "literature." I doubt whether it quite comes within the definition of that word, but that is its common name. He sent out in all 8,590,000 pieces of such political matter. He sent them out in envelopes carrying 2-cent stamps. He was a Member of the other House of Congress; he had been for 14 years a Member of that body; and he could have, had he seen fit to do so, put speeches into the RECORD and sent them out at Government expense under his frank, as has been done, but he did not do that. All of these 8,590,000 pieces of literature were sent out in envelopes bearing 2-cent stamps. Of course, he paid for the printing; he paid for the stationery; he paid for the stamps.

In addition, he ran advertisements in 168 English-speaking newspapers or periodicals; he ran advertisements in 77 foreign-language newspapers. We have a great many people in Pennsylvania to whom some other language than English is easier to read, and we have a large number of foreign newspapers. To that element of the voting population he made a particular appeal. So that his advertising bills, which have been reported in detail, were very large.

He printed his platform in 14 different languages. As I said a while ago, he sent that throughout the State. He had bills posted on billboards and fences throughout Pennsylvania at nearly every turn, advertising not only himself but advertising Beidleman for governor, James for lieutenant governor, and Woodward for secretary of internal affairs. He made his appeal directly to the people, passing the newspapers, because from them he thought he could not get a fair deal.

The total amount expended by VARE, Beidleman, James, and Woodward and by committees supporting congressional candidacies, committees supporting aspirants for State senatorships and committees supporting the 208 members of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania—the total spent by this great throng was $785,000. Of that Mr. VARE himself spent $71,436. That was the expenditure of Senator VARE himself. He has accounted for every penny of it. The sum of $17,000 of it went for 2-cent stamps. The remainder of it went for printing, for addressing letters, for letter writing. He sent out hundreds of thousands of letters which he himself signed. The remainder of it was spent for the dissemination of political information by mail in such a way as he considered advantageous to his candidacy.

Mr. Beidleman himself, as I have stated, spent $105,000 of his own money and his friends' money in the Beidleman-for-governor campaign, and that fund had nothing whatsoever to do with Mr. VARE's candidacy and was not known to Mr. VARE until long afterwards; I think not until it came out before the special investigating committee.

A newspaper publisher in one of our counties outside of Philadelphia, Ralph B. Strassburger, who had been a delegate to the national convention, spent some $16,000—about which, I believe, Mr. VARE knew nothing—in the advocacy of a modification of the Volstead Act, sending out newspapers and that sort of thing. That has been added into this total as if it had been spent by VARE for VARE's candidacy, when, in fact, it was

not. About $650,000 appear to have been the aggregate of all expenses all over the State by Mr. VARE and by his friends which in any way could inure to the benefit of the whole ticket or to him personally. Understand that, from the intensity of the campaign, it is a safe statement to make that more than half of that was contributed and spent with the governorship in mind. It is utterly impossible for any human being to allocate the proportion of it ascribable to any particular candidate out of these hundreds of candidates who were upon this ticket; but it is a safe statement that Mr. VARE received the benefit of less than half of it.

While Mr. VARE was doing that, what were the others doing? Mr. Pinchot, whose candidacy was coupled with no one else's, spent for his own particular private benefit in that campaign $187,000, although he had access to the newspapers in a way that Mr. VARE could never dream of getting. The sum of $187,000 was expended for his own interest, all for himself, with no partners in the race, and nobody to share the benefit of it. That sum was within $8,000 of what Newberry spent, and received the condemnation of the Senate for spending. I do not for a moment blame Mr. Pinchot for that; in view of the size of the State and of the magnitude of the problem with which he was confronted, his expenditure was not at all excessive, and I do not want that implication to be drawn from what I say. When one remembers that there are 4,000,000 of possible voters in Pennsylvania, 4,000,000 of citizen adults competent and qualified to vote, that the appeal had to be made to a voting group of 4,000,000, the sums spent by these men were very small.

Mr. VARE testified that it cost 6½ cents to print, address, stamp, and post a letter to each voter.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I merely wish to be sure that I do not misunderstand the Senator. Does he mean to say that in a population of—I think he said there were about 9,000,000 people living in Pennsylvania at this time——

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The estimate is nine and a half millions.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania mean to say that there are 4,000,000 qualified voters out of that number?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. There are 4,000,000 adult citizens qualified to vote. Not so many voted, however.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But that many were qualified to vote. It is rather a large percentage, being nearly one-half of the entire population.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is about 40 per cent.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I am merely trying to get this matter clear—know how many actually voted?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. About 1,600,000 persons voted in the primary; that is about 40 per cent of our voting population actually went to the polls and voted. I am sorry to say that that percentage has been dwindling for a hundred years. It is about the same average as elsewhere in the Eastern States.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BAYARD. I will ask the Senator was not the total vote as between Pinchot, VARE, and Pepper a little over 1,450,000?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I can give the Senator the figures almost instantly. Mr. VARE received 596,000 votes, Mr. Pepper received 515,000 votes, and Mr. Pinchot received 339,000 votes. The Democrat, Mr. Wilson, who was unopposed, received 153,000.

Mr. BAYARD. The Senator is not counting the votes for Mr. Wilson, the Democratic candidate, in connection with the appeals put out by Mr. VARE, is he?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The same people who voted for Mr. VARE could not have voted for Mr. Wilson. They were, however, qualified voters, and even in Pennsylvania we consider voters in the other party as eligible to change their minds. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Can the Senator tell us the population of Philadelphia as compared to the population of the remainder of the State?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have not the exact figures at hand, but the population of Philadelphia is nearly 2,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator know what proportion of the qualified voters in Philadelphia cast their ballots?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The proportion was about the same there as it was in the remainder of the State, although it may have been slightly larger.

Mr. FLETCHER. I saw a statement somewhere to the effect that 85 per cent of the qualified voters of Philadelphia had voted and their votes had been counted.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not think the proportion will run so high as that.

Mr. President, in 1925 Congress passed an act to regulate expenditures in elections. That act defined elections in such a way as plainly to exclude primaries. Congress in that act made no attempt to regulate expenditures in primary elections. I think we will all admit that; but Mr. VARE knew about that act, and he was scrupulous in his effort to comply with the spirit of it in that primary election, although he knew that the letter of it did not apply to his actions. That act provides, in substance, that the personal contribution of any candidate for Senator may not exceed $25,000, but it also provides that money spent in sending out letters and printed political matter shall not be included in that total. Mr. VARE did not spend a cent for any other purpose. He did not give a cent to any political committee; he did not give a cent for any activity in that campaign whatsoever, except the printing and typewriting of letters, broadsides, platform announcements, and marked copies of newspapers which he mailed out under United States Government stamps.

The primary election resulted according to the figures that I have given. There were no charges of fraudulent registration or voting in the city of Philadelphia. There never has been a charge, supported by any evidence, of any improper or illegal act by Mr. VARE in that primary. Bear in mind we who have just voted on a case in which it was charged that a crime had been committed are about to vote on a case in which no one charges any crime of any sort, no violation of any law. The only error, if it be an error, that Mr. VARE committed was to send out too many letters, to appeal to too many voters, to make too public the issue on which he was running.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Has the State of Pennsylvania a statute limiting the expenditure of a candidate for the Senate?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; Mr. President, there is no such statute. There is no statute to prohibit anything that was done by the Vare forces or by Mr. VARE himself in that campaign.

Now, let me come to another point which the Senate probably has not fully understood. Back in the year 1906 the Legislature of Pennsylvania was summoned into special session by the governor to adopt more rigorous election laws to prevent fraud in elections, both primary and general elections. At that session one of the most forceful and able leaders of the Roosevelt following, former State Senator William Flinn—I think he was the leader of the Roosevelt party in Pennsylvania, and he had been active in all manner of ballot-reform movements in Pennsylvania—introduced and secured the passage of a bill which provided that in every primary and general election each candidate might employ what were known as "watchers," not more than two for each district, and that those watchers might have access to the polling places, remaining outside of the voting inclosure but having the right to be present there throughout the day, and that those watchers should receive certificates from the county commissioners of each county establishing their official status as watchers in behalf of the candidates that they represented.

The passage of that law was regarded as a great step forward in election reform in Pennsylvania, and it has come to be the recognized practice followed by all candidates in every election, no matter what party ticket they are running on or whose primaries they are running in or for what office they are trying to get nomination or election, to employe such watchers; and it is the implication, I think I ought to say in all candor, that the man who is employed is friendly to the candidate who employs him. Of course, he would not employ him if he thought he was not friendly; and being friendly, and being employed as a watcher, and expecting to receive five or ten dollars for his day's work—which is rather small pay when you consider the hours he has to be on duty—nevertheless it is customary to regard those watchers' certificates as privileges, and the pay that they carry as reward for political work as well as for watching. There is nothing new about it. It is the direct outcome of that

reform law passed by the Pennsylvania Legislature 20 years before, and it has gone on in every election.

Personally, I do not like the practice. I think its disadvantages are obvious; but at least it was not invented by Mr. VARE and used solely in this campaign. It has been used in every campaign by every candidate for 20 years.

That explains, if I have expressed myself clearly, the references that have been made to the employment of this peculiar type of official known as a watcher. Understand, the candidate pays the watcher; and a part of the committee expenses of this Vare-Beidleman committee went to the payment of watchers in different parts of the States throughout the 8,000 election precincts that we have in Pennsylvania. When you remember that each candidate was entitled to appoint two watchers, that each person on the slate was entitled to appoint two watchers in each of the districts of the area for which he was running—which, of course, in the case of the governorship and the lieutenant governorship and the secretaryship of internal affairs and the senatorship covered the whole State—you can realize that that amount of money, spread over 8,000 districts, was very far from being a great outpouring of money in any one of them. It simply could not be. It averaged up much less than one watcher per candidate in each district.

Now, let me call to your attention some of the statements that have been made in the preamble to the resolution that we are considering.

At the top of page 2 occurs this statement:

Whereas the said committee——

That is, the special investigating committee headed by my friend from Missouri—

has reported that the evidence without substantial dispute shows that at the primary election at which the said WILLIAM S. VARE is alleged to have been nominated as a candidate for the United States Senate, there were numerous and various instances of fraud and corruption in behalf of the candidacy of the said WILLIAM S. VARE.

If I may stop there, I have seen no instances, no testimony, no charge backed up by proof, that there was fraud or corruption in the nomination of Mr. VARE. None is given in the committee's report; at least, I have not found it, and I have read it several times very carefully; and none was given by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] in his opening address yesterday.

Then the preamble goes on to recite—

that there was spent in behalf of the said WILLIAM S. VARE in said primary election, by the said WILLIAM S. VARE and his friends, a sum of money exceeding $785,000

I have already explained to the Senate that that statement is clearly incorrect, and is shown to be incorrect by the report of the special committee filed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Just to start with, $105,000 of that total was spent by Beidleman, for Beidleman, without Mr. VARE's knowledge; and the balance of it was spent for this great throng of candidates for offices more bitterly contested than this one; and thousands of men shared in that and benefited by it, and not merely Mr. VARE.

Then follows this statement:

Whereas the said WILLIAM S. VARE has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts—

Why, Mr. VARE has controverted it in published statements; he has controverted it in spoken speeches; in every place that opportunity has been given to him to answer it he has controverted those statements that they call "the foregoing facts." He has never remained silent about the matter. He has only been clamoring for a chance to testify to it before some committee of the Senate that would listen to him and let him present his side of the case.

Then the preamble goes on:

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence taken by said committee is now and for many months has been on file in the Senate, and all of the said facts appear without substantial dispute—

But they do not. They do not appear with or without substantial dispute. They do not appear at all; and yet the resolution on which you are expected to act recites that as if there were no dispute about it.

Then the resolution goes on to recite the strange certificate that Governor Pinchot sent to the Senate after the general election. I am skipping rapidly over the general election, because there is no proof of any fraud in that. There is a contest, which has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but no proofs have yet been taken. Mr. VARE was elected by an enormous majority—175,000 I believe. It was very big. There is no proof of corruption in that regard, except such as might have been deduced from certain wards in which Mr. VARE's opponents received no votes whatever in the city of Philadelphia. But when we came to look into the facts we found that there was an equal number or a greater number in which Mr. VARE had received no votes whatever scattered around through the balance of the State, and we do not charge that those were fraudulent; at least we do not need to for the purposes of this case; and the zeros just about counteract one another. No one has produced proof that there was any fraud or any corruption in that election.

After the election was over Governor Pinchot sent to the Senate, a few days before he went out of office, a certificate concerning the election of his successful rival; and that certificate was accompanied by a letter addressed to the President of the Senate, in which Governor Pinchot recited that he could not certify in the usual form because of his belief that Mr. VARE's election was "partly bought and partly stolen." If that is evidence of corruption, then that is the only evidence of corruption in that election that there is. No circumstances were given; no supporting evidence was given then or has ever been given since. The statement stood there wholly unsupported, and it looked like a Parthian shot at his successful adversary in the contest.

But, be that as it may, it was followed within a few days by a proper certificate from the Governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Fisher, who was on the ticket opposed to Mr. VARE, who was the opponent of this Mr. Beidleman who was Mr. VARE's teammate. Governor Fisher, nominated in opposition to the VARE slate, as soon as he got into office gave Mr. VARE a proper certificate in the usual form; and, after some little debate, when that certificate was presented here in the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and by them was found to be regular and in due form, and by them was reported back to the Senate with that statement, that they found it all in proper form. Yet the preamble of this resolution, which pretends to give fair play, makes no mention whatsoever of the fact that that certificate was filed, was referred to the committee, was approved by it, and was accepted by the Senate, and is now on file with the Secretary.

That ends the recitals in this strange resolution.

Regarding the suggestions of fraud which were offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] in his speech yesterday, let me call to your attention just one situation which will show you why Philadelphia turned out as it did.

Back in 1922, when Mr. Pinchot was a candidate for governor, he was opposed by the Philadelphia organization, and they did their very best to beat him. There were eight so-called independent wards, nonorganization wards, in Philadelphia in which Mr. Pinchot received a decided majority. He got 49,000 votes in those eight wards against his opponent's 37,000. Four years later these same independent wards, still independent, gave Mr. VARE 75,000 against Senator Pepper's 55,000. You can not explain a turnover like that, or a vote against the organization in the one election and for Mr. VARE in the next one by any theory that those voters are bought or paid for, or driven like sheep to the polls. Those people do their own thinking; and, whether they were right or wrong, they voted their thought as they meant to vote it in that election, and there is no corruption shown or instanced in any one of those.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether that change was not due to a return to sanity on the subject of prohibition?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator's question may be natural, but I have troubles enough without getting into that subject.

Mr. BORAH. I would like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether that would be a reason for the Senate to reject Mr. VARE.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I beg Senators not to go into that. We are going to have all winter to talk about that subject.

Mr. BRUCE. The question whether a man is fit for office is a question of supreme importance, compared with which even such an issue as prohibition sinks into insignificance.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As I said to the Senate, Mr. Pinchot, for his own candidacy, spent $187,000. The benefits of no part of that went to any other candidate than himself. The opposition ticket, that which was headed by Senator Pepper, Governor Fisher, their candidate for lieutenant governor, and their candidate for secretary of internal affairs, spent in all $1,804,000, approximately three times as much as all the

expenditures that by any stretch of the imagination could be said to have benefited the Vare candidacy, either in whole or in part.

Is it not a striking thing, Mr. President, that if this resolution passes in the form in which it is, a vacancy will be created in the Senatorship the appointment to fill which will belong to a governor elected on a ticket that spent three times as much as did Mr. VARE? That would be the effect, in the direction of purity in government, in opposition to the spending of money, that the Senate would achieve by the passage of the pending resolution. It would take the nomination and election away from Senator-elect VARE and give it to the opposition ticket, which spent three times as much money as did he and his friends. I do not mean to imply that what they spent was improper; but that is not the question here.

Gentlemen talk about corruption in the registration. How could there be corrupt registration where Mr. VARE's adversary was the person who appointed the registration board that made the lists? How can the Senator from Nebraska accuse Mr. VARE of corruption in registration when Mr. VARE's adversary moved the whole machinery that registered every voter in Philadelphia, and when, if they were deceived, they had a large corps of investigators, both before and after the election, to run down any fraud that was suggested to them; and not one suggestion of fraud was given them either before or after. How can we talk of corruption in the registration there?

Senator Pepper, whose vote ran almost as large as did Mr. VARE'S, had every opportunity to challenge that registration, had every opportunity after the primary election was over to try to break it down and not abide its results if he could show fraud in the registration. He made no effort to do it. Governor Pinchot, with all the machinery at his hand, with every opportunity to show corruption if corruption existed, made no motion to do it, save to state in that letter to the Senate what I read a little while ago.

I want, if I can, to discuss this matter without the slightest bitterness toward any person. I do not want by my attitude to criticize any of the participants in this primary, or any of the participants in the subsequent election; but I can not help calling this to the attention of the Senate, that where Mr. VARE spent $17,000 on postage stamps to send out his printed matter and his appeal to the electorate—$17,000; that is, by him, himself—of course, his committee spent more—that money came right back here into the Government Treasury. When it came to the general election somebody sent out over the frank of the Senator from Nebraska about a quarter of a million speeches, printed by the Government Printing Office and sent out in Government envelopes, without one cent of postage. VARE paid his postage bills; the Government paid his adversary's.

I am here to appeal to the Senate for fair play—nothing more. Remember, if you please, that the committee itself which investigated this case reported that they did not have time to finish their investigation. Remember that Mr. VARE had had no chance to cross-examine the witnesses against him.

Remember that he has had no counsel there before that committee, no opportunity to object to hearsay, or to cross-examine the witnesses who have been heard, no opportunity to call witnesses in his defense and to examine them himself; although I gladly admit that my friend the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], had he been given the names of any witnesses by any responsible person, would have summoned them if he had had time.

Mr. VARE has had no opportunity to present anything on his side of the case except in one brief session, when he was called himself and cross-examined by the members of the committee, without any counsel of his own present, and without any chance to put in any direct testimony in his own behalf.

Mr. VARE has had only an inquiry, half finished on the side of the prosecution, without one syllable of defense or opportunity for defense. He has had no chance to be heard in his reply to these accusations. What he says in reply to Governor Pinchot's letter about the election being "partly bought and partly stolen" the Senate does not know, except as it has heard it from my poor lips to-day. He, himself, has been mute, necessarily.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have two certificates here, as I understand, one from the present governor certifying Mr. VARE's election and one from the governor who was governor at the time he was elected. One is in due form; the other is accompanied by a letter stating that the election was bought, obtained by fraud and corruption. What are we to do about it? Which are we to consider the right certificate?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The governorship is a continuing office like the presidency. The governor in office at the time the usual certificate was rendered had authority to make it. It has been referred to our committee and our Committee on Privileges and Elections has wholly ignored the Pinchot certificate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the committee has ignored it, but did it have it before it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Both certificates were referred. They were both referred at the same time.

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee ignored it. What is the Senate to do?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senate accepted the committee's report.

Mr. OVERMAN. Is the Senate to ignore absolutely a certificate from the governor of the State who was governor at the time of the election that the election was obtained by fraud or purchase? I do not know anything about whether the governor knows what he is talking about or not, but that certificate is here before me.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The regular certificate has been passed on and accepted by the Senate. I do not know what possible legal effect the certificate of Governor Pinchot would have. I do not want to argue that from a lawyer's standpoint. I do not want to split hairs. I am trying to argue the full question of fair play to this man who stands before the bar of the Senate for judgment at this moment.

We all know how that certificate came from Governor Pinchot, and we all know why it was sent.

The Senate knows that Governor Pinchot was a disappointed aspirant for that same office. The Senate knows that there never has been a syllable of testimony or evidence of any kind to support that statement in Governor Pinchot's letter. Surely we are not going to punish Mr. VARE, or, more important, punish the State of Pennsylvania, because in a letter to the President of the Senate—not in a certificate, but in a letter to the President of the Senate—Governor Pinchot makes such a statement as that; and he accompanied it by a formal certificate that Mr. VARE "appeared to have been chosen." It is not in his certificate that the trouble came, but in the letter of transmittal with which he sent it down here.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KING. If I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania, he indicated that the two certificates had been transmitted to the special committee investigating campaign expenditures.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If I said that, I misspoke myself. They were transmitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which made a report to the Senate on March 4.

Mr. KING. I was about to observe that none of the certificates was transmitted to the special committee, and whatever disposition was made, it related to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator for his correction. It was a slip of the tongue if I said that.

One thing more; and this, I know, will appeal to the sense of fairness of every Senator here. Last summer, after much litigation over the continuance or noncontinuance of the special committee of investigation, the Federal courts in Pennsylvania held that the committee had ceased to exist, and that only the Senate could revive it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am sure the Senator does not want to make a misstatement. Does the Senator construe the decision of the district judge as holding that the committee had ceased to exist? Does not the opinion rather state that there was no judicial question presented, and that the Senate itself must determine whether the committee was still in existence, or whether it had ceased to function?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to accept that suggestion, too. Anyway, the courts held that committee could not have the ballots.

The special committee went to Pennsylvania and tried to get possession of the ballots cast in a number of counties outside of Philadelphia. We have the ballots here from Philadelphia and Allegheny County; that is, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. We have here something like 2,500 ballot boxes, and all of their contents; but there remain some 5,500 ballot boxes still back in the State, the ballots in which, under the State law, were going to be destroyed before the September primary of 1927.

The special committee tried to get them, and could not. The courts for whatever reason, declined to order the surrender of the ballots.

Some of us suggested that it was of the highest importance to a fair determination of this case that those ballots should be saved, and suggested that the Committee on Privileges and Elections ought to gather the ballots in. A conference was held in Chicago—I trust I am repeating this correctly, and if I do not, the Senator from Missouri will correct me—a conference was held in Chicago, at which there were present certain members of the special committee, certain members of the Privileges and Elections Committee, and also Mr. VARE and Mr. Wilson, his contesting opponent in the election. Mr. Wilson, as I said, has filed a contest here in the Senate, which has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

It was obvious that there was no money to pay for gathering those ballots, and finally Mr. Wilson said, "I want the ballots from four counties," and Mr. VARE said, "I want the ballots from all the other counties examined." They then and there agreed that Mr. Wilson should pay the expenses of bringing down to Washington the ballots from the four counties, and that Mr. VARE should pay the whole expenses, out of his own pocket or out of the pockets of his friends, to bring down the ballots from 61 counties. VARE has paid. He has paid over $25,000 already to assist the United States Senate to get together and prevent the destruction of these ballots throughout that great area.

How can we now pass a resolution that will say to Mr. VARE, "We were only joking when we let you spend your $25,000 to save these ballots. We are going to bar you at the door, and without listening to your side of the case, and without offering to refund to you the money that we led you to spend in expectation of a fair hearing, we are going to stop you at the door and say your election is no good."

That is not the way the Senate can treat people who appear before it in good faith in an effort to assist it to get the whole truth. That is not good faith.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KING. I apologize to the Senator for interrupting him.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to be interrupted.

Mr. KING. Is the Senator quite accurate—and I ask for information because I am not clear—in his statement that the Senator-elect, Mr. VARE, obtained or, rather, procured the transmission or shipment to Washington of all the remaining ballots? My understanding is that friendly actions were brought before the three district judges of the United States in Pennsylvania for the purpose of securing an order to impound the ballots, and pursuant to the injunction, whether interlocutory or otherwise it is immaterial to inquire, an order was issued by the judges respectively to impound the ballots. It is quite likely that Mr. VARE, either he or some person in his behalf, advanced the money for the purpose of carrying into effect the order of the judges to impound those ballots.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I must have misspoken myself again, and if I did it was unconsciously. What actually happened was that the ballots from 5,500 precincts had been gathered together and concentrated under seal—not the ballot boxes. The ballots were taken out under official supervision, sealed up in United States mail sacks, and carefully sealed within them, and they are now under guard. But the process of collecting them and going through this very formal method of taking out the ballots under the supervision of both sides cost a lot of money. That is what Mr. VARE paid for. The ballots physically are not in Washington, but are in concentration points in Pennsylvania ready to be sent here if required.

Mr. KING. But in the possession of officials designated by the court?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Absolutely, as I understand it. I am not sure whether it is the clerk of the Federal court or who it is, but it is some official agreed on by both sides.

I have spoken of fair play for Senator-elect VARE. I have almost finished the appeal that I want to make, but I think I come now to the most important part. I want to appeal for fair play to the people of my State. The Senate to-day does not know one thing about the primary election that was not fully known to the people of Pennsylvania in November, 1926, when they elected Mr. VARE to the United States Senate by over 175,000 majority. We are going to pass judgment here on Mr. VARE'S qualifications and fitness to sit in the United States Senate, but when we do it we do not know anything that all the people of Pennsylvania did not know and that they did not hear discussed ad nauseum in that campaign, not only by the adversaries of Senator VARE in Pennsylvania but by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who went into Pennsylvania and campaigned throughout, telling the people of Pennsylvania before they voted everything that he told the United States Senate here.

I do not say as matter of law that their contention is conclusive. I admit for the purposes of the argument that the Senate can reverse their decision. But surely when, with full knowledge of all the facts, the people of Pennsylvania have deliberately sent Mr. VARE here by a huge majority, we can not say to the people of Pennsylvania, "You had no sense in what you did. The man you elected with such deliberation is not even fit to belong to the Senate of the United States and speak for himself while his case is being heard. The prima facie right that you give your elected Senator is not even strong enough to let him participate in the votes of the Senate while his case is being considered."

I am not talking now for Mr. VARE. I am talking for the people of the great State of Pennsylvania, and it is a great State, if only in numbers. Ten per cent of the population of the United States lives there. With the utmost deliberation and with their eyes wide open they sent their representative to the United States Senate. The Constitution can not be amended in its provisions for equal representation in the Senate. We do not get a proportionate representation in the Senate. Sixteen States in the West have a population aggregating smaller than that of this one State of Pennsylvania. Surely we are not asking too much when we say that at all times we are entitled to have our two Senators on the floor. Surely that is not an excessive request from the people of Pennsylvania. When they sent to this body one who has served with credit for 14 years in the other branch of the Congress of the United States, do we run great risk of taint when we let him stay here for the 60 days that are necessary to count these ballots? Is our purity so precarious that 60 days of the presence of this Congressman, who never hurt the House, is going to do injury to us? Can not we have Pennsylvania equally represented during that brief time?

It is not for Mr. VARE that I speak, but it is for the people of Pennsylvania. Their decision was deliberate, and they have the right to enjoy the results of that decision as much as we have the right to overrule it after consideration; but we should not overrule it before consideration. We owe the State that much in the same kind of fair play and good faith for which I have been pleading for Mr. VARE himself. It is a case between the people up there and 94 Senators down here.

If the legislature had elected Mr. VARE, I can see that the opinion of the United States Senate would be entitled to at least as great weight as the opinion of the Legislature of Pennsylvania; but the people elected him. There is no fraud in the election and none has been proven by the slightest scintilla of evidence. How can it be said that the case against those millions of people is so clear that we will make them go on for an indefinite period with only one-half of the representation which the American Constitution guarantees them?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, again I want to preface my remarks by stating that, being a member of the committee which took the evidence in this case and being a member of that committee to which the resolution just adopted sends the Smith case—and I presume the pending resolution will be similarly modified or an attempt made to so modify it——

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator mean that he is going to propose a modification of the resolution we are now discussing?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I say that I suppose that a modification will be offered in view of the Senator's claim that a full hearing was not granted or was not obtained.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I understand the position of the Senator from Missouri to be that these cases ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Senator certainly so stated and offered a resolution to that effect last winter. May I remind the Senator of just what he said?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. On the 19th of January of the present year the Senator from Missouri offered a resolution to refer the Smith case to the Privileges and Elections Committee. The Senator from Missouri then stated:

> I want Mr. SMITH to have the fullest opportunity to appear by counsel, to try his entire case before a committee which can not be said to have in any manner prejudged the merits of the controversy. He may have evidence and may be able to make a showing to that committee which was not submitted to the select committee. I would like to see that course taken, Mr. President, because I realize the gravity of the question involved.

I supposed that was what the Senator wanted to do with both these cases.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well, if that is the question the Senator wants to propound.

I started to say that in view of the fact that the Smith case had been referred by the Senate to the select committee of which I have the honor to be chairman and in view of the fact that this case may take a similar course, though I do not know what course it will take, I do not feel like going into an extensive argument regarding the facts or particularly the inferences from the facts which I might make or others might make if they were arguing that phase of the case. What I rose to do was merely to state some of the facts in the case as they appear, which I think the Senator from Pennsylvania forgot, and I am sure he would have stated them all if he had thought of them, and also to correct an impression or two which he made by stating the rest of the story.

The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that there is no evidence here reported by the committee of fraud in the election as distinguished from the primaries. Of course that is true, and the Senator from Pennsylvania knows why and everybody in the United States who reads the newspapers knows why.

They know that when the committee asked for some additional powers and for an express declaration that it should continue its authority during the recess, and that when there was an abundance of votes in the Senate to pass the resolution if a vote could be taken, my distinguished friend, with all the ability which he has acquired in his long practice at the bar, supported by the very able and cultured Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and backed up by several other gentlemen of good lung power, filibustered the resolution to death. They did it even though the filibuster prevented the passage of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill and other important legislation. It, therefore, hardly lies in the mouth of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania to complain that there is no formal evidence before the Senate at this moment. He is a little like a gentleman who locks the door of his house and then declares that you have not entered, and hence have no right to say anything about what is inside the house. That is all history; and so it is a fact that there is no formal evidence before this body as to what took place at the election in November which was holden after Congress adjourned and when this committee's authority to act was challenged.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, however, has gone outside of any record to state certain facts connected with the election, and hence, it seems to me, has invited consideration of all of the commonly and generally known and understood facts connected with the election itself. It is, however, not accurate for the Senator to say that there has been no challenge of the election here in the Senate, because Mr. Wilson at least has filed a very direct challenge to the election itself, and the former Governor of Pennsylvania has filed a very direct challenge.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I thought I had mentioned the fact that a contest had been filed by Mr. Wilson and had been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I may have missed that part of the Senator's speech. It is not, however, very material.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is in error also—at least I think he is in error—when he states, in substance, that the certificate of Governor Pinchot was in regular form but that the comment of Governor Pinchot was in a letter. Now, I have before me the document which, I take it, transmitted to the Senate the certificate of election. It appears on page 1338 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1926.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is all a part of the preamble of the pending resolution, is it not? The resolution we are discussing recites that whole thing, does it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; but I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the certificate of the election was regular and that the letter was sent here in some separate form.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; I dislike to interrupt the Senator so often, but he could not have heard me correctly. I said that the certificate stated that Mr. VARE "appears to have been chosen"; it used the phrase "appears to have been chosen." I brought that out.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; and all the papers came to the Senate in one envelope; the letter transmitting the certificate came to the Senate at the same time and is signed by the governor. So I think it is mere—I would not say the Senator ever quibbled on anything, but it is almost in the nature of quibbling to say that these two documents are not one and the same thing. The form of the certificate is not the regular form and the reason is stated in the communication transmitting it. So the Senate is officially advised that charges of the gravest nature have been made.

The evidence to support the charges touching the election proper is not here because we had a filibuster in the Senate. I say the "evidence supporting it." That evidence, if taken, would be taken, we must presume, fairly, and the evidence to rebut the charges would also be here before the Senate, but for the representative——

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that a special committee of this body did take such testimony with reference to the Smith case.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is it true that the committee took no testimony or no material testimony with reference to the Vare case?

Mr. REED of Missouri. We took evidence with reference to the primary election, which is here, volumes of it, and to which I intend to refer briefly; but the election itself was held after the special committee had been hamstrung.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I thought; and I was misled by the statement of the Senator that there is no evidence here. The evidence of what transpired in the primary is probably as full in the case of Pennsylvania as in the case of Illinois?

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is very full. I will not state that it is as complete, because when we were about to proceed to take further testimony the interruption occurred.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the election took place in 1926 and the "hamstringing," of which the Senator speaks, did not occur until March, 1927?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator is correct. However, I should have said this: The special committee had gone through the primary and practically completed it and we then had to go to Illinois. By the time we were through with Illinois, and one or two other States, where it was claimed there were great emergencies, and were ready to take up the election itself, and asked for further authority, then it was that we met this filibuster. I thank the Senator for the correction.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the Senator designate, Mr. VARE, was given no chance to present his side of the controversy to the committee. My information has been, and the record so shows, that Mr. VARE himself testified.

Mr. REED of Missouri. He testified twice.

Mr. CARAWAY. He testified every time he wanted to do so?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes. I am glad to have the correction.

The situation, then, was this: When we were ready to resume operations in Pennsylvania the Senator from Pennsylvania, I presume speaking then, as he speaks now, for Mr. VARE, conducted a filibuster for the purpose of stopping that investigation by the particular committee that was then undertaking it. So, if the evidence was not reported here, the charges were here, and Mr. VARE's representative upon the floor of the Senate prevented the disclosures which might have been made, and it must be presumed that as shrewd a man as he knew why he was preventing it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator need not worry about my being Mr. VARE's representative. I spoke then and speak now as the representative of the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. I suppose the people of Pennsylvania met in convention somewhere and told the Senator from Pennsylvania for God's sake to stop this investigation by some means. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The people of Pennsylvania have approved its being stopped, I will say.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will discuss that in a moment with the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator from Missouri why did they object to the election being examined into? The Sena-

tor from Pennsylvania says they approved the action stopping the investigation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not know. The Senator will have to get a man from that State to answer his question.

What was the next thing that happened? The special committee had brought in a resolution asking for an enlargement of its powers. A statement was made on the floor of the Senate at that time in the debate that the members of the committee had no doubt of their authority to proceed, but that question had been raised, and was then evidently being raised, as to the authority of the committee to sit during the recess, and that the committee desired to remove all question of that kind, so that they would not be met by recalcitrant witnesses or by the refusal to turn over the documents concerning the election. The filibuster occurred. The committee then said it would proceed with its work, but it was met with a notice from the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate that he would O. K. no bills for expenditures incurred by the committee—a remarkable and unprecedented act. The paymaster of the Senate had been notified not to pay any of the bills of the committee. The Sergeant at Arms was called before the committee and furnished with subpœnas to serve upon witnesses and with papers to authorize him to obtain possession of the ballots in the counties where they had not been already gathered; but the Sergeant at Arms, under whatsoever instructions he may have had, inquired promptly where the money was coming from to pay his expenses, and when he was informed that if the money was not paid by the paymaster on the requisition of the Senate the committee would advance the money, he still said that he did not know whether he would have the right to take money in that way, and he wanted a day to consult—whom I do not know. The committee gave him three or four hours time to consider, and then wrote him a demand that he should perform his duties as requested by the Senate. We received a reply in substance and effect—I have all the papers here, and in due course I am going to lay them before the Senate on another matter—that he had not had sufficient time, and so he declined to act, and we had to proceed by the appointment of a special representative of the committee.

So it appears that we had the filibuster, and then we had the additional thing of trying to starve the committee to death—that is, to deprive it of funds with which to carry on its work. I do not suppose my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania ever heard of any of those things; but I am sure the people of Pennsylvania who instruct him to come here and take the position he does were all advised of the circumstances.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I advised with some of the gentlemen he has mentioned, and I told them that I thought their conduct was right; and I was very much encouraged to find that the courts thought so, too.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I thank the Senator.

Now we come to the question of the courts.

We sent over to Pennsylvania originally for the ballots of Philadelphia and the ballots of Allegheny County. The courts granted orders for those ballots, and they were impounded and brought here, and have been ever since locked up in the Senate Office Building; and we were just organizing and getting ready to count them and look into those ballot boxes and returns when our money was cut off in this way. I thank the Senator for admitting frankly his part in the transaction.

Proceeding in the same way, we sought to secure the ballots from the other counties. We made the first application in one district. It was preliminarily heard by one of the older Federal judges; but when the case came to a hearing it was transferred to a new Federal judge. The new Federal judge had been confirmed the last day the Senate was in session. I recall that my genial friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and Senator Pepper came to me as one of the members of the Judiciary Committee and said there had not been time to get this appointment through the committee in the regular way; Senator Pepper was going out of office and they very much wanted to have the pleasure of having this man confirmed; and so I and other members of the Judiciary Committee O. K'd the appointment, and he is the gentleman who decided the case. My understanding is—I may be in error, and if I am I hope somebody will correct me—that he never said that this committee had no authority, but that he indicated that there had been a challenge of the authority of the committee and that the Senate must settle that question, and that that decision of his was made the decision of the court of appeals in a memorandum opinion. I think the court held that under the circumstances presented to him this was not a question for the courts to decide, but for the Senate itself to decide whether its committee had authority.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is not the Senator in error in saying that Judge Kirkpatrick had anything to do with this case? I am told that he had nothing to do with it; that the case was heard and decided by Judge Thompson, who has been on the bench for years.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The only thing I know about it is what I was told by the man who went up and presented the case.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Then the man told the Senator wrong.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was there.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not recall the name of the judge to whom the Senator from Missouri refers, who was confirmed just prior to adjournment. I do know that the judge who tried the case was Judge Thompson. If he was not the one who was nominated and confirmed just before adjournment, then I should think the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Judge Kirkpatrick used to be a Congressman. He was confirmed in the manner that the Senator from Missouri speaks of; but he had nothing whatever to do with this case or the decision.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If that is correct, then I was misinformed, and, like the Senator a while ago, I made a mistake in a statement; but I shall inquire about it particularly. I think he had something to do with this case—with one of these cases, anyway—but I will find out. Anyway, that is the kind of decision that was rendered, and that is the important thing. There was no decision, as I understand, that the Senate did not have power to create such a committee; that the Senate did not have power to send for books and papers; but it was held that there was a question raised as to whether the Senate must not itself decide that disputed question. That is very far from saying that the committee had no authority.

The next proposition I want to get the Senate to understand is the method by which these ballot boxes were obtained.

When the Senate sent over there for these orders to impound the ballots, so that the ballots would not be destroyed in the succeeding September, we met with very strong opposition in the courts; and, of course, if the ballots had been destroyed, the counting of the ballots would have been impossible in the contest of Wilson and VARE. It is true that the special committee had practically exhausted its means of getting these ballots. When we asked for the ballots we did not get them. Then it was said that the Committee on Privileges and Elections could get them. Then a joint meeting was held of the two committees, and Mr. VARE and Mr. Wilson were asked to come before the committees and they both came. Prior to that, in some statements Mr. VARE had made, he had declared that he wanted all of the ballots, and that arose in this way:

When this special committee was working, and working unchallenged, it had before it Mr. VARE and Mr. Wilson. The question was asked Mr. Wilson if he desired the ballots from any other counties than Philadelphia and Allegheny. He named four other counties in which he said he would like to have the ballots preserved and examined. The question was then put up to Mr. VARE whether he made any charges of fraud or wrongdoing in any other parts of the State. I think I quote Mr. VARE correctly—and if I do not, he can speak to Senator REED, who will correct me—when I say that he said in substance this:

> I do not desire to make charges of fraud anywhere; but if the ballots are to be counted in any part of the State, I then insist they shall all be counted.

Subsequently he had made a statement, we were advised, that he would pay half of the expense and Mr. Wilson should pay the other half of the expense of getting these ballots; this occurring after the money of the committee had been cut off and at a time when there had been no money appropriated for the use of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

These gentlemen were brought before the joint committee, and Mr. Wilson was asked if he could pay one-half of the expense; and it was stated that Mr. Wilson had no money with which to pay one-half of the expense—a well-known fact; for it has always been understood—and I can say it without hurting his feelings at all—that Mr. Wilson is a poor man.

Then the statement was made:

Mr. Wilson, you say that you want the ballots from four counties. That is the evidence you want saved. That is your case. You must present your own case, and you must get the money for the four counties if you want those ballots saved. We hope this money will all be paid back when the Senate meets and when our genial friends have taken their hands off the money that legitimately ought to be employed.

And Mr. Wilson's friends who were present said they could raise enough money for the four counties.

Then the statement was made to Mr. VARE:

You say, although you charge no fraud in other counties, that you nevertheless want those ballots preserved. That is your evidence. Now, Mr. VARE, will you advance the money to impound those ballots?

And Mr. VARE said that he would.

That having been done, the opposition to having these ballots impounded—not brought here, but impounded—seems to have disappeared; and they went to these courts in Pennsylvania and obtained proper orders to preserve the ballots. So, without reflecting on anybody or criticizing anybody, I make that statement of the facts so that the Senate may understand them; and I think there is no dispute about them.

There are many statements that my friend made which I think need some correction. In the first place, the statement that Mr. VARE has never had a hearing.

He has never had a hearing about the election itself; but I do not think it is correct to say that he did not have a hearing as to all of the matters with which the committee proceeded. Mr. VARE came before the committee on two occasions and was welcome there at all times. On some of those occasions he was represented by his counsel, and I think on every occasion he had his lawyer with him; and he had his friends and consulted with them. There certainly can not be any doubt about Mr. VARE having had attorneys there. It is true that they did not cross-examine. To state it fairly, not having asked for the right to cross-examine, the committee conducted the investigation as best it could. If they had asked for the right to cross-examine, it would have been accorded. If they want the right to cross-examine now, I am perfectly in favor of giving it to them.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of Mr. VARE having a lawyer there. Whom does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I shall have to ask my colleague to remember names.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator mean Mr. Mackey?

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; I mean that there were attorneys who sat over there that Mr. VARE whispered to and talked with—men whom I understood to be his counsel.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, Mr. Burke appeared as counsel. The Senator from Missouri understood that he represented Mr. VARE. I did not. I understood that he represented Mr. Pepper. I took Mr. Mackey to be the attorney for Mr. VARE.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. Mackey was a witness. Mr. Burke represented somebody else entirely.

Mr. KING. Mr. Francis Burke was there; but, as I understood, he represented Mr. Pepper.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I simply want the Senate to understand how this committee tried to be fair to these gentlemen and still wants to be fair to them. I should be the last person to exclude any proper evidence that could be offered in explanation of anything that has been heretofore testified to, or the last to deny Mr. VARE his counsel or the right to reexamine any witness who has already been examined. This appears in the record:

Mr. MACKEY. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement as representing the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE in that particular?

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. MACKEY. Harry A. Mackey. I represent the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE here in the capacity of the campaign manager of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee, as well as being authorized by Mr. VARE to make this notation upon the record.

We are here with all our witnesses, all our books, all our receipts and evidences of all our expenditures. We are here to give this committee all the information it desires, and we do not place upon the record any question as to the limitations to the qualifications of this committee.

Mr. Mackey proceeded, and Mr. VARE twice testified and at length.

I think no man will dare say that Mr. VARE asked the privilege of making any statement in any answer, or asked to make a statement otherwise, and was denied. So that whether this examination be complete or not complete, up to this date Mr. VARE has been denied no right that he has requested, and he was there to testify; and Mr. Mackey was there claiming to be his representative, and made this statement I have read, in the presence of Mr. VARE. I think that disposes of that phase of the matter.

Mr. President, there are a good many things I might say, but I do not want to say them. I do not want to prejudge this case. I do not want to take as true the statements that I have heard about that election until they are sworn to by somebody and until that evidence appears to be credible and sound. But if one side of the case is to be stated aliunde the record, perhaps it might be well just to say that there is another side stated upon the authority of the press and upon the authority of many good men, and solemnly charged in the contest of Mr. Wilson.

The statement has been made that the people of Pennsylvania returned Mr. VARE. That, I say again, is the question: Did the people of Pennsylvania return Mr. VARE? If they did, they are entitled to have him sit here, unless he is disqualified for reasons that the Senate may find are absolutely controlling. But the question is, Did they select him? It has been said that he was elected by a tremendous majority. The fact is that Pennsylvania is so thoroughly Republican that long ago when a Democrat emigrated into the State of Pennsylvania he adopted the slogan, "Who enters here leaves hope behind."

William B. Wilson made this campaign, according to the testimony, without any money. I say it with respect, he is not a man who can stir great multitudes by his eloquence. He can make a plain, common-sense speech. He had nothing to back him but his character as an honest man; and that is universally recognized. I understand he carried every county in the State of Pennsylvania except 12. He came to the Allegheny County line in that Republican State with something like 98,000 majority, as I recall the figures; and they are subject to correction.

Allegheny County is where Pittsburgh is located. That is the city where I believe they have just indicted 132 gentlemen in one day for election frauds, so the newspapers have said. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is correct, Mr. President. We punish them in our State when they do anything wrong.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The mills of the gods grind very slowly, I am afraid, in the State of Pennsylvania. Through the action of Pittsburgh, or of Allegheny County, Mr. Wilson's majority was cut down to approximately 50,000; but he went to the Philadelphia line with approximately 50,000, and the majority of which my friend speaks was all created in Mr. VARE's town. I am not charging that I know it is dishonest—I am simply speaking now about the necessity of finding out—but it is charged by the press of that city, it is charged by many citizens of that city, that the election reeked with fraud. It is charged that in precinct after precinct, where there were hundreds of votes returned, there was not a single vote returned for Mr. Wilson.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Just the same as up-State the contrary was true.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I thought the Senator would say that. I knew he would. It would be the defense if I perpetrated a fraud, and the other man perpetrated a fraud, and I offset my fraud against his fraud; but if both were guilty of frauds, then neither can enter here.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope the Senator can reconcile the two statements the Senator from Pennsylvania made. He said in his statement a moment ago that there never was even an intimation that there was anything crooked in the election, and then he said they indicted people in Pittsburgh because they had done wrong with reference to the election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In a subsequent election, Mr. President.

Mr. CARAWAY. It was the November election?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the election they were talking about.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; plenty of men have been indicted in both towns.

I speak with some earnestness, but I hope without vehemence and without feeling. I simply want it plainly understood that it will not do to stand here and make an ex parte statement that there are no charges of fraud, when the air is filled with them. I am not saying that those charges are true. I am say-

ing they are made, and having been made, the challenge is here. But outside of those charges there is evidence here warranting the Senate in not administering this oath, and upon the evidence as it stands, that would be my vote.

If Mr. VARE wants a further investigation, wants to be represented by counsel, and wants the privilege of this floor to defend himself, just as we have granted it to SMITH, I am willing to grant it to him. If this matter goes to the committee over which I have the honor to preside—and the Senate may send it wheresoever it pleases, as, of course, it will, for it is the judge—Mr. VARE will be treated with every courtesy; every witness he brings there in proper form will be heard, and every argument his counsel see fit to present will be listened to, and there will be as faithful a report made to the Senate as we know how to prepare.

I could go into many other things, but I shall not. I wanted the situation clarified to whatever extent I have been able to perform that task.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I had intended to say a few words in the Smith case; the vote, however came somewhat unexpectedly, and I did not have an opportunity to do so.

What I intended to say, however, applies equally as well to the Vare case now before the Senate, and will apply to subsequent action in the Smith case in all probability.

Article V of the Constitution provides that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States.

I do not pretend to be a constitutional lawyer, and I have no intention of making any constitutional argument. It does seem to me, however, that by the course which the Senate has assumed in the Smith case, and which it will in all probability assume in the Vare case, the great States of Illinois and Pennsylvania will be deprived during the next six years of one of their respective two seats in the United States Senate.

The credentials of Mr. SMITH and Mr. VARE have been declared by the Committee on Credentials to be in proper form. These credentials have been presented to the Senate, and the Senate refuses to allow the two Senators to be seated.

What is the result of this action?

It can not be said that when the Senate refuses to allow a Senator, with proper credentials, to take his seat in the Senate that a vacancy is thereby created; or that the credentials are nullified. Should the personnel or the opinions of the Senate change at any time during the period for which the credentials run there is nothing to prevent the holder of the credentials from again applying for admission to the Senate.

Clearly, these men if they see fit to do so can hold their credentials and can at any time during the period for which they are elected ask the Senate that they be admitted to its membership, and clearly the Senate can so admit them if it sees fit to do so. Certainly neither State would call an election to fill a vacancy which does not exist.

Should they be allowed to take their seats in the Senate and then be turned out for one reason or another, their case is disposed of for all time.

I believe—and many of my colleagues believe—that these men, in view of the fact that their credentials are in proper order, have the right to be admitted to the Senate, and I am in full sympathy with the most strenuous investigation of the charges made against them after they have taken their seats. Should they then be found ineligible for membership, I should most certainly not be in favor of retaining them in the Senate.

But, believing as I do that they have the prima facie right to be seated in the Senate on the presentation of their properly attested credentials, I am left, and others who believe as I do are left, with no opportunity to vote on the merits of the charges made against them.

These men, if guilty of conduct that makes them ineligible for membership in the Senate, should be punished. The only way that I can see to punish them adequately is not to refuse their admission to the Senate, thereby depriving their States of representation, and allowing them an opportunity at any time during the next six years to beat at our doors for admission, but to admit them, investigate them fairly and thoroughly, and if the proven circumstances warrant it remove them finally from the United States Senate.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 8, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, *December 7, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit Divine—the eternal source of all things good and pure, the way, the truth, the life—dissolve our hearts in gratitude and mold our wills with Thine. Thou all-embracing love, Thou all-preserving power, bless and guide us this day by Thy holy presence. Amid the burden and the care, amid the labor and the calm, it shall hold us and make easy the yoke of toil. Bless us in that rigid service that makes us master of pure desire and gives us a thirst for that law that makes us dead to force and fear. Blessed Lord, may we see the crown of that which was once our cross; the good of that which was once our thorn; the victory of that which was once our trial. Throughout our fair land—wherever the lamp of truth is shining, wherever the rugged virtue of justice is lifting a warning finger, wherever charity and tolerance are wearing their heavenly liveries—we beseech Thy richest blessings upon them. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. HILL of Alabama appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw papers used in support of private pension claims submitted with H. R. 1269 of Sixty-eighth Congress.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT IN TENNESSEE

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1927, the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee issued an order upon the subject of water-power development in that State. I think the subject matter of this order will be very pertinent to discussions that are likely to come later on the floor of the House, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the official order issued by the railroad and public utilities commission of my State at that time.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what did the gentleman say was the subject matter?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Water-power development in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. SWING. At any particular place?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; it mentions no place. They are general rules and regulations under which permits will be granted, and so forth.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Nothing about Muscle Shoals?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Nothing about Muscle Shoals. Muscle Shoals is in Alabama, I will say to the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RAILROAD AND PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE,
Nashville, Tenn., November 1, 1927.

WATER POWER DOCKET NO. 1

On October 10, 1927, an order was made by this commission, acting upon its own initiative, copy of which has been furnished to certain applicants before the Federal Power Commission by the secretary of this commission. That order states briefly the attitude and purpose of this commission with respect to the development of the vast water-power resources of the State of Tennessee. However, it may not be amiss at this time to restate the views entertained by this commission with respect to its powers and duties and to indicate to applicants and prospective applicants for certificates of necessity and convenience the general principles which will govern this commission in its action in dealing with this subject. The commission is deeply impressed with the tremendous importance and far-reaching effect of the subject in hand, not only to the present generation, but to the State and to all its people for all time.

This commission will therefore be guided in all things by these fundamental principles: That the navigable waters and the title to all lands thereunder are held in trust by the State for the benefit of all the people as a whole for all time, and that the State has the power,

as such trustee for the public, so to regulate the public uses of navigable waters as to best accomplish and promote the public interest, and that the rights of riparian owners to use the waters of navigable streams are in strict subordination to the rights of the public. The rights, title, and power of the State with respect thereto are limited only by the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution and legislation of the Congress in accord therewith.

While the waters of nonnavigable streams and the beds thereunder may not be said to belong to the State in the same sense as navigable waters and beds, nevertheless the State has definite rights therein and under its police powers, certain definite and well-defined powers with respect to the construction and maintenance of dams and the impounding of large bodies of water which might break away and devastate large areas and thus destroy both life and property, and might otherwise affect the health and safety of the public. The State also has the undoubted right, as sovereign, to regulate and control the public utilities of the State. Furthermore, the applicant for a certificate of necessity and convenience under and by virtue of which it proposes to acquire property and construct and operate a public utility in the State, may avail itself of the benefit of the State's power of eminent domain to condemn private property wherever same may be needed to effectuate its ends.

This commisison acts by virtue of authority conferred upon it by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee and in so doing is exercising the sovereign power of the State as respects both navigable and nonnavigable waters.

It is the firm resolve and deliberate purpose of this commission to assert and fully protect all the sovereign rights of the State of Tennessee to the end that the State and its citizens may be protected to the uttermost, not only with respect to the rate to be charged for service to the public, but also that the State as such may be fully compensated for the privilege of using the State's property and resources and for the costs and charges incident to the supervision of the same. It should also be borne in mind that the character of this trust held by the State is such that it must be dealt with in such manner that future generations may enjoy the same rights and privileges as do we of to-day. This trust is a continuing one. The people of the State 50 years hence are entitled to enjoy the same benefits flowing from this trust that we of to-day may enjoy, and this right this commission will maintain by writing into any certificate of convenience and necessity which it may issue the proper safeguards and restrictions necessary to preserve this trust inviolate.

This commission has definitely determined that to the full extent of its powers it will not permit these valuable and inestimable rights of the State and its people to be frittered away, neither will it suffer speculators whose purpose is exploitation of the water-power resources of this State to get control of these valuable rights; but, on the other hand, the commission will welcome bona fide investors and developers of our natural resources who may satisfy the commission of their financial ability to carry the proposed improvement to a successful conclusion within a reasonable time. The commission is also mindful of the fact that the State must first work to the interest and welfare of its citizens, and in the operation of public utilities it will require applicants and operators to serve the needs of the people of Tennessee before serving the citizens of other States.

It should be stated that this commission in the issuance of certificates of necessity and convenience will in no case require less than that expressed in the Federal water power act of June 10, 1920, with respect to valuation of property for rate-making purposes. To illustrate, it is provided in section 20 of said act, among other things, "In any valuation of the property of any licensee hereunder for purposes of rate making, no value shall be claimed by the licensee or allowed by the commission for any project or projects under license in excess of the value or values prescribed in section 14 hereof, for the purposes of purchase by the United States, but there shall be included the cost to such licensee of the construction of the lock or locks or other aids of navigation and all other capital expenditures required by the United States, and no value shall be claimed or allowed for the rights granted by the commission or by this act."

Or, in other words, when any project has been completed under the certificate of necessity and convenience issued by this commission, the rate base for the said project shall be fixed by the commission and the actual money properly invested in the property shall be the basis upon which the rate base shall be computed. No consideration will be given to any water-power value over and above the actual investment in the project.

The commission will also reserve to the State all the rights and privileges reserved or attempted to be reserved to the Federal Government in the said act of June 10, 1920, including the right of recapture, to the State or any municipality thereof, at the expiration of 50 years.

The commission hereby declares that it will grant no certificate of convenience and necessity to any applicant except upon the following terms and conditions:

(a) That the applicant shall declare his willingness to submit himself to the jurisdiction of this commission and to the laws of the State of Tennessee.

(b) That the applicant satisfy the commission, at a public hearing or hearings to be held by the commission, that his object in securing the certificate is to make a bona fide development of the water power in question, and of his financial ability and purpose to carry the same to a successful conclusion within a reasonable time.

(c) That in fixing the value of the property for rate-making purposes when operated as a public utility, the applicant shall not claim, and the commission shall not include within the rate base, any value for the rights granted by the commission or by the State of Tennessee or the United States; nor shall it include as an element of value in the rate base the water-power value as separate and distinct from the value of the lands and structures thereon; that is to say, that the values allowed for water rights, rights of way, lands, or interest in lands shall not be in excess of the actual reasonable costs thereof at the time of acquisition by the applicant.

(d) That the applicant will at all reasonable stated times submit its books and records to an examination by the auditors or representatives of the commission or the State at some convenient point within the State of Tennessee; and if the project be operated as a public utility that its books of accounting and records shall be kept within the State of Tennessee.

(e) That the certificate of convenience and necessity shall not be assigned, transferred, or otherwise alienated, by operation of law or otherwise, whether the sale be made by any trustee or court or by the holder of such certificate without the written consent and approval of this commission duly entered upon its minutes.

(f) That the applicant agree to pay to the State of Tennessee not less than 1 mill for every kilowatt hour of electricity generated by the hydroelectric development for which he secures a certificate of public convenience and necessity. This payment shall be in addition to any property or privilege taxes which may be lawfully imposed by the State, any municipality, or taxing district.

(g) That the applicant agree not to enter into any contract or combination with any other producer of or dealer in electricity, or become any part of any combination, unlawful trust, or monopoly in violation of the laws of the United States or the State of Tennessee, formed for the purpose of limiting the production of hydroelectricity, or any restraint of the sale price or distribution of the same, a violation of which shall work a forfeiture of his rights under this certificate, at the option of the commission.

(h) That the applicant agree that the right of recapture at the expiration of 50 years shall be preserved to the State and its municipalities upon the terms to be set out in the certificate of convenience and necessity.

(i) That before the applicant shall begin the construction of any development on any navigable stream within the State of Tennessee he shall comply with all the laws of the United States with respect thereto.

It should also be stated that the commission is very anxious to have the most speedy development possible made of the State's water-power resources consistent with adequate protection of the rights of the State and its people. Wherever there is a reasonable prospect of a demand for the proposed development the commission will lend a ready ear to bona fide applicants to make such development. But where it appears to the commission that the applicant is a speculator merely, that his purpose is to secure a certificate of convenience and necessity with a view of exploiting the resources of the State or preventing prompt and bona fide development, his application will be summarily denied.

All applicants will receive a full, fair, and impartial hearing and investigation and full opportunity will be given to every applicant to present such facts as may be necessary in order to enable the commission to determine which of the applicants for any water-power right may be most desirable, from the standpoint of the interest and welfare of the State and its people. Priority in point of date of filing an application shall not constitute priority in right in any case, but every application will be considered upon its merits. Printed forms of application for certificates of convenience and necessity will be furnished all persons desiring to make application for such certificates, and no application will be received or considered unless the same complies with all the conditions and provisions contained in said printed form. Within a reasonable time, to be fixed by the commission, after filing of any application as hereinbefore stated, the commission will give 30 days' notice of the time and place of hearing by publication in a newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in the grand division of the State where the proposed development is located, at which hearing all applicants for such power sites and privileges and all other persons interested therein may be present and offer such evidence as may be desired.

The commission is indeed happy to know that the Federal Power Commission will cooperate with this commission in its efforts to serve the people of the State and secure a speedy development of its natural resources by having a representative present at the hearings before this commission and in furnishing such data and information as may have been gathered by representatives of the Federal Power Commission and advising with this commission as to the proper course to be pursued in relation to said development. The commission desires to express its appreciation of the friendly offices of the Federal Power Commission as informally expressed by Hon. O. C. Merrill, its executive secretary, at a recent meeting with this commission. The friendly cooperation of the two commissions, Federal and State, is much to be desired, and this commission will to the utmost of its endeavors act in harmony with the Federal Power Commission in working out a satisfactory program for the development of the resources of the State.

Printed forms of application for certificates will be furnished by the secretary of the commission upon written request therefor. Persons desiring further information with respect to the matters mentioned herein may secure same by communicating with the secretary or with the attorney for this commission.

HARVEY H. HANNAH, *Chairman.*
PORTER DUNLAP, *Commissioner.*
L. D. HILL, *Commissioner.*

IMPERIALISM—THE NEW FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order at this time, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of foreign relations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been urged by a great many people in Wisconsin to oppose any measure likely to involve the United States in war at this time. The policy of this administration in carrying on war in Nicaragua and China without the sanction of Congress has aroused the public. People are protesting; they do not want war; they want peace. They believe that domestic problems in America are of sufficient importance to require the undivided attention of this administration without carrying on war abroad.

The foreign policy of the United States in recent years has been characterized by imperialism toward weak nations. The demand of American financiers for the "protection" of their investments in foreign fields by the armed forces of the United States has brought on this extraordinary attitude of the State Department toward small nations.

At the outset I want it understood that I am unalterably opposed to the policy of this administration in its relations with Nicaragua, China, and Mexico. I abhor the wholesale murder of Nicaraguan citizens by American marines, and I pity the Chinese who are struggling for economic and political freedom with American guns opposing them. But I look with greater apprehension upon the policy of this country which has made these killings possible. Such results are inevitable wherever imperialism is practiced by one country against another.

The United States has taken upon herself, under this new policy, the responsibility for supervising the establishment and operation of the governments of its weaker neighbors, not only in the Western Hemisphere, but elsewhere in the world as well. The most notable example of this is the sordid story of the American relations with the tiny country of Nicaragua, a nation scarcely as large as the State of Pennsylvania, with only 650,000 inhabitants.

This story has its beginning back in 1909 when American marines were first sent to Nicaragua shortly after American capital began to exploit that country. From that year to the present, conditions have been growing worse until a status of war has actually existed for the past year between the United States and the people of Nicaragua.

The administration of President Coolidge has waged war in Nicaragua! It has sent military forces into that country to keep in power a government that never had the support of the Nicaraguan people, and keep out of power the duly elected public officials of that country. Its representatives have fomented revolutions; it has exercised military control over Nicaraguan territory and Nicaraguan citizens; it has supervised her elections in the shadow of the bayonets of American marines and American bombing planes; it has engaged in battle with Nicaraguan soldiers and killed upwards of 600 of her citizens; and it has disarmed the citizens of a sovereign country by force. If these acts do not constitute war, then I know of nothing that does. If these acts are not every one a violation of international law, then there is no such law. If these acts do not constitute an invasion of the sovereign rights of an independent nation, then there is on such thing as national sovereignty. Underneath it all is the question of American investments and American loans plus American demands for canal rights.

In the past American marines were maintained in Nicaragua for the acknowledged purpose of protecting the investments of American capitalists and maintaining in power a government selected and set up by these interests. The records show that representatives of the State Department actively engaged in fomenting revolutions and supported one faction as against another. American capitalists selected one Diaz to be President of Nicaragua. The people refused to elect him; they elected another, and at every opportunity have expressed themselves overwhelmingly against Diaz. The latest expression occurred last month when Nicaraguans under the very bayonets of American marines stationed there to "supervise the elections" and keep Diaz in power, voted two to one against him, and still he is President—with the aid of the United States marines.

This puppet of American capitalists negotiated a loan of $10,000,000 from Morgan & Co. He mortgaged the railroad of Nicaragua and practically every other natural resource, including the independence of the country, to secure that loan. Two-thirds of the people of Nicaragua opposed the loan, but it went through, with the aid of American marines.

We next find the Administration attempting to justify the intervention of American marines in Nicaragua on the ground that the right to build a canal across that country secured under a treaty negotiated some years ago (with the aid of American marines) must be "protected."

Strangely enough, there is no evidence that anybody is seriously threatening the rights of the United States to build such a canal. It appears now that a canal of that sort could be built whenever the United States is prepared to do so. It appears extremely unlikely that the Nicaraguan natives will run off with the site for such a canal; so such an excuse for intervention seems to have been the last straw and that has broken.

Of course, the fact that these alleged canal rights were obtained under a treaty opposed by 80 per cent of the Nicaraguan people, negotiated between the United States and the government it set up and kept in power in Nicaragua meant nothing. Talk about "self-determination of small nations!"

Press reports from beleagured Nicaragua filtering through the censorship established by American military forces indicate that 540 Nicaraguans have been killed by our marines in the past year. The number of marines killed does not exceed six. That is a remarkable record. I recall no instance in history where the science of killing human beings has been developed to such a high degree of efficiency. In these days it does not pay to be a Nicaraguan, especially in Nicaragua.

Nor is this all. The War Department of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of War, has sold arms and ammunition to Diaz and accepted in return therefore not cash but promises to pay. These arms and this ammunition are to be used by Diaz and his handful of supporters against the three-fourths of Nicaraguan population who do not want him as their president. This paraphernalia of war was shipped by the War Department to Diaz against the wishes of the Nicaraguan people—it was shipped with the aid of American marines.

The next step in this fiasco is the appointment of former Secretary of War Stimson to go down to Nicaragua as the personal representative of President Coolidge for the purpose of bringing about some kind of a settlement between the warring factions. Mr. Stimson was well qualified to bring about a settlement; he had headed the military branch of this Government, the branch carrying on war. He accomplished his purpose in Nicaragua—with the aid of American marines. He notified the opponents of Diaz to hand over their arms and ammunition to the American marines or the United States would send a military force to compel them to do so. The State Department then notified the press of the United States that a "settlement" had been reached and things were cleared up. That was true, a settlement had been reached, but 540 of those who opposed it were dead, killed by American marines, and the others driven into the mountains where they were pursued by the marines and airplanes of the United States. About this time, Secretary Kellogg, finding it rather embarrassing to explain the killing of Nicaraguan citizens opposed to Diaz by American marines and airplanes, hit upon the expedient of branding every Nicaraguan opposed to Diaz as a "bandit," and so for several weeks our marines have been pursuing "bandits," even after Stimson's "settlement."

This history of American interference in Nicaragua discloses constant turmoil in that country, constant strife, with the spectacle of representatives of the Department of State intriguing with local despots for the overthrow of governments selected

by the people; with Uncle Sam's hands dripping with the blood shed in revolutions he fomented. If this administration is embarrassed at conditions in Nicaragua, the people of the United States may rest assured that those conditions are largely due to the machinations of that very department in following its policy of imperialism in Nicaragua. It is a disgraceful story, one no true American can defend. It has caused the unanimous hostility of the South and Central American Republics toward the United States.

MEXICO

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kellogg, in his mad desire to impose his will upon other nations, has brought the United States to the brink of war with Mexico. He has sought to force the Government of Mexico to retract its laws concerning the ownership of lands held by American and British oil companies. There seems to be no question but what Mexico had a perfect right to pass whatever laws it deemed wise governing the conditions under which foreign corporations might operate in that country. The records show that by far the greater part of those owning lands affected by the laws in question were willing to abide by them. But one, E. L. Doheny, well-known American oil man, is largely interested in a number of oil companies in Mexico. Upon the passage of these laws his companies called upon the State Department to protest to Mexico.

Nor is this the whole story. Morgan & Co., of New York, with other bankers, underwrote a huge loan to Mexico a few years ago. That loan was in danger when American relations with Mexico became so strained over the oil question, and as a result we now have the spectacle of one of the partners of Morgan & Co. appointed United States ambassador to Mexico. Wall Street now emerges from the front door of the American Embassy in Mexico City. It does not require the intellectual acumen of a genius to deduce from these facts that the loan of Morgan & Co. to Mexico will be protected. Morgan & Co., E. L. Doheny, and Secretary Kellogg, the three figures in the foreground of our conflict with Mexico.

CHINA

The efforts of Secretary Kellogg in China are well known. The liberal Chinese, struggling to free themselves from the economic oppression of foreign exploiters and throw off the yoke of domestic tyranny, find themselves opposed by Uncle Sam's marines. Standard Oil interest in the rich oil fields of China must be protected—with the aid of the American marines. The opium trade, in which Great Britain is so deeply interested and which is one of the chief causes of British soldiers in China, finds itself indirectly protected by American marines lined up to support the British and Japanese. Thousands of American marines, American battleships and American airplanes in China engaged in "protection"; protecting what? Protecting with American lives and American taxpayers' money the strangle hold that the Standard Oil and other foreign capitalists have on the throats of the Chinese people.

It is time there was a new deal in foreign relations of the United States. It is time that the United States assumed a benevolent attitude toward the struggling masses in foreign countries who, not so fortunate as Americans, have not yet tasted the fruits of democracy, and have not become experienced in the science of self-government. It is time America lent a helping hand to those struggling to throw off tyranny instead of stationing its Army and Navy in foreign capitals for the purpose of protecting American financiers bent upon fastening their holds upon the economic life of these people.

Even as American planes bomb the ragged Nicaraguans and American guns cowe the ignorant Chinese, there comes a message of hope from o'er the sea. Sweden has disbanded her armies, Russia proposes to the Council of the League of Nations that they disarm; tear down their forts, dismantle their battleships, and turn loose their soldiers. The American representative at that council is reported by the press to have stated that the matter would be given "*careful consideration.*" Would that America might have led the nations of the world in the Christian movement to abolish war.

Two thousand years ago the greatest Exponent of Peace the world has known offered this formula; He said "Peace on earth, good will toward men." It appears quite evident that our State Department does not subscribe to this Christian creed.

LAYING THE CORNER STONE OF ADDITION TO THE NORTHEASTERN TEACHERS' COLLEGE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by me at Tahlequah, Okla., on Saturday, November 12, 1927, at the corner-stone laying of the new education building:

We have assembled here to lay the corner stone of this education building, an additional unit to the Northeastern State Teachers' College. It is urgently needed to care for the increased attendance. This added facility will attract greater numbers and enlarge the usefulness of the institution.

We are living in an age of rapid development. We must keep step with the progress of events. To stand still is to retrograde, because the world moves off from us. We are living in both (1) a great Nation, a progressive State, and in (2) an eventful age.

Only 151 years have elapsed since the signing of the Declaration of Independence and 138 years since the institution of an organized stable Government. This is a short time in the life of a nation. We have developed wonderfully. Our population has increased from 3,000,000 to approximately 115,000,000—from 13 original States fringing along the Atlantic coast. We have expanded from ocean to ocean and from Lakes to Gulf and are represented by 48 stars on the field of blue. We builded wisely upon a firm foundation and for the future.

Historically, as a State, we are not yet 20 years old. We were admitted to statehood under unusual circumstances. We first laid our constitutional foundation deep and strong, protecting the individual citizens in their personal liberties and property rights.

We have since vitalized its provisions by legislative enactments to insure those guaranties and to meet the changing needs as they arise. How well we have succeeded a brief comparison and a hurried survey will disclose.

We had a population then of about one and a half million people, attracted here by inviting opportunities. Now we have approximately two and a half million progressive citizens from every State in the Union and almost every foreign country assisting in the development of our wonderful resources.

Instead of crushing the Indian population they were assimilated into the citizenship of the State and Nation, and they are bearing their part in the continued development of the State.

The name of Oklahoma, adopted for our State, means the home of the Red Man. The symbols of the seals of the Five Civilized Tribes were merged into and became a part of the great seal of the State of Oklahoma. This is further evidenced by the purchase of this beautiful site and the original building of this school, formerly the Cherokee Female Seminary, hallowed by the memory of three-fourths of a century, thus perpetuating and enlarging its usefulness, recognizing and capitalizing a sentiment of incalculable educational value to Oklahoma. We to-day rededicate and reconsecrate this institution to a continued and larger service to the entire citizenship of the State and Nation. The remembrance of the splendid influence exerted by the predecessor of this college over the members of a tribe passing into history will ever remain as a continuing challenge to lofty purposes and high ideals.

The country had only been but recently surveyed and allotted. Much of the land was unfenced and a very large part not reduced to tillage. To-day almost every acre of productive land is inclosed and in cultivation, yielding harvests which support its citizenship and in addition pour into the channels of local commerce increasing golden streams from surplus products marketed, adding to the happiness and prosperity of the State and Nation.

We see primitive dwelling houses replaced by comfortable homes. There is a noticeable improvement in livestock and it is a real joy for our eyes to feast upon the splendid thoroughbred cattle and registered hogs placed on exhibition at local and surrounding fairs. The poultry and dairy products once neglected are encouraged and recognized as important agricultural assets. Our fruit culture offers unusual opportunities. We raise all kinds of forage crops.

We have a diversified State. We raise a variety and in abundance all agricultural and allied products. We produced in 1926 wheat valued at $87,019,000; corn valued at $32,260,000; oats valued at $14,172,000. We were third to Texas and Mississippi in the production of cotton—1,760,000 bales valued at $85,360,000. We outrank all States in the production of broomcorn. We now are first in the production of petroleum.

We lead in the production of zinc.

In 1926 we produced minerals of the value of $500,181,000 and were second only to Pennsylvania.

We were eighth in agriculture and second in value in the production of agricultural commodities and minerals combined.

We have discovered coal sufficient to care for the needs of the country for a thousand years. Cheap coal, oil, and gas and potential water power and the production of the raw products means the bringing to our State many of the mills and factories now located in the East and North.

Our climate, water, our minerals, and diversified agricultural lands are inducing increasing numbers to settle and make their homes here, invest their capital, and assist in the further development of our productive State.

The development of our agricultural and mineral resources does not present a satisfying picture of our progress.

We have 6,000 miles of railroads and are developing a splendid system of highways to market our products. Twenty years ago we had impassable roads and trails. We were stopped by swollen streams everywhere. To-day bridges are being built and roads either completed or in course of construction, connecting every community with a market in the principal cities and towns of the country. We have many large cities and towns with every modern convenience.

We must not construct a State founded on material development alone. The moral and educational training must not be neglected. In every city and town and in every rural community Sunday schools are conducted and church services held to care for the spiritual needs of our citizenship.

Our schools for the most part in eastern Oklahoma consisted of those established in cities and towns with but little rural school advantages, except the tribal schools of the Five Civilized Tribes. To-day in every school district in the State we find not only comfortable, well-equipped houses but teachers trained in the latest and most approved methods in the six teachers colleges conveniently located over the State, of which the Northeastern State Teachers College is one.

We have made wonderful strides in the educational development of the State. Our work is just begun. Our expenditures for education is a splendid investment. Statistics show that throughout the Nation we spend annually approximately $2,400,000,000 on education. The demands for this purpose will continue to increase. We can not take a backward step. The provisions for this educational building for the Northeastern State Teachers College is a compliment to the vision of our State legislature. With the added facilities for educational development comes the increased responsibility from those who enjoy its privileges.

Statistics show that 17 per cent of the boys and girls of the Nation do not go beyond the fifth grade. Only 63 per cent enter the eighth grade, and only 34 per cent enter high school, and 14 per cent finish high school and get their diplomas. Out of this number only 7 per cent enter college and only 2 per cent graduate. The other 98 per cent are scattered all along from the fifth grade. It should be the mission and the duty of teachers' colleges to send forth teachers so well equipped who will not only arouse the boys and girls of the cities and towns but accept appointments and be crusaders in the rural communities for the educational, moral, and material development of our country. The teachers are the centers of community life and from them should radiate the influence that will result in rural awakening. Illiteracy should be reduced to a minimum and Oklahoma should take the lead in this respect and outrank her sister States.

Their burning enthusiasm should induce every child of school age to attend school. They should arouse the local communities until they would not be content with anything less than a full school term. They should encourage the boys and girls to thirst for higher educational advantages. Their duty does not end here, but they should be so well equipped in everything that pertains to the material development of rural life as to be of incalculable value in aiding in the comprehensive development of the communities which they serve. They should assist in making every citizen feel the responsibility in doing his part in rendering that service which will better his community and develop the State.

We must not be content in Oklahoma to keep abreast of local environments, but with enlarged vision we must keep pace with the opportunities of the age in which we live. Recent inventions have left us in a state of expectant uncertainty as to the future. Motor transportation in the automobile and in the airplane has replaced the wagon and buggy and to a large extent the railway train. The intrepid Lindbergh, unaided and alone, in 33½ hours rose aloft in New York and landed in Paris, acclaimed as a world hero by the people of every nation and tongue.

The telephone and telegraph are being rapidly supplanted by the wireless and radio. Science and inventive genius are solving the problems of the world, and we must be alert and active to be a part of the progressive spirit of the age. We look to the splendid citizenship of Oklahoma to do their part, and to the progressive leadership of the Northeastern State Teachers College to so equip and train the teachers of the State and Nation that they will so awaken the people of our State to a full sense of their responsibility that they will seize every opportunity.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE BUDGET FOR 1929

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting the Budget for 1929, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed.

[See Senate proceedings for message of the President, page 163.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had concurred in House Concurrent Resolution 3, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Alexander H. Stephens, presented by the State of Georgia, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his distinguished humanitarian service.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Georgia.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5800, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; and pending this, I ask unanimous consent that there may be three hours of general debate to be equally divided between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and myself. I have very little demand for time in general debate, and if this request is granted, I shall grant 30 minutes of my one hour and a half to the gentleman from Tennessee to meet the demands which he has. I may also state that to-morrow when we begin the reading of the bill I should like then to present an explanation of the items in the bill and will ask for a little more time than that usually used under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois permit a statement at this point?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am advised by the chairman of the committee on committees of the minority that the report of that committee will be ready to submit to caucus immediately after the adjournent of the House to-morrow afternoon, and therefore a caucus of the minority will be called for that time. We should be pleased if we could be through here by 4.30, but in any event we will meet immediately upon the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that if they are ready at that time and want us to do so, we will adjourn at 4.30 to-morrow afternoon even though we may not have finished consideration of the bill, in order to accommodate the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency bill, and pending that, asks unanimous consent that there may be three hours of general debate equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows that every department of the Government and every independent office makes its estimate as to what it shall need for each fiscal year and the Budget passes on the requests and then sends its recommendations as to amounts to the gentleman's committee. The gentleman's committee then passes bills carrying out the recommendations of the Budget, sometimes enlarges them, and grants the appropriations for the fiscal year. We have already passed the supply bills for all departments covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928.

After we have passed the annual supply bills, on the third day of this Congress the committee comes in here with this bill appropriating $198,916,264.91, covering deficiencies and supplementary appropriations additional to the Budget.

Now, where is this going to stop? I think the people of the country ought to know exactly what these deficiencies are, what they amount to, not only the ones in this bill we have up during the first three days of the Congress but in the other deficiency bills that will be passed during all the rest of this Congress.

I wish the gentleman would couple with his request, so it will be in shape for future reference, that instead of reading the bill the bill be printed in the RECORD without reading. I shall not object to that. It ought to go in the RECORD, and the people of the country ought to know what the items are for and what they relate to, and where it is going.

What does the bagatelle of expense amount to in printing the bill which carries $198,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. All right; I have no objection to printing the bill without reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, but that the bill be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

To pay to Rhea Thomas, a son, and Barber Nell and Annie Lee Thomas, daughters, of R. Y. Thomas, jr., late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, $10,000, to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House by paying one-third thereof to Rhea Thomas, one-third to Barber Nell Thomas, and one-third to the legal guardian of Annie Lee Thomas.

To pay the widow of Maurice E. Crumpacker, late a Representative from the State of Oregon, $10,000.

To pay the widow of Ladislas Lazaro, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, $10,000.

To pay the widow of Walter W. Magee, late a Representative from the State of New York, $10,000.

To pay the widow of A. E. B. Stephens, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, $10,000.

To pay the widow of William N. Vaile, late a Representative from the State of Colorado, $10,000.

The five preceding appropriations shall be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

Contingent expenses: For stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, fiscal year 1928, $125.

Committee employees: The unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1927, granted to the Committee on Revision of the Laws for the employment of competent persons to assist in compiling and codifying the laws relating to the District of Columbia, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1928.

The unexpended balances of appropriations for salaries of assistant clerks to the Committee on Appropriations for the fiscal year 1927 are made available to pay to the assistant clerks of that committee, for the period from February 23 to June 30, 1927, inclusive, amounts representing the difference between the rates of compensation received by them during such period and the rates of compensation provided for them by the legislative appropriation act, approved February 23, 1927.

Committee on Ways and Means: For defraying such expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the preparation of a bill or bills for the revision of the laws relating to the administration of customs, $2,500, to remain available until June 30, 1928, and to be available also for the reimbursement and/or payment for expenses incurred, in connection with a similar study and investigation by members of such committee of the Sixty-ninth Congress, during the period from March 5 to December 5, 1927.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1927, of the appropriation available during the fiscal year 1927 to provide for expenses of the joint committee created by section 3 of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1924, is continued and made available until June 30, 1928. And the joint committee (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act) is authorized to compensate the secretary and special disbursing officer at the rate of not to exceed $50 per month from June 30, 1927, to June 30, 1928.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Subway transportation: Not to exceed $2,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $5,000 for the fiscal year 1927 for subway transportation between the Capitol and Senate Office Building shall remain available until June 30, 1929.

House Office Building: For maintenance, including miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1920, $889.80.

Capitol power plant: For maintenance, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, $178.

BOTANIC GARDEN

Enlargement and relocation: For carrying out the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for enlargement and relocating the United States Botanic Garden, and for other purposes," approved January 5, 1927, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $600,000.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

To pay Samuel Robinson, William Madden, Joseph De Fontes, and Preston L. George, messengers on night duty during the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, $900 each, fiscal year 1928, $3,600.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright office: For the register of copyrights, assistant register, and other personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1928, $8,000.

Sunday opening: To enable the Library of Congress to be kept open for reference use on Sundays and on holidays within the discretion of the Librarian, including the extra services of employees and the services of additional employees under the Librarian, at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, fiscal year 1928, $1,000.

Printing and binding: For the printing of catalogue cards, fiscal year 1928, $32,000.

Index to State legislation: To enable the Librarian of Congress to undertake the preparation of an index to the legislation of the several States as authorized and directed by the act entitled "An act providing for the preparation of a biennial index to State legislation," approved February 10, 1927, including personal and other services within and without the District of Columbia (including not to exceed $2,500 for personal services at rates to be fixed by the Librarian), travel, necessary material and apparatus, stationery, and incidentals, fiscal year 1928, $15,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

For expenses arising in connection with carrying into effect the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution directing the President to institute and prosecute suits to cancel certain leases of oil lands and incidental contracts, and for other purposes," approved February 8, 1924, and for the same purposes authorized in the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide an appropriation for the prosecution of suits to cancel certain leases and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1924, including the reimbursement and/or payment for expenses incurred for such purposes during the period from June 30, 1927, to the date of the approval of this act, $90,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929; and in addition thereto the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $100,000 for such purposes, contained in the second deficiency act, approved July 3, 1926, is reappropriated and made available.

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $60,000 for expenses arising in connection with carrying into effect the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to institute proceedings touching sections 16 and 36, township 30 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian," approved February 21, 1924, contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926, shall remain available until June 30, 1929.

Not to exceed $25,000 of the appropriation of $375,000 for reconstructing the roof, attic, and ceilings of the second story of the Executive Mansion, contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926, approved July 3, 1926, shall remain available until June 30, 1929, for refurnishing and for necessary repairs and alterations to the Executive Mansion, to be prosecuted by contract or otherwise as the President may determine.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1928, $103,000.

For an additional amount for necessary traveling expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $82,500.

For an additional amount for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Civil Service Commission, including same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $6,000.

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923 and for contingent expenses, including the same objects specified under these heads in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928 and including personal services in the field, fees, and mileage of

witnesses, contract stenographic reporting services and rent, fiscal year 1928, $240,000.

For an additional amount for printing and binding for the Employees' Compensation Commission, fiscal year 1928, $10,000.

For an additional amount for the payment of compensation for the fiscal year 1928 and prior fiscal years, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $700,000.

FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

For five commissioners at rates fixed by law, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Radio Commission in performing the duties imposed by the radio act of 1927, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, contract stenographic reporting services, printing and binding, supplies and equipment, travel and other necessary expenses, for the period from February 1 to June 30, 1928, inclusive, and including for the period prior to February 1, 1928, such amounts as may be legally due to commissioners who have not been compensated, $52,186.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for rent of buildings, fiscal year 1928, $10,400.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE EXHIBITION

For carrying out the provisions of the Act entitled "An act to provide for maintaining, promoting, and advertising the International Trade Exhibition," approved February 14, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $150,000.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

For an additional amount for printing and binding for the Interstate Commerce Commission, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $170,000.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

For an additional amount for scientific research and technical investigations, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $25,000.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1928, $16,560.

For an additional amount for general expenses in connection with the maintenance of public buildings in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $14,960: *Provided*, That not exceeding $7,000 of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1928 is hereby made available for furnishing uniforms for employees.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Natural History Building: For safeguarding the dome of the rotunda, Natural History Building, United States National Museum, including all necessary incidental repairs and alterations of the building (the work to be performed under the direction and supervision of the Supervising Architect, Treasury Department), $80,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929; of this sum not to exceed $5,000 may be used to reimburse the Supervising Architect's Office for preparing necessary drawings and specifications and superintending the work.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

For additional amount for printing and binding for the Tariff Commission, fiscal year 1928, $4,000.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU

Military and naval compensation: For an additional amount for the payment of military and naval compensation accruing during the fiscal year 1928 or in prior fiscal years, $19,400,000, and in addition thereto unexpended balances of the appropriations of the United States Veterans' Bureau are hereby reappropriated and made available under the appropriation "Military and naval compensation, Veteran's Bureau, fiscal year 1928 and prior years," as follows: Military and naval compensation, fiscal year 1926, $1,732,000; military and naval compensation, fiscal year 1927, $259,000; salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1926, $3,136,000; salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1927, $5,517,000; medical and hospital services, fiscal year 1926, $1,148,000; medical and hospital services, fiscal year 1927, $4,499,000; vocational rehabilitation, fiscal year 1926, $166,000; vocational rehabilitation, fiscal year 1926, $10,140,000; printing and binding, fiscal year 1926, $83,000; military and naval insurance, fiscal year 1926, $8,920,000.

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the United States Veterans' Bureau under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document No. 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $477.02.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GENERAL EXPENSES

Purchasing division: For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1928, $1,250.

License bureau: For purchase of metal identification tags for horse-drawn vehicles used for business purposes and motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, or for the purchase of material for the manufacture of tags, fiscal year 1927, $1,644.56.

Office of director of traffic: The appropriation of fees received for reissuing motor-vehicle operators' permits, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927, is continued available until June 30, 1928.

Register of wills: For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, telephone bills, printing, typewriters, towels, towel service, window washing, street-car tokens, furniture and equipment and repairs thereto, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, fiscal year, 1928, $5,000.

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Condemnation of insanitary buildings: For expenses necessary and incident to the enforcement of an act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, fiscal year 1927, $120.75.

Advertising: For general advertising, authorized and required by law, and for tax and school notices and notices of changes in regulations, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, $2,398.60.

For 1927, $2,972.56.

For advertising notice of taxes in arrears July 1, 1926, as required to be given by the act of March 19, 1890, to be reimbursed by a charge of 50 cents for each lot or piece of property advertised, fiscal year 1927, $2,085.44.

Employees' compensation fund: For carrying out the provisions of section 11 of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved July 11, 1919, extending to the employees of the government of the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, fiscal year 1928, $21,500.

Refund of erroneous collections: To enable the commissioners, in any case where special assessments, school tuition charges, rents, fees, or collections of any character have been erroneously covered into the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in the proportion required by law, to refund such erroneous payments, wholly or in part, including the refunding of fees paid for building permits authorized by the District of Columbia appropriation act approved March 2, 1911, fiscal year 1928, $2,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for such refunds of payments made within the past three years.

Rent: For rent of a building or buildings for activities of the District of Columbia vacating quarters in squares 226, 227, and 228, $17,425; for repairs and alterations thereof and for equipment, fuel, and other necessary expenses, $7,575; in all, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $25,000.

STREET AND ROAD IMPROVEMENT AND REPAIR

Street repair, grading, and extension: The indefinite appropriation "Extension, etc., of streets and avenues, District of Columbia, 1928," contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, is hereby made available to pay the awards and expenses under the act entitled "An act to authorize the opening of a street from Georgia Avenue to Ninth Street NW., through squares 2875 and 2877, and for other purposes," approved January 13, 1927; the act entitled "An act to provide for the widening of Nichols Avenue between Good Hope Road and S Street SE.," approved February 14, 1927; and the act entitled "An act to provide for the widening of First Street between G Street and Myrtle Street NE., and for other purposes," approved March 11, 1926: *Provided*, That the time for filing the petition to condemn land under the provisions of the act last named is hereby extended for six months from and after the date of approval of this act.

For current work of repairs to suburban roads and suburban streets, including maintenance of nonpassenger-carrying motor vehicles, fiscal year 1928, $100,000.

Chain Bridge: For reconstruction of Virginia abutment of Chain Bridge, such work to be performed by day labor or otherwise, in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $40,000.

Refund to Charles Schneider Baking Co.: For refund to the Charles Schneider Baking Co. of amount paid on September 26, 1923, for land comprised in part of a public alley in square 516, fiscal year 1928, $442.44.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Not exceeding $80,000 of the unobligated balances of appropriations for buildings and grounds, public schools, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927, and any unobligated

balance remaining in the appropriations for the construction of the Garnet-Patterson Junior High School are made available for the construction of an addition to the Garnet-Patterson Junior High School, to be expended, in the discretion of the commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of the existing contract for the construction of said junior high school.

For completely furnishing and equipping combination assembly hall and gymnasium, West School, $3,000; and combination assembly hall and gymnasium, Petworth School, $3,000; including a piano for each school; in all, fiscal year 1928, $6,000.

POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S RELIEF FUND

To pay the relief and other allowances as authorized by law, a sum not to exceed $120,000 is appropriated from the policemen's and firemen's relief fund, fiscal year 1928.

COURTS AND PRISONS

Police court: For compensation of jurors, fiscal year 1926, $431.

Supreme Court, District of Columbia: For the additional amount required for the compensation of the chief justice and five associate justices in accordance with the act approved December 13, 1926, fiscal year 1927, $7,500.

For fees of jurors, fiscal year 1926, $1,985.

Court of Appeals, District of Columbia: For the additional amount required for the compensation of the chief justice and two associate justices in accordance with the act approved December 13, 1926, fiscal year 1927, $5,750.

Support of convicts: For support, maintenance, and transportation of convicts transferred from the District of Columbia, including the same objects specified for this purpose in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1926, $890.88.

Writs of lunacy: For expenses attending the execution of writs de lunatico inquirendo and commitments thereunder in all cases of indigent insane persons committed or sought to be committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital by order of the executive authority of the District of Columbia under the provisions of existing law, fiscal year 1926, $783.28.

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1927, $1,620.96.

BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS

For maintenance of feeble-minded children (white and colored), fiscal year 1926, $1,356.62.

Board of Children's Guardians, District of Columbia: For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District, and for temporary care of all children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, etc., fiscal year 1926, $1,096.40.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Division of child welfare: For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of the Board of Public Welfare by the courts of the District, and for temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, with authority to pay not more than $1,500 each to institutions under sectarian control and not more than $400 for burial of children dying while under charge of the board, fiscal year 1927, $40,000.

Jail: For maintenance of prisoners at the jail, including pay of guards and all other necessary personal services, and for support of prisoners therein, expenses incurred in identifying and pursuing escaped prisoners, and rewards for their recapture, repair and improvements to buildings, cells, and locking devices, fiscal year 1928, $6,125.

For furniture, furnishings, and other equipment necessitated by the enlargement and remodeling of the jail building, including dormitory, cell, kitchen, and hospital equipment, fiscal year 1928, $13,000: *Provided*, That any unobligated balance of the appropriation of $275,000 contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926, for an additional building at the jail of the District of Columbia, is made available for the purposes of this paragraph.

Workhouse: For maintenance, custody, clothing, guarding, care, and support of prisoners; rewards for fugitives; provisions, subsistence, medicine, and hospital instruments, furniture, and quarters for guards and other employees and inmates; purchase of tools and equipments; purchase and maintenance of farm implements, livestock, tools, equipment, and miscellaneous items; transportation; maintenance and operation of nonpassenger-carrying motor vehicles; supplies and labor; and all other necessary items, fiscal year 1927, $12,764.71.

Reformatory: For additional amount for maintenance, for the purchase of material for the manufacture of metal (automobile number) tags, fiscal year 1928, $13,000.

Medical charities: For care and treatment of indigent patients under contracts made by the Board of Public Welfare with the following institutions for the fiscal years named:

Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital: Fiscal year 1924, $1,216.85; fiscal year 1926, $383.55; fiscal year 1927, $1,261.60;

Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital, fiscal year 1927, $5,438.40; in all, $8,300.40.

Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum: For general repairs and for additional construction, including labor and material, and for expenses of heat, light, and power required in and about the operation of the hospital, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, fiscal year 1926, $565.45;

St. Elizabeths Hospital: For support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, fiscal year 1927, $214,162.

AUDITED CLAIMS

Audited claims, District of Columbia: For the payment of the following claims, certified by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia to be due, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, being for the service of the fiscal year 1924 and prior years:

Courts (1921), reports of opinions, court of appeals, $71.50; streets (1922), disposal of city refuse, $42.30; public schools (1922), fuel, gas, and electric light, $750.24; public schools (1923), fuel, gas, and electric light, $750.24; contingent and miscellaneous expenses (1923), maintenance of motor vehicles, $61.81; improvements and repairs (1923), repairs to suburban roads, $6.50; small parks (1923), $1.10; electrical department (1923), street lighting, $5; Rent Commission (1923), expenses, $241.50; water department (1923), maintenance and operation, $97.81; street improvements (1923-24), Thirteenth Street, Spring Road to Shepherd Street, $4; contingent and miscellaneous expenses (1924), judicial expenses, $591.61; contingent and miscellaneous expenses (1924), maintenance of motor vehicles, $15.50; contingent and miscellaneous expenses (1924), general advertising, $9; Rent Commission (1924), salaries and expenses, $13.07; in all, audited claims, $2,661.18.

JUDGMENTS

For payment of final judgments, including costs rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Document No. 74, Seventieth Congress, $6,817.12, together with the further sum to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 per cent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until date of payment.

PROPORTION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid as follows: Such sums as relate to the fiscal year 1920 and prior fiscal years, 50 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 50 per cent out of the Treasury of the United States; such sums as relate to the fiscal years 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924, 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, and 40 per cent out of the Treasury of the United States; and such sums as relate to the fiscal years 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929, jointly or severally, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed for defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia by the District of Columbia appropriation acts for such fiscal years.

WATER DEPARTMENT—OUT OF THE WATER REVENUES

For purchase of a site for a new third high service reservoir, $34,000, in addition to $50,000 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927: *Provided*, That the amounts herein specified shall be available until June 30, 1928, for the acquisition of such site in accordance with a final award in condemnation proceedings.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document No. 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $1,086.36.

WEATHER BUREAU

Credit is authorized and directed in the accounts of the disbursing clerk of the Department of Agriculture with payments heretofore or hereafter made for expert services under existing agreements entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the erection of a building for the Weather Bureau at Lansing, Mich.

General expenses: For an additional amount for necessary expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, dimatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, fiscal year 1928, $7,660, of which amount not to exceed $3,540 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

For an additional amount for the investigation, improvement, and utilization of wild plants and grazing lands, and for determining the

distribution of weeds and means for their control, fiscal year 1928, $2,400.

For an additional amount for the investigation and improvement of fruits, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $10,000.

FOREST SERVICE

For an additional amount for fighting and preventing forest fires, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $769,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this amount may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in meeting emergencies caused by forest insects on national forests.

For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, $1,880,000, to remain available until expended, being part of $7,500,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1928 by the act approved June 22, 1926, and authorized to be apportioned and prorated among the States and obligated by contracts and otherwise by the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

General expenses: For an additional amount for the investigation and development of methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical problems relating to the composition, action, and application of insecticides and fungicides, fiscal year 1928, $10,000.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

For an additional amount for investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $5,000.

For an additional amount for investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $45,000.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake control operations, inspections, surveys, and investigations necessary for the control and eradication of the Mexican fruit worm, in cooperation with the Federal Horticultural Board in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing quarantines promulgated under the plant quarantine act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and in cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals as may be deemed necessary, and in cooperation with the Mexican Government and local Mexican authorities or organizations, including rent outside the District of Columbia, the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, fiscal year 1928, $100,000, of which amount not to exceed $1,680 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Preventing spread of Japanese and Asiatic beetles: For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the spread of the Japanese beetle, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $50,000, of which amount not to exceed $3,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The appropriation for administration of the United States warehouse act for the fiscal year 1926 is hereby made available for payment of the claim of the Curtis-Martin Newspapers (Inc.) for advertising for the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1922, in the sum of $25.53 found due by the Comptroller General.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton," approved March 3, 1927, including employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, and the purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying automobiles outside of the city of Washington, fiscal year 1928, $70,000, of which amount not to exceed $12,350 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

For an additional amount to enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic-wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $2,500.

FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD

Eradication of pink bollworm of cotton: For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet an emergency caused by the appearance of the pink bollworm of cotton in Arizona, New Mexico, and adjoining States, including the same objects specified under the heading "Eradication of pink bollworm" in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $90,000.

FOOD, DRUG, AND INSECTICIDE ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, and transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $5,000.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the importation of milk and cream into the United States for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry of the United States and protecting the public health," approved February 15, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $50,000, of which amount not to exceed $4,350 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

MISCELLANEOUS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to safeguard the distribution and sale of certain dangerous caustic or corrosive acids, alkalies, and other substances in interstate and foreign commerce," approved March 4, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $23,000, of which amount not to exceed $10,490 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct special investigations of insect pests and fungous diseases attacking mushrooms, including the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and other expenses, as may be necessary, $12,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929; of such amount $7,400 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

NATIONAL ARBORETUM

For the acquisition of land pursuant to the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1927, and for necessary expenses incident thereto, including the employment of persons and contracting for title abstract services in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $300,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Department of Commerce under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 569 and 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $815.

Aircraft in commerce: Of the appropriation for aircraft in commerce contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1928, a total of not to exceed $165,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Transportation of families and effects of officers and employees: For an additional amount covering the same objects and purposes specified under this heading in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1928, $10,000.

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES

Claims for damages: To pay the claims adjusted and determined by the Commissioner of Lighthouses and approved by the Secretary of Commerce under the provisions of section 4 of the act approved June 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 537), on account of damages occasioned to private property by collision with vessels of the Lighthouse Service and for which the vessels of the Lighthouse Service were responsible, as set forth in House Document No. 568 and Senate Document No. 222, Sixty-ninth Congress, $584.79.

Retired pay: For retired pay of officers and employees engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Lighthouse Service, except persons continuously employed in district offices and shops, fiscal year 1928, $33,000.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Census of agriculture: For an additional amount for the census of agriculture, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1925, and including compensation of temporary employees who may be appointed under the civil-service rules at per diem rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the provisions of the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1928, $55,000.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Power plant equipment, Bureau of Standards: For the purchase and installation of new power and heating plant equipment, together with such auxiliary equipment as may be necessary, the moving and installing of equipment on hand and the tie-in with the present heating and power systems, including contract labor and personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1928, $100,000.

Sugar standardization, Bureau of Standards: For an additional amount covering the same objects and purposes specified under this heading in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1928, $25,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929, of which amount not to exceed $11,040 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

Wireless communication laws: For an additional amount covering the same objects and purposes specified under this heading in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1928, including expenses of the Federal Radio Commission to and including January 31, 1928, $84,000, and, in addition thereto, $60,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Enforcement of wireless communication laws," fiscal year 1927, is hereby reappropriated and made available under the appropriation for similar purposes for the fiscal year 1928.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

For all necessary expenses for the construction and equipment of one surveying vessel, including purchase or preparation of plans and specifications and traveling expenses of inspectors, and for the purchase or construction of one tender of from 50 to 60 tons, including equipment, $408,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

BUREAU OF FISHERIES

Power vessel: For the purchase or construction of a vessel for the Boothbay Harbor, Me., fisheries station, including Diesel engine and equipment, and including contract personal service, not to exceed $1,000, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary to prepare plans and specifications therefor, $50,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Fish hatchery, Neosho, Mo.: For general repairs and improvements to grounds, ponds, water supply, and buildings, $15,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Fish hatchery, Springville, Utah: For repairs to the cottage, ponds, and water supply, and for the construction of a garage and workshop at the Springville, Utah, fisheries station, fiscal year 1928, $8,000.

BUREAU OF MINES

Oil-shale investigations: For development of oil shale, including purchase or mining and transportation of shale, operation, repairs, and alteration of plant, the construction, maintenance, and repair of necessary camp buildings and appurtenances thereto, and the alteration, operation, and maintenance of experimental refinery, and for all necessary expenses incident thereto, including personal services, supplies, equipment, and traveling expenses, fiscal year 1928, $45,000, of which amount not to exceed $4,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Economics of mineral industries, Bureau of Mines: Of the appropriation for economics of mineral industries contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1928, a total of not to exceed $170,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Garage at Norton, Va., Bureau of Mines: For building and equipping an addition to the garage at Norton, Va., for storage and hadling of mine-rescue and first-aid supplies and equipment, fiscal year 1928, $5,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay the claims for damages to privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Department of the Interior under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 222 and House Document No. 645, Sixty-ninth Congress, $1,654.58.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies: For expenses necessary to the purchase of goods and supplies for the Indian Service, including inspection, pay of necessary employees, and all other expenses connected therewith, including advertising, storage, and transportation of Indian goods and supplies for the fiscal years that follow: For 1923, $110.06; 1924, $12,193.05; 1926, $91,910.27; 1927, $80,286; in all, $184,499.38.

Payment of judgment against Cherokee Indians, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For payment of the judgment rendered June 23, 1924, by the United States Court of Claims against the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma, and in favor of the United States, in the case of the Cherokee Nation against the United States, No. 34449, in the Court of Claims, which judgment was for the cost of printing the record in the case and was affirmed on April 12, 1926, by the Supreme Court of the United States, $31.70, payable from funds to the credit of the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma.

Suppressing contagious diseases among livestock of Indians: For reimbursing Indians for livestock which may be hereafter destroyed on account of being infected with dourine or other contagious diseases, and for expenses in connection with the work of eradicating and preventing such diseases, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $20,000.

Paiute allotted lands, Truckee-Carson project, Nevada (reimbursable): To carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cancellation and remittance of construction assessments against allotted Paiute Indian lands irrigated under the Newlands reclamation project in the State of Nevada and to reimburse the Truckee-Carson irrigation district for certain expenditures for the operation and maintenance of drains for said lands," approved June 26, 1926, fiscal years 1924 and 1925, $611.55.

Indian pueblos, New Mexico: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for reconnaissance work in conjunction with the middle Rio Grande conservancy district to determine whether certain lands of the Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana, Sandia, and Isleta Indians are suceptible of reclamation, drainage, and irrigation," approved February 14, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $50,000.

Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex.: For construction and equipment of new boys' dormitory, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $80,000.

Sequoyah Orphan Training School, Oklahoma: To provide an adequate water supply, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $12,000.

Compensation to certain pueblos in New Mexico for losses: To compensate the Indians of Jemez and Tesuque pueblos, in the State of New Mexico, for loss of lands and water rights, in accordance with the findings of the Pueblo Lands Board created by section 2 of the act approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. L. p. 636), $29,801.20, of which sum $500 shall be credited on the books of the Treasury Department to the Indians of Jemez pueblo and $29,301.20 to the Indians of Tesuque pueblo, such sums to draw interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum: *Provided*, That the $500 credited to the Indians of Jemez pueblo is hereby made available until June 30, 1929, for the purchase of land and water rights for such Indians, and $14,150 of the sum credited to the Indians of Tesuque pueblo is hereby authorized to be expended during the fiscal years 1928 and 1929 in providing an additional water supply for such pueblo: *Provided further*, That the remainder of such funds, and the interest thereon, shall be subject to future appropriation by Congress.

Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians (tribal funds): To enable the Secretary of the Interior to make payment of fees to the attorneys of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, under a tribal contract approved October 12, 1923, fiscal year 1928, $85,000, payable out the fund held in trust for said tribes under the provisions of Public Resolution No. 36, approved June 12, 1926.

Road, Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz.: For the improvement and construction of the uncompleted part of the road from Tucson to Ajo, by way of Indian Oasis, within the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz., as authorized by the act approved June 23, 1926, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $125,000.

Coolidge Dam across canyon of Gila River near San Carlos, Ariz. (reimbursable): For construction of the Coolidge Dam across the canyon of the Gila River near San Carlos, Ariz., as authorized by the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. pp. 475, 476), and under the terms and conditions of, and reimbursable as provided in said act, $3,450,000, to continue available until June 30, 1929: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for payment to the Southern Pacific Railway Co. for relocating its railroad pursuant to its existing contract with the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $163,452 shall be available for payment of property and other damages: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $72,324 shall be available for the replacement at Rice Station, Ariz., of agency buildings to be abandoned at San Carlos, Ariz.: *And provided further*, That not to exceed $17,718 shall be available for enlargement of the Rice Station boarding school to accommodate pupils from the day school to be abandoned at San Carlos.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS

Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, fiscal year 1928, $46,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Refund of construction charges: For refunds of construction charges heretofore paid on permanently unproductive lands excluded from the Federal reclamation projects specified in the act approved May 25, 1926, in accordance with section 42 of such act, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $100,000, to be paid out of the reclamation fund.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Roads and trails, national parks: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, $1,000,000, being part of the amount of the contractual authorization contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1928, approved January 12, 1927.

BUREAU OF EDUCATION

Education of natives of Alaska: Not exceeding $3,064.84 of the unexpended balance of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1926 shall be available for the payment of obligations, as follows: Traveling expenses, $625, and freight, including operation of U. S. S. *Boxer*, $2,439.84, in addition to the amounts appropriated for those objects under this head for said fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Salaries: For salaries, Department of Justice, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1928, $25,400.

Contingent expenses: For the purchase of law books, books of reference, and periodicals, including the exchange thereof, for the Department of Justice, fiscal year 1928, $1,925: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2 per volume shall be paid for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Traveling and miscellaneous expenses: For traveling and other miscellaneous and emergency expenses, authorized and approved by the Attorney General, to be expended at his discretion, fiscal year 1927, $2,746.82.

MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For the enforcement of acts to regulate commerce, including the same objects specified for this purpose in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary, for the fiscal year 1926, $2.50.

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For the additional amounts required from January 1 to June 30, 1927, inclusive, on account of the increased compensation granted by the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States," approved December 13, 1926, under the following appropriation accounts, respectively:

"Salaries, Supreme Court, 1927," $17,452.75;

"Salaries of circuit, district, and retired judges, 1927," $198,457;

"United States Court of Customs Appeals, 1927," $10,000;

"Salaries, Court of Claims, 1927," $11,441.29;

"Salaries, judges, marshals, etc., Territory of Alaska, 1927," $4,503.88;

In all, $241,854.92, which shall be credited, respectively, to the appropriation accounts above enumerated.

For salaries of United States district judges, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1928, $51,000.

MARSHALS, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, CLERKS, AND OTHER EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES COURTS

Salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals: For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1924, $3,841.56.

Pay of special assistant attorneys: For assistants to the Attorney General and to United States district attorneys employed by the Attorney General to aid in special cases, for the fiscal year 1923 and prior years, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary, for the fiscal year 1923, $5,000.

Salaries and expenses of clerks: For salaries of clerks of United States district courts, their deputies, and assistants, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1928, $25,000.

Fees of commissioners: For fees of United States commissioners and justices of the peace acting under section 1014, Revised Statutes of the United States, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1922, $585.70.

For 1925, $13,098.70.

For 1927, $25,000.

Costs taxed against the United States: For the payment of costs taxed against the United States by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in the case of United States of America, owner of the steamship *Samoset*, libelant, against Mexican Petroleum Co., owner of the oil barges *No. 11* and *No. 12*, respondent, fiscal year 1926, $33.20.

For the payment of the cost of a transcript of testimony for the defendant, furnished by direction of the court, in the case of the United States against Earl Battice, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, fiscal year 1928, $672.

Compensation and expenses of commissioner in case of State of Oklahoma against State of Texas: For payment of one-third of the costs of executing the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States, dated January 3, 1927, in the case of the State of Oklahoma, complainant, against the State of Texas, defendant; the United States of America, intervenor, No. 6, original, October term, 1926, including the compensation and expenses of the commissioner appointed by the court to run, locate, and mark the boundary between the State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas, $18,000, to remain available until the completion of such work and to be paid on the order of the court.

Pay of bailiffs, etc.: For bailiffs and criers, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1927, $20,162.78.

Books for judicial officers: For the purchase and rebinding of law books, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1924, $10.

For the purchase of law books, including the exchange thereof, for United States judges, district attorneys, and other judicial officers, including the libraries of the nine United States circuit courts of appeals, for the purchase of the Federal Reporter and continuations thereto as issued, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, fiscal year 1928, $55,399: *Provided*, That all books purchased hereunder shall be marked, plainly, "The property of the United States," and shall in all cases be transmitted to their successors in office: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2 per volume shall be paid for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated.

PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.: For the United States penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1927, $5,000.

United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.: For establishment of a water system, purchase and installation of new boilers and other machinery, construction, repairs, and alterations to power plant, and all other expenses connected with either the water system or power plant, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $25,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $200,000 for the fiscal year 1927 for the purchase and installation of new boilers, shall be available for the purposes of this paragraph: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may contract with an engineer for the preparation of plans, listing of specifications, supervision, superintendence of all work, and the performance of any other duties necessary to the construction of a complete power plant and the establishment of a water system.

Not exceeding $14,000 of the working-capital fund for the fiscal year 1928 shall be available for the completion of the addition to the textile-mill building.

United States penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash.: For the United States penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1928, including not to exceed $12,900 for salaries of officers and employees, $12,900.

For extension of underground water system and repairs to existing water system, equipment for wells, construction of water reservoir, installation of water supply on farm, repairs to docks and dolphins, construction of breakwater bulkheads, and purchase and installation of oil-burning equipment, oil-storage tanks, pumps and piping, including all necessary labor and supplies in connection with the above, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $62,250.

Credit is authorized and directed in the account of the warden of the United States penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash., with payment of $523.46 made during the fiscal year 1924 for purchase of additional boiler and engine room equipment, which was inadvertently charged to the appropriation for construction of buildings contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 19, 1919.

United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio: Not to exceed $100,000 of the appropriation "United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, 1927," shall remain available until June 30, 1929, to enable the Attorney General to furnish the necessary material, supplies, and equipment, and to defray such other expenses as may be necessary to provide adequate facilities for the employment of prisoners and the development of the institution in accordance with the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a United States Industrial Reformatory," approved January 7, 1925.

Federal Industrial Institution for Women, Alderson, W. Va.: The unexpended balances of the appropriations for construction work of $909,100 contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1925, and continued available during the fiscal year 1927 by the second deficiency

act, fiscal year 1926, and of $1,509,300 contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926, shall remain available until June 30, 1929.

National Training School for Boys: For the National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1927, $1,805.37.

Support of United States prisoners: For the support of United States prisoners, including the same objects specified under this head in the acts making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1924, $6,141.18.

For 1925, $7,576.26.

For support of United States prisoners, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1927, $420,965.07.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay the claim in favor of James O'Connell for damage to his property, as adjusted and determined by the Secretary of Labor, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, and as fully set forth in House Document No. 645, Sixty-ninth Congress, $35.97.

Salaries: Not to exceed $5,240 of the appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration, fiscal year 1928, shall be available for transfer to the appropriation for salaries, office of the Secretary of Labor, fiscal year 1928.

BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION

For refund of amount covered by cashier's check No. 15824 of the First State Bank & Trust Co., of Laredo, Tex., deposited as security on bond furnished in the case of the alien Sergei Chacotcin, who departed from the United States in accordance with the terms of the bond, fiscal year 1928, $500.

For refund of amount covered by cashier's check No. 15823 of the First State Bank & Trust Co., of Laredo, Tex., deposited as security on bond furnished in the case of the alien Peter Koklagin, who departed from the United States in accordance with the terms of the bond, fiscal year 1928, $500.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

For an additional amount required for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, including the same objects specified under this head in the appropriation act for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1927, $40,354.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Navy, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 645 and 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $2,861.22.

To pay claims for damages adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Navy under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 645 and 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $12,815.45.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Hydrographic Office: For purchase and printing of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, copperplates, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $14,000.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

Engineering: For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery and auxiliary machinery, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $435,000.

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

Construction and repair of vessels: For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $565,000.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

For the reimbursement of A. T. Marix, colonel, United States Marine Corps, retired, for the loss by fire of personal property in Christiana, Norway, fiscal year 1928, $1,500.

For reimbursement of Emanuel Xuiereb, chief mechanic, at the United States naval hospital, Canacao, P. I., for the loss of private funds in the form of Liberty bonds, fiscal year 1928, $1,750.

For reimbursement of Thomas J. Ryan, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, for the loss of uniforms, equipment, clothing, and personal effects, as a result of the earthquake and fire disaster in Japan on September 1, 1923, fiscal year 1928, $1,221.65.

The Navy pension fund is hereby made available for the payment of the claims, amounting to $127.22, allowed by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 29, 1918 (40 Stat. p. 499), as set forth in Senate Document No. 221, Sixty-ninth Congress.

The Navy pension fund is hereby made available for the payment of the claim, amounting to $175.43, allowed by the General Accounting Office in certificate of settlement 0162113, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 29, 1918 (40 Stat. p. 499).

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

The limit upon expenditures for clerical inspection, drafting, messenger, and other classified work in the field from appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1928," is hereby increased from $975,000 to $1,000,000.

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

Navy Yard, Puget Sound, Wash.: For rebuilding railroad, $75,000.

Navy yard, Boston, Mass.: For improvements of central power plant, $7,870.90.

Submarine base, New London, Conn.: For replacement and repair of piers, $150,000.

Naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba: For replacement of fuel-oil dock, $75,000; reconstruction of marine railway, $25,000; salt-water fire-protection system, $45,000; in all, $145,000.

Navy yard, New York: For replacing public works facilities destroyed by fire February 9, 1927, $25,000; improvement of Dry Dock No. 4, $250,000; in all, $275,000.

Air stations: Toward the construction of buildings and improvements at air stations, as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1927, as follows: Coco Solo, Canal Zone, $632,000; Sand Point, Wash., $210,000; San Diego, Calif., $380,000; Hampton Roads, Va., $640,000; in all, $1,862,000.

Marine barracks, Parris Island, S. C.: For construction of a steel bridge across Archers Creek, $30,000.

Marine barracks, Quantico, Va.: For construction of public works as authorized by the act approved February 15, 1927, $1,650,000; and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such construction at a cost in the aggregate not to exceed $2,205,000.

Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.: For repairs to heating tunnel at intersection of Gilliss Avenue and roadway to main building, and for repairs to balustrade around 12-inch equatorial dome of main building, $7,500.

Not to exceed an aggregate of $40,000 is made available from the foregoing appropriations for "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," to provide for the employment of classified personal services in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and in the field to be engaged upon such work and to be in addition to employees otherwise provided for.

MARINE CORPS

For additional amounts necessary to defray the increased expenses incident to maintaining armed guards of marines detailed for duty in protecting the United States mails and for expeditionary forces in Nicaragua and China, including the same objects specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927, under the headings that follow:

Pay, Marine Corps: For allowance for lodging and subsistence of enlisted men, $8,418, and for mileage and actual and necessary expenses to officers, etc., $117,213; in all, fiscal year 1927, $125,631.

General expenses, Marine Corps; For provisions, subsistence, board, and lodging of enlisted men, etc., $596,700; for military supplies and equipment, etc., $470,300; for transportation of troops, etc., $400,000; for miscellaneous supplies, etc., $351,000; in all, fiscal year 1927, $1,818,000.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

Construction and machinery: For an additional amount for the purposes specified under this heading in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $10,800,000.

ALTERATIONS TO NAVAL VESSELS

Major alterations, naval vessels: Toward the alterations and repairs required for the purpose of modernizing the U. S. S. *Oklahoma* and *Nevada* as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1927, $5,635,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for alterations to increase the range of the turret guns of such ships.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

OUT OF THE POSTAL REVENUES

Office of Postmaster General

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for

the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 570 and 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $16,817.84.

Personal or property damage claims: For an additional amount required to enable the Postmaster General to pay claims for damages to persons or property, in accordance with the provisions of the deficiency appropriation act, approved June 16, 1921, fiscal year 1926, $4,000.

Freight, express, or motor transportation of equipment, etc.: For an additional amount required for the transportation and delivery of equipment, materials, and supplies for the Post Office Department and the Postal Service by freight, express, or motor transportation, and other incidental expenses, fiscal year 1928, $30,000.

Office of the chief inspector

Payment of rewards: For payment of rewards for the detection, arrest, and conviction of post-office burglars, robbers, and highway mail robbers, fiscal year 1926, $25,500: *Provided*, That rewards may be paid, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, when an offender of the class mentioned was killed in the act of committing the crime or in resisting lawful arrest: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used to pay any rewards at rates in excess of those specified in Post Office Department Order 7708, dated July 1, 1922.

Office of First Assistant Postmaster General

Compensation to postmasters: For an additional amount required for compensation to postmasters, fiscal year 1926, $93,693.50.

Temporary city delivery carriers: For pay of substitutes for letter carriers absent with pay and of auxiliary and temporary letter carriers at offices where city delivery is already established, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1923, $26.62;

For 1924, $310.63.

Special-delivery fees: For fees to special-delivery messengers, fiscal year 1925, $275.74.

Pneumatic-tube service: For an additional amount required for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, including power, labor, and all other operating expenses, fiscal year 1928, $1,800.

Office of Second Assistant Postmaster General

Railway postal clerks, travel allowances: For an additional amount required for travel allowance to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, fiscal year 1927, $26,000.

Balances due foreign countries: For balances due foreign countries, fiscal year 1920, $3,648.41.

Balances due foreign countries: For balances due foreign countries, including payment of balances to Great Britain for excess parcel-post weights covering the period from January 1, 1919, to September 30, 1924, as follows: Fiscal year 1919, $31,764.90; 1920, $45,814.13; 1921, $10,731.15; 1922, $21,321.52; 1923, $13,567.56; 1924, $9,094.68; 1925, $2,273.68; in all, $134,567.62.

Balances due foreign countries: For an additional amount required for payment of interest to Norway, Sweden, and Denmark on balances found due by arbitral sentence under the provisions of article 23 of the Universal Postal Union of Rome and under the provisions of article 25 of the Universal Postal Convention of Madrid, fiscal year 1927, $4,531.18.

Contract Air Mail Service: For an additional amount required for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, under contract, and for the incidental expenses thereof, in accordance with the act approved February 2, 1925, and amended June 3, 1926, fiscal year 1928, $2,000,000.

Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General

Mail bags and equipment: Not to exceed $600,000 of the appropriation "Mail bags and equipment, 1928," may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of the amount of $500,000 specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1928.

OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY

Payment to W. F. Morgareidge: For carrying into effect the act entitled "An act for the relief of W. F. Morgareidge," approved July 3, 1926, fiscal year 1928, $364.30.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Contingent expenses, United States consulates: For an additional amount for the contingent expenses of United States consulates, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1928, $35,000.

Contingent expenses, foreign missions: For contingent expenses of foreign missions, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1928, $70,000.

Transportation of Foreign Service officers: To pay the traveling expenses of Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1928, $25,000.

Transporting remains of Foreign Service officers and clerks: For defraying the expenses of transporting the remains of Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers of the United States, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1926, $713.16.

Foreign Service buildings fund: For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the "Foreign Service buildings act, 1926," and for each and every object thereof, including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings heretofore acquired under specific authorization of Congress for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

Consular building, Amoy, China: The unexpended balances of the appropriations for acquisition of buildings and grounds and construction at Amoy, China, continued available until June 30, 1927, by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926, shall remain available until expended.

Water boundary, United States and Mexico: For an additional amount for the water boundary, United States and Mexico, covering the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1927, and including also personal services and supplies and equipment for the installation of additional gauging stations and the improvement and operation of existing stations on the Rio Grande, fiscal year 1928, $21,000, which amount, together with so much as may be necessary of the appropriation "Water boundary, United States and Mexico, 1928," may be transferred by the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to the United States Geological Survey for direct expenditure.

International Radiotelegraphic Convention: The unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1925, approved March 4, 1925, for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to the Conference for Revision of the International Radiotelegraphic Convention of July 5, 1912, to be held in Washington, and continued available until June 30, 1927, by the act approved July 3, 1926, shall remain available until June 30, 1928, for such purposes, and shall also be available to reimburse the appropriation "Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, 1928," for expenditures made therefrom on account of such conference, including expenditures made for official cards and on contracts for stenographic reporting services.

Preparatory Commission on Armaments: For the expenses of further participation by the United States in the work of the preparatory commission at Geneva, for the purpose of making preliminary studies and preparations for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including compensation of employees, travel, subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act); and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, $70,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Waterways treaty, United States and Great Britain; International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain: For an additional amount for the waterways treaty, United States and Great Britain; International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, covering the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1927, approved April 29, 1926, and for the expenses of making such further investigations and taking such further action as may be deemed necessary in relation to the boundary waters within the scope of the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain, and waters flowing into or therefrom, including personal services within the District of Columbia or elsewhere, travel, and such other expenses as the Secretary of State shall deem proper, $25,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

International Fisheries Commission: For an additional amount for the International Fisheries Commission, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1928, $3,000.

Expenses of prisons for American convicts: For an additional amount for the expenses of prisons for American convicts, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1928, $5,000.

International water commission, United States and Mexico: The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $20,000 made by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, and continued available until June 30, 1927, for the Commission on Equitable Use of Waters of the Rio Grande, shall remain available until June 30, 1928, for the expenses, including the purchase, at not to exceed $1,500, and maintenance of a passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicle, of the commission authorized by the resolution approved March 3, 1927, entitled "Joint resolution amending the act of May 13, 1924, entitled 'An act providing a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the Rio Grande,' etc."

Payment to Etelka Bell: For payment to Etelka Bell, widow of Edward Bell, late counselor of legation and chargé d'affaires at the American Embassy at Peking, China, as authorized by the act approved July 3, 1926, fiscal year 1928, $9,000.

Payment to Edith L. Bickford: For payment to Edith L. Bickford, widow of George F. Bickford, late consul at Antung, China, as authorized by the act approved July 3, 1926, fiscal year 1928, $3,500.

Payment to Agnes W. Wilcox: For payment to Agnes W. Wilcox, widow of Henry T. Wilcox, late American consul at Vigo, Spain, as authorized by the act approved February 9, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $4,500.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 645 and 731 and Senate Documents Nos. 222 and 227, Sixty-ninth Congress, $4,838.80.

DIVISION OF BOOKKEEPING AND WARRANTS

Recoinage of minor coins: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the recoinage of worn and uncurrent minor coins of the United States now in the Treasury or hereafter received, and to reimburse the Treasurer of the United States for the difference between the nominal or face value of such coins and the amount the same will produce in new coins, fiscal year 1928, $7,500.

CUSTOMS SERVICE

For the payment of claims for refund of duties paid on domestic animals and offspring thereof returned to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the public resolution approved May 24, 1926, fiscal year 1928, $4,690.95.

FEDERAL FARM LOAN BUREAU

Salaries: For an additional amount required for salaries of members of the board and for other personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, fiscal year 1928, $75,000: *Provided*, That the amount to be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1928 shall not exceed $242,000;

Miscellaneous expenses: For an additional amount required for miscellaneous expenses, including the same objects of expenditure specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1928, $10,000: and said appropriation for miscellaneous expenses is hereby made available for law books, periodicals, newspapers, contract stenographic reporting services, and expert services for the preparation of amortization tables: *Provided*, That whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, the Farm Loan Board shall find that the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby, it may, in lieu of actual operating expenses, under such regulations as it may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 3 cents per mile for motor cycle or 7 cents per mile for automobile, used for necessary travel on official business;

In all, Federal Farm Loan Bureau, $85,000, payable from assessments upon Federal and joint-stock land banks and Federal intermediate credit banks.

INTERNAL REVENUE

Refunding taxes illegally collected: For an additional amount required for refunding taxes illegally collected under the provisions of sections 3220 and 3689, Revised Statutes, as amended by the revenue acts of 1918, 1921, 1924, and 1926, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1928 and prior years, $43,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1928: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress of the disbursements hereunder as required by such acts, including the names of all persons and corporations to whom payments are made, together with the amount paid to each: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to refund any amount paid by or collected from any manufacturer, producer, or importer in respect of the tax imposed by subdivision (3) of section 600 of the revenue act of 1924, or subdivision (3) of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921 or of the revenue act of 1918, unless the Commissioner of Internal Revenue certifies to the proper disbursing officer that such manufacturer, producer, or importer has filed with the commissioner, under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, a bond in such sum and with such sureties as the commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the immediate repayment to the United States of such portion of the amount refunded as is not distributed by such manufacturer, producer, or importer, within six months after the date of the payment of the refund, to the persons who purchased for purposes of consumption (whether from such manufacturer, producer, importer, or from any other person) the articles in respect of which the refund is made, as evidenced by the affidavits (in such form and containing such statements as the commissioner may prescribe) of such purchasers, and that such bond, in the case of a claim allowed after the passage of this act, was filed before the allowance of the claim by the commissioner.

BUREAU OF PROHIBITION

Enforcement of narcotic and national prohibition acts: The limitations upon the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia under this head in the acts making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1927 and 1928 are hereby amended so as to authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $603,600 for said purpose during the fiscal year 1927, and not to exceed $658,320 for said purpose during the fiscal year 1928, and the limitation upon the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from the appropriation "Collecting the internal revenue, 1928," is hereby amended so as to authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $8,949,680 for said purpose.

COAST GUARD

Rebuilding and repairing stations, etc.: For an additional amount for rebuilding and repairing stations and houses of refuge, temporary leases, rent, and improvements of property for Coast Guard purposes, including use of additional land where necessary, fiscal year 1928, $61,600.

Mileage, etc.: For an additional amount for mileage and expenses, including the same objects of expenditure specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1928, $15,000.

Communication lines, etc.: For an additional amount for coastal communication lines and facilities and their maintenance, fiscal year 1928, $30,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals: For an additional amount for pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1928, $124,891.

Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases: For an additional amount required for preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, including the same objects of expenditure specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1928, $95,388.

Quarantine service: For an additional amount required for the quarantine service, including the same objects of expenditure specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1928, $25,000.

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

New York, N. Y., courthouse and post office: For reconstruction of roof, $12,000.

Marcus Hook, Pa., quarantine station: For new boiler and necessary remodeling of boiler house, rehabilitation of river bulkhead, back filling, repairing gangway, boat landing, repairs of isolation ward, fencing, and incidental work, $21,000.

Carville, La., marine hospital: For water-supply tank, additional hydrants, additional filters, connecting pipe, $30,000.

San Francisco (Calif.) Mint Building: For an additional vault and work incidental thereto, $90,000.

Pittsburgh, Pa., post office and courthouse: For removal of four old boilers and installation of three new ones, $25,000.

New York, N. Y., quarantine station: For restoration of chemical storage building and new roof covering, buildings Nos. 2 and 3, $12,000.

Outside professional services: For an additional amount required for outside professional services, including the same objects of expenditure specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1928, $350,000: *Provided*, That in all cases where contracts have heretofore been entered into or may hereafter be entered into under the provisions of section 2 of the public buildings act approved May 25, 1926, for outside professional services, wherein the period of performance extends beyond the fiscal year in which such contract or contracts were entered into, payments thereunder shall be made from the appropriation "Outside professional services, public buildings," available at the time payment is due for the particular services rendered.

Relief of the Davis Construction Co.: For the carrying out of the act entitled "An act for the relief of the Davis Construction Co.," approved April 24, 1926, fiscal year 1928, $32,569.28.

PUBLIC-BUILDING PROJECTS UNDER SECTION 3, PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT APPROVED MAY 25, 1926, AS AMENDED

Akron, Ohio, post office and other Government offices: For acquisition of additional land and completion, $866,280.

Athens, Tenn., post office, etc.: For completion, $30,000.

Batavia, Ill., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $8,000.

Bayonne, N. J., post office, etc.: For completion, $100,000.

Branford, Conn., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000.

Buffalo, Wyo., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $22,500.

Caribou, Me., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000.

Central City, Nebr., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $10,000.

Chicago, Ill., marine hospital: For completion, $132,000.

Cody, Wyo., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $40,000.

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, post office, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $148,200.

Des Moines, Iowa, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $474,500.

Detroit, Mich., marine hospital: For completion, $350,000.

Donora, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000.

East Las Vegas, N. Mex., post office, courthouse, and other Government offices: For continuation, $30,000.

East Orange, N. J., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $160,000.

Fallon, Nev., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $36,500, under an estimated total cost of $90,000, in lieu of $69,500 fixed in the act of July 3, 1926.

Fort Fairfield, Me., post office, customhouse, and other Government offices: For completion, $28,000, under an estimated total cost of $90,000, in lieu of $70,000 fixed in the act of July 3, 1926.

Fort Plain, N. Y., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000, under an estimated total cost of $85,000 in lieu of $75,000 fixed in the act of July 3, 1926.

Globe, Ariz., post office, courthouse, and other Government offices: For completion, $65,000.

Jamestown, N. Dak., post office, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $125,000.

Lancaster, S. C., post office, etc.: For completion, $25,000.

Leominster, Mass., post office and other Government offices: For continuation, $40,000.

Lewistown, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For continuation, $45,000.

McKees Rocks, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $19,500.

Madison, Wis., post office, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $482,000.

Marianna, Fla., post office, courthouse, and other Government offices: For continuation, $45,000.

Metropolis, Ill., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $40,000.

Millville, N. J., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $60,000.

Missoula, Mont., post office, courthouse, and other Government offices: For continuation, $100,000.

Montclair, N. J., post office, etc.: For continuation, $30,000.

Montevideo, Minn., post office and other Government offices: For continuation, $15,000.

Mount Carmel, Ill., post office, etc.: For continuation, $10,000.

Newburyport, Mass., post office, etc.: For completion, $27,000.

Olyphant, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $5,000.

Paxton, Ill., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $35,000.

Red Bluff, Calif., post office and other Government offices: For continuation, $40,000.

Sand Point, Idaho, post offices and other Government offices: For completion, $10,000.

Sayre, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000.

Shelbyville, Ky., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000.

Southbridge, Mass., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $48,000, under an estimated total cost of $110,000, in lieu of $80,000 fixed in the act of July 3, 1926.

Syracuse, N. Y., post office, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $700,000.

Tamaqua, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $37,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may accept a title to a site for such building which reserves or excepts all coal or other minerals on the lands with the right of mining same.

Tarentum, Pa., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $20,000.

Tomah, Wis., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $25,000.

Utica, N. Y., post office, customhouse, and courthouse: Toward the construction of the building, $500,000.

Waynesburg, Pa., post office and other Government offices: Toward the construction of the building, $50,000.

Williamson, W. Va., post office, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $99,000.

Wilmington, Ohio, post office and other Government offices: For completion, $55,000.

Wilson, N. C., post office, courthouse, etc.: For completion, $95,000.

Winchester, Mass., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $19,500.

Wyandotte, Mich., post office and other Government offices: For completion, $65,000.

Yonkers, N. Y., post office, etc.: Toward the construction of the building, $318,603.56; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to enter into contracts for the entire estimated cost of such building for not to exceed $520,000, in lieu of $500,000 fixed in the act of July 3, 1926.

Total appropriations for projects under section 3, act of May 25, 1926, as amended, $5,306,583.56.

PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS UNDER SECTION 5, PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT APPROVED MAY 25, 1926, AND SECOND DEFICIENCY ACT APPROVED JULY 3, 1926

Birmingham, Ala., post office and courthouse: For completion, including attic, remodeling, etc., $100,000.

Chicago, Ill., post office: For completion of acquisition of site, $450,000.

Chicago, Ill., marine hospital: For completion, $100,000, under an estimated total cost of $200,000, in lieu of $184,000 fixed in the act of July 3, 1926.

Memphis, Tenn., subpost office: Toward extension and remodeling, $75,000.

Total appropriations for projects under section 5, public buildings act of May 25, 1926, and deficiency act approved July 3, 1926, $725,000.

Corinth, Miss., post office, etc.: For acquisition of additional land and commencement of extension and rehabilitation of the building, $35,000; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the entire estimated cost of such project for not to exceed $75,000.

PUBLIC-BUILDING PROJECTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNDER SECTION 5, PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT APPROVED MAY 25, 1926, AS AMENDED

Agricultural Department buildings: Toward the construction of the central part of the administration building, $750,000.

Toward the construction of an extensible building, $1,000,000.

Liberty Loan Building: For completion of the construction of two additional stories, $125,000.

Water mains and other utilities: For water mains, removal or diversion of such sewers and other utilities as may be necessary incident to construction of buildings in the District of Columbia under the act approved May 25, 1926, $225,000.

Total appropriations for projects in the District of Columbia under section 5, act of May 25, 1926, as amended, $2,100,000.

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

To enable the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind in accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended by the act approved February 8, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $23,000.

WAR DEPARTMENT—MILITARY ACTIVITIES

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Pay, etc., of the Army: For pay of the Army, including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1926, $1,000,000.

For pay of the Army, including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927, $2,426,809, and in addition thereto the sum of $271,050 of the appropriation "Incidental expenses of the Army, 1927," is reappropriated and made available.

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document No. 567, Sixty-ninth Congress, $322.13.

For the complete satisfaction of the claims of Col. Nathan D. Ely, Judge Advocate General's Department, and Charles Falkenthal, master sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, for the loss of personal property stored in quartermaster warehouses, $375 and $27, respectively; in all, $402.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Subsistence of the Army: Purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations to troops, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $4,535,893.

Army transportation: Credit is authorized and directed in the accounts of disbursing officers of the War Department for the payment of obligations heretofore or hereafter incurred for expert services under existing contract entered into by the War Department in connection with the construction of the ferryboat authorized by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926.

Military posts: For construction and installation at military posts of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances thereto, as authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1927, without

reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, including also in connection with the erection of barracks at Fort Jay, Governors Island, not to exceed $30,000 for the employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of architects, or firms, or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be deemed necessary without regard to civil service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States, $6,162,000, to remain available until expended; of this amount $3,680,000 shall be payable from the military post construction fund created by section 4 of the act approved March 12, 1926, and $2,482,000 shall be payable out of the general fund of the Treasury.

Walter Reed General Hospital: For completion of the construction of additional facilities authorized by the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional facilities at Walter Reed General Hospital, in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, and the "First deficiency act, fiscal year 1926," $950,000.

For Mills, Corregidor, Philippine Islands, central power plant: For completing repairs to steam plant and changing the present coal plant to oil, construction of facilities to house Diesel engines and oil storage, purchase and installation of three Diesel units in the central power plant, and all other necessary expenses incidental thereto, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $309,000.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Armament of fortifications: For purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for seacoast cannon, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing projectiles from Lake Denmark to Picatinny Arsenal, fiscal year 1928, $37,000.

Rehabilitation of Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: For repairing and rebuilding the Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey, including the necessary construction, the purchase and installation of machinery and equipment, and the purchase of approximately 350 acres of land in the vicinity of the arsenal as authorized in the act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation to rehabilitate the Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey," approved March 3, 1927, $2,300,000.

Distribution of captured war devices and trophies: The unexpended balance on June 30, 1927, of the appropriation "Distribution of captured war devices and trophies," contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926, is extended to June 30, 1928, for the completion of an equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies under the provisions of an act approved June 7, 1924, as amended by the act approved May 22, 1926.

BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS

Reimbursement of Philippine government: For full reimbursement to the Philippine government for expenses incurred by it for maintaining alien crews prior to April 6, 1917, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize reimbursement of the government of the Philippine Islands for maintaining alien crews prior to April 6, 1917," approved March 3, 1927, fiscal year 1928, $11,400.81.

OFFICE OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Salaries, office of Chief of Engineers: In addition to the sum authorized under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, the further expenditure of not to exceed $10,000 from appropriations heretofore made is authorized for the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other employees as the Secretary of War may deem necessary in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors, surveys, preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor estimates and bills, fortifications, engineer equipment of troops, engineer operations in the field, and other military purposes.

WAR DEPARTMENT—NONMILITARY ACTIVITIES

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

National cemeteries: For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $94,000.

Headstones for graves of American soldiers in Europe: To complete the furnishing and erecting of headstones for the graves of American soldiers in Europe, $186,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929: *Provided*, That the headstones furnished hereunder shall be of such design and material as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Tomb of the Unknown Soldier: For every expenditure requisite for or incident to the work of securing competitive preliminary designs for completing the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery, as authorized by the public resolution approved July 3, 1926, $2,500, to remain available until June 30, 1929: *Provided*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of such public resolution the Secretary of War is authorized to do all of the things necessary to accomplish this purpose, by contract or otherwise, with or without advertising, including payment for designs submitted under such conditions as he may prescribe.

Shiloh National Military Park: For the purchase of additional land within the boundaries of the park, $7,100, to remain available until December 31, 1928.

For the payment of obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1925, in accordance with the act of June 7, 1924, in connection with the acquisition of a strip of land contiguous to the park, to connect the Shiloh National Military Park with the Corinth (Miss.) National Cemetery, fiscal year 1928, $14,000.

To complete the erection and equipment of a school building in Shiloh National Military Park, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $10,000.

Moores Creek National Military Park: The appropriation "Moores Creek National Military Park, 1927," $1,500, is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1929.

Survey of battle fields: The balance of the appropriation "Survey of battle fields, 1928," $15,000, contained in the War Department appropriation act approved February 23, 1927, is hereby continued and made available for obligation to and including June 30, 1929, including mileage to officers and traveling expenses of civilian employees traveling on duty in connection with the survey of battle fields.

Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial: For commencing the establishment of a national military park to be known as the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial, as authorized by the act approved February 14, 1927, including the condemnation, purchase, or lease of the necessary lands, surveys, maps, marking the boundaries of the park, opening, constructing, or, repairing necessary roads, pay and expenses of commissioners, salaries for labor and services, traveling expenses, supplies, and materials, $50,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Stones River (Tenn.) National Military Park: For the establishment of a national military park at the battle field of Stones River, Tenn., in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a national military park at the battle field of Stones River, Tenn.," approved March 3, 1927, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $5,000.

Memorials: The appropriations "Memorial to Virginia Dare, 1927," $2,500, and "Memorial to Roger Williams, 1927," $1,500, are continued and made available during the fiscal year 1929.

Lincoln Birthplace Memorial: For improvement of the road providing access to the memorial hall and the log cabin in which Abraham Lincoln was born and for repairs and minor improvements in connection with such buildings and reservation, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $5,000, to be expended under the direction of the Quartermaster General.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Artificial limbs: For furnishing artificial limbs and apparatus, or commutation therefor, and the necessary transportation, fiscal year 1928, $36,385.

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Cape Cod Canal: For the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal and other property pertaining thereto, in accordance with section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1927, $5,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Emergency flood control, Mississippi River: For reimbursement of the appropriation for "Flood control, Mississippi River," and the appropriation for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," for amounts expended therefrom for emergency work on the lower Mississippi River on account of the flood of 1927, $7,000,000: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds for the flood of 1927 by the Secretary of War from the appropriation for river and harbor works is hereby approved and validated.

Examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors: For examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors for which there may be no special appropriation, $50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law.

River and harbor damage claims: To pay the claim adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, with the approval of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the authority contained in section 9 of the act approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. p. 1015), and certified to Congress in House Document No. 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, $1,317.20.

Wharf and walk, Jamestown, Va.: For the construction upon Government-owned land of a suitable public wharf to provide access to the United States monument which commemorates the three hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Jamestown, and for the construction of a suitable walk from the wharf to the monument, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $15,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be available only when an amount at least equal to this appropriation is provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia and/or the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and any contributed funds shall be expended under the direction of the Chief of Engineers.

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS

For support of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers: For "subsistence," "household," "current expenses," and "hospital," at the following branches, including the same objects respectively specified in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927 under each of such heads for the Central Branch, namely:

Central Branch, Dayton, Ohio: Subsistence, $15,283.86;

Eastern Branch, Togus, Me.: Subsistence, $7,125.56; household, $2,894.68;

Southern Branch, Hampton, Va.: Subsistence, $5,436.10;

Western Branch, Leavenworth, Kans.: Current expenses, $300; subsistence, $11,204.73; household, $15,778.10;

Pacific Branch, Santa Monica, Calif.: Repairs, $8,914.60;

Danville, Ill., Branch: Household, $4,225.20; hospital, $2,544.82;

Battle Mountain Sanitarium, Hot Springs, S. Dak.: Subsistence, $8,175.41; household, $13,923.17; hospital, $15,103.03: *Provided*, That the sums above specified, aggregating $110,909.26, shall be used to reimburse the post fund of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers for sums expended to meet deficiencies during the fiscal year 1927.

State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors: For continuing aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled volunteer soldiers, in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended, including all classes of soldiers admissible to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, fiscal year 1927, $3,373.69: *Provided*, That for any sum or sums collected in any manner from inmates of such State or Territorial homes to be used for the support of said homes a like amount shall be deducted from the aid herein provided for, but this proviso shall not apply to any State or Territorial home into which the wives or widows of soldiers are admitted and maintained.

THE PANAMA CANAL

The appropriation for civil government, Panama Canal and Canal Zone, fiscal year 1927, shall be available for payment of the salary of the district judge of the Canal Zone at the rate authorized by the act approved December 13, 1926.

JUDGMENTS, UNITED STATES COURTS

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," as amended by the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911, certified to the Sixty-ninth Congress in House Document No. 727 and Senate Document No. 218, and to the Seventieth Congress in House Document No. 75, namely: Under the Shipping Board, $3,150; under the Department of Commerce, $4,378.87; under the Department of Labor, $1,280.05; under the Navy Department, $10,413.81; under the War Department, $22,561.03; in all, $41,783.76, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

For the payment of judgments, including costs of suits, rendered against the Government of the United States by United States district courts under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. p. 1112), certified to the Sixty-ninth Congress in House Document No. 726 and Senate Document No. 220, and to the Seventieth Congress in House Document No. 79, as follows: Under the Department of Commerce, $1,834.75; under the Navy Department, $23,133.05; under the Treasury Department, $4,530.67; under the War Department, $12,682.79; in all, $42,181.26, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest as and where specified in such judgments.

For payment of the judgment, including costs of suit, rendered against the Government of the United States by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, under the provisions of the act of August 10, 1917 (40 Stat., pp. 276–279), and as certified to the Sixty-ninth Congress in House Document No. 725, as follows: Under the War Department, $14,928.70, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interests as and where specified in such judgment.

For payment of the judgments rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the Northern District of California under the provisions of the act approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat., p. 595), and certified to the Sixty-ninth Congress in House Document No. 722, as follows: Under the Treasury Department, $61,398.48.

For payment of the judgments, including costs of suits, rendered against the Government by United States district courts in special cases and under the provisions of certain special acts and certified to the Sixty-ninth Congress in House Document No. 721 and Senate Document No. 226, and to the Seventieth Congress in House Document No. 76, as follows: Under the United States Shipping Board, $29,251.73; under the Navy Department, $141,698.25; under the Treasury Department, $13,578.15; under the War Department, $7,948.17; in all, $192,476.30, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on certain of the judgments as and where specified in such judgments.

None of the judgments contained under this caption shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired except such as have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise.

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS

For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to the Sixty-ninth Congress in House Document No. 723 and Senate Document No. 219, and to the Seventieth Congress in House Document No. 78, namely: Under the United States Shipping Board, $5,230,929.85; under the United States Veterans' Bureau, $1,671.52; under the Navy Department, $1,151,223.72; under the Treasury Department, $9,730.98; under the War Department, $1,729,924.26; in all, $8,123,480.33, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on certain of the judgments at the legal rate per annum as and where specified in said judgments.

None of the judgments contained under this caption which have not been affirmed by the Supreme Court or otherwise become final and conclusive against the United States shall be paid until the expiration of the time within which application may be made for a writ of certiorari under subdivision (b), section 3, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, and to further define the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals and of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1925.

AUDITED CLAIMS

SEC. 2. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1924 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in House Document No. 720, Sixty-ninth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

For national security and defense, committee on public information, $635.80.

For salaries and expenses, United States Shipping Board, $33.33.

For medical and hospital services, Veterans' Bureau, $19.91.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Bureau, $3.

For vocational rehabilitation, Veterans' Bureau, $2,908.84.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, $10.21.

For cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams, $1.25.

For general expenses, Weather Bureau, $2.57.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce, $42.89.

For party expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey, $5.82.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For traveling expenses of inspectors, Department of the Interior, $4.

For maps of the United States, $125.

For Army pensions, $112.50.

For support of Indians in Arizona, $2,620.25.

For support of Sioux of different tribes: Subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, $6.

For support of Indians at Colville and other agencies and Joseph's Band of Nez Perces, Washington, $1.05.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $18.99.

For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $3,452.80.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For war emergency employment service, $1.26.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

For pay of the Navy, $4,785.10.

For organizing the Naval Reserve Force, $3.63.

For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $361.42.

For pay, Marine Corps, $15,694.24.

For pay, miscellaneous, $165.62.

For aviation, Navy, $1,985.46.

For maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, $541.35.

For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, $129.

For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $112.12.

For construction and repair, Bureau of Construction and Repair, $30.94.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, $180.08.

For contingent expenses, foreign missions, $31.02.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For collecting the revenue from customs, $37.38.
For collecting the war revenue, $9.
For collecting the internal revenue, $8.02.
For enforcement of narcotic and national prohibition acts, internal revenue, $1,116.22.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, $5.82.
For refunding internal revenue collections, $10.
For Coast Guard, $543.70.
For freight, transportation, etc., Public Health Service, $55.
For care of seamen, etc., Public Health Service, $321.
For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, $65.24.
For preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, $45.98.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $11.10.
For mechanical equipment for public buildings, $180.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $2.50.
For operating supplies for public buildings, $0.58.

WAR DEPARTMENT

For pay, etc., of the Army, $32,847.46.
For pay of the Army, $5,708.53.
For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, $1,901.78.
For pay, etc., of the Army, war with Spain, $51.07.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, $20.
For subsistence of the Army, $35.70.
For clothing and equipage, $55.08.
For clothing and camp and garrison equipage, $40.44.
For Army transportation, $996.23.
For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $1,746.08.
For horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc., $335.98.
For construction and repair of hospitals, $1,454.93.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $6,952.44.
For Signal Service of the Army, $934.99.
For Air Service, production, $285.71.
For medical and hospital department, $31.33.
For Chemical Warfare Service, Army, $2.
For armament of fortifications, $6,735.31.
For Field Artillery armament, $6.49.
For manufacture of arms, $387.50.
For ordnance service, $4.45.
For ordnance stores, ammunition, $13,796.84.
For quartermaster supplies, equipment, etc., Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $36.
For proving grounds, Army, 2 cents.
For Organizer Reserves, $101.25.
For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, $9,615.03.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, $2.94.
For national cemeteries, $6.92.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—POSTAL SERVICE

(Out of the postal revenues)

For airplane service between New York and San Francisco, $226.37.
For clerks, contract stations, $130.51.
For compensation to postmasters, $11.15.
For compensation to assistant postmasters, $60.36.
For indemnities, domestic mail, $1,706.59.
For indemnities, international mail, $380.73.
For mail messenger service, $5.64.
For rent, light, and fuel, $721.74.
For separating mail, $40.
For shipment of supplies, $14.45.

Total audited claims, section 2, $123,827.03, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

AUDITED CLAIMS

SEC. 3. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1924 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 217, Sixty-ninth Congress, there is appropriated, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

For Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 83 cents.
For medical and hospital services, Veterans' Bureau, $244.93.
For vocational rehabilitation, Veterans' Bureau, $1,261.19.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture, 4 cents.
For general expenses, Extension Service, $10.06.
For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $3.08.
For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, $6.24.
For general expenses, Weather Bureau, $5.15.
For suppressing spread of pink bollworm of cotton, 28 cents.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For national security and defense, Department of the Interior, $42.90.
For stationery, Department of the Interior, $22.30.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, United States courts, $150.34.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $720.80.
For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $90.99.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For expenses of regulating immigration, $4.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

For organizing the Naval Reserve Force, 33 cents.
For pay of the Navy, $881.80.
For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $1,326.
For pay, Marine Corps, $25.
For pay, miscellaneous, $35.10.
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, $101.40.
For general expenses, Marine Corps, $88.16.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For contingent expenses, Treasury Department: Stationery, $3.94.
For collecting the revenue from customs, $332.04.
For enforcement of narcotic and national prohibition acts, internal revenue, $103.19.
For refunding internal-revenue collections, $25.
For collecting the internal revenue, 42 cents.
For Coast Guard, $231.67.
For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, 39 cents.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $268.12.

WAR DEPARTMENT

For pay, etc., of the Army, $12,886.19.
For pay of the Army, $337.45.
For increase of compensation, military establishment, $1,310.56.
For increase of compensation, War Department, $20.
For pay, etc., of the Army, war with Spain, $17.04.
For Army transportation, $55.14.
For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $871.52.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $1,318.34.
For armament of fortifications, $1,813.99.
For Chemical Warfare Service, Army, $610.09.
For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, $16,612.99.
For aviation, Navy (Navy transfer to War, May 21, 1920), 76 cents.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—POSTAL SERVICE

(Out of the postal revenues)

For city delivery carriers, $103.52.
For compensation to postmasters, $34.39.
For indemnities, domestic mail, $359.01.
For indemnities, international mail, $34.52.
For rent, light, and fuel, $137.50.
For vehicle service, $69.02.

Total, audited claims, section 3, $42,777.72, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

AUDITED CLAIMS

SEC. 4. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations for balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1925 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in House Document No. 80, Seventieth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

LEGISLATIVE

For Capitol power plant, $6,325.25.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

For United States Coal Commission, 90 cents.
For salaries and expenses, Federal Board for Vocational Education, $1.64.
For Interstate Commerce Commission, $37.86.
For American ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, $4.86.
For fuel, lights, etc., State, War, and Navy Department Buildings, $9,257.33.

For increase of compensation, Veterans' Bureau, $10.
For medical and hospital services, Veterans' Bureau, $3,071.41.
For military and naval insurance, Veterans' Bureau $57.50.
For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Bureau, $152.01.
For vocational rehabilitation, Veterans' Bureau, $16,512.63.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For fees of witnesses, Supreme Court, District of Columbia, $37.75, to be paid in the proportions of 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury of the United States.

For fees of witnesses, Supreme Court, District of Columbia, $2.50, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For salaries, Department of Agriculture, $16.
For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $1,599.66.
For general expenses, Forest Service, $44.60.
For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, $965.20.
For general expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $6.
For enforcement of packers and stockyards act, $510.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For increase of compensation, Department of Commerce, 67 cents.
For collecting statistics, Bureau of the Census, $2,000.
For expenses of the Fourteenth Census, $602.
For commercial attachés, Department of Commerce, $10.
For promoting commerce, Department of Commerce, $15.
For contingent expenses, Steamboat Inspection Service, $5.20.
For expenses, mining experiment stations, Bureau of Mines, $4.91.
For industrial research, Bureau of Standards, $132.71.
For equipment, Bureau of Standards, $566.35.
For testing structural materials, Bureau of Standards, $19.
For general expenses, Bureau of Standards, 50 cents.
For investigation of public utility standards, Bureau of Standards, $405.50.
For scientific library, Patent Office, $12.85.
For pay, etc., of officers and men, vessels, coast survey, $23.47.
For pay and allowances, commissioned officers, Coast and Geodetic Survey, $48.
For party expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey, $53.50.
For salaries, lighthouse vessels, $1.83.
For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $50.03.
For miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Fisheries, $14.18.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For aviation of the Navy (Navy transfer to Interior—Bureau of Mines, act January 24, 1923), $528.89.
For salaries and commissions of registers and receivers, $9.09.
For contingent expenses of land offices, $15.90.
For protecting public lands, timber, etc., $16.24.
For Geological Survey, $3.
For Glacier National Park, $144.
For Grand Canyon National Park, $60.15.
For Mount Rainier National Park, $892.62.
For Yellowstone National Park, $115.30.
For roads and trails, national parks, $4,290.39.
For medical relief in Alaska, $1.84.
For investigation of school and home gardening, Bureau of Education, $425.
For Army pensions, $110.91.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $983.16.
For inspectors, Indian Service, $19.23.
For pay of judges, Indian courts, $14.
For expenses of Indian commissioners, $27.78.
For industrial work and care of timber, $86.01.
For industry among Indians, $83.50.
For diversion dam, Gila River Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable), $51.20.
For diversion dam, Gila River Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable), $201.
For irrigation project, Gila River Reservation, Ariz (reimbursable), $57.
For Indian schools: Support, $122.09.
For Indian school and agency buildings, $1.38.
For Indian boarding schools, $8.51.
For Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., $13.54.
For Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., assembly hall, $52.43.
For Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., dairy herd, $51.07.
For education, Sioux Nation, $19.20.
For relieving distress and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, $999.60.
For support and civilization of Indians, $136.54.
For support of Indians in Arizona, $90.
For support of Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, $11.45.
For support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., $27.91.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For salaries, Department of Justice, $55.
For printing and binding, Department of Justice and courts, $2.50.
For enforcement of acts to regulate commerce, $1.45.
For investigation and prosecution of war frauds, $163.25.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $1,611.68.
For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, United States courts, $14.20.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $468.55.
For fees of jurors, United States courts, $83.
For fees of witnesses, United States courts, $67.20.
For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $267.47.
For support of United States prisoners, $25.50.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For special examiners, etc., Division of Naturalization, 54 cents.
For employment service, Department of Labor, 50 cents.
For miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naturalization, $3.
For expenses of regulating immigration, $898.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

For additional employees, Navy Department, $3.79.
For increase of compensation, Navy Department, 67 cents.
For pay, miscellaneous, $2,230.99.
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, $2,931.37.
For gunnery and engineering exercises, Bureau of Navigation, $457.13.
For instruments and supplies, Bureau of Navigation, $2,467.34.
For organizing the Naval Reserve Force, $328.66.
For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $94,823.75.
For construction and repair, Bureau of Construction and Repair, $4.50.
For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $56,746.10.
For pay of the Navy, $34,267.06.
For provisions, Navy, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $164.35.
For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $264.73.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $2,246.12.
For bringing home remains of officers, etc., Navy Department, $78.61.
For care of hospital patients, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, $60.
For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $1,016.91.
For aviation, Navy, $3,638.54.
For pay, Marine Corps, $414.94.
For general expenses, Marine Corps, $435.78.
For maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, $1,799.01.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For salaries of ambassadors and ministers, $777.78.
For salaries, chargé d'affaires ad interim, $68.61.
For salaries of secretaries, Diplomatic Service, $625.
For clerks at embassies and legations, $291.66.
For salaries, interpreters to embassies and legations, $63.66.
For contingent expenses, foreign missions, $881.20.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, $239.
For immigration of aliens, Department of State, $22.35.
For relief and protection of American seamen, $304.91.
For salaries, Foreign Service offices, $286.97.
For salaries, diplomatic and consular officers, while receiving instructions and in transit, $118.91.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, $1,146.19.
For post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers, $149.58.
For arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims between United States and Great Britain, $750.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For increase of compensation, Treasury Department, $45.95.
For collecting the revenue from customs, $892.73.
For salaries and expenses of collectors, etc., of internal revenue, $23.64.
For collecting the internal revenue, $162.31.
For collecting the war revenue, $67.38.
For enforcement of narcotic and national prohibition acts, internal revenue, $12,512.75.
For payment of judgments against internal revenue officers, $28.75.
For refunding internal revenue collections, $5,310.95.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, $292.75.
For Coast Guard, $1,255.21.
For repairs to Coast Guard cutters, $15.35.
For additional vessels, Coast Guard, $3,828.16.
For pay of other employees, Public Health Service, $4.75.
For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, $710.64.
For field investigations of public health, $144.24.
For freight transportation, etc., Public Health Service, $120.05.
For maintenance, hygienic laboratory, Public Health Service, $7.
For medical and hospital services, Public Health Service, $658.50.

For preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, $11.02.
For quarantine service, $31.50.
For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Bureau (transfer to Public Health Service, act February 13, 1923), $109.33.
For general expenses of public buildings, $25.44.
For mechanical equipment for public buildings, $430.16.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $233.39.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $401.77.
For vaults and safes for public buildings, $62.
For operating force for public buildings, $2.
For operating supplies for public buildings, $624.93.

WAR DEPARTMENT

For additional employees, War Department, $40.
For military post exchanges, $1.
For registration and selection for military service, $1,159.24.
For vocational training of soldiers, $115.39.
For Army War College, $2.86.
For pay, etc., of the Army (longevity act, January 29, 1927), $280,953.42.
For pay, etc., of the Army, $160,065.49.
For pay of the Army, $22,959.27.
For pay, etc., of the Army, War with Spain, $171.08.
For arrears of pay, bounty, etc., $302.68.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons $215.39.
For mileage of the Army, $9.50.
For increase of compensation, War Department, $87.45.
For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, $28,257.20.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, $6.82.
For Army transportation, $6,556.93.
For barracks and quarters, $20,735.51.
For clothing and equipage, $286.45.
For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $39,976.90.
For incidental expenses of the Army, $116.
For regular supplies of the Army, $2,640.72.
For roads, walks, wharves, and drainage, $100.81.
For subsistence of the Army, $966.65.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $96,308.84.
For completion of acquisition of land for military purposes, Camp Bragg, N. C., $59.17.
For completion of acquisition of land, Scott Field, Ill., $75.
For water and sewers at military posts, $13,653.75.
For replacing regular supplies of the Army, $714.36.
For replacing medical supplies, $718.19.
For replacing ordnance and ordnance stores, $1,521.55.
For Signal Service of the Army, $5,474.15.
For Air Service, Army, $232.13.
For medical and hospital department, $84.25.
For ordnance service, $107.88.
For ordnance stores and supplies, $7.65.
For ordnance stores, ammunition, $185.37.
For barracks and quarters, seacoast defenses, $428.
For armament of fortifications, $29,220.81.
For field artillery armament, $2.20.
For proving grounds, Army, $25.22.
For Chemical Warfare Service, Army, $301.37.
For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, $42,129.25.
For arms, uniforms, equipment, etc., for field service, National Guard, $1,502.75.
For civilian military training camps, $11.46.
For Organized Reserves, $378.63.
For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $8.76.
For disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees, $30.38.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, $21.58.
For national cemeteries, $45.30.
For artificial limbs, $175.
For National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Central Branch, $15.
For National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Northwestern Branch, $3.97.
For increase of compensation, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, $2.38.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—POSTAL SERVICE

(Out of the postal revenues)

For airplane service between New York and San Francisco, $31.60.
For balances due foreign countries, $22,389.41.
For city-delivery carriers, $1,651.40.
For clerks, contract stations, $1.
For clerks, first and second class post offices, $975.04.
For clerks, third-class post offices, $1.66.
For compensation to postmasters, $843.76.
For indemnities, domestic mail, $6,687.53.
For indemnities, international registered mail, $1,439.92.
For indemnities, international mail, $796.37.
For mail-messenger service, $40.23.
For miscellaneous items, first and second class post offices, $67.57.
For personal or property damage claims, $651.50.
For post-office equipment and supplies, $22.40.
For power-boat service, $2,000.
For railroad transportation, $945.88.
For railroad transportation and mail-messenger service, $743.90.
For Railway Mail Service, miscellaneous expenses, $40.50.
For Railway Mail Service, salaries, $3.23.
For railway postal clerks' travel allowances, $14.
For rent, light, and fuel, $777.25.
For Rural Delivery Service, $465.85.
For separating mails, $453.24.
For shipment of supplies, $37.07.
For special-delivery fees, $2.08.
For star-route service, $74.39.
For vehicle service, $252.58.

Total, audited claims, section 4, $1,094,609.95, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

SEC. 5. For the payment of claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the acts approved June 11, 1926, and March 3, 1927, as fully set forth in House Document No. 77 of the Seventieth Congress, $3,955.42.

SEC. 6. Appropriations for the fiscal years 1928 and 1929 available for expenses of travel of civilian officers and employees of the executive departments and establishments shall be available also for expenses of travel performed by them on transfer from one official station to another when authorized by the head of the department or establishment concerned in the order directing such transfer: *Provided*, That such expenses shall not be allowed for any transfer effected for the convenience of any officer or employee.

SEC. 7. This act hereafter may be referred to as the "first deficiency act, fiscal year 1928."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not at this time make the statement that I propose to make in connection with the bill. Later on I will make the statement with reference to these expenditures, and at that time I shall give a very complete explanation of every item in the bill; and I feel quite sure that even the gentleman from Texas will see that every item in the bill is amply justified. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not consume the time of the committee in a general discussion of the pending bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has just stated that later on he will discuss the various provisions of the bill, and he will do so of course with his usual fairness and usual clearness and completeness with which he presents matters to the House. I may say that there are no material differences in the Committee on Appropriations on the provisions of this bill. This bill carries many of the appropriations that were carried in the general deficiency bill at the last session of Congress which failed on account of the filibuster in the Senate during the closing days of that session.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. For a question.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman has stated that the bill failed on account of the filibuster in the Senate. Would he permit a question as to the accuracy of that statement?

Mr. BYRNS. I will withdraw the statement rather than consume the time of the committee if the gentleman objects to it. I stated what I thought was the accepted fact. Those appropriations not carried in this bill have either been entirely eliminated or left to be included in the regular annual bills which will be reported at a later date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. For a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There were items in the last deficiency bill which are not in this bill, for instance with reference to the public buildings—will they be reported in a bill later?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; in the regular appropriation bills. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] later on will explain very fully the provisions of this bill and state to the House what the intentions are with reference to the items to which the gentleman refers. The failure of the deficiency bill caused considerable inconvenience and embarrassment to a number of governmental activities which had not been provided with sufficient money to carry them to the beginning of the next fiscal year which began July 1, at which time the appropriations for the fiscal year of 1928 went into effect.

Since the President declined to accede to what appeared to be a popular demand and call Congress into extra session to

provide the necessary funds, to meet the demands, it was necessary to resort to various subterfuges, and in some cases actual violation of the law, to carry on some of the activities. For example, some $38,000,000 was necessary to pay pensions in June and some $35,000,000 was required to meet deficiencies in May and June for the Veterans' Bureau. The Comptroller General ruled that these sums might be borrowed from the 1928 appropriations, but since the appropriations did not become available until July 1, I fail to see just how they could be borrowed to be used prior to that date. Neither do I see how the Comptroller General could justify the application for 1927 of appropriations which had been specifically designated by Congress for 1928.

The great Mississippi flood which occurred last spring destroyed many lives and millions of dollars worth of property. After the flood had subsided crevasses were left in the levees, which constituted an actual menace to life and property in the event of further rains.

It was necessary to close them. The Mississippi Flood Commission had $5,000,000 to expend for that purpose, but that was not sufficient. Two million dollars more was needed, and because an extra session of Congress was not called by the President, the Secretary of War was compelled to take that money from the 1928 appropriations for rivers and harbors.

This bill restores these and other sums, and to that there is certainly no objection, but it was a plain violation of law, and no one denies it. I do not say this in captious criticism. The purpose for which the money was applied was worthy and necessary, and not a dollar was lost to the Treasury by such action. Neither do I call attention to this in a partisan spirit, but I call attention to it at this time for the purpose of entering an earnest protest against what has appeared to be an increasing encroachment upon the rights and functions of Congress by the executive branch of the Government. This encroachment of the Executive on the prerogatives and privileges of the Congress has been going on for many years. Only last year when the hurricane occurred in Florida the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the President, took $250,000 from the appropriations for the foot-and-mouth disease and loaned it for the purpose of buying seed—a commendable object, perhaps, but no less a plain violation of law and a plain disregard of the Constitution, which gives to Congress alone the right to make appropriations and to say how they shall be applied. The responsibility must rest with the Executive. I have no criticism to make of the Secretary of War or of anyone who sat in with him in advising him as to the borrowing of this $2,000,000 from the river and harbor fund. Lives were at stake, possibly, and, of course, that should take precedence over everything else. This was and is a national problem, one that concerns the whole country, but I repeat that the responsibility for this violation of law rests alone with the Chief Executive. He could have called an extra session of Congress without expense, and there was a general demand that he should do so, and these appropriations would have been legally and properly provided had he done so. We have a very strong suspicion that the reasons for not doing so were political. There would have been no expense, as I say, in calling Congress together, because the salaries of Members and of the officials of the House and Senate are paid whether Congress is in session or not. True, had Congress been called in session a majority would probably have insisted upon staying here through the summer months and upon giving that relief which is so much needed by the farmers, depriving Members and officials of pleasant summer vacations.

Other important legislation, which might have been equally embarrassing to the administration, might have been considered. But better that than to force a situation which compelled a disruption of the orderly and constitutional procedure of Government, and which tends to weaken the respect of the administration officials for the laws which should govern them in the discharge of their duties. All laws, of course, should be observed. No one is above the law. The higher the official, the more careful he should be to respect the law. No one has a right to disregard one law any more than another. We can not inculcate obedience to law unless we ourselves respect all laws, whether important or otherwise. Example is more essential than precept.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say this in a partisan spirit. I am simply appealing to Congress to preserve its own constitutional rights and to let it be understood in the future that it will not permit those rights to be encroached upon by executive officials. The safety of our Government lies in keeping the three branches of our Government distinct and separate, each performing its functions under the Constitution, and each jealous of encroachment by the others.

Congress is in large measure responsible for this gradual assumption of its powers by the executive branch, and the consequent lessening of public confidence, and I was about to say respect. The executive branch has been magnified in importance at the expense of the legislative branch. Only yesterday I read what purported to be an interview with the majority leader of this House, in which he heartily indorsed a bill proposed by the chairman of a committee of this House in which it is proposed to surrender and turn over for all time to come the constitutional prerogative and power of the House to apportion its own Members to a member of the Cabinet, who is not even responsible to the people.

For six years Congress has been unable for one reason or another to dispose of the $150,000,000 investment at Muscle Shoals, Ala. Yet we have to-day in face of that fact a proposition pending to expend $125,000,000 upon another dam on another great river. Congress should take up the Muscle Shoals matter one way or the other, without further delay. If I had the time I could point to numerous laws in which Congress has delegated its powers to boards and commissions appointed by the President and under which the executive departments are given the power to frame regulations which have the full force and effect of law.

Mr. Chairman, I have been led to submit these brief remarks not in opposition to the items in the bill restoring the funds so used to those from which they were taken, and certainly not in criticism of the amounts or manner in which they were expended, but simply to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that this violation of the law for a most worthy purpose could have been avoided if Congress had been called into extra session, and to express the hope that Congress will in the future more jealously guard its rights and prerogatives from encroachment, and thus regain the prestige which we are told in newspaper editorials and other published articles it has lost to some extent by its own voluntary surrender in recent years.

I am not going to discuss at this time the Budget which has just been presented to the House. At some future day after an opportunity to analyze it I shall ask the privilege of the House to discuss it.

May I say in conclusion that the Budget estimate for 1929 just submitted amounts to $4,238,793,765.53. This is $305,311,765.06 more than the appropriations for 1928. Without exception the cost of every department of the Government, of every governmental establishment in the Government, is and has been steadily increasing during the past years despite the claim of economies and reductions made. [Applause.] The President has several times taken the opportunity very seriously to criticize the increasing cost of State and municipal administration. That criticism could be as well applied to the cost of the United States Government under his own administration. Doctor Coué recommended his famous cure for only physical ills. He has not claimed for it that by simply saying, "Every day in every way expenses are growing smaller and smaller" will actually bring about a reduction in governmental expenses unless some definite action is taken by the administration to make good its claims. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used exactly 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. In considering the items for deficiencies in the State Department expenditures, which will be found in the bill now before us, I would like to philosophize a bit on various matters "touching on and appertaining to" the foreign relations and activities of the State Department, to cabbages and kings, to ambassadors and Americanism, to legations and lickspittles, to snobs and secretaries, and to that mess of pottage of bunk and betrayal, treachery and toadyism, falsehood and flapdoodle, insincerity and insolence, embraced under the comprehensive name of American diplomacy, for which we pay so liberally.

In older and more robust days America gave the world what was called "shirt-sleeve diplomacy," rough, resolute, and productive of results. To-day we have "shirt-tail diplomacy" [laughter], suave, servile, socially serviceable abroad, nationally noxious at home, that crooks the pregnant hinges of the knee in alien courts and capitals and shows the abashed American the door.

In the good old days, when this Republic was a congeries of colonies, an ambassador was a well-paid Ananias, who lied for his king and country, and spent his time smelling, spying, suborning, and slandering the nation he was accredited to; and though his methods and morals were dubious, his love of and

loyalty to his country were above doubt and beyond question. He went out of fashion with wigs and powder. American diplomacy and diplomats are something else and marked by mediocrity, misfits, and millions.

American ambassadors for monetary merit from Bradstreet, and the black and blue books of our financial centers, wherein those who can afford butlers and bay windows are listed and whose philanthropy and patriotism shine in the ledgers of the Republican National Committee, adorn our legations abroad. All else, I say, with the exception of Bradstreet and the Republican National Committee, is leather and prunella [laughter]; culture, knowledge of peoples and languages, tact, good manners, and trifles of that sort are needless, provided the ladies of the legation can chatter and tango and are garnished with French dressing, and the ambassador is gilded, gastronomically generous, and willing to spend and scatter and souse the socially select. [Laughter.]

The old-style dollar diplomat, who sported spinach and used tobacco as a diet is in the museum; the 1927 ambassador goes in for cigarettes, safety razors, safety first, and social eminence, and is visible to the naked eyes of only those wandering Americans bearing mandates from Republican magnates. For all others—the air, the landscape, the department of the exterior. [Laughter.]

The real business of the legations, their habits, customs, usages, tone, table manners, and rules and regulations for the treatment of visiting Americans are provided by chargés d'affaires, secretaries, clerks, valets, flunkies, and minor parasites, mostly resentful aliens, attached to the pay rolls. Their job is to appraise American callers, separate the sheep from the goats, give the elect the administration hand and smile, administer the boot and the "bum's rush" to the unworthy [laughter], apologize for being Americans, and shudder when the American flag and Republic are mentioned. Almost all legations have one thing in common—contempt for the country they serve and a slavering sycophancy for the country they are serving in. For diplomats and their attachés the waters of the Atlantic Ocean, like those of the ancient River Styx, have a strange chemical action on heart and brain; the trip overseas causes them to abjure their native land and transforms them into the most ardent Germans in Germany, the most intense Frenchmen in France, the most effusive Britons in Anglo-Saxony, all of them into denatured Americans [laughter], ashamed of America, and apologetic of all things American. They misrepresent the dignity and honor of the Republic and seem only to reflect the spirit and sentiment of expatriate America, of those so-called American colonies in European capitals made up of exiles and bankrupts, "demireps," and detrimentals and those who have left America for America's good. What can we do, my colleagues, with such misrepresentatives? Protected by the civil service and the Republican Party, how can we get rid of them? Cut them off at the Treasury or what? God knows; I do not! [Laughter.]

Recently the mayor of the greatest city in America visited Europe and was honorably received on his tour everywhere by all except the diplomatic representatives of his own country. Our ambassador to France, at home in Ohio and sick, was represented in Paris by the chargé d'affaires, one Sheldon Whitehouse, who promptly put detectives on his trail to try and get something on this mayor who was a member of Tammany Hall, a political body not in sympathy with the party in power here in our own America. Think of it, brethren! The American legation turned into a spy agency to discredit a distinguished American citizen. Rather a base and contemptible piece of diplomacy, methinks. My old college friend, the ambassador to the Court of St. James, fled to the Highlands of Scotland to avoid meeting the distinguished tourist. [Laughter.] Valiant enough to face a Scotch stag, his courage failed him at the thought of the Tammany tiger [laughter]; but the visitor was met at the legation by an underling with an English accent so blamed English and so unlike anything American, that he congratulated the legation secretary upon his Anglicization, much to that comic official's embarrassment.

In Ireland he was fortunate in meeting an American minister, who is an American 24 hours a day and 365 days a year, Frederick A. Sterling, our representative in the Irish Free State [applause], where Americans are popular, and where every citizen is a potential American [laughter], and where it is dangerous to belittle or apologize for America. I would we had more Sterling Americans in our diplomatic service and fewer Whitehouses of ill fame to make us blush for the honor and good name of America.

I hate to vote away good American money for bad American diplomatic service, for those who misrepresent us, who injure our good name abroad and our pride at home, men unwilling or unable to defend and strengthen our policies and purposes abroad; and I wish we could rid ourselves of diplomatic detrimentals.

I honor the White House here in Washington; but I should like to see the Paris Whitehouse booted out of the diplomatic service of America, in sæcula sæculorum. [Continued applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The gentleman has given a magnificent address in regard to the matter of the welfare of our country, abroad particularly. It is a timely utterance, and if the gentleman will permit me, I wish to congratulate him on a great speech delivered with more than his accustomed eloquence. The gentleman who preceded him [Mr. BYRNS] made reference to the flood situation in the Mississippi Valley. The people who live in that vast region of our country sympathize with the people of New England in their recent disaster, and I am quite sure Congress will do all in its power to alleviate the sufferings and losses of that flood catastrophe. May I ask the gentleman what is the attitude of the people of his great historic section with reference to the flood-control problem of the Mississippi Valley and the responsibility of the National Government to meet that problem fully, completely, and exclusively, so as to make for a unified control instead of the present system of dual control and local contribution?

Mr. GALLIVAN. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Louisiana, I must say that I can hardly speak for all the people of my section of the country, but I can speak for the greatest Democratic district in all America. [Applause.] My people believe that the Mississippi River disaster is a national problem. [Applause.] They believe that the right arm of Uncle Sam should be lifted in every exigency to do its level best by their fellow countrymen who abut on the Mississippi River. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back 10 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Tennessee can use more time now if he desires, or with the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee I will yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire at this time to prepare the way for an amendment which I understand will be offered this afternoon or to-morrow by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], with a view to striking out of the deficiency bill now before the House certain language which the Committee on Appropriations inserted, to the effect that no part of the sum of $5,635,000 for the reconstruction and repair of two battleships shall be used in elevating the guns of those two ships.

It appears that the Committee on Appropriations, in doing this little thing, is constituting unto itself a supreme power which the rules of the House do not contemplate. Congress last February enacted a law which authorized the appropriation of $13,150,000 for the reconstruction and repair of two of our first-line battleships, the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada*. Remember, my friends, that both of these ships are slower than every single battleship in the British and the Japanese navies. Remember also, my friends, that every battleship that Japan owns and every battleship that England owns can shoot from 2,000 to 11,000 yards farther than these ships can.

Now, Congress in its wisdom has determined that by expending $13,000,000 on these two ships we can put them in absolutely first-class condition, so that they will be prepared to go out and defend the best interests of this country against anything that floats. The Committee on Appropriations in their wisdom or unwisdom have provided $1,300,000 for these ships for protection against submarine and aircraft attack. They provide for further reboilering these ships $1,200,000, and for new fire control $865,000. But in the name of Heaven, what good is the fire control that directs the big guns when your projectiles can not reach the target? Not worth a damn. But that is exactly what the Committee on Appropriations has brought to this House for its consideration.

Of course, if Congress is going to authorize expenditures by a vote in this House of 266 to 111, and then the Committee on Appropriations says, "Well, we in our wisdom have determined that this authorization shall be null and void; we will not appropriate the money"; if the Committee on Appropriations is going to assume that attitude, then all the other committees of

the House which authorize expenditures might just as well go out of business. If the guns of our ships, the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada*, are elevated from their present 15° to 30° their efficiency will be increased in fire from their big guns just 50 per cent. In other words, by a small expenditure they will be enabled to elevate their guns so that they will have a greater trajectory, which will increase their range from 21,000 yards to 31,000 yards.

Now, if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is anything at all, he is one of the best and fairest business men on earth. I have always thought so But I can not understand how in the name of good business we are asked to authorize $865,000 for improving gun-fire control, which is only one-half of the amount necessary—$1,730,000—to make gun fire more accurate on these two ships.

If we are going to expend $1,730,000 for improving range finding on these ships, why not improve the efficiency of the guns themselves? Change in elevation does not change the character of the gun. It is the same gun on substantially the same gun carriage. We merely change the carriage slightly, so as to permit elevating the guns from 15° to 30°. That greater trajectory provided in the higher angle of fire gives 10,000 yards greater range, or approximately 5 miles. I can not for the life of me see why we are asked to spend $1,730,000 for fire control of guns which are outranged by every big gun in the British and Japanese Navies, unless we couple with that appropriation the elevation of the gun itself, so we can shoot as far as our British and Japanese friends.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think perhaps the gentleman has answered the question already. The gentleman made the statement that the British guns can shoot 31,000 yards?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. The *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada* shoot but 21,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the elevation of the guns give us 10,000 additional yards?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; 10,000 yards additional.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the life of this ship?

Mr. BRITTEN. It is due to be replaced in 1936 under the terms of the Washington treaty.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That applies to the two ships we are talking about?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; to the two ships we are talking about.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. After the results of the Geneva conference, has the gentleman any idea as to the reason why the Committee on Appropriations is not in favor of raising the guns? Is it a question of economy?

Mr. BRITTEN. It is probably a question of economy, but the economy comes in such bad grace when in one line we contemplate an expenditure of $1,730,000 to improve gunfire, and then in the next line we say that no part of this sum shall be expended toward improving gun ranges on these ships. The whole matter, from my point of view, is so hard to understand. If it is economy only, then it is the rankest kind of economy, because it will result in destroying the value of two first-class ships which under the treaty of Washington we can not replace until 1936.

Mr. CONNERY. I just wish to say that I am in hearty agreement with the gentleman. Not only should we raise the elevation of the guns, but I think the United States should have the best Navy and strongest Navy in the world and not a Navy based on the 5–5–3 ratio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Were these vessels constructed before the Washington conference?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Why was there not a sufficient elevation given to the guns then?

Mr. BRITTEN. Because in those days we did not have the benefit of spotting our shots from the air. Now we can shoot 30,000 yards or 31,000 yards, much over the horizon, with very great accuracy. That is made possible by the use of airplanes, which give instant accurate returns on every shot at the longest possible ranges. That is the great reason for improving our guns.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How long will it take to make these alterations?

Mr. BRITTEN. A year and a half.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Are treaty rights involved in raising the elevation of the guns?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. Of course, there are some gentlemen on the floor of this House, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is one of them, who say that the Washington treaty will be violated if we do this reconstruction work; but the then Secretary of State who negotiated the Washington treaty, Charles Evans Hughes, has in a written opinion declared that this alteration is not a violation of the Washington treaty.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish the gentleman would put that opinion in the RECORD, because I do not find it at any place.

Mr. BRITTEN. I have it, dated January 6, 1925:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, January 6, 1925.

Hon. THOMAS S. BUTLER,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication on behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, transmitting House Resolution 387 and requesting that the information therein described should be furnished if not incompatible with the public interest.

This proposed resolution asked for "such data, information, or objections" which the Secretary of State "may have from any foreign government in connection with the modernization of certain capital ships of the United States Navy by increasing the elevation and range of turret guns."

While I understand that the resolution has not been passed, there is no objection to giving to your committee the information desired. The only "data, information, and objections" which the Department of State has received from any foreign government relating to the increase of the elevation and range of turret guns are as follows:

In a communication under date of March 15, 1923, the British ambassador at Washington reviewed the reports that had been made as to the increase in the elevation of the turret guns of British ships, and made the categorical declaration that no alteration had been made in the elevation of turret guns of any British capital ships since they were first placed in commission.

In subsequent communications from the British ambassador at Washington it has been stated to be the view of His Majesty's Government that an increase in the elevation of turret guns is not permissible under the terms of the naval treaty, with special reference to Chapter II, part 3, Section I (d) which prohibits, subject to certain exceptions expressly provided for, any reconstruction of retained capital ships or of aircraft carriers, except for the purpose of providing means of defense against air and submarine attack. As regards the question whether such increase in the elevation of turret guns involves any "reconstruction," it is stated to be the view of the British Government that the increase of the elevation of guns, together with consequential alterations such as scrapping or replacement of existing fire-control systems, etc., involves considerable "reconstruction" in the fullest sense of the term. The British Government lay particular emphasis upon what is described as a larger aspect of the question; that is to say that one of the objects of the treaty is to reduce the burdens of competition in armament, and the British Government feel that action by the United States in the elevation of turret guns would tend to defeat this object to a considerable extent. In these circumstances the British Government make an earnest appeal that the Government of the United States should not impose upon the peoples of the countries concerned the burdens of competition in armament which are deemed to result from the execution of the proposal to elevate the turret guns on retained capital ships of the United States, it being considered that even if arguments can be found in support of the contrary interpretation of the treaty, the effect of carrying out such proposals would be incompatible with its intentions. The assurance is repeated that no alteration has been made in the elevation of the turret guns of any existing British capital ships since they were first placed in commission. It was further proposed that the Government of the United States, the Japanese Government, and the British Government (the Governments of France and Italy not being deemed to be directly concerned in view of the exceptions of the treaty) should undertake not to make during the term of the treaty any increase in the elevation of the turret guns of their existing capital ships.

I have been informed by the Japanese Government that it was not the view of the Japanese Government that a change in the gun eleva-

tions, which did not require changes of the prohibited sort to the ships themselves, would be a violation of the naval treaty.

I may add that, in view of the detailed description given by the Navy Department of the nature of the changes which would be necessary to elevate the turret guns on the capital ships retained by the United States, these changes appear to be of a minor sort, and, in my opinion, would not constitute a reconstruction of the ships within the meaning which should be attributed to the provision of the naval treaty. I am of the opinion, however, that while such changes as would be contemplated in the case of American ships would not constitute a violation of the terms of the treaty, they would tend to evoke the competition which it has been the policy of this Government to mitigate. It may also be stated that so far as the United States is concerned the question appears to be of consequence only in relation to certain of the specified retained ships, and these ships under the replacement clauses of the treaty are to be replaced within 10 or 12 years.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

When Ramsay MacDonald was Premier of England he was quoted as being opposed to the elevation of our turret guns. He said that it was in conflict with the spirit of the Washington treaty, but our own Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, has subsequently given an opinion to the contrary. I believe Members of the House will insist, as I do, that the time has not yet come for Great Britain or any other power to interpret that treaty for us.

The intent of the treaty was clear in that the British and American navies were to be equal in capital ships. It is absurd to argue equality when every British ship is superior to ours in speed and gun range.

If the English-speaking nations are to maintain the peace of the world, they can do so only as equals, for America and American citizenship will not accept inferiority. A warship outranged and outsped can neither hit nor run away.

Here is another point I would like to bring to the attention of the House, not about gun elevation, but as affecting the Navy itself. Every ship in the British Navy has superior speed over these ships and every ship in the Japanese Navy has superior speed over these ships. Now, with their superior speed, in the event of an emergency or a conflict, they can select their range and their speed and blow us out of the seas, just as the British did the Germans at the battle of Falkland Islands. I do not see any trouble ahead between the United States and England. It is unthinkable by most Americans and British alike. War or a conflict between the United States and Japan is equally out of the question, but it is my belief, and it has been so determined by the Members of the House of Representatives in their vote last session of 266 to 111, that if we are going to keep these ships in commission, their guns should be elevated and the highest possible efficiency maintained, and if we do not want to do that let us strike this appropriation out of this appropriation bill, this entire $5,635,000. We should not spend a dollar of this money if we are not going to permit these guns to shoot as far as other guns can shoot, for if an enemy can hit you and you can not hit him, you are simply out of the fight entirely.

This is not a question of rivalry between the United States and Great Britain, and it is not a question of rivalry between the United States and Japan. It is simply a question of making these two ships efficient. If you are going to spend $6,500,000 on each of them, not on both of them—if you are going to spend $6,500,000 on each of them—let us improve their gun fire; let us improve their efficiency in an emergency and let us provide for the elevation of all their guns. If we do not do that, we might as well strike the entire amount out of the deficiency bill, and I will be for that if this language is retained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy General Board has repeatedly gone on record for elevating the guns on our 13 ships which are outranged and outsped by both Great Britain and Japan. The Bureau of the Budget has recommended to Congress that it make appropriation toward elevating the guns for the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada*. Congress itself has acted on this very item by a vote of 266 to 111 in the House and an almost unanimous vote in the Senate. To refuse to appropriate at this time would be to deny to 1,200 officers and men on each ship the right to properly defend themselves and their country in an emergency. Surely there is no answer to the argument that the country's defenders in an emergency should not be equipped on the sliding scale of economy. When the time comes to shoot, let us be prepared with the best that money can buy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I merely wish to take this one minute in order to call attention, especially the attention of the Ways and Means Committee, to the fact that I have introduced a bill to-day asking Congress to extend the time for the application of ex-service men for the soldiers' bonus from January 1, 1928, to January 1, 1929. This bill will go to the Ways and Means Committee, and if it does not pass Congress before January 1, 1928, 500,000 service men and their dependents will be unable to apply for the bonus. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to pass favorably on this bill and report it to the House in time to be passed before January 1 and thus protect the service men and their dependents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, there is one subject about which more desk men have much to say than any other in the world. Frequently the less they know the more they talk and the more expert they think their advice. This has been the greatest natal year of history for frantic actions and foolish words on the subject of agriculture.

Last summer Nathan Adams, a noted banker of Dallas, Tex., in his cloistered wisdom from behind a mahogany desk, gave utterance to a remarkable statement in the form of an interview.

TWENTY-CENT COTTON

A higher price than 20 cents for cotton, says Mr. Adams, "would cause a false wave of prosperity and end in a spending spree that would offset the profits made."

What a discovery! In other words, according to this sage of the money counter, the way to keep the wholly irresponsible farmer from becoming intoxicated with his own prosperity and indulging in a "spending spree" is to force him to sell his cotton for not more than 20 cents. If the fleecy staple advances beyond 20 cents, the old boy might become too frisky and, who knows, might buy a victrola or a radio or even put linoleum on the kitchen floor. Shades of Benjamin Franklin and his Poor Richard's Almanac!

If that had been said by a man who lived in an industrial center and who had never seen a farm it would even then have been surprising; but when its author lives in the premier agricultural State of the Union, producing commodities that are the basis of even his own prosperity, it is amazing. It simply staggers credulity.

MR. ADAMS AGAIN

This self-appointed guardian of the farmers' rights is further quoted as saying that—

the 1927 crop of cotton in Texas will reach nearly 4,000,000 bales, and to sell at 20 cents the farmer would make a nice profit and be enabled to pay off outstanding debts.

That is the big idea. Enough to pay our debts. I suppose he thinks if we get more than that we are likely to get unruly and throw a monkey wrench into the orderly machinery that weaves the business fabric. So long as we can get 20 cents, or just enough to pay our debts, everything will be lovely, and we should be satisfied.

What a strange and cruel philosophy! What right has the farmer to have a comfortable home, to have modern conveniences, to have money in the bank, to have some of the better things that appeal to the finer side of our natures? What right has he to want a well-stocked farm, with no mortgage on it to fret away his life and destroy his independence? What right has he to want to provide for the care and education of his children? Ask Mr. Adams.

PRICE FOR A PERIOD OF YEARS

If the farmer always received 20 cents for his cotton and a similar price for his other products, that would be a different story. It is easy for the man who draws his fixed percentage regardless of the seasons, in bad as well as in good times, to philosophize about the other man's business.

But everyone with a grain of practical knowledge knows that the farmer must face the uncertainties of the season, the drought, the rainy spell, the problem of overproduction, and a thousand other worries. He does not know whether he will make anything, and if he does, whether it will be worth anything. In good years he must recoup the losses of bad years, if he can.

Over a period of years cotton has sold for below a 20-cent average. Last year it sold for 10 and 12 cents and even lower. Where was Mr. Adams then?

HE DID NOT THINK

The trouble with the banker was he did not think. He thought he was thinking when he was not. He had been reading in his banker's journal what some scissor-tailed fellow, who had never seen a cotton patch or a wheat field, had to say, and he thought he was a modern Columbus discovering a new America. It was the plainest sort of propaganda, and he fell for it like a child reaching for the moon.

True, Mr. Adams, after he had been blistered on all sides, made a belated explanation, claiming he had been misquoted and misunderstood. But in the explanation he talked about everything except what had been in the original interview. He seemed to want to get as far away from that as possible, and I do not blame him much.

In Dallas there is an organization known as the "Bonehead Club," to which they elect men who pull prize boneheads. Mr. Adams should be elected unanimously and his membership dated back to the beginning, so he could be officially referred to as a charter member.

Mr. HASTINGS. Or made president of it.

Mr. JONES. Yes; probably made president of it, as my friend suggests.

The Dallas banker is not the only one who has held to those views. Like the parrot he talked too much, but he is only one of a good many who have been misled by propaganda from selfish parties, whose interests conflict with the interests of the Nation at large. Why smart men fall for it is a mystery, but somehow they sometimes do.

SPECULATORS IN FARM PRODUCTS

Why didn't he carry his argument to New York and Chicago and try it out on the cotton speculators and the wheat gamblers. They made cotton fluctuate above 20 cents and then below 20 cents, and the farmer lost both ways. This wild speculation in the farmer's products should be stopped.

The cotton farmer has been struggling for years against burdens, debts, and losses; then just about the time it looked like prices were about to get to the point where he could pay a portion of these debts and losses, the Department of Agriculture gave out a prediction of lower prices and the market broke several dollars per bale, causing millions in losses to the South.

Then, as the prices were slowly recovering, the department gave out another statement to the effect that the carry-over would be 7,800,000 bales, and prices tumbled again. Why they gave out these figures is a mystery. Manifestly they are too high—800,000 bales higher than the estimate made by even the interested buyers. Again, why did they give the carry-over in bulk, including the nonmerchantable cotton?

DID NOT FOLLOW THE LAW

During the last session a law was passed, of which law I was the joint author, and am therefore familiar with its provisions. It provided that the nonmerchantable cotton should be listed separately from the merchantable. During the last few years considerable nontenderable and nonmerchantable cotton has accumulated. Of course it depresses the market the same as if it were good cotton. The purpose of this law is to require the department to make their carry-over reports show how much is merchantable cotton. If the department officials were not ready as yet to completely list such cotton, they might either have deferred their estimate or have explained that their estimate included a considerable amount of nontenderable cotton. But they did not do this. They bulked it all together and at the same time gave an estimate that was manifestly too high. Why did they do this, when they are supposed to promote the welfare of the farmer?

THE SECRETARY INDORSES THE BLUNDER

To cap it all, the Secretary of Agriculture, instead of correcting these glaring mistakes, gave out two or three interviews in which he attempted to justify them. It was terrible to make them, but the public was inclined to attribute them to some irresponsible employee. However, when the Secretary indorsed them, they were astonished. No greater blunder has been made by the Department since it was established.

Personally, I like Secretary Jardine. He is a man of much ability. But I think this action on his part clearly qualifies him for membership in the aforementioned Bonehead Club. [Laughter.]

PICTURE FARMERS

But these are not the only men who live in a land of make-believe in reference to the farmer's interests.

One can not help recalling the picture of the President pitching hay, wearing at the same time a pair of overalls drawn over black dress trousers and a white shirt—bareheaded in the August sunshine. The black trousers clearly show through the side slits of the overalls. It was all in the presence of the camera—that is why it was taken. Of course, this was all right, but it could not give him an insight into the problems of agriculture.

SHOULD SEE THE REAL FARMER

Oh, Mr. Banker, and Mr. Secretary, and Mr. President, I wish you would get away occasionally from the industrial centers, the smokestacks, and financial wizards; out in the South and West, out where they actually produce cotton and wheat and cattle and hogs; not under the click of the camera, but in the atmosphere of reality. Go out and pitch some real hay, pick some cotton under southern skies, and shock or harvest some wheat in the western fields, or at least see how it is done. Then perhaps you will be in a better position to give the farmers some advice. There amid the toil and the sun and the mortgages you will see the injustice of the ultrahigh tariff schedules which destroy the market for his products and enhance the price of his supplies, that force him to sell in a low market where he is not permitted to buy. Then you will see the wrong of special favors to anyone or any section—the rank injustice of it all.

ENOUGH TO PAY HIS DEBTS

Why, Mr. Adams, if you had gotten some facts before you spoke, you would have known that cotton at even 30 cents would not pay one-fourth of the outstanding mortgage indebtedness of Texas farms, and that indebtedness is less than the average of the States. Cotton this year at 20 or even 30 cents would pay only a small part of it, even though it were all profit. The same is true of farms all over the Nation.

EQUALITY

I want to see enough prosperity on the farm and prices high enough for the payment of debts and the ending of the high interest rates. Then with laws which grant special favors repealed, real prosperity in its full measure will come to the farm. With debts paid and mortgages lifted, there will be occasion for rejoicing, and the happy hillsides will be the scene of a great jubilee.

When every farmer in the South shall eat bread from his own fields and meat from his own pastures, and disturbed by no creditor and enslaved by no debt, shall sit among his teeming gardens and orchards and vineyards and dairies and barnyards, pitching his crops in his own wisdom and growing them in independence, making cotton his clean surplus and selling it in his own time and in his chosen manner and not a master's bidding—getting his pay in cash and not a receipted mortgage that discharges his debt, but does not restore his freedom—then shall be breaking the fullness of our day.

Those burning words of Henry Grady, true 38 years ago, are true to-day and will be true to-morrow.

The farmer has a right to expect prices that year upon year average enough to pay his current debts, and profit enough to live decently and make payment on his mortgage indebtedness. The industrious farmer has the same right as other men to plan for the care and education of his children.

Over these ramparts of equality the farmer has planted his flag, the emblem of his faith and hope. And the Adamses and the Jardines shall not tear it down. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 55 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that the gentleman from Tennessee has that much time left.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield one-half hour of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am completing 11 years of active service in Congress. Organized labor has realized at last that I am not its enemy but am one of its most valuable friends. Without exception I have vigorously supported all of its worthy proposals, opposing only such as were inimical to the public good.

During the war our Government paid all industrial workers tremendous wages, yet 6,000 strikes occurred. They were exempt from draft because needed to work. I voted to make them either "work or fight." (2) When Congress gave the extra $240 bonus to our 100,000 Government employees in Washington I voted that during war they should work eight instead of only seven hours per day. (3) I contended that the Government should retain its right to supervise the work of its employees in its navy yards and arsenals. (4) I protested against unions dominating our Government legislatively. (5) I opposed unions forcing all Government employees to unionize and pay dues against their will. (6) I warned President Samuel Gompers that if he would preserve his unions, which meant much to labor, he must repudiate the anarchy and communism pervading them and free them of such menaces as William Z. Foster. In all such acts I was the true friend and

not the enemy of labor. And before he died President Gompers did publicly repudiate Foster, anarchy, and communism, and recently his successor, President William Green, has likewise repudiated them. Yet, in those strenuous times during and following the war, because I dared to do my duty President Gompers denounced me as an enemy to labor and did everything within his power to destroy me and get me out of Congress. In the 1920 campaign such reputable and reliable authority as Editor Lloyd B. Thomas asserted in his Times that approximately $100,000 was spent in my district to defeat me. The Advance, published by Don Biggers at Olden, carried pages of attacks against me in practically every issue, Samuel Gompers having one whole page therein over his own signature. But many of the finest citizens in my district are members of union labor and for years had been my strong, personal friends and knew that they could depend upon me to give labor a square deal in all of its worthy undertakings, and they loyally supported me. Then a union publication asserted that—

if they could not defeat me at the polls they would find some other means of getting me out of Congress.

I have felt that it is our duty to know all about our Government's business. Many Congressmen do not know where half of our 225 bureaus, commissions, and independent offices of the Government are located, and hardly anything about their activities. When a Member carefully and properly investigates any of them, his findings reported in detail should always be helpful to Congress. In order to familiarize myself with the intimate details of their business and to learn just where all of the people's tax money goes, I have carefully investigated every bureau in Washington, but to do so I have used practically all of my vacations for 11 years.

In 1921 numerous employees, some being helpless women, appealed to me for protection, asserting that while through civil service they could easily obtain Government positions, yet unions would not let them continue long in employment unless they joined and paid the prescribed union dues. Naturally, I investigated such conditions.

In May, 1921, certain of the 4,450 employees then in our Government Printing Office appealed to me for protection, asserting that unions controlled the plant and required all employees to join the union, pay its monthly dues and assessments, and in addition to pay the required extra 10 per cent of their salaries to carry on the nation-wide strike for the 44-hour week. It being my duty to do so, I investigated this plant. I found conditions in this plant, which in conjunction with conditions in other departments, that should be publicly known. I believed that such conditions were so outrageous and important that my colleagues in both the House and the Senate would highly appreciate my bringing such facts before them. There was but one way to acquaint the 96 Senators and the other 434 Congressmen with such facts, and that was to print same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for their information.

So before preparing my report, from the floor of the House, on October 4, 1921, I requested the House to grant me permission to print my report in the RECORD as an "extension of remarks," and such permission was unanimously granted.

And in the back of the RECORD for October 22, 1921, as "extension of remarks," I printed such report, which I had dated October 21, 1921. In same I quoted a letter from an employee, Millard French, to the Public Printer, duly sworn to by French, which embraced improper language, which I deleted in the same manner official court reports are printed. With the exception of this quoted letter, there was not one word in my entire report that was in any way improper or subject to criticism. Omitting this objectionable letter, I want to read you the balance of my report that is not objectionable.

I now read same from pages 7417 to 7425 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it was originally printed on October 22, 1921, to wit:

THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON, OF TEXAS, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1921

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have proven my friendship for the Public Printer, Mr. George H. Carter, on numerous occasions by taking the floor in his defense whenever his efforts to bring order out of chaos and to economize and improve conditions in his department have been criticized. I have stood by and applauded when he has accomplished results. And along some lines he has been successful, working wonderful improvement. In other respects he has failed. And I feel deeply grateful to my colleagues for unanimously permitting me (RECORD, p. 6678) to discuss conditions as they really exist in this, the largest printing establishment in the whole world.

5,107 EMPLOYEES OCTOBER 6, 1919

On October 6, 1919, there were 5,107 employees on the pay roll of the Government Printing Office. Their annual salaries ranged from $6,000 to the Public Printer, $3,600 each to 5 employees, $3,000 each to 8 employees, $2,700 each to 65 employees, and on down to lower sums. On October 4, 1920, the number of employees had been reduced to 4,459 on the regular rolls.

The present Public Printer abolished the following positions:

POSITIONS ABOLISHED IN THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, APRIL 5 TO OCTOBER 2, 1921

Superintendent of work, $3,600; assistant foreman, job section, $2,300; two desk men, hand section, $4,000; chief laborer, linotype section, $1,252; electrotype molder in charge, foundry section, $2,128; desk man, $1,252; desk man, $1,878; laborer, $776.40; pressman in charge, $2,003.20; clerk in pressroom, $1,252; assistant storekeeper, $2,000; computer, $2,200; helper, $1,126.80; eight clerks, $8,640; bookbinder in charge, $2,003.20; directress, $1,252; six bookbinders in charge, $12,019.20; counter, $1,126.80; stereotyper, $2,003.20.

4,444 EMPLOYEES STILL ON ROLL

But, Mr. Speaker, even though I feel somewhat encouraged by the reduction effected by the Public Printer, I can not forget the fact that three years after the armistice, on the 3d day of October, 1921, we still had 4,444 employees on the pay roll of the Government Printing Office. In just recognition to the merit of the present Public Printer over his predecessor, however, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that on October 1, 1921, he had 44,662 folios of copy on hand to print, as compared with 22,244 folios on hand October 1, 1920. And in addition to this, he had 2,920 galleys in the proof room on October 1, 1921, as compared with only 948 galleys in the proof room on October 1, 1920. This proves conclusively that there has been a large surplus of employees.

STOPPED GAMBLING IN GOVERNMENT BUILDING

When Mr. Carter took charge gambling of every kind was carried on in the Government Printing Office. Some participated in stock gambling. Others played the racing boards. And still others "shuffled the deck and threw the bones." Mr. Carter stopped it, though to do it he first had to suspend and dismiss certain employees. I congratulate him.

But on a most important improvement promised by him Mr. Carter has utterly failed. He tried, but was too weak. His intentions were good, but he is not properly supported by Members of Congress; and they have not supported him because many do not know anything about existing conditions there. For instance, on September 19, 1921, Mr. Charles S. Lewis, a prominent business man of St. Louis, Mo., wrote to our distinguished colleague, Congressman NEWTON of Missouri, protesting against "closed-shop" conditions in our Government Printing Office, and deprecating the report that certain employees were paying as much as $25 each month out of their salary on assessments made by the Typographical Union for its 44-hours-per-week strike expenses and their regular union dues.

In his reply from St. Louis, dated September 25, 1921, Congressman NEWTON stated:

"Those employees in the Government departments who desire to become members of any organization, which they think will better their condition, are permitted to do so. A very large per cent of them, however, prefer not to join such organizations, and their failure to do so does not in any way militate against their employment. The matter of membership in any organization is purely with the individual. But to my mind a statement to the effect that these employees each are paying $25 a month out of their niggardly salaries, which they receive, is utterly absurd."

And recently, the president of the Standard Printing Co., of Louisville, Ky., wrote to our distinguished colleague, Congressman BARKLEY, protesting against such closed-shop conditions, to which our colleague replied:

"The STANDARD PRINTING CO.,

"Louisville, Ky.

"GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of October 5 indorsing certain alleged 'efforts' being made by the Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, to release the 'death grip' which you say the printers' union has had on the United States Printing Office for these many years.

"In the first place, there is no such death grip upon the Government Printing Office, and never has been. Men who are employed in that institution undergo a civil-service examination to test their fitness for the positions which they seek, and the question whether they belong to a union is not inquired into. They may belong or not, as they choose, and there is no discrimination in the Government Printing Office one way or another on that account.

"I might add that I am not in sympathy with the chronic tirades of Mr. BLANTON against labor unions, and I decline to be led by him upon that subject.

"Sincerely yours,

"ALBEN W. BARKLEY."

And in reply to our colleague, this Louisville business man wrote the following:

"Hon. A. W. BARKLEY,

"Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 8th and regret to note your lack of first-hand information relative to the conditions that exist in the Government Printing Office in Washington.

"I have in my employ a gentleman who has within the past 30 days left the employ of the Government Printing Office in Washington, and he advises me that in his 12 years' experience in the Government Printing Office he knows absolutely that the typographical union has dominated the office to such an extent that any other employee of the Government Printing Office that was not a member of the typographical union was unable to secure anything like justice or fair dealing in the matter of advancement, and that by the silent treatment, ostracism, and other like measures the life of any employee who was not a member of the typographical union was made most miserable, indeed.

"Your statement that there is no discrimination in the Government Printing Office one way or another is therefore not borne out by facts.

"The writer knows nothing whatever about the tirades of Mr. BLANTON against the labor unions, but he does know that the time has come when the employers of this country, especially in the manufacturing lines, must refuse to be further dominated by unionism. The writer, as well as all employers claiming to be decent and honest, will ever stand on the side of and for labor, for we do not claim to be other than of that class; but we do stand and will fight against the further domination of the best interests of this country by unionism.

"With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I beg to remain,

"Yours very truly,

"STANDARD PRINTING CO."

The writer of the above two letters signed "Stondard Printing Co." is Hon. David B. G. Rose, president of said company, who was grand master of the Masonic Lodge for the State of Kentucky.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the above are merely samples of a number of such letters I have received, indicating that my colleagues are not familiar with just how strong a hold our employees' unions have upon the throat of this Government. Therefore I am going to this trouble to inform them.

Do they all get "niggardly salaries," as the gentleman from Missouri believes? Not at all. They all get Sunday off, or one day each week in lieu of Sunday. They get all of the lawful holidays. They get all of the special holidays so numerously occurring in Washington. They get half of Saturday throughout the summer months. And they are all given 30 days' vacation each year on full pay. The night shifts receive 20 per cent extra pay. They are neither pushed nor rushed in their work. They work in a most comfortable, modern building, under pleasant surroundings, with steam heat, electric lights, electric fans, ice water, comfortable furniture, and modern machinery, apparatus, and appliances. And here are the niggardly monthly salaries some of them get:

Wages paid for the month of July, 1921, by the United States to certain employees in the Government Printing Office, amount received by each employee: George H. Carter, $500; John Greene, $300; Marion E. Bullock, $300; E. E. Emerson, $300; Walter R. Metz, $300; A. P. Tisdel, $291.66; William A. Smith, $250; Elwood S. Moorehead, $250; James K. Wallace, $250; Martin S. Speelman, $250; William H. Cornish, $250; Bert E. Bair, $250; Edward M. Nevils, $250; James H. Heslet, $250; Henry H. Wright, $229.16; Edwin F. Geyer, $228.33; Arthur J. Symonds, $228.33; William J. Manning, $228.33; Harry A. Brandt, $209; Miss Mary A. Tate, $228.33; Robert W. Summers, $228.33; Benjamin W. Butler, $228.33; Edward J. Wilver, $228.33; Russell O. Beene, $228.33; John A. Massey, jr., $228.33; Sheridan C. Koons, $228.33; Charles E. Young, $228.33; Stanley W. Ridings, $228.33; John R. Berg, $228.33; Edward G. Whall, $228.33; Hugh Reid, $228.33; Allan C. Clough, $228.33; William H. Kirvin, $228.33; Rufus J. Allen, $228.33; Harry B. Goodrell, $228.33; John E. Scheaffer, $228.33; Robert R. Dillard, $228.33; Louis C. Schell, $228.33; James J. Conroy, $228.33; John E. Walsh, $228.33; John J. Kelly, $228.33; William A. Knapp, $228.33; John W. Moran, $228.33; William H. Dahl, $228.33; George T. Lecompte, $220.32; Charles F. Markley, $220.32; Michael M. Sweetman, $220.32; Samuel M. Edmunds, $220.32; Emerson B. Swayne, $220.32; Stephen T. Brown, $220.32; Charles C. Cawson, $220.32; Frank A. Dougherty, $220.32; John T. Dunlap, $220.32; Arthur J. McMillan, $220.32; Joseph H. Benner, $220.32; George W. Godwin, $220.32; Oscar J. Homer, $220.32; John T. Quinn, $220.32; Charles S. Taylor, $220.32; Harrison M. Browning, $220.32; Luther L. Browning, $220.32; Daniel Clark, $220.32; Robert H. Clauser, $220.32; John C. Grace, $220.32; Charles L. Nay, $220.32; John A. Pike, $220.32; Thomas H. Mumford, jr., $220.32; Thomas F. Patterson, $220.32; John M. Richards, $220.32; James S. Bragg, $220.32; Charles T. Jarvis, $220.32; John Linquist, $220.32; Howard R. Loeffel, $220.32; Howard V. Mills, $220.32; Peter W. Pritchett, $220.32; William H. Shreve, $220.32; Finley S. Hayes, $220.32; Albert McMillan, $229.32; Frank L. White, $220.32; Alpheus E. Riddle, $220.32; William A. Mitchell, $211.66; John F. Fitzpatrick, $211.66; Richard C. Lohmeyer, sr., $211.66; John A. Patterson, $211.66; Charles Meier, $211.66; John J. O'Brien, $211.66; George Gerberich, $211.66; William H. Chase, $211.66; William T. Herritage, $211.66; J. H. Phillips, $211.66; John O'Donoghue, $211.66; W. F. Crump, $211.66; B. M. Connolly, $211.66; T. P. Rooney, $211.66; W. D. Skeen, $211.66; E. A. Kerr, $211.66; Louis Naylor, $207.80; J. B. Newlon, $207.80; Daniel O'Connell, $207.80; F. W. Parker, $207.80.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the above are among the highest-paid employees, the above list being absolutely correct, approved by the Public Printer. But they are not getting niggardly salaries.

It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that during the month of May I had up with the Public Printer the question of whether it was necessary for one of his employees to join the typographical union in order to hold his job. And I succeeded in getting the Public Printer to then assert that President Roosevelt's decision in the Miller case should be his guide. Miller was kicked out of the Printing Office because he refused to join the union. President Roosevelt reinstated him, and held:

"That no union rules or regulations can be permitted to override the laws of the United States, which it is my sworn duty to enforce. These laws are enacted for the benefit of the whole people, and can not and must not be construed as permitting discrimination against some of the people. I am President of all the people of the United States without regard to creed, color, birthplace, occupation, or social condition. My aim is to do equal and exact justice as among them all. In the employment and dismissal of men in the Government service I can no more recognize the fact that a man does or does not belong to a union as being for or against him than I can recognize the fact that he is a Protestant or a Catholic, a Jew or a Gentile, as being for or against him."

And based upon such decision of President Roosevelt in the Miller case, which he quoted, the Public Printer announced his policy as follows:

"If by the term 'open shop' you mean a place where a person may be employed regardless of whether he belongs to a labor organization, then I presume the Government Printing Office may be called an 'open shop' under the system of appointments through the civil service, as I have above stated.

"It is but fair to advise you, however, that I have been informed that most of the employees in the skilled trades of the Government Printing Office do belong to their respective labor organizations. Such membership, I assume, is a matter entirely in their own discretion. I take it that they have the same right to become affiliated in trade organizations as we have to join the various religious and fraternal organizations that may seem beneficial to us."

With such a declaration as the above, Mr. Speaker, coming from the Public Printer direct, one would naturally presume that employees of the Government Printing Office were not forced to join the union in order to retain their positions after being placed there by the United States civil service. Yet I received the following from a Government employee:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 19, 1921.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative from Texas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am an employee of the Government Printing Office, being a compositor on the seventh floor. I have held such position continuously for about two years. I receive 75 cents per hour, plus the $240 a year bonus.

Against my will I was forced to join the union, as I was given to understand by employees that I could not hold my job long in the Government Printing Office without it. In addition to the 2 per cent assessment that comes out of our salary each month, one-half of which goes as dues to our local, we have been assessed an additional 10 per cent to pay the expenses of the strikes that have been going on over the United States in behalf of the 44-hour week, for which our union is contending.

I deemed the oath to my union, which I was compelled to take when I joined, contrary to the pledges I made in my oath to my Government which I took at the time I entered the service.

Mr. Flanigan, who is chapel secretary for our union, likewise works for the Government, and makes a practice of going among the men during business hours and collecting dues. When the first payment of assessments in June was due, I refused to pay same, as I felt that same was an imposition. On last Friday, during business hours, Mr. Flanigan, the chapel chairman, advised me that unless I paid my assessments to the union I could not work in the Government Printing Office any longer. While a number of employees do not carry cards in the union any longer, the union makes it so unpleasant that work there is practically unbearable. I appeal to Congress to see that we are not further molested.

Very truly, yours,

MILLARD FRENCH.

I immediately wrote to the Public Printer about the matter and sent him Mr. Millard French's letter, and after writing the second time on July 22, 1921, I finally received Mr. Carter's reply, as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, July 23, 1921.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letters of July 15, 20, and 22, relative to the reports you have re-

ceived concerning activities of labor organizations in this office, especially as to the case of Millard French.

Upon receipt of your letter of the 20th, I at once called for Mr. French and had what appeared to be a satisfactory talk with him. I understood then that he was going to advise you as to my position in the matter, which seemed to meet with his approval.

I have also talked with Mr. Flanagan, in regard to whom Mr. French made his complaint, and several other employees of the shop who I thought might have some knowledge of the alleged activities of the organizations to which you referred. I called their attention to the letter which I addressed to you under date of May 25, 1921, and in the statement of President Roosevelt which I quoted therein. I informed these employees that I am in full accord with the views of President Roosevelt on this subject. Mr. Flanagan denied to me that he had told Mr. French that the latter "could not work in the Government Printing Office any longer" if he did not pay his union dues. I advised him and the other employees with whom I talked that I will not permit any intimidation of the employees in this office, and that the working time of the shop can not be used for other than the business of the Government. I received assurances that my directions would be complied with and that there will be no ground for further complaint.

Thanking you for calling the matter to my attention, I beg to remain.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. CARTER,
Public Printer.

But about that time, Mr. Speaker, I also received a letter from another employee in the Government Printing Office asking me not to make his name public, from which letter I copy the following excerpt:

"1. A printer goes into the shop ignorant that it is closed to nonunion men. Immediately after he is assigned work he is approached by the 'walking delegate' (using Government time) and asked for his 'card.' If he hasn't one, he is told that this is a union shop; that everyone in the shop carries a card.

"2. If he delays taking out a card, which costs all the way from $5 up to $25, pressure in every conceivable manner is brought to bear till life is made unbearable, and if sensible of injustice a condition is made to render honest work impossible. He is told by 'voluntary confidentials' that he will not likely cross over the dead line of probational service (six months), and that he need not expect promotion without a card.

"3. It is a safe estimate that seven-eighths of the force now in the Government Printing Office have been forced to join the union, one by one, as they come in the shop.

"4. The 'walking delegate' collects dues during work hours from a list made up from the Government time slip, and if working in pairs his partner is idle during this time.

"5. The 'walking delegate' calls time to commence and quit work.

"6. This appointed agent of the union can and does assess fines for any infraction of the union rules.

"7. Girl helpers and laborers are told by the 'walking delegate' that they will be taken care of in preference to nonmembers.

"8. It is an open secret that the 'walking delegate' in some divisions has more to say in the conduct and control than the authorized foreman.

"9. The regular union dues are 2 per cent of all earnings; old-age pension, 2½ per cent of all earnings; and for the 'strike assessment,' 10 per cent of all earnings—total, 14 per cent of every dollar earned by a printer. Every printer pays the union each month approximately $25.

"10. If the 44-hour 'strike' is won, no Government employee can benefit by it, even if he favored it.

"11. Bulletin boards in every division are plastered with union bulletins that would tend to intimidate and hold in line weak members.

"12. In arguments over the 'strike' more than one printer has been heard to say: 'I hold my allegiance to the union above that of the Government.'

"13. The secretary of the Washington City union is sick. 'Spadge' Parsons, foreman of the monotype section (day), Government Printing Office, is acting in his stead. If a printer refuses to 'take out a card,' this man (Parsons) is in the dual capacity of 'secretary of the union' that says 'keep him out' and that of a sworn Government official passing on his qualifications at the end of six months' probational service.

"14. The obligation required to enter the Government service and that required by the union are at entire variance; hence the closed condition of the Government print shop forces every employee to indirectly perjure himself."

And concerning the threats made to kick Millard French out if he did not pay up his union dues and assessments, I put Mr. Carter on notice concerning their methods, as follows:

"Hon. GEORGE H. CARTER,
"*The Public Printer, Government Printing Office,*
"*Washington, D. C.*

"MY DEAR MR. CARTER: Supplementing the letters I wrote you on the 15th and 20th instants, to neither of which I have yet received a reply, this is to state that I learn the way the unions in the Government Printing Office have of getting rid of a man who will not join them is to attack his efficiency record, when it should not be subject to attack. In view of the fact that Mr. Millard French's record was first class up to the time I wrote you on July 15, this is to request that should any such tactics be employed against him that you give the matter careful consideration and investigation before taking action.

"Very sincerely, yours,

"THOMAS L. BLANTON."

Within a few days I received the following from Mr. John W. Powers, another employee of the Government Printing Office, answering specific questions propounded by me, to wit:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 31, 1921.*

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In response to the various questions you have propounded to me, I feel that I have no right to refuse to answer same, hence give you the data requested.

I am 48 years of age, and have been in the print shop practically all my life. I have been editor of country newspapers, and the attached copies of letters herewith will evidence my standing with men who know me.

Ever since I was required to take the typographical union oath, which, among other things, provides:

"that my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interferred with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise"—

I have felt that it conflicts with my oath to the Government, which I took when entering public employment.

After we were assessed an extra 10 per cent of our salaries by our union, to pay the expenses of the union's 44-hour-week campaign, and its strikes all over the country, I felt that I was unable financially to stand this drain, and on July 1, 1921, I gave up my union card, and refused to pay the 10 per cent assessment. I then went on a vacation of two weeks' leave.

All proof readers work in pairs. Mr. A. A. Meridith works with me, and we are called partners. Since I have been back from my vacation, both the foreman, Mr. William H. Cornish, and the night superintendent, Mr. Bullock, have refused to speak to me. The acting desk foreman, Mr. Harry B. Goodrell, has refused to speak to me. I have been subjected to what they call "the silent treatment," which no man of any self-respect can long stand.

Giving you the specific instances requested, will state that on July 22, 1921, during work hours in the Government Printing Office, the following colloquy took place between Mr. John Hooper, the copy editor, who is a strong union man, and my partner, Mr. Meridith, concerning myself:

"JOHN HOOPER. I see they have your partner on the slab.

"A. A. MERIDITH. Yes.

"JOHN HOOPER. I hope they get him."

On the preceding day, July 21, 1921, I had been called down by the foreman for a mistake, which Mr. Meridith admitted was not mine but his.

Yes; it is a fact, that on July 25, 1921, I was made to move my desk to right under the supervision of the foreman, which is the first time I have been forced to move positions during my service. I am the only proof reader on that floor who does not belong to the union.

Yes; it is a fact that on July 26, 1921, both Mr. Bullock and Mr. Goodrell refused to speak to me. Mr. Goodrell accused me of delaying rush proof, which I had not done. Later, he remarked to my partner, Mr. Meredith: "That fellow (meaning me) has been slamming things down on the desk."

Yes; it is a fact that on July 26, 1921, the following colloquy occurred between Mr. Charles N. Travis, a strong union man, and my partner, Meridith:

"CHARLES N. TRAVIS. Did your partner fix up his card?

"A. A. MERIDITH. He didn't pay his last assessment.

"CHARLES N. TRAVIS. You will get in bad if you stay with him.

"A. A. MERIDITH. Well, I don't feel disposed to ask the foreman to make a change; he knows as much about the situation as I do."

Yes; it is a fact that on July 26, 1921, Mr. Smith, of the monotype section, indicated that he would like to give up his union card, but stated, "I simply couldn't stand the gaff if I gave up my card."

With regard to what occurred in the Courtney cigar store on July 26, 1921, the following colloquy took place between Mr. Robert L. Townsend, a proof reader and strong union man, and my partner, Meridith:

"ROBERT L. TOWNSEND. What is that fellow Powers doing? Is he going to pay up?

"A. A. MERIDITH. I am not in his confidence.

"ROBERT L. TOWNSEND. They will get after him if he don't."

Yes; I have heard that it is a fact that on July 27, 1921, the four nonunion printers in the monotype section were moved into one alley close under the foreman's supervision.

With regard to additional slights, Mr. Charles F. Cooke, a proof reader, who until I dropped my card was my friend and had accepted medicine from me, now refuses to speak to me.

With only one exception, the union men in the Government Printing Office from my own State pass me up cold without speaking. No man with self-respect can long withstand their snubs and insults. Present conditions are simply unbearable to any man who refuses to affiliate with the union. I am not a tatler, and give you these facts only because you have asked for same. Mr. Carter, the present Public Printer, is a splendid gentleman, and I feel sure would remedy these conditions if he fully understood them.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. POWERS.

The following, Mr. Speaker, will show who Mr. John W. Powers is, and that he stands well with the present Republican organization:

[Will H. Hays, chairman; Clarence B. Miller, secretary; Fred W. Upham, treasurer; James G. Blaine, jr., eastern treasurer]

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
TREASURER'S OFFICE,
111 WEST WASHINGTON STREET,
Chicago, Ill., April 1, 1921.

Mr. JOHN W. POWERS,
326 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR POWERS: Here is a letter that Senator McCormick sent to me some time ago which you better have. You can show it to him if you ask him for a letter to the new Public Printer. I am also handing you my letter to Mr. Carter, which I hope won't do you any harm.

Very truly yours,

FRED W. UPHAM.

[United States Senate. Committee for Consideration of a National Budget. Medill McCormick, Illinois, chairman]

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 2, 1921.*

Hon. FRED W. UPHAM,
111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR FRED: Just a line to acknowledge your letter of January 25 in behalf of Mr. Powers, and to say that I am taking the papers back to Washington with me and will do all that I can.

Sincerely, yours,

MEDILL MCCORMICK.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 1, 1921.*

Mr. GEORGE H. CARTER,
Public Printer, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARTER: I am particularly interested in Mr. John W. Powers, who is now connected with the Government Printing Office.

He aspires to the position of assistant superintendent of work (night), and it will please me very much if he gets the position.

Senator McCormick, of Illinois, I know will be glad to join in this recommendation.

Very truly yours,

FRED W. UPHAM, *Treasurer.*

And also in July, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a young man employed as a helper in the Government Printing Office, wherein he says:

"The unions here have kept all apprentices out of the Government Printing Office for years, all mechanics being appointed from the outside as journeymen. Young men who start in as laborers and finally succeed in becoming helpers, although they learn and know the business, they can never become mechanics, as the union has it fixed that way.

"I will have to remain a helper the rest of my life, although I have learned the trade and in many instances do the same work as a mechanic.

"The unions frequently work mechanics in on 'helpers' jobs when they become vacant, so that as mechanics they then receive double what the helpers draw.

"I wish you every success, and must say you are doing wonderful work in Congress, and hope you will be able to force the union to permit apprentices to work in the largest printing plant in the world, so that a young man will have a chance of becoming a journeyman mechanic.

UNIONS FORCED FRENCH AND POWERS TO RESIGN

Within a few days after the Public Printer wrote me that—

"I will not permit any intimidation of the employees in this office, and the working time of the shop can not be used for other than business of the Government"—

the union forced both Millard French and John W. Powers to resign. I immediately went to the Public Printer and called his attention to the threats I had heard his employees had made, to wit, "that if the Public Printer fooled with them, they would take his job away and supplant him with another, as they had more influence on the Hill [Capitol] than he did."

And I asked Mr. Carter if he was going to let such threats influence him. And he said he was not, and that he was not going to accept the resignations of French and Powers, but was going to have them work on and protect them. I called his attention to the fact that on Monday, May 23, 1921, upon request, Mr. Edgar Wallace, representative of the American Federation of Labor, produced at a hearing before the District Committee on the antipicketing bill a copy of the constitution of the International Typographical Union, same being the personal copy belonging to Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, with his name printed on the back, and which, on page 15 thereof, under the heading "Obligation for members," appeared the oath taken by all members of said typographical union, to wit:

"Every person admitted as a member of this union shall subscribe to the following obligation, which shall apply only to matters pertaining to the printing industry:

"'I (give name) hereby solemnly and sincerely swear (or affirm) that I will not reveal any business or proceedings of any meeting of this or any subordinate union to which I may hereafter be attached, unless by order of the union, except to those whom I know to be members in good standing thereof; that I will, without equivocation or evasion and to the best of my ability, abide by the constitution, by-laws, and the adopted scale of prices of any union to which I may belong; that I will at all times support the laws, regulations, and decisions of the International Typographical Union, and will carefully avoid giving aid or succor to its enemies, and use all honorable means within my power to procure employment for members of the International Typographical Union in preference to others; that my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interfered with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise; that I will belong to no society or combination composed wholly or partly of printers, with the intent or purpose to interfere with the trade regulations or influence or control the legislation of this union; that I will not wrong a member, or see him or her wronged, if in my power to prevent. To all of which I pledge my most sacred honor.'"

You will note in said oath that each member swears:

"That my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interfered with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise."

And I told him that the above oath and evidence was in the hearings on the antipicketing bill, on file in his office, and that that oath was the one every one of his employees had taken and was the one both Millard French and John W. Powers considered was in direct conflict with their oath to the Government. I warned him that the union men would find some way of getting rid of French and to be on the lookout.

UNION'S MINIMUM SCALE FOR 44-HOUR WEEK

On July 30, 1921, M. A. Bodenhamer, president of Columbia Typographical Union No. 101, here in Washington, D. C., issued the following minimum scale per week, for 44 hours' work, to remain in effect until April 30, 1922:

Hand men, day work, per week of 44 hours	$40.00
Hand men, night work, per week of 44 hours	45.00
Machine men, day work, per week of 44 hours	42.00
Machine men, night work, per week of 44 hours	47.25

On August 15, 1921, I received the following from Mr. Powers:

AUGUST 15, 1921.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: If what Mr. Carter means by his statement, "No union dues will be collected in the shop during work hours," is that none will be paid during the time that we are actually reading proof, has been partially accomplished—not wholly by any means.

Last Thursday night (pay day) when the bell rang for lunch, at 11 o'clock, the union collector with his money box and receipt book moved up and took charge of the copy desk, and to all intents and purposes did a regular clearing-house business—took in money and issued license to the printers, that gives them the privilege of reading proof another two weeks without being ostracized and referred to as "rats." During this 30-minute lunch time the Riggs Bank never did a more flourishing business over and above board.

I watched this functioning of a business organization inside a Government department with deadened amazement, and really wondered if Mr. Carter called that "dues stopped collected during work hours."

Sincerely,

JOHN W. POWERS.

A few days thereafter, in company with my colleagues, Congressman Webster, of Washington, and Congressman UNDERHILL, of Massachusetts, we thrashed over the situation with the Public Printer, and were assured by him that both French and Powers would be given a square deal.

BUT THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED TO FRENCH

Here appeared deleted by dashes a statement duly sworn to by Millard French, filed in the Government Printing Office, detailing the inhuman treatment accorded him by a union foreman, Levi Huber, aided and abetted by two other union employees, James Leek and Burney Parker, forcing French to quit work, which because of objectionable language is now omitted.

It was dated "Mount Rainier, Md., September 3, 1921," addressed to "Mr. George H. Carter, Public Printer, Government Printing Office," and duly sworn to by said French on September 5, 1921, before David Laing, notary public, with seal. It showed that on September 2, 1921, when French reported this attack on him, the Public Printer required him to file this detailed sworn statement. It showed that without any provocation whatever French was shamefully cursed and abused, said Huber calling him a black-hearted scab, a fool, a coward, a dirty cur, and numerous profane and dirty names, which Huber also applied to the "Public Printer and Congressman BLANTON" for interfering with their union methods; said Huber asserting that he could not be hurt by French reporting him, as he was not afraid of the Public Printer, insinuating that he and his union were well intrenched at the Capitol and would be protected by Members of Congress. In printing the objectionable language it was abbreviated by use of initial letters and dashes, such as is done when printing same in judicial decisions in court reports. To which sworn statement the Public Printer replied with the succeeding letter, which resumes said printed report here copied from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 22, 1921, to wit:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
September 9, 1921.

Mr. MILLARD FRENCH,
Mount Rainier, Md.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of September 3, in which you file certain charges against a fellow workman in the section in which you are employed.

A hearing was held, and Mr. Huber, the employee against whom the charges were made, was suspended and requested to answer the same in writing.

After thoroughly investigating the case I can not regard you as entirely guiltless in the affair. Your oral and written charges, I am inclined to believe, contain several misstatements which I can not overlook, especially your statements as to reporting the occurrence to the foreman of the section. Therefore, in the interest of peace and harmony in the office, I have directed your transfer to another section.

You are cautioned not to engage in similar altercations hereafter, and if employees manifest improper conduct toward you, you are to immediately report the same to your superior officer.

Respectfully,

GEORGE H. CARTER,
Public Printer.

MOUNT RAINIER, MD., *September 10, 1921.*

Mr. GEORGE H. CARTER,
Public Printer, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, stating that you find it necessary to transfer me to another division of the office.

I consider this action on your part virtually a repudiation of my sworn statement and a humiliation to me, as the members of the union will herald it as a victory—first blood.

As the union at present dominates the office (and I see no hope of it being remedied now), it is an impossibility for me to longer stand up under the humiliation and do honest work.

I consider it impossible to work in the shop in peace without a union card, therefore consider this my resignation.

Personally, I beg to remain your friend.

Very truly yours,

MILLARD FRENCH.

MOUNT RAINIER, MD., *September 17, 1921.*

Mr. GEORGE H. CARTER,
Public Printer, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th instant.

I note that you say:

"You are hereby notified that you will be given until Monday to report for duty; otherwise your name will be dropped from our rolls on that date."

Mr. Carter, you are reminded that on the 10th of this month I sent you my resignation, of which you have acknowledged receipt.

However much I dislike to be driven out of the office, I am forced to accept the inevitable—leave the office.

Reiterating my resignation: "It is impossible to work in peace in the Government Printing Office without carrying a union card."

Respectfully,

MILLARD FRENCH.

And so, Mr. Speaker, out into the gutter these union employees in the Government Printing Office kicked Millard French, a poor man with a wife and five children to support, because he would not pay dues.

AND WHAT IS HAPPENING TO JOHN W. POWERS

On September 29, 1921, I received the following letter from Mr. Powers:

"DEAR MR. BLANTON: I am sending you a copy of the Trades Unionist. This page was nailed upon the proof-room bulletin board the day after publication and remained there till we commenced work last Tuesday night. I might as well post up argument against the Democratic Party or reflections against some church, it occurs to me, with the same propriety. The man who wrote it is an employee of the office; he and the man that put it upon the bulletin board (if they are not one and the same party) should be disciplined, and the foremen who let it hang there are none the less guilty.

"I am reliably informed that Tuesday a petition was being circulated and signed in the hand section protesting against this 10 per cent assessment, and that the foreman, Hugh Reid, stopped it with the remark: 'You are giving aid and comfort to the enemy.' I thought it was the limit for officials of the union to interfere in such matters inside the office, but for designated officials of the bureau to brazenly step up and give orders, when the printers are making an effort within their own ranks to throw off this union yoke, points suspiciously to who is 'in the saddle.'

"Sincerely,

JOHN W. POWERS."

You will note that the foreman, Hugh Reid, mentioned, is drawing $228.33 per month from the Government, and that he is also listed in the Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, as the associate editor thereof, and I am informed that he spends much time in the congressional press galleries as a reporter, though of this I have no personal knowledge. The portion of the Trades Unionist which Mr. Powers says was posted on the bulletin board of the Government Printing Office and remained there for about a week is the front page, containing a large cartoon drawn by J. M. Baer, of a laborer with great balls and chains attached to his feet, entitled "Industrial slavery," with the following printed article attacking Powers:

"[From the Trades Unionist, official organ, Central Labor Union, Washington, D. C., September 16, 1921]

"MANUFACTURERS RECORD MAKES ATTACK ON I. T. U.—SAYS CONDITIONS IN GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE ARE HORRIBLE AND QUOTES INGRATE

By Fred S. Walker

"In the issue of September 8 the Manufacturers Record prints another installment of its serial attack upon the typographical union with a recitation of the horrible conditions in the Government Printing Office. The Record has been carrying on the attack commenced by Congressman BLANTON and reproduces letters from an employee of the shop who claims that Uncle Sam's printery is a closed shop entirely dominated by union officials. This tirade has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in newspapers over the country as propaganda in the open-shop crusade, and it would appear that a review of the battle is in order. Statements have been made uncontradicted which are far from truth.

"In the first place, the attack commenced when a member of the union who had been the recipient of every form of assistance imaginable from his fellow workers declined to continue payment of dues and wrote Mr. BLANTON, of Texas. This man did not drop out of the union on account of inability to find the money, but because, as he expressed it, 'I am tired of being bled.' He unblushingly insinuated that he had never sympathized with union principles, and that he saw a good chance to wreck the organization. He probably also saw himself a hero and the idol of the Typothetae and the Manufacturers' Record. But after he had made the break he looked in vain for his followers; and this after accepting meat, fuel, and clothes from his friends in the organization.

"The Manufacturers' Record reproduces letters from an employee of the night proof room, who states, 'I make the simple statement that no self-respecting citizen can work in the Government Printing Office without first getting a license from the International Typographical Union.'

"That this anonymous complainant is a self-respecting citizen is evidenced by the fact that he was willing to forget his antiunion convictions and carry a card. His own words classify him when he admits that he had not the courage to stand up for his principles, but joined the union merely to avoid 'ostracism.'

"It is not difficult to guess the author of these letters, and as he is not a member of the union and as his letters appear without signature, he may be excluded from the class of 'self-respecting citizens.' He also intimates very clearly that the Public Printer is misleading Congress as to the true condition of affairs, which may call for an explanation, if Mr. Carter hears of it.

"It should also be here stated that it is not now nor has it ever been necessary for a man to own a union card to work in the Government Printing Office. Of course, by remaining outside the organization of his fellow workers he necessarily alienates their interest in his welfare, but if his ideas are founded on truth he should be able to stand upon them.

"The Record also attacks the oath of the printers, stating that it places the union above the Constitution of the United States. The publishers of the Record know full well that better men than they have subscribed to that same oath without censure. We mention Presi-

dent Harding, Horace Greeley, George W. Childs, Congressman Albert Johnson, of Washington, and many other men who are and have been leaders in the progress of American democracy. It ill becomes a mouthpiece of organized capital to attempt to belittle a trade-union which has for more than a hundred years been tried and not found wanting.

"These would-be 'free and independent workers' further allege they are ostracized because of their nonparticipation in their coworkers' efforts to advance the cause of the workingmen. And why not? No man who takes all and gives nothing will ever be popular with honest denizens of this world.

"They may fit in somewhere, but you must swear when you mention it."

And, Mr. Speaker, I hear that union members have made life so unbearable to Mr. Powers that they have forced him to send in his resignation again.

$739,107 RECEIPTS FROM 10 PER CENT STRIKE ASSESSMENT IN ONE MONTH, $915,673.53 IN ANOTHER

On page 141 of the August issue, 1921, of the Typographical Journal is the following letter from the president of the union, from which I quote:

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

JULY 25, 1921.

To the Members of the International Typographical Union.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The struggle for the 44-hour week continues with unabated intensity, but little change taking place since the last month, and with but little likelihood of any change in the near future from present indications. The antagonistic employers have apparently settled down to an indefinite period of hostilities, urged on by forces they are powerless to resist. Having but little success in manning their offices with competent help, their efforts are centered mainly on attempts to destroy the morale of our members. The number of towns affected is 220 and the number of members on strike 8,607.

We now have 347 unions signed up. An examination of the financial statement shows that for the month, May 21 to June 20, inclusive, receipts from the 10 per cent assessment were $739,107, while defense expenses and benefits amounted to $689,765.79, leaving a balance in that fund of $49,341.21. For the month of June 21 to July 20, inclusive, receipts were $915,673.53, and expenditures $844,271.12, leaving a balance for the month of $71,405.41.

And from page 181 of said Typographical Journal, here is what it reports on conditions in the Nation's Capital:

"WASHINGTON, D. C.

"The July meeting of Columbia Union was well attended in spite of the more or less well-known impression that the National Capital is a torrid summer resort. And, everything considered, it was a rather warm meeting. The business committee spanked the foremen on the two morning papers for violating union rules, and the recommendations were adopted vigorously. Propositions relating to the assessment received scant consideration, and after a half hour of fiery oratory the meeting uproariously adopted the following resolution, which was fathered by Jacob Wagner, of the National Capital Press, though there is a strong suspicion that it was mothered by our new assistant secretary. The resolution concludes:

"'*Resolved,* That we declare anew our determination to continue to pay in full the 10 per cent assessment, and all other assessments that may be necessary, until victory is complete.'

"Columbia Union is in this antiunion fight to the finish, and the reports in the papers that a few pressmen and binders have returned to work will not weaken our determination to win. Those weak-kneed cider pressmen and highbinders can do very little work until there are some printers on the job to set type. And when the printers return to work it will be under 44-hour agreements.

"Our relief committee is just now badly in need of relief. The chairman, Joseph H. Cummings, we are told, is listening to the wild waves in Atlantic City. Miss Ella M. Wallace is also on leave.

"Government Printing Office foremanships are still on the move. Sheridan C. Koons, of the proof section, is now in charge of the branch in the Congressional Library. Allen C. Clough (pronounced like 'tuff') now enjoys the privilege of putting his feet on the desk in the job room. Stanley A. Ridings is back on his old job as chief of the monotype section. Hugh L. Reid, former chairman, is the new director of destinies in the day hand section, assisted by Maj. Will H. Chase, with Edward Coleman in charge of the night force. John R. Berg, one of the old-time bosses, came back as captain of the day linotype section, and William D. Skeen, an operator, is first mate. William H. Cornish, for several years chairman of the day proof section, is in charge of the night proof room, assisted by James E. Maynard. Edward M. Nevils is king of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD force. Marion E. Bullock is in charge of the office at night.

"This is one of the fancy jobs and deserves a paragraph by itself: Ellwood S. Moorhead, operator on the night CONGRESSIONAL RECORD force, to Foreman of Printing."

You will note that it boasts of the fact that Mr. Hugh Reid, drawing $228.33 per month as a Government employee, is a foreman in the Printing Office. Now, as associate editor of the Federal Employee, note what Mr. Hugh Reid permits on page 8 of the October 8, 1921, issue to be said about Secretary Denby:

Here is omitted a short attack upon a former Secretary of the Navy, the language of which might be objectionable.

Now, in this connection, Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues and the country of what Hon. Herbert D. Brown, Chief of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, said against Government employees belonging to unions:

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1920.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have just received your letter of March 2, in which you make certain inquiries concerning personnel conditions in the executive departments in Washington. I will quote your questions and undertake to answer them in the order in which they appear in your letter:

"(1) Both Congressman MADDEN and myself estimate that there are now in Washington 40,000 idle, unnecessary clerks still on the pay roll, whose services could be dispensed with without crippling the service. Is this true or not?"

I do not know whether your figures are correct or not, because I have not had the opportunity to find out. I know that there are a great many unnecessary clerks in Washington (literally thousands), but whether the number of them is 20,000, 40,000, or some other figure, I can not say. I know that there are very many superfluous clerks in Washington, because investigations made by the Bureau of Efficiency in certain offices have disclosed that fact.

"(2) May we expect efficient service generally from our employees as long as they are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?"

I believe that the affiliation of Government employees with labor organizations must, of necessity, result in a reduction of efficiency in the departments. I am of the opinion that such affiliation has an unfortunate effect on the morale of the service. The employee comes to feel that his success depends not so much on his individual effort as on the political strength of the organization to which he belongs.

"(3) Is there not fully as much reason for separating our Government employees from strike organizations as there was for separating the police and firemen from such organizations?"

Yes; quite as much reason, and even more. In the event of police strikes or strikes involving a fire department it will always be possible, because of the relatively small number of people involved, for residents of the community to assume the burdens laid down by the striking policemen or firemen, and while it is true that inexperienced persons would not be able to safeguard the public interests to the same extent as could regular policemen or firemen, yet the danger to the community could be kept within reasonable bounds and situations of this sort could be taken care of with a relatively small loss to the public. In the case of a strike of Government workers, which might involve not merely a few employees but practically the entire force in the Government service, the damage to the public interest would be far greater. Such a strike would practically result in the suspension of all the functions of the Federal Government. It would affect not merely a few people, or a few thousand people, but, practically speaking, the entire population of the country.

"(4) I call your attention to the attack made upon you in the Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, for February 28, 1920, page 3 thereof, suggesting your demise, by reason of your late activities for efficiency. Is this veiled threat of the official organ of Government employees going to stop your activities and cause you to 'lay down'?"

My answer to this inquiry is "No." I shall continue to work for economy and efficiency in the Government service without regard to threats that may be made by any person or organization.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT D. BROWN,
Chief Bureau of Efficiency.

CLOSED SHOP IN ALL DEPARTMENTS

Now, Mr. Speaker, to show my colleagues and the country that this union closed-shop condition applies to all other departments of the Government as well as the Printing Office, let me quote the following evidence I submitted in June, 1919, before a joint hearing held by the House and Senate Committees on Labor:

STATEMENT OF MISS MARY CUNNINGHAM

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is Miss Mary Cunningham, whose home is in Plainview, Tex. She is not even a resident of my district.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name, please?

Mr. BLANTON. Her name is Miss Mary Cunningham.

Senator KENYON. And what is her business?

Mr. BLANTON. She is employed at the present time in the new War Risk Insurance Bureau under Mr. Jones.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Miss Cunningham, you are a niece of Judge J. F. Cunningham, who is a prominent lawyer, known all over Texas, are you not?

Miss CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. To save time I am going to ask a few leading questions. Miss Cunningham, you have taught school for a number of years in Texas before coming to Washington, have you not?

Miss CUNNINGHAM. Yes, sir; three years.

Mr. BLANTON. Prior to your coming to Washington were you a member of a union?

Miss CUNNINGHAM. No, indeed.

Mr. BLANTON. Since you have been at work here in Washington, have you joined a union?

Miss CUNNINGHAM. Over at the War Risk; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. State to the committee why did you join the union.

Mr. MACCRATE. Let me ask a question. Were you ever employed in the Bureau of Employment Service of the United States Government?

Miss CUNNINGHAM. I have never been in any bureau but the War Risk Bureau, and I was appointed to that.

Mr. MACCRATE. I do not see how it is at all relevant; I do not see the relevancy of testimony of an employee of any other department of the Government when we are inquiring into this branch of the service and this branch of the service only.

Mr. BLANTON. Let her answer. State to the committee how came you to join the union and what made you join.

Mr. MACCRATE. I object to that, Mr. Chairman, on these grounds: If we are going to take up personal reasons and other reasons why girls join different associations, we will never finish here in this world. They may bring in girls from any one of the other departments and take up the time of this committee——

Mr. BLANTON. That is the only question that I desire to ask this witness; and I will say this: That she was induced to join one of them upon representations that that was the only way by which she could hold her position.

The CHAIRMAN. But you would not charge Secretary of Labor Wilson and Mr. Densmore——

Mr. BLANTON (interposing). I want to show that that fact existed here in connection with some other matters which I desire to bring out and to charge Mr. Densmore with.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is not material.

Mr. BLANTON. I will connect it up directly with the Employment Service, and I will show that a person was discharged out of the Employment Service because she did not join a union.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, there is a great variance of opinion about organized labor. Some gentlemen do not like it and some do like it, and——

Mr. HERSEY (interrupting). And Mr. Mooney is not on trial here.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say that I like it, where it is properly functioned, but where it is not it is absolutely wrong. I will try and connect this evidence up immediately with the Employment Service, but I will show that they not only discharged a woman over there because she was not a member of the union, but they followed up—followed that good woman up in various departments with the object of keeping her out of the Government employ. I will connect her testimony up with another——

Senator KENYON. You mean to say that this young lady had to join a union in order to hold a place in the War Risk Bureau?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and another has been discharged because she did not join a union, and has been discharged from another place since. She was first discharged from the Employment Service.

Mr. WATSON. Well, don't you think that that should be shown by the one who was discharged from the Employment Service? Did they get Miss Cunningham her job?

Mr. BLANTON. They did not. I believe that I can show that it has been found to be absolutely necessary to join a union, almost, to hold a position in the city of Washington to-day.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose that be true; in what way is that going to throw any light on the conduct of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. BLANTON. But if the United States Employment Service itself discharged employees, and not only discharged employees but has followed her through to other departments, through their other employees, and prevented them from holding their jobs, it is not only important but it is an outrage.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman, I press my objection.

Senator KENYON. I think Mr. BLANTON should produce the other witness and show it.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee would not like to hear her testimony? I will call the next witness.

STATEMENT OF MISS J. RAYNES LILESTONE

Mr. BLANTON. Your home address is Indianapolis, Ind., is it not, Miss Lilestone?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. In order that this good woman's standing may be known to the committee, I would like, with the permission of the committee, to place in the record a number of indorsements, one from Senator OVERMAN, who is chairman of the Committee on Rules of the United States Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Until that is questioned, what is the use of putting a letter into the record. Nobody questions her at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do it for this reason: It has been brought to my attention——

The CHAIRMAN. She can tell who she is, and I do not think that anyone here will dispute her.

Mr. BLANTON. May I give my reasons? It has been brought to my attention that there has been an effort—that by reason of the fact that a certain auditor in the Shipping Board made a statement in the record a shore time ago—there has been an effort to prove that the man is insane—and witnesses are in this room now to attack the credibility of the witnesses that are brought in here.

Mr. MACCRATE. Until the witness's credibility is attacked I believe that the committee will assume that she is honest.

Mr. BLANTON. But I can not come back and refute the testimony that they will bring out. I have but a short time to appear before this committee—only two hours this morning. I do not expect to come before the committee any more, as I am very, very busy, and I can not be here to hear their testimony and introduce testimony to refute it.

But you have lived in Richmond, Va., for a number of years, and you have lived in Indianapolis, Ind., for a number of years?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And you were employed by the Labor Department, Miss Lilestone?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. When?

Miss LILESTONE. I began my services during the month of September.

Mr. BLANTON. When?

Miss LILESTONE. September 12.

Mr. BLANTON. And after entering your employment state whether or not you were requested to join a union.

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And what answer did you make to them?

Miss LILESTONE. I told them that I did not think it was necessary for me to join a union. The question was asked if I was a member of organized labor, and I told them no.

Mr. CASEY. What is that?

Miss LILESTONE. I told them no, that I did not think it was necessary in order to keep my Government position.

Mr. BLANTON. And what other statements, if any, was made to you?

Miss LILESTONE. The statement was made that in order to have a safe position that I would be compelled to join the union.

Mr. BLANTON. It was in the Labor Department?

Miss LILESTONE. It was in the Labor Department; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And you refused to join the union?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Were you working for the Employment Service system of the branch of the Department of Labor?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NOLAN. And who was your superior officer?

Miss LILESTONE. The superior was Roger Babson, but he was not there during the time that I was employed.

Mr. NOLAN. What branch of the service was it?

Miss LILESTONE. It was the educational. The bureau of education.

Mr. NOLAN. And is it connected with the United States Employment Service?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. How long did you work there after that?

Miss LILESTONE. I worked—not quite—I would say just about a month. I received my dismissal; the letter was dated on the 9th; and I received my dismissal; it was dated on the 9th, and I received it on the 11th.

Mr. BLANTON. Of what month?

Miss LILESTONE. October.

Mr. NOLAN. You were there just one month?

Miss LILESTONE. You have the letter there, Mr. BLANTON. I think that I gave it to you.

Mr. BLANTON. You have a document here from the Civil Service Commission in which it shows that you made a rating of 81?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERSEY. Let us see the letter of dismissal. What does it state?

Mr. BLANTON. Here is your dismissal, signed by Mr. S. J. Gompers, chief clerk, and there is your dismissal [handing letters to Miss Lilestone].

Mr. HERSEY. This is dated the 16th.

Miss LILESTONE. I entered the service on the 12th.

Mr. BLANTON. Please read the dismissal.

Miss LILESTONE. "October 10, 1918. Miss J. Raynes Lilestone. By direction of the acting chief of the service, your services as clerk at $1,100 per annum in the industrial plants position have been discontinued, effective at the close of October 9, 1918. Robert C. Starr, chief clerk, information and education service."

This gentleman, as I understand it, is a member of the union.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you go to see that gentleman after you received that letter?

Miss LILESTONE. I did; and he said that he had orders from the department head to dismiss me.

Mr. BLANTON. And then did you ask him the reason for your dismissal, Miss Lilestone?

Miss LILESTONE. I asked him the reason for my dismissal; and if you gentlemen will just let me explain—they never gave me a chance.

Senator KENYON. Do you mean that they never gave you a chance from the time that you went there?

Miss LILESTONE. They never gave me an opportunity. Of course, I knew I made good.

Senator KENYON. Then, what do you mean by saying that they never gave you a chance?

Miss LILESTONE. They never gave me any reasons why such a dismissal was sent; they never gave me a hearing or anything of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. And right after that you were employed by the Commission on Training Camp Activities in the War Department?

Mr. CASEY. Wait one minute. Is it not a fact that the information and educational services is one of the emergency divisions set up in the Department of Labor during the war?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes; I think it is.

Senator KENYON. Were there any others discharged about the time you left?

Miss LILESTONE. Not that I know of. I knew very few people there.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is a certificate from the Commission on Training Camp Activities showing that you worked for them. Would the committee mind her reading that, showing that her services were satisfactory?

Senator KENYON. That was after that?

Mr. HERSEY. I would like to know how long after she was discharged that she went to work for some other branch of the service?

Miss LILESTONE. Just shortly after; in fact, the very following week. I saw that my means were very limited on account of the conditions existing here, and I made an application to the administration—the Railroad Administration—and I received a position, beginning at a salary of $1,500 per year; but on account of my physical condition, due to the experience that I had undergone—that is, the humiliation part of it—it was not the question of work but it was the humiliation part of it—I broke down and was taken ill, and I was compelled to go into the hospital. When I came out I made application to the War Camp Activities——

Mr. BLANTON. Let me read that.

JANUARY 14, 1919.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Miss J. Rayne Lilestone has worked in the accounting office of the Commission on Training Camp Activities from December 11 to January 11, 1919, upon a special piece of work which is now completed, and we are therefore giving Miss Lilestone a release. Her work for the Commission on Training Camp Activities has been very satisfactory.

CHESTER C. WATERS,
Chief Accountant.

Now, Miss Lilestone, after that you had an appointment from the War Department, the purchase, storage, and traffic division, General Staff, dated March 21, giving you employment at $1,100?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you cease to be employed by the War Department? You were employed by the War Department up to when?

Miss LILESTONE. Up to the 23d.

Mr. BLANTON. The 23d of June?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And the 23d was the day before yesterday?

Miss LILESTONE. Day before yesterday; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. That was Monday?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir. With the purchase, storage, and traffic division.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Miss Lilestone, I will ask you, while you were working for this War Department, if any person who purported to be interested in organized labor, and who had previously known you in the Labor Department when you worked there, had occasion to see you working in the War Department, and have a conversation with you, and if so, state who it was and when it occurred?

Miss LILESTONE. I was sitting at my desk, and I was approached by a lady whom I did not recognize immediately, and she says, "What are you doing here?" I said, "Why, I have a perfect right to be here. I am under civil service." She said, "Are you a member of the employees' league?" I said, "I am not." Then I said to her, "What is your name?" I thought perhaps she was one of the members of the department there. She said, "I was with the Federal Employment Service." I did not remember her. I said, "I do not know your name." I said, "What is your name?" She said, "I can not tell you." Then she disappeared from the room. A gentleman in charge there——

Mr. BLANTON. Now, just a minute, in that connection; during that conversation did she give you any information of whether or not you would be permitted to remain in the War Department?

Miss LILESTONE. Well, she intimated—she——

Mr. MACCRATE. Not what she intimated; tell us what she said. What did she say?

Miss LILESTONE. Well, she said it would be safer to be a member of the employees' union, but I paid very little attention to it, because those things—I thought that the Government would take care of its employees without having to join an organization in this country.

Mr. MACCRATE. Just give us the conversation. State what this conversation was. Is that all of the conversation?

Mr. BLANTON. You are out of a position right now, are you?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And you are dependent on working for a living?

Miss LILESTONE. I am.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever see me in your life until a short time ago?

Miss LILESTONE. I never knew you.

Mr. HERSEY. Was there any reason for your discharge from the last position? Have you that discharge?

Miss LILESTONE. You have my dismissal there, Mr. BLANTON?

Mr. BLANTON. May I say this to the committee: There may be not only an effort to attack the standing of the witnesses, but also an effort to attack me, and I want to say that I am amply able mentally, morally, and physically to maintain any position that I take in the House, before this committee, or anywhere else. I am amply able to do that, and I want the fellows who have been attacking this good woman to understand that I am going to protect the people who are brave enough——

Mr. MACCRATE. I trust that we will have——

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting). I do not like to have them send a special secret-service man out to stand under my nose.

The CHAIRMAN. You may put in your testimony.

Mr. MACCRATE. In that dismissal, did they give any reason for her dismissal?

Miss LILESTONE. They did not; and I demanded an explanation, and I wanted it in writing.

Senator KENYON. Miss Lilestone, at the time of this talk that you had with this lady in the Department of Labor; it occurred in the hall, you say?

Miss LILESTONE. Well, the rooms are just a large room. I do not know whether it is a hall.

Senator KENYON. Were you sitting down or standing up?

Miss LILESTONE. No; I was standing up.

Senator KENYON. Was the person a woman?

Miss LILESTONE. A woman.

Senator KENYON. What kind of a looking woman was she?

Miss LILESTONE. It seems to me that she was a blonde.

Senator KENYON. Was she the same woman that talked to you in the War Department.

Miss LILESTONE. No.

Senator KENYON. Did you ever see her afterwards?

Miss LILESTONE. I never did.

Senator KENYON. And in about a week after that you were discharged, you say?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Senator KENYON. Do you know of others in there who did not belong to unions?

Miss LILESTONE. No, sir.

Mr. HERSEY. Do you know whether the Employment Bureau had anything to do with your dismissal?

Miss LILESTONE. I do not; but from my standpoint it looked as though they did, as though they had agents all through the departments. It looked very plain to me, but I gave it very little thought.

Mr. MACCRATE. Now, this second lady that asked you about the United States employees' league, what was her description?

Miss LILESTONE. She was a blonde, but not the same one.

Mr. MACCRATE. And she came right in and walked right out again——

Miss LILESTONE (interrupting). Yes, sir.

Mr. MACCRATE. And just simply said to you that you had better join the union, and she left you right away?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the committee hear Miss Cunningham now?

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear anyone.

Mr. NOLAN. Before the lady leaves the witness stand, I think that the—she has intimated that she thought the United States Employment Service had agents around these departments. Now, Mr. Chairman, is it fair to permit questions affecting the service—if it is, I think it also fair to permit the service, or those representing the service, to defend themselves and cross-examine the witness.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no objection.

Mr. NOLAN. It is a matter for this committee to decide, and I ask that the other side be entitled to cross-examine the witness if they care to. Mr. Densmore is here.

Mr. MACCRATE. I do not think that any cross-examination is necessary so far as this witness is concerned.

Mr. NOLAN. Well, one of her last statements was that the United States Employment Service had agents throughout the departments.

Mr. MACCRATE. But they can meet that statement when they go on the stand.

Mr. NOLAN. I ask that the representative of the Employment Service, if he so desires, be permitted to cross-examine this witness.

Miss LILESTONE. May I speak a word just a moment?

Mr. NOLAN. I am only suggesting that they be asked if they want to cross-examine the witness.

Mr. HERSEY. If we pursue that policy there will be no end to the hearing.

Miss LILESTONE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting). Unless they want it; that is all I want from you.

Miss LILESTONE. I want to take the time——

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment.

Senator KENYON. If the witness wants to say something, she may do so.

Mr. BLANTON. I am through with her.

Miss LILESTONE. I was asked by Grace Porter Hopkins, who is superintendent of the Women's Division of the Employment Bureau, and her story is a lengthy one, if you want to listen to it now. She asked me if I was a member of the Employees' League, and I told her no, and she said that "it would be safer for you to become a member of it."

(The following letter was thereafter ordered by the chairman to be incorporated in the record in full, as follows:)

JUNE 27.

Hon. J. M. C. SMITH,
Chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor,
Senate Room 201, Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In my testimony before the committee which is investigating the Employment Bureau of the Department of Labor, owing to the limited time allowed me, I was unable to state the following facts, which I would like to appear in the record:

Owing to physical breakdown, due to my experience in the Education Information Bureau of the Department of Labor, I transferred my $1,500 position to a man who was in need of employment. This, on the assurance of Mrs. Grace Porter Hopkins, Chief of the Employment Bureau, that she would secure me another position when my strength would permit me to resume work.

After explaining to her my extreme financial condition, I then asked Mrs. Hopkins if the Government made any provision for hospital treatment for its employees at reasonable rates. She answered in the affirmative, and sent me to Providence Hospital, saying that the Government would bear my expenses while there. My expenses authorized by Mrs. Hopkins were $35 per week. This hospital bill has not been paid by the Department of Labor.

Probably because I am not a member of the Employees' Union, the Employment Bureau has made no effort to secure me a position. I was not only advised by Mrs. Hopkins and Mrs. Neal, another chief of the same division, to leave Washington, but efforts were made by their clerks to get me out of the city.

Very truly yours,

JULIA RAYNES LILESTONE,
826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR UNINTERESTED

Mr. Speaker, after the committee showed that it was absolutely uninterested in the testimony of Miss Cunningham, disclosing that she was forced to join a union in order to hold her Government position in Washington, and that about the only interest Mr. Nolan and Mr. MacCrate seemed to take in the fact that Miss Lilestone had been dismissed from the Department of Labor and hounded from department to department by purported representatives of the United States Employment Service, apparently because she would not join a union, was the assertion that the service would clear itself as soon as its representatives testified, I deemed it futile to go into the question further, and offered no other of the available witnesses on that point.

And, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues and the country may be again reminded of something about Mr. Luther C. Steward, president of the Federal Employees' Union, let me again quote the statement of Mr. Charles H. Burroughs, one of the auditors of the United States Government, to wit:

STATEMENT FROM GOVERNMENT AUDITOR

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
United States Representative, City.

DEAR SIR: Answering, as requested, in detail your specific inquiries, will state:

My name is Charles H. Burroughs; live at 221 B Street NE.; am now one of the auditors in the United States Shipping Board, employed in room 1046, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

First, I would like to state that in answering your inquiries I am not volunteering information; that I am dependent upon my position for a livelihood, and hope that you will not cause me to lose my position with the Government.

You are correct in stating that formerly I was Chief of Transportation and Revolving Fund Section of the United States Employment Service. I voluntarily left such position.

Relative to your inquiry concerning record of travel vouchers of Special Representative Luther C. Steward for the months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918, wherein Mr. Steward claimed and there was allowed to him for travel expense: For July, $134.45; for August, $127.25; for September, $87.50; for October, $113.25; for November, $120.50; and for December, 1918, $127.50, per vouchers numbered, respectively, 197, 2450, 6248, 9656, 14331, and 18495. I am familiar with such departmental matters. Numerous parties connected with the service were furnished with transportation books containing printed requests and stubs in same, and such parties would present such requests, filled out by them, to the railroads and get transportation, and their books, with the stubs, were supposed to be returned to the department. The claim of Mr. Steward was in addition to such transportation furnished by the railroads. Thousands of dollars were absolutely wasted in this way. I doubt whether one-third of these books were ever returned and filed with the department. It can not be shown that it was necessary for Mr. Steward to make these trips. He was receiving in the neighborhood of $3,500 or more from the Government and at the same time drew about $2,750 from the Employees' Union, and for a time, at least, his wife worked in the Munition Building at about $1,100. If this service is properly audited, it will be found that thousands of vouchers were issued in irregular and unnecessary transportation, and it will also be found that there were numerous details made from stations merely to enable parties to draw their $4 per diem in addition to their salaries and travel transportation. It was wholly unnecessary for Mr. Hibbard and Mr. Harry H. Stone to take that expensive trip to France. Mr. Harry S. Parks took many unnecessary trips at great expense. Relative to the transportation voucher and three Pullman tickets issued to Miss Jeannette Densmore, sister of the director general, from New York to Atlantic City on July 4, 1918, and the return by Miss Densmore from Atlantic City to New York on July 7, 1918, will state that is only one of hundreds of such trips such agents took on the expense of the Government. In my opinion, the business management of the whole department was rotten. Answering your inquiry, will state that, in my judgment, had Congress allowed the proposed $10,000,000 appropriation requested in February that at least two-thirds of same would have been wasted. It would be a waste of public money for Congress to allow this United States Employment Service any more appropriations until the whole service has been properly audited and investigated and reorganized on proper business lines. It has been continually stated that much has been done and is being done for the returning soldier. Reports of this work are padded and is mostly propaganda, as I do not believe that returning soldiers have received any benefit from the great bulk of the enormous expenditures wasted by this service. I was absolutely disgusted with the system and practice.

If the department is properly investigated, Congress will be astounded at the revelation awaiting accounting.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. BURROUGHS.

And since we have gotten Director John B. Densmore separated from the United States Employment Service he has gone into the banking business here in Washington.

TO FIGHT AS THEY HAVE NEVER FOUGHT BEFORE

Mr. M. A. Bodenhamer, president of the Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, here in Washington, has recently issued a large circular, dated September 30, 1921, calling attention to the fight I am making to free the Government Printing Office from the slavery of the union closed shop, and he admonishes his members as follows:

"Every element of organized labor should know that the fight for our very existence is on; and knowing it, prepare to fight as they have never fought before. Standing as solidly together in the future as the International Typographical Union has stood in the past, there can be no question as to the outcome; but we must stand together—internal bickerings must be laid by until the outside enemy is defeated—or, as the immortal Franklin said, 'We will hang separately.'"

And to show you that the typographical union will not let even union men attend to their own business way down in Texas, I quote the following from the Brownwood Bulletin:

"A STATEMENT TO THE PUBLIC

"To whom it may concern:

"Inasmuch as unnecessary publicity has repeatedly been brought forward which we have heretofore ignored, in pursuance of the latest developments from the 'seat of war,' it is our intention to make a straightforward statement that interested friends may not be misled in interpreting our position.

"Several months ago the matter was suggested that inasmuch as the reconstruction days had forced to the front matters that we felt might be satisfactorily carried out in the eastern cities and large

centers, but would prove a burden and hardship upon the frontier, the question was submitted to the local union whether we maintain or surrender our charter for a time, until the objectionable handicaps should be adjusted. The vote was taken and those present, by a large majority, voted to send in the charter. The question was then raised that San Angelo chapel, which was under our jurisdiction, had a right to vote on this question. To be fair and reasonable the opposition were granted another opportunity to prove that 'Big I' was indeed and in fact 'the majority.' Thirty days after, at the next regular session, the question was again submitted and again the majority voted to surrender the charter, and the secretary was instructed to send in the books to headquarters, which was done, and the equipment was duly received and the receipt and acceptance was regularly acknowledged by National Secretary J. W. Hays in these words:

"AUGUST 31, 1921.

"'DEAR MR. CHARNQUIST: I have your letter of August 27. The charter and supplies of No. 737 reached this office yesterday.'

"Since the settlement of these affairs the opposition have done all in their power to discountenance the Bulletin force, and by distributing cards, publishing display ads, and other means have endeavored to injure in various ways the standing of this, the majority contingent, and to injure the Bulletin financially by making it appear that they had adopted nonunion rules, and to a representative of I. T. U. they wailed that the whole business had been done illegally. Why didn't 'Big II' compel it to transpire legally? They say that, contrary to rules, members without 'paid-up working cards' were allowed to vote. Why didn't the officer on the throne see to it that they had paid up or that they had no franchise?

"We thought matters would adjust themselves. Only an occasional puff of smoke and a blare of trumpets gave evidence that mischief was brewing.

"Several days since, a scout from the front appeared upon the scene and the enemy marched from behind their camouflage with stately tread and a blare of trumpets, and so mightily did they blow that verily we believe their brains went out at the big end of the horn.

"Behold what they did. Next day the scout scouted all the way to San Angelo to call for recruits to organize a Brownwood local union, leaving the rear guard to hold the fort. The scout scouted back and, evidently failing to round up the recruits, came back and reported that he had decided to wire to headquarters to send 'back the original charter, pronto.' Had this been done by a full representation of the defunct local, it would have put us back where we were before the surrender and the same officers would be in office and Mr. P. H. Charnquist would naturally have received the returned equipment. He did not receive it.

"The next bale of guncotton hurled at us was a stunner because of its idiocy and rank bolshevik venom and bluff.

"Anyone even slightly versed in parliamentary usages knows that the membership of a union meet, discuss, plan, formulate, and through the assistance of committees decide upon, set a date—always time sufficient to "get together"—confer, and arbitrate, if allowed. Upon failure to adjust differences an ultimatum is forwarded to the business concerns or managers of the opposition forces. We are at a loss to know just what sort of document the following specimen is—it's hard and taxes our ingenuity to classify. Here it is:

"'STRIKE ORDER

"'This is to notify the journeymen printers of Brownwood that by authority of the executive council of the International Typographical Union the charter of the Brownwood Union has been returned and will be retained by a sufficient number of card holders under the old number. A reorganization of officers has been effected.

"'The management of the Brownwood Bulletin and the Greenwood Printing Co. having seen fit to refuse to comply with certain working conditions instituted by the entire membership of the International Typographical Union, the local union, by authority of the executive council, herewith notifies the journeymen printers of the said Bulletin office and the Greenwood Printing Co. that these offices will not be open to organized labor after Friday, October 7.

"'Those employees desiring to renew or retain their membership cards in the International Typographical Union must cease their connection with the said offices on the above date or automatically sever their relationship with the International Typographical Union, forfeiting all benefits and insurance and privilege of future membership, except under conditions imposed by the international executive council.

"'Members complying with this strike order will be paid the customary benefits by the headquarters office of $17 per week for single men and $22 for married men as long as they are unemployed.'

"Analyzed, first paragraph stands:

"Notify journeymen printers.

"Authority executive council.

"Charter returned.

"Will be retained by sufficient number of card holders.

"Reorganization of officers has been effected.

"Although not permitted to participate, we are regarded as journeymen printers, and that the suffering minority is unqualifiedly empowered to ram down our throats an organization whether we wish it or not. Horrors! Next the old charter has been returned and will be maintained by sufficient number. Wonder how many? Must their safe be 'burgled' to find the list—probably was not published for 'lack' of space.' And then comes the coy little flip: 'A reorganization of officers' has been effected. It seems the 'officers were reorganized all right.'

"About 3.30 p. m. on that eventful day, October 7, A. D. 1921, this little bomb was placed upon the work benches of these journeymen printers. At first glance it appeared 'innocent' enough, but it carried suspicious odors, sulphuric and dynamic; and the sputtering fuze gave warning that the receptacle was masterfully charged with 'hot air.' 'O mores! Oh h—ll.' One hour and thirty minutes' notice to act upon a mighty question of state! A history-making epoch of stupendous significance! After October 7 the offices of the Daily Bulletin and the Greenwood Printing Co. must snap its doors and forever inclose us within the toils, with no escape made ready, and subject to the penalties imposed upon us by the international executive council.

"We poor, downtrodden journeymen are not aware that penalties were assessed against us. Then to revive our drooping spirits we are tendered an 'all-day sucker' wrapped up in the sweet little missive; that strikers will be paid the princely sum of $17 and $22 per week, and the writer says headquarters will pay the bill. At the end of the funeral oration appears the name of the high and mighty ruler of this local as president. Tears perhaps obscures the signature of the secretary, and our strongest reading glass fails to bring out the faintest outline of a seal, usually so boldly placed in the convenient left-hand lower corner, which custom wisely set aside for parade of authority. And wonder of wonders! the boasted emblem upon which all union craftsmen depend for proof of genuineness—the label—escaped the argus eyes of its sponsors and decamped, probably ashamed to submit itself to such ignoble uses.

"Another explosion occurred in the last issue of the Semi-Weekly News, as follows:

"'BROWNWOOD TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION REORGANIZED

"'After several months of restlessness during which time a certain element of members of the Brownwood Typographical Union "railroaded" by a superior force of numbers the surrender of the charter, that body is again reorganized. This was effected through the aid of a representative from the international headquarters at Indianapolis.

"'Since the reorganization and as matters now stand, the employees of the Brownwood Semi-Weekly News constitute the only union shop in Brownwood.'

"The ultimatum reached us 3.30 Friday, to take effect at 5 p. m. Anticipating and unable to hold in check their elation over the horrible slaughter of the vast majority, instead of waiting their souls in patience to see the effect of their last bombardment they read off the dead list and printed the obituary in the News that night and called for an attorney to read the last will and testament, setting up claims of heirship and stated that 'as matters now stand, the employees of the Brownwood Semi-Weekly News constitute the only union shop in Brownwood.' Naturally all these things, if true, were news to us and we obtained a search warrant to discover the emblem of authority—the label. We could not find it, and it was not there unless we overlooked it stowed away snugly in the middle of a display advertisement. If they were reorganized or had the old charter restored, why did they not put in evidence their label?

"Everything we did in these matters was open and above board, but the opposition branded themselves when they refused to submit themselves to the will of the majority, and all of these evasions and false representations are disgusting and we are sure do not appeal to the conservative, thinking union element of Brownwood. The Bulletin has and are carrying out the policy followed for the past several years and have acted fairly to their employees in every way, and do not merit the misrepresentations and attacks directed at them by two or three disgruntled individuals who are governed by self-exultation and a desire to 'come back' and heap vengeance upon those who dare to have their own opinions and fail to bow their knees to the high and mighty wizard leading the klan.

"THE JOURNEYMEN PRINTERS OF THE BULLETIN FORCE."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me add that it is now up to President Harding, Vice President Coolidge, his Cabinet, and Congress to clean up this Government Printing Office and the other departments of the Government and establish the American open shop. The people of the United States are going to stand for nothing else. They are not going to accept any side-stepping or passing the buck. The Republican Party is in absolute control of the Government and has a majority of 170 Members in the House of Representatives. What is it going to do about it?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the foregoing, omitting French's letter, is an exact reprint of my expunged official report on the Government Printing Office, word for word, as same was printed on pages 7417 to 7425 inclusive of the original daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 22, 1921. This is the report

that the Republican floor leader, Mr. Frank H. Mondell, caused to be expunged. There was not one single improper word in my entire report. The only improper language in it was that of the union foreman, Huber, applied to his fellow Government worker, French, contained in said deleted sworn statement of French, then on file as a Government archive in the Government Printing Office, which deleted language I quote in my report.

I was not disseminating improper language. I was endeavoring to stop its use by Government employees while transacting public business. I was bringing its use to the attention of Congress. There was no other way to apprise the other 434 Congressmen and 96 Senators of its use by Government employees toward their fellows. I believed that my colleagues would welcome knowledge of same, and would commend me for the hard work I did in bringing it to their attention. I was merely performing my official duty as a Representative of this Government. With such facts before me, I would not have done my duty had I done less.

UNION LEADERS AMBUSHED ME

Unions here realized that there was no answer to the facts established by my report. They could not afford to have same made public. They were determined to obliterate my report. So they persuaded the floor leader of the House, Mr. Mondell, to have it expunged. And without notice to me, when the House met on October 24, 1921, Mr. Mondell moved to expunge my entire report, and moved the previous question, which cut off all debate. I implored him to give me 10 minutes to explain same, but he refused. I asked him to expunge only the French statement, and to allow my report to remain, but he refused. He was determined to get my entire report out of the RECORD. And he forced an immediate vote, with the Members hurriedly called over to vote without knowing my side of the controversy. Naturally they voted to expunge my report, and it was expunged.

UNION LEADERS HERE WERE DETERMINED TO GET RID OF ME

The next day Majority Leader Mondell moved to put me out of Congress. It was an afterthought. Union leaders here demanded it. He did not refer the question to a committee, required by an unbroken line of precedents. He did not give me counsel, which has been given by Congress to every Member whose seat was at issue. He did not confront me with witnesses, and let me cross-examine them. He did not give me any time to prepare my defense. He did not give me sufficient time to present my defense. He pushed his resolution to take my seat from me, based on his mere statement that I had printed improper language in the RECORD, causing the public throughout the United States to believe that I had used improper language, when my whole desire and purpose was to stop its use by Government employees when transacting Government business.

I then urged Leader Mondell to permit my report to go back into the RECORD, as there was nothing improper in it. He objected, and thus kept it out, for it required unanimous consent to put it back.

There were 302 Republicans then Members of the House. Mr. Mondell was their party leader. He thus controlled a majority of 170 votes. He called many Republican Members to his office, and as their leader urged them to vote to put me out. But altogether he could muster only 204 votes against me out of a total membership of 435 Congressmen. His 302 Republicans knew that his motion to put me out would be voted upon, and could have been there to vote with their leader had they desired.

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD W. POU, OF NORTH CAROLINA

During the Wilson administration Congressman EDWARD W. POU was chairman of the great Committee on Rules. He is now the ranking Democrat thereon. Replying to Mr. Mondell's insistence that I be put out, Congressman POU then said:

> The Member from Texas has printed in the RECORD an affidavit which speaks the truth concerning an occurrence in the Government Printing Office. The truth of the matter contained in the affidavit has not been challenged by anyone. We must therefore assume the accuracy of same. * * * When you expel him for telling the truth about an occurrence in a public institution, you may raise an issue and set a precedent which will rise up to plague you hereafter.

IT DID RISE UP TO PLAGUE MONDELL THEREAFTER

Mr. Mondell had been the sole and only Congressman from the whole State of Wyoming for 26 years continuously. He was the Republican floor leader of the House. He ran for the Senate in the first election thereafter, and while Wyoming elected a Republican to succeed him in Congress, Mr. Mondell was able to carry only one county in the entire State of Wyoming—the county of Goshen. Every other county in the State went against him. While our present distinguished colleague, Mr. WINTER, a Republican, carried Wyoming by a majority of 3,868 votes to succeed Mr. Mondell in Congress, Mr. Mondell's opponent, a Democrat, carried Wyoming by a majority of 9,107 votes for the Senate. And thus in 1922 Mr. Mondell was put out of Congress by the decisive vote of his own people, while the people I have the honor to represent have kept me in Congress continuously.

In its issue of November 8, 1921, the Daily News of Little Rock, Ark., said:

> BLANTON employed initial letters and dashes to indicate the vile words. Had BLANTON not in some way brought the language out in his speech, he would not have made out his case.
>
> The News wants even one Member of Congress, who so violently opposed BLANTON'S use of the initial letters and dashes, to tell us just how BLANTON would have gotten the facts before the Congress if he had not used them.
>
> Be it said to BLANTON'S credit that if he fights hard he also fights fair, and that he fights for what he conscientiously believes is right.
>
> BLANTON did not indorse such language; he was condemning it. No little child and no woman would understand the letters and dashes.
>
> BLANTON believed that the people should know about it. And why shouldn't they? Does not the Government Printing Office belong to the people? Are they not entitled to know the conditions there?
>
> The tempest in the teapot would have been not so riotous if BLANTON'S exposé had not somewhat unsettled ancient customs at Washington and thrown the searchlight of public disapproval on some Government secrets that had been hidden in the closets these many years.
>
> Right and justice are American qualities, and by holding BLANTON up to public scorn Congress can not cover up the fact that the Government Printing Office at Washington is the most disgracefully conducted department in the whole American Government. BLANTON may be able to come back.

That was the sentiment of thousands of citizens from one side of the United States to the other, and from many newspapers, expressed in letters and clippings sent me by them. Just let me quote one of these letters typical of them all from a distinguished preacher, Rev. W. W. Pippin, jr.:

APPOMATTOX, VA., *October 28, 1921.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLANTON: As a reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am familiar with its contents.

I deeply regret that the rules of the House are such as not to permit a public record of facts. Such things are awful to repeat, but somehow I have a lingering conviction that under such circumstances a "verbatim" account best serves the ends of justice.

Be assured, dear Congressman, that "truth crushed to the earth will rise again," and long after this is forgotten you will be wafted high on the wings of your noble struggle for justice. Be assured of my sincere prayers, sympathy, and respect.

W. W. PIPPIN, Jr.

Mr. Mondell was in no way concerned about punishing Levi Huber for using this "awful" language to his fellow employee. He took no steps to punish Huber.

On March 13, 1922, about five months thereafter, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] stated that it was in his mind to say something that he had very frequently thought of; that he had never even made an inquiry privately about the matter, but he would like to know, and he wondered if any gentleman could tell him whether Levi Huber (the man who had used this bad language) was still in the employment of the Government. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] rang up the Government Printing Office to ascertain, and reported to the House that Huber was still employed there.

Let me read you a resolution that was passed by the Democratic district convention in my district last August, respecting my reelection:

Resolution passed by the Democratic convention at Abilene, Tex., on August 28, 1926

To the Democratic district convention for the seventeenth congressional district of Texas:

We, your committee on resolutions, duly selected and appointed by the Democratic district convention representing the Democrats in the 19 counties composing the seventeenth congressional district of Texas, to submit appropriate resolutions to said convention, each member of this committee being either a delegate or holding the lawful proxy of a delegate duly chosen and authenticated from some one of the 19 counties of this district, by unanimous agreement respectfully submit to this convention for adoption the following

Resolution

Whereas in the recent Democratic primary election held July 24, 1926, Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Abilene, Tex., for the second consecutive time has carried each and all of the 19 counties in his district by an overwhelming majority in each county, carrying his former old home county of Shackelford by 996 votes for BLANTON and 228 for Smith, and carrying his home county of Taylor by a majority of 3,475 votes, his home box, known as Parish House Precinct No. 25,

giving BLANTON a majority of 741 votes, he carrying each and every one of the 26 voting precincts in his home county by an enormous majority, said BLANTON receiving 45,257 votes in his district; and

Whereas in Burnet County, where his opponent lives and was county judge eight years, Congressman BLANTON carried each and every one of the 21 voting precincts in the home county of his opponent, he carrying Burnet County by 1,797 votes for BLANTON and only 821 for Smith; and

Whereas in Coleman County, where his opponent Smith maintained headquarters, and from which place Smith's campaign organization distributed much literature, placed many half-page advertisements against BLANTON in newspapers, directed Smith helpers and speakers over the district, and spent much money in efforts to defeat BLANTON, said Coleman being the home of Hon. Leon L. Shield, State Senator Walter C. Woodward, and Mayor E. P. Scarborough, who, in the Coleman Democrat-Voice of May 7, 1926, and in other newspapers over the district, were advertised as being strong supporters of Smith, Congressman BLANTON nevertheless carried each and every one of the 25 voting precincts of said Coleman County by a huge majority in each, he carrying said Coleman County by 3,449 votes for BLANTON and only 865 for Smith; and

Whereas the above demonstrates conclusively that the people of the seventeenth congressional district of Texas are practically unanimous in backing Congressman BLANTON in his fights to eliminate waste, extravagance, and graft from the business of this Government, and that he has their confidence, esteem, and commendation; and

Whereas were he in the United States Senate, Congressman BLANTON could accomplish more for the people and his opportunities there for effecting sane retrenchment of unnecessary expenses and helping to reduce taxes would be greatly multiplied: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Democrats of the seventeenth congressional district of Texas in convention assembled: (1) That we approve and commend the record of Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON and his work in Congress.

(2) That we heartily indorse Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON for the United States Senate and urge him to make the race for that position in 1928, and we pledge him our support; and we especially commend him to the people of Texas as being worthy and well qualified to hold such position with profit and benefit to the people.

* * * * * * *

(7) That we stand for fewer and better laws, for efficiency in public service, and for retrenchment in public expenditures.

ED. S. HUGHES,	M. S. LONG,
Mrs. D. M. OLDHAM, Jr.,	R. G. COGDELL,
W. R. KEEBLE,	Mrs. G. L. GREGG,
JOHN GUITAR,	LLOYD B. THOMAS,
E. N. KIRBY,	D. D. PARRAMORE,
JAS. P. STINSON,	M. B. HANKS,
W. P. HEAD,	*Committee on Resolutions.*

The foregoing resolution was presented to the convention and adopted unanimously.

FRED COCKRELL,
Chairman, Democratic District Convention,
Seventeenth Congressional District of Texas.

Attest:
R. W. HAYNIE,
Secretary of the Convention.

Who are these people who signed and presented this resolution? Hon. Fred Cockrell, chairman of that convention, is the son of a former Congressman, Hon. J. V. Cockrell, of Texas, than whom there has never been a better patriot and statesman. He is a nephew of Hon. Francis Cockrell, a distinguished Senator from the State of Missouri in the United States Senate for years. Fred Cockrell is the best educated and best known farmer in the whole State of Texas.

Who is R. W. Haynie? He is the present president of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, one of the biggest organizations of any kind in my State.

Ed. S. Hughes is a distinguished business man and financier. He has an office to-day in New York City. He is the president of the largest bank and of one of the biggest business concerns in my home city and spends nine months of each year in New York City.

Mrs. D. M. Oldham, jr., is the wife of the Federal referee in bankruptcy in my city, a Democrat appointed by a Democratic judge, not a Republican judge.

Mr. W. R. Keeble is a distinguished and reputable banker in my district.

Mr. John Guitar is one of the largest business men in my district. Hon. E. N. Kirby was for 12 years mayor of his home city. Hon. Jas. P. Stinson was for years prosecuting attorney for an adjoining judicial district to my own judicial district, and he is now the Democratic county chairman of his county, and he is also the Democratic district chairman of my seventeenth congressional district.

Mr. W. P. Head is a distinguished citizen in my district, a prominent ranchman. Hon. M. S. Long is the district judge of that district over which I presided as judge for eight years. Mrs. G. L. Gregg is the wife of a prominent merchant of my district. Mr. R. G. Cogdell is one of the highly respected plumbers of my home city, and a splendid gentleman. Lloyd B. Thomas was formerly a very prominent editor in Texas, but now in another business. Mr. D. D. Parramore is a prominent ranchman. Mr. M. B. Hanks owns one of the largest daily newspapers in my district.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I have the right to take this time under these circumstances. I want to say to my new colleagues in the House, when you know you are right, if every man on this floor is against you, do not be afraid. Do not hesitate to proceed if you know that you are right; but first know that you are right. You will find these men here, your colleagues, the fairest men in the world when they fully understand a proposition. The fairest men on earth are these colleagues of yours when they understand a question.

I came to Congress 11 years ago prejudiced against Hon. Champ Clark, of Missouri, that great statesman, and then I learned to love him. Do you know what caused me to be prejudiced against him? Reading lies about him in the press. I was prejudiced against him—a great man whose greatness will grow greater as the years go on. [Applause.] One day he said to me, "BLANTON, this House is just as full of moods as a dog is full of flees, and when the House gets in a mood nothing on earth will change it; you might just as well let it alone." And that is as true as anything. Our colleagues get in a certain attitude sometimes, and this House is as liable to do a wrong as is an individual when it does not understand the situation; but in the end it will do justice. I have the strongest lifelong friends that I have ever made in my life in this House, and do not you think I do not appreciate my association with all of them. There is no greater honor that can be conferred upon any man than to be a Member of this House, and to my new colleagues I want to say that there is room here for you. You need not be on the Committee on Ways and Means, you need not be on the Committee on Appropriations, you need not be on the great Rules Committee to accomplish things. This committee that is operating right now is the main committee for a Congressman, and all 435 Members of us are members of it, and you have your rights here. If you will stay here on the floor in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when these supply bills are being considered and framed—and here is where they are finally framed—you will find that you have just as much rank and authority here as any other Member if you know the rules, whether you be the chairman of a committee or not. Here is the place where you may exercise your prerogative as a Representative of the people of your district. Here is the place to be heard.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; certainly to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman has made the statement that he loves the House and the Members of the House. It is rumored around in the great Democratic district that I represent, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is figuring on leaving this House. Does he love it so well that he can leave it and go somewhere else? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I shall let the Speaker of this House whom we all love—Democrats as well as Republicans—answer, when he said on Monday that he would rather be Speaker of this House of Representatives than hold any other office within the gift of the people. Is that an answer for the present?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think so, because it is rumored that the gentleman wants to leave this body and go somewhere else in this Capitol and represent a great party and a great State.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not a candidate for any office right now [laughter] but am busy here about the public business, and until the appropriation bills are framed and passed by this body I will not be a candidate for any office. When we get through and pass the supply bills that our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] brings in here to supply with needed funds the departments of the Government, which will be along about the last of February, and after I have performed my duties here as a Representative by working and voting on these supply bills and helping the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to keep them within the budget recommendations, as I expect to do, then after that I may make an announcement for some office of some kind.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman may be persuaded?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not refuse an office if elected. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me further answer the gentleman in this way: I have heard it said there will be

fact that he is or is not a member of any particular religious or fraternal organization. I have stated my position to officers of labor organizations and they have readily agreed that I was entirely right in this viewpoint as Public Printer. Furthermore, for the first time in many years the collection of dues to unions and other organizations has been discontinued in the office during working hours, and this also has been readily acceded to by the representatives of the organizations affected thereby. Likewise the designated representative of the union, or chapel chairman as he is sometimes called, has discontinued the practice of notifying the men in his room when they should begin and stop work, I having taken the position that this is the function of the officers of the Government. Again, I have appointed a number of noncraftsmen to positions which, I understand, at least some of the unions regarded as belonging to their particular trades, and this also has been done without any objection whatever from these organizations.

I also note in your "Extension of remarks" a protest from a helper in the Government Printing Office because such employees have not been given an opportunity to learn a trade in this shop. I respectfully invite your attention to the fact that Congress, in the printing act of January 12, 1895, limited the number of apprentices which the Public Printer might appoint to 25 and that since that time no apprentices have been employed in this office. I am pleased to advise you, however, that several months ago I took up the subject of an apprenticeship system in this office, and under date of August 29 received a report from the committee which I had appointed unanimously recommending the employment of apprentices for the various trades in the Government Printing Office. As soon as the necessary details can be worked out I hope to put an apprenticeship system in effect, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, which has already informally advised me they will gladly assist in such a plan.

I am inclined to believe, therefore, that I have remained faithful to my promise to conduct this office to the best interests of the American people and not at the dictation of any particular clique or organization of men, whether they be unionists or antiunionists. As long as I am Public Printer, whatever my personal views may be, there is only one course for me to pursue, and that is to conduct this office as a shop open to both union and nonunion workmen, at least until Congress may otherwise direct. On the other hand, I can not permit the opponents of organized labor * * * to drive union men out of this office or deny them their rights as American citizens. In other words, union and nonunion men must and do look alike to me, and will receive the same treatment from me so long as I may remain in charge of the Government's printing office.

Yours truly,

GEORGE H. CARTER,
Public Printer.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, last spring, immediately after the adjournment of Congress, I took up the Attorney General's opinion on the McNary-Haugen bill, and I went over it carefully, read all the decisions that he cited, and then dictated a statement which I have before me. I thought possibly this statement might be of interest to those who favor farm-relief legislation, and that is my excuse for taking this opportunity of bringing it to your attention and getting it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE M'NARY-HAUGEN BILL AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION

Mr. Chairman, accompanying the veto message of the President on the McNary-Haugen bill was the opinion of the Attorney General setting forth his constitutional objections to that bill. In the last paragraph of that opinion the Attorney General presents the grounds on which he relies to base his conclusion that the said bill, if enacted into law, would violate the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

First. In that it takes from the President the constitutional Executive power and duty of making appointments to fill the office created by it and by legislation confers that power upon others.

Second. In that Congress delegates its constitutional power of legislation to private cooperative associations and corporations, and individuals acting collectively, and the board created by the statute.

Third. In that it contravenes the provisions of the Constitution against the taking of property without due process of law.

First. The first objection of the Attorney General to the constitutionality of the McNary-Haugen bill was by me discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives in my speeches on the constitutionality of that bill on May 10, 1926, and on February 17, 1927. There is serious doubt in my own mind as to the constitutionality of that portion of the bill providing for the nominating committees. However, as I stated in my speech of February 17 last, the unconstitutionality of the provision for nominating committees would not carry with it the provision creating the Federal farm board itself. These two provisions are clearly separable, so that the invalidity of the former would not impair the validity of the latter. The constitutionality of the provision establishing the Federal farm board has never been questioned to my knowledge by anyone. If the provision for nominating committees is unconstitutional, then it naturally follows that the nominations to the Federal farm board would be made by the President in the usual way. In view of what I have just presented on the separability of the provision for nominating committees, and even conceding said provision is or may be declared to be unconstitutional, I do not regard that the first objection raised by the Attorney General to the constitutionality of the bill presents a justifiable ground on which to base a veto.

Second. The second objection of the Attorney General is that Congress delegates its constitutional power of legislation to private cooperative associations and corporations, and individuals acting collectively, and the board created by statute. This objection against the constitutionality of the McNary-Haugen bill as it was framed in the Senate and passed by the House without amendment during the closing days of the last Congress presents, in my opinion, the most dangerous issue that has been raised against the constitutionality of the bill in the form it was submitted to the President. It behooves the proponents of farm-relief legislation embodying the McNary-Haugen principles to give heed. The Attorney General cites a number of cases to support his position on this point. Before the Attorney General rendered his opinion I had read every case cited by him in support of his second objection, and since reading his opinion I have re-read every case cited by him. It is quite evident that on this point the McNary-Haugen bill of the second session of the last Congress is more vulnerable than was the Haugen bill which was reported to and considered by the House of Representatives during the first session of the last Congress. In fact, I think that the latter bill was free from this constitutional objection. The issue is whether Congress in the McNary-Haugen bill of the second session of the last Congress undertook to delegate its power to make a law. It must be conceded that the Congress can not delegate its power to make a law. In drafting a new bill due weight and careful consideration should be given to this constitutional objection of the Attorney General. In my speech of February 17 I quoted from Field *v.* Clark (143 U. S. 649, at 693, 694) for the guidance of Members of the House in determining what is and what is not a delegation of legislative power. The quotation referred to points out clearly the scope of and the limitations on legislative power in this regard and reads as follows:

> "The true distinction," as Judge Ranney, speaking for the Supreme Court of Ohio, has well said, "is between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and conferring authority or discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first can not be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made." (Cincinnati, Wilmington, etc., Railroad *v.* Commissioners, 1 Ohio St. 88.) In Moers *v.* City of Reading (21 Penn. St. 188, 202) the language of the court was: "Half of the statutes on our books are in the alternative, depending on the discretion of some person or persons to whom is confided the duty to determine whether the proper occasion exists for executing them. But it can not be said that the exercise of such discretion is the making of the law." So, in Locke's Appeal (72 Penn. St. 491, 498): "To assert that a law is less than a law because it is made to depend on a future event or act is to rob the legislature of the power to act wisely for the public welfare whenever a law is passed relating to a state of affairs not yet developed or to things future and impossible to fully know." The proper distinction, the court said, was this: "The legislature can not delegate its power to make a law, but it can make a law to delegate a power to determine some fact or state of things upon which the law makes, or intends to make, its own action depend. To deny this would be to stop the wheels of government. There are many things upon which wise and useful legislation must depend which can not be known to the law-making power and must, therefore, be a subject of inquiry and determination outside of the halls of legislation."

Third. The reasons given by the Attorney General in support of his third objection, that the McNary-Haugen bill contravenes the provisions of the Constitution against the taking of property without due process of law, are not at all persuasive. The only case cited by him in support of his position is Parkersburg *v.* Brown (106 U. S. 487). The main issue in this case was whether the Legislature of West Virginia acted within its constitutional power in authorizing the city of Parkersburg to issue its bonds for the purpose of lending the same to persons engaged in manufacturing, and what the court decided in this case was that the Legislature of West Virginia did not have the power to authorize the city of Parkersburg to issue its bonds for that purpose and, therefore, held the bonds to be void. Among sentences in this case, on which the Attorney General may have relied, are the following on page 501:

Taxation to pay the bonds in question is not taxation for a public object. It is taxation which takes the private property of one person for the private use of another person.

It is difficult to get the bearing of these sentences or of the case as a whole on anything in the McNary-Haugen bill. The bonds in the Parkersburg case were not for a public object. The equalization fee in the McNary-Haugen bill is not a tax. That fee is only imposed on a basic agricultural commodity during an operating period on such commodity. The equalization fee is imposed not to raise money for a public object or for the support of Government or for the discharge of any Government obligation, but that fee is levied in order to support the marketing system which the bill undertakes to set up and is imposed only on so much of any commodity which enters the channels of trade during an operating period. The fee is paid by the persons to be benefited, and in no sense does it constitute the taking of the private property of one person for the private use of another person. In my opinion neither the reasons assigned by the Attorney General nor the court decision cited by him support his third constitutional objection.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. If I have time.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I want to ask the gentleman's opinion, because I regard him as one of the best lawyers in the House, taking the bill as a whole as it passed the last Congress and vetoed by the President, if it was pending in the Supreme Court on a bill of exceptions urging it was unconstitutional, would there not be sufficient legal doubt in respect of the constitutional question raised, in the gentleman's judgment, to invoke the rule that where there is a doubt about the constitutionality of an act it is resolved in favor of its validity and held to be constitutional?

Mr. RAMSEYER. In my early practice of the law I not infrequently undertook to state what the Supreme Court of the State or of the United States would do under certain circumstances. I did not undertake to say in my statement what the Supreme Court would do, but to give my reaction on the Attorney General's opinion.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. What does the gentleman think, under the question submitted, would be the ruling of the Supreme Court?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman in his question stated correctly the rule the Supreme Court would follow in such a case. The court would find for the constitutionality of the act unless the court should find beyond doubt that the act was unconstitutional. Some courts have stated the rule that an act should not be declared unconstitutional unless the court should so find beyond a reasonable doubt. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has only 11 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. How much time does the gentleman need?

Mr. BYRNS. About 10 more minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I surrender 10 minutes of my time.

Mr. BYRNS. Then I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the President of the United States in his message to Congress has again touched upon the subject of agriculture. I take it from his message that his position upon this question has not changed materially from the position he took in the opening session of the last Congress. Now, gentlemen, the President of the United States says that the Congress should have to approach this question—

with a sincere and candid consideration of the different measures to be presented to the Committee on Agriculture for the purpose of solving this difficult and most important question.

For my part I have followed the gentlemen who have advocated the Haugen bill, and I have followed the McNary-Haugen bill. But, gentlemen, I want to say to you Members of this House we have not yet been able to get any relief for the farmer. The President of the United States took the responsibility of vetoing the McNary-Haugen bill, and now that question is back here again. For my part, I propose to vote for any reasonable, sound legislation proposed by the committees of this House, but I do not propose to stand up here and vote for bills for political purposes or to badger the President of the United States. We want relief in the farming and agricultural districts of this country, and we want it now. We are not going to be able to wait until you can discuss whether or not you are going to have a bill exactly as it suits you.

I have supported these bills and have supported them conscientiously and sincerely. But I say it is the duty of this House in accordance with the messages of the President of the United States to go to work and help the President work out an agricultural bill here that will do good to the country, and if it is not just what we want, we do not adjourn forever, and we can make the bill work. I am in favor of getting down to the facts and not playing politics with this proposition. [Applause.] I do not think I can be charged with having played politics on this question. It is a most important question to me and to men who come from districts like mine, and it is no satisfaction to the farmer in my district for me to go back and say, "I made a hard fight, I stood up and worked for this bill, or for that, to the last, but I do not bring any results." It is no consolation to the fellow whose home is being sold out under the hammer to be told that I worked for this bill and voted for it when I knew that the President of the United States was not going to approve it.

I want a bill passed here that we can vote for, a bill that will offer some relief to the farmers of this country, a bill that the President is willing to sign. It is of no use to pass a bill here that is going to be vetoed again, and which can not be passed by a two-thirds vote over the President's veto.

The farmers in my district are in a desperate condition, and that condition is not due to law and not due to economic conditions, but it is due to weather conditions and other specific causes. The pest of the boll weevil went into the southeastern portion of Oklahoma and absolutely destroyed the cotton of that part of the country.

In western Oklahoma there is a bountiful growth of cotton, but in south and central and in southeastern Oklahoma there are hundreds upon hundreds of acres where the farmers were not justified in going in with even one cotton sack; acres upon acres will not produce a hundred pounds of seed cotton; lands which under ordinary conditions would produce a bale of cotton to the acre. That is the condition down there. As I say, it is not due to economic conditions or to political conditions, but to the weather and to pests.

I believe that if the President is as sincere as he says he is, and if Congress is as sincere as I know it is, we ought to go to work here and within 60 days give the farmer something that will give him a chance to get out of the terrible situation he is in now. The newspapers in my section can scarcely find enough space to print the foreclosure proceedings that are going on down in the courts there, and I understand that is the situation in other States also. It is a situation that needs the attention of Congress and the conscientious and sincere study of men who will give their best thought to it without any idea of politics, because it is a nonpartisan question. It is a fundamental question which ought to be dealt with by men without regard to politics. I am satisfied that within a few days this Congress could write a bill that would bring some cheer to the despondent agriculturists of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Are we assured that the Democratic candidate, Al Smith, will not have an agricultural-relief plank in his platform?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say that I hope he will not need to have an agricultural-relief plank in his platform, and I hope this matter will be settled before the assembling of the convention. If we do not settle this farm question here as Democrats and Republicans, it will be doubtful after awhile whether we shall have much to say about it; the people themselves will settle it at the next election. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from Tennessee used all his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has six minutes left.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am 50 years of age to-day. This morning I looked from the window where I room at 411 Fourth Street SE. and for a few minutes reflected on the frailty of man and the shortness of his fleeting hours. His earthly existence is so short, his responsibility is so great, that it must be discharged promptly and in a brief span of years or left undone. I wondered then, and I wonder now, if I and all of us are measuring up to our full responsibility in behalf of the people we represent.

I looked again from the window; to the south I could see Seward Square, named for that splendid statesman. I looked to the north, along Fourth Street, to where the British soldiers marched when the Capitol and White House were burned in the War of 1812. I saw children playing and felt again the

burden that all should feel of doing the things which will give the children of the Nation a chance for the fullest development of their higher and better selves. Along this very street Col. Charles A. Lindbergh played as a child, while his father, then Congressman, lived near by. Over this street the same Lindbergh flew as the most beloved hero in all the world only a few short years later. He was the same noble boy both when he played on the street in his early youth and when he flew through the sky above the street, bringing on the wings of the *Spirit of St. Louis* the justly earned honors of all the peoples of all the earth.

Then I thought again of the children playing on the street, of the little boys and girls of my district and of the Nation, and I wondered how many Lindberghs, Washingtons, and truly great men and women are among them. Then I answered my own question and said—surely they are all great. They are our all in all. They are the boys and girls of to-day and the future preservers and defenders of our Nation, our Christianity, and our every God-given right. Then I said there is but one yardstick by which all of our legislation should be measured, and that is the yardstick of our children's physical, educational, moral, and general welfare.

Oh, that a little child may lead us and that those of us charged with responsibility here would day after day see the hands of untold millions of children held up to us, pleading for better laws, more wholesome and proper enforcement of law, and higher ideals of civic, political, and moral righteousness. I can hear the children now, throughout the length and breadth of our country, pleading for a better chance in all the higher and better spheres of development.

When we think of a change of our Constitution, or statutory law, let us ask whether the interest of the children can be best served by the change. Let us have their welfare at heart, and we will not go wrong.

If Sunday movies, Sunday theaters, Sunday dance halls, Sunday night clubs, Sunday gambling dens, and Sunday desecration generally are helping our boys and girls become nobler men and women, then by all means there should be no law to interfere, but everything possible should be done to encourage and assist these Sunday activities in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere.

If the clear, pure stream of innocent childhood is improved and made better by pouring into it the slush and filth of the movie and theater, the vulgarity of the modern dance, the profanity of the Sunday pool rooms, and the curse of the Sunday night club and gambling den, then those who oppose the Sunday laws are mankind's greatest benefactors and deserve the support of all humanity.

I am an ardent advocate of the "separation of church and State," and the "freedom of religion," but I am frank to confess that, for the very life of me, I can not see how closing Sunday dens and dives of iniquity will bring about the union of church and State, or to the least degree deprive any one of their fullest religious freedom. How can the moral protection by law of our children bring union of church and State, or destroy religious freedom any more than the snatching of our children from a horrible death of their physical bodies would destroy these sacred rights? Ah, Mr. Chairman, my bill to provide Sunday as a day of rest in the Capital of the Nation ought not to be enacted into law if it is not in behalf of the children of the Nation. In fact, there is no law worthy of its place on the statute books which is not in behalf of our children. No book or periodical should have ever been printed which injures the children of the Nation, and no lecture or sermon should have ever been delivered or preached which injures the youth of our land. Mr. Chairman, no sword was ever drawn in behalf of liberty unless it was drawn in behalf of the children, their fathers and mothers, and their homes. So, Mr. Chairman, let us legislate now and in the future in behalf of our children.

I am pleading for farm legislation in behalf of the good fathers and mothers of my district, so they may give to their children the splendid assistance I know they wish for them and which we, as legislators, should gladly bestow. I have made many speeches, introduced many bills in which and by which I am seeking to help the children of my district and the Nation. Legislate for the children and there will be no need to worry about the welfare of the parents. Some may legislate for and serve the corporate interest; but for me, let me serve the children. Give us a land of splendid childhood rather than a nation of politicians and profiteers. Let our motto be—corrupt monopolies and spoilsmen never, restrictions for corporations, equal rights for men and women, and special privileges for children.

May we have farm relief for men, women, and children and not for the exploiter and the profiteer. Let us help the farmer and his family directly, not indirectly; by clear, definite means and not by circuitous, unknown, and unfathomable provisions; through agencies of their friends and not their enemies; by applying the assistance to their own pockets and not through the pockets of others; by helping them make a profit out of their own products and not by setting up an expensive governmental agency to speculate on their products; by making them masters of their own fortune and not by putting their fate in the hands of others; and by making them the masters of the great business of feeding and clothing the world rather than slaves doing the bidding of all others. And let us do all of this for the children and their fathers and mothers of the farm, and the service we render them will inure to the children and the fathers and mothers of our great Nation.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been making some observations and giving you my reflections as I looked from my window this morning. I can not in this short time picture to you all the thoughts in behalf of humanity that then and there came trooping through my mind.

I am 50 years of age and my future service to humanity must necessarily be of short duration. At best life is gone almost before we begin our service to our fellow man—

> Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud,
> Like a swift fleeting meteor, a fast-flying cloud;
> A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
> Man passes from life to his rest in the grave.

But, Mr. Chairman, I looked again from my window to the northward, across the yard of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, where Dr. John Chester, its founder, preached for 30 years, and I saw just beyond the splendid brick home, No. 129 Fourth Street SE., at the northwest corner of B and Fourth Streets SE., the home of the late lamented Senator Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, while he was first serving in the United States Congress several years ago. Then I thought of his most excellent service to humanity and his wonderful contributions to the literary world, and I came to my office and read and reread his beautiful essay "At fifty." The author evidently wrote this from some point on the east coast of Florida, but it could easily have been inspired at any point on the Georgia or Florida coast, with such an author as Watson "At fifty." Let me read some extracts from this inimitable classic:

> A narrow spur of land, stretching out from inlet to inlet, forming a ribbonlike island, closed in upon the east by the Atlantic and on the west by the streams that drain the Everglades—such is the place. Ages and ages ago the wash of the ocean, met by the wash of the rivers, banked up a ridge of sand; and upon this sand nature, in the long run of the years, planted a jungle; and in the tangled mazes of the jungle the deer tramped a trail, the wildcat found a lair, the raccoon made a home, the cougar crouched for squirrels, and the rattlesnakes multiplied. Water fowl of all kinds whirled and screamed as they flew from feeding ground to roosting place; and the redbird, the wren, and the mocker were never more plentiful or musical than here.
>
> The ships in stately procession pass down from north to south; over yonder on the distant horizon you can see the smoke, or the masts, of those that follow the Gulf Stream from the south to the north. Here, on the one hand, is the great world and the ocean; on the other, the inland route—by lake and sound and river—where traffic flows in safer ways and no storm besets the sailor.
>
> Sit here on the wall of the boathouse and gaze southward. A lovelier stretch of water the world does not hold—for the tide is still on and everything is water. A fringe of forest bounding the view southward, a thread of brilliant blue marking the spear thrust which the ocean makes into the brown bosom of the river, the tossing foam which shows where the billows from the sea charge home upon the distant beach; and, over all, the mellow radiance of the sunny afternoon—for the tide is ebbing now, and the sun is going down.
>
> All that the ocean could do at this time has been done—forevermore. The outgoing currents drove back the lake and the river, mounting over them both, marching mile after mile landward, conquering mile after mile of reluctant ground—but the invader could go so far and no farther, and he is now sullenly drawing back into the sea.
>
> Great monsters of the deep followed the invading waters as they rolled toward the Everglades, and many a tragedy that was veiled by the water would make you shudder at its story, if the victim could speak of its cruel fate; but the monsters are drifting seaward now and their battle of life moves to another field.
>
> If you glance over the island you will see that the air is white with butterflies. There are countless thousands of them. They do not fly from flower to flower, some one way and some another, hovering aimlessly or lighting idly here and there, as we dwellers of the upcountry have been accustomed to see them do. These butterflies are drifting all in one direction; these butterflies have no mind to stop; these butterflies neither linger nor hover nor dwadle; these butterflies go drifting from north to south, as though they had been called by some mysterious voice, were fastened to some mysterious purpose, and were the helpless instruments of some mysterious fate.

All day long they have been flying by, over the jungle, over the beach, over the lake, over the sound, over the river, obeying some unheard order, following some unseen leader, answering some unfathomable design.

I wonder what it will all be like when the last tide has rolled backward to the sea, and its monsters come forth no more—for I am 50 years old, and it is the time of the ebbing tide and the declining sun with me.

I wonder whether those creations of the mind, which some of us have thought important, are, after all, as aimless and as fragile and as ephemeral as these butterflies which go streaming past, leaving no trace on earth or sea or sky—for I am 50, and I should like to know whether all this effort of heart and mind leaves the world brighter and better, or whether we are just so many butterflies which yesterday did not know, and to-morrow will forget.

* * * * * * *

Who would be a drone in the hive? Who would be a deserter from the fight? Shall trumpets call strong men to the fields of human effort, and I play dastard? Shall flags float by, with brave soldiers marching forth to the service of duty, and I play the coward?

Never, by the splendor of God!

Better the march and the struggle, and the heartbreak of failure than the selfish refusal to try! Better the battle, the failure, than the selfish refusal to try! Better the battle, the good fight and the defeat, than the craven lurking in the rear.

* * * * * * *

Give me the man who will live and die for his ideals, who will surrender no righteous position without a struggle, who will perish rather than pollute his soul by apostasy from right!

Better—a thousand times better—the tempest and the shipwreck with such a creed than inglorious decay at the wharf, with any other. Better a Waterloo and a glorious death in the squares of the Old Guard than worldly pensions and honors for base betrayal of cause and country.

So I thought at 20. So I think at 50. I have the scars to show for it. And, like any other soldier of the wars, I am proud of them.

Let the tide ebb—it must be so; let the daylight fade, it must be so—but this much any poor mortal can do, and should do: Hold aloft, to the very last, the banner of your creed; fight for it as long as you can stand; and when you go down, let it be possible for you to say to those who love you, "Lay a sword on my coffin, for I also was a soldier in the great struggle for humanity."

Let me say, we should study every legislative proposal from the standpoint of the children, their parents, and their homes. Bring on your farm relief bills and I will decide whether I will support them or not as soon as I determine whether or not they are helpful, directly, to the individual farmer and his family.

Your Muscle Shoals proposals are all camouflage and smoke screen except in so far as they provide now and hereafter for the fullest protection of the ultimate consumer of the power of that great plant, whether it be in the form of fertilizer or electrical energy. Show me wherein the legislative plan is for the benefit of the individual citizen—the farmer and his wife and children, if you please—if you desire my support of the proposition. We must, here and now, protect the rights of our children and generations yet unborn, in the great God-given heritage at Muscle Shoals or by our votes sanction and approve the fleecing of the public—within the law—long after we are gone. God forbid that we should discharge so criminally, so sacred a trust.

We can not afford to become disheartened to the extent of ceasing our fight because of the opposition we encounter, but rather we should surge onward with, ever and ever, more determination.

My people have done more for me than I have ever been able to do for them. In our fight here for the farmer, the laboring man, and the common people we are met by the strongest opposition from every direction and at all times. We can not afford to lessen our efforts but must gird ourselves for a more militant conflict.

We have been able to pass hundreds of small bills for the farmers, for instance, but we have never passed for them a real piece of constructive legislation, such as has been passed for the railroads, the banks, the manufacturing corporations, the shipping interests, and others.

We must admit that they are not getting a square deal. All others fleece them. They, in the long run, pay all the taxes, for all taxes are passed on to the ultimate consumer and eventually to the farmers. Bills are drawn to relieve the taxes of the more wealthy but not of the farmer.

Some say there is no way to help the farmer. This is a false theory. I know definitely where the trouble is and know how it can be remedied. The trouble is the farmers do not have enough friends in Congress. Too many draw bills to help others help the farmers, and the farmers never get the help, or if they get it they pay too much for the service. Let us help them directly. Let us help their children and their folks.

During my service here I have introduced scores of bills and engaged in thousands of contests, but I have found only one true yardstick for the measurement of proposals, and that is the yardstick of the children's interest and welfare. All else is treacherous and sinking sand.

Let us quit playing politics, dodging adverse newspaper publicity, pleading sectionalism, representing the corporations, making money and property the criterion and legislate for folks, for fathers and mothers, and for their children.

If we would serve all that is highest and best we must serve the children. If we would legislate for our communities we must legislate for the children. If we would help our districts and States we must help the children. If we would preserve the Nation we must preserve our children.

If we would strengthen and make imperishable our great Government we must preserve our children and make stronger at every opportunity the laws for their physical and moral welfare and growth.

If we would serve all mankind we must serve the children, and by so doing we will serve Him who said:

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto Me.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this morning, when we entered upon the discussion of the bill, I suggested we would like to fix the time at three hours and that when we began the reading of the bill I would ask for a little more time. I have only five minutes remaining, but I will probably want to ask a little extra time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman allow the Chair to suggest that the time was fixed in the House. The Chair would suggest that the first section of the bill be read and then the gentleman can get whatever time is necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes. I may not use that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the urgent character of the preparation and consideration of this bill is due to the failure of the second deficiency bill and the public buildings appropriation bill during the last session of Congress. The failure of these bills resulted in embarrassment to the business of the Government and to those charged with its administration. The failure has resulted in postponements, stoppages, and great inconvenience in all quarters where funds for the conduct of the Government were short. Many of the most serious situations have been temporarily cared for by exigency measures, which is not good practice.

By the time this bill can become a law, 10 months will have elapsed since the failure of the two bills to which I have called your attention. This passage of time has resulted in many changes in the status of items in those bills. Many are no longer needed at all. Many are needed in decreased amounts and a few are needed in increased amounts. A number have been transferred to the 1929 Budget and will be found there in substantially the same form as in the bills that failed. Many entirely new items, which have arisen since Congress adjourned, are presented for the first time in the bill that is before you.

The estimates submitted for this bill aggregate $205,538,858.02. The bill carries, in the recommendation of the committee, $198,916,264.91, or $6,622,593.11 less than the Budget recommendations.

Several large items make up the total of the bill. We carry for the refund of taxes paid in excess of the amount due $43,000,000.

The Treasury Department has on hand unexpended about $53,000,0000 for this purpose, and this $43,000,000 added will make $96,000,000 with which they will be able to meet the obligations on refund claims between now and the 1st of July.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. How much longer will we have to pay those refunds?

Mr. MADDEN. You will be paying them as long as you are paying taxes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. There is no way of correcting it?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no way on earth to stop you from paying more than you ought to if you make a schedule indicating that you owe more than you do owe. When the audit occurs and they find out you have paid them too much they pay you the money back. It all depends on you and on me. A large part of these refunds is also due to court decisions.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And sometimes you must pay more in order to avoid penalties pending adjustment?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; sometimes. However, most of this is paid because the schedules show an amount in excess of what you really owe. We have paid back from July 1, 1916, to June 30, 1927, $793,000,000. The total internal-revenue collections in that period was $35,000,000,000. Three billion six hundred million dollars of that was collected on underpaid schedules, so that while we have been paying money back on overpaid schedules to the amount of over $800,000,000 we have been collecting on underpaid schedules $3,600,000,000. This would be about $4.50 collected on underpaid schedules for every dollar we have returned on overpaid schedules.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I am very glad to have that go in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. We have an item amounting to $46,000,000 for pensions due the veterans of the Civil War and all other wars. This amount was $37,200,000 in the last deficiency bill. The bill failed and we were obliged to borrow the money from the 1928 appropriation to meet the 1927 obligations. We have to add to that $37,000,000 about $9,000,000 more because of an underestimate for the fiscal year 1928.

Then we have military posts. We have a building fund created from the sale of military property no longer needed for military purposes, and all the moneys that are derived from that source go into a special fund to be used for the construction of military buildings to house the Army. We carry $6,162,000 for post construction, as authorized by the act of February 25, 1927, and $3,680,000 of this comes from that special fund.

We have also military and naval compensation. That is under the Veterans' Bureau, and the amount is $19,400,000 of direct appropriation and a reappropriation of $35,600,000, making in all $55,000,000. I may say here that $19,000,000 of this $55,000,000 is due to an act passed by Congress last year alloting $50 a month to veterans who are classed as arrested tuberculosis cases. Thirty-six thousand of these cases have already been adjusted. There are 60,000 altogether estimated, and this leaves 24,000 to be adjusted. It is estimated that this legislation which you passed, fixing $50 as the monthly compensation in arrested tuberculosis cases, will cost the Government $15,000 per man, based on their expectancy of life, and that altogether for the period of the lives of these men it will cost the Government $900,000,000.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. That basis is upon a consideration of natural health, I suppose, and with these ex-service men having tuberculosis——

Mr. MADDEN. These are arrested tuberculosis cases. The tuberculosis has been stopped in all of these cases.

Mr. ALLGOOD. But naturally their expectancy of life would not be so great.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, I am not an actuary and can not answer the gentleman's question definitely. I am giving the gentleman such information as came to us from the Veterans' Bureau.

You will remember that we have an act approved May 26, 1926, authorizing the expenditure of $165,000,000 for public buildings. The sum of $15,000,000 of that $165,000,000 was intended to be added to the limit of cost of buildings which were authorized in 1913, but which it was impossible to build on account of increased prices due to the war. The amount of $50,000,000 was allotted to be used in the District of Columbia for the erection of additional public buildings, and $100,000,000 was to be used throughout the country, outside of the District of Columbia. The limitations placed by the law on the annual expenditure was in the aggregate $25,000,000.

This bill carries $8,131,000. The bill which failed last session carried nearly $20,000,000 for public buildings. The difference between $8,131,000 and the $20,000,000 has been transferred to the annual Treasury bill in which all public buildings are usually provided for. The reason for this is that $25,000,000 is all that the Government can spend in any one year under the law. With what they have already expended in 1928—and this is for the 1928 fiscal year—and that which they have on hand unexpended, plus this $8,131,000, and what they can use from the next bill, would bring them up to the total of the amount they are authorized to expend. So a number of buildings provided for in the bill that failed have been transferred to the annual bill; but none of these buildings has been set aside except for some very unusual special reason. Practically all of them are provided for in the Treasury bill, and that bill will become a law in the next few months and no rights will be lost.

However, I think it is fair to say, for the information of the House, that on account of the failure of the bill last spring the progress of the public building program has been retarded at least a year, because you can not expend under the law the money within the year on account of the passage of time that could have been expended if we had been able to go on and spend the money that was provided for between that time and the 1st of next July. Therefore we are a year behind.

There will be many buildings delayed more or less on account of the failure of the other bill, and it may be that in the total round-up of the provisions that can be made out of the proposed $100,000,000 to be expended under the act we will not be able to reach all the buildings.

We proposed $100,000,000 more early last spring before we adjourned, as you will recall, and the measure passed the House but did not pass the Senate. I think this bill for an additional $100,000,000 ought to be passed early in this session, and we should increase the limit of annual expenditures for buildings and make it $35,000,000 instead of $25,000,000 a year and give to each State greater elasticity in the creation of the obligations that follow the letting of contracts for public buildings and thereby give to the various sections of the country the advantage of the new facilities that could be afforded out of the additional $100,000,000; and I hope that before long such a bill will be introduced, reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and passed by the House, sent to the Senate, passed by the Senate, and signed by the President. [Applause.]

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. I would like to ask the chairman if any immediate benefit would accrue to the country by authorizing an additional $100,000,000 when the $100,000,000 that has been authorized can not be expended during three years to come, even under a $35,000,000 limit?

Mr. MADDEN. We could fix the limit so there would be an advantage by putting more into it every year, and we could make it more elastic by allowing more to be expended in any one year than is being expended now.

Mr. BUSBY. But as the law stands this additional $100,000,000 that the gentleman speaks of——

Mr. MADDEN. We could modify that, too.

Mr. BUSBY. You could not reach that even with a $35,000,000 limit before three years from now.

Mr. MADDEN. No; but we could modify that act.

Mr. BUSBY. Does not the gentleman think we ought to increase the amount available to more than $35,000,000 a year if we authorize another $100,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. I just suggested that as a mere form of speech. You can do anything you want to do and fix any limit you like; it will be very agreeable to me. I am just suggesting an idea, and I am not tying anybody up to the figures I have indicated.

Then we have an item here of $7,000,000 for flood control. This is an important item. It is an item that was expended without anybody having any authority as to some of it to authorize its expenditure. I am as culpable, perhaps, as anybody, and probably more so. I am willing to go to jail for having violated the law in a good cause, if that is necessary. But this is the situation, and I think every Member of the House ought to know about it.

The Mississippi floods were terrible. The loss of property and of life was appalling. Nobody can dream of the terrible situation that existed there unless he saw it.

The Mississippi River Commission had on hand about $3,100,000 when the floods receded low enough so they could begin to do some work to protect for the future. They had the right to spend this $3,100,000 as they thought proper. The expenditure of this money was strictly within the law. They had already expended about $1,900,000 of their funds before this question which I am about to describe to you was raised, and many people were telling about the need of $20,000,000 more to

fill up the gaps that were washed out of the levees by the floods. One hundred and seventeen, I think, was the total number of crevasses.

Some of these needed as much as 2,000,000 yards of filling. There was a danger of a flood from fall rains, and the danger that would follow from the new floods with these crevasses that were open and no money to meet the emergency. It was suggested that we use the money that was on hand for the Mississippi River Commission. Then the further suggestion that we authorize the Secretary of War to use $2,000,000 from the river and harbor fund. It was clear that the Secretary of War had no authority to use money for this purpose. The matter was submitted to the Comptroller General, who rendered an opinion that nobody had authority to authorize the expenditure. That decision was clearly within the law.

I was away, the President was anxious, and the Secretary of War was willing to act, and everybody along the Mississippi River trembled with fear of another flood. It was some time before they could reach me. I had no more authority than anybody else, but I happened to be chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It was like it was in the war when we ordered ships to be built to carry troops and supplies. We authorized the President to use the Shipping Board to build the ships. The only reason we used it was that that was the nearest thing that sounded like ships, and, although they knew nothing about it, they built them.

So they came to me because I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee. They asked me to authorize the expenditure of $2,000,000 outside of the law and take a chance of getting Congress to ratify my action. I wrote to the Comptroller General, got a copy of his decision, and I agreed with every word of it. I wrote and told him that if I had been in his place I would have rendered the same decision that he did, but perhaps not with as much ability. There are times in one's life when it is more important to meet a great emergency than it is to obey the law. I was in a position where I would prefer to meet the emergency than to obey the law.

Congress was not in session, and I could not appeal to Congress for the money. So I said to the Secretary of War—and the President and the Director of the Budget agreed—that the Secretary of War was the party to carry out the mandate, if you call it that. He was ready to go to jail with me if we had to go to jail for doing it. So we authorized the expenditure of $2,000,000, with the hope that when the work was done the Congress would see the justice of the expenditure. Here we are. We come to you to pay back the $5,000,000 that was spent by the Mississippi River Commission out of funds it had and the $2,000,000 allotted by the Secretary of War out of the river and harbor fund. The $7,000,000 was used to fill up these crevasses.

The crevasses were filled up and the property of the people down there was protected. The expenditure was made for a legitimate purpose and we ask you to ratify it by appropriating the $7,000,000 that I have described and validate the action that was taken.

Then we have $9,300,000 in this bill to cover the increased limit of cost on the airplane carriers *Saratoga* and *Lexington*. That will bring the total cost of the two carriers up to $77,000,000. They are the two biggest craft of their kind in the world, and the fastest and most expensive.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will this be the last increase?

Mr. MADDEN. One is already in the service and the other will be as soon as we can get her out in the stream from behind the bridge where she now lies.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There have been three or four increases.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; they were built on cost plus, and they have been coming up from $30,000,000 to $40,000,000. They have the speed and size, and they will give the service. The life of these ships is not very long, and still we have to have them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They have too much size; it would be better if they were smaller.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we have got them, and we are meeting the obligations placed upon us.

Now, in reference to the submarines. It used to be, not long since, when you could build a battleship at a cost of $5,000,000. Now submarines cost $7,000,000. A cruiser would cost about $4,000,000, and now they cost $20,000,000. And yet we are going to build a lot more cruisers, and we will have to have them to meet the obligations placed upon us by—what shall I say—the atmosphere existing between the different peoples of the world or between the leaders of the world.

Then we have the Cape Cod Canal that has been with us a long time. The legislation enacted in connection with this canal has placed upon us an obligation of $5,500,000.

When the act was passed they wanted $7,000,000, of which $1,500,000 was for interest. We refused to allow them to collect the interest, and we are carrying this item here without interest, at the principal figure of the cost agreed to under the contract.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the balance of the $11,000,000, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. There are $6,000,000 of bonds existing on the property, and $5,500,000 is for other property of various kinds. When we pay the $11,500,000 the Cape Cod Canal will probably serve a very useful purpose, after we have spent about $25,000,000 more on it.

Mr. BLANTON. And after they get this sum the gentleman assures that they will not get this interest?

Mr. MADDEN. They will not as long as I have anything to say about it.

Mr. BLANTON. As long as the gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but I do not want to take up too much of the time of the committee on this. We have a great many items in the bill. Some of them are controversial. One of them perhaps I ought to explain at this time. The Secretary of the Navy came and wanted $4,500,000 with which to buy oil to fill the tanks that were built by the Doheny people and others in Hawaii and at Portsmouth. It is a good thing to fill the tanks, because they belong to the United States and the Supreme Court has decided definitely that these tanks do belong to the United States beyond the right of those people to sue for them. Of course, they can come to Congress, and I understand that they will, but as far as I am concerned I am opposed to the payment of one cent to anybody on that account. [Applause.] However, they wanted the right to fill the tanks, but they wanted the right to take the money out of the receipts from royalty oil and put it into this fund instead of into the Treasury, and then pay for the oil out of that. I am opposed to that. If they want $4,500,000 with which to buy oil to put into the tanks, I am for that by direct appropriation, but I am not in favor of letting anybody use any money that does not come into the Treasury first, to be appropriated by the Congress. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. So we have eliminated the provision for this $4,500,000.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is it not true that the original contract was made by the Navy to avoid the necessity of coming to Congress and asking for this appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid that it was.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And now that we have caught them with the goods on, they want Congress to forgive them.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid it was, but I am not willing that they should repeat it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. We have another item recommended by the Budget, not all here, of $13,150,000, half of which we have for this bill. It was intended to be used for improvements on the battleships *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, putting the blisters on and otherwise improving them. It had included within it, without saying so specifically, the sum of $940,000 for the elevation of guns on 2 ships. There are 13 of these ships on which the guns were to be elevated. Nothing was specifically said about the elevation of the guns in the proposal that came to the committee, and I was not willing, nor was any other member of the committee willing, to come to the House with the proposal and ask you to appropriate what would result in the expenditure of $6,500,000, including this item here, without knowing what you were voting on, and so to make this question one that would raise the issue and give you knowledge of what it is we are proposing, the committee, at my suggestion, struck out the $940,000 for the elevation of the guns and wrote a proviso into the bill following the rest of the appropriation to the effect that no part of that money should be used for the elevation of the guns on these two ships. And this morning we had a friend who hurt his throat telling you how iniquitous the committee is and how it assumed arbitrary authority to deny the right of the House to express its opinion. Of course, no reply will be made to that.

What we want you to know is that the committee considers itself the servant of the House, and we consider that we owe certain obligations to the House, and that one of the greatest obligations we owe to the House is to let the House know what it is we are asking you to do. Therefore, we wrote this proviso into the bill so that you could not avoid knowing that you were

being asked to vote $940,000 to elevate the guns on these two ships. But they say, or our friend said, "Why do they take superior power, why do they presume to have the right to think—did not we think for them? Did not the Naval Committee bring a bill in here last year and tell them what to do, and why do not they do it?" Well, they did not tell us what to do, and you voted on the bill, but there is nothing in the bill that says that you are going to be asked to appropriate the money to elevate these guns—not a thing. They avoided that, and the answer to that charge is that it was stated in the report. But, gentlemen, the report is not a part of the law. They have not bound and gagged us and stopped us from thinking and informing you of what we have been thinking. We have noted that there is no specific law on the subject of elevating the guns. There was nothing in the proposal that came to us to indicate that any of this money was to be spent specifically for elevating the guns. As loyal servants of the House we believe that we must come to you and tell you in this important case what it is we are seeking to do.

If they vote to do a thing we ask them not to do they will have done that with notice, and that will be our action as well as theirs. But if we come and do not tell you, you would have just cause for complaint. You would have the right to denounce us then because we had failed in the performance of our duty and say we were not only neglectful but that we have not the faculty to think, and that would be a proper charge then. Now we come to you and say that we have studied this problem of gun elevation. We have been informed from sources that have no information and those sources have been in the vicinity of the Navy, if they are not directly connected with it. We find the Japanese guns have been elevated—they said the English guns have been elevated, but they have not been able to prove that. They said the Japanese had. I said, "All right, are you sure; if not sure do not deceive us. Give us information upon which we can act intelligently and let us not be in a position where we have got to deceive the House on account of our ignorance. We want to know, and we will not deceive them, because our policy is to work in harmony with the House and give them all the information we possess." Well, they sent up two pictures of the gun elevation of the Japanese Navy. The guns are standing up rather erect in those pictures, but when we asked the direct question if these guns were elevated before the treaty on the limitation of armaments or after, they could not tell. They said the picture indicated they had. Now you know when the question of the elevation of guns was up once before, we appropriated $6,500,000 for elevation. We entered into a treaty. I did not know the legal limitations placed upon our right to do those things, I am not a lawyer, but I have investigated a great many phases of the case, and I have no object in the world except to bring the truth to you. I have no object in the world now except to bring the facts and let you act upon the facts as you see proper.

We appropriated $6,500,000, and I said then when the matter was before the Committee on Appropriations if there is any doubt about our right to do this under the treaty I was opposed to it. I was told there was no doubt about our right to do it, but I did not want to take the responsibility. I know our Navy and our guns ought to be as efficient as any Navy or guns anywhere; that is the way I want them. I did not want to take the responsibility of doing a thing as a Representative that I would not do as an individual citizen of the United States. I am not going to do that now. You can criticize all you want to.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is it not true that we have naval attachés in Japan and Great Britain and everywhere else?

Mr. MADDEN. It is.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Can not the Navy Department, through its attachés or the State Department, find out something about these foreign navies? They know all about ours. Can not they find out whether the guns have been elevated and whether they were elevated since the treaty or before the treaty?

Mr. MADDEN. I will just answer that question in this way. When we appropriated the last $6,500,000 I had some doubt about it, and we wrote a provision in the act submitted to you that this money could not be used if it violated the treaty. We did not know whether it did or not. Then it turned out there was some doubt about whether it violated the treaty or not, that they did not tell the truth about it, and our fellows—I am going to tell this story, which I think ought to be told.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Tell it.

Mr. MADDEN. I demanded the facts, and I got this statement: There were two naval officers, one an American naval officer and the other an Englishman, and they were in a convivial condition, I understand. They were sitting around eating rich food, drinking mineral water over in England, and each one told a story and talked of this, that, and the other, and finally the Englishman said that his navy was the best, that she had the longest range, that they had elevated their guns on certain ships. Our man told this to somebody else, and somebody else said they had been told the story by some one who saw the guns while they were being elevated, and the next man who told it said he was told by somebody who saw them after they were elevated, and the next man telling the story said he was told by somebody who saw them when they shot the range. I understand they have never been elevated—not since the treaty—they may have been elevated before, but I do not know. Now, I am not asking you to do anything except to believe me when I say we are bringing you the facts as we find them, and you must do as you like with them. [Applause].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Capitol power plant: For maintenance, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, $178.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to call your attention to the fact that I have just placed in the bill hopper a bill to regulate lobbyists and to disclose their interest in legislation before the Congress; I ask each and every Member of Congress to consider the provisions of this bill.

An editorial recently appearing in the Wisconsin News, one of the Hearst newspapers published in Milwaukee, Wis., contains such a forceful argument in favor of this legislation that I shall read it into the RECORD. I believe this editorial has appeared in every Hearst paper throughout the country, because I find it in the Washington Times for November 21, 1927, as well as many other of the Hearst newspapers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman say he believes in the principles advocated in all the Hearst papers?

Mr. SCHAFER. Not all of them. However, I believe in many of them, including those indicated in the editorial which I am about to read.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted to be sure about that.

Mr. SCHAFER. I agree with a great many of their editorial policies, such, for example, as to the modification of the Volstead Act. [Laughter.] I read:

FORCE LOBBYISTS INTO THE OPEN—CONGRESS SHOULD FOLLOW WISCONSIN'S EXAMPLE

Congress, soon to assemble, must do one job of house cleaning before the session closes. It is that of putting into the open lobbyists of all brands receiving compensation for their services, that Congress and the country may know their connections, if not their methods.

One writer has described the swarms of lobbyists as the "third house of Congress." They are brazenly, perniciously active at all times. The majority of Members of Congress do not know the truth as to their activities and their connections. The public knows nothing unless the President or some statesman forces an investigation of lobbying processes, which seldom happens.

HIRAM JOHNSON comes out with charges that the Electric Power Trust is again prepared to spend immense sums of money to defeat the Boulder Dam project or any other legislation in Congress that does not suit the mighty combination of electric power and electric interests in this country.

Aside from the matter of Boulder Dam, lobbyists do swarm in the Halls of Congress, visit committee rooms, entertain persons of influence, and get away with things the American people would not tolerate if they knew the facts.

These lobbyists can be brought into the open. They can be controlled. They can be prevented from underground work that is a disgrace to the country.

That they have the right to present their affairs to Congress is not questioned. Every American citizen on legitimate business has the right to petition Congress, to present his views there, or to any other governmental agency. No law will attempt to prevent that.

The paid lobbyists may be reached by a law requiring their registration at the Capitol. Massachusetts and Wisconsin have such laws and they are reasonably effective.

Upon dockets are entered the names of all persons employed as legislative counsel or agents. These entries must include the names of employers; the names, residences, and occupations of the employees; the dates of employment, agreements, etc., and even the subjects of legislation engaged upon, with the titles and numbers of bills.

Lobbyists are denied admission to the floors of the legislative chambers, to cloakrooms, reading rooms, or reception rooms.

The Wisconsin law requires that legislative agents or counsel whose names appear on the legislative dockets must file, within 30 days after the close of a session, complete and detailed statements of expenses under oath.

There are suitable penalties for violating the provisions of these laws, as there should be.

The leadership of conservative Massachusetts and progressive Wisconsin could safely be followed by Congress. It should be followed by that body.

The country is entitled to know what interests are attempting to influence important legislation in Congress. It is entitled to light, not darkness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. May I have another minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. My bill is patterned after the laws of Wisconsin. If enacted into law, it will bring to the light of day the interests represented by lobbyists and their employers, and will also prevent former Members of this House and of the Senate during the time in which they are employed as paid legislative agents or lobbyists from coming upon this floor or the floor of the Senate. It is highly improper for a former Member of Congress to have the privilege of the floor of this House and the cloak rooms and mingle with the Members during a period in which he may be the highest paid lobbyist in the country, perhaps employed by such an insidious organization as that which is now making such extraordinary efforts to procure the repeal of the Federal inheritance tax. I feel that the majority of the membership of this House, after reading my bill, will reach the conclusion that it is fair and just and that its enactment is highly desirable by the Congress and a great majority of the people of America. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATER DEPARTMENT—OUT OF THE WATER REVENUES

For purchase of a site for a new third high service reservoir, $34,000, in addition to $50,000 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927: *Provided*, That the amounts herein specified shall be available until June 30, 1928, for the acquisition of such site in accordance with a final award in condemnation proceedings.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: On page 22, after line 24, insert the following: "The rates of assessment in effect on June 30, 1927, for laying or constructing water mains or service sewers in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of the act of April 22, 1904, shall continue in effect during the remainder of the fiscal year 1928 and thereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, $1,880,000, to remain available until expended, being part of $7,500,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1928 by the act approved June 22, 1926, and authorized to be apportioned and prorated among the States and obligated by contracts and otherwise by the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we shall return, before the completion of the reading of this bill, to this point in the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the nature of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. COLLINS. It is an amendment which is identical with the item carried in the bill of last year.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection to returning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to return to this point in the bill, before the completion of the reading of the bill, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount to enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic-wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $2,500.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: On page 26, line 22, add: "*Provided*, That hereafter all statements for publication shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval before they shall be given out for publication by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that, but will withhold it if the gentleman from Alabama desires to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I see where the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is asking for $25.53 to be placed to the credit of the Curtis-Martin Newspapers (Inc.) for advertising. This bureau did some very unfavorable advertising, so far as the Southern States are concerned, this year by reason of a statement issued, which, in my opinion, was uncalled for and was without the bounds of the law as prescribed. The law provides:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton," approved March 3, 1927.

And the law provides for certain statements to be issued by the Department of Agriculture. But it seems to me that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics went beyond its authority under the law in making an extraneous statement which unfavorably affected the sale of our cotton right at the time it was being marketed. This Bureau of Economics made a statement that "compared with former years of production and consumption, they expected to see cotton sell at a considerably cheaper price"; and as the result our cotton market broke $10 a bale immediately upon the issuance of this statement. We have never been able to overcome that lick or stroke from behind. The psychology of it was bad. It is like saying something evil about the character of a man or a woman; it is hard to overcome. We have not been able to overcome this stroke that was made by this Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This statement was of such a character that the people of the Nation know that it should not have been made.

It has cost us millions of dollars. It caused our people to sell their cotton at a low price because thousands of them could not hold it. Poor men, the men who really needed the best price for their cotton, were forced to sell at that time because they had debts that were due and had to be paid.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was that a forecast of the crop?

Mr. ALLGOOD. No; it was a statement that was not authorized by law. It was an extraneous statement, and one absolutely unauthorized under the law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was the statement erroneous?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Yes; it was erroneous.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They issue regular bulletins as to the amount of the crop?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Yes; according to law. But we have not been able to understand why the Department of Agriculture, the department that is supposed to be the friend of the farmer and to safeguard the interests of the farmer—we of the South were not able to understand why the Bureau of Economics of the Department of Agriculture would issue a statement like this. It caused such a furor over the country that the President called a Cabinet meeting and there were orders given that no such statement should be made hereafter. But this present administration is going out and we do not know who will hold the reins of Government hereafter, and we would like to be safeguarded and protected.

Therefore I have seized this occasion on the first day of this session of Congress that this House has done any legislative business to bring this matter to the attention of the Members of the House and have seized this opportunity to offer this amendment which will prevent by law the issuance of similar statements in the future. I hope the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will see fit to withdraw his point of order against the amendment and give this House the opportunity to adopt the amendment, but if he feels that he can not do so, I want to say now that I will appeal to the Committee on Agriculture to bring in a bill that will do what my amendment would do, and I shall leave nothing undone to get this bill enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is a change of law.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt in the opinion of the Chair as to the fact that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians (tribal funds): To enable the Secretary of the Interior to make payment of fees to the attorneys of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, under a tribal contract approved October 12, 1923, fiscal year 1928, $85,000, payable out of the fund held in trust for said tribes under the provisions of Public Resolution 36, approved June 12, 1926.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of my colleague [Mr. McKEOWN] to return to this point in the bill to-morrow in order to offer an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I told the gentleman from Oklahoma that we would not foreclose his right to offer his amendment to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to return to this point in the bill to-morrow for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. McKEOWN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF EDUCATION

Education of natives of Alaska: Not exceeding $3,064.84 of the unexpended balance of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1926 shall be available for the payment of obligations, as follows: Traveling expenses, $625, and freight, including operation of U. S. S. *Boxer*, $2,439.84, in addition to the amounts appropriated for those objects under this head for said fiscal year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed by the Ways and Means Committee to make a favorable report on H. R. 1, to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that I have until midnight to-night to file that report. I understand the request is entirely agreeable to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until 12 o'clock to-night to file its report on the tax bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but I want to ask the gentleman a question. I note that the gentleman's committee has incorporated a provision in the bill increasing the salaries of the legislative counsel to $10,000 each.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee over that matter?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The committee's jurisdiction is entire. We created that office and fixed the salary originally.

Mr. BLANTON. What I mean is this: Has the committee jurisdiction to create the office and fix the salary? Because the committee did wrong once and got away with it is no reason why it should keep on doing wrong.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The committee did not do wrong and is not doing wrong now.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about the merits of the proposition, but the assumption of authority and jurisdiction by this great Committee on Ways and Means, which it probably does not have.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not think the gentleman is correct about that. We would not put it in the bill if we did not have the authority.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is necessary or not, but I want to reserve all points of order on that bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think the gentleman will object when I explain the provisions of the bill. This particular provision applies only as long as the office is filled by the present incumbent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing two resolutions of the legislative assembly of my State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two resolutions adopted by the legislature of his State. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following concurrent resolutions adopted by the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota. These were received by me after the adjournment of the last session of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Robert Byrne, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the twentieth legislative assembly on the 28th day of February, 1927.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this, the 28th day of February, 1927.

[SEAL.] ROBERT BYRNE,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution (introduced by Mr. R. O. Signalness and Mr. Walter Tester) memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish the Roosevelt National Park in Billings County, N. Dak., and to provide for the substitution of public lands of the United States for the State school lands located within the proposed park area

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill to establish the Roosevelt National Park in Billings County, N. Dak., introduced by Congressman SINCLAIR, of North Dakota, December 7, 1925, being H. R. 3942; and

Whereas the tract of land in such proposed park consists of the petrified forest and the famous "Bad Lands" lying on both sides of the Little Missouri River in Billings County, N. Dak., where Theodore Roosevelt operated his historic cattle ranches and hunted wild game in the early history of Dakota Territory, and which tract is admirably fitted by nature for scenic purposes and preserves in its natural state the mountainous character and the wild, unchanged condition which existed in the West 50 years ago, and which tract it is practicable and appropriate to preserve as a national park in the honor of Theodore Roosevelt, in the interest of American scenic beauty, and as a relic of the traditional pioneer conditions of the West, which have all but disappeared from the North American Continent; and

Whereas there is included in said proposed park area approximately 42,000 acres of public lands belonging to the State of North Dakota known as State school lands, which was granted to it by the United States under sections 10 and 11 of the enabling act of February 22, 1889, to be held in trust by the State of North Dakota for the common schools, which lands, on account of its rough and barren character, can not be sold for the minimum price of $10 per acre, as prescribed in section 11 of said enabling act, and from which the State of North Dakota gets only a nominal income; and, it further appearing that it would be expedient to exchange the said State school lands located within such proposed park area for public lands of the United States of like quantity, character, and value located in the vicinity of such proposed park: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this twentieth legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby indorses said Roosevelt National Park project and respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to establish a national park as provided for in said H. R. 3942; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress, in furtherance of said park project, make appropriate provisions for exchanging with the State of North Dakota public lands of the United States, of equal quantity, character, and value, for the State school lands lying within said proposed park area heretofore granted to the State of North Dakota under the provisions of sections 10 and 11 of the enabling act of February 22, 1889; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen for the State of North Dakota.

JNO. W. CARR,
Speaker of the House.
C. R. VERRY,
Chief Clerk of the House.
WALTER MADDOCK,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Robert Byrne, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the twentieth legislative assembly on the 28th day of February, 1927.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this the 28th day of February, 1927.

[SEAL.] ROBERT BYRNE,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution introduced by Senator Martin

Be it resolved by the senate and house of representatives: Whereas during a period of the World War the United States Government established and fixed an arbitrary price upon the value of wheat cereal; and

Further, the Government organized and maintained a corporation which purchased and took over, handled, and resold all of the wheat grown in the United States, and prescribed certain rules and regulations concerning the sale, distribution, and consumption of the same; and

Further, that during the years 1919 and 1920 the United States Government made urgent requests of the farmers and wheat growers of the United States to put forth an effort to increase and swell the volume of wheat for consumption in the United States and for export, in order that a famine situation might be averted; and

Further, that contrary to the implied promise of the United States Government that it would continue to support the market for wheat and would maintain the price of wheat in 1919 and 1920 upon relative price level with that which was guaranteed and maintained during the period of the actual continuance of the operations of the World War; and

Further, that the Federal Government neglected to redeem its implied promise to so do; and

Further, the market price for wheat for the said years dropped considerably below the minimum price guaranteed by the Federal Government through the Federal Grain Corporation, and that by reason thereof the wheat farmers of the United States sustained tremendous losses on account of the said reduction and price;

Further, that the cost of the production of the 1919 and 1920 wheat crop was vastly enhanced by reason of the scarcity of labor and the consequent high prices paid therefor, and the high prices prevailing for all implements, machinery, and supplies necessarily used by the wheat farmers of the United States in the production of said 1919 and 1920 crops; and

Whereas the said United States or Federal Grain Corporation closed out and ceased its operations with a large surplus in the Treasury, which said surplus represented profits realized by the said Federal Grain Corporation during the period of the war, when it operated and enjoyed a complete monopoly of the wheat markets of the United States, and through said power and influence it exercised a dominant power over the markets of the world, and that in justice and equity the said surplus belongs to the wheat growers of the United States of America;

Whereas the Federal Government after the close of the World War and the termination of its contract with the manufacturers of war materials and supplies, many such manufacturers were settled with and paid large sums as a remuneration for losses sustained on account of the contract relation existing between the Federal Government and the said manufacturers;

Whereas, further, the Federal Government settled with paid claims of the railroads and transportation companies with which it had contracts, either expressed or implied, for the transportation of war material, soldiers, sailors, etc., and that large sums were paid to said transportation companies in settlement of claims which they presented to the Federal Government, many of which claims were not covered by express contracts;

Whereas the Federal Government during the period of war by its rules and regulations assumed to dictate and control the production acreage of wheat grown in the United States during the period of actual hostilities and for the years 1919 and 1920, being the reconstruction period after the war, and in consequence thereof an implied contract arose between the wheat growers and the Federal Government, and the wheat growers relied upon the said implied contract and in justice and right should be remunerated for their losses in a sum not less than a price guaranteed by the Federal Government for wheat during the period of hostilities;

Whereas the Federal Government realized a profit at the expense of the wheat grower and that the wheat grower in good faith complied with all the rules, regulations, and requests of the Federal Government, it is the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota that in justice and equity Congress should take full cognizance of these millions of dollars now in the National Treasury so retained and belonging to the wheat growers of the United States; that this money should be made available to use in any manner required in connection with legislation which should be enacted at the earliest possible date, establishing for the grower of wheat in the United States a price for his product, based upon American standards of living and costs.

Further, that a copy of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota and forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

WALTER MADDOCK,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.
JNO. W. CARR,
Speaker of the House.
C. R. VERRY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR FESS

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the speech delivered by Senator FESS, of Ohio, last night in the city of Washington.

Mr. SCHAFER and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on what subject?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It is a speech delivered before the Republican National Committee.

Mr. SCHAFER. It is not a prohibition speech?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Senator SIMEON D. FESS:

Senator FESS. Chairman Butler, ladies and gentlemen of the National Republican Committee, your committee are the directing body in aiding the American electorate to a final decision upon the administration of the affairs of the National Government. Under our constitutional system this decision comes every four years. Since the organization of the Republican Party there have been 18 such contests, covering 66 years. In 14 of these campaigns the party you represent has been commissioned to the responsible task covering 50 of the 66 years. You are met here to make preliminary plans for the campaign of next year.

You are to be congratulated on the grounds upon which you seek a favorable verdict from the people. The past is secure. The progress of the Nation since the close of the Civil War is conceded to be the record of accomplishment by the Republican Party, only twice interrupted when Cleveland and Wilson were placed in power. During Wilson's administration the leadership in prosecuting the World War was supplied by the Republican Party, although in the minority.

PRINCIPLES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Strong, efficient party organization is essential to the proper dissemination of its principles and accomplishments. The principles of the Republican Party have been added to as conditions required, but time has not yet proven any of them unsound. Accomplishments of the Republican Party are the bright spots of our history based upon those sound principles.

At the close of the World War the American electorate, with an unprecedented vote, commissioned our party to the task of rebuilding the Nation, when the problems of peace were as acute as those of war. We are now entering upon our eighth year of that task. You are come to present our case before the American people for their approval. It is upon that record you will ask a decision. A public debt of $26,500,000,000 has been reduced to less than $18,000,000,000. An annual interest charge of a fraction over $1,000,000,000 has been reduced to $670,000,000. In this connection it should not be overlooked that the Executive, the spending agency, was under control of our opponents until March 4, 1921; Congress, the appropriating agency, was under the control of the Republicans from March 4, 1919. The record will disclose savings

of hundreds of millions of dollars estimated and recommended by the Democratic President but denied by the Republican Congress. The payment of every dollar of the public debt since March 4, 1919, was made possible by the Republican Congress in power since that date. The payment of a billion dollars per year, at an annual saving of forty-five millions in interest, does not seem so stupendous until viewed in the light of the payment of the Civil War debt of but two billions in 60 years. Stupendous as has been this accomplishment it did not prevent progressive reduction of the burdens of taxation in 1922 to the amount of $835,000,000; in 1924, an additional $400,000,000; and in 1926, an additional $387,000,000, totaling a saving of something like four and a quarter million dollars per day every day in the year. We are now preparing to save an additional half or three-quarter million per day at an early date in the present session of Congress.

Valuable as are these accomplishments, they could not have been realized were it not for a governmental policy of applying the burdens in such a way as to insure business activity, upon which depended the flow of revenue to the Treasury in the form of taxes. One of the most important tasks was revision of our taxing system so as not to dry up the channels of business. There is still work ahead of us in this particular field. You have heard discussed this evening the part legislation has played in solving these problems. Let me now indicate what has been done by the administrative department of the Government.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING

The most outstanding feature of this problem is the manner in which the financial operations of the Government have been carried on. The absorption of the liquid assets of the banks to care for the hang over of over $3,000,000,000 of unfunded Government debts denied to industry at least $7,000,000,000 of credit. Its worst phase was an unemployment problem of 5,000,000 men. The immediate task was to release these funds for industry. The success is well known.

The next task was to refund or retire the Victory notes of four billion plus, due in May, 1923. The manner in which this was done is well known. Including the three-fourths billion dollars of war-savings stamps, here were maturities due amounting to nearly $8,000,000,000 adjusted by short-time refunding and retirement at a lower rate of interest without disturbing the business activity of the Nation.

The Treasury then took up the second Liberty loan of $3,407,000,000, due in 1942. By September of this year all but three-fourths of a billion dollars had been cared for at convenient maturities so as to enable the Government to take care of them when due. The September financing was at 3⅛ per cent. The Treasury is now ready to take up the third Liberty loan of $2,147,000,000, due next October. Here are financial operations approaching $14,000,000,000 readjusted at lower rates of interest and handled in such manner that neither the national structure is strained nor the industrial organization interrupted. If there is any approach to this success in the financial history of any country or at any time, I am not aware of it. It suggests what might have been done had we had less ability in the management.

SUSTAINED PROSPERITY

One, if not the greatest, achievement of this administration is sustained prosperity through stabilization of industry by which the country is saved from the calamitous results of the cycle in business where a low level follows a high level of business activity. It has ever been the course of industry to follow a period of great prosperity with one of great depression. This had come to be looked upon as an inevitable situation which could not be avoided. So general was this rule that one period was always looked upon as a warning to the country of the other. Even to-day every recession of business is a warning to the business world of the beginning of the looked-for depression. We are far in the sixth year of a high level of business, the longest sustained level of our experience, where the volume is beyond that of any period in our history. Production has gradually increased, and is generally higher in 1927 than any year of this period of phenominal enterprise. This increase extends to manufactures, mining products, and electric-power production. It is many points beyond pre-war production.

The construction program for the past five years reached a volume of six billion per year, or thirty billion. The present year may reach $7,000,000,000, a volume never before reached.

Agriculture, the first to feel the hurt and last to find relief, has gradually approached an equal price level with industry.

Transportation, a fair barometer of conditions, has reached its highest plane of service. The year 1927 furnishes the country with the greatest volume of traffic, the greatest number of weekly car loadings, the most expeditious and safe transit, the cheapest service, with least delays due to scarcity of equipment ever experienced in the history of transportation.

Labor is better employed, in more stable condition, at the highest scale of wage in history.

The price current of money is reasonable, and wholesale and retail sales are slightly lower. If this recession were due to failure of market, it would be disturbing, but since it is due to efficiency in industry, where cost is lowered without reducing wages, it is the soundest economy, as it thereby increases the purchasing power of the public, the best barometer of sound prosperity.

The American standard of living is not only the highest of all countries, but it is higher to-day in America than ever before, almost double what it was before the World War. This standard does not only display itself in the purchasing power of the average citizen, but especially in his savings, and our national income.

This period of high business level, beginning with the program of "work and save" of this administration, is not accidental, but the result of sound economic judgment applied to the Government's business and keeping the door open to enterprise, both the organization of new and the expansion of old.

Our industrial leaders have been concerned about when we shall reach the saturation point. They fear that production will produce an unsalable surplus, when industry must slow down, and by breaking down the buying power, be compelled to slow down indefinitely to the great hurt of the suffering public. The recent slowing down of steel was to them a warning. The falling off of freight likewise gave them a scare. But when the new car reaches production which will revive the auto trade, steel will again reach capacity.

When it is learned that coal, the chief element of freight, had been moved at an earlier period when car loading had reached the peak, the scare was relieved.

It has been an ambition of this administration to prevent an undisposable surplus in industry, by adopting the "from hand to mouth" policy of production to hold it within the limits of consumption. When production is for storage rather than consumption, danger is ahead. Whether overproduction or underconsumption, the situation invariably breaks the power of consumption, and wide suffering prevails. This administration avoids this situation by urging slowing down of production when it outruns contracts for future delivery. In this way industry is stabilized and the cycle in business is avoided. Only genius and efficiency could accomplish these results.

INTEREST IN AGRICULTURE

If this principle could be applied to agriculture, it would solve the problem. It is obvious that agriculture does not admit of regulation of production as easily as industry, but it can be very materially aided through its marketing agencies assisted by the Government. It is at least a field for sincere investigation. The administration has not been tardy in legislation for the agriculturist. Its program of rehabilitation was the most ambitious. It enacted an emergency tariff act limited to agricultural products. No such favor was ever given to any other industry at any time. Its program as enacted into law upon the recommendation of two agricultural commissions included:

(1) The agricultural credits act.

(2) Giving agriculture representation upon the Federal Reserve Board.

(3) War Finance Corporation.

(4) Cooperative marketing act.

(5) Packers and stockyards act.

(6) Grain gambling act.

(7) Warehouse act.

(8) Butter standard act.

(9) Naval stores act.

(10) Filled milk act, and many other acts, besides an enlargement of the department to aid the farmer in his marketing.

LABOR'S HIGH STANDARD

One of the very best barometers is the situation of labor, and, judged by that standard, our country is in a most fortunate position.

Labor is generally employed, and at a scale of wage higher in some branches than at the peak of the war. A high scale of wage has been accepted as a sound economic principle. Profit in business is no longer a big margin over cost by breaking down labor, but rather a small margin and big sales, which is possible because of buying power created by a reasonably high scale of wage.

Labor has never been more efficient than to-day. The old rule of sustaining price by limiting hours and output of work has given way to giving increased production for increased pay. Never in history have deposits in our savings banks reached such amounts as to-day. Out of our 115,000,000 people, men, women, and children, there are about 40,000,000 who have savings accounts of one form or other.

The trend toward labor in the ownership of securities in the industries in which they are employed is one of the most profound of our present day. The numbers will reach seven figures. In the steam transportation lines alone, probably 600,000 laborers own stock in the companies. Another even more profound tendency of labor is home ownership. The movement in real estate in every city of the land in building homes, not for rent but for ownership, sold on a basis of payment where it is possible for the laborer to own his own home, is profound. There are three and a half times more home owners among American labor than all the home owners, big and little, rich and poor, in the United Kingdom of Great Britain. Labor has become so financially strong that at least 15 banks are owned and operated by union labor in the United States to-day, to say nothing of nearly 100 financial corporations of one sort or another. Never has there been a better feeling between labor and capital than to-day. Few periods of recent time have been so free of the lockout and strike. This is due in part to the administration's ef-

fort to set up machinery for adjustment of disputes. The recent railroad adjustment legislation is an example where numerous disputes have been amicably settled without disturbance to the public.

But in the main the real explanation is a policy to promote prosperity, that of a protective tariff by which we aim to open the way to profitable investment of American capital in the employment of American labor, at an American scale of wage, to insure an American standard of living, the highest to-day ever reached by any people in history. This American policy creates the American market for American agriculture, without which agriculture would cease to be more than to feed the producer of food, which would totally prostrate that first great industry.

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS

The United States of America to-day, nine years after the close of the World War, occupies the place of influence and power never reached by any nation of history. We emerged from the war with the same aims and aspirations we had when we entered it. Our foreign policy announced by Washington and Monroe had been rigidly respected. After the World War ended a most bitter controversy took place over the determination of the then party in power to abandon our policy heretofore adhered to. Twice have the American people spoken on the proposal, and twice they overwhelmingly refused to abandon it. We refuse to bind ourselves in advance upon unknown contingencies. We do not choose isolation, but we do demand independence. We prefer cooperation to alliance. We reserve the right to make our own decisions rather than have them made for us by dictation. Our influence is more potent when acting as an independent sovereign than when pooled. We stand ready to assist, but must be the best judge as to what and when. We wish not to become a partisan in Europe's political quarrels, but are ready with our counsel and good offices, as well as our good will and bounty to succor to our limit.

There is scarcely a country which, in the hour of great disaster, has not had our aid. This administration led the world in world peace in limiting capital ships, ending naval rivalry, and attempted to induce Europe to take similar steps in the army.

We canceled the Anglo-Japanese alliance and set up machinery for settling disputes arising in the Pacific Ocean regions. We led in the open door in China and secured her political and territorial integrity.

We led in the economic recovery in Europe and gave our best assistance to furthering the peace of the Old World. Our President used his best efforts toward substantial peace in the only rational assurance against war—a reasonable limitation of arms.

We have pacified and stabilized the political and industrial situations in Haiti and Central America. We have aided Mexico in her efforts toward stabilization without sacrificing the rights of American citizens. In all of our relations we have a desire for peace and justice. We ask nothing for ourselves which we do not freely grant to others. No nation in the past has ever reached a position of power, influence, and honor superior to the United States in 1927. At no time in history have a people enjoyed greater prosperity with comforts of life so generally distributed as do our people. No people of history ever approached the buying power as do our people, with greater liberties under the law. These are some of the accomplishments which justify you in seeking approval from the people. They are what may be called Republican prosperity. Some would say Coolidge prosperity. Lighter burdens in the Government mean greater savings for the people. Money saved by rigid economy means comforts assured for the people.

This is the Coolidge philosophy underlying his governmental policies.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 47

Resolved, That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, for the use of the House document room.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. KIESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I may say that the supply in the document room is already entirely exhausted and there are thousands of demands for it.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer another resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 48

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed 300 additional copies of the hearings before said committee on a bill to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this provides for less than one copy per Member. Why does not the gentleman bring in a proper resolution which would give us at least two copies apiece?

Mr. KIESS. There are 1,000 printed copies and this provides for 300 additional copies.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean two extra copies apiece. The revenue bill is one of the most important bills coming before the Congress and our constituents are interested in it, and the taxpayers of the country generally are interested. Certainly each Member ought to have two additional copies. I would like to have two additional copies.

Mr. KIESS. I am sure the gentleman can have them.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want more than my proportion of them, however.

Mr. KIESS. There are 1,000 copies printed by order of the committee, and this is the same number printed in former Congresses when we had a similar revenue bill. If there is a shortage, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, we will issue an order from the Joint Committee on Printing, under the $200 limit, to print some more, so I am sure this will take care of the requests.

The resolution was agreed to.

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one moment in the absence of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] desired to make the announcement to the Members of the House that at 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, in Statuary Hall, there will be ceremonies incident to the unveiling of the statue of Alexander H. Stephens.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE OSCAR E. KELLER

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to proceed under unanimous consent for just a moment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Speaker, the Members, I am sure, will all recall the very faithful service extending from the period of the Sixty-sixth Congress through the Sixty-ninth Congress, of Oscar E. Keller, of St. Paul, Minn.

I regret very much to have to announce that something like three weeks preceding the convening of this Congress he passed away after a rather extended illness. Mr. Keller, prior to coming to Washington, had rendered useful service to his municipality in a number of very important positions. We all know of the faithful way in which he endeavored to perform his work here. In his death his friends have lost a very loyal friend and his constituency lost a courageous man with fine public spirit.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 8, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

160. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 9); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

161. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements from the offices and bureaus of the Treasury Department showing in detail what officers and employees performed travel on official business from points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

162. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations under the legislative establishment for the bookstacks in the Library building, fiscal year 1929, the sum of $387,000 (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1. A bill to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4423) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hill; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4424) granting an increase of pension to Tillie C. Wood; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4425) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Bennett; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4426) granting an increase of pension to Exie L. Stebbins; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4427) granting an increase of pension to Alice G. Lewis; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4428) granting an increase of pension to Adelia L. Brown; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4429) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Anderson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4430) granting an increase of pension to Mary Johnson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4431) granting an increase of pension to Eliza G. Carr; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6019) to establish a Federal farm board to prevent overproduction of agricultural commodities and to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6020) to establish a Federal farm board to prevent overproduction of agricultural commodities and to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 6021) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6023) to extend the limitations of time upon the issuance of medals of honor, distinguished-service crosses, and distinguished-service medals to persons who served in the Army of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6024) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Gainesville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6025) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Winder, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Lawrenceville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Commerce, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Canton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Buford, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Toccoa, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6031) authorizing an appropriation of $150,000,000 for manufacture at Muscle Shoals of ammonium phosphate or other high-grade fertilizer, to be sold to farmers for cash at cost for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6032) to pension teachers of the universities, their branches included in the association of colleges, or institutions awarding degrees in courses of higher education in the different States of the Union receiving Federal appropriations for instruction in military science or agriculture, who are not less than 75 years of age and who have served continuously on the faculty for not less than 52 consecutive years next preceding retirement, upon retirement; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6033) to establish a national park in the national forest reservation in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6034) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6035) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 6036) to abolish the Bureau of Efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 6037) to exempt certain property from real and personal property taxes applicable in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6038) to reimburse the city of Philippi, in the State of West Virginia, for the cost of paving street abutting Federal property; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 6039) placing first, second, and third class postmasters in the competitive classified service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 6040) to amend, "An act to authorize the collection and editing of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the national archives," approved March 3, 1925; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6041) granting the consent of Congress to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Allegheny River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

My Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 6043) to amend subdivision (a) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6044) to divest articles made with convict labor of their character as subjects of interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6045) granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to replace and repair the bridge across the Mahoning River at South Avenue, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6046) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Youngstown, Ohio, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River at West Avenue, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 6047) to amend the organic act of Porto Rico approved March 2, 1917; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6048) to amend the classification act of 1923; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6049) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 6050) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Hopewell, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6051) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Chase City, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6052) to enlarge, extend, and remodel the post-office building at Petersburg, Va., and to acquire additional land therefor if necessary; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 6053) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington Road, in Perry and Decature Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 6054) to provide for one additional district judge for the southern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6055) to regulate the height and exterior design and construction of public and private buildings in the National Capital fronting on or located within 200 feet of a public building or public park; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6056) to provide for addition of certain land to the Challis National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6057) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 6058) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6059) granting the consent of Congress to Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6060) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6061) granting the consent of Congress to Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6062) granting the consent of Congress to the Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 6063) to provide for holiday service on rural mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 6064) to refer the claims of the loyal Creek Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6065) authorizing pension for widows of honorably discharged soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6066) authorizing interstate compacts between the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, or between any of them, or between any of the States of the Union, for the purpose of control of floods and the conservation of flood waters, and the application of such waters to beneficial uses; and for the diminution of injury and damage by floods; for the security of intrastate and interstate commerce, and the transportation of the United States mails, and military; and for the purpose of agreeing upon control of conservation districts created under such compact, and promoting agreement on the apportionment of benefits and costs thereof, and assumption of benefits and costs thereof; for division of revenue, if any therefrom, and for other purposes, and providing for the participation of the United States of America therein, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6067) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to provide additional hospital facilities at the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6068) to amend section 15 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 6069) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 6070) to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6071) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wailuku, Maui County, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6072) to construct a public building for the Immigration Service at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 6073) granting a permit to construct a bridge over the Ohio River at Ravenswood, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 6074) to provide for the further development of agriculture extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act entitled, "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories, which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 6075) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with the States for the transfer to them of activities of the Indian Bureau dealing with education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6076) to authorize an extension to the San Francisco National Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R.. 6077) to extend the provisions of an act entitled, "An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 6078) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Bristow, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Ada, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (R. R. 6080) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Holdenville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6081) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Okemah, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6082) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Sapulpa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6083) for the erection of a public building at Drumright, Creek County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6084) to equalize longevity pay of enlisted men of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6085) to authorize issue of surplus or reserve stores and materials to the National Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6086) to authorize the free issue of surplus or reserve uniforms and other equipment or material to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and to limit the cost of stocks furnished by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6087) to authorize the employment of civilians to deliver special lectures at general and special service schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6088) to provide for the transfer of enlisted men of the Regular Army to the Regular Army Reserves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6089) to continue the establishment of a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6090) regulating the mileage and other traveling allowances of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 6091) to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, includ-

ing farm wood lots and those abandoned farm areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 6092) granting the consent of Congress to the Sunbury Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River from Bainbridge Street in the city of Sunbury, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6093) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Slater, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6094) to amend section 7 of Public Act No. 45, entitled "An act authorizing the use for permanent construction at military posts of the proceeds from the sale of surplus War Department real property, and authorizing the sale of certain military reservations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 6095) donating Revolutionary cannon to the New York State Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 6096) to require the Secretary of War to cause to be made a preliminary examination and survey for a sea-level canal at or near Miami, Fla., beginning at the Miami River about 6 miles from Miami, following along the Tamiami Trail in a westerly direction, then southwest along the State highway into the Gulf of Mexico at or near Poinciana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6097) to require the Secretary of War to cause to be made a preliminary examination and survey for a cross-State canal beginning at or near Stuart, Fla., through the St. Lucie Canal, across Lake Okeechobee, then via the canal and the Caloosahatchie River to the Gulf of Mexico at or near Fort Myers, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 6098) to disclose interest of and to regulate lobbyists who attempt to procure the passage or defeat of any measure before the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6099) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to construct, maintain, and operate a toll highway bridge across Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 6100) to transfer the levying of license taxes on business and trade to the Alaska Territorial Legislature, to repeal certain license tax laws applicable to Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 6101) to amend the Federal corrupt practices act of 1925; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 6102) to authorize an appropriation for the erection of a suitable memorial monument and the improvement of the grounds at the birthplace of Millard Fillmore, former President of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6103) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) to amend sections 57 and 61 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) to authorize the licensing of patents owned by the United States; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6106) to amend section 3702, Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 6107) repealing the act of July 31, 1912, prohibiting the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) for the investigation of the advisability and cost of securing lands in the Southern Appalachian Mountains for perpetual preservation as a national park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) creating a commission to select a summer White House, or the site for a summer White House, west of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory of Sacajawea, or Bird Woman; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) for the relief of Leah Frank, Creek Indian, new born, roll No. 294; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) concerning lands and property devised to the Government of the United States of America by Wesley Jordan, deceased, late of the township of Richland, county of Fairfield, State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) for an investigation of the nature and use of narcotic drugs, and the methods that are being used in the treatment of drug addicts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILBERT: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) proposing a referendum to ascertain whether or not popular sentiment in the Philippine Islands favors immediate independence; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 43) to investigate certain charges and the documents supporting same against the Government of Mexico made by the publications of William Randolph Hearst; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH: Resolution (H. Res. 44) directing the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives with a copy of the proposal made by the French Minister of Foreign Affairs to renounce war between the two nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 46) directing the Secretary of State to negotiate a reciprocal treaty with the Republics of Santo Domingo and Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, protesting against the passage of a Federal inheritance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, with reference to Government schools and training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, requesting Congress to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the chief of staff of the United States Army made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 6108) granting a pension to Nancy Elizabeth Paul; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 6109) granting an increase of pension to Emily Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 6110) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Storrs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6111) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) for the relief of Armstrong Hunter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 6113) granting a pension to Fannie Crocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 6114) granting an insurance to William H. McClure; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 6115) granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6116) for the relief of R. P. Biddle; to the Committee on Claims

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6117) granting an increase of pension to William H. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6118) granting an increase of pension to William S. Kemp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to Harry E. Millikin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6120) for the relief of Emory Lord; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) for the relief of Hoyt G. Barnett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) for the relief of Arthur McRee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) for the relief of W. W. Giles, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6124) for the relief of W. K. Crow; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) for the relief of A. L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6126) for the relief of James M. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 6127) for the relief of Basil N. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6128) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Fortney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 6129) for the relief of Charles F. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 6130) for the relief of Stuart O. Pusey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6131) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 6132) granting an increase of pension to Emma D. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 6133) granting a pension to Lee K. Bochroch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6134) granting a pension to John J. Dewey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 6135) granting an increase of pension to Mattie H. Meise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 6136) granting an increase of pension to Ella J. Duygan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6137) granting an increase of pension to Nettie D. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6138) granting a pension to Emma J. Cotie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6139) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6140) granting a pension to Emogene McStraw Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6141) granting a pension to Harold W. Kenny; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6142) granting a pension to Frances G. Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6143) granting a pension to Oril Lucretia Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.'

Also, a bill (H. R. 6144) granting a pension to Roy A. Haas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COHEN: A bill (H. R. 6145) granting a pension to Alexandria L. Ide; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6146) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. J. Kneeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6147) granting a pension to Marion G. Eudy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) to authorize Capt. Royden Williamson, United States Army, to accept from the Haitian Government the medal "Honneur Et Merite"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6149) to allow the distinguished-service medal for service in the World War to be awarded Maj. A. R. McAlily; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 6150) for the relief of Charles H. Penley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6151) for the relief of Oswald H. Halford, Hunter M. Henry, William C. Horne, Rupert R. Johnson, David L. Lacey, William Z. Lee, Fenton F. Rodgers, Henry Freeman Seale, Felix M. Smith, Edwin C. Smith, Robert S. Sutherland, and Charles G. Ventress; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) to correct the military record of Cromwell L. Barsley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6153) granting a pension to Angie W. Weatherspoon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 6154) granting a pension to Susan F. Gale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) for correction of the military record of Frank N. Curtiss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6156) granting a pension to William Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6157) granting a pension to Eva A. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6158) granting a pension to Jessie F. Langridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6159) granting a pension to George A. McAmis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) granting a pension to Margaret Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6161) granting a pension to Frank D. Yandes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6162) for the relief of Thomas M. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) for the relief of Amon C. Mann; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6164) for the relief of Kenneth B. Turner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6165) for the relief of Walter E. Sharon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6166) for the relief of Jacob Kaufman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill H. R. 6167) for the relief of Arthur Jacobs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6168) for the relief of Joseph M. Hayden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6169) for the relief of John H. Grout; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) for the relief of Laurin Gosney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) for the relief of Bernhard Henry Dahlke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6172) for the relief of Leslie E. George; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6173) for the relief of George W. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6174) for the relief of May Gordon Rodes and Sara Louise Rodes, heirs at law of Tyree Rodes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6175) for the correction of the military record of Allen Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6176) to authorize the appointment of Capt. M. M. Cloud, retired, to the grade of major, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) granting an increase of pension to Faustina B. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6178) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 6179) for the relief of Albert A. Mathieson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6180) for the relief of William H. Armstrong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) for the relief of Edmund L. Moore; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6182) for the relief of Blanche Andrews; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6183) to reimburse W. B. Donelson for revenues wrongfully paid; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6184) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6185) for the relief of Thomas Jefferson Shropshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Preble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6187) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie M. Bird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6188) granting a pension to Sadie Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6189) granting an increase of pension to Catherine T. Pickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 6190) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6191) granting a pension to Minnie Carlton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6192) for the relief of James A. Finney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6193) for the relief of C. M. Glenn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 6194) for the relief of Frank Stinchcomb; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6195) granting six months' pay to Constance D. Lathrop; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6196) granting a pension to Joseph K. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6197) for the relief of the legal heirs of Walter Blake Heyward; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 6198) granting a pension to Esther H. Kendall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 6199) granting an increase of pension to Della Ham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 6200) for the relief of Katherine Frances Lamb and Elinor Frances Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) for the relief of the children of William Wheeler Hubbell and his wife, Elizabeth Catherine Hubbell, both deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6202) providing for a preliminary examination and survey at and near City Island, New York City, with a view to the construction of a breakwater; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6203) for the relief of Donald G. Wetterauer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6204) for the relief of Rebecca J. Rider; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6205) for the relief of James H. Green; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) granting a pension to Catherine Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6207) granting a pension to Lydia M. Seadars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) granting a pension to Lillian M. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) granting a pension to James E. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6210) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Kenan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6211) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6212) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Wessner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6213) granting an increase of pension to Rutherford B. H. Blazer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6214) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Mereness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Brokaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6216) granting a pension to Addie M. Paff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) granting an increase of pension to Harry B. Gorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) for the relief of John D. Hanrahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 6219) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Clothier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6221) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Dooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 6223) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) granting an increase of pension to Clemenza A. Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 6226) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Ginder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6227) granting an increase of pension to Catherine West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6228) granting a pension to Jennie C. Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6229) granting an increase of pension to Josepha Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6230) granting an increase of pension to Mary Whiteleather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Oberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 6232) granting a pension to Charles Frismuth, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) granting a pension to Bessie Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) granting a pension to Mary E. Paynter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) granting a pension to Mary M. Bowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) granting a pension to James Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6237) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Newlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6238) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bookhammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6239) granting an increase of pension to Jane Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6241) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Conwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6242) granting an increase of pension to Mary Carrie Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) granting an increase of pension to G. Annie Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Darby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Viven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6247) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 6248) for the relief of Allen Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 6249) granting a pension to Abbie A. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 6250) granting a pension to Mary A. Hulbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 6251) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 6252) granting an increase of pension to Nettie Hamill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6253) for the relief of Horace S. Johnston, late lieutenant (junior grade) Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 6254) for the relief of Fred A. Knauf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 6255) granting a pension to Annie E. Hastings; to the Committee Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) to correct the military record of John K. McMains; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to Triphenia Goodenough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 6258) granting a pension to Fleming Trexler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6259) for the relief of Walter E. Switzer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6260) for the relief of Mary Loy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6261) to renew and extend certain letters patent to George J. Pilger; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) for the relief of Alice McCrea; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6263) to provide for reinstatement of Larry Cardwell in the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6264) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) granting a pension to Sarah B. Yarnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6266) granting a pension to Ellen M. Dyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6267) granting a pension to Mariette Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6268) granting an increase of pension to Honora J. Hoffliger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 6269) granting an increase of pension to Isadora B. Meadows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 6270) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Corle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 6271) for the relief of James C. Fritzen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 6272) granting a pension to Jennie Glass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6273) granting a pension to William L. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6274) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6275) granting an increase of pension to Dora E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) granting an increase of pension to Ella Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6277) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) granting a pension to Manning E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6279) granting a pension to Bertha M. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 6280) for the relief of the estate of Jarib L. Sanderson, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6281) for the relief of Catherine ReQua Johnson; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of Henry Shull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6283) granting a pension to Mary Belle Denny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) granting a pension to N. L. Stemmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 6285) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Cave; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 6286) granting a pension to Lydia E. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6287) granting a pension to Rosanna Ulman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) granting a pension to Permelia J. Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) granting an increase of pension to Frederike Pille; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6290) granting an increase of pension to Manerva J. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) granting an increase of pension to Cathrine Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) granting an increase of pension to Jennie W. McDanield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6293) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Leiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6294) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Larue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6296) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6297) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hoagland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6298) granting an increase of pension to Curney G. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6299) granting an increase of pension to Melissa E. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6300) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hartupee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6301) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Hancock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6302) granting an increase of pension to Alice Gormley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Doupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Dewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) granting an increase of pension to Emma Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6308) granting an increase of pension to Jerusha H. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6309) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Belt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6310) granting an increase of pension to Lola Beebe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6311) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Batch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6312) granting an increase of pension to Martha Barrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6314) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6315) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6316) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6317) granting an increase of pension to Ella Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6318) granting an increase of pension to Permelia E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6319) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6321) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Malinda Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6322) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Tibbits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Swick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6325) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Slick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6326) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Schoonover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Rodgers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Raley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6330) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Prame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6331) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Mahurg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6332) granting an increase of pension to Esther M. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6333) granting an increase of pension to Anna Adella Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 6334) granting a pension to Sarah Elizabeth Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6335) granting an increase of pension to Helena Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6336) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6337) granting an increase of pension to Jane Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting an increase of pension to Molly Yocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6339) granting an increase of pension to Ruth E. Prudence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) granting a pension to Mary A. Mumma; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 6341) granting a pension to Ida H. Byrd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Langley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) for the relief of Louis F. Kestler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6345) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) granting an increase of pension to Liddie Leffert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6347) granting a pension to Martha S. Spry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) for the relief of the Black Hawk Country Club, of Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6349) granting a pension to Mary E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 6350) for the relief of Bertram Lehman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 6351) for the relief of Lydia Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6352) authorizing the reinstatement of Carl L. Bernau as a captain in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 6353) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) granting an increase of pension to Huldah Leedom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6356) granting an increase of pension to Arriadne Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 6357) granting a pension to Oliver P. Swain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6358) granting a pension to Sara R. Brewster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6359) granting an increase of pension to Ollie T. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 6360) for the relief of Edward S. Lathrop; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6361) for the relief of Frank Rizzuto; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6362) for the relief of O. L. Beindorff; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) for the relief of Arthur C. Bingle; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6364) for the relief of Edward Tigh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) for the relief of John O'Hara; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) for the relief of John Christians; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) authorizing the redemption by the United States Treasury of 20 war-savings stamps (series of 1918) now held by Dr. John Mack, of Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) authorizing the Treasury of the United States to refund to the Farmers Grain Co. of Omaha, Nebr., income taxes illegally paid to the United States Treasurer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claim of William Quinlan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) granting a pension to Ida McAllister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6371) granting an increase of pension to Clara Swanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6372) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6373) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Robley D. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) granting a pension to Elzia W. Robar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6375) granting a pension to Alonzo W. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 6376) granting an increase of pension to Jesse R. Oastler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6377) for the relief of John Shannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6378) granting a pension to Matilda P. Sutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to Fletcher Adkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) granting a pension to Sarah L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting a pension to Ernest B. Crotshin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) granting an increase of pension to John H. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6383) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Low; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6385) granting an increase of pension to Edmonia V. Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R.) 6386 granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jessee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Pasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) for the relief of Ruth Gore; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) for the relief of Samuel Pelfrey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 6390) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 6391) granting a pension to Alexander Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting a pension to Abram J. Vandebrook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6393) granting a pension to Mrs. Cassius C. Lester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6394) granting a pension to Joann Thornton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting a pension to Frances E. Bishopp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6396) granting a pension to Abbie M. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) granting a pension to Flora P. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6398) granting a pension to Maria F. Tooker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6399) granting a pension to Minnie S. Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6400) granting a pension to Alice H. Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) granting a pension to Mrs. Thomas Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6402) granting a pension to Sara W. Bowlby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6403) granting an increase of pension to Johanna L. Harris Blish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6404) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Ann Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6406) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6407) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Crelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6409) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6411) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6412) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kisor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6413) granting an increase of pension to Matilda McDougall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6414) granting an increase of pension to Anna Hagen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) granting an increase of pension to Anna Prince; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6416) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Brunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6418) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Van Tuyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6419) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Alexander Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6420) granting an increase of pension to Kittie C. Hyde; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6421) granting an increase of pension to Sarah H. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6422) granting an increase of pension to Ellen L. Curran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6423) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6424) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6426) granting an increase of pension to Oleava Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6428) granting an increase of pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6429) granting an increase of pension to John Milburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6430) granting a pension to Mary E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) for the relief of Lewis H. Easterly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 6432) for the relief of James E. Moyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 6433) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6434) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6435) granting an increase of pension to Minnie W. Hurlburt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6436) for the relief of Mary E. O'Connor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 6437) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6438) for the relief of David Parrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6439) granting a pension to Emily F. Grotton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6440) for the relief of Alfred W. Mathews, former ensign, United States Naval Reserve Force; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6441) to correct the naval record of Silas Henry Stahl, alias Silas Monroe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 6442) for the relief of Ralph H. Lasher, whose name appears in the Army records as Ralph C. Lasher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6443) for the relief of Pattie M. Eakins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Fiori; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 6445) granting a pension to Robert L. Boaz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 6446) for the relief of Lucius Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 6447) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Albright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6448) granting an increase of pension to John Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6449) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Bitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6450) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Borlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6451) granting a pension to Harvey Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6452) granting an increase of pension to Mary Clem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6453) granting a pension to Carrie M. Cramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6454) granting a pension to Ella Nora Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6455) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6456) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6457) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6458) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Writenour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 6459) granting a pension to Ada Daniels Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: Resolution (H. Res. 45) to pay Regina Reidesel, widow of Frederick C. Reidesel, late clerk to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, a sum equal to six months' salary and $250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

64. Petition of the Citizens Party, 1427 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the seating of JAMES M. BECK as a Representative of the first congressional district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

65. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition from the sugar samplers on duty at the port of New York, asking an increase in salary to put them on equal terms with privately employed samplers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

66. By Mr. BURTON: Resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Cleveland Graphic Arts Club, Cleveland, Ohio, urging a substantial reduction in the existing corporate Federal income tax rates at the earliest practicable time, and certain changes in the existing legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

67. Also, petition of citizens of Burton, Ohio, and Auburn Township, Ohio, urging increased pensions for widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

68. Also, resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Cleveland Graphic Arts Club, Cleveland, Ohio, urging a substantial reduction in the existing corporate Federal income-tax rates at the earliest practicable date and urging certain changes in administrative provisions of the corporation tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

69. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of the American Legion, 305 Hall of Records, New York City; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

70. Also, petition of America Legion, 305 Hall of Records, New York City; to the Committee on Flood Control.

71. Also, petition of Post Office Department Post, No. 930, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

72. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Ohio State Senate, that the Eighty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Ohio request the passage by Congress of legislation similar to the Tyson and Fitzgerald bills introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

73. Also, petition of veterans of the World War in Dayton, Ohio, praying for the passage of a bill by Congress granting pensions to veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

74. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of residents of Monroe County, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation in behalf of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

75. Also, petition of residents of Lebanon, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation in behalf of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

76. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of the Southern Implement Supply Co., Dallas, Tex., urging tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

77. By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolutions of the Yellowstone Valley (Mont.) Beet Growers Association, favoring an increased tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

78. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of citizens of Woodburn, Iowa, and vicinity, opposing legislation for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, *December 8, 1927*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 6, 1927)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Harvey A. Welsh) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shortridge
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Simmons
Bingham	George	McNary	Smith
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	Metcalf	Stéck
Blease	Glass	Moses	Steiwer
Borah	Goff	Neely	Stephens
Bratton	Gould	Norbeck	Swanson
Brookhart	Greene	Nye	Thomas
Broussard	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Bruce	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Tyson
Caraway	Hawes	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Ransdell	Warren
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Waterman
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Edge	Keyes	Sackett	
Edwards	King	Schall	
Ferris	La Follette	Sheppard	

Mr. BRATTON. My colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is ill and is detained from the Chamber on that account. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FLOOD CONTROL OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is submitted herewith a letter from the Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, transmitting with favorable recommendation the report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, containing the plan of the Army engineers for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley.

In my message to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of the first session of the Seventieth Congress, the flood-control problem of the lower Mississippi and the urgent necessity for its solution were outlined. The general duties and responsibilities of the Federal Government in connection therewith were therein discussed.

The total cost of the recommended project is $296,400,000, distributed over a period of 10 years. This large sum is manifestly justified by the necessities of the situation and the benefits that will result. In determining the distribution of the costs, there must be considered not only the people of the valley itself, who receive the major portion of the benefits, but also the great mass of taxpayers who suffer less directly from Mississippi River floods and upon whom most of the burden of Federal taxation falls. It is axiomatic that States and other local authorities should supply all land and assume all pecuniary responsibility for damages that may result from the execution of the project. It would be revolutionary for the Federal Government to establish the precedent of buying part of the land upon which to build protective works to increase the value of the remainder. Similarly it would be very unwise for the United States in generously helping a section of the country to render itself liable for consequential damages. The Federal Treasury should bear the portion of the cost of engineering structures for flood control that is justified by the national aspects of the problem and the national benefits. It may even bear 80 per cent of such costs, but substantial local cooperation is essential to avoid waste. The portion this would leave to be borne locally for flood-control structures represents an expenditure of about $3, or 30 cents per year, for 10 years for each acre in the alluvial valley to be protected every year from Mississippi River floods. The value per acre, including railroads, towns, cities, and other improvements, is estimated at something over $200. It would seem that the States should share with the Federal Government the burden of assisting the levee districts and individual property owners, especially in view of the fact that the States benefit directly by the increased taxes from land made more valuable by reason of its protection.

The plan transmitted herewith is comprehensive and appeals to me as being adequate in its engineering. I concur in general in the conclusions and recommendations reached in the report, and suggest that appropriate legislation be enacted putting them into effect.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the acts of March 4, 1915, and February 28, 1916, I transmit herewith the report of the United States Bureau of Efficiency for the period from November 1, 1926, to October 31, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirement of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Alien Property Custodian submitting the annual report of the proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1926.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying routine report, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on matters concerning the Department of State, required by certain provisions of law enumerated in the report.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the Forty-fourth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

ORGANIZATION OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to discontinue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided,* That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further,* That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further,* That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor.

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state the following changes in the organization of the customs service have been made by Executive order since the last report:

By Executive order dated December 8, 1926, Holeb and Jackman were consolidated into one customs port of entry to be known as Holeb-Jackman and to comprise all of the territory at present included in said ports in customs collection district No. 1 (Maine and New Hampshire), with headquarters at Portland, Me., effective December 15, 1926.

By Executive order dated January 27, 1927, the ports of Ellsworth, Bar Harbor, and South West Harbor, in customs collection district No. 1 (Maine and New Hampshire), were abolished and a new port of entry created to be known as Bar Harbor, in the said customs collection district, with headquarters at Portland, Me., and comprising Mount Desert Island, the city of Ellsworth, and the townships of Hancock, Sullivan, Sorrento, Gouldsboro, and Winter Harbor, effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated February 5, 1927, the ports of Kenosha and Kewaunee, in customs collection district No. 37 (Wisconsin), with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis., were discontinued as ports of entry, effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated February 25, 1927, Akron, Ohio, was created a port of entry in customs collection district No. 41 (Ohio), with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio, effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated August 19, 1927, Coos County, N. H., at that time a part of customs collection district No. 1 (Maine and New Hampshire), with headquarters at Portland, Me., was made a part of customs collection district No. 2 (Vermont), with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated September 22, 1927, Lancaster, Minn., was created a port of entry in customs collection district No. 34 (Dakota), with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated September 30, 1927, Alpena, Charlevoix, Detour, Escanaba, Houghton, Mackinaw, Manistee, Marine City, Marquette, Muskegon, St. Clair, and St. Joseph were abolished as ports of entry in customs collection district No. 38 (Michigan), with headquarters at Detroit, Mich., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated October 8, 1927, Oklahoma City, Okla., was created a port of entry in customs collection district No. 45 (St. Louis), with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

All of the above changes were dictated by consideration of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes, with the enforcement of which the customs service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORTS OF THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with paragraph 5, section 2 of the Army appropriation act, approved August 29, 1916, I transmit herewith the tenth and eleventh annual reports of the Council of National Defense for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Library:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the act of Congress of March 4, 1921, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927. The attention of the Congress is invited to the recommendation of the commission that the memorial to the Unknown Soldier be completed.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

PORTO RICAN PUBLIC SERVICE FRANCHISES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 38 of the act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 951), entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of each of 10 franchises granted by the Public Service Commission of Porto Rico. The franchises are described in the accompanying letter from the Secretary of War transmitting them to me.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE PORTO RICAN LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the Act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith copies of acts and resolutions enacted by the Eleventh Legislature of Porto Rico during its second regular session (February 14 to April 15, 1927) and its second special session (April 25 to May 8, 1927).

These acts and resolutions have not previously been transmitted to the Congress, and none of them has been printed as a public document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

LAWS AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE PHILIPPINE LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 19 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," I transmit herewith a set of the laws and resolutions adopted by the Seventh Philippine Legislature during its second session, from July 16 to November 9, 1926.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I submit herewith the thirteenth annual report of the committee for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

Attention is invited to the remarks of the committee on the death of its late chairman, Dr. Charles D. Walcott, on whose advice the committee was established by the Congress in 1915. At a time when there was but little appreciation of the value of aeronautics and but slight conception of its problems, Doctor Walcott had the vision to see the need for organized scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight. The establishment of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the development of its usefulness in the formulation of policies, and the results of its labors in the field of research are a tribute to the leadership of Doctor Walcott, and stamp him as a great constructive force in the upbuilding of American aeronautics.

The technical improvement in the performance and efficiency of aircraft for all purposes, the policy of the Government in the regulation and encouragement of aviation, and the great impetus given to aeronautical development during the past year by the transoceanic flight of Lindbergh and others have combined to cause a broader recognition of the practicability of aircraft as a means of transportation that I believe is destined to play an ever-increasing part in the advance of civilization.

The attention of the Congress is invited to Part V of the committee's report, presenting a summary of the present state of aeronautical development. It is gratifying to note the committee's opinion that aeronautical progress in the United States during the past year has surpassed the hopes of a year ago, and that the present governmental policy is primarily responsible. I concur in the committee's judgment that further substantial progress in aeronautics is dependent largely upon the continuous prosecution of scientific research.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. EDGE presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

House Concurrent Resolution 1

[Passed senate March 7, passed house January 31]

The one hundred and fifty-first Legislature of the State of New Jersey begun and held at the city of Trenton, on Tuesday, January 11, 1927

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of a Federal law regulating the shipment of machine guns, revolvers, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons, and the ammunition adapted thereto, in interstate and foreign commerce

Whereas stricter supervision in the matter of the sale, shipment, and importation of revolvers, machine guns, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons will materially aid in the suppression of crime; and

Whereas the Federal Government by reason of its exclusive control in interstate commerce may regulate the shipment and importation of revolvers, machine guns, automatic rifles and other deadly weapons: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized for the passage of a Federal statute prohibiting the shipment of revolvers, machine guns, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons in interstate and foreign commerce.

2. *Resolved*, That copies of this memorial, signed by the speaker of the house of assembly and attested by the clerk thereof, be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States; and further, that copies so signed and attested be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ANTHONY J. SIRACUSA,
Speaker of the House of Assembly.

Attest:

FREDERICK A. BRODESSER,
Clerk of the House of Assembly.

Mr. McLEAN presented the petition of the Y's Men's Club, Y. M. C. A., of New London, Conn., praying the passage of legislation looking toward flood prevention in the Mississippi River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Amston and Coventry, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the compulsory closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of Griffin A. Stedman Camp, No. 6, Sons of Union Veterans, of Hartford; L. D. Penfield Camp, No. 16, Auxiliary to Stanley Post, No. 11, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Britain; Elisha Kellogg Camp, No. 18, Sons of Veterans of Thomaston; Alden Skinner Camp, No. 45, of Rockville; and T. B. Robinson Camp, No. 31, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, of Bristol; all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation to transform the old Ford Theater in the city of Washington into a museum to house the Lincoln relics recently purchased by the Government, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 430) granting a pension to William W. Freeman; and

A bill (S. 431) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Boler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 432) for the relief of Martin E. Riley;

A bill (S. 433) for the relief of Harry C. Bradley; and

A bill (S. 434) for the relief of Sadie Klauber; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 435) for the relief of Claude J. Neis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 436) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Green;

A bill (S. 437) granting a pension to Emilio Du Bois;

A bill (S. 438) granting a pension to Royce E. Marshall; and

A bill (S. 439) granting an increase of pension to Maria Candalaria de Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 440) for the relief of Charles H. Send; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 441) granting a pension to Grace E. Avery; and

A bill (S. 442) granting a pension to Georgia Ann Fussell; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 443) for the relief of Larry M. Temple;

A bill (S. 444) for the relief of H. C. Magoon;

A bill (S. 445) for the relief of the Florida East Coast Car Ferry Co.; and

A bill (S. 446) for the relief of the Gulf Towing & Transportation Co., of Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 447) granting an increase of pension to Emeline A. Buck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 448) for the relief of Lieut. George H. Hauge, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 449) for the relief of James Covington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 450) for the relief of Charles James Anderson, former commander, United States Naval Reserve Force; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 451) granting a pension to Jeremiah Sheehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 452) granting a pension to Adeline Thompson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 453) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pelkey;

A bill (S. 454) granting a pension to Margaret F. Gallaher; and

A bill (S. 455) granting a pension to Mary E. McElheney; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 456) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward I. Gallagher, of New York, administrator of the estate of Charles Gallagher, deceased;

A bill (S. 457) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy;

A bill (S. 458) for the relief of Robert H. Leys;

A bill (S. 459) for the relief of the city of New York;

A bill (S. 460) for the relief of the owners of the barge *Mary M;*

A bill (S. 461) for the relief of the Union Ferry Co. of New York and Brooklyn, owners of the ferryboat *Montauk;* and

A bill (S. 462) for the relief of the estate of William Bardel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 463) for the relief of David J. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 464) granting a pension to Gerhard Kolligs;

A bill (S. 465) granting a pension to Clara M. Roberts;

A bill (S. 466) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Swift;

A bill (S. 467) granting a pension to Emma F. Reed;

A bill (S. 468) granting a pension to Daniel F. Shaser;

A bill (S. 469) granting a pension to Otto Leiendecker; and

A bill (S. 470) granting a pension to Elizabeth Tuttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 471) for the relief of Agnes McManus and George J. McManus; and

A bill (S. 472) for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 473) granting an increase of pension to Emily C. Bufter;

A bill (S. 474) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Porter;

A bill (S. 475) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Walter;

A bill (S. 476) granting an increase of pension to Caroline G. Yockel;

A bill (S. 477) granting a pension to Margaret E. Caples;

A bill (S. 478) granting a pension to Edward T. Conway;

A bill (S. 479) granting a pension to George W. Keeney;

A bill (S. 480) granting a pension to Mary Larson;

A bill (S. 481) granting a pension to Ella B. Lockwood; and

A bill (S. 482) granting a pension to Arthur S. Pattison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 483) granting an increase of pension to Rosine Bigger (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 484) for the relief of Joe W. Williams; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 485) for the relief of the legal representative of the Bank of West Tennessee;

A bill (S. 486) for the relief of E. B. McHenry, receiver of the Bank of West Tennessee;

A bill (S. 487) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Mosby, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt;

A bill (S. 488) for the relief of Walter W. Price;

A bill (S. 489) granting increased compensation to Wilson S. Jaynes by the Employees' Compensation Commission;
A bill (S. 490) for the relief of the city of Bristol, Tenn.;
A bill (S. 491) for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co. of Fayetteville, Tenn.;
A bill (S. 492) for the relief of Thomas J. Hunt, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt;
A bill (S. 493) for the relief of Walter W. Price;
A bill (S. 494) for the relief of the heirs of Haym Salomon;
A bill (S. 495) for the relief of M. Zingarell and wife, Mary Alice Zingarell;
A bill (S. 496) for the relief of M. Zingarell and wife, Mary Alice Zingarell;
A bill (S. 497) for the relief of Mrs. O. K. Joplin;
A bill (S. 498) for the relief of John Plumlee, administrator of the estate of G. W. Plumlee, deceased;
A bill (S. 499) for the relief of W. K. Ellis;
A bill (S. 500) for the relief of the estate of Matthew C. Butler, jr., deceased;
A bill (S. 501) for the relief of Daniel M. Whitaker;
A bill (S. 502) for the relief of the legal representatives of Enoch Ensley, deceased;
A bill (S. 503) for the relief of Mary Whitaker Moffatt;
A bill (S. 504) for the relief of Emma Grooms;
A bill (S. 505) for the relief of the Crystal Steam Laundry;
A bill (S. 506) for the relief of the heirs of Robert E. L. Rogers;
A bill (S. 507) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in matter of the claim of the Overton Hotel Co.;
A bill (S. 508) for the relief of Cabell Rives Berry;
A bill (S. 509) for the relief of Eureka Cotton Mills;
A bill (S. 510) for the relief of Jacob D. Nelson;
A bill (S. 511) to reimburse Horace A. Choumard, chaplain in Twenty-third Infantry, for loss of certain personal property;
A bill (S. 512) for the relief of the Shelby Medical College, of Nashville, Tenn.;
A bill (S. 513) for the relief of the Hottum-Kennedy Dry Dock Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;
A bill (S. 514) for the relief of Lillian Powell Beach;
A bill (S. 515) to reimburse Capt. K. E. Kern, Fifty-fourth Infantry, for certain expenditures; and
A bill (S. 516) for the relief of Minta Goike; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 517) for the relief of Robert K. Christenberry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 518) authorizing the President to appoint J. H. S. Morison to the position and rank of major, Medical Corps, in the United States Army;
A bill (S. 519) to correct the military record of William Mullins;
A bill (S. 520) for the relief of Martin A. Hayes;
A bill (S. 521) for the relief of Robert C. Wilcox; and
A bill (S. 522) to correct the military record of Thomas H. Nolley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 523) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Williams;
A bill (S. 524) granting an increase of pension to William Estes;
A bill (S. 525) granting a pension to John P. Gray;
A bill (S. 526) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Driggs;
A bill (S. 527) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hawkins;
A bill (S. 528) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown;
A bill (S. 529) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pinion;
A bill (S. 530) granting a pension to William M. Robinson;
A bill (S. 531) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Wells;
A bill (S. 532) granting a pension to F. W. Gerding;
A bill (S. 533) granting an increase of pension to Israel W. Bennett;
A bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Benton;
A bill (S. 535) granting a pension to Oscar M. Simpkins;
A bill (S. 536) granting a pension to William Estes;
A bill (S. 537) granting a pension to Laura Barker;
A bill (S. 538) granting an increase of pension to Bessie L. Christie;
A bill (S. 539) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Simpkins;
A bill (S. 540) granting a pension to Roger James Richmond;
A bill (S. 541) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hart;
A bill (S. 542) granting a pension to Robert C. Kistler;
A bill (S. 543) granting an increase of pension to George Milams;
A bill (S. 544) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Taber;
A bill (S. 545) granting a pension to Lissie Young;
A bill (S. 546) granting a pension to Albert M. Griffith;
A bill (S. 547) granting a pension to George W. Hacker;
A bill (S. 548) granting a pension to James Besheers;
A bill (S. 549) granting a pension to Mary A. Huckaba;
A bill (S. 550) granting an increase of pension to Murray Pierce;
A bill (S. 551) granting a pension to Patrick S. Horton;
A bill (S. 552) granting a pension to Florence Storr;
A bill (S. 553) granting a pension to George A. Huffar;
A bill (S. 554) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Howell Butler;
A bill (S. 555) granting an increase of pension to Percy H. Allen;
A bill (S. 556) granting an increase of pension to Anita Stephens;
A bill (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to John L. Dick;
A bill (S. 558) granting an increase of pension to Annie N. Sullivan;
A bill (S. 559) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Spence;
A bill (S. 560) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Blevins;
A bill (S. 561) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. C. Blevins;
A bill (S. 562) granting a pension to Mattie Johnson;
A bill (S. 563) granting a pension to Abe Erlich;
A bill (S. 564) granting a pension to Mattie Wood;
A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Fain;
A bill (S. 566) granting a pension to William H. Hart; and
A bill (S. 567) granting an increase of pension to Tide Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution No. 2, submitted by Mr. NORRIS on Monday last, opposing the seating of WILLIAM S. VARE as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I fully realize my utter inability to say what I think ought to be said in this Chamber this morning, but, wisely or unwisely, I have convinced myself that it is my duty to try to say in my feeble way a few things which I think should be said.

In the first place, Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Senate, if I can, the exact position which it now occupies before the American people. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]—and we all recognize the Senator's ability and his high purpose—in his statement with regard to the pending resolution told us that Mr. VARE is a bad man and that there is no question about it. The then Governor of Pennsylvania sent to the Senate a communication in which he tells the Senate that Mr. VARE is a bad man and that there is no question about it.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]—and I think he is a credible witness; I know no man in the Senate who has superior abilities or finer instincts—tells us that these charges are without foundation. Now it is proposed that this controversy be recommitted to a special committee and they are to do the best they can to find out whether Mr. VARE is a good man or a bad man. In the meantime it is to be assumed that he is a bad man.

The Senator from Pennsylvania called our attention to the fact that in ancient days in England, in Judge Jeffreys's court, a man was presumed to be guilty until he could establish his innocence and was treated accordingly. If my recollection serves me correctly, Dante, in his Inferno, tells us that a similar policy prevails in the courts of that region. So to-day we have Satan and the Senate as the two—I trust the only two—living protagonists of this policy. I think I may be pardoned for saying that personally I do not like the association.

That is not all, Mr. President. For more than four centuries the humblest citizen charged with a crime in Anglo-Saxon circles has been accorded certain preconviction privileges, and first among them is the right to be tried by a disinterested court. I think we know that that privilege can not be granted to Mr. VARE. I am sure I need not go into the history of the forces that established that right to demonstrate its wisdom.

I think we all realize that there is a good reason why civilized nations to-day defend the humblest citizen, his life, his liberty, his property, and, above all, his good name against interested and arbitrary political officials. It has been said,

and well said, I think, that in every country to-day the value set by that country upon the good name of the citizen is the measure of the degree to which it has become civilized.

I do not know why the framers of the Constitution made this body the sole judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members, but they did it, and it is unimportant for us to inquire into the reasons. They may not have anticipated the rapid development of political parties, with their bitter rivalries and antagonisms. It may be that they felt that inasmuch as a disinterested, unprejudiced court for the trial of contested-election cases could not be had in this world, the power to work an injustice might as well be left in the numerous and supposedly great and good Senate as in a tribunal consisting of one, two, three, four, or even five judges; but the fact remains, Mr. President, that if the title to a seat in the Senate is questioned that question can not be tried by a disinterested tribunal; that under the Constitution, which we all love and respect and sometimes obey, if that question is raised it can not be tried by a disinterested court.

Let us take the case at bar. When we contemplate the vital importance of one or two votes in the organization of this body and in its subsequent proceedings we know that each and every Member of the Senate has a deep personal and political interest in the result of this trial. It may be, Mr. President, that each and every one of us can subordinate that deep personal interest to a still deeper sense of justice and right; but if we want to do it, if we want to evidence that purpose, my position is that we must indicate it by our conduct rather than by conversation, however eloquent and ornamental and oriental that conversation may be. If we want to demonstrate to the American people our intention to be as fair as we can be under the circumstances the way is wide open. It is not our fault that Mr. VARE is to be tried by an interested tribunal, and it is not his fault, but, if we want to do the best we can to give him a fair trial, the way is wide open.

Mr. President, that provision of the Constitution which requires a two-thirds vote to expel a Member from this body was one of the very few provisions that met with unanimous approval of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention. I think the vote of Pennsylvania was divided on the question of the jurisdiction, but on the question involved here every delegate from every one of the Colonies saw the wisdom of placing the right to a seat in this body upon as high a plane as that provided in the case of a judge of a district court. Every delegate from every Colony saw the danger of reposing in this body the power to impeach a Senator by a mere majority vote.

We have the power to do it. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] in discussing this subject called the attention of the Senate to the fact that all administrative bodies and all courts have the power to play ducks and drakes with justice if they see fit. I admit that; but, Mr. President, to our everlasting comfort, it can be said that the instances are exceedingly rare where a court of consequence in this country has surrendered principle to expediency. This single fact has done more to strengthen and support and preserve the confidence of the American people in this Government than all of its other achievements in peace or in war; and I think we know that our courts must remain above suspicion if we are to remain a civilized people. It is my position that the Senate must remain above suspicion if this Nation is to fulfill its destiny.

Mr. President, shall we, the Senate of the United States, which claims to be the highest court in the world; shall we, who have power to remove Presidents and Vice Presidents and Chief Justices, the power to make and unmake courts and judges; shall we now, fired with partisan zeal, with heads void of facts and hearts filled with determination, hazard our reputation for honesty of purpose while we are demanding that no man of dishonest purposes shall become a Member of this body?

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. The Senate can endure the presence of Mr. VARE. It can not endure a series of political lynchings, I care not how certain the promoters may be that they are avenging the outraged purity of this Republic.

If this controversy is brought before the Senate as it should be, in harmony with the sacred and revered traditions of this body; if this controversy is brought before the Senate in harmony with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, my vote will be controlled by the evidence; but if the resolution now pending is forced to a roll call, I shall consider the good name of the Senate of far greater consequence than the good or the bad name of WILLIAM S. VARE.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I know it is unnecessary for me to disclaim any intention of discussing the pending resolution from the standpoint of constitutional interpretations; and yet, as I have considered the entire subject, I think in most, if not all, its phases, I am convinced that even a layman can formulate an accurate opinion concerning some of the questions involved.

I am not going to discuss, I repeat, just what the word "qualifications" as contained in the Constitution means. I am of the opinion, however, that if the framers of the Constitution had intended the qualifications for admission in this body to extend beyond age and citizenship and residence, they would have said so. I recognize that leading authorities take both that position and the counterposition. But there is one other word that to me surely can have but one interpretation contained in the paragraph in Article I, which in effect—I have not the language before me—states that the Senate shall have power to decide the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members. I want to emphasize particularly the word "members." To me "members" can only mean what every one, I think, has always accepted as the meaning.

In Webster's Dictionary, among other definitions of the meaning of the word "member," is recited the following:

> Member: One of the persons composing a society, community, or party; an individual who belongs to an association.

There can not be any question as to the meaning of that definition. It is not a quibble to emphasize that word in this debate. How is it possible to pass upon a Member's qualification until he becomes a Member? You can not dismiss a man from membership until he becomes a Member. In my judgment the use of that word clearly shows that the framers of the Constitution—as has been stated by other Senators reaching their conclusions, perhaps, from other premises—meant that a Senator elect must first be placed upon precisely the same basis as those who try him. Questions of qualification beyond those clearly defined in the part of the Constitution to which I have referred are questions of a proper qualification to retain membership after the Senator elect has been sworn in and is on a basis of equality, so far as membership is concerned, with those who will judge his qualifications.

I agree absolutely with the splendid address of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday, in which his conclusion—reached, perhaps, from another basis, or upon other grounds—was substantially the same. Each of the States, under the Constitution, is entitled to two Members in the Senate. We, without any question of a doubt, have the full power to decide whether these Senators, as Members, are qualified to remain as Members of this body but not to deny them admission.

The discussion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], in speaking to his resolution, was almost entirely devoted to the alleged expenditure of money or illegal practices in the primary campaign. As I followed it, there was very little reference to the constitutional right of a Senator elect first to become a Member. I believe these two questions should be absolutely divided. I should like to vote, and will vote, as I have, as far as the resolution before us permits us to do so, to admit a Senator elect with proper credentials at any and all times; and I will just as readily vote to refer any protests or challenges as to his right to retain his seat to the proper standing committee, and withhold judgment until its investigation and report is before the Senate. But to dispose of a case of the highest privilege—in which class, of course, this question belongs—in this manner, combining the two issues, as it were, in one, seems to me unfair to two great States, as well as to those who have received the majority votes of the legal electors voting in those States.

Just a word on the question of alleged expenditure of money.

As I have indicated, I do not think that should be the subject of discussion to-day; but if we are to debar a Senator elect from admission to this body mainly, as I take it, upon the ground of an alleged expenditure of money in amounts which are deemed immoral, then we owe it to the country, we owe it to every State in the Union, we owe it to every man or woman who properly is ambitious to become a Member of Congress or to serve his or her State or his or her country in an elective office that there should be a clear definition, based upon population, which we can not properly evade, in order that men will know what is considered an immoral expenditure and what is considered a justified expenditure.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] very ably pointed out yesterday, the great State of Pennsylvania, with practically one-tenth of the population of the Union, with an estimated population of approximately 9,500,000 people, with a legal voting population of approximately 4,000,000, can not in all justness be on the same basis in its total expenditures for election purposes as the State of Nevada or any other State of far less population. Roughly computing the expenditure admitted by Senator-elect VARE and those who were associated with him as candidates for office as about $800,000, and then giving proper consideration—which must be arbitrary, in a

way—as to how much of the $800,000 should be charged to the Vare campaign in view of the many candidates running with him, let us arrive for purposes of comparison at an arbitrary figure, say, of $600,000.

If we admit that three-fourths of that entire expenditure, or $600,000, was particularly for the benefit of the nomination of Senator-elect VARE, under the circumstances we are certainly very liberal. With 4,000,000 legal voters, an expenditure of $600,000 would mean 15 cents per voter for educational and all other purposes. A heated political campaign justifies the presentation of the facts to the public. Fifteen cents per voter in Pennsylvania approximates, as I have said, $600,000. Fifteen cents per voter in a number of the smaller States of the Union, without attempting to consult the figures of population, would probably amount to in the neighborhood of five or six thousand dollars, or a little more.

I ask the question in absolute fairness, and with a desire at least to bring this question before the Senate in such a way that ultimately, I hope, some solution or decision can be arrived at: Would it be considered that a Senator for whose election a total of five or six thousand dollars had been disbursed in the same proportion that money was spent in Pennsylvania had been guilty of corruption, or that the total was immoral; that he was thus unfitted for admission to this body? It is a question which in all fairness we can not evade. The ratio must be fixed proportionately if we are to regulate primary elections, as I think many Senators believe we should; and I am inclined to a similar belief. Certainly a great State can not be fairly penalized simply because it is big.

In the resolution now pending there is recited in full the certificate from the then Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor Pinchot, together with a letter. Obviously, from the fact that it appears in the resolution, it is deemed by its proponent, the Senator from Nebraska, as an important argument against the seating of Senator-elect VARE. It is made a part of his case, his complaint, in other words.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] was most generous and considerate in touching upon this phase of the situation as he did in that very quiet and modest manner for which he is noted. But is it not fair to emphasize the fact that if the expenditures as testified to by Senator-elect VARE as to his own disbursements, approximately $70,000, are correct—and I have not heard that that statement has been disputed—and the figures as turned in by Governor Pinchot, the former Governor of Pennsylvania, whose testimony is used as the leading evidence against Senator-elect VARE, something short of $200,000, are likewise correct, then the latter spent approximately two and a half times as much as the Senator elect in an unsuccessful effort to defeat him? If Senator-elect VARE's expenditures have been immoral because they have reached $70,000, then the man whose testimony has been used as the reason for excluding Senator-elect VARE has been two and a half times as immoral.

Mr. President, I said at the outset that it was not my intention to discuss in detail the alleged expenditures, because I assume that when the committee reports that will be one of the subjects of its report and will be the subject of debate finally. The committee will be charged with the investigation of that matter, and when the committee reports, we will, of course, have additional information and additional testimony which can be discussed.

I only wanted to put before the Senate, before the committee enter again upon their very important deliberations, that this country deserves to know—and in all fairness the man or woman who in the future will aspire to public office has a right to know—if expenditures are to be the main reason for exclusion, as the debate seems to indicate, what is to be the standard of justified or unjustified disbursements. When 33 men—that is what this action or precedent means, 32, a third, plus 1—can bar any and all applicants in the future when a new Congress assembles, it is well for us to carefuly consider our great responsibility; yes, and our great power.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in this appeal from Daniel to Noah Webster engaged in by the Senator from New Jersey. He proposes to settle all the constitutional questions by reference to the dictionary. Of course that is a very simple way.

I was also much impressed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], who assured us that the devil has taken up his abode in the Senate. He did not tell when he was elected and from what State he came, but having such intimate knowledge of him, I presume he knows how to get him out.

I also want to call attention to the constitutional argument made yesterday by my very distinguished friend from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It was truly a great argument. It was divided equally between the two contending forces, and either may read the half of it it likes the better and be governed accordingly.

As I gather from the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut, and also the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], if one shall present his credentials, purporting that he has been selected as a Senator from one of the 48 States, his right to be seated is absolute, that the Senate may look only between the four corners of the certificate; if it be regular as to form, he is entitled to be sworn in.

If that is not their position, I am unable to follow their argument at all, because if you may go back of that certificate for any purpose, if you may examine back of it to ascertain whether he was a resident of the State from which he comes, or whether he had been nine years a citizen of the United States, or whether he had attained the age of 30 years—if you can look back of it for any purpose, then you may go back of it to determine whether the Senator designate has the proper qualifications, as the Constitution gives the Senate the power to determine his election and qualifications for a seat in the Senate. It is obviously true that they must accept one or the other theory, either that if one present a certificate of election that is regular upon its face he is entitled to be sworn in, or they must concede that the Senate has the power to go back of his certificate to determine whether he is entitled to a seat in the Senate.

If we have no power whatever to go back of the certificate prior to the administration of the oath to the Senator designate, then anybody coming here with a certificate is entitled to be sworn in, although every Member of the Senate might know he was not a resident of the State from which he came; although they might know he was not a citizen of the United States; although they might know that he had not attained the age of 30 years. If we have no right to go back of the certificate, we must swear him in and then exclude him.

I doubt if anybody would like to go that far. In some unwatched hour Mr. Insull, who seems to have some control of the seats in the Senate for Illinois, might purchase a seat for the King of England, and the great mayor of Chicago then would have to put him out of the Senate, as he is putting him out of Chicago. [Laughter.] I hope they will not impose upon him the additional duty of guarding the Senate after guarding the city of Chicago against foreign invasion by the King of England. Yet, as absurd as the proposition seems to be, if the contention of these gentlemen as to the Constitution is correct, that we can not look back of the certificate; when a man comes here with a certificate proper as to form we must admit him, and then determine his right to a seat. There is no use dodging the question. Let us be perfectly candid. Let us say that his certificate gives him the absolute right to be sworn in, or the Senate has the right to go back of the certificate and determine whether or not he has the qualifications necessary to entitle him to a seat.

I am frank to say that I do not agree with some of my colleagues about the Governor of Pennsylvania having the right to give to the Senator designate a certificate in which the question of the legality of his election is raised. I do not concede the Governor of Pennsylvania has that right. I do not think the governor of any State has the right to say whether an election was fair or unfair. If he has, then the Senate itself is not the exclusive judge of the election and qualifications of its Members, but the governor of the State from which a Senator elect comes shares that responsibility. Therefore I have not agreed with some of my colleagues who have thought that the governor's tainted certificate was entitled to be received and considered. I do not agree that a governor has the right to issue such a certificate. I think that all he has to do is ministerial, to certify that a man was or was not, apparently, upon the face of the returns, elected.

Therefore it makes no difference to me what kind of a certificate is brought here if it certifies that the man was elected. If that is all there is in it, I think he ought to be seated. But inasmuch as I contend that the Senate is the judge, and not the Governor of Pennsylvania, I think the Senate may inquire into the things that preceded the issuing of the certificate of election. If it has not the power to inquire into that before the Senator is seated, it has not that power after he is seated.

To me it would seem the height of absurdity to say that the Senate has no right to guard itself against the admission of an improper person, but has a right, after he has been admitted, to expel him; in other words, that a Senator designate has more right in this Chamber than a Senator who has been sworn in. That seems to me to be such an absurd conclusion that I hesitate to treat seriously anyone who takes that view of it. To deny that the Senate has the right to guard itself against the admission of an improper person, but the absolute and unqualified right to exclude him after he has been admitted, seems to me to be, as I said before, too absurd to be considered.

Let me refer a moment to this question of the use of money, about which my friend from New Jersey is so much disturbed. The Senator from Pennsylvania stated he was not prepared to criticize the expenditure of $1,800,000 for his colleague when he and his colleague were making an effort to return him to the Senate. Pennsylvania went on record in 1921 on the questions of expending money in elections. A Democrat had the certificate of election to the House of Representatives from a Pennsylvania district, and was deprived of his seat because a committee with which he had no connection and of which he had no knowledge expended a few thousand dollars in his behalf more than the act of Congress then prescribed.

Every Republican Member of the House from Pennsylvania who voted at all voted to exclude him except one. Strange to say, one Member from Pennsylvania voted to seat him. Every Republican Member of the House from Illinois who voted at all voted to exclude him because of this expenditure, and, like Abou Ben Adhem, leading all the rest was the Senator designate from Illinois [Mr. SMITH], then a Member of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The report of the committee upon which the action referred to by the junior Senator from Arkansas was taken disclosed that personally Mr. McLane expended $748.04, but that a campaign committee expended $11,749. In its report the committee says:

> The committee therefore finds that the contestee, Patrick McLane, must under the law be held to have had constructive knowledge——

Mr. CARAWAY. Although he had no actual knowledge.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (continuing)—

> of expenditures made in excess of the amount permitted under the corrupt practices act. For that reason, in accordance with congressional precedent and as a matter of principle, he is not entitled to his seat in the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Mr. CARAWAY. And all the Republican Representatives from Pennsylvania who voted at all voted in accordance therewith with that report except one. As I said a moment ago, Mr. SMITH, then a Member of the House from Illinois, had himself recorded in the affirmative when that question came up for consideration.

My friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, says that Mr. VARE should not be held accountable for the $105,000 which the governor spent for his own campaign; though how he could spend that for his own alone when they ran as partners I do not know.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. They did not run as partners until the campaign was nearly over.

Mr. CARAWAY. They ran that way when they were spending the money.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the Mr. McLane in the House, about whom the Senator has been speaking, was sworn in by the House, and was then tried and denied his seat?

Mr. CARAWAY. But the question is this: The Senator said yesterday that the $105,000 of which Mr. VARE knew nothing should not be charged to him when every Republican Member of Congress said a Democrat was charged with constructive knowledge of every dollar that might have been expended in the campaign in which he was interested.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But the Senator will notice the difference. One was spent for Mr. McLane's candidacy, but the other was not spent for Mr. VARE's candidacy.

Mr. CARAWAY. It was spent on the candidates for governor and for Senator and for the local candidates, so they say; but the point is that McLane knew absolutely nothing about it and yet they charged him with constructive knowledge of it, and Pennsylvania went on record that he was not entitled to keep his seat in the House because of that fact.

The Senator said he comes here with a mandate from the State of Pennsylvania, but there was a mandate saying that if these people spent money for McLane unrighteously because they said McLane must have constructive knowledge of its expenditure.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. It would seem also that that money was used largely for Mr. VARE, because his candidate for governor was defeated.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, he got more for his money than the governor got.

My friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] said that the Senator designate, Mr. VARE, spent a very great deal of money for educational purposes. I have read his campaign document. It consisted in declaring that "We want beer." That was the campaign of education. The man who has an educated appetite for beer does not require $800,000 to be expended to tell him that he wants beer. To talk about that being a campaign of education, even in Pennsylvania, is perverting the use of the term "education." From what I have heard about Pennsylvania, they do not need any education on the question of wanting beer.

I am not going to read what the Senator himself said about Mr. VARE when he was a candidate, although it makes interesting reading. I might mention it to show that he was not carrying on a campaign of education. The Senator said that "the questions on which he would be required to act are the live questions of tariff, immigration, taxation, banking, farm relief, railroad, foreign affairs, and shipping," and he said that of these the Senator designate knows nothing. Of course, I take for granted that my friend from Pennsylvania knew him and his limitation. If those were the questions about which Mr. VARE knew absolutely nothing, what use did he have for $700,000 to carry on a campaign of education?

Mr. REED of Missouri. How could he represent Pennsylvania? How much is Pennsylvania deprived of?

Mr. CARAWAY. I can not answer the Senator from Missouri as to how much Pennsylvania will lose by reason of the fact that the gentleman does not sit. I do not know.

It was said by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]—and I read his speech again to be certain that I could not be mistaken—that there was not a taint of suspicion attaching to this election. He was talking about both primary and general elections, but he was speaking particularly about the November election because he said the people in Pennsylvania gave him a mandate to stop an inquiry into that. The committee inquired into the primary, but he got a mandate from the people of Pennsylvania to keep it from that inquiry. Therefore he was alluding to the general election, and said no taint of suspicion attached to it. Then, modestly, he admitted that in his own city they had indicted 132 people for doing wrong in connection with that election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I probably did not talk loud enough for it to penetrate the Senator's consciousness, but I tried to tell the Senate yesterday that those indictments were based on irregularities in the primaries in September of this year. They have not any more to do with the case which the Senator is arguing than if they had happened 10 years ago.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the first time the Senator has said anything about it. Why should he be talking about what took place in this year when we are all talking about the election that was held last year?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Because the challenge was made by somebody on the Senator's side of the aisle, and I answered the challenge, but the Senator apparently did not listen to the answer.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, I did; and I read it again this morning. Fortunately, if I can not understand a Senator when he talks, I can read the RECORD to see what he said.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I would not dream of contradicting the Senator, but I would be interested in having the Senator point out where in the RECORD he finds the statement he just quoted.

Mr. CARAWAY. Very well.

I do not know who Mr. Harry A. Mackey is, but he is somebody up in Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Manager for Mr. VARE.

Mr. CARAWAY. Manager for Mr. VARE?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. God bless his soul! [Laughter.] Therefore I guess he is entirely credible, is he not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. He is mayor elect of Philadelphia.

Mr. CARAWAY. Since that time he is entirely credible. Here is what was said about him:

> Harry A. Mackey, in an address at Scranton, is credited with the statement that 225,000 votes could be changed in 10 minutes by sending a marked ballot to the 1,492 voting precincts. Roper and other officials of the Pepper-Fisher headquarters claim they have unearthed a series of favorite methods used by the Vare machine—

I hope I will not be held responsible for the "Vare machine"—

> in past elections for defrauding the voters of an honest election vote and count.

Mr. Mackey ought to know. He was VARE's campaign manager.

Roper warns all voters to be on guard next Tuesday to prevent such tactics.

The magical methods of rolling up Vare totals is described as the "floating ballot." It is put into effect, according to Roper, when a Vare sympathizer enters the polling place and asks for a ballot. Upon receiving it, he enters the polling booth. Then he produces a blank piece of paper which is the same size as the regulation ballot. He marks the official ballot and folds it and the blank paper. The paper is deposited in the ballot box. The real ballot is later turned over to a Vare worker, who establishes a chain system by turning it over to a controlled voter, who, after he deposits it, returns the blank ballot over to the worker. This is then marked and handed to another "regular." In this way assistance is avoided and the Vare sympathizers waste no time in the booth.

That was the speech he made. I do not know whether I had better take his word when he makes a speech or not. He seemed to have some idea that is the way they hold elections in Pennsylvania. I do not know. I think one thing about Pennsylvania, and I say it with a great deal of admiration. It is the one Commonwealth in these forty-eight where they can confer upon one immortality. Get on the Republican voting list there and you will never die! [Laughter.] I think it even goes beyond that. It seems that a ripe banana voted very earnestly in this last election. [Laughter.]

But I did not intend to argue the question of the facts. I only rose to comment upon what seemed to me to be an utter inconsistency in saying that the Senate is clothed with the power to exclude those who are not properly elected and is utterly devoid of power to prevent those who are not properly elected from being first sworn in as Members of the Senate. That is a logic, if it be logic, which I can not follow. I would be as far from excluding one upon a charge as anybody, but here was a case in which the sworn testimony had been developed and both the Senators designate had appeared and testified, and from their own evidence they disclosed that they had made expenditures far in excess of what even the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], in his famous resolution declaring Mr. Newberry had been elected, could approve. He there stated that the expenditure of such large sums of money—$190,000—with or without the knowledge of the candidate, was dangerous to our institutions and hurtful to the dignity of the Senate, and therefore, following it to its conclusion, I thought that at least until some explanation of those expenditures should be made there was not any injustice done to the people of Pennsylvania and Illinois to let those Senators designate stand aside until the question could be developed. That is all we are doing here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the author of the resolution, and in his name I desire to perfect the text of the resolution as follows:

On page 2, first line, strike out the word "that" and in the same line, after the word "evidence," insert the word "which," so that as amended it will read:

Whereas the said committee has reported the evidence which—

And so forth.

As the committee did not report findings of fact, there is manifestly a clerical error or an error in expression which my amendment will correct. I have the authority of the Senator from Nebraska to perfect the text in this way, and ask that that be done.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. There is no objection. May I inquire of the Senator in that connection whether, if it is his plan to amend the resolution so as to send this case for further inquiry, he ought not to agree to strike out the preamble entirely, because it completely prejudges the case which we are sending to a committee for a supposedly impartial investigation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I could not agree at this time to any arrangement of that character. I think the proponents of the resolution would desire a showing in the resolution, in the nature of a preamble, for the reference of the credentials. I think it would be improper to make the reference without that explanation, particularly in view of the fact that the resolution contemplates that the Senator designate shall not be seated until after the committee has reported.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely, but the Senator's resolution, as he plans to amend it, sends the case to a committee of the Senate with such instructions and findings of fact by the Senate as preclude any answer but one to the questions which are submitted to that committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not think the preamble to the resolution as modified prejudges the findings of fact. I do not think it estops the committee in any way.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think it is too soon for me to make any motion on the subject, until the Senator has finished perfecting his resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. In the same way, for and on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska, I desire to further perfect the text of the resolution as follows:

Strike out the last resolve and insert in lieu thereof the following, the language being the same as that employed in the case of the Senator designate from Illinois except, of course, that the name of WILLIAM S. VARE appears in this amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May we have it read?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (reading):

Be it further resolved, That the claim of the said WILLIAM S. VARE to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the said special committee of the Senate, with instructions to grant such further hearing to said WILLIAM S. VARE and to take such further evidence on its own motion as shall be proper in the premises, and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible date; and that until the coming in of the report of said committee and until the final action of the Senate thereon the said WILLIAM S. VARE be, and he is hereby, denied his seat in the United States Senate.

And so forth.

I ask to perfect the text by the adoption of that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The text will be regarded as so perfected.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to submit another amendment. It is the amendment which was offered yesterday by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in another case then pending before the Senate, and is as follows:

Add at the end of the pending resolution the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That the said WILLIAM S. VARE shall be accorded the privileges of the floor of the Senate for the purpose of being heard touching his right to receive the oath of office and to membership in the Senate."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, while the Senator is about it, would he not be willing to strike out, for the present at least, the first paragraph of the resolution, which declares unqualifiedly that the election was tainted with fraud?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I shall be glad to consider that suggestion after the amendment which I have just indicated shall have been disposed of and as soon as I have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I beg the Senator's pardon. I supposed he had the right to perfect the resolution in any way that he pleased.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not make the statement that I am offering this amendment in the name of the Senator from Nebraska. I am offering this amendment in my own name at the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas to the resolution as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator, if he has finished with his amendments, whether he would not consider also a further amendment requiring a report from the special committee within 60 days?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I would be very glad to consider such an amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator consider that in connection with my other suggestion?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not able to answer that question immediately for reasons which I think must occur to the Senator. I do not know what the proponent of the resolution himself would think about such an amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am only suggesting it for the Senator's consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think, if the Senate desires to do so, that it might be very well to take a short recess in order that I may consider his suggestions.

Mr. CURTIS. Would a recess until 2 o'clock be sufficient?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That would be ample.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock, at which hour it reassembled.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 2, submitted by Mr. NORRIS on Monday last, opposing the seating of WILLIAM S. VARE as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shortridge
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Simmons
Bingham	George	McNary	Smith
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	Metcalf	Steck
Blease	Glass	Moses	Steiwer
Borah	Goff	Neely	Stephens
Bratton	Gould	Norbeck	Swanson
Brookhart	Greene	Nye	Thomas
Broussard	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Bruce	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Tyson
Caraway	Hawes	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Ransdell	Warren
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Waterman
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Edge	Keyes	Sackett	
Edwards	King	Schall	
Ferris	La Follette	Sheppard	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GILLETT obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me for a moment? With reference to the subject matter of the suggestions of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] for amendments to perfect the text of the pending resolution, I desire to make those at this time. However, if the Senator from Massachusetts prefers to make his speech first, I shall wait.

Mr. GILLETT. It makes no difference. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. With respect to the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the time within which the committee may report be limited to 60 days, I have no objection to expressing the following limitation:

Within 60 days if practicable.

I would not be willing to charge the committee with responsibility to report within 60 days if a filibuster or other obstructive process is to be conducted against the proceedings of the committee. I feel that it would be absurd to hamper the Senate and its committee by requiring a report within 60 days if the committee, after all due diligence, should be unable to conclude its work. It will be recalled that the occasion for the further reference to take additional testimony is due, in part at least, to the fact that at the last session, when the committee asked for certain authority, when there was an overwhelming vote, apparently, in the Senate ready to give that authority, the Senate was prevented from registering its action on the resolution by a filibuster ably conducted against the amendment. We desire that the report may be made just as soon as possible, and we would like to have it made within 60 days if that is practicable; but for the reason I have stated I would not offer an amendment which would compel the committee to come in with its work unfinished, if it is to be obstructed and hampered in the performance of its duty. If the amendment as I have offered it is desirable to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I shall be glad to propose it; otherwise, I would prefer to let the text stand.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Of course, I am going to offer a substitute for the entire resolution. If my substitute should meet the same fate as that met by the substitute of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] on yesterday, then we will come back to the resolution with reference to which the Senator from Arkansas is now suggesting an amendment. I think that it would be well to have in the resolution a 60-day limitation expressed in that way.

I am told by the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections that it will be possible for that committee to complete its count of the Pennsylvania ballots in 60 days. The Senate has already referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections the election contest brought by Mr. Wilson. If the committee can complete that great work in 60 days, it would seem that it would be wise to have the report of this special committee also in the hands of the Senate at the same time. For that reason I offer no objection to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am offering it to meet the suggestion made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do not care to offer it unless he would prefer to have the amendment made.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the resolution is to be adopted, I prefer to have the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. I propose the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KING. Let the proposed amendment be reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the substitute offered strike out the words "at the earliest possible date" and insert in lieu thereof the words "within 60 days if practicable," so as to make the sentence read:

Resolved, That the claim of the said WILLIAM S. VARE to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the said special committee of the Senate, with instructions to grant such further hearing to the said WILLIAM S. VARE and to take such further evidence on its own motion as shall be proper in the premises, and to report to the Senate within 60 days if practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There are two other amendments which I intend to propose, as follows:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "Senate," insert the words "prima facie," and on page 4, line 10, after the word "Pennsylvania," insert the words "prima facie," so that it will read:

"*Resolved*, That the expenditure of such a large sum of money to secure the nomination of the said WILLIAM S. VARE as a candidate for the United States Senate prima facie is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, and, together with the charges of corruption and fraud made in the report of said committee, and substantiated by the evidence taken by said committee, and the charges of corruption and fraud officially made by the Governor of Pennsylvania, prima facie taints with fraud and corruption the credentials of the said WILLIAM S. VARE for a seat in the United States Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any part in this discussion, but there is one phase of it which has not been expressed which goes far to determine my vote. Before casting my vote I wish to state my opinion. I appreciate that the Senators have made up their minds, that no argument can affect the result, and I shall be very brief.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on yesterday, with his usual force and thoroughness, discussed the question of elections to the Senate, and in his conclusions I concur, but there is a further point which I believe has great bearing on the subject which I wish to emphasize, namely, that the Senate has no right at all to consider the fitness of any Member elect except upon the three grounds specified in the Constitution—age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. I appreciate that the language of the Constitution may be interpreted in two ways; that it may be interpreted to limit our powers or it may be interpreted not to do so. It is ambiguous, and when the language of an instrument is ambiguous it is proper to consider the intention of its framers. In looking back to the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention and the atmosphere that existed at that time, I can not help believing that the framers of the Constitution never intended to support a proposition—and if such a suggestion had been baldly placed before them they never would have adopted it—to allow the Senate absolute and unlimited discretion to determine the fitness of Members elected to this body by the States.

We know that at the time of the Constitutional Convention the one great objection to the Constitution against which the persons who were advocating its adoption had constantly to fight was the jealousy of the States of Federal power. State rights then had a force and conviction which is unknown to-day. The marvelous success of our experiment in government has largely overwhelmed all opposition, but at that time there was an unconcealed fear of the Federal power not only in the Constitutional Convention, but in the State conventions when the States came to ratify the Constitution. So great was that opposition that the Constitution was only ratified, as we know, by a very narrow margin, because of the feeling of State rights

and the unwillingness to concede power to the Federal Government. It was only by concessions in the way of amendments which limited Federal power that the ratification of the Constitution was finally obtained.

It seems to me inconceivable that as to the Senate, which was then looked upon as the citadel of the rights of the States, where every State had equal representation, those men in that atmosphere, if the proposition which is advocated to-day had been put before the Constitutional Convention, it would never have adopted it. I believe that had it been advocated that the Senate should have the power to decline to seat any Member elected by any State for any reason which it saw fit, that such a proposition would have been overwhelmingly rejected. It is practically the argument to-day that we can reject anybody elected to the Senate if we think he is unfit, no matter whether or not his State may have condoned any alleged offense or impropriety.

Take the cases before us to-day. In both States the objections which are made here on the floor of the Senate to the seating of these Members elect were well known to the voters. The Senate committee had made its investigation, and I do not think publicity was shunned as to the results of that investigation. The facts were well known throughout the States. Knowing those facts the States sent these men to the Senate. Consequently, it seems to me, inasmuch as these men meet the three qualifications which the Constitution provides, that it is our duty to accept them, and we have no right on the ground of unfitness to say that they shall not be admitted to the Senate.

I appreciate that this is the unpopular side of the question; I appreciate that every instinct of selfishness would urge a man to take the other side. I confess that I have great sympathy with that third of the Senate who will come up for election next year and who are now confronted with this issue and must take a public stand upon it, because we have seen in the past how powerful an issue it can be made. Against them it can be said that they are on the side of wealth and corruption and that they are not willing to stand for the purity of the ballot.

I can conceive that Senators against whom their rivals have no issue, who have a certainty of nomination and election, might well feel that here is an issue that could be raised against them, and that it would have great force and danger. I, fortunately, am not in that position, but I can see the embarrassment and the pressure that must come upon every man who stands in that unfortunate attitude.

I do not believe that the doctrine announced in the Newberry case by the Senate is sound doctrine. As I understand, that was a simple statement that the amount of money which was spent constituted an impropriety and was dangerous to the perpetuity of the Nation. In my opinion it is not the amount of money which is spent but the purpose for which the money is spent which determines whether the expenditure is corrupt or whether it is proper. The sum of $100 spent to corrupt and purchase a vote would be more reprehensible than $1,000,000 spent for legitimate purposes of information and advertising. We should not forget that this is the age of advertisement. The use of money in elections has been increasing, and I regret to say has become more and more necessary, I believe, to a successful contest. Why? Not because the people are more corrupt, not because the money is spent directly to influence the people, but because this is the age of publicity, and expensive and helpful methods of publicity have been discovered.

I noticed this morning in the Washington Post that the people of the impoverished flood districts of the Mississippi have inserted a whole page advertisement, which must have cost a handsome sum, for the purpose of impressing the people at large with their needs. Every good as well as every bad object and purpose appreciates the value of publicity, and every man entering a campaign appreciates it.

In my section of the country—I do not know how it is elsewhere—I believe the improper use of money is much less common than it was a generation ago. I remember when I was a young man that the purchase of votes was not unknown, but now I never hear of such a thing. In my section I do not believe there is now any corrupt use of money in the sense that votes are purchased or the electorate is corrupted; but indirectly it is used in the way of advertisement, in the way of propaganda. We all agree that what we want is a ballot uninfluenced by any selfish consideration, yet in my opinion the use of money, so far as interfering with the integrity of the ballot is concerned, is not comparable with race prejudice, or class prejudice, or religious prejudice, or, in the great cities, with organizations which all through the year give out patronage and offices and work and charity and then on election day demand and receive obedient votes. That all interferes with the purity and integrity of the ballot, and in my opinion vastly more than does the use of money. But the question always in my mind is not how large a sum of money has been used but for what purposes it has been used. The adoption of the primary system has largely increased the need of the expenditure of money. A man who, instead of appearing before a convention where he would probably be known to the delegates, has to bring himself before the constituency of a whole district or a whole State necessarily seeks to make himself known, and that requires advertisement, information, propaganda. So long as it is legitimate and proper information it is useful; it encourages and educates the public. Of course, if money is used corruptly everybody would denounce it, and if the charge of corruption is proved it is sufficient to invalidate the election; but the mere amount of money is not of itself, it seems to me, necessarily a subject of criticism, although I appreciate that on the stump resounding attacks will be made.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, if he does not think the amount of money expended is a pertinent question, what chance he thinks Daniel Webster would have had for election to the United States Senate from a State where there was expended in the primaries $1,800,000?

Mr. GILLETT. I think Daniel Webster would have been elected in Massachusetts if he had not spent a dollar.

Mr. GLASS. After a while he would have been, perhaps; but when he was a poor man and had to borrow $50 from a bank what chance would he have had of election against an opponent who could spend $800,000 in an election?

Mr. GILLETT. Of course, the man who can obtain publicity, and has the money to obtain publicity, has a tremendous advantage, and any young and poor man is at a disadvantage against such an opponent.

Mr. GLASS. Does the Senator think that ought to be so?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not see how we are going to prevent it. I do not see why it is improper.

Mr. GLASS. We have not prevented it; but does not the Senator think we should prevent it?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think we ought to punish a man for legitimate advertising.

Mr. GLASS. No advertising for a political office is legitimate which costs $800,000.

Mr. GILLETT. That depends, of course, on the size of the constituency. As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] suggested this morning, nobody would think of objecting if a candidate in Nevada spent $6,000. We would not think that was illegitimate, and yet $6,000 in Nevada is as much as $800,000 in Pennsylvania.

Mr. GLASS. Suppose we back away from the theory of the thing now and get down to a practical question. Does the Senator believe that anybody in Pennsylvania knew any more about W. S. VARE after the expenditure of this $800,000 than he knew before?

Mr. GILLETT. I certainly do.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator does?

Mr. GILLETT. I certainly do.

Mr. President, I only wish to repeat that, in my opinion, the Senate has absolutely no right to pass upon the fitness of these men except from the standpoint of the three qualifications which the Constitution provides.

Mr. GLASS. Right on that point may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. GLASS. If that be so, how does the Senator account for the fact that the original draft of this particular provision of the Constitution was affirmative and that the second draft was negative—that is to say, in the nature of disqualification rather than in the nature of asserting a qualification? Furthermore, how does the Senator account for the fact that with respect to the provision of the Constitution which says that each House of Congress shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members, when Mr. Randolph proposed a property tax it was objected to by Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, upon the ground that to assert any one disqualification might preclude either branch of Congress from considering other disqualifications.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not remember that last incident, but I went carefully through the deliberations of the constitutional convention last winter, and, while I recognize that some actions pointed one way and some the other, I concluded that on the whole nobody would have dared on the floor of the convention to have proposed such an open claim as is now made.

Mr. BLEASE obtained the floor.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Massachusetts takes his seat I should like to ask him a single ques-

tion, because I want to put myself in a position to feel the full force of his contention.

Suppose the fact should be developed, between the time of the election of a Senator and the time he came here to take his seat, that he was a thief or some other grossly flagitious kind of criminal. Does the Senator mean to contend that nobody, neither the State from which he came nor the Senate of the United States, would have the power to exclude him from a seat in this Assembly?

Mr. GILLETT. Do I understand the Senator to say after his election?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes. Suppose the fact that he was a thief was developed between the time that he was elected and the time that he came here to take his seat. I ask the Senator, would we be legally expected to sit beside him and to breathe for six years in this Chamber the amosphere that he breathed?

Mr. GILLETT. Not at all; but we would be expected to seat him, because we have no right under the Constitution not to do so; and then we would have the right to expel him.

Mr. BRUCE. That is denied by Mr. JAMES M. BECK, who has prepared probably the ablest dissertation on the subject of this debate from his side of the question that anyone has done. He claims, the Senator will recollect, that the Senate has no power to expel except for some cause that has arisen in the course of the discharge of the duties of the Senator.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not recollect that Mr. BECK said that; and, while I have great respect for Mr. BECK, I should certainly differ from him if that was his position.

Mr. BRUCE. I think the Senator will find, if he gives a little more thought to the subject, that with his premises it is impossible to escape that conclusion. Mr. BECK'S conception is that the right of the Senate to expel is a purely disciplinary right—that is to say, a right of the same general nature as the right to punish a Member of the Senate for disorderly behavior. I ask the Senator again, assuming that that is so—

Mr. GILLETT. I do not agree that that is so.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator does not?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly I do not. Of course, I appreciate that both sides of that question have been taken.

Mr. BRUCE. That multiplies my difficulties. I do not know exactly what I have to meet. One of the protagonists of the two applicants for seats here takes one view, and, as I understand, that view has very considerable support among the partisans of Mr. VARE and Mr. SMITH; and now we find the Senator from Massachusetts taking a radically dissimilar view. What view are we to take?

Mr. GILLETT. Obviously, each Member of the Senate—as has been shown so clearly that it is hardly necessary to refer to it—takes his own view.

Mr. BRUCE. Then I will take the view of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator recalls, of course, that explusion can be effected only by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly; and that was the very purpose, it seems to me, of that provision. In such a case as the Senator has used as an illustration there would be no question about a two-thirds vote, I should suppose; and it is for just such cases, in my opinion, that the power of expulsion is given.

Mr. BRUCE. That is to say, no matter how infamous the applicant for the seat was, no matter whether he was a thief or an embezzler, the Senate would have no choice except to administer the oath to him and admit him to his seat, and then to expel him afterwards by a two-thirds vote?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly I take that position. Of course, the Senator is suggesting, as is generally suggested to make an argument, an extremely improbable case. It might happen, of course; and in that extremely improbable case there is a remedy, as I say.

Mr. BRUCE. That is to say, after the Senator is seated the Senate could proceed to do what it would seem in all propriety it should have done before when the applicant appeared here?

Mr. GILLETT. Exactly.

Mr. BRUCE. I say it is impossible that the framers of the Constitution could have formed any such narrow conception of their duty as that. When they provided that the Senate should be not simply the judge, as the Senator from Arkansas said this morning, but the sole judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members, I assert that they intended to use the word "qualifications" in a sense that would meet all exigencies of every sort that might arise in relation to the misconduct or the evil repute of a Senator elect.

That is to say, if the Senator is right, we are to admit a thief, knowing that he is a thief. We are to admit him as a thief, desecrate our oath of office by administering it to him, seat him in his seat with every ceremonious gesture that belongs to the ordinary proceedings of a parliamentary body, but all with the intention of unseating him, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] so appositely suggests. I say that can not be.

Mr. GILLETT. In our experience of over 100 years no such instance as that has ever happened. It probably never will happen. The Senator, of course, can conceive something that is quite embarrassing; but, in my opinion, it is quite beyond the bounds of probability, although I have given what I think is a sufficient answer to it.

Mr. BRUCE. Why, Members of Congress have been charged with the perpetration of criminal offenses after they have come here, and those criminal offenses have been made the basis of proceedings against them in Congress. There is more than one precedent of that sort. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WATSON. But, Mr. President, does the Senator know of a single instance where a man has been excluded from the Senate on any such ground?

Mr. BRUCE. I can not recall any specific instance. I do not profess to have any remarkable degree of familiarity with the precedents relating to this subject; but the statement was made here the other day, and was unchallenged, that in 18 instances the Senate has refused to administer the oath to a Senator elect and to admit him to a seat in this body.

Mr. WATSON. That was because of irregularities in the credentials, or because he lacked some one of the essential qualifications.

Mr. BRUCE. Not at all, as I understand. No such contention was set up. I do not believe it can be set up.

Mr. WATSON. Then I challenge the correctness of the statement, because it can not be shown that that is true. In other words, I will say to my friend, he has not examined the precedents. Except in the time of the Civil War and the period immediately following the Civil War, the hectic conditions of society immediately after that great struggle, the precedents are absolutely uniform that where a man came here with regular credentials, possessing the regular qualifications as shown by those credentials, he has been sworn in.

I remember in one case where it was charged over on the House side that some man was a moral monster. That was the charge made against him—that he was a moral monster.

Mr. BRUCE. That is no charge at all.

Mr. WATSON. But they proceeded to specify. It might not be in these days a charge. It was then considered something.

Mr. BRUCE. You do not have to resort to any generalities of that kind in the State of Indiana, I am sure.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. James A. Garfield rose up to say:

> Is there anything in the Constitution to show that the people have not the right to elect a moral monster if they want to? If a moral monster is elected, and comes here regularly authenticated, it is our duty to swear him in.

Mr. GLASS. There is something in the Constitution that gives us the right to exclude him, though.

Mr. WATSON. Provided his credentials are not regular, and provided he comes here not clothed with the three essential qualifications prescribed in the Constitution of the United States.

Of all the great men who have ever dealt with this subject from the foundation of the Government up to this hour I want the Senator to name me one man who has taken a contrary position. From Madison and Monroe and Hamilton and all the men who dealt with that proposition in the Constitutional Convention up to this very hour, where is there a man who has taken the contrary position?

Mr. BRUCE. All I know is that eighteen times——

Mr. WATSON. No; I challenge the statement.

Mr. BRUCE (continuing). The Senate has refused to administer the oath to applicants for seats in this body. Let the Senator produce the 18 precedents. But the Senator attaches to the credentials of which he speaks a finality that I do not attach to them. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] argued this morning, I think that any effect which would ordinarily attach to the credentials that the governor of a State sends here with reference to a Senator are overridden by the power that the Senate has as the sole judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members. It has the right at any time that it pleases, without reference to the credentials that come here from any governor, to say whether or not a Senator shall be admitted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Indiana has made a challenge, and he has made it entirely too broad. Two

great Senators expressed an opinion contrary to that which he asserts is the universal opinion of great men, including himself.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. From Daniel Webster to James E. Watson.

Mr. WATSON. I am very glad to say that I am happy to follow the precedents established by that great man, from which he never departed, while my friends on the other side, after having for over 140 years stood for the doctrine of State rights, have yesterday for the first time utterly abandoned it and cast it on the scrap heap.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not think this debate should degenerate into a partisan or a political discussion. I think the remarks of the Senator from Indiana are calculated to promote that end. He made a challenge which I accept. I think Trumbull, of Illinois, was a great man and a great Senator, and I think Charles Sumner was a great man and a great Senator.

Mr. WATSON. They both were.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then the Senator concedes that the two men to whom I have referred were great statesmen.

Mr. Trumbull is quoted as making this declaration:

> It is not true that credentials have not been referred before parties have been sworn in in the Senate. Usually, where the credentials were fair upon their face, the person claiming a seat has been sworn in as a Member; but there are cases where the credentials themselves were referred, cases where Senators were refused their seats, and where Senators received their seats after the credentials have been referred.

Mr. Sumner is quoted as making this declaration:

> It is said that the proposition now before the Senate is without a precedent. New precedents are to be made when the occasion requires. Never before in the history of our country has any person appeared to take a seat in this body whose previous conduct and declarations as presented to the attention of the Senate gave reasonable ground to distrust his loyalty. It belongs, therefore, to the Senate to make a precedent in order to deal with an unprecedented case. The Senate is at this moment engaged in considering the loyalty of certain Members of this body; and it seems to me it would poorly do its duty if it admitted among its Members one with regard to whom, as he came forward to take the oath, there was a reasonable suspicion.

Mr. Sumner laid down the doctrine that one whose conduct and acts showed him to be disloyal was not entitled to be sworn in; and I undertake to say that if one came to the door of the Senate now confessing himself to be a traitor within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States there is not a Senator in this body who would dare vote to seat him for one moment.

The Constitution, in the clause referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, does not define loyalty to the flag or to the country as one of the qualifications prescribed for Senators.

If the Senator from Maryland will indulge me for just a moment more——

Mr. BRUCE. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will make a statement upon that subject which I think will help clear up the constitutional phase of the question; I hope it will. I realize that Senators who have reputations as lawyers have discussed this subject, and that some of them have expressed a different conviction from that which I entertain. But I undertake to say that the language in the Constitution of the United States which declares that "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State for which he shall be chosen," is not the equivalent of a declaration that any person who has been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and who is 30 years of age, and who is, at the time of his election, a resident of the State for which he is chosen, is necessarily qualified. The difference in the two declarations is apparent to any one. In my judgment, it does not require a constitutional lawyer to make that distinction.

The three conditions named in the Constitution are disqualifying conditions, rather than qualifying conditions. No one can be a Senator who is not 30 years old, no one can be a Senator who has not been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and no one can be a Senator who is not a resident of the State for which he shall be chosen at the time of his election. But that does not mean, it does not imply, that one who is a self-confessed criminal, or one who is disloyal to the country, shall be a Senator if he possesses the three qualifications to which I have referred. It is a matter of common sense as much as it is a matter of legal interpretation.

This opinion was expressed by one of the greatest men who ever served in this body, a lawyer of international renown, Elihu Root. He said, in a speech the echo of which still rings through this Capitol, that the power of the Senate to pass upon the qualifications of its Members is practically unlimited, and that the Congress itself can not impose a limitation on that power. He recognized, as all Senators should recognize, the obligation to exercise this power the more cautiously because of the fact that it was unlimited.

I undertake to say that the great danger to this country now is not that the Senate will abuse its power in passing upon the qualifications of its Members, but it is that it will fail to exercise its power, and the institutions of this Republic, the Senate itself, be undermined by the processes of corruption which, like slimy worms, cavern their way into the walls and towers of state in unsuspecting hours. Your danger and my danger is not so much that we will abuse our power but that we will be servile and fail to exercise it.

There is no question here of denying the right of equal representation to the States. The question is whether a Senator designate has been chosen and is qualified. Equal representation does not always mean full representation. I grant you that such an application of the law and of the Constitution should be made as will give, whenever practicable, the full representation of a State, but I make the assertion that those who invoke the equal-representation clause of the Constitution are practicing a subterfuge. Neither in this case nor in any other that has ever come before the Senate of the United States has there been an attempt to say that Rhode Island shall not have as many Senators as Pennsylvania, but the proposition is, when one presents himself at the door of the Senate, whether the Senate can determine the question of his qualifications.

Senators have said that the right to exercise that power begins only after the Senator elect has been sworn in. I challenge any lawyer to give a reason why such an interpretation should be placed upon the Constitution. If the power is practically unlimited, it attaches from the beginning, it attaches when the Senator designate presents himself, and it is an absurdity of which Senators should not be guilty to say that the facts are such that they will vote to unseat a man but in some mysterious way are compelled by the Constitution first to vote to seat him. If Senators have received evidence which, in their opinion, would justify them in finally voting to unseat a man, it is a senseless act, which no constitution or law requires, to vote first to seat him and then vote to unseat him.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. BRUCE. I believe I have the floor.

Mr. WATSON. Oh, yes; I suppose the Senator has, although I am not sure whether the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Massachusetts had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] has the floor.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from Arkansas has anticipated so completely my argument——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I want to apologize to the Senator for taking his time.

Mr. BRUCE. Not at all. I will not say, as I intended to do, that the Senator has not only stolen all my thunder, but all my lightning.

In reply to the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. WATSON. Inasmuch as my friend, the Senator from Arkansas was replying to me, may I not say a word?

Mr. BRUCE. No; I am sorry I can not yield now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina was recognized. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BLEASE. With great pleasure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BLEASE. I want him to get his speech off his system.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not catch what the Senator said. I know, however, that it was just a pleasantry.

Mr. BLEASE. I said I wanted the Senator to get his speech off his system.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator is always so extremely courteous that I knew that what he said was something of that nature.

The Senator from Indiana was referring to the case of Mr. VARE as well as that of Mr. SMITH, as I understood his remarks, and I simply wish to say this, first of all: What he was saying hinged largely on the claim that in the Vare case we have unimpeachable credentials emanating from the governor of the State, and that those credentials are entitled to the highest degree of respect; in other words, should be given prima facie

effect, and that Mr. VARE should be allowed to take the oath and occupy his seat.

So far as the Vare case is concerned, I desire to remind the Senator from Indiana that Mr. VARE does not turn up here with irreproachable credentials. He turns up here with a certificate from the Governor of Pennsylvania that his title to a seat in this body, whatever it may be, was partly bought and partly stolen. Is that the conception of unimpeachable credentials that the Senator from Indiana entertains?

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator suffer an interruption there?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. My understanding is that the credentials issued by Governor Pinchot stated that Mr. VARE appeared to be elected, but the credentials themselves say nothing about purchase.

Mr. BRUCE. You can not separate them.

Mr. WATSON. He wrote a letter.

Mr. BRUCE. You can not separate the letter from the credentials; it is one indivisible document the Senator will find when he comes to examine it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. The credentials of Senator-elect VARE were sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the committee, as I understand, reported that his credentials were valid upon their face. I understand that that is the record upon which we are now proceeding.

Mr. BRUCE. I have been here too long to accept as gospel every report that comes from a committee, even when the distinguished Senator from Idaho happens to be one of its members.

The point I make is that the Senator from Indiana errs when he makes the statement—I will not say the rash statement—that Mr. VARE, at any rate, came to this body with unassailable credentials. He did nothing of the sort. I believe that afterwards some sort of certificate was obtained from Governor Fisher.

Mr. WATSON. Some sort? Was not the one sent by Governor Fisher in regular form, the kind that is always sent?

Mr. BRUCE. Was it in order?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. BRUCE. A title must be bad, indeed, when it takes the certificates of two governors to confirm it.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator knows very well that Pinchot was one of the candidates against VARE. Everybody understands that.

Mr. BRUCE. I also know that Mr. Pinchot enjoys the reputation of being an honorable and public-spirited man.

Mr. WATSON. That is a matter I am not going to discuss.

Mr. BRUCE. I say that with pleasure, because of the fact that I differ profoundly from him with reference to many public questions.

Mr. WATSON. I myself have differed long with Governor Pinchot on most public questions, and I am not going to discuss him.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator has disagreed with him so long that he is not able to do him justice.

Mr. WATSON. I decline to discuss that question, because it has not anything to do with the case. But the fact about it is that he was an opponent of VARE, and the fact is that he himself spent $187,000 in this campaign, which was as much as we expelled Newberry for expending.

Mr. BRUCE. I am not saying that Mr. VARE partly bought and partly stole his seat. God forbid! His case is to be referred to a committee, he is to have the fullest opportunity to present any testimony to that committee which he may choose to present, and he is to have the further opportunity to appear upon the floor of the Senate and to make his personal appeal to the Senate as best he can; and until that time, I propose to reserve my opinion as to his case.

I had no intention in the world of making an address to the Senate when I rose, but I do wish to say one thing in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]; and he knows that there is no Member of this body who entertains a deeper feeling of respect for him than I do.

The Senator from Massachusetts seems to think that the views of the framers of the Federal Constitution with respect to State rights were of such a very pronounced, unreserved character that it is impossible to conceive that they could have intended to confer upon the Senate the power to exclude a Senator elect on such grounds as those on which it is proposed to exclude Mr. VARE or Mr. SMITH.

I say that in many respects the framers of the Federal Constitution exhibited quite as sedulous a degree of tenderness for the rights and the powers of the Central Government as they did for the rights and powers of the States, and in no respect does the Federal Constitution manifest a more cautious and a more circumspect spirit than it does with regard to the control that Congress is to have over persons who are certified to it as duly elected by their States.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Suppose we concede all that for the purpose of the argument, that the Senator from Maryland is right in his contention——

Mr. BRUCE. I will say to the Senator, do not concede too much, because then I shall not have an opportunity to say anything at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Starting afresh, suppose, for the purpose of the argument, we concede all that the Senator from Maryland has said as to the right of the Senate to expel a Member, before or after he is sworn in, for any cause which, in the judgment of the Senate, seems sufficient. Suppose we concede that now for the moment. That is not the question with which we are confronted to-day. The Senator from Arkansas, by his amendment to the resolution, has shown that there is at best only a prima facie case against Mr. VARE; has shown that it is necessary to refer it to a committee of the Senate to make further investigation and a definite report; that in the meantime we have no conclusions to act on, but only the presentation of one side of the case. When the record is in that condition, how could the Senator justify the action of the Senate in refusing to administer the oath?

Mr. BRUCE. The record is in that condition because the Senator from Pennsylvania and his associates chose to interrupt the orderly course of investigation by that special committee, as I am informed, and endeavored to do it, first, by an absolutely indefensible filibuster, which has met, so far as I can see, with the universal condemnation of the country; and then attempted to do it by starving the committee out; and now the Senator from Pennsylvania is here claiming that he is not being given his day in court. If he has not been given his day in court, that fact is chargeable, as I see it, entirely to the Senator from Pennsylvania—he and those who cooperated with him in the Vare controversy.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRUCE. I will.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the filibuster last March was a sin, I am answerable for it, with the others who took part in it. If it was the fault of the Democrats that important legislation failed, as the RECORD shows it was, they are answerable for that. But Mr. VARE was not in the Senate, the people of Pennsylvania were not in the Senate, and it is their rights which we are discussing now. If the Senator wants to punish me for my record, the time will come when he can do it, but that is not the question before us now. Will the Senator, as a lawyer, answer this question: Does he feel that on a prima facie showing like this there is any justification for the Senate denying to Pennsylvania temporarily—60 days or 90 days, or whatever it may be—the equal representation which the Constitution guarantees to us?

Mr. BRUCE. First, I would like to say that the State of Pennsylvania was in the Senate. It was here in the person of its two Senators, and therefore it and the people of Pennsylvania are responsible for what those Senators did.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator please answer the question I asked him?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but I was dealing with one thing at a time. Should Mr. VARE take his seat, I do not know whether the people of Pennsylvania would be represented in this body or not. I shall have to have some more light touching the circumstances surrounding that primary and election in Pennsylvania before I shall be prepared to admit that.

As I understand it, the special committee met and afforded an opportunity to everybody who craved one to present any testimony he pleased. Everybody who wanted a day in court could have had that day in court. As I imagine, all the testimony that could be adduced on either side of the controversy would have been adduced at this very moment but for the obstruction worked by the attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania and his associates.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator would have liked it better if we had been less efficient.

Mr. BRUCE. Though I do not profess to have any critical degree of familiarity with the testimony in this case—I have

not had an opportunity to analyze it closely enough to make that claim—yet there is enough in the record now, in my opinion, to justify the Senate in reaching the conclusion that the oath should not now be administered to Mr. VARE and that Mr. VARE should not now be allowed to take his seat, though he should be allowed the privilege of bringing forward any further testimony that he may choose to bring forward and even to come upon this floor in his own person to make his plea for his seat.

There is another thing which I hope will be done. I do not know whether it is the intent of the committee to do it or not, but I trust that the general political conditions now prevailing in the city of Philadelphia will be developed by the committee, because I say without any hesitation that those conditions are a disgrace, I trust not an indelible disgrace, but a disgrace to the entire people of the Nation.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Has the Senator ever been in New York?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes, I have; and I have walked the streets of that city with the exultant pride of an American citizen, if for no other reason, because there was a time when it had just such a corrupt government as the city of Philadelphia has, and because its people had the courage, the independence, and the manhood to bring that corrupt government to an end, as the city of Philadelphia has never done. They always kept up the eternal note of protest, and there never was a time, no matter how depraved the political conditions in New York City were, when its noble people did not prove themselves worthy of the heritage of a free people by their unceasing remonstrance against misgovernment and political abuses in every form. Nor do I ever thank God more fervently than I do when I recall the fact that while for many years there was also misgovernment in the city in which I live, Baltimore, fostered not by Republican but by Democratic agencies, I was so fortunate finally as to be one of the instruments, though only an humble one, by which that misgovernment, too, was terminated.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I hesitated to interrupt the Senator, because he had made such a beautiful defense of New York.

Mr. BRUCE. I am earnest and sincere in it.

Mr. COPELAND. But I must in all humiliation say that the Republicans up State are still voting the tombstones, "immortalizing," as Senator CARAWAY says, the Republican voters in that part of the State.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not know that.

To get back to the line of comment I was about to make, nothing is more manifest on the face of the Federal Constitution than the intent of its framers to give Congress the very largest measure of power in determining for itself whether any man who comes to Congress with the credentials of the governor of his State has really been elected or not, or really deserves to hold a seat in Congress or not.

Why, just recall the different provisions of the Federal Constitution in that connection. First of all, it says that the States shall have the power to regulate the times, the places, and the manner of holding election, but that these regulations may be altered by Congress except as to places for the election of Senators. In other words, so far as the time and the manner of holding elections for Congress was concerned, the central Government was by the Federal Constitution given complete residuary control. There is also the provision, of course, that the House and the Senate shall be the sole judges of the elections, the returns, and the qualifications of their Members. There is also the provision bestowing on the two Houses the power to *punish* any Member of either House for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, to expel a Member.

How, I ask, could the intent of the framers of the Constitution to take practically everything relating to the election of Senators out of the hands of the States, and to lodge them in the hands of the Federal Government, have been more plainly evinced? So what should really be contended for in this debate is not the power of the States over the elections, the returns, and the qualifications of Members of the Senate but the rights and powers of the General Government. The framers of the Constitution thought that it was essential to the dignity, the efficiency, and the usefulness of Congress that no considerable degree of residuary power should be left in the States with respect to the elections, the returns, and the qualifications of Members of Congress in either House.

So I submit that the strict principle of State rights which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] invoked has no application here. What we should be jealous about in this discussion is not the rights and powers of the States but the rights and powers of the Central Government—that is, the rights and powers which are essential, as I have said, to the maintenance of the dignity, the efficiency, and the usefulness of the two Houses of Congress. I affirm that every principle of sound reasoning denies the proposition that a State might elect some individual to the United States Senate; and that yet even should the fact be disclosed between the time of his election and the time that he applied for his seat, that he was a thief, there would be no power anywhere—neither in the State itself nor in the Federal Government—to get rid of him.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to take the position that the Constitution places no limit upon the power of the Senate in passing upon the qualifications of Senators?

Mr. BRUCE. I think practically none.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Addressing the Senator as a historian familiar with the formation of the Constitution and with the various steps which were taken and proceedings had in the then original thirteen States to ratify the Constitution, may I ask him whether he thinks that the convention which met in Richmond, Va., for example, in which one of its most distinguished members was Patrick Henry, would have ratified the Constitution if it had been even suggested that the Senate of the United States had unlimited power or jurisdiction to fix and pass upon the qualifications of its Members?

Mr. GLASS. Virginia never would have ratified the Constitution at all if it had followed the advice of Patrick Henry.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Of course, that is true; but what would have been done if such a suggestion had ever been made?

Mr. BRUCE. I will say, so far as Patrick Henry was concerned, of course, he opposed the adoption of the Federal Constitution anyway, though happily his great eloquence did not prevail.

However, I say without hesitation that in my opinion James Madison as well as John Marshall, who was also, of course, a member of that Constitutional Convention, would not have hesitated one moment to give their approval to the proposition that, so far as any question relating to the election or return or qualifications of a Senator was concerned, it was the intent of the framers of the Federal Constitution to bestow, for all practical purposes, absolutely unlimited, unconditional power upon the Senate, and, if for no other reason, because otherwise it would have been in the power of the States not simply to have discredited but to have, more or less, brought to shipwreck the operations of the Federal Government.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland permit me to make merely a further brief observation?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Not now but perhaps on some other occasion I shall undertake to demonstrate to others, if not to convince the learned Senator from Maryland, that as of the time of the meeting of the Virginia convention and of the one in Albany and in each and every of the other 13 States held to consider and pass upon that great instrument, there was not one member in any one of those conventions who ever advanced an argument along the lines of those which the distinguished Senator from Maryland is now presenting.

I will go further, if I may, and undertake to demonstrate that the States as of that time considered themselves absolutely sovereign, and that they had the power, which was admitted on all hands, themselves to choose their Senators, but that they voluntarily limited their power by providing that those whom they should choose should be of a given age, a certain period of citizenship, and an inhabitant of the State. For the moment I wish merely to throw out this thought—that the instrument before them did not create the States; the Federal Government in a sense is the creature, the States the creator; and sovereignty does not rest here in the Senate, but does rest in the people. I therefore confess respectful surprise that learned gentlemen, supposed to inherit the fundamental principles of Jefferson and of Jackson and the long line of great men, their predecessors, will take a position now which I think is in direct hostility and contrary to those fundamental principles entertained by those who framed and adopted the Constitution and which have been adhered to down to this hour.

Mr. BRUCE. I will say to the Senator from California that I am just as much opposed to any undue encroachment by the States upon the rights and powers of the General Government as I am to any undue encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights and powers of the States. I say that the great

men who framed the Federal Constitution realized that it was essential to the proper workings of Congress that it should be clothed with practically unlimited discretion over every question relating to the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Will the Senator pardon me a further interruption?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I did not rise to advance my views now; they have been indicated by my vote. I am not thinking of persons. I am not thinking of the individuals who are rapping at this door. I am taking the position I should take if the State of Maryland were rapping at that door, or if Virginia or Georgia, which so quickly and unanimously ratified the great instrument, were rapping at that door. I am thinking of the great quasi-sovereign States of the Union, of my own great State of California; not of these individuals. The Senator from Maryland and I will pass away, but our Nation, we hope, will be immortal; and it can not be unless we preserve the constitutional rights and recognize the quasi-sovereignty of the individual 48 States.

Mr. BRUCE. I will say that no argument for the purposes of this discussion should be suggested by the thought that this extraordinary power of Congress might be abused. So far as that is concerned, it is in the power of the States themselves at any moment, by general concert, to bring the entire Federal Government to an end simply by refusing to send any Members of Congress here at all. The workings of every constitution presuppose the fact that men will be sane enough, patriotic enough, and dutiful enough not to handle the machinery of government in any respect in a perfectly arbitrary, irrational, and tyrannical way.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland permit an interruption?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Maryland is always very fair and usually very accurate in any statement which he makes. I think, however, that it has escaped the learned Senator that in the detailed draft of the Constitution as it was submitted to the constitutional convention this provision was submited:

> SEC. 2. The Legislature of the United States shall have authority to establish such uniform qualifications of the Members of each House, with regard to property, as to the said Legislature shall seem expedient.

That was antagonized by Mr. Madison, and his opposition to that and to any provision which would permit the National Legislature to fix the qualifications of any of its Members is stated as follows:

> Madison opposed the proposed section 2, Article VI, "as vesting an improper and dangerous power in the Legislature. The qualifications of elector and elected were fundamental articles in a republican government and ought to be fixed by the Constitution. If the Legislature could regulate those of either, it can by degrees subvert the Constitution.
>
> "A republic may be converted into an aristocracy or oligarchy as well by limiting the number capable of being elected as the number authorized to elect. In all cases where the representatives of the people will have a personal interest distinct from that of their constituents there was the same reason for being jealous of them as there was for relying upon them with full confidence when they had a common interest. This was one of the former cases."

If the Senator will pardon me, Mr. Madison insisted that the provision in the Constitution as it left the committee on detail and went to the committee on style committed to the Constitution itself all the qualifications, which were the three to which the Senator has referred. Mr. Madison further insisted that neither the National Legislature nor the States could superadd qualifications or disqualifications to those three which were incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, I confess that all that has not recently, at any rate, been brought to my attention, but we must consider that what was said there was said in the light of the particular proposition with which Mr. Madison was dealing. I imagine that he was dealing with the proposition that was made when the convention was pending, that the States should nominate certain persons for the Senate and that then the Senate should make the selections. Is not that true?

Mr. KING. The proposition which the Senator is now discussing had been disposed of anterior to that time. The Senator is right as to that proposition having been made, as well as various other propositions, but they had been eliminated, and the question was then as to whether the qualifications should be fixed in the Constitution, whether they should be left in the States, or whether they should be left to the Senate and the House, respectively. Madison's contention was—and that was the contention of Mr. Hamilton, as evidenced by repeated statements in the Federalist and also by statements made by Mr. Madison in his signed articles—that the Constitution should fix the qualifications and that the qualification should not be left either to the Senate or to the House.

Mr. BRUCE. Then, under those conditions, who was to have the power to repel or to expel a Senator elect who was deemed unfit to hold a seat in the Senate?

Mr. KING. I do not propose to go into that argument, because it would take too long, but I invite the attention of the Senator——

Mr. BRUCE. The very fact that the Senator can not answer that point——

Mr. KING. I can answer it.

Mr. BRUCE. The very fact that he can not answer that question shows the logical consequences to which he is giving his approval.

Mr. KING. The Senator is drawing an improper deduction from the observation which I made. It would take some little time to go into that discussion, and I did not want to infringe upon the Senator's time; but the point can be answered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Maryland if the argument or the thought suggested by the Senator from Utah as well as by the Senator from California does not lead to the conclusion that the Senate has no power, if the claim of the Senator elect from Pennsylvania shall be conceded, ever to go any further into the case; that the presentation of the certificate ends the matter, provided the three conditions or qualifications set forth in the Constitution have been met? In other words, if we can not now do what it is proposed to do, it can not be done at all.

Mr. BRUCE. The most that could be done would be to expel, and, as I have already said, Mr. BECK takes the position that no cause for expulsion can exist unless it arises during the course of the term of a Senator.

Now, just a few words more in conclusion. I think it not unlikely that when the entire case of Mr. VARE shall be presented that it will be found to rest on somewhat different questions from the case of Mr. SMITH. So far as Mr. SMITH is concerned, I have never experienced a single impulse of hesitation as to what I should do in his case. I do not profess to be anything more than an ordinarily honorable man. I think that I am that. When I made up my mind to become a candidate for the United States Senate I was the general counsel for the Public Service Commission of Maryland, which is just such a body as that in Illinois of which Mr. SMITH was chairman.

Though the office was eminently agreeable to me in every respect, and my election was by no means a certainty, I felt that it was my duty to resign it, and I did resign. Yet here we have a man so completely lost to every consideration of political and social decency as to continue to act as the chairman of a commission clothed with the power of regulating the rates and working rules of the public-utility corporations of the State of Illinois, and to receive hundreds of thousands of dollars toward his campaign expenses from the head of the public-utility interests of that State!

I will say that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] simply gave expression to his own manly, brave, incorruptible character when he said that under such circumstances Mr. SMITH was merely a pecuniary investment as a candidate for the Senate.

I want to see the fullest measure of justice dealt out in both cases. I think that the managers of the special committee acted very properly in affording the opportunity to Mr. SMITH and holding out the prospect of an opportunity to Mr. VARE to address any additional testimony that either one of them may choose to offer before that committee, and in giving to each the opportunity to appear upon the floor of the Senate and to make their personal appeals. When the Senate has done that it has done all that could be expected under the circumstances. The idea that when two men are laboring under such grave accusations as Messrs. SMITH and VARE the oath of office should be administered to them, and they should be admitted to their seats before the accusations shall have been disposed of, is, in my judgment, an idea both morally and legally untenable.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I have been somewhat amused at the statement that if a traitor or a thief or a felon were to present himself at the door of the Senate, the right of the Senate to turn him back would be questioned. I think the Constitution settles that question without the Senate having anything to do with it. The Constitution itself, if I read it aright, disqualifies a man in that situation as a citizen of the United States, and he is not competent to hold any office. Therefore that question would be settled without the Senate having to pass on it at all.

Then I think it rather peculiar that Senators would presume that a State of the American Union, in its part sovereignty—which is all it has to-day—would be so low down, and its citizenship would so disregard the rights of other States, as to elect any such person to come here to the Senate; and I think that alone should settle that question.

Mr. President, I do not care to discuss or debate this matter. I only wish to read into the RECORD South Carolina's position in it.

I have already said all that I care to say in reference to the seating of the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH, Senator elect from the State of Illinois, and the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, Senator elect from the State of Pennsylvania; and my position on these matters is well and thoroughly known to the people of the State which I have the honor to represent on the floor of this Senate.

I have absolutely no apology to make for my position, nor for any word or act that I have said or done in reference thereto; but I present in further proof of the strength of my position the senate journal of the State of South Carolina, 1927. On page 1046 of that journal the following will be found:

WEDNESDAY, *March 23, 1927.*

The Hon. W. C. Hamrick, of Gaffney, senator elect from Cherokee, appeared in the chamber and presented his credentials, which were as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
By the Secretary of State.

To the honorable President and Gentlemen of the Senate of South Carolina:

Pursuant to the provisions of law I have the honor to submit herewith a report of the special election held in Cherokee County on Tuesday, March 22, 1927, for the purpose of electing a State senator to fill the unexpired term of the Hon. Richmond Stacy, deceased.

The returns from the county board of canvassers show that there were 1,131 votes cast at the said election, and that of said number—

W. C. Hamrick received	535
E. H. De Camp received	466
W. D. Kirby received	113
Mrs. B. M. Sparks received	17

Respectfully submitted.

[SEAL.] W. P. BLACKWELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
By the Secretary of State.

To W. C. HAMRICK, *Gaffney, S. C.:*

Whereas, in pursuance of the constitution and the statutes of the State, an election was held on the 22d day of March, A. D. 1927, for Senator for Cherokee County, and upon examination of the returns which have been received and by the determination and declaration of the board of State canvassers, filed in this office, it appears that you, W. C. Hamrick, have been duly elected by the highest number of votes. I do, therefore, by virtue of the power in me vested, certify that you, the said W. C. Hamrick, have been declared duly elected as senator from the county of Cherokee.

Given under my hand and the seal of the State, in Columbia, this 23d day of March, A. D. 1927, and in the one hundred and fifty-first year of the independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL.] W. P. BLACKWELL,
Secretary of State.

The president read the following telegram to the senate:

GAFFNEY, S. C., *March 23.*

Lieutenant Governor BUTLER,
Statehouse, Columbia, S. C.:

I hereby protest the seating of Hamrick until the vote is officially counted.

ED. H. DE CAMP.

On motion, the Hon. W. C. Hamrick was presented at the bar of the senate so that the oath of office might be administered by the president.

Mr. McColl addressed the senate as follows:

* * * * * * *

"My understanding of the power of the senate is that it has absolute control over the legal requirements of its members, to be determined by the process of referring it to the committee on elections, and prima facie, all we have to act upon is the certificate of election which, I understand from the Chair, is in regular order, and on that showing being made he is entitled to be sworn in.

"Both sides have the right to appear here later, and if it is determined he is not entitled to be seated, then the senate decision as to the rights of the parties is the judgment of the senate."

The oath of office was administered to Mr. Hamrick by the president, and thereupon assumed his seat as senator from Cherokee.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, when the Senate of the United States was in session, the senate of South Carolina was in session. A member of the State senate died, and an election was ordered to fill that vacancy. The Hon. W. C. Hamrick was elected. His seat was contested by Mr. Ed. H. De Camp, editor of one of the Gaffney papers. He went to Columbia with his attorneys, ready to make a contest before the senate. They requested that Hamrick be not sworn in until this contest or protest was heard. The senate immediately administered to him the oath of office, taking the position that I take here and have taken all along, that they had no jurisdiction of him and no right to hear any contest or protest in reference to him until he was seated. By the way, it was charged in part of those charges that Mr. Hamrick had used too much money in having himself elected to the State senate. Later, the contest was filed.

Mr. President, on page 1270 of the same journal will be found the committee report, as follows:

Committee report

COLUMBIA, S. C., *April 6, 1927.*

The committee on privileges and elections, to whom was referred the matter of the election of the senator from Cherokee County, respectfully report that they have duly and carefully considered the same, and recommend that the whole matter be referred back to the board of county canvassers for Cherokee County, with the request that said board do canvass the election and certify the result thereof to the senate, sending therewith a copy of the testimony taken at such canvass, and that at such canvass any candidate shall be permitted to be heard in person or by counsel, and that such board take such testimony bearing on said election as they deem necessary.

Senator SUMMERS, *for Committee.*

On page 1271 of this journal the following resolution appears:

Whereas the committee on privileges and elections, to whom this matter was referred, have recommended that a canvass of said election be had; and

Whereas the senate alone is the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own members and, therefore, has exclusive jurisdiction of said contest; and

Whereas at the hearing before the committee aforesaid it was announced on behalf of the contestant, and also on behalf of the senator from Cherokee, that a canvass of said election was desired: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate, That the sergeant at arms of the senate do forthwith procure from the board of canvassers of Cherokee County the original ballot boxes containing the ballots, poll lists, and the election returns at the election held in Cherokee County on March 22, 1927, and deliver the same to the committee on privileges and elections, who shall, with all convenient speed, count the ballots cast at said election and make report thereof to the senate.

This resolution was adopted.

Final action will be found in the report of the committee on privileges and elections on page 1464 of the journal, April 15, 1927:

Report of committee on privileges and elections

The committee on privileges and elections, to whom was referred the matter of the seating of the senator from Cherokee, after a full and complete investigation, report that they have carefully considered the matter and find that the Hon. W. C. Hamrick has been properly seated.

S. J. SUMMERS, *for Committee.*

On motion of Mr. Williams, the report was adopted and made the judgment of the senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is seen that the Senate of South Carolina at their session in 1927 unanimously indorsed my position in toto in the Smith-Vare cases.

I desire to call further attention, however, to the action of the convention of the people of the State of South Carolina, held in city of Charleston, on the 12th day of May, 1788:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

In convention of the people of the State of South Carolina by their representatives, held in the city of Charleston on Monday, the 12th day of May and continued by divers adjournments to Friday, the 23d day of May, A. D. 1788, and in the twelfth year of the independence of the United States of America.

The convention having maturely considered the Constitution or form of government reported to Congress by the Convention of Delegates from the United States of America, and submitted to them by a resolution of the legislature of this State passed the 17th and 18th days of February last, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to the people of the said United States and their posterity, do, in the name

and behalf of the people of this State, hereby assent to and ratify the said Constitution.

Done in convention the 23d day of May, A. D. 1788, and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth.

[SEAL.] THOMAS PINCKNEY, *President.*

Attest:

[SEAL.] JOHN SANDFORD DART, *Secretary.*

Immediately following that, in that convention, the following resolution was adopted:

And whereas it is essential to the preservation of the rights reserved to the several States and the freedom of the people under the operations of a General Government that the right of prescribing the manner, time, and places of holding the elections to the Federal Legislature should be forever inseparably annexed to the sovereignty of the several States. This convention doth declare that the same ought to remain to all posterity a perpetual and fundamental right in the local exclusive of the interference of the General Government, except in cases where the legislatures of the States shall refuse or neglect to perform and fulfill the same according to the tenor of the said Constitution.

This convention doth also declare that no section or paragraph of the said Constitution warrants a construction that the States do not retain every power not expressly relinquished by them and vested in the General Government of the Union.

* * * * * * *

Resolved, That it be a standing instruction to all such delegates as may hereafter be elected to represent this State in the General Government to exert their utmost abilities and influence to effect an alteration of the Constitution conformably to the foregoing resolutions.

Done in convention the 23d day of May, A. D. 1788, and the independence of the United States of America the twelfth.

[SEAL.] THOMAS PINCKNEY, *President.*

Attest:

[SEAL.] JOHN SANDFORD DART, *Secretary.*

* * * * * * *

It will therefore be seen, Mr. President, that the position of South Carolina by her representatives in convention assembled in 1788 and in 1927 is my position in the Smith-Vare cases now and has been all through the controversy; and as their representative, in carrying out the instructions and mandates as heretofore cited, I am but obeying the will of my people and advocating that for which all of them have ever stood.

I noticed in the Washington Post of this morning, December 8, 1927, a little editorial which I want to read. It is headed:

ILLINOIS LOSES ITS RIGHTS

Fifty Senators voted yesterday to exclude the Senator elect from Illinois. As only 32 Senators voted to seat him, the action of the 50 becomes the action of the Senate. The Senate temporarily denies to Illinois its equal representation in the Senate.

The State of Illinois can be permanently deprived of its two Senators with as much justice as it can be deprived of them for one hour.

No State in the Union can be sure hereafter that it will be represented in the Senate by two men of its own choice.

The inquiry into the Smith case will proceed, with one of the States of the Union unable to exert its equal powers in the making of laws and treaties. During the inquiry the Nation's business is to be transacted, but Illinois will have less than a State's right to participate in the business. All other States will have two votes to Illinois's one.

The Senator elect from Illinois has been granted the privilege of appearing as a private citizen, without a Senator's rights or powers, to plead for the seat to which he is entitled. Having convicted him in advance, the Senate will now consider the evidence in his case. Mr. SMITH should stand upon his rights as a Senator elect and should refuse to enter the Senate Chamber except upon his way to take the oath.

The State of Illinois is not required by the Constitution to ask permission of the Senate to admit its Senators.

Evidently, a majority of Senators stand ready to exclude the Senator elect from Pennsylvania also. Very well; if Senators already seated can exclude one Senator elect they can exclude all newcomers.

Ignorance, cowardice, and partisanship have combined to commit the United States Senate to a violation of the Constitution. It is a melancholy exhibition of the Senate's rapid degeneracy during the last few years. Apparently very few of the clear thinkers in that body gave any consideration whatever to their constitutional duty in this matter. The whole Senate is tainted by the action of a little more than half of is membership.

If a town council or a county board of supervisors should convict one of its memebers first and then provide for trying him afterwards it would make itself a subject of ridicule and contempt. But no town council or board of supervisors has made such a blunder. Only the Senate of the United States has done so.

Mr. President, I object to the words "The whole Senate is tainted by the action of a little more than half its membership." No act of any man or set of men anywhere can cause another to be tainted unless he be a party to that act. For instance, Mr. President, I do not think the other Disciples were tainted because Judas Iscariot took 30 pieces of silver. It reminds me of a little incident down in my State. We had a man for governor who was very much opposed to lynching, and he said he was going to stop it. On one occasion they were fixing to perform that ceremony on a negro who had assaulted a white woman. The governor found it out and jumped in his automobile and rushed to the scene just as fast as he could go. When he got there he found a crowd and also the victim. He got up and made a beautiful speech, a wonderful speech, and just as he was about two-thirds through one of his great friends who was standing looking up at him said, "Hurry up, Governor. You are making a beautiful speech, but we want to lynch this nigger and get back to our work." They proceeded to carry out the job. I do not think that the people who were there taking no part in the lynching were responsible, and I do not think this paper ought to charge us who voted the other way on this question as being tainted with what somebody else did.

Mr. President, an hour ago I walked across the rotunda of the Capitol and I saw the American flag drawn back from the statue of the vice president of the southern Confederacy, Alexander Hamilton Stephens. I could not help wondering if Alexander H. Stephens were sitting in this Chamber instead of out there in marble what he and Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson and the thousands of Confederate soldiers who followed the leadership of Jefferson Davis and others, and who stood with their breasts bared to the bullets and the bayonets of the enemy—now our friends, I am glad to say—would say if they could see the sons and grandsons of Confederate soldiers sitting on the floor of the United States Senate and voting to deprive a State of the Union of its constitutional right to have two representatives on the floor of this body.

Mr. President, I may possibly be wrong. I am not censuring any man for his vote on this question. It does not make any difference to me personally whether you seat these gentlemen or not; it does not affect my seat. I am already in, and it would take two-thirds to put me out of the Senate. But I am interested in South Carolina. I am interested in the State of the American Union that first seceded from it. I am interested in the State which passed the acts of nullification, and I am interested in the future Senators elect who will come to the door of this Chamber from the State of South Carolina and may be told that they shall not enter. And on what grounds?

It has been said by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the Senate has a right to regulate primary elections for the nomination of Senators to this body. It has been hinted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] that that will be done. When a South Carolinian comes to the door of this Chamber and a Republican comes by his side and says, "I contest this man's seat because he deliberately kept the colored people from voting at the ballot box," I ask the Senate if they are going to stand him outside there, as they are doing SMITH and VARE, and investigate whether that is true or not? If they do, some people may not get in here. Some may be here now who would not be here if every man 21 years of age who could read and write the constitution of his State and paid his taxes had been allowed to cast his vote, even though his skin were black. Is that question to come back here and haunt the Senate again? Is the black cloud again to rise? Is that what is meant by the statement that primary elections can be regulated? Is that what is meant by the statement that primary elections will be so regulated? Then I ask some gentlemen what their votes will be when a South Carolina Senator comes here and is stopped at the door because of my State's noncompliance with the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States?

As I have said, personally I do not care what you do, but it is laying down a very dangerous precedent. I still maintain that these two gentlemen should have been sworn in. I shall ever so contend. I maintain that when they were sworn in, if there was a protest or a charge of dishonesty or a charge of wrongdoing, that question should be tried as the Brookhart matter was tried; it should be tried as other cases have been tried and then should be turned out of the Senate if corruption were proven; and I will vote to put both of them out if it can be proven to me that they have spent one dollar to corrupt the ballot box.

Illinois knew all about FRANK SMITH, and they elected him. I presume Pennsylvania knew all about Mr. VARE, and they elected him. But surely no man would stand on this floor and say that the only places in the world where there are corrupt elections are Pennsylvania and Illinois. Surely no man will stand on the floor of the Senate and say he came here without him or his friends spending money. If he did, he must have come in the darkness of the night, and Senators know it.

How much did Mr. Pepper spend? I sought to get that information, but I never could get it. How much was spent by the combination that tried to beat VARE?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BLEASE. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has neglected to read the report of the committee. That information is given there. But I do not want to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BLEASE. I want the figures, and I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am sure the Senator wants to get the matter correct.

Mr. BLEASE. I want to have in the RECORD a statement of what VARE spent, and what was spent to beat him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Pepper-Fisher expenditures, excluding the expenditures that were exclusively for Fisher, were $1,804,979. That is stated in the report.

Mr. BLEASE. I thank the Senator. Mr. VARE, I think, claims he spent about $600,000. Yet you are going to kick VARE out of the door, a man who spent only $600,000, and let a man appoint his successor who admits he spent over a million to get to be governor of his State. Where is the honesty in that? It is proposed to throw one man out for spending $600,000, and say to a man who spent a million and more in a conglomerated pot, you might say, like a poker pot, mixed up with dimes and nickels and quarters, "You are more corrupt than this other man, you spent more money than he did, your gang got you in, but we are going to put out a man spending less money, and give you, the man who spent more to corrupt the ballots of Pennsylvania, the power to appoint his successor." Is that consistent?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator pardon just another interruption, to enable me to give him the figures accurately? I do not care to discuss the matter or to interrupt the thread of his statement.

Mr. BLEASE. I am practically through. I am glad to have the information.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The committee report states that the Vare-Beidleman combination spent $785,934. It is fair to say, however, that $105,464 of that amount was expended by a separate committee, operating particularly in the interest of Mr. Beidleman. But the evidence very clearly discloses that what helped one of these gentlemen pretty much helped the other. They were running together—in pairs.

Mr. BLEASE. That is what I understood.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator stated it had not been made known by the committee. It is all very plainly stated in this report.

Mr. BLEASE. I am glad the Senator gave me the information. That does not change my position at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am not saying that it does.

Mr. BLEASE. The man who is going to appoint this man's successor spent more money to corrupt the voters of Pennsylvania than he did.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is not the statement I am controverting.

Mr. BLEASE. I know; but that is the statement of the figures there.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I did not want the Senator to let go into the RECORD the statement that the committee had not disclosed to the Senate the facts.

Mr. BLEASE. Oh, no. I offered a resolution here at the last session asking for the Pepper statement, but never got it. I did not say that the committee tried to withhold anything. I do not charge them with that.

So far as Mr. VARE's certificate is concerned, I do not know anything about Mr. Pinchot, but I was told by my daddy when I was a little boy that it was a mighty dirty bird that would befoul its own nest.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, we have had some rather strange arguments advanced in the Senate in the consideration of these two cases, some Senators holding that if these Senators elect are once seated, it will require two-thirds of the Senate to get rid of them, others holding that the Senate can by a majority of the Members remove them from this Chamber. If it is true that it requires a two-thirds majority, those who voted to seat them temporarily are hiding behind a screen, because it would be perhaps hard to get a two-thirds majority to remove them, and if we should fail to get the two-thirds majority those who vote to seat them temporarily will, in effect and in fact, have voted to give them a seat permanently.

I think that the Senate ought to set a precedent for all the States of the Union that no person who comes seeking membership in this body will be admitted at all unless he comes with clean hands. If he buys his seat in the Senate as one would buy a seat on a stock exchange, it is the duty of honest men in this body to reject him. Why should we respect such a certificate in the outset, born in corruption, brought forth in iniquity, and presented here by those who place the stress and emphasis upon money rather than upon manhood and merit of the candidate in the various States of the Union?

I do not think that we are surrendering any State rights when we undertake to protect and preserve the good name, honor, and integrity of the Senate. I am a State rights Democrat. The States themselves agreed that this body should determine who should be admitted to membership here. The States themselves select a candidate and elect him, but they clothe this body with authority to say whether or not he should be accepted as a Member when he gets here. The Constitution makes it the duty of the Senate to determine that question. If we have found that the man whom they sent here is not a suitable person, is an unfit person to have a seat in this body, we reject him and the State straightway selects another. If the State selects one who is clean and honest and whose certificate is free from fraud and corruption, he will be accepted. There never has been any question about that.

Mr. President, this is the gravest occasion that has been presented to the Senate during my service of some 20 years in the Capitol. I recall when this body, for good reasons, rejected Clark, of Montana, a Democrat, and Lorimer, of Illinois, a Republican, who bought his seat in this body, and when Newberry, Republican, of Michigan, who spent about $200,000 in the purchase of his seat, was finally gotten rid of. But this is the first time in the history of this body, so far as I know, where two men seeking admission to the Senate were on trial at the same time for corrupting the ballot in their States and buying Senate seats on the auction block.

The Senator from Pennsylvania told us that one-tenth of the population of the whole country lives in the State of Pennsylvania. I remarked to some of my colleagues yesterday that they were corrupting a larger portion of the whole population than I had thought prior to that time. Ten per cent of the people of the whole country have been injuriously affected by that election. Illinois, another great State, stands shamed and humiliated because of the political corruptionist. There sleep the remains of the immortal Lincoln, who proclaimed it to the world that he stood for the doctrine which places the man above the dollar. That doctrine has been reversed in Illinois, and the dollar has been placed above the citizen. Out in Illinois they select a man for the Senate by the sheer use of money at the polls. And over in Pennsylvania $1,800,000 was spent by one group of candidates for State offices and one candidate for the United States Senate. Think of that, Senators!

It is our business as Senators to safeguard the interests of the Republic. If we fail to do that, we are unworthy to be in this body. Personal feelings and considerations do not enter into this matter with me.

I am very fond of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE]. I served with him in the House, and I also served there with Mr. SMITH. But personal likes and dislikes should not be considered in a case like this. Our duty to our country should determine our course. There are two groups of people in this country now and at this very hour they are arrayed on opposing sides in a great battle. One of those groups is fighting to keep the ballot clean, is fighting to keep the corruptionists away from the ballot box, which is the Ark of the Covenant in our civic affairs, fighting to keep the senatorial toga off the auction block. The other group is fighting to beat back the senatorial candidates of moderate means and to set aside the senatorial offices as the political preserves of men of great wealth. They want the dollar to become the main thing, the all-powerful thing in senatorial elections.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has indirectly laid down that doctrine here to-day. He said the time has come when it requires a great deal of money to be a candidate for office and that a man should not be criticized for spending vast sums to get his cause before the people. Why, Senators, that is one of the things we are worried about here to-day. If we are going to say that that doctrine is sound, then the rich man can open his barrel, as was done in Illinois and Pennsylvania, and go out and buy a seat in the Senate. If we permit a man to use all the money he pleases to send out vast amounts of literature, to hire men at the various polling places in the State, each candidate, if he had it, could spend a million dollars or more, and it would be said it was all right, according to the standard set up to-day by the Senator from Massachusetts. Let me analyze his position a moment.

Suppose a rich man who relies on his money to elect him enters the race for the United States Senate. A poor man of merit, capable, of high character, popular, a man known to be one of sound principles and a friend of constitutional govern-

ment, likewise enters the race and is assailed by the rich man. He is attacked in paid advertising matter in a half dozen big dailies in the State. The poor candidate comes forward and says, "There is no truth in those charges. They are false." His friends say, "But you must answer his charges." "How am I going to answer them?" "Answer them in the newspapers, where he made them." When he goes to ask what it will cost, he is told that it will cost him $500 a page. He says, "I am a poor man and not able to pay it." Thus we can see in what sort of a fix the poor man would be if the rich man can spend all he pleases to spend in a senatorial election. His friends say to him, "You had better get out of the race. You are not able to go through such a campaign with this man because he has too much money."

So it is proposed to drive men and women of merit out of politics. It is proposed to put the stress and emphasis on money, and money is to become the dominating thing in the politics of the country. Do we want to see that done, Senators? Is it safe for the country to permit it to be done?

The time was when the people asked of a candidate, is he capable, is he honest, is he trustworthy? But now the corruptionists ask, How much money has he got? The boodlers who gather about the polling places want to know how much money he has. More and more people who do not think very much about these things are being encouraged to sell themselves like sheep in the market place to the man who wants to buy a seat in the Senate. Some people do not know why they want seats here. It is our duty to tell them. They want these seats because they have power here to enact laws which give to big favor-seeking corporations the advantages which they want over the people whom they wish to pillage and plunder. They want seats in this body because it enables them to get more completely control of the national Government. God knows they are making inroads upon it fast enough; ways other than buying seats in the Senate.

I heard somebody say yesterday, "I am so sorry for SMITH and VARE," But we are not trying these cases on our sympathies. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] told us yesterday about how beneficent and kind and fine Mr. Vare had been in various ways; that he had some of the Senators almost in tears over what a great outrage was about to be perpetrated on Mr. VARE, and his friend wore an expression of injured innocence. It reminded me of a story about a lawyer in my State, St. John, of Cullman, Ala. He went home one afternoon about dark and found that Mrs. St. John had the 6-year-old boy standing up in the corner delivering a lecture to him about some of his misconduct. St. John came in and said, "Mama, I wouldn't scold that boy. He is the best boy in town." The boy, looking very innocent, looked up at his father. St. John said, "He came over to my office to-day and got my mail and opened it for me." The boy was deeply touched; he commenced to pucker up his lips as if he were about to cry. St. John, continuing, said: "I heard him humming a religious tune this morning." The little fellow could not stand it any longer. He interrupted his father to say, "And I am going to be baptized soon." [Laughter.] One would think that these two gentlemen seeking admission to the Senate were ready to be translated and borne away on angel wings to their immortal homes. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] this morning stated that Pennsylvania was the only State that could confer immortality on the citizen, that if a man ever got on the Republican poll list in Pennsylvania he never died. It is said that all they want in Philadelphia is a name. On one occasion they asked a negro if anybody else lived in his house. He said, "No, sir; nobody but my dog Tige." "Tige who?" "Tige Johnson." They said, "Put him down and vote him." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, when election cases from these two great States, Illinois and Pennsylvania—two of the very greatest States in the Union—are here for consideration in this body at one and the same moment, is it not high time that Senators were waking up? Senators have a duty to perform. Our fathers achieved our liberty. It is up to us to preserve it. We can not preserve it by permitting anybody, be he Democrat or Republican, to corrupt the voter in his State, make barter of the ballot, and buy seats in the United States Senate.

There ought not to be any difference of opinion on this question in this body; there ought not to be any politics in a question like this. Each side should vie with the other to see which could go quickest to the rescue of American institutions at a time like this.

Senators, we are going to do one of two things about this matter: We are going to sustain the doctrine of clean and honest elections or we are going to yield and surrender to the forces of corruption in politics. That is the issue involved in the cases before us. On which side do you stand in this critical hour? That is the question that I put to every Senator in this body.

The able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] told us that $3,000,000 was spent in Pennsylvania and Illinois in the elections of 1926. Think of that, Senators! That amount of money would pay the salaries of two United States Senators for 150 years, and yet the "interests" in those States think enough of two seats in this body to go out and spend $3,000,000 in political battles in two States to obtain two seats in the Senate of the United States. They must think that they would be worth a lot to them in six years' time.

It is not the honor, then, that they are after; it is not the matter of trying to elect some friend. Senators, it is high time that this body was reconsecrating itself to the highest and best interests of our country. Special interests are anxious to get their agents into this body; they are anxious to get them into the other House of Congress. They are so anxious to do so that they have bought newspapers to poison public sentiment, and they help the cause of the corruptionist along. They have not stopped with that, but now they have invaded the sacred precincts of the ballot box itself and stand there with their bags of gold. They are putting prices on the heads of those who wield the ballot, the mightiest weapon known to a free man, a weapon with which this Government is to be preserved or by the corrupt use of which this Government is to perish. Senators, more governments have perished from corruption from within than have by armies from without. It is easy to get some men to fight for their country in time of war, but it is hard to arouse them to the importance and necessity of fighting in time of peace to preserve free institutions.

I say this with all kindness to Senators here who do not agree with me; but some of them seem so careless and indifferent about this very important question; they do not seem to realize the importance of the great fight that is before us. They do not seem to realize that we have got to win this fight or surrender to the corrupt money bunds of America. There can be no compromise with the forces of corruption. We have got to fight to the bitter end and rout these forces; expel them from the Capitol and thus destroy this corrupt power in the States or surrender to them and tell them to carry on their work of destruction until this Government shall totter and fall. That is the situation with which we are confronted.

The Washington Post, which is Ned McLean's paper, discusses this matter editorially. Think of Ned McLean, with his Fall and Doheny record, lecturing the Senate of the United States! He has a very short memory or a very thick hide. Senators will recall that he admitted that he had told falsehoods about furnishing Fall the money that he really got from Doheny to betray his trust and his country, to barter the oil reserves of the Nation. Ned was mixed up in that scandal very deeply and he came out stained and soiled all over. Now he undertakes to lecture the Senate, and says the Senate has disgraced itself by voting to protect itself and the country from the forces of political corruption in the States of Illinois and Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, do not the facts show us how determined the "interests" are to continue to buy seats in this body? They were not satisfied; it did not make much impression on them when the Senate got rid of Clark, of Montana; they were not taught anything, it seems, when Lorimer was put out of this Chamber; it seems that they derived no lesson from our action with regard to Newberry. They come now with twin evils—two States at a time. They are worse now than ever before. The State of Pennsylvania comes with a candidate whose certificate the governor of the State says was procured through fraud and corruption. They stole part of it, he said, and bought the other part. Still the editor of the Washington Post tells us that we have disgraced ourselves by voting to keep out of the Senate the man who comes here as the result of fearful conditions described by the governor of the State.

In Illinois Mr. Insull, the great hydroelectric power magnate, puts up money by the thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars for Mr. SMITH, who was chairman of the commission which regulated the charges for light and power in Chicago and throughout Illinois. Those charges were raised, we are told, and Mr. Insull got the benefit of the increased price, and therefore had more money to contribute to Mr. SMITH, who remained chairman of that commission rendering service to his benefactor and his benefactor helping his friend, whom he expected to be his agent or friendly instrumentality in the Senate of the United States.

Thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars were contributed in that way, and Mr. Insull, when called before a committee of this body, declined to tell what he knew. This arrogant and pompous representative of the money trust of America folded his arms and said, "I decline to answer." He defied this

body—the constituted authority of the Nation—refused to tell the truth as he knew it, and we have not obtained it to this day; yet we secured enough admissions to know that they spent $800,000 or more to procure for themselves a seat in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said at the outset that when a man comes here he must come with clean hands. We rejected Mr. SMITH last winter. When Mr. McKinley died the Governor of Illinois, who himself had been indicted and was accused by people throughout his State of being an improper man to be in that office, appointed Mr. SMITH. They thought they would turn a trick on the Senate.

They said the Senate is bound to accept him now, because the contest over the election will not come up until after the 4th of March. They can not go into that until the term for which he is elected begins. So they said, "We will slip him down there and they will keep him, and after the 4th of March, if they try to put him out, the country will laugh at them and say, 'If he was good enough to serve under an appointment, he is good enough to serve under the certificate of election.'" The Senate, however, properly asked, in effect, "Are you the same SMITH who ran in the primary? You are the same man for whom they spent nearly a million dollars? You are the man against whom charges have been filed which a committee has investigated and has about recommended that you are not entitled to a seat? The same man. And now you come under the appointment of a governor, and you think you will get in? Well, you will not be admitted." I voted to stop him at the door then, and I have no apology to make for my vote. I voted to halt him at the door on yesterday, and I have no apology to make for that vote. As for me and my vote, so long as I am a Member of this body I am going to fight to the last the corruptionists of every State in the Union. I am not going to vote to seat a man for whose election barrels of money have been spent and who, if seated, will help to make laws for my State and the other States of the Union.

This is more than a State question. The other States are vitally interested. Senators from Illinois and Pennsylvania vote on laws for Arizona, Alabama, New York, New Hampshire, and all the other States of the Union. So the people in all those States are interested. We who sit in this body are the judges as to who shall come here and occupy seats, and when a citizen comes properly clothed and comes with clean hands nobody asks any questions. Even if he has an ordinary contest on his hands he is sworn in and takes his seat and the contest is then proceeded with. But, Mr. President, I submit that these are exceptional cases, extraordinary cases; and methods have been used to procure seats here that ought to be frowned on and condemned by this body as a whole. We ought to teach a lesson to the corruptionists of other States. They must be made to know that certificates of election to the Senate will not be accepted unless they are free from fraud and corruption. I will tell you one thing that has happened already as a result of the challenge of Mr. SMITH'S right to a seat here. I understand that Mr. Insull, out in Illinois, has said, "I am not going to give a dollar to anybody's senatorial campaign in the future." They said, "Why?" He said, "Well, it does not do any good. They will not seat him even if we put him over."

That is the lesson we are trying to teach them. That is the thought that we should get into their heads. That is the thing we ought to make plain to all of them. When they go around and say, "You give me money and I can win this race," the answer will be, "No; you will have to win on your merits. You will have to consult the people whose Government this is. If they want to vote for you, all right. I think you are a fair man, and I believe you would do justice by our interests, as you would by everybody else's interests. I do not ask for any special favors. I should be glad to see you elected, because I think you are a fair man and a capable man."

That is what we want, Mr. President. We do not want these men to go with their hats in their hands to these big moneyed interests and gather up shekels from them and go out to make their campaigns for election to the Senate. It is humiliating to the citizen; it is dangerous to the body politic, because when you carry on a campaign like that you induce the citizen to sell himself; and I want to tell you another thing: The man who will buy a seat in this body will sell it in more ways than one. There is no question about that. Whenever they buy a seat in this body they know that they are going to get value received, at least, and sometimes a hundredfold more, or they would not make the investment at the outset.

I hold no prejudice against capital. It is necessary. It is a valuable thing to have in our country. I wish it well in all of its legitimate endeavors; but I do not want capital to control the country. I do not want capital to become the dominating thing in my country. I want capital to stand on the level with every other interest and let them all say, "The only interest I have in the selection of a Senator is that I want one who is big enough and broad enough and honest enough and just enough to give me fair treatment. That is all I ask. I want a Senator who believes in sound principles, who is capable, and who will support and sustain to the best of his ability this great Government of ours."

But, Senators, they are getting away from that. They want to put all that in the background now; and they want to say, as they said in the Newberry case, "How much will it take to put it over?" They told them, and they put up the money; and John Newberry said he spent it, and his brother did not know it; and some Senators voted to keep Newberry in here because, they said, he did not know. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] pointed out this morning that Mr. SMITH of Illinois voted to unseat Mr. McLane, of Pennsylvania, because somebody without his knowledge spent $3,000 more than they thought they ought to have spent, and that he only spent $700 in all himself; and Mr. SMITH of Illinois voted to turn him out. Now, however, he comes up with about $800,000 piled up around him; and still they say we ought to bring these men in and put the purple robes on them, and sit them down on the front seats, and spread a feast, and let them enjoy themselves and be happy for a time before we execute or excuse them. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I am in favor of operating on them before we go to all that trouble. They ought to have thought of all this before, as the judge said to the criminal who stood in front of him:

"Stand up! What have you to say why the sentence of the law should not be pronounced upon you"?

"Well, judge," he said, "life is a precious thing. I hate to give it up. I hate to leave my wife and children behind. I hate to die. If there is any way for you to get around it, Judge, I wish you would do it. It would please me more than I can tell you. You do not know how sorry I am for all that I have done."

"Yes; yes," the old judge said, as he stroked his whiskers. "You ought to have thought of all that before you killed that man, murdered him in cold blood and deprived his wife of her husband, and his children of their father, and left them alone in the world with nothing to subsist upon. You should have thought of all that when you were doing the thing that brings you where you are to-day."

I commend that story to the gentlemen whose seats are being relieved of them. They ought to have thought of that when they went out into the sacred precincts of the American ballot box and held a poor man up who was hard pressed to get money to pay his rent, and asked him to betray his country and disgrace himself and sell himself on the auction block, and he halted and hesitated for a time, and they said, "Here is $10. You are a poor man. Go ahead and vote this ticket"; and he walked up with a lump in his throat and a tear in his eye and sold himself at the altar place of his country; and the minions of mammon laughed as they dragged that citizen down into the political mire of those who betray their country for a price.

They who go to the ballot box and station their emissaries about it with their money, clinking their dollars and dimes, and inviting these people that they have oppressed in the common walks of life, where they have made it hard for them to live, and say, "You people have not got anything much. You are having a hard time. Why not make some money out of this? What do you care about it? Get in the game. Here is $10"; and some come up and accept it. The man who corrupts the voter is a public enemy. These corruptionists who care nothing for the temple of liberty in America, who care nothing for constitutional government in the United States. They will betray it, weaken it, and sell it to increase their riches. Greed and avarice unbridled, unchecked, is rampant around many of the polling places of this Republic, and the honest men in this body have it in their power to stop it, to put an end to it, to be done with it. We are either going to do that or we are going to accept the standards of the Newberrys and the Lorimers and the Clarks and the group back of the two gentlemen who stand here knocking at the door of the Senate to-day and permit the work of destruction to go on.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] in effect has laid down the doctrine that money becomes the paramount thing. You have got to advertise more, and keep on advertising. Then, according to his position, there should be no limit to the campaign fund that a candidate should spend. He laid down that doctrine. When he laid it down he said to the American people, "Those who have money in abundance can get these places. Those who can not advertise can not get them. Only the rich can run for these places. Only the rich can be elected to the Senate. Only men of great wealth can reach the position of United States Senator."

They want to make money the dominating thing in American politics.

Money, money, money! Remember Thomas Moore's poem on corruption and intolerance:

> Like Jove of old
> They have turned their thunder into showers of gold,
> Whose silent courtship wins securer joys,
> Taints by degrees, and ruins without noise.

That is what they have done in Illinois and Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, in other days these enemies of clean and honest government moved around with dark lanterns, but they have become very bold in recent years. They have thrown aside their dark lanterns and now they dare to come boldly to the Capital of the Nation and employ learned lawyers to write their briefs and make their arguments and send them free to Senators in book form to influence them to sanction the sale of seats in the Senate. No longer do they proceed by dark-lantern methods. They are bold and defiant now. They write their checks. Insull gives his check for $25,000, $50,000, $75,000, and so on, into the hundreds of thousands, and the same thing goes on with these men in Pennsylvania; and when you catch them in the act they say, "Why, yes; we spent this money. What of it?" They throw out their chests and swell up in their imaginary importance when they should hang their heads and hide their faces.

Senators, are we who speak for the people of the various States going to permit this sort of thing to continue? Are we going to encourage or condone those who have been guilty of procuring votes in senatorial elections by the corrupt use of money?

The Senator from Massachusetts admitted to us that the people want SMITH and VARE kept out of the Senate. He said: "I am sorry for the Senators who have to run next year if they vote against this resolution." That is what he said. He was admitting that the people wanted them stopped at the door. We are a Government of the people, and he was admitting that we were carrying out the wishes of the people. Then we are doing what the Constitution gives us the right to do and authorizes us to do—to say who shall come in here and occupy seats and make laws for the people of every State in the Union. These two cases are not on the same footing with the ordinary one where a Senator presents himself for admission and objection is had because of some irregularity in his credentials, and so forth. The fraud and corruption in the primary election of both of these gentlemen were so pronounced and offensive that the Senate appointed a committee of Senators to investigate and report the facts to the Senate, and the committee did so. The facts substantially as reported by the Senate committee to the Senate are not denied, and in the face of those undisputed facts the Senate is justified in refusing them admission.

We are here to protect the honor and integrity of this body, to safeguard the rights and interests of the American people, and to keep this place clean and free from the corruptionist in politics. These are the things that should concern us to-day.

The Senator from Connecticut said the Senate could remove the President, could remove Supreme Court judges, could remove the Vice President, and that is true, and yet they come in here and scold the Senate for refusing to admit to membership men whose credentials are badly tainted with fraud and corruption. The Senate, that can impeach the President of the United States, ought certainly to keep the Senate clean and trustworthy. Candidates for the Senate from all political parties must be made to understand that the candidate for the Senate who corrupts the voter and obtains election through fraud and corruption, as these men did, will not be admitted to membership here. But some of the Senators on the other side tell us that we are denying a State representation in the Senate. We are not doing anything of the kind. We are trying the case of men seeking admission to the Senate, and as soon as we are through with them the Governors of Illinois and Pennsylvania will have the opportunity to appoint another Senator from each of those States, and if the governor appoints one who can come with clean certificate there will be no objection to him at the bar of the Senate.

But what has happened with Illinois? The governor of that State undertook to force Mr. SMITH down the throat of the Senate, and the Senate refused to let him do it. The governor said, "If you do not take this man, I will not send you another"; so the Governor of Illinois, not the Senate, deprived his State of representation in this body during that brief time.

When this body made known its reasons for refusing the credentials of Mr. SMITH the governor should have said, "They have exercised their constitutional right; there is nothing for me to do but to select another," and he should have done so. I do not think anybody will take the position that the Senate should be coerced by the governor of that State. The Senate has its own rights under the Constitution, and the States have their rights. The State selects the candidate, as I said before, but it owes it to the people of the State and owes it to the Nation to select one with clean hands, not one whose position has been bought for him at the polling places of the State. We must make that plain to them all, and the sooner we do it the better.

Take the State of Pennsylvania again, a State with 67 counties, a rock-ribbed Republican State. My recollection is that Roosevelt carried it by 500,000 majority in 1904. It is known as a rock-ribbed Republican State. Yet William B. Wilson, a Democrat and a poor man, carried 55 counties of the 67 counties, and reached Philadelphia with a clear majority of 60,000 votes. The only counties that he lost were those counties where they had the padded poll lists and where the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] says they confer immortality on the citizen. Once on the poll list, they live on and on, for all voting purposes. They continue to vote them after they are dead. Republicans and Democrats alike repudiated the Vare machine and voted for Wilson, a poor but an honest man. It is time this body was teaching a lesson to those who have made money the paramount thing in the politics of our country.

The Senator from Massachusetts said:

> When I was a young man I used to hear about corrupting voters, but we do not hear of that any more.

Mr. President, it has become so common under Republican rule in some of the States that it is no longer interesting table talk. Among some Republicans they accept it as a matter of course. Money to control elections! The Senator says he does not hear of it much now. Oh, Mr. President, there is plenty of it in these two cases. There are more ways of corrupting voters than one. One way is to offer them so much money to vote the ticket; and then there is another way, hiring them with liberal pay to become watchers, or to take part in other ways in the campaign, to draw them into their political net and tie them hard and fast. The man who does not have plenty of money can not employ high-priced watchers like they have in Pennsylvania. The man who does not have a lot of money can not give employment to political grafters. A poor man who does not believe in appealing to the power of the purse, but who appeals to the judgment and conscience of the voters, must stand by and see voters influenced and controlled by money directly and indirectly paid for votes.

Mr. President, that brings me back to the proposition that we have got to surrender to these miserable forces or whip them and rout them completely. For instance, take a newspaper in my State, the Birmingham News, which has been attacking me in edtorials and otherwise, misrepresenting and slandering me since I opposed the Mexican war program of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. I wanted to print a statement in reply to some of their attacks, and the Birmingham News wired me that it would cost me $4 an inch. Think of that—$4 an inch to state the truth regarding their slanderous and villainous attacks upon me.

What is a poor man going to do with an unprincipled bunch like that, unless he is already in public life, as I am, and the people of his State know him and understand him and support him, as they do me. I went over my State, and every place I spoke the audience, by a vote of 98 per cent of those present, passed a resolution condemning and repudiating that paper and indorsing me. In the city of Birmingham, where the Birmingham News is published, I addressed an audience of 7,000 people in the city auditorium, and there the whole audience, by a rising vote, passed that resolution. Carry your fight to the people in person. That is the thing to do. You can buy some newspapers now, just as you can buy a pig at the butcher's shop, and you can buy the editorial pages of some of them now just as you can buy space for advertising purposes. This is another evil that must be checked.

Three-fourths of the press of the country is owned or subsidized by selfish and sordid interests. These interests are getting a stranglehold on the Associated Press's throat right here at the Capitol. Mussolini, the dangerous Italian tyrant, has an agent right here at the Capital in touch with the Associated Press who looks out for his interests, and they are giving Mussolini more favorable publicity in the press of the United States, together with the Fascist societies, than they are the whole membership of the United States Senate.

The sinister interests are letting their money talk in many ways. It is getting hold of these instrumentalities in our Nation. I repeat, in conclusion, that it has invaded the ballot box and corrupted the voter. Many of the newpapers suppress the

truth. They will not let it reach the country through their columns. They are making money the all-powerful thing, so that they can lay the candidacy of the rich man before the people and keep that of the poor man away from the people.

Now they march boldly and brazenly upon the ballot box itself, corrupting the citizen, buying votes, and buying seats in the Senate. This thing must be destroyed or it will destroy the free institutions that we love. Senators, the time will come when you will fight in vain if you do not fight now to stop at this door those who have, by corrupting the citizen, committed a crime against the country. The man who comes to this body with an election certificate bought by the avaricious money bunds of America is not entitled to be sworn in. Let him be heard, as the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has provided; let him go before the committee again, let him come in and have the privilege of the floor to make his statement and defend his title. But never let him have the satisfaction of saying that he is a United States Senator, that he has been sworn in and clothed with the authority, the majesty, and the power of a Senator of the United States. Deny him that as a part of the punishment for his crime against his country. Make that a part of the penalty for all those who deliberately corrupt the ballot and poison the Nation at its source. Halt him at the door of this Chamber. Tell him that a certificate bought in the market of corrupted ballots will not admit him here. Repudiate his action and deny him admission. Senators, let us as patriotic Americans stand as one on this vital question and protect and preserve the institutions intrusted to our care. Let the citizen approached by one of these unprincipled corruptionists with the proposition to buy his vote be encouraged to scorn and spurn him, and report him to the lawful authorities, and let us have a law under which such a person can be prosecuted and severely punished. Let us throw every safeguard possible around the voter for in his hands and in her hands are lodged the power to preserve or destroy the Government of the United States.

When you corrupt the voters of a single State you are weakening and impairing the Federal Government of all the States; and the Senator who seeks to discourage and prevent the corruption of voters in a senatorial election in any of the States is rendering valuable service to the people of all the States. And the only way the Senator can do that without interfering with the rights and prerogatives of the State is to refuse to accept as a Member of this body the candidate who comes here with a title tainted with corruption, with a certificate bought at the ballot box. A title to land obtained through fraud and corruption is not valid and the courts will declare it null and void. You can prevent the party claiming title under the fraudulent transaction from taking possession of the land for even a minute. Then how much more important it is that this Senate, the greatest law-making body in the world, shall declare the title to seats in this body that were obtained through fraud and corruption are of no effect and null and void.

RECESS

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, December 9, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, *December 8, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou art divinely good again to gladden our hearts and to cheer our lives. Thou hast continued to bestow upon us Thy sacred gifts. Through the serene of light and the calm of dark we have been kept by Thy soothing, restful Providence. We thank Thee. Our Republic, O God, with all its splendid traditions, with all its marvelous progress, do Thou remember. By the inspiration of high idealism and Christian aspiration may it live on and on to disappoint our foes and to surprise our friends. May every section be guarded against any enemy that may be stalking to mar or disturb our national unity. May the culture of peace, good will, and brotherhood keep our Nation erect and calm for the blessing of all who dwell within our borders. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. CASEY, of the twelfth Pennsylvania district, and Mr. MANLOVE, of the fifteenth Missouri district, appeared at the bar of the House and were sworn in by the Speaker.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON H. WALTERS

Mr. LEECH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEECH. Mr. Speaker, it is with real sorrow that I announce to the House the death last night of Hon. Anderson H. Walters, of Johnstown, Pa. Mr. Walters, who was my immediate predecessor, honored the State of Pennsylvania as Representative at Large in the Sixty-third, Sixty-sixth, and Sixty-seventh Congresses, and the twentieth district of his State in the Sixty-ninth Congress. During the past two years my friend had suffered from an incurable disease, pernicious anemia, which caused his brother's death some years ago, but in the face of the inevitable he consistently displayed the quiet courage and cheerfulness that so clearly portrayed his real character. He was of unassuming personality, but his strength of character was outstanding to those who knew him at home, as I now know they knew him here. Pennsylvania and his district are poorer by reason of the untimely death of Mr. Walters.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. At 3 o'clock this afternoon the statue of Hon. Alexander Hamilton Stephens will be unveiled in Statuary Hall. The Governor of Georgia and about a thousand Georgians are here to participate in the ceremonies. Vice President Dawes, on behalf of the Nation, will accept the statue that was prepared by Mr. Borglum.

Mr. Stephens was one of Georgia's most distinguished patriots, orators, statesmen, and historians. He served in this House for 26 years. A part of that service was rendered when Statuary Hall was the Hall of the House of Representatives. He was one of the Members who moved from that Hall to this one, and his statue will reside permanently in the place where he served with great ability his State and Nation as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The governor has asked me to invite the Members of the House to attend these ceremonies, and in conclusion I will read the formal invitation to the House. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 6, 1927.*

To the Members of the United States Congress now in session:

GENTLEMEN: On Thursday afternoon at 3 o'clock in National Statuary Hall the statue of Alexander Hamilton Stephens, distinguished Georgian, gifted statesman, author, and patriot, and for 26 years a Member of your honorable body, is to be unveiled.

On behalf of his honor, the governor, I wish to extend a cordial invitation to you to be present for the exercises on this eventful occasion.

Sincerely,

GARNETT W. QUILLIAN, M. D.,
Chairman Governor's Statuary Committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to say a word on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, when Abraham Lincoln was a Member of this House he sat for two years in a seat adjoining Alexander H. Stephens and the result was a warm and close friendship between them.

At one time he wrote to his partner Herndon back in Springfield and said:

I have to-day listened to the best speech of an hour's duration that I ever heard, delivered by Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, a little wizened-up man, but my old eyes are still filled with tears, and if his speech is printed I assure you my constituents shall have many copies.

If you will pardon me for a personal reference, I want to say that Lincoln's seat was later taken by my own father, who also sat in a seat adjoining Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on December 7 Mr. Arthur H. Sapp, president of the Rotary International, delivered an address before the Washington Rotary Club at the New Willard Hotel, in the presence of 32 diplomats, representing the principal nations of the world. I think his address is one of considerable importance and would be of interest to the Members. I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert the same in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, whose speech is it?

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is a speech by Mr. Arthur H. Sapp, president of the Rotary International, and it deals with the International Rotary in the form of universal peace among the nations of the world.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, in order to ask from the powers that be on both sides of the House what their policy is going to be with reference to printing extraneous matter in the RECORD. I have been the goat just about as long as I want to be in trying to protect the RECORD from speeches, resolutions, editorials, and other matter which has nothing to do with the business of Congress; but if the leadership of the House is willing to have this go on as it has in the past and continue the abuse as it has been in the past, I do not know that any one humble Member of the House has any right to butt in.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. This is a matter in which every Member of this House is equally interested and as to which each Member has equal power. It is the duty of each Member, just as much as it is the duty of the majority or the minority leader, to protect the RECORD. I do not think that the entire membership of this House on both sides should attempt to unload upon the shoulders of the leaders of the respective sides the duty of protecting the RECORD. I repeat, it is the duty of every individual Member on this floor to accept the responsibility, and if any one Member sees any reason why a particular thing should not be extended in the RECORD, then he should say so, and he should not try to unload his responsibility upon the leadership or upon anyone else.

Mr. UNDERHILL. What I asked was what the policy of the leadership is to be?

Mr. BUTLER. And how are we going to know what the matter is until we have an opportunity to read it? We would simply have to guess at it.

Mr. TILSON. The policy is made by the individual Members of the House, because it is a matter requiring unanimous consent. The leadership might establish some policy in their own minds, only to have it upset by some one Member. It is a matter in which every Member of this House is equally interested, and as to which he is equally charged with responsibility.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, until some policy has been determined upon, I shall object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is too late with his objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that in a situation like this, where it is impossible for the Chair to see all gentlemen who rise to object, that the gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to recognition to object. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

FLOOD CONTROL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Flood Control:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is submitted herewith a letter from the Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, transmitting with favorable recommendation the report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, containing the plan of the Army Engineers for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley.

In my message to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of the first session of the Seventieth Congress, the flood-control problem of the lower Mississippi and the urgent necessity for its solution were outlined. The general duties and responsibilities of the Federal Government in connection therewith were therein discussed.

The total cost of the recommended project is $296,400,000, distributed over a period of 10 years. This large sum is manifestly justified by the necessities of the situation and the benefits that will result. In determining the distribution of the costs there must be considered not only the people of the valley itself, who receive the major portion of the benefits, but also the great mass of taxpayers who suffer less directly from Mississippi River floods and upon whom most of the burden of Federal taxation falls. It is axiomatic that States and other local authorities should supply all land and assume all pecuniary responsibility for damages that may result from the execution of the project. It would be revolutionary for the Federal Government to establish the precedent of buying part of the land upon which to build protective works to increase the value of the remainder. Similarly it would be very unwise for the United States in generously helping a section of the country to render itself liable for consequential damages. The Federal Treasury should bear the portion of the cost of engineering structures for flood control that is justified by the national aspects of the problem and the national benefits. It may even bear 80 per cent of such costs, but substantial local cooperation is essential to avoid waste. The portion this would leave to be borne locally for flood-control structures represents an expenditure of about $3, or 30 cents per year for 10 years for each acre in the alluvial valley to be protected every year from Mississippi River floods. The value per acre, including railroads, towns, cities, and other improvements, is estimated at something over $200. It would seem that the States should share with the Federal Government the burden of assisting the levee districts and individual property owners, especially in view of the fact that the States benefit directly by the increased taxes from land made more valuable by reason of its protection.

The plan transmitted herewith is comprehensive and appeals to me as being adequate in its engineering. I concur in general in the conclusions and recommendations reached in the report, and suggest that appropriate legislation be enacted putting them into effect.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

> The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to discontinue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor.

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state the following changes in the organization of the Customs Service have been made by Executive order since the last report.

By Executive order dated December 8, 1926, Holeb and Jackman were consolidated into one customs port of entry to be known as Holeb-Jackman and to comprise all of the territory at present included in said ports, in customs collection district No. 1 (Maine and New Hampshire), with headquarters at Portland, Me., effective December 15, 1926.

By Executive order dated January 27, 1927, the ports of Ellsworth, Bar Harbor, and South West Harbor, in customs collection district No. 1 (Maine and New Hampshire), were

abolished and a new port of entry created to be known as Bar Harbor, in the said customs collection district, with headquarters at Portland, Me., and comprising Mount Desert Island, the city of Ellsworth, and the townships of Hancock, Sullivan, Sorrento, Gouldsboro, and Winter Harbor, effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated February 5, 1927, the ports of Kenosha and Kewaunee in customs collection district No. 37 (Wisconsin), with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis., were discontinued as ports of entry, effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated February 25, 1927, Akron, Ohio, was created a port of entry in customs collection district No. 41 (Ohio), with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio, effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated August 19, 1927, Coos County, N. H., at that time a part of customs collection district No. 1 (Maine and New Hampshire), with headquarters at Portland, Me., was made a part of customs collection district No. 2 (Vermont), with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated September 22, 1927, Lancaster, Minn., was created a port of entry in customs collection district No. 34 (Dakota), with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated September 30, 1927, Alpena, Charlevoix, Detour, Escanaba, Houghton, Mackinaw, Manistee, Marine City, Marquette, Muskegon, St. Clair, and St. Joseph were abolished as ports of entry in customs collection district No. 38 (Michigan), with headquarters at Detroit, Mich., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

By Executive order dated October 8, 1927, Oklahoma City, Okla., was created a port of entry in customs collection district No. 45 (St. Louis), with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., effective 30 days from the date of the order.

All of the above changes were dictated by consideration of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes, with the enforcement of which the customs service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

COMMISSION ON ERECTION OF MEMORIALS, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the act of Congress of March 4, 1921, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927. The attention of the Congress is invited to the recommendation of the commission that the memorial to the Unknown Soldier be completed.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

POLITICAL STATUS OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 19 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," I transmit herewith a set of the laws and resolutions adopted by the Seventh Philippine Legislature during its second session, from July 16 to November 9, 1926.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirement of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Alien Property Custodian submitting the annual report of the proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1926.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on matters concerning the Department of State, required by certain provisions of law enumerated in the report.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

FORTY-FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the Forty-fourth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

AERONAUTICS

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committees on Naval Affairs, Military Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I submit herewith the thirteenth annual report of the committee for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

Attention is invited to the remarks of the committee on the death of its late chairman, Dr. Charles D. Wolcott, on whose advice the committee was established by the Congress in 1915. At a time when there was but little appreciation of the value of aeronautics and but slight conception of its problems, Doctor Walcott had the vision to see the need for organized scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight. The establishment of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the development of its usefulness in the formulation of policies, and the results of its labors in the field of research are a tribute to the leadership of Doctor Walcott and stamp him as a great constructive force in the upbuilding of American aeronautics.

The technical improvement in the performance and efficiency of aircraft for all purposes, the policy of the Government in the regulation and encouragement of aviation, and the great impetus given to aeronautical development during the past year by the transoceanic flights of Lindbergh and others have combined to cause a broader recognition of the practicability of aircraft as a means of transportation that I believe is destined to play an ever-increasing part in the advance of civilization.

The attention of the Congress is invited to Part V of the committee's report, presenting a summary of the present state

of aeronautical development. It is gratifying to note the committee's opinion that aeronautical progress in the United States during the past year has surpassed the hopes of a year ago, and that the present governmental policy is primarily responsible. I concur in the committee's judgment that further substantial progress in aeronautics is dependent largely upon the continuous prosecution of scientific research.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PORTO RICO

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith copies of acts and resolutions enacted by the Eleventh Legislature of Porto Rico during its second regular session (February 14 to April 15, 1927) and its second special session (April 25 to May 8, 1927).

These acts and resolutions have not previously been transmitted to the Congress and none of them has been printed as a public document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, PORTO RICO

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 38 of the act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 951), entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of each of 10 franchises granted by the Public Service Commission of Porto Rico. The franchises are described in the accompanying letter from the Secretary of War transmitting them to me.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORTS OF COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with paragraph 5, section 2, of the Army appropriation act, approved August 29, 1916, I transmit herewith the tenth and eleventh annual reports of the Council of National Defense, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

REPORT OF BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the acts of March 4, 1915, and February 28, 1916, I transmit herewith the report of the United States Bureau of Efficiency for the period from November 1, 1926, to October 31, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1927.*

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5800), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5800, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For the additional amounts required from January 1 to June 30, 1927, inclusive, on account of the increased compensation granted by the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States," approved December 13, 1926, under the following appropriation accounts, respectively.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we were all very much interested, entertained, and amused yesterday while listening to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts on the subject of our diplomacy. If it were not for the fact that some false impression might be had, I would not here offer anything in refutation of what was then said. But that there may be no false impression with refernce to the facts concerning the thing about which Mr. GALLIVAN so humorously spoke, I desire to correct the statement that he made concerning the treatment of the mayor of New York City while visiting in Europe. Mr. GALLIVAN said:

Recently the mayor of the greatest city of America visited Europe and was honorably received on his tour everywhere by all except the diplomatic representatives of his own country.

Then he proceeds to tell of the indignities to which he was subject in the city of Paris at the request and by reason of the suggestion of a chargé d'affaires, Mr. Sheldon Whitehouse, at that time. The fact of the business is that Mr. Walker was well received wherever he went throughout Europe, and that reception was augmented and contributed to by Mr. Sheldon Whitehouse, who gave him a reception and a dinner, to which were invited prominent men of France and a number of prominent men of the United States then in Paris, so that if he appreciated the entertainments given him and in honor of his occupying the office of mayor of the greatest city of the United States, I do not think it well becomes Mr. Walker to come back here and criticize or for anyone to criticize in this House any treatment to which he might have been subject without knowing the facts. When Mr. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, appeared before the subcommittee having this bill in charge, the gentleman from Massachusetts asked whether there was any portion of the fund appropriated to the Department of State in reference to our foreign relations that was used in the hire of private detectives to exercise espionage over distinguished citizens while abroad. Mr. Carr very promptly and firmly denied there was anything of that character and agreed with the chairman of this committee [Mr. MADDEN], who said that if such were the case that such an expenditure would be without the pale of the law and whoever did such a thing would be subject to just criticism. Notwithstanding that fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts comes here and criticizes the Department of State because, forsooth, he alleges—and no doubt he received his information from what he deemed a reliable authority—that this character of surveillance was exercised over the gentleman from New York.

At the meeting of the Appropriations Committee on November 30 Congressman GALLIVAN stated that Mr. Sheldon Whitehouse had hired detectives to shadow Mayor Walker during his visit to Paris. Mr. Carr denied that any Government funds had been used for this purpose and said that he believed the assertion that Whitehouse had hired any detectives was untrue. On the chance that the matter might come up in Congress, the department telegraphed the embassy for information. Whitehouse stated that the assertion was entirely without foundation, and that when the story appeared in the Paris Herald on October 4 he had told several correspondents that it was absurd. The department then asked him whether it might not be possible that protection was given by the French police to Mayor Walker as a distinguished visitor. The French police stated that this was the case and that, on the arrival of the Legion, they had

added two or three other plain clothes men to look after Mayor Walker, because they were very anxious to prevent any possible disagreeable incidents at that time. Other distinguished Americans in Paris at the time were given the same protection, the embassy was well guarded, and the efforts made by the French police to prevent trouble were completely successful.

What was done with reference to Mayor Walker was done entirely by the prefect of police of the city of Paris. The same thing was done in reference to Assistant Secretary of State Carr while he was visiting abroad. He was in Paris about that time, and because of the excitement prevailing throughout continental Europe in consequence of the approaching execution of Sacco and Vanzetti, the prefect of police in the city of Paris and the other great metropolitan cities of Europe were more than anxious to see that there were no incidents to occur that would bring criticism upon their country because of any mistreatment of an American citizen. Now the same character of surveillance was given to Mr. Carr that was given to Mr. Walker.

Mr. Carr later submitted the following statement, obtained from Mr. Sheldon Whitehouse, chargé d'affaires of the United States in Paris, in regard to the report that private detectives had been employed to shadow a distinguished American visiting Paris:

The prefect of police stated that the distinguished American in question was followed by two plain-clothes men from the time of his arrival in Paris. This is what is usually done by the police in the case of distinguished visitors. In this instance two or three more plain-clothes men were added later as an additional precaution. It is not the practice of the prefect to inform the distinguished visitor of the nature of the precautions which it is deemed proper to take on his behalf since experience has shown that visitors often object to the precautions, either as in their opinion unnecessary or because they do not desire to inconvenience the local authorities to the extent of providing special protection. The embassy was not concerned with the employment of the men in question.

Mr. Carr further testified that there are no secret detectives in the State Department. They have some investigators, and they are on their regular roll, their names can be had by anyone who requests them, but they are not employed in any private detective work or personal surveillance. And in this case there is no truth in fact with reference to the charge that has been made against the State Department that it had private detectives following Mayor Walker throughout Europe. It is not only an aspersion upon the Department of State, but it is an aspersion upon the United States itself.

I regret exceedingly that such information should be given currency in this Chamber. I regret exceedingly that any man occupying the high position that is occupied by Mayor Walker should think, or that any of his friends should feel, that he has been discriminated against.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a correction?

Mr. WOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I just wish to correct the impression the gentleman is giving. So far as I know, Mayor Walker never made such a charge. Those charges have been made by newspapers and others, but not by the mayor of our city.

Mr. WOOD. I am pleased to hear this from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman point out in my speech where I used one single word indicating the name of Mayor Walker?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts means to try to mislead the members of this committee with reference to the position that he now occupies. His language is that "recently the mayor of the greatest city in America"——

Mr. GALLIVAN. Some people thought I referred to the mayor of Chicago. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD. No; there is no one who had any such idea. There is no one who even thought that the gentleman referred to the great city of Boston. The State Department knew to whom he had reference because of the fact of the publications in the newspapers that have already been alluded to. There is no mistake about the identity of the mayor, and the gentleman will not deny that or can not deny that in truth.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And there is no mistake about the greatest city of America, either?

Mr. WOOD. No. We all agree on that proposition.

I thought that in justice to the State Department and to this House and to the country the facts in the premises should be given to you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes, out of order, to reply to the gentleman; or three minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought the gentleman ought to be allowed to take three minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Make it five minutes, out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I do not know just what amendment my eminent friend from Indiana offered, but I am opposed to it anyway. [Laughter.] But, of course, he has not told the House at all what happened in our committee. We are not supposed to tell the House what happens in an executive session, and if he will find one word in the printed record of that session where Mayor Walker's name was mentioned I will resign here and now.

I made no attack on the State Department, and when I referred to "the mayor of the greatest city of America," several members of the Illinois delegation, thinking I was referring to the city of Chicago, asked me, "What happened to Bill Thompson over there?" [Laughter.] I said, "You had better ask my friend, MARTIN MADDEN; I do not know."

Of course, I made no attack upon the department, even for spending money for private detectives. As a member of the subcommittee, I asked Mr. Carr if any of the money for contingent expenses was provided to hire private detectives to shadow distinguished American officials, and Mr. Carr said, "Not to my knowledge," and, having the highest regard for Mr. Carr, I accepted his word for it.

I know this much, that when it appeared in the American press and in the press of countries overseas that the gentleman whose name has been mentioned by my good friend from Indiana had been shadowed, the chargé d'affaires at Paris never denied it then, and no denial to my knowledge has ever appeared until his statement was filed with the committee after we made up this bill. Therefore I do not want the House to get the wrong impression. As a member of the subcommittee I felt that it was my province to ask questions. That is my privilege as a member of this important subcommittee.

Now, with all due regard to the statement made by my good friend from Indiana, who has evidently been in close conference since yesterday with officials of the State Department, I desire to say to you here and now that I could repeat with much more emphasis than I placed on the whole story yesterday and with a little more detail, everything that I told to the House in the course of my remarks. Why? Because Members of this House have come to me—Members from both sides of the aisle, mostly on the Republican side—and they have told me that they themselves received the same kind of treatment I described when they visited the embassies abroad. I have never been abroad. These good men from the Republican side, I repeat, congratulated me and applauded me and said, "You have told the truth, and I am glad somebody has had the courage to stand up in Congress and let the country know just what those fellows are doing over there if one does not approach the embassies with the right sort of credentials." I have no apologies to offer for what I said yesterday, and I do not take back one single word of that speech. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, $241,854.92, which shall be credited, respectively, to the appropriation accounts above enumerated.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wanted to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to his pleasure when we should return to a certain controverted item.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman has an amendment which he wants to offer which may or may not be controverted. Of course, we will not foreclose his rights. But I may say we have another item which may cause some discussion, and

when we reach that I will ask that these other controverted items also be taken up.

Mr. McKEOWN. Very well.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MADDEN. I object. We must not waste time in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. All right. "What is sauce for the goose will be sauce for the gander."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of United States district judges, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1928, $51,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. This $51,000 is in addition to the sums of $60,000 and $90,000, found on pages 6 and 7 of the bill, providing funds for prosecuting the defendants involved in the oil leases.

Mr. MADDEN. This is for the salaries of judges, while the other was for the employment of counsel.

Mr. BLANTON. But the judges sit on the benches?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And try the cases.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows what it is for.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to discuss those items together, and that is the reason I mentioned the other ones. I hope the chairman of this committee and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee will look into the manner of conducting such cases and prosecutions here in the District of Columbia. No case wherein the rights and the interests of this Government are so vitally concerned ought ever to be tried in Washington, and if the gentleman from Illinois and the Judiciary Committee will look into the manner of conducting such cases here and the manner of the selection of the juries to try them and the personnel of the jury panels from which a jury must be selected they will provide means to force such cases to be tried in some other jurisdiction than that of Washington.

In my State in every case of felony, important and unimportant, the jury must be kept together in a State court, in charge of an officer of the court, and that is the rule that prevails, I dare say, in every State in this Union, but here in Washington, concerning a case wherein important individuals, if you please, rich and influential citizens, if you please, coupled with a former important official of this Government, when their jury was selected the court permitted them to separate, go to their homes each night, and go wherever they pleased. Then we had the charge made here in Washington that a bunch of Burns detectives from New York was here shadowing the personnel of that jury for means of approach. It is a disgrace to the judiciary of this Nation for such an occurrence to take place, for the ensuing mistrial cost thousands of dollars. I hope the gentleman from Illinois, as the head of the Appropriations Committee, and I hope the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will look into this question, and I hope they will take steps to provide a different jurisdiction in which to try such important cases which concern so vitally the interests of the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARSHALS, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, CLERKS, AND OTHER EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES COURTS

Salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals: For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1924, $3,841.56.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this is a deficiency bill, but I do want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the salaries paid deputy marshals in large cities. The salaries are out of all proportion to the important duties they must perform, especially at this time when added duties have been placed upon them. We have men in New York City, deputy marshals, paid as low as $1,400 and $1,500; and, Mr. Chairman, a man can not live in New York City on that salary. These men are intrusted with the custody of prisoners, with the transportation of prisoners, with the service of injunction papers, with duties in connection with padlock cases. The deputies in New York and other large cities are so underpaid that it is simply a disgraceful condition. I hope something will be done. It is no comfort to these men to tell them that the classification commission is studying their complaint in order that something may be done.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not put bread on the table?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; and it does not pay the rent. Some of these men can not afford to buy decent clothes to wear; so I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will grant an opportunity, at the proper time, to present all of the facts to your committee. Regardless of what may be in the Budget recommendations, I am going to ask the committee for a hearing when it takes up the Department of Justice appropriation bill. A comparison of the duties of these deputy marshals with a patrolman in the city will show that the United States deputies have in many instances a great deal more responsibilities, longer hours, and harder work. Their pay does not even commence to compare with that of a patrolman in New York City. Many of the Members who talk so emphatically on forcing obedience to the law will stand here and vote against amendments seeking to increase the pay of these men. There are many temptations that these deputies are subjected to and if good, loyal, efficient service is expected the least the Government can do is to pay them a living salary so that these men can live decently and support their families properly.

You can not compare salaries and living conditions in small communities with those in New York and the large cities. In a small place a man may go home for his lunch, rents are low, he has no car fares to pay, and it is simply absurd to try and compare the duties of these deputies in the southern and eastern judicial districts of New York with the duties of a single deputy in a place where Federal court may be held but a few weeks out of the year. Why, gentlemen, the Government treats the prisoners that these deputies take to Atlanta better than they do the deputy marshals.

Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation bill comes up, both in committee and on the floor, I am going to ask your cooperation to increase their salaries and to put them on a proper basis with a living wage.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash.: For the United States penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1928, including not to exceed $12,000 for salaries of officers and employees, $12,900.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line. At this time, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I would like to call attention to the condition of the Federal jails throughout the United States. They are woefully overcrowded, crowded beyond capacity, and now that many of the States and counties have served notice on the Federal Government that they will no longer receive Federal prisoners after February 1, 1928, some action should be taken. So I take this occasion to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is of the utmost importance and of vital necessity that the House should look into this matter of penal institutions under Federal control.

I might say that I have introduced a resolution at the request of many people interested in the care and housing of Federal prisoners providing that a commission be appointed by the House to go into the entire matter. In 40 years nothing has been done toward investigating conditions in Federal prisons. If you go to the Department of Justice, you are not even able to get a list of the number of prisoners confined in Federal prisons. There are over 900 jails and penitentiaries in the United States which to-day are housing Federal prisoners. The only way you can find out the number and the names of the occupants is to go over the expense accounts of the various United States marshals. In order to get exact information on this subject it has cost approximately $40,000, which has been spent by a welfare institution in the city of New York. Therefore it shows you the importance of the House taking up this matter in order that something may be done.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman include in his proposition to investigate the unfortunate conditions of the prisons of our country an investigation of the use of narcotic drugs, especially as revealed by Colonel Forbes's statement in the last few days in the prison at Atlanta and in other Federal prisons of the country?

Mr. BOYLAN. I will be very glad to accept the proposed amendment of the distinguished medical gentleman from New York and incorporate that in the resolution.

I would like to say that one very flagrant case was brought to my attention where in a penitentiary or jail in Florida a woman, a Federal witness, was detained in one of these jails for nearly two years without proper facilities for her care during that period. There are other cases throughout the United States where the treatment of Federal prisoners and the payment for their maintenance is on a most ridiculous scale.

In some of the States the Federal Government is paying 30 cents a day for the maintenance of prisoners, and it costs the particular county maybe a dollar a day to maintain them. In other cases they are paying 60 or 70 cents a day when it costs the county $2 a day to take care of them.

We want to get away from this cheap way of doing business. We have here the richest country in the world and we have the United States marshals, through the Department of Justice, dickering with county superintendents and wardens and prison commissions to have prisoners maintained as cheaply as possible, and putting part of the burden on the States.

Our whole system of Federal housing in connection with the various departments is wrong and ought to be remedied. Only last week I visited Governors Island, in the harbor of New York, and found troops quartered in corrugated-iron buildings that were erected during the war for storage purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two or three minutes additional.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman will take such time on another item in the bill.

Mr. BOYLAN. Then I will only take time to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to these conditions.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio: Not to exceed $100,000 of the appropriation "United States industrial reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, 1927," shall remain available until June 30, 1929, to enable the Attorney General to furnish the necessary material, supplies, and equipment, and to defray such other expenses as may be necessary to provide adequate facilities for the employment of prisoners and the development of the institution in accordance with the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a United States industrial reformatory," approved January 7, 1925.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this motion for the purpose of getting some information with reference to the continuation of this appropriation of $100,000 for the industrial reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman want me to make a statement on that?

Mr. LANHAM. Let me state what it is with reference to which I desire information and then I should like to have the statement.

I understand the purpose of this appropriation is the installation of a brick-making plant at this institution, and it becomes, it seems to me, rather important in this regard to inquire whether or not the Government here or elsewhere contemplates entering the business of brick making and thereby coming into competition with the brick manufacturers of the country, who pay, through their taxes, their share of the support not only of the Government in general but of those various penal institutions. I should like to know the purpose for which this money is to be expended, and I shall appreciate information from the chairman of the committee in this regard.

Mr. MADDEN. In the first place, the World War left us with a great institution that was used during the war as a camp. Later on, the gentleman and I suppose myself and all the other gentlemen who were here at the time enacted a law turning this institution over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. LANHAM. I am familiar with that law and with the establishment of the reformatory.

Mr. MADDEN. I am citing this preliminary to my answer to the gentleman's question. We found we had to do something to house the people that were incarcerated at the place. There were nothing but temporary war buildings there and we had to construct new buildings. We had to find employment for the men who were incarcerated. There were about 120 men there a year or so ago and there are now 375 men there. They will go crazy if we do not give them something to do.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me ask the gentleman if it is contemplated that the brick to be manufactured in this plant shall be used at this institution?

Mr. MADDEN. Only.

Mr. LANHAM. Only; and not put in competition with outside brick manufacturing?

Mr. MADDEN. That is it. It is a humanitarian proposition.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to make this observation: Even if some of the brick had to be sold, what is wrong about it? I know there is a disposition on the part of some to say that convicts should not produce, but the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is well aware that these men must be supported by some one, and one of the most humane things that can be done is to make a man self-supporting.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is about to take all my time.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will get the gentleman more time.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope gentlemen will not take too much time on this item.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, I want to make one observation.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say in parenthesis here that I promised the Democratic leader of the House that we would turn the Chamber over to them at half past 4, and we want to finish this bill before that time.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will not take any more time when I have finished this observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. I should like to say, in response to the question of my colleague from Texas, that if this be for the training of men in order that they may go out after their period of incarceration and engage in this trade and be skilled in it, then, probably, there could be no objection to it; but if it be a matter of putting the Government in business to compete with institutions taxed by the Goverment in their private business, I think it is a very serious question.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I want to say to the gentleman, as I recall, a year ago when these hearings were first had, it was stated positively to the committee that they needed about 18,000,000 bricks to construct brick bulidings to take the place of these old, antiquated buildings that had been put up there at the cantonments.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is what I was about to add.

Mr. BYRNS. And this plant was asked for with a view to providing the brick necessary for Government purposes strictly. I do not understand the plant is to be used for commercial purposes in any sense. It will take about four or five years to make the necessary brick.

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad to have this information, and if the scope of it be merely the manufacturing of brick for this institution I think there would be no serious objection to it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I agree, Mr. Chairman, with my colleague from Texas that it is desirable always that convicts be put to the production of those things that are necessary and, as far as possible, can be used for State use. I think that method should be used, as far as practicable, and yet if it is impossible to employ the convicts at occupations producing things for use in State institutions, I think the State owes it to the convicts as well as the taxpayers to find other employment for its convicts and I think a diversification of industries is very much better than to center all the work on one or two.

I have heard a few of the men engaged in certain lines of industry on this subject, and they frequently suggest that convicts be made to work on the farm. Of course, it is obvious that such labor would then come in competition with the farmers, but I am not opposed to that to such extent as it seems wise and practicable to work convicts on the farm. I think the convicts should be dealt with humanely. They should have good living quarters, they should be well fed on plain, wholesome food; they should be well clothed, and they also should be required to produce. Society is not benefited by having any large number of people idle.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to my colleague that brick making is very laborious work, and my information is to the effect that in one State where in its penal institutions they manufacture

brick as a part of the operations, they have come to use that branch of the service for disciplinary measures and men are put there when by reason of some infraction of the rules it is necessary to punish them. They put them at this hard work. Now, in searching for work for these small boys in the reformatory it occurs to me that it might be of doubtful propriety to put them at the work of making brick.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK or Texas. I will.

Mr. MANLOVE. Is it not a fact that practically all of the making of brick is done by machinery?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. That is my information.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. We have labored to prohibit goods, wares, and merchandise, convict made, from entering another State. Would the gentleman like to see the industries diversified in the penitentiary and allow them to be sold in the open market?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I think that could probably be done. What I am trying to suggest and emphasize is that it is desirable to diversify the industries so that men can be put to employment where they are best adapted. It is not right to the convicts nor is it right to the taxpayers to keep them idle.

Mr. CONNERY. I will say that they have been making shoes and textiles in these institutions, and the cities of Lynn and Lawrence, Mass., have been bearing the brunt of the convict labor.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. There has been too great a disposition to centralize their occupations. I think that is a fundamental mistake. I think the industries should be sufficiently diversified so that the convicts can be put to such work for which they are best adapted. Within reasonable limitations, this is undoubtedly the best policy.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. When these buildings are constructed, after the necessary brick has been manufactured for use in the building on the industrial reformatory grounds at Chillicothe, will the manufacture of brick be continued?

Mr. MADDEN. It will take six or seven years to put the buildings up. We have been advised that the cost of the machinery will be more than paid by the lower cost of the brick that will be made by the prisoners. We have had no definite contract to bind future Congresses, but these prisoners are to be employed solely for the making of brick for the buildings in which they are incarcerated.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. The gentleman will agree with me that his answer is not quite responsive. He does not say whether the plant is likely to be dismantled later; and if so, what will become of the surplus brick.

Mr. MADDEN. A statement from me that the plant would be dismantled would be worth no more than a statement from any other person who knew as little about it as I do. I do not know what will be done six or seven years from now and perhaps that will not interest me or the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Let me inquire whether in that immediate neighborhood there is clay available for the making of brick?

Mr. MADDEN. The clay is there suitable for this work. It makes good brick; it is right there where the prisoners can be employed, and they ought to be employed as a matter of humanity.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Is there clay on the Government ground at that place? I had an understanding to the contrary.

Mr. MADDEN. We have a complete report on that question. The gentleman can be assured that there is clay there, good clay, clay which has been tested by the Bureau of Standards. The proper thing to do both from the standpoint of governmental economy and as a matter of practical humanity is to allow this proposition to go on.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. What about the policy of the Republican Party that is trying to get the Government out of business, if they continue the business after they have the necessary brick to put up the buildings at Chillicothe?

Mr. MADDEN. What are you going to do with these prisoners?

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. I am frank to say from a humane standpoint that I am interested in them; and yet, at the same time, we have a great many people who have their money invested, to the extent of millions of dollars, in brick manufacturing plants, and even though we say that this brick will be used only in connection with Government buildings, nevertheless these private concerns have been selling to the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Every industry makes the same charge when we undertake to employ prisoners. Take the situation down at Atlanta. We have there a great cotton-duck mill. We are in the heart of the Cotton Belt. We had the same trouble there when we first began, but everybody now is happy, and the same is true of Leavenworth. We have at Leavenworth broom and shoe factories, and everybody is perfectly happy about that. Even the prisoners are, because they have something to do. We have been doing a great humanitarian service, and I hope the gentleman will feel it within his conscience to join in that movement.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. I am sorry that my conscience does not lead me just that way, and I would like to have the gentleman tell me how to make the brick manufacturers in my district happy, when they are now about 75 per cent closed down, and have a surplus stock on hand. If the gentleman could do that, I might agree with the gentleman, but I do not understand how to do it.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman and myself both voted for the law that transferred the jurisdiction of this Chillicothe plant over to the Department of Justice, and we charged them with the responsibility of treating and disciplining these men, and of doing everything that is necessary to be done to punish them in the way they ought to be punished for the crimes that they have committed. They are there. They are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, and God knows I would be the last man to drive any private concern out of business, but I think this is one thing where we can feel justified that we are doing right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Support of United States prisoners: For the support of United States prisoners, including the same objects specified under this head in the acts making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1924, $6,141.18.

For 1925, $7,576.26.

For support of United States prisoners, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year 1927, $420,965.07.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "United States," in line 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER: Page 48, line 5, strike out the words "United States."

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of all of the Members of this House, who believe that all fundamental principles of the Constitution should be respected, to the fact that I am shortly going to offer an amendment to this bill on page 53 to strike out the deficiency appropriation for the expenses of our troops in the war in which they are now engaged in Nicaragua and in China. Under our Constitution the power to declare war is vested in the Congress of the United States. Notwithstanding this we are at war in Nicaragua and in China although Congress has not declared war. Yesterday's paper noted that our American soldiers had again turned their machine guns upon the citizens of Nicaragua. It is a remarkable situation when we prohibit Chinese citizens from emigrating to America under the provisions of the quota, and at the same time send our armed forces into China to tell them how to run their Government.

Page 430 of the printed hearings on the deficiency bill now under consideration shows that General Richards testified that the deficiency resulting from the occupation of Nicaragua and China by our marines "was an obligation that was authorized at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and authorized by the President of the United States." Therefore it is clear that the war in which we have been and are now engaged in Nicaragua and in China has been declared by the President of the United States, by the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Navy. I do not think Congress should ratify and validate this declaration of war. When you vote for the deficiency appropriation resulting from the occupation of Nicaragua and China you are approving of the declaration of war by the President of the United States, the Director of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Navy. There are many Members of this House who are opposed to the present military occupation of Nicaragua and China, and now is the time to show your opposition and cast your vote according to your convictions. Every man who believes in enforcing the Constitution and all of the amendments, including the eight

eenth, which we hear so much about, should see to it that the war-making provision is enforced. Some say it is not war. Can this be peace, with our armed forces occupying Nicaragua and China and shooting their citizens? It is just as much war as when the German Imperial Government sent their armed forces into Belgium. I wish that under the rules of this House I could have an opportunity to force a record roll-call vote to see what Members are willing to ratify this declaration of war and validate the usurpation by the Secretary of the Navy, by the President, and by the Director of the Budget of power which is vested in the Congress of the United States under the Constitution. I am going to offer this amendment and hope that during the period of time between now and when we reach page 53 the Members will carefully consider the matter and when the vote comes on the amendment to stand up and vote and show that the Members of this House believe in the fundamental principles of the Constitution and that they do not ratify the declaration of war against China and Nicaragua.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reimbursement of Thomas J. Ryan, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, for the loss of uniforms, equipment, clothing, and personal effects as a result of the earthquake and fire disaster in Japan on September 1, 1923, fiscal year 1928, $1,221.65.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining some information. Are not these refunds in the nature of claims?

Mr. MADDEN. They are all appropriated for by reason of special acts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Acts heretofore passed?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Thank you.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Marine Corps: For provisions, subsistence, board and lodging of enlisted men, etc., $596,700; for military supplies and equipment, etc., $470,300; for transportation of troops, etc., $400,000; for miscellaneous supplies, etc., $351,000; in all, fiscal year 1927, $1,818,000.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SCHAFER: Page 53, line 25, after the word "mails," strike out "and for expeditionary forces in Nacaragua and China."

Page 54, line 5, strike out "$117,213" and insert "$17,213."

Page 54, line 6, strike out "$125,631" and insert "$25,631."

Page 54, line 9, strike out "$596,700."

Page 54, line 10, strike out "$470,300."

Page 54, line 11, strike out "$400,000."

Page 54, line 12, strike out "$351,000."

Page 54, line 12, strike out "$1,818,000" and insert "$718,000."

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I spoke of a few moments ago. It is very unfortunate, indeed, that under the rules of the House it appears I will not be able to obtain a record roll-call vote on this amendment. If I could, I feel confident the amendment would pass by a decisive vote.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I wondered if the gentleman would like for me to tell him what this means, in a word?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. These appropriations here are to meet obligations occurring in 1927 and closed on June 30 last, and anything that would be done would not affect the situation at all.

Mr. SCHAFER. Oh, yes. The gentleman from Wisconsin knew what these obligations were for before the gentleman gave the information. When we pass this deficiency to meet these obligations we are putting our stamp of approval upon the declaration of war with the citizens of Nicaragua and China, which war was not declared by Congress but by the President, the Director of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Navy, in violation of the war-making provisions of the Constitution. Furthermore, section 9 of Article I of the Constitution states that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law. Congress has not declared war in Nicaragua and China, and therefore we have no right under the circumstances to make appropriations in this appropriation bill to carry on the war of the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the Budget. If this is not war in Nicaragua and China to-day, I would like to know what war is. Let the bill for the obligations incurred by reason of these wars be sent to those responsible for said wars. How would the American people like it if, when a Chinese laundryman is murdered, the Chinese Government should send their troops to Washington, to Milwaukee, New York, and Texas to protect her nationals, and in doing so shoot down American citizens, as our armies have done in Nicaragua and China?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing to take the responsibility, if he had the power to do it, to say that nowhere in the world shall we do anything to protect the rights of American citizens wherever they may be. That is what we are doing.

Mr. SCHAFER. Did the American Government send their Army and Navy to Belgium when the Imperial German Government went into Belgium? Were not American citizens holding property in Belgium? Suppose some oil interest should go into the depths of Africa, are we to send detachments of troops to every little town and hamlet in Africa where they might have an oil well or an American citizen employed? If we were to send our Army to foreign lands wherever an American citizen may go, or wherever American property may be located and where the life of such citizen or such property may be jeopardized, we would have to have nearly all the man power in America in the Army. Not only are Chinese citizens murdered here, but the daily newspapers carry stories of murders of citizens of other countries. If we are to set out to send our Army to every land where American citizens or American property may be in danger, we should also grant to other nations of the world the privilege of sending their armed forces into America when their citizens are murdered or the property of their citizens destroyed in America. All laws and constitutional provisions should be enforced. The war-making powers of the Constitution are just as sacred as any part of the Constitution and amendments. We should not put a stamp of approval upon the illegal war in which we are now engaged in Nicaragua and China, and which has been declared by the Secretary of the Navy, the President, and the Director of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the point that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has presented is well made. He is not seeking by his amendment to secure the withdrawal of the troops from anywhere at the present time. We realize that such action can not be accomplished in this way. He stresses, and properly so, the point that troops were sent into foreign lands on active military duty without the authority of Congress, and when the troops were sent to Nicaragua we were in session. It would have been an easy matter for the Navy Department, or the President, to have come to Congress and obtained the authority and the appropriations necessary to carry out the expeditions. To be perfectly frank about it, at the time troops were sent to Nicaragua and Congress was in session had the department come to the House and asked for authority to use troops for that purpose, and if they had come here for appropriations for such purpose it would not have been granted. The gentleman from Wisconsin points out that, notwithstanding Congress was in session at the time, the troops were sent into a foreign country on a military expedition, without the authority of Congress and without funds appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I agree with the gentleman, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin was only stressing the fact that although we have the right and power to protect our citizens wherever they may be, it seems that the United States Government is exercising that power only in countries unable to protect themselves.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am speaking of the powers of Congress. Declaring war, appropriating money, and directing how money should be spent is not an executive function. Not even by implication. It resides entirely with Congress; and the executive department, knowing that such action would not meet with the approval of the Congress at the time, sent these troops to Nicaragua. Now they come in a left-handed way and endeavor to secure the money spent without authority of Congress.

I think the gentleman's amendment is entirely proper. It may not carry, but it should at least serve notice on the department and on the Executive, if you please, that if United States troops are to be sent to a foreign country on a military expedition they should be sent only in pursuance of the authority written in the Constitution for that purpose.

Mr. CONNERY. I agree with the gentleman on that, and also when he says further that if a Chinese laundryman in this country were attacked or killed the Chinese Government would have the equal right to declare war on us. But the United States Government goes into Nicaragua and China and seeks to interfere in their affairs without the consent of their citizens.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Apropos the remarks of our friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] and of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], now that my friend from Missouri [Mr. DYER] has come on the floor, I wish to say that yesterday or the day before I heard on the floor a socialistic declaration about "chickens coming home to roost." Our friends, the gentleman from New York and I believe also the gentleman from Wisconsin, voted for the bill that was sponsored by our friend from Missouri [Mr. DYER], which is known as the China trading act.

Mr. SCHAFER. I do not think that this gentleman from Wisconsin voted for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Possibly not, but that was an act which in behalf of just a few corporations in the United States gave special exclusive trading rights in China, giving them the right to do business with Chinamen in the old American way in behalf of Americans; and then, if I remember correctly, these two friends of ours from Wisconsin and New York likewise voted for the supplemental bill of our friend from Missouri [Mr. DYER] to exempt these China trading corporations from paying income taxes to the United States Government.

Of course, the chickens come home to roost, according to the socialistic declaration referred to, and now that they have given these Chinese corporations of our friend from Missouri these exclusive privileges in China, with our flag behind them to protect them, of course when the necessity arises the President must send our marines into China to protect our friend DYER and his China trading corporations. That is all I have to say at this time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] usually is well informed as to matters under discussion in the House. I do not know what companies he would have you believe the legislation to which he made reference gave protection to, or was intended for, but it does not apply to any company such as he referred to—the Standard Oil or the American Tobacco Co., or any of those big corporations—because they have not taken advantage of the so-called China trading act to incorporate under it. In fact, the taxation benefits to these companies are not of great value. The 1926 revenue act has given practically these same exemptions to American citizens and corporations engaged in foreign trade in all other countries. There have been only a few companies, some 50 or so, very small companies, who have taken out charters under the China trading act. None of those operating with any great capital have taken advantage of it; in fact, they have refused to take advantage of it. All of the big concerns operating in foreign trade in China are under British charters, operating under British laws, so far as this country is concerned. The troops that have gone to China have gone there for the sole purpose of protecting American lives. The British Government has had troops there, not in any great amount, but many more than we have had.

Mr. BUTLER. Fifteen thousand.

Mr. DYER. They have had thousands where we have had only a few hundred. All we have had in China, now or at any time, are a small number of marines, and the Navy has had some few ships there, but only with the idea which the President had in mind to protect American lives. Whenever it is necessary to do that it is the duty of the President to send our forces, because the Chinese people under the present conditions, with imperialism exercising sole power in China, are unable to protect foreigners. For that reason also we have our own courts in China to exist and operate, as we have the right to do. Under our treaties with China for the protection of and to maintain law and order among our own people our citizens are entitled to protection in life, in property, in China, and they are entitled by treaties to engage in business in that country.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does the gentleman think as a matter of principle that where American lives and property are in jeopardy in foreign countries it is proper and necessary for the Executive to obtain permission from Congress to use the forces of the United States for their protection?

Mr. DYER. No; he does not have to do that, and it is the duty of the President to provide that protection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman stated, if I understood him correctly, that there were some fifty-odd corporations organized under this China trade act, and the gentleman further stated that none was associated with the larger corporations. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD the basis of his information?

Mr. DYER. I will put in the name of each concern that has been incorporated under this law.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And the gentleman states that none of these concerns is controlled by or are subsidiaries of the larger corporations?

Mr. DYER. They are not, so far as I am informed. They are simply small companies.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But they may be subsidiaries of the larger companies.

Mr. DYER. My information is that none of them are. The information requested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is as follows:

CLASSES OF BUSINESS REPRESENTED BY CHINA TRADE ACT CORPORATIONS

Automobiles (total, 10 companies operating): American-Chinese Co., Tientsin; Asia Motors, Shanghai; Bills Motors; China Motors; Electric Service Corporation; H. S. Honigsberg & Co.; Mark L. Moody & Co.; Oriental Motor Co.; Union Motors; and Universal Hire Service.

Bakery (1 company operating): Bakerite Co.

Building construction (1 company operating): Shanghai Building Co.

Clubs (1 company operating): The Little Club.

Engineering and machinery (4 companies operating): China-American Engineering Corporation, Tientsin; Engineering Equipment Co., Shanghai; J. E. Hayes Engineering Co., Shanghai (closed out Shanghai branch, but Tientsin branch will continue); E. W. Langdon & Co., Shanghai.

Finance (4 companies; 1 complete, 3 incomplete): American Oriental Finance Corporation (China trade act company incomplete, but is operating as Delaware corporation pending completion of China trade act); China Finance Corporation, operating; International Bond & Mortgage Co., incomplete; International Securities Co., incomplete.

Firecrackers (incomplete).

Hoy Sun Co., Canton (never completed China trade act organization; have been notified that revocation proceedings in the United States court are to be instituted; let in under China trade act, because they imported American chemicals in manufacture of their firecrackers).

Hospital and dental supplies (1 company operating): Pasco Trading Co. (This company has been losing steadily and the directors have decided to liquidate it.)

Insurance (5 companies operating): American Asiatic Underwriters; American Asiatic Underwriters, North China; American Asiatic Underwriters, South China; International Insurance Office; W. R. Rice & Co. (agents for West Coast Life).

Motion pictures (3 companies): Odeon Theater (operating); China National Pictures & Oriental Films Co. (incomplete and not yet operating; charters now being revoked).

Oils (1 company operating): Essential Oil Co., Peking. (Let in under China trade act on supposition that they are going to use considerable American machinery in the crushing of essential oils, especially peppermint oil.)

Paints (1 company): Campbell Paint Co. (incomplete organization).

Paper (1 company): Cosmos Paper Co.

Plumbing and heating (1 company): C. J. Doughty & Co. (operating).

Raw silk (2 companies; 1 liquidated and dissolved, 1 now operating): Robert Lang Co. (operating); Shanghai Raw Silk Co. (voluntarily dissolved).

Radio (1 company): Kellogg Radio Corporatiaon (incomplete under China trade act corporation; meanwhile old company operating as the Kellogg Switchboard & Telephone Co.).

Real estate (2 companies operating): Asia Realty Co., China Realty Co.

Rugs (1 company operating): Fette Rug Co., Peking.

(NOTE.—Would not pass incorporation under China trade act until this company took on the agency for the National Aniline Chemical Co. and as such was developing a market for American dyes.)

Steamship operators: (4 companies; 1 voluntarily dissolved, 1 incomplete and now in course of having certificate of incorporation revoked; 2 companies operating, but both of these are in a very involved state): China Coast Transportation Co. (voluntarily dissolved); Hambleton China Co. (incomplete, charter being revoked): Yangtsze Navigation Co. (operating); Yangtsze Rapid Steamship Co. (operating).

Tobacco (1 company whose certificate is now being revoked): F. & E. Soter Tobacco Corporation (certificate being revoked).

Trading companies (8 companies): E. D. Bush & Co. (application now pending); China-American Trading Co., Tientsin (operating); Fobes Co. (never completed China trade act organization, certificate now being revoked in United States court); Frazer & Co., Tientsin (operating); Kuling Supply Co., Kuling (operating); North China Co., Shanghai (certificate revoked); Standard Products Co., Shanghai (operating); Wah Chang (voluntary dissolution—took this course rather than have certificate revoked in United States court).

Trust companies (1 company): Raven Trust Co. (incomplete as a China trade act corporation, but operating as Delaware corporation until China trade act organization is complete).

RECAPITULATION

Automobiles:		
Complete	9	
Incomplete	1	
Total		10
Bakery:		
Complete		1
Building construction:		
Complete		1
Clubs:		
Complete		1
Engineering and machinery:		
Complete		4
Finance:		
Complete	1	
Incomplete	2	
Application pending	1	
Total		4
Fire crackers:		
Incomplete		1
Hospital and dental supplies:		
Complete		1
Insurance:		
Complete		5
Motion pictures:		
Complete	1	
Incomplete and not operating	2	
Total		3
Oils:		
Complete		1
Paints:		
Application now pending		1
Paper:		
Incomplete		1
Plumbing and heating:		
Complete		1
Raw silk:		
Complete and operating	1	
Voluntarily dissolved	1	
Total		2
Radio:		
Incomplete		1
Real estate:		
Complete		2
Rugs:		
Complete		1
Steamship operators:		
Voluntarily dissolved	1	
Incomplete and not operating	1	
Incomplete but operating	2	
Total		4
Tobacco:		
Incomplete and certificate being revoked		1
Trading companies:		
Application pending	1	
Complete and operating	4	
Certificate revoked	1	
Voluntarily dissolved rather than have certificate revoked in court	1	
Certificate now being revoked in court	1	
Total		8
Trust companies:		
Incomplete		1
Total number		55

Number completed corporations	36
Number incomplete	8
Number applications pending	3
Number voluntarily dissolved	3
Number certificates revoked	1
Number certificates now in course of being revoked	2
Number who have been notified that certificates are to be revoked but no formal steps yet taken in the United States court	2
Total number	55

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Major alterations, naval vessels: Toward the alterations and repairs required for the purpose of modernizing the U. S. S. *Oklahoma* and *Nevada* as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1927, $5,635,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for alterations to increase the range of the turret guns of such ships.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to postpone the consideration of this item until we have finished the bill, and then we will probably be able to give more time to this item than we could now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to pass over this paragraph for the present and return to it later. Is there objection?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to my colleague from Illinois that there are a number of Members of the House present right at this moment who have their minds very well made up on just what they are going to do in connection with the amendments that are to be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, and I think it is rather unfair to them to place the time for a vote on these amendments in a haze. A vote may be reached to-day or it may not be reached until sometime to-morrow.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it will be reached to-day.

Mr. BRITTEN. Word was sent out yesterday, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, advising Members of the House to be present after 1 o'clock to-day. They are here, and I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations ought to recognize that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BRITTEN. With that statement, I shall not object, but I do not think the gentleman's request should be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. I suppose, of course, my good friend will give us every opportunity in the wide world to notify the Members of this House to be present when this item is reached?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly. The reason for my request, and in order that everybody may understand it, was that a great many Members wanted to go away and come back when the vote was reached. I said I would ask unanimous consent to pass over this item in order to accommodate them. There will be no advantage taken of anybody.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Could the gentleman give us some idea as to how much time will be required in the discussion of these amendments?

Mr. MADDEN. It depends on how antagonistic we all become.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will it take a half hour?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it will take more time than that.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. It is the intention of the chairman to allow amendments to be offered to this paragraph at the conclusion of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois will bear in mind that there has been at least a tentative agreement for an adjournment at 4.30?

Mr. MADDEN. That is one of the reasons I thought we could dispose of this matter quicker, if it stood alone, and dispose of all the rest of the bill in a hurry, so we could give the Chamber to the Democrats for their caucus.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the gentleman's idea that it is possible for us to get through with the other pending amendments as well as the gun amendment before 4.30?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there is any question about that, because there are no other amendments of any consequence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may, I want to appeal to the membership of the House to allow us to expedite the consideration of the bill as much as possible this afternoon so we can give all of the time that may be necessary to the consideration of this gun-elevation proposition and at the same time enable us to give the Chamber to the Democrats at half past 4.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, Mr. Chairman, it is the understanding that at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill we will return to this portion of it and consider the amendments of which the chairman speaks?

Mr. MADDEN. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR

Payment of rewards: For payment of rewards for the detection, arrest, and conviction of post-office burglars, robbers, and highway mail robbers, fiscal year 1926, $25,500: *Provided*, That rewards may be paid, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, when an offender of the class mentioned was killed in the act of committing the crime or in resisting lawful arrest: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used to pay any rewards at rates in excess of those specified in Post Office Department order 7708, dated July 1, 1922.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question with respect to the proviso which limits the appropriation of $25,500, on page 56. I note the paragraph refers to a Post Office Department order, and it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the provisions limiting this appropriation ought to be set out in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. It is $2,000 in any one case. That is what it means.

Mr. DOWELL. It seems to me that should be set out in the bill. I think it would be subject to a point of order, although I do not want to make one, because it has a good purpose. At any rate, to legislate post-office orders into the statute, it seems to me, is a bad practice.

Mr. MADDEN. You could not do that very well in this case for the reason that the maximum sum that can be paid in a case of robbery where conviction has been had is $2,000. They were paying as high as $5,000 in some cases.

Mr. DOWELL. That limitation could easily be put in.

Mr. MADDEN. But they go down as low as $25.

Mr. DOWELL. Even that could be put in, which would be better than making it a part of the statute. It seems to me that is bad practice.

Mr. MADDEN. We can not tell what they are going to pay until the thing is all settled. It is impossible, because it is a matter of negotiation. They have authority to pay up to $2,000, but they do at times pay as low as $25.

Mr. DOWELL. Then permit me to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that it is up to the department, anyway, and why not leave it without this limitation in the appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. If we left it without any limitation, it might cost us $5,000 in a given case, and we do not approve of that. Some were settled in that way and that is why we stopped it.

Mr. DOWELL. I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preparatory Commission on Armaments: For the expenses of further participation by the United States in the work of the preparatory commission at Geneva, for the purpose of making preliminary studies and preparations for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including compensation of employees, travel, subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act); and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, $70,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking some questions of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with respect to this item. Has there been any proposal brought before the committee with respect to the holding of another conference on limitation of armament in the immediate future?

Mr. MADDEN. There is a commission to meet in February to prepare a program. This has already been provided for and they are at work upon it. The plan is that within a year or so there will be a new conference that will relate to the subject in extenso.

Mr. HUDSON. So there will be no other authorization for expenditure, for the preliminary work at least, of another conference?

Mr. MADDEN. No; we have that provided for.

Mr. HUDSON. And that is in this bill.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNAL REVENUE

Refunding taxes illegally collected: For an additional amount required for refunding taxes illegally collected under the provisions of sections 3220 and 3689, Revised Statutes, as amended by the revenue acts of 1918, 1921, 1924, and 1926, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1928 and prior years $43,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1928: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress of the disbursements hereunder as required by such acts, including the names of all persons and corporations to whom payments are made together with the amount paid to each: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to refund any amount paid by or collected from any manufacturer, producer, or importer in respect of the tax imposed by subdivision (3) of section 600 of the revenue act of 1924, or subdivision (3) of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921 or of the revenue act of 1918, unless the Commissioner of Internal Revenue certifies to the proper disbursing officer that such manufacturer, producer, or importer has filed with the commissioner, under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, a bond in such sum and with such sureties as the commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the immediate repayment to the United States of such portion of the amount refunded as is not distributed by such manufacturer, producer, or importer, within six months after the date of the payment of the refund, to the persons who purchased for purposes of consumption (whether from such manufacturer, producer, importer, or from any other person) the articles in respect of which the refund is made, as evidenced by the affidavits (in such form and containing such statements as the commissioner may prescribe) of such purchasers, and that such bond, in the case of a claim allowed after the passage of this act, was filed before the allowance of the claim by the commissioner.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the second proviso in the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Page 65, line 20, after the word "each," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this section which I have asked to be stricken out are admittedly impracticable of being carried out. The paragraph provides for repayments to those who have paid taxes which the courts have adjudged to be illegally collected.

This proviso sets forth that these illegal payments shall not be refunded unless the manufacturers to whom they are refunded shall agree to hand them out to somebody else. I know of many cases in my own district where manufacturers have paid these illegal taxes. The courts have decided they should be refunded. As a matter of fact these manufacturers have never collected these taxes from any purchaser of their goods, so that the effect of this proviso is to say that the decisions of the courts shall not be carried out, and I therefore think to prevent such injustice the proviso should be stricken out.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought not to strike out the proviso. It was put in last year at the suggestion of the Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee, I understand, is about to report, in the new revenue bill which is soon to come before us, a provision that will be practicable.

In the meantime, we ought not to create a hiatus by striking this out, because to do so may involve the Government in some embarrassment. We ought to carry this provision along until the other provision is enacted and then we will have something that is practical, as I understand.

Mr. MERRITT. Does the gentleman understand that the provision in the new revenue bill will take care of these old cases?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what it will provide.

Mr. MERRITT. The law as it now stands is a denial of justice to men whom the courts have decided should receive back these taxes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know just what the provision is, but I think we ought not to eliminate this proviso until we get the other provision enacted into law.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. This was put in to take care of the refund from automobile taxes, was it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Not upon general taxes, but upon taxes where the producer had collected a tax from the consumer.

Mr. MADDEN. On automobile accessories.

Mr. MERRITT. But the fact is that some of my constituents manufacture staple articles, sold at regular market price, which the Treasury Department decided should be considered as automobile parts and therefore subject to the tax. The courts then decided that the contention of the manufacturer was correct with respect to such things as bolts and screws in general consumption. The courts decided they were not automobile parts and were not therefore subject to the tax.

They sold them at the regular market price. The court said they shall get the tax back, but this proviso says that they can not get it back unless they hand it over to some one else.

Mr. HUDSON. They collected the tax from the consumers, did they not?

Mr. MERRITT. No; they did not.

Mr. HUDSON. They had to in order to sell because the Federal Government had levied the tax and before they sold it they had it taxed. It is true that after they sold them they could not get the tax back to the purchaser, but they are not out anything because they do not get the rebate.

Mr. MERRITT. They did not add the tax.

Mr. MADDEN. We ought not to settle the question this way. Let the new legislation clarify it. By striking out the proviso you are only complicating the situation.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If gentlemen will look at the tax bill that is soon coming up, they will find that it clarifies the situation where the consumer did not pay the tax. There are two exceptions, and one applies to the conditions spoken of by the gentleman from Connecticut why the consumer did not pay the tax.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I have not the floor.

Mr. KETCHAM. Do I understand that this provision in the tax bill is retroactive?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes; it clears up the whole situation and requires a bond only where the ultimate consumer pays the tax.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PROHIBITION

Enforcement of narcotic and national prohibition acts: The limitations upon the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia under this head in the acts making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1927 and 1928 are hereby amended so as to authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $603,600 for said purpose during the fiscal year 1927, and not to exceed $658,320 for said purpose during the fiscal year 1928, and the limitation upon the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from the appropriation "Collecting the internal revenue, 1928," is hereby amended so as to authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $8,949,680 for said purpose.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman for what purpose this money is to be expended?

Mr. FRENCH. Speaking in behalf of the committee, the item to which the gentleman refers is made necessary because of the transfer from the Internal Revenue Bureau to the Bureau of Prohibition. It is intended to take care of the expense incurred in that transfer.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is this $658,000 for both the narcotic and prohibition?

Mr. FRENCH. It would apply to both. You created a bureau of prohibition that has to do with both, and takes over the duties that theretofore had devolved upon the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does it cost more under the new bureau?

Mr. FRENCH. We have not had an opportunity to compare the cost under the new plan. The work has been going on under that bureau only a few months. This is to straighten out the financial appropriations that were made when the bureau took over the work.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman allow me to make this statement? It seems that this was for office work that was done in the bureau before and is not for additional field work.

Mr. LINTHICUM. May I ask the gentleman a question? Has he noticed that Mr. Lowman has stated that they should stop preaching prohibition and preach temperance, and does the gentleman think it is going to cost as much to preach temperance as it has to enforce prohibition?

Mr. HUDSON. If the people are as slow to understand what temperance means, I think it will cost as much.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I shall not object to the item, but I want to say this: That the more you try to enforce the Volstead Act and the eighteenth amendment the more it will be demonstrated that it can not be enforced, even if you call out the Army and the Navy, as has been suggested by one of the leaders of the prohibition movement in this country.

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to a few things that come from the Anti-Saloon League, and I think it will be quite a surprise to most Members of the House and to Members of the Senate also. According to the statement of the Anti-Saloon League they expended from 1883 to 1918, $50,000,000. In 1919 they spent $2,500,000. In 1926 they estimated the expenditures at $2,000,000 and from 1920 to 1925 the sum of $13,065,313.72, making a total expenditure by the Anti-Saloon League of $67,565,313. That is what it has cost to obtain this dry legislation and the endeavor to coerce the Government to enforce the act. Now, I want to close my remarks by asking permission to print the items and the States wherein the money was expended as taken from this pamphlet issued by the Anti-Saloon League, which I have.

Mr. KETCHAM. Reserving the right to object, I am interested to know whether or not the mantle of our former associate, Col. John Philip Hill, has fallen on the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. BLANTON. It is not necessary to ask that question. It is self-evident.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I assure the House that I shall not ride a white horse at least. I shall not vote for a protective tariff and many things necessary from a Republican standpoint, but I shall emulate him in calling attention to the failure of the Volstead Act and point to a way by which temperance can be obtained without coercive legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland to print certain matter in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The league has spent $67,565,313.

Amount of money collected and expended by the National Anti-Saloon League and 37 State leagues from 1920 to 1925, inclusive. This report is taken from the official records of the league and never before has been made public.

	Receipts	Disbursements
National	$3,428,829.62	$3,430,285.87
Alabama	122,305.20	121,176.95
Arkansas	14,606.66	14,606.66
California	347,288.62	349,987.22
Colorado	64,175.21	64,441.59
Connecticut	14,400.74	14,564.53
Florida	71,759.42	71,733.21
Georgia	60,000.00	60,000.00
Illinois	1,186,645.23	1,200,599.46
Indiana	316,963.02	320,778.08
Iowa	304,013.19	306,510.83
Kansas	189,991.09	189,844.66
Kentucky	104,674.59	114,494.68
Louisiana	15,598.43	15,598.43
Maine	93,498.40	92,390.66
Maryland	221,950.87	223,350.10
Massachusetts	294,106.80	296,481.01
Michigan	287,939.66	295,608.59
Minnesota	254,002.76	251,923.27
Mississippi	21,600.00	21,600.00
Missouri	258,708.62	265,628.68
Nebraska	60,427.91	58,266.95
New Hampshire	38,068.24	39,461.81
New Jersey	385,752.97	383,412.20
New York	1,629,618.89	1,738,810.94
North Carolina	101,329.68	100,977.31
Ohio	876,093.91	882,137.94
Oklahoma	231,613.30	58,026.46
Oregon	123,843.88	123,843.88
Pennsylvania	841,562.14	852,542.65
Rhode Island	55,390.62	55,192.57
South Carolina	28,842.47	28,842.47
South Dakota	60,538.89	61,046.89
Texas	194,541.41	184,221.93
Vermont	65,865.97	65,289.30
Virginia	291,577.51	265,393.32
West Virginia	91,026.85	80,819.26
Wisconsin	367,280.87	365,423.36
Grand total	13,116,433.64	13,065,313.72

According to the official records of the Anti-Saloon League, the sum collected and disbursed from 1883 to 1918 was	$50,000,000.00
In 1919	2,500,000.00
In 1926 (estimated)	2,000,000.00
Grand total	67,565,313.72

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST GUARD

Rebuilding and repairing stations, etc.: For an additional amount for rebuilding and repairing stations and houses of refuge, temporary leases, rent, and improvements of property for Coast Guard purposes, including use of additional land where necessary, fiscal year 1928, $61,600.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that in this paragraph an expenditure of $61,000 is added to many more that we have formerly appropriated for the purpose of guarding our coasts. We are all in favor of that. It is necessary for the protection of the lives and the property of the people of the Nation, but in contrast with that I call attention to the fact that spreading from the Alleghanies to the Rockies is the Valley of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and that

great river is by far a greater menace to the people of these United States than any enemy that can invade our coasts, which are to be protected through this appropriation and others. I note that the Treasury of the United States is charged with all of the expenditures for guarding the coast. I call attention to the fact that only to-day we have been reminded by the President of the United States that the poor suffering people of the lower Mississippi Valley—people who are suffering not from an enemy that is particularly theirs but from an enemy of the people of the entire United States which strikes without opportunity of being stayed by the hand of diplomacy—are asked, and we of this Congress are asked, to provide means for stopping the striking of that enemy and to assess a part of that cost to the sufferers on the river. I say, unlike the fellows of the coast, the poor, suffering men, women, and children of the Mississippi Valley and its tributaries are asked by this administration and by the country to bear a part of that cost. One is an enemy that strikes from outside, the other is an enemy that strikes from inside. The protection of the coast and the protection of the people of the Mississippi Valley are similar in that each is a national duty. Why discriminate against the people of the Mississippi Valley and its tributaries, when you protect the coast line of those on our oceans?

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Is it not true that this Government has constantly been appropriating not to take care of an enemy, as the gentleman terms it, but of the menace of the flood waters of the Mississippi Valley? Has not Congress after Congress appropriated for that purpose, and has Congress ever withheld its interest in trying to take care of the menace of the flood waters of the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Congress has appropriated all of the money, as I understand it, that has been asked for by the Mississippi River Commission, but Congress has appropriated it in the same manner that the engineers are asking for it to-day—to do the work in an incomprehensive manner, piecemeal, that will be of no benefit after it is done.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to state the facts about this thing, and I happen to know them. The statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] is somewhat misleading. The law provides that $10,000,000 a year shall be appropriated for the Mississippi flood control. That money is being provided and has always been provided under the law. The law has not been violated under any circumstances.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I did not seek to intimate that it had, but I said that we had appropriated everything that they asked for.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman said that we are doing it piecemeal. We are doing it according to law. We are giving everything that is authorized.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The gentleman misunderstands me. I say the work on the Mississippi has been done in a piecemeal manner.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not our fault.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

New York, N. Y., courthouse and post office: For reconstruction of roof, $12,000.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to call attention to the appropriation of $12,000 for the repair of the roof of the old courthouse and post-office building in Park Row, New York City. In my judgment, this is just dumping $12,000 of the taxpayers' money into a well. Of course, I realize some protection must be afforded to the roof, some repair must be made, but the old courthouse building in New York City, which is now occupied both as a courthouse and as a post office, is inadequate and antiquated. It was established by joint resolution of Congress May 16, 1866, to be used as a courthouse and post office. An interesting legal discussion of the status of the building and its site may be found in the case In re Lyman (55 Fed. Rep. p. 29). The building has far outlived its usefulness. The Government at this time must rent quarters in the expensive building across the street, the Woolworth Building, in order to house the judges and to house those parts of the courts not used for jury trials. A committee of distinguished lawyers and judges met in New York City last week, at the suggestion of the Hon. Martin T. Manton, senior circuit court judge, and plans were formulated for a new building. A joint resolution will be introduced in Congress by me to-day looking to the establishment of a new courthouse near the old courthouse. The officials of the city of New York, the mayor, and the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York have been consulted, and they feel that the old post office should be moved up town near the new post office, at Thirty-third Street and Eighth Avenue, and an exchange of property effectuated in New York's civic center at Chambers Street, so that the old building can be removed, leaving City Hall Park as it was many years ago.

Mr. MADDEN. But, in the meantime, you know, you have got to use this building, and we want a roof on it.

Mr. WELLER. Very true; and I am serving notice on the gentlemen of Congress and the country that we are coming down here and we are going to ask Congress——

Mr. MADDEN. But in the meantime you had better get the roof on the old building, without protest.

Mr. WELLER. We have a roof on now which keeps out the wind and weather.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman protests against the thing you have got to have.

Mr. WELLER. In the meantime we are going to pursue this plan. We are going to ask for an appropriation from Congress, and we do not want to go through the Budget; that a joint committee of the House and Senate take up this matter with a view of establishing——

Mr. MADDEN. And who is this joint commission of the House and Senate?

Mr. WELLER. I am introducing a bill providing for a joint committee of the House and Senate.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid the gentleman will never get that bill passed.

Mr. WELLER. We up in New York feel we are entitled to have it passed irrespective of the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I know, but we want things done our way frequently, but that is going a good deal further than anybody has gone.

Mr. WELLER. At the same time the city of New York is willing to make an exchange of land whereby there shall be no additional cost to the United States Government; the cost will be to tear down the old courthouse building and an appropriation sufficient to build a new modern courthouse which will house the court for the district of the southern district of New York. If that is done a courthouse can be constructed which will be also a revenue producing one, for offices and space may be rented.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion that might help his future intercourse with Congress?

Mr. WELLER. I am always glad to receive a suggestion from the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Not to ask to make innovations which go outside of traditional practice if he expects to get anywhere much.

Mr. WELLER. The Government is paying approximately $38,000 a year for quarters in the Woolworth Building across the street because there is not sufficient room in the old post-office building and courthouse. It ought to be a modern courthouse. You must take into consideration that the conditions in the old courthouse in New York where juries and grand juorors are housed are abominable, the ventilation is detrimental to the health of those who serve on them. The judges and jurors and grand jurors are often taken sick on account of the conditions. In addition to the regular court business we have the naturalization of citizens, and that work in the Federal court sometimes brings as many as 5,000 persons in one day into that building. The building is unsafe and insanitary, the elevators are not safe or sufficient, it has been condemned by everybody, and it would probably be condemned by the fire department of the city of New York if an investigation were made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I do this particularly to ask a question in regard to a previous section. I notice that the sum of $100,000 is made available until June 30, 1929, to enable the Attorney General to furnish the necessary material, supplies, and equipment, and to defray such other expenses as may be necessary to provide adequate facilities for the employment of prisoners and a development of the institution, in accordance with the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a United States Industrial Reformatory," approved January 7, 1925, referring to the Chillicothe Reformatory.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it has not been knocked out. It has been allowed to remain in, and we have given a complete explanation. We are trying to find something for prisoners to do to keep them from going insane, and trying to use the money for the purpose of enabling them to make brick for the buildings

there. Protests have come from various brickyard owners, but we did not think those protests ought to be paid much attention to as a matter of fact.

Mr. REECE. It is not contemplated to make brick and cement plants to produce those materials there in competition with plants maintained by private resources?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Mr. REECE. I rose to get the information, because I did not think such should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Liberty Loan Building: For completion of the construction of two additional stories, $125,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I have been down to the Liberty Loan Building on a number of occasions, and it appears to me to be one of the most unsightly public buildings constructed in Washington. I want to ask the gentleman whether the $125,000 will improve the looks of that building as well as add two stories?

Mr. MADDEN. The two stories are already on, and its looks are to be what they already are.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am very sorry to know a building like that is called the Liberty Loan Building, as it looks more like a liberty hall building.

Mr. MADDEN. We are appropriating $125,000 to finish the interior of the two stories which have already been put on.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And there is no intention of improving the architecture of the building?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not see how it could. There it is and there it stands.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total appropriations for projects in the District of Columbia under section 5, act of May 25, 1926, as amended, $2,100,000.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall not take time but simply ask permission to insert a few remarks on buildings along Pennsylvania Avenue in connection with our building program. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this big item in the deficiency appropriation bill, it may not be out of place to speak about a situation which has arisen in Washington. The Nation, through the action of Congress, is going to spend vast sums of money in this city for buildings. These are needed expenditures to house the activities of the Government.

But above the mere physical needs we are also moved to make these expenditures because we feel there is a national desire to make the Nation's Capital architecturally and artistically and scenically worthy of the Nation.

But while we are appropriating money so liberally to beautify Washington, according to the local newspapers, there are property owners in this city who will neither cooperate with nor conform with these plannings. At an important point on Pennsylvania Avenue it is proposed to erect a building which the Fine Arts Commission has found entirely out of harmony with what the Government is planning on the opposite side of the Avenue.

Interested only in advertising and profits, a corporation proposes to erect what I assume with be a garish piece of architecture. They propose to attract buyers for their wares even if it may detract from the city which we are trying to make fit our Nation, and that at great expense.

I trust that some ways and means may be found to stop this "public be damned" effort on the part of the corporation until the Congress can enact a law giving some one authority to regulate construction along the streets and avenues facing Government buildings.

Nor is the issue involved limited to Washington. Through similar greed we are not only standardizing all the main streets and byways of the country but we are making America from ocean to ocean a succession of gaudy and garish signboards to match the extravagantly painted store fronts.

The natural beauty of America is being sacrificed to greed. Every bit of natural beauty along a public highway is to some one only an invitation to extend the sale of pale pills or something equally inconsequential. These billboard makers are even vulgarizing the spelling and the use of the language, which we should cherish as a sacred heritage.

One may almost hope that some day there may be superassociation in America composed of all men and women who cherish ideals and who want to perpetuate the beauty of the countrysides pledged to refuse to patronize those who mar our towns and cities and our waysides.

The Clerk read as follows:

Army transportation: Credit is authorized and directed in the accounts of disbursing officers of the War Department for the payment of obligations heretofore or hereafter incurred for expert services under existing contract entered into by the War Department in connection with the construction of the ferryboat authorized by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1926.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 78, after line 14, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"For transportation of the Army and its supplies, etc., including the same object specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $578,100."

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall have to object to that now.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman withhold that objection for a moment?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GAMBRILL. It is very seldom that I take up the time of this House. The proposition I propose to present is one that can hardly be developed in five minutes. I ask the consideration of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment so as to provide funds for the removal of some of the most dangerous explosives from the ammunition depot at Curtis Bay, in the vicinity of Baltimore city. This amendment appropriates $578,110, and if it is accepted by the Committee of the Whole House, two other amendments will be offered for the appropriation of $121,476 and $100,000, respectively; thus, making the total amount appropriated for this purpose $799,586.

I am conscious of the difficulty which confronts the Maryland delegation in having an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole House when it has not the sanction of the powerful Committee on Appropriations. And yet I do not hesitate to make the assertion that the refusal of the Committee on Appropriations to include this item in the deficiency bill was based on misinformation, intolerance, and a lack of understanding of the menace to Baltimore city, its inhabitants, and its industrial life by this ammunition depot being at Curtis Bay. I have read the committee hearings, a copy of which I obtained yesterday, and it is evident that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and some of his colleagues dismissed this subject as being unworthy of serious consideration, and they did this on the false assumption that Baltimore city had sought this ammunition depot and now wanted to get rid of it.

If you will turn to page 469 of the committee hearings you will find this comment by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, referring as he was to the people of Baltimore city:

The CHAIRMAN. They begged them to put the arsenals there, and now they are importuning them to take them away.

What are the real facts and not the gratuitous conjectures on which the Committee on Appropriations acted?

This ammunition depot at Curtis Bay was established during the war, and its location near Baltimore was a war measure inaugurated without any solicitation on the part of the citizens of Baltimore or any official or civic body. Little information was obtainable at the time regarding its purpose or its use, but the general impression was that it would be used for the storage of airplane parts. It is safe to say that no one connected with the municipal affairs of Baltimore had any idea that this depot was intended to house the most powerful and dangerous explosives that human ingenuity could manufacture. And I venture the assertion that even though its use had been known, no one in the official life of Baltimore and no great or small industrial concern, however serious the menace to them, would

have protested against the establishment of this depot if it was considered essential or necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. But since the war, with a knowledge of its menace to the life and property of the citizens of Baltimore, and with a knowledge, in a measure at least, of the vast concentration of high explosives at this depot, the city of Baltimore and the people having great property rights in its vicinity have made unceasing efforts to rid themselves of this danger and for the complete evacuation of this ammunition dump. It was felt that a measure of relief had been provided when the President and the Director of the Budget recommended to the House the insertion in the deficiency bill items aggregating $800,000 for the removal of the high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay depot, but the Committee on Appropriations disallowed these items on the ground that no emergency existed. It is quite evident from reading the hearings of the committee that the members thereof were of the impression that the depot is located at some remote section, far removed from Baltimore, and that if an explosion occurred, the destruction of lives and property would be confined to its immediate vicinity. Visualize if you will the situation. This depot is on Curtis Bay, one of the important estuarys of the Patapsco River and on an air line is within 5 miles of the City Hall of Baltimore, which may be said to be the heart of the commercial activities of the city.

Within 2 miles of the depot is over $100,000,000 worth of industrial property, most of it located there long before the depot was established or thought of. Opposite the depot is the great Davison Chemical Co., one of the largest, if not the largest, manufacturers of sulphuric acid in the country, with its delicate machinery and equipment. Very close to the depot is the United States industrial alcohol plant. Just across from the depot are the large elevators and railroad terminals of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Western Maryland Railroad Co. In immediate proximity to the depot are the large oil refineries and storage plants of the Prudential Oil Co., and across the Patapsco is the vast plant of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. Curtis Bay is the only natural deep-water channel in the Baltimore region, and its industrial development is being prevented by the danger now existing. So we have this depot lying on the border of the most active industrial area of the city of Baltimore; on an important portion of our harbor; within 5 miles of the heart of the city, and just on the border line of the city itself. Just how much high explosives are stored in this depot, only the War Department knows, but it is illuminating to observe that the department estimated it would cost over $2,650,000 to remove all of the explosives, and it is known that at times there have been as high as 3,000,000 pounds of T. N. T., 158,000 pounds of tetryl, 1,700,000 pounds of black powder stored there, and the amount of smokeless powder has been estimated at anywhere from 15,000,000 to 45,000,000 pounds. The value of the stores has been given as $120,000,000. It is no exaggeration to say that an explosion at this depot would completely wreck or cause incalculable damage to the three great industrial centers of the port of Baltimore—Curtis Bay, Canton, and the Bethlehem Steel Corporation—and bring great loss to Baltimore and perhaps cause death to hundreds of people. This is no figure of speech or idle prophecy; it is a fact that can not be dismissed by the laconic statement of Major General Williams that "The amount of danger is not sufficient to cause any real apprehension to the surrounding community." It is interesting to recall that in 1926 some of the Representatives in Congress from Maryland called on General Williams seeking to secure action looking to the removal of this ammunition, and in discussing the causes which might lead to the setting off of these explosives it was suggested that there was the ever-present danger of the ammunition being exploded by a bolt of lightning. This suggestion was dismissed by General Williams as an unheard-of possibility and as one unworthy of serious consideration; and yet within a few weeks after this statement by General Williams, the arsenal at Lake Denmark was practically destroyed by a bolt of lightning, with a large loss of life and the destruction of property amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. And that at an arsenal which I heard described by a prominent naval officer as being the most favorably located depot under the control of the Navy. Should an explosion occur at Curtis Bay, the loss of life and property would be beyond description or prophesy, as the explosion at Lake Denmark was felt for 30 miles and the town of Mount Hope, several miles from the depot, was almost totally destroyed. We, the Representatives from Maryland, protest against this menace to the city of Baltimore, because of its ever-present and potential danger to the whole city, because it has and is blocking the normal expansion of its chief industrial center, and because no reason for its retention is to be compared to the danger to which the lives of the citizens of Baltimore and the owners of property are subjected by its existence—a danger which can not be estimated in money.

Apparently the Committee on Appropriations approached its consideration of this subject or made its decision on three major premises, all of them erroneous and conceived in a misconception of the real facts. First, the committee assumed that as no protest was made against the location of this arsenal at Curtis Bay, no heed need be given to the demands for the removal of the ammunition stored there. Secondly, that as the protests have been coming for three or four years for its removal, and no explosion has occurred, no emergency now exists for the transfer of these explosives. Thirdly, that the danger of the detonation of this ammunition is very remote. Bear in mind that this depot was located at Curtis Bay as a war measure, so as to offer quick and ample accommodations for transportation by water, and not because the depot was sought by the city of Baltimore. And then by a process of reasoning, which I can not follow, the Committee on Appropriations took the position that no emergency existed for the removal of the ammunition, because, forsooth, protests have been made for three or four years and the ammunition is still there and no explosion has occurred; and there it is apt to remain if the members of the committee are going to dismiss the subject with the gratuitous statement that the removal of this ammunition at this time is not urgent and no danger exists. The fact is that most of this ammunition would be removed to the depot near Ogden, Utah, which is 7 miles from the small city of Ogden, where there are 35 empty magazines; to Savanna, Ill., a remote reservation in the northwest part of the State of Illinois and on the Mississippi River; and to what is known as the depot at Charleston, S. C., which depot is in fact 11 miles from the city; and to Pig Point, in Virginia. But I address myself to the remarkable statement made by Major General Williams, and generously accepted by the committee, that there is no cause for "real apprehension."

Let us see how remote that danger is. I do not know the number of large ammunition depots in the United States in use by the Army and Navy, but I would assume that 20 would be a generous approximation. Then, if you will turn to the committee hearings, when the deficiency bill was before the Committee on Appropriations in the Sixty-ninth Congress, you will be met with the startling statement that since 1916 there have been six or seven disastrous explosions at ammunition depots, several in New Jersey, one at Black Tom Island, one near one of the Amboys, one at the Raritan Arsenal, and one at Lake Denmark, to say nothing of the disastrous explosion which occurred at Halifax and the one at London, both causing the destruction of millions of property and a large loss of life. Major General Williams reasons that in the ratio that 6 or 7 bears to 20 that the danger of an explosion at Curtis Bay is very remote, and in making this statement he takes an indefensible position. And as a complete refutation of the false assurances General Williams seeks to give of there being no danger it is only necessary to tell this committee that in September last over 100 shells loaded with high explosives were set off at this depot by a small fire, and for a time it appeared that a catastrophe was imminent.

This amendment should pass, and indeed there should be an amendment for the immediate and speedy removal of all this ammunition, which could be stored elsewhere without danger to the communities near which these depots are located. But if this objective can not be secured, then by all the demands of common sense and prudence let us adopt the amendment now before the committee and remove part of this ammunition which menaces the life and property of the citizens of Baltimore. To do less will be a great injustice to that city.

I know the difficulty of securing an appropriation which has not met the sanction of the powerful Committee on Appropriations, but simple justice demands that some relief be given Baltimore, and this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not know how to impress this proposition upon this body more strongly than has my colleague [Mr. GAMBRILL], nor more strongly than we presented the proposition at the last session of Congress, when we endeavored to have this item inserted into the bill and passed. As he has said, it has been recommended by the War Department; it has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President. Only last evening I spoke to the Secretary of War and told him I was very sorry that this item had been left out of the bill, this being such a menace to the city of Baltimore. He said to me, "I have done all I can do. I recommended it, and it was in our tentative program; but what your committee has done is to strike it out, and I have no control over that." It does seem

to me that in recommending all these appropriations which the Secretary of War wants for various things that certainly we ought to insert this one which he has recommended for the removal of these explosives. General Williams speaks about there being no danger, but you would have been surprised if on the 24th of September you had taken up your morning paper and found that in this Curtis Bay depot an explosion had taken place the day before [displays daily paper]. But that is true. The population was leaving there in automobiles, in carriages, and walking, trying to get away. A fire took place and the soldiers went there, as well as reporters, but the reporters were not permitted to enter because the authorities did not want the people to know just how serious the situation was. However, the fact is that an explosion took place on the 23d day of September last, and if it can take place and destroy a certain number of shells it can take place again and destroy a greater number of shells. At that time some 50 shells exploded.

This menace is right in the center of the industrial section of Baltimore city, which section is about a mile and a half from Curtis Bay. Curtis Bay is a town of a great many inhabitants, a town where they manufacture many articles, where the great coal piers are. It is a great industrial section. It is right across the river from Fort McHenry and very near the center of Baltimore city, where 850,000 people live.

All we are asking you is that some of this ammunition be removed. We are not asking that all of it be removed. There are 25,000,000 pounds of ammunition stored at this place, but we are not asking that all of it be removed. We are asking that the high explosives, the T. N. T., the amatol, and those other things which are liable to go off at any time, be removed.

I would not wish this thing on anybody else, but General Williams says it can be stored safely and remotely from any danger. He says it can be stored at a place where it will not menace a vast population of people, and he recommends that it be sent to Savanna, to Charleston, to Ogdon, to Pig Point, and at these places it will not be near any dense population; it will be far from everybody, it will be safe and the people of Baltimore will be relieved of this menace.

I do not know whether any explosion is going to take place there. I did not think it was going to take place but it did take place on the 23d day of last September, and if it had not been for the prompt arrival of the fire department, soldiers, and guards, we would have had a terrible conflagration, but we did not have it because of vigilance.

How would you like to live alongside of a menace of that kind? How would you like to have all of your municipal buildings, your Government buildings, and all those buildings menaced by 25,000,000 pounds of explosives? I do not think there is anybody here who would want it.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Is it not a fact that the War Department admits they have places at which they can put this ordnance where it would not be a menace to anybody?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; they have selected the places to put it. Not only have they selected the places to put it but they have recommended its removal to those places, yet we can not get this committee to understand the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is only fair that the chairman of this committee should say a word on this subject. We are not as indifferent as the gentleman from Maryland says nor do we enter upon the consideration of these things from the standpoint he indicates. We enter upon the consideration of the problems that come before the committee with the greatest care within our power and with due deliberation and consideration of all the elements involved.

They propose here to remove explosives from Curtis Bay and from Raritan, N. J. The character of the explosives at Curtis Bay is high-explosive shell and shrapnel. The Chief of Ordnance, General Williams, assures us that there is very remote danger of any explosion of these shells. The explosions which occurred at other places were due to the fact that a fire started in bulk explosives. General Williams, the one man in the United States whose knowledge and experience is unquestioned everywhere throughout the world, tells the committee that there is no need to remove these explosives on account of the danger that exists to Baltimore.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I happen to know that the people in that neighborhood are in a state of continuous fear, and the mere fact that General Williams may tell them there is no danger does not amount to anything as far as they are concerned.

Mr. MADDEN. But he is presumed to know, and I am giving you my statement based on General Williams's knowledge and experience.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Did General Williams tell you anything about the explosion that occurred on the 23d day of September last? I do not find one thing in his testimony about it.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not recall that he did. Now, the danger of an explosion from loaded shells would come through a fire of sufficient magnitude to burn down the storage and heat the shells sufficiently to detonate them. That is the only danger there is of an explosion from these shells or damage to property or life. There is no part of the ammunition used by the Army that is so little a menace to a community than that which is stored at Curtis Bay, if the information which comes to the Committee on Appropriations be true, and we assume it must be true, because it comes from the technical experts of the Army, and they say that there is no necessity for moving these explosives.

What are they trying to do here? The request for the removal of these shells at Raritan and Curtis Bay did not come from the War Department. The value of the material is $60,000,000, $40,000,000 at Raritan and $20,000,000 at Curtis Bay.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Would the gentleman, in spite of General Williams's statement, like to live in that neighborhood?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not on the witness stand as to what I would like to do.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I know, but the psychological element of fear is there. Those people are afraid of it.

Mr. MADDEN. I am giving the business side of this thing, the War Department's side of it and the Treasury's side of it, too. The tonnage to be removed is 16,800 tons from Curtis Bay and 32,200 tons from Raritan. These gentlemen want this ammunition sent to Savanna, Ill.; Ogden, Utah; Pig Point, Va.; and Charleston, S. C. The cost of removal from Curtis Bay alone is $800,000, and the cost of removal from Raritan is $2,310,000, which makes a total of $3,110,000.

We are advised, as I said before, by the responsible expert of the Government in the matter of explosives that there is only remote danger from these explosives at Curtis Bay.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. No; not just now. Let me first finish this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for about two minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will not the gentleman take three minutes to answer my question?

Mr. MADDEN. I will answer the gentleman in any event later.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. No one will say that the explosives will not explode. Of course, they will explode. This is what they are manufactured for.

The committee went thoroughly into the situation at the last session. They recommended against the removal of these explosives then and were sustained by the House. They have again gone thoroughly into this question, notwithstanding what my friend from Baltimore has said. The gentleman has said that we approach the question in a spirit of levity. We do not. We are serious. We are serious-minded men and we are all old enough to have quit our practices of levity, and we go on and on and we do the thing we think is best for the whole country.

In the opinion of the Chief of Ordnance of the War Department, who has had long experience with explosives, let me repeat, the danger from explosives of this character is not sufficient to justify the expenditures proposed or involved in the cost of transportation and removal.

I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask the gentleman—and in asking the gentleman, of course, I am also asking the House—does the gentleman think that for the mere sum of $800,000 it is fair to keep 850,000 people under the menace of this situation at Curtis Bay, regardless of the millions of dollars invested in this section and in the city of Baltimore? Does the gentleman

think it is fair to keep them in this situation of fear all the time for the purpose of saving a mere sum of $800,000?

Mr. MADDEN. No one would give more ready response to the gentleman's suggestion than I if I thought there was a menace, but I believe in my soul that there is no menace, based on what the Chief of Ordnance has said.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS IN THE DIPLOMATIC GALLERY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to call the attention of the membership of the House present in the Committee of the Whole to the fact that we are honored to-day by having as visitors in the diplomatic gallery the Governor General of Canada and Viscountess Willingdon, accompanied by the Minister of Canada and Mrs. Massey, and the United States Minister to Canada and Mrs. Phillips. [Applause.]

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that debate is closed on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LEHLBACH). Debate on the pending amendment has been exhausted and continuation of the debate by means of pro forma amendments virtually is by unanimous consent.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should object——

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the people who live in the neighborhood of this arsenal are in a constant state of alarm. I do not live on the western shore of Maryland. I live on the other side of the bay, but I was in Curtis Bay about a year ago and some of the most reputable people there told me that the entire neighborhood was in a state of apprehension constantly on account of these high explosives.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois says he is discussing this matter from a business standpoint and from a practical standpoint. Of course, we should all discuss the matter from this standpoint, but the humanitarian standpoint is also a business standpoint and a practical one. These people and the people of Baltimore city are afraid of these explosives. The psychological effect is bad. The War Department admits it has a place to put these explosives where they can be of no possible menace or danger. The only thing the Chief of Ordnance will say is that in his opinion there is not sufficient danger to justify the expenditure of $800,000. He does not say there is no danger, but not sufficient danger to life and property to justify the cost. What right has he or any man to say that the possibility of destruction of human life and property is not worth $800,000 or any other sum?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that there is one fact that is entitled to very great consideration? General Lord, who is a very experienced Army officer and also the Director of the Budget, has examined into this matter and has come to the conclusion that the action desired ought to be taken.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The committee will be very glad to have that information.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it not a fact there is a large university at Baltimore with students from all parts of the country?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is true.

Mr. REED of New York. And is it not true that there is a very large conservatory of music there with girls from all sections of the country?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is true.

Mr. REED of New York. So it is not altogether a local question. Every man here may have a very vital interest in the matter with relation to his own district.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is quite true.

Mr. REED of New York. And is it not true there is danger at any time through lightning striking this plant and causing an explosion?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. There is no question about it. There is not a State in this Union whose youth is not represented in Baltimore, either in a medical school, a law school, or in its other great universities and institutions of learning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 42, noes 54.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MADDEN and Mr. GAMBRILL.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 78 ayes and 70 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, after line 14, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For transportation of the Army and its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Raritan ordnance reserve depot, fiscal year 1928, $1,621,890."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the arguments that have been advanced in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GAMBRILL] apply with equal force to the amendment that I have offered. This provides for Army transportation for the removal of high explosives at Raritan Arsenal in the vicinity of New Brunswick. Within a radius of 6 miles of this munitions storage plant there are over 150,000 people. It is almost adjacent to the cities of New Brunswick, Perth Amboy, and South Amboy and within a metropolitan area with a population of 8,000,000. The people of my district are very fearful of the dangers attendant to the storage of these explosives at Raritan Arsenal. There are over a million pounds of T. N. T. stored there, within a county that is one of the greatest industrial counties of New Jersey. That fact is retarding the economic growth and development of Middlesex and adjacent territory.

In 1918 we had a disastrous explosion at the Morgan Arsenal with a great loss of life and an attendant loss of millions of dollars in property damage. Later, we had a series of explosions at Camp Raritan, and in 1924 there was a disaster at the ammonite plant, adjoining Raritan Arsenal, resulting in the loss of 20 lives and hundreds of thousands in damage to property. I submit that the situation causes a feeling of apprehension that is entirely justified in the minds of the people of my district. I believe that the Government of the United States is not justified in storing high explosives in times of peace in an industrial area of this character, and I submit that this body ought to take action similar to that which has been taken on the previous amendment, and adopt an appropriation which will provide for the removal of dangerous explosives that constitute a potential menace to life and property. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know when this arsenal was built?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was built in 1918, during the time of the war.

Mr. BUTLER. The people have not moved up side of it by the sale of town lots?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; it was a war-emergency measure.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will confine what statements I have to make to a disclosure of the number of private institutions manufacturing high explosives in the State of New Jersey. New Jersey is honeycombed with this kind of institutions. Nobody is asking for the removal of a private institution. Now, let us see what they have there. They have the Atlas Powder Co. They have the du Pont Powder Co. They have a du Pont Powder Co. again, and yet another. Then there is the Hercules Powder Co. All the powder companies of any consequence in the United States are located in New Jersey and Delaware.

Mr. EATON. Are they located in the center of population?

Mr. MADDEN. They are located in New Jersey, and I venture to say there is no less population where they are than there is where the gentleman is seeking to have the removal of this explosive from.

Mr. EATON. Let me say that the manufacturing plants dealt with by the gentleman from Illinois are black powder and dynamite plants, and if one of those exploded it would not be more than a firecracker, but when it comes to exploding tons of T. N. T. that is a different matter.

Mr. MADDEN. You can not explode T. N. T.

Mr. EATON. It has exploded.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no danger of its exploding where it is. There ought not to be such a cry for the removal of these explosives to another part of the country. Just as soon as we get them put some place else, then the people there will demand

their removal to some other place. What are you going to do about it? The Army is demanding that we shall give them the right to carry war supply ammunition. On the other hand, everybody who demands that we shall conform to the views of the Army is also demanding that we shall do away with the supply of ammunition by removing it to some point from which it can not be removed when we need it. They want to get it a thousand miles away from any place. It is just a question of spending money for no purpose at all. There is very little danger in either of these cases, and I am surprised that the Committee of the Whole voted to spend $800,000 to move the explosives, so called, from Curtis Bay.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military posts: For construction and installation at military posts of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances thereto, as authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1927, without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, including also in connection with the erection of barracks at Fort Jay, Governors Island, not to exceed $30,000 for the employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of architects, or firms, or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be deemed necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States, $6,162,000, to remain available until expended; of this amount $3,680,000 shall be payable from the military post construction fund created by section 4 of the act approved March 12, 1926, and $2,482,000 shall be payable out of the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to the language beginning on page 78, line 19, down to the bottom of the page, and to lines 1 and 2 on page 79, up to and including the words "United States."

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment at this point to strike out line 19 on page 78——

The CHAIRMAN. Pending the decision on the point of order that amendment is not in order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can discuss his amendment, but he can not offer an amendment to a portion upon which a point of order is pending.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, it is rather embarrassing to me to object to an item in the deficiency appropriation bill, particularly being a new Member and to seemingly place my views and opinions as against the Appropriations Committee, composed of so many of the senior Members of the House, but I am asking the saving of moneys instead of spending same. I have given very deep study and thought to Governors Island from a business man's point of view and can see the tremendous advantage to the business interests if it is possible to transform Governors Island into an express landing station for airplanes and hydroplanes.

As a military post it is obsolete. In 1800, when ceded by the Federal Government to the State of New York, there was need for a military post on Governors Island. In 1810 there were almost more soldiers on Governors Island than in 1927.

These soldiers have been used for parade purposes and the island has been used for a makeshift headquarters for the Division of the East. Outside of that, the only use for the island has been its parade grounds, polo fields, golf course, tennis courts, baseball field, running tracks, and afternoon teas.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. As I understand, the gentleman is not opposed to bettering the housing conditions in the Military Establishments.

Mr. COHEN. Oh, no; I am very much in favor of improving the present housing conditions through all of the Government posts, wherever they are needed.

One objection—and the only objection that has been made—to the use of Governors Island for a landing field has been the question of fog. The honorable chairman [Mr. MADDEN] also quoted the same objection.

I have a statement from Mr. Scarr, the head of the meteorological department of the city of New York, in which he states that the fog conditions on Governors Island in 1926 covered 22 days, and over a period from 8 to 56 years an average of 24 days. He also stated to me personally that the fog condition on Governors Island was 1 per cent better than any other proposed airport around New York.

Such noted fliers as Commander Byrd, Clarence Chamberlain, and Casey Jones, the wonderful air pilot now connected with the Curtis company, have stated to me that Governors Island is ideal for an airport or landing field.

Major General O'Ryan, president of the Colonial Air Transport Service, which company is running airplane service between New York and several of the different cities, stated to me less than a week ago that Governors Island would be ideal for a landing field.

During the war it was used as a training field for aviators, and if inexperienced flyers could use the same, I can see no objection to experienced flyers.

My desire to have the appropriation of $1,860,000, which has been appropriated for the housing conditions of Governors Island—and I fully agree that an improvement in the same is needed—held up is to give this body the opportunity of passing upon the merits of Governors Island for an airport.

ITS ADVANTAGES

Within five minutes by ferry of the lower part of New York City; the possibility of connections by the extension of the mail tubes so that mail can be delivered in New York in less than 10 minutes as against 1 hour and 50 minutes as at present as per post-office records.

This thought is not new with me, and I refer to a report of the Sixty-eighth Congress, second session, No. 1653, in which a committee of this House recommended Governors Island for an airport and also to the bill introduced by Mr. LAGUARDIA and Mr. PRALL in 1926, and by Senator Wadsworth in the Senate, to transform Governors Island into an airport. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, what I desire to point out and what I am seeking to do is to not to hold up the appropriations for military posts for the barracks where they are needed but simply to defer spending any money on Governors Island before this matter is settled. If we appropriate this money to-day the War Department, because the General Staff is opposed to this for the reasons pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COHEN], will rush right in and then use that as an argument against using Governors Island for the very logical purpose that God intended it should be used for—and you can not go any higher than that. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDBLOM). Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I admit the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 79, line 7, after the word "Treasury," strike out the period and add the following: "*Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be used for erection of barracks or other buildings at Fort Jay, Governors Island."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, that would simply defer the spending of any money for the moment. This is a deficiency bill. The regular appropriation bill will come in in a few days, and in the meantime we will get our case before the Committee on Military Affairs, and that is the logical proper manner in which to treat this case, first, defer it, and then determine whether we shall spend the money.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will vote down the amendment. There is no justification for it.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fort Mills, Corregidor, P. I., central power plant: For completing repairs to steam plant and changing the present coal plant to oil, construction of facilities to house Diesel engines and oil storage, purchase and installation of three Diesel units in the central power plant, and all other necessary expenses incidental thereto, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $309,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 79, after line 20, insert as new paragraphs the following:

"Ordnance service: For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $121,476.

"Repairs of arsenals: For repairs and improvements of arsenals and depots, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $100,000."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, these amendments are merely companion amendments to the amendment which was adopted. The committee adopted an amendment of $578,110. These two amendments are $121,476 and $85,000, making a total of $784,506, being the amount we told you it would take to move this ammunition from Curtis Bay. You understand the money is expended by different departments of the Army. The $578,000 is expended by the Army transportation, and the other by the Ordnance Department, being the Gambrill amendment as adopted. These amendments aggregate $784,586 which we have asked you for the purpose of removing this ammunition. Now it is necessary for us to have these two amendments in order to carry into effect the first amendment which we have already adopted. They are merely companion amendments to the first.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote these amendments down. I am not going to make a speech. The same thing applies to the one previously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNELL). The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Division.

On a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 57, noes 82.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. MADDEN and Mr. LINTHICUM] reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Headstones for graves of American soldiers in Europe: To complete the furnishing and erecting of headstones for the graves of American soldiers in Europe, $186,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929: *Provided*, That the headstones furnished hereunder shall be of such design and material as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can inform the committee whether this is to buy Carrara marble in Italy with the money appropriated?

Mr. MADDEN. That has already been spent.

Mr. FISH. No.

Mr. MADDEN. This is to complete the work, and I think it is all Carrara marble.

Mr. FISH. Has the gentleman any information that the committee in charge, the Battle Monuments Commission, has agreed to buy Carrara marble?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I have not.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is probably aware that a good many women's organizations are opposed to buying Carrara marble for headstones, and I am trying to find out whether any definite action has been taken?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman on the committee, who I think has that information.

Mr. MADDEN. I have the information. General Cheatham said in the last session of Congress:

General CHEATHAM. Congress gave us $548,550 some time ago to put the headstones in European cemeteries. That estimate was based upon a slab type of marker. The Battle Monuments Commission, and finally Congress, authorized a stone cross. We find that the stone cross costs a little more than the slab, and therefore the $548,000 was not enough to complete it. We have let a contract for 14,186 of those crosses, at a cost of approximately $23, installed, including all costs for foundation and erection. We feel that this work should be completed. We have enough money left of the $548,000 to make a second contract, but not enough to complete the entire number of 31,000 graves. This $186,000 that is asked for here will enable us to buy, erect, inspect, and, finally, clear up the entire situation in France and England, and do it promptly.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman does not know how many gravestones have been already erected and out of what material?

Mr. MADDEN. They have contracted for fourteen thousand a hundred and some odd.

Mr. FISH. Have they erected any as yet?

Mr. MADDEN. We do not know.

Mr. FISH. And out of what material?

Mr. MADDEN. Carrara marble.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can throw some light on this subject. I have just been furnished with the following information by the Quartermaster General of the Army. The Quartermaster General has already contracted for 22,686 markers out of the 31,200 required, and those at a cost actually erected upon graves in the cemeteries in France of about $20 each.

These markers are of Carrara marble. It is estimated that there are about 8,500 still to be contracted for. The cost of the Carrara marble crosses procured from Italy, as against the cost of granite crosses procured from this country, was, as I am informed, about three or four times in favor of the Carrara marble. The lowest actual bids received for American granite crosses erected were $82 for stone from Concord, N. H., and $119 for stone from Barre, Vt. The marble crosses from this country would have cost $40 per cross. At the present time 6,309 crosses have actually been erected, divided as follows:

At Suresnes	1,455
At Meuse-Argonne	2,474
At St. Mihiel	2,380

In addition to those actually erected 3,395 have been manufactured and accepted and are now in process of erection in the eight cemeteries in France, Belgium, and England. At Suresnes about two-thirds of the total markers had been erected when I visited this cemetery last September when I was over there with the American Legion.

Concerning the use of Carrara marble, I am informed that the kind of material to be used was exhaustively studied by the War Department before final decision, and I shall include in my remarks a letter from General Pershing, chairman of the Battle Monuments Commission, on this subject to the Secretary of War, with a copy of which I have been furnished by the Quartermaster General. From this letter the reasons which led to the decision of the commission will fully appear:

THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION,

Washington, June 6, 1926

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,

War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The American Battle Monuments Commission at its recent meeting discussed at great length the type of stone which should be used for the headstones in the American military cemeteries in Europe. I have been asked to communicate to you the results of this discussion and present the various considerations which entered into the commission's decision.

For over two years the question of material for these headstones has been the subject of many conferences and much correspondence by the commission with organizations and individuals who are interested in the matter from one standpoint or another. The commission has made an exhaustive investigation of European stone and has given the American stone producers ample opportunity to present to the commission such information as they desired. At this meeting representatives of the American granite industry were heard, and Mrs. Bentley, a member of the commission, presented the views of the Gold Star organizations.

As a result of this study and investigation, the commission approached the subject for a final decision with the following ideas in mind:

(a) That the most suitable material should be used regardless of cost.

(b) That the durability of the stone beyond a period of 30 or 40 years was secondary in importance to that of appearance. The reason for this is that these cemeteries are under constant care and supervision and that the headstones can be and will be replaced whenever necessary.

(c) That if other considerations were at all equal, American stone should be used.

(d) That certain types of white French stone and Carrara marble would give as beautiful a result as any white American stone.

(e) That these headstones should be erected as soon as possible.

Examining the list of bids it is seen that French stone and Carrara marble are much the cheapest in price. If the ones bid on are good representatives of their class, they are entirely suitable in appearance and durability. The use of one of these stones will make for speed in erection, as they can be procured without the delay incident to obtaining an additional appropriation. In other words, in the opinion of the commission, these stones are entirely suitable and the advantages in using them entirely outweigh any objection which might be raised that they do not come from this country.

In view of the above, the commission has asked me to inform you that it votes in favor of using either a French stone or Carrara marble

for these headstones and that it would like an opportunity, if you agree with this decision, to select from among these when the full-sized models, required by the specifications under which the bids were made, are received.

I have the honor to remain, respectfully,

JOHN J. PERSHING, *Chairman.*

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I happened for a little while to be a member of the commission, but this question had been dealt with before I became a member. However, I think that in order to have the record here complete, this should be stated; at least this is my recollection of what caused the real determination of the material to be used. It was fundamentally a question of color. The commission was of the opinion that these crosses should be of white material. It was impossible to get granite that would meet the idea of color which the commission had, and hence for that reason marble was adopted.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I do not think the gentleman was on the board at that time. I appeared before that board, with others, in favor of granite, and it was shown there that it was quite serviceable, and apparently at that time the argument made seemed to be based on this theory. I think the argument is still sound that Carrara marble is not suitable, on account of its soft texture and liability to wear, for such decoration. We were assured that the granite would be permanent. The committee made that statement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, I may be in error, but the impression that I gained from the discussion which took place in the commission after I had become a member—the matter came up in an incidental way—it had already been determined before I became a member; but as I recall the discussion it was a question of color. That was the thing that determined the selection. However, the gentleman from Massachusetts may be correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Cape Cod Canal: For the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal and other property pertaining thereto, in accordance with section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1927, $5,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been read yet.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 85, after line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows: "Harbor reimbursement: To pay the city of Miami for part reimbursement of the $1,605,000 advanced or loaned to the Government by said city for the improvement of Miami Harbor, as provided under the rivers and harbors act, passed March 3, 1925, in accordance with House Document 516, the sum of $500,000."

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, last February I appeared before the committee when this bill was up and presented this item to the subcommittee. On February 26, 1927, I briefly argued the matter before the Committee of the Whole.

Now, briefly, I will state the facts in this case. On September 15, 1927, I wrote letters to the Chief of Engineers and Mr. MADDEN, which I ask to be incorporated in my remarks:

(Personal)

KISSIMMEE, FLA., *September 15, 1927.*

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,

Chairman Committee on Appropriations,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MADDEN: I am herein inclosing you a copy of a letter I have just written to General Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, relative to an additional refund of the money advanced to the Government by the city of Miami for work on Miami Harbor.

Miami is up against it good and hard, and I certainly trust an additional refund can be made to the city. I understand several additional bonds which the city sold to make the advance to the Government will come due soon, and the city will suffer a great loss unless a refund, as stated in my letter to General Jadwin, is made at the earliest possible moment. I dislike to write this kind of a letter, and I feel I can say for Miami and the State that they join me in the above, but circumstances over which they had no control makes it imperative.

If you feel you can write General Jadwin, suggesting if it is possible for him to do so, that he make an additional refund to the city of Miami, I assure you myself and the citizens of Dade County will greatly appreciate it.

I sincerely trust your health is better and that you have had a pleasant vacation. I am kept on the go, because so many people from Illinois and other States have moved down. However, I have enjoyed being home and mingling with my constituents and finding out their needs.

With kind regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

W. J. SEARS, M. C.

(Personal)

KISSIMMEE, FLA., *September 15, 1927.*

Maj. Gen. EDGAR JADWIN,

Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL JADWIN: From an Associated Press dispatch I understand there is approximately a $2,000,000 surplus from the rivers and harbors bill. I saw this in connection with an effort to have this amount transferred to the flood-control appropriation, but General McCarl ruled that this could not be done. I am for giving every relief possible to the flood sufferers and shall work with this end in view at the next session.

Miami was hard hit by the hurricane, and unless an additional $500,000, or at least $300,000, of the money advanced to the Government by the city for work on Miami Harbor is refunded to the city, frankly I don't know what they will do. It is true the work has been rapidly pushed, because Miami advanced the money, but it is also equally true that Miami would not ask for one cent refund until the Government saw proper to make same if the city's loss had not been so severe, due to the hurricane. They have struggled on, but frankly I don't know how they can manage it unless the Board of Engineers makes an additional refund, for I understand several additional bonds which the city sold to make the advance to the Government are coming due soon.

Certainly with a surplus of more than $600,000,000 in the United States Treasury and, if the Associated Press dispatch was correct, an additional two million or more surplus from the rivers and harbors bill, the good citizens of Dade County should not be made to suffer a financial loss due entirely to an act of Providence and no fault of their own.

You have been more than courteous to me and I know you will give this matter your usual prompt consideration. Congressman MADDEN, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has also materially assisted me in regard to the work on Miami Harbor, and I am therefore mailing him a copy of this letter, also a copy to the Secretary of War.

I trust you have had at least a short vacation and that you are enjoying good health.

With kind regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

W. J. SEARS, M. C.

I have thanked my colleague [Mr. MADDEN] for his cooperation in securing a refund last year, and now want to thank him publicly. I received a letter from the Chief of Engineers, under date of September 24, 1927, and one from the Secretary of War, under date of September 28, 1927, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, September 28, 1927.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,

Representative in Congress, Kissimmee, Fla.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 15th instant, inclosing a copy of your letter to the Chief of Engineers of same date, in regard to another refund from the current appropriation for river and harbor improvement of money advanced by the city of Miami, under the provisions of section 11, river and harbor act of March 3, 1925.

There is no surplus of river and harbor funds. The unallotted balance of the $50,000, appropriated by the act of February 23, 1927, for improvement of rivers and harbors, is only sufficient to meet the contingencies incident to the work of the department during the remainder of the present fiscal year. Allotment from river and harbor funds to meet the emergency on the Lower Mississippi has been made with the expectation that it will be repaid from a special appropriation by Congress early in the next session.

While the hardship imposed on the city of Miami by the hurricane last year is appreciated fully, I regret to state that under the circumstances set forth above I am not in a position at this time to approve an additional allotment for Miami Harbor.

Very truly yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, September 24, 1927.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,
Representative in Congress, Kissimmee, Fla.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: 1. The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of September 15 in regard to another refund from the current appropriation for river and harbor improvement of money advanced by the city of Miami under the provisions of section 11, river and harbor act of March 3, 1925.

2. There is no surplus of river and harbor funds. The unallotted balance of the $50,000,000, appropriated by the act of February 23, 1927, for improvement of rivers and harbors, is only sufficient to meet the contingencies incident to the work of the department during the remainder of the present fiscal year. Allotment from river and harbor funds to meet the emergency on the lower Mississippi has been made with the expectation that it will be repaid from a special appropriation by Congress early in the next session.

3. While the hardship imposed on the city of Miami by the hurricane last year is appreciated fully, I regret to state that under the circumstances set forth above I am not in a position at this time to recommend an additional allotment for Miami Harbor.

Very truly yours,

EDGAR JADWIN,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

The river and harbor act of March 3, 1925, page 14, provides:

SEC. 11. That whenever local interests shall offer to advance funds for the prosecution of a work of river and harbor improvement duly adopted and authorized by law the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, receive such funds and expend the same in the immediate prosecution of such work. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to repay without interest, from appropriations which may be provided by Congress for river and harbor improvements, the moneys so contributed and expended: *Provided*, That no repayment of funds which may be contributed for the purpose of meeting any conditions of local cooperation imposed by Congress, nor under the authority of section 4 of the river and harbor act, approved March 4, 1915, shall be made.

In January, 1926, the city of Miami advanced the Government the sum of $550,000. In September, 1926, the city of Miami made an additional advance in the sum of $1,105,000 in compliance with the section which I have just read. Immediately after the city of Miami had deposited this sum of $1,655,000 a hurricane struck Florida.

Some of the streets of Miami were buried about 3 feet deep in sand, trees and telephone poles were blown down, and there was a loss of about $78,000,000 worth of property in that section of the State. They would not be asking you now to make a refund if it had not been for their severe loss. Under the laws in our State cities are limited as to their taxing power. We are not asking you for one cent. We are simply asking you to refund us, at perhaps an earlier date than you would, that to which we are entitled and which you are morally bound to refund at some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the city of Miami was very happy indeed to get the cooperation of the War Department in the work that the War Department did for the city and to advance money for the work when the War Department did not have the money. They have been getting their money back under the agreement, and they will continue to get it back. There ought not to be any pressure brought here to get this money now, and this is not the way to do it. They have an agreement with the War Department under which the money is to be paid back to the city of Miami out of river and harbor appropriations. That is where it ought to be paid from and we ought not to create a special fund now to meet that obligation. The obligation will be met. It has been met partly, and it will be met wholly under the conditions that were provided when the money was advanced. Why does the gentleman insist on offering an amendment providing for the payment of the money back out of its regular order?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I tried to make myself perfectly clear.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman did.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. We would not be asking for it if it had not been for the unfortunate hurricane which struck us.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows I have done everything I could to help him in this matter.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The Secretary of War says he has no money with which to pay it back.

Mr. MADDEN. He has.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. We are now asking for the return of that money, because we have not the taxes with which to raise it, and it is a question whether we can float those bonds or not.

Mr. MADDEN. There will be another rivers and harbors appropriation in a few months, and out of that, undoubtedly, the city of Miami will get its money. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, because it is only fair to have it withdrawn. In view of all that has already been done in this matter, I think the gentleman ought to be generous enough to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, appreciating the help my colleague has given me in this matter and knowing that he will carry out his agreement to assist me in every way he can to get this money at an early date I will withdraw my amendment, because I do not wish to embarrass the House.

I only desire to say this: We certainly should be as liberal in dealing with our own people as we have been in dealing with people of foreign countries, especially in view of the fact that Miami is asking for the return of her own money and not asking for one cent from the Government. I want to say further that the Miami harbor and terminals are different from most of the harbors in the country in that Miami spent nearly $3,000,000 of her own money in addition to the advance we are seeking to have refunded in the improvement of the harbor and turning basin.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency flood control, Mississippi River: For reimbursement of the appropriation for "Flood control, Mississippi River," and the appropriation for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," for amounts expended therefrom for emergency work on the lower Mississippi River on account of the flood of 1927, $7,000,000: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds for the flood of 1927 by the Secretary of War from the appropriation for river and harbor works is hereby approved and validated.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the proviso:

That the allotment of funds for the flood of 1927 by the Secretary of War from the appropriation for river and harbor works is hereby approved and validated.

Withholding that reservation, I desire to make a short statement. It has been claimed that the transfer of these funds by the Secretary of War was an emergency. I maintain that the record of the hearings on this bill indicate that no emergency existed, for the reason that many days and weeks and months elapsed subsequent to the flood in which the President of the United States could have called a special session of Congress to make appropriations and the President should have called Congress in special session. We now have the spectacle of Congress being asked to approve of a direct violation of the Constitution. Section 9 of Article I states:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 107, we find in the President's message, in his reference to prohibition, the following:

This imposes upon the citizenship of the country, and especially on all public officers, not only the duty to enforce but the obligation to observe the sanctions of this constitutional provision and its resulting laws.

I maintain that every part of the Constitution should be enforced, and it is out of place for a high officer of this Government to state with reference to the prohibition act that every citizen and public officer should abide by the constitutional provision and at the same time to deliberately flaunt and violate a constitutional provision which is just as binding, one which should be followed by the American people and public officers just as much as the eighteenth amendment. I do not approve of such a policy.

I am for flood relief. It is a Federal proposition and I shall vote to appropriate all necessary funds from the Federal Treasury for that relief.

A special session of the Congress should have been called to take care of the emergency after the waters of the Mississippi had gone on a rampage. If such session were called the expenditure in violation of the Constitution which we are now asked to validate and legalize would not have been made, as Congress could legally have made this appropriation in conformity with constitutional provisions and any other appropriations found necessary by reason of the emergency.

I do not entirely agree with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois on the Bill Thompson manner of flood relief, which includes diverting water from Lake Michigan and emptying that water with sewerage into the Mississippi and its tributaries, thereby being a contributing factor in adding to the rush of waters which caused this flood disaster. However, I will not force my point of order at this time, although I know it would be upheld, because of my high regard for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has reported this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, the recent floods were the most disastrous and covered a greater area than any we have had within the memory of those now living and perhaps for a century. They have emphasized the necessity for comprehensive legislation. We have recently witnessed an appalling destruction of life, the submerging of a large number of the cities and towns, the inundation of millions of acres of productive land, the destruction of innumerable railroad and highway bridges, and a loss of property approximating a billion dollars which we do not now have sufficient data to estimate. In addition to the loss of life thousands have been rendered homeless who must be cared for through Federal and State aid, the Red Cross, and other charitable and local organizations. Some of the damage to property may be repaired, but permanent damage has been done to a very large acreage of productive bottom lands by the destruction of fertile soil and by erosion along the banks of the rivers.

In my own State of Oklahoma the engineer for our State drainage board reports to its chairman, after a most careful survey, the following estimate of the area flooded and the damage done to property as follows:

"This brings the total flooded area of all the streams in Oklahoma to 782,300 acres. It is safe to say that the floods in Oklahoma cause an annual loss to the landowners of some ten to fifteen million dollars. Besides, the loss to the State, counties, railroads, and other public utilities possibly is equal to five to ten million dollars annually."

This report is very conservative. It gives the flooded area on each stream, showing a total of 782,300 acres flooded in the aggregate. The estimated annual damage to property of approximately $25,000,000 is the carefully estimated annual loss; and when we add to these figures the permanent loss to land and other property described in the report, reaching perhaps as much more, we are startled with the fact that the annual loss to property in one State alone will equal the average amount that the Congress has authorized to be expended annually on rivers and habors for the entire Nation.

We have been attempting incomplete, if not ineffective remedies since the beginning of the Government. From year to year appropriations are made and expended through the direction of Army engineers. In 1879 the Mississippi River Commission was created. Since that time large sums of money have been expended upon levees along the lower reaches of the Mississippi River. In normal times these levees are sufficient, but they fail to protect life and property during unusual disastrous floods such as occurred recently. Before the creation of the Budget Committee the Rivers and Harbors Committee had jurisdiction of initiating and reporting the appropriations for river and harbor improvements. Then, as now, the money was expended under the direction of Army engineers. In 1916 we assisted in having an item incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill appropriating $235,000 for the improvement of the Arkansas River in Oklahoma and Arkansas. Not a dollar was spent in the State of Oklahoma. Since then no additional sums for the Arkansas River in Oklahoma, except for surveys, have been appropriated.

The Arkansas River is approximately 1,460 miles long. Rising in the State of Colorado it flows through the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas and empties into the Mississippi River. There is no more fertile valley in the United States and its development during the past few years has been phenomenal. The illuminating report of Maj. A. B. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, dated March 24, 1915, reviews at length the history of the legislation and appropriations for the improvement of the Arkansas River since the first congressional appropriation approved July 3, 1832. By the act of March 3, 1879, Congress extended the improvement of the river to Wichita, Kans. This report urges that this improvement should not be abandoned and succinctly sets forth the commercial importance of the great stretch of country through which this river and its major tributaries flow. The money expended upon this river up to June 30, 1914, amounts to $3,243,650.91. During the past few years the importance of the Arkansas River has been greatly underestimated although the development of the valley through which it flows and the contiguous country has been marvelous.

We believe that the recent floods have taught us the necessity for a change in our legislative policy toward flood control. In the first place, let me say that in my judgment the question of river improvement and flood control is a national problem and the larger part of the expense, if not all, should be borne by the Federal Government. In the second place, our legislation should comprehend and define the permanent policy of the Government in a plan carefully thought out, which could be worked together by the Federal and State Governments and local communities all cooperating together. We believe that the recent floods show the futility of depending upon the levee system alone. Our first duty, of course, is to take care of the distressed, the widows and orphans and to alleviate their suffering and the Federal Government should be more than generous in that regard. We must not weigh the loss of life and place the human equation in the same balance as against property loss. That having been cared for as an emergency measure, our attention should be turned to the permanent plan of improvement. We should, of course, repair and strengthen the levee system. Additional spillways should be provided for. The larger streams should be revetted, snagged, dredged, and deepened. In addition, we insist that reservoirs should be established upon the upper reaches of the Arkansas River and each of its larger tributaries where, in the event of menacing floods, the waters may be impounded in sufficient quantities to be withheld so that they will not pour with torrential force down the several tributaries into the Arkansas, then into the Mississippi River, where they can not be controlled. These impounded waters should be released gradually for the benefit of irrigation and navigation, and the power that could be generated from the dams constructed utilized for the benefit of municipal and industrial purposes in the several communities and States. Following 1832 there was some navigation on the Arkansas River as far up as Wichita. Since then the forests along its banks and of its principal tributaries have been cut and removed and the land placed in cultivation up to their very brink, and when we have excessive rains resulting floods then carry into the streams and finally into the Arkansas River vast quantities of alluvial soil, sand, silt, and gravel, filling up the channel of the river, rendering it useless for navigation. When the banks of these streams are reforested and the main body of the Arkansas River snagged, dredged, deepened, and its banks revetted, and the waters at strategical points impounded, these disastrous floods can measurably be prevented, and the banks protected from erosion so that the channels would not be filled with silt and sand, but would be kept open and the impounded water gradually released to maintain navigation. This would permit large areas of fertile lands to be drained and reclaimed for productive purposes and the owners encouraged to permanently improve these lands with the assurance that the disastrous floods, which from year to year have swept their homes and livestock and growing crops away, would not again recur.

The impounded waters could be released in the West to make productive large areas of semiarid lands in western Oklahoma and Kansas. What is true of the Arkansas River is also true of the Missouri and the other large tributaries of the Mississippi. The power generated could be used for municipal and industrial purposes, which would induce the location of factories of various kinds to utilize the raw material produced in our western country. The navigation of the Arkansas River as far north as Wichita would result not only in water transportation for the bulky haul but in the lowering of freight rates,

so vital to the prosperity of the Middle West. With cheaper freight rates the development of our western country would be unparalleled and the population of our cities and towns doubled within the next decade. We should not only have the imagination to vision the future but the courage to make those dreams come true.

Congress should lead the way in the enactment of legislation in which the several States affected should join, so that the Federal Government and the various State governments and local communities could cooperate in this great constructive improvement. The policy should be permanent and definite to insure the confidence of all that it will not be abandoned but energetically carried through to a successful completion.

To the extent that expenditures are made in aid of navigation, including dredging, snagging, revetment work, reforestation, flood control, and the building of reservoirs, that should be regarded as a national problem and borne by the Federal Government, with the municipalities, drainage districts, local communities, and individuals either contributing their equitable share toward expenditures for irrigation, water power, and other benefits utilized by municipalities or individuals for local or personal purposes, or compensating the Government to the extent of the benefits derived. If a conflict of jurisdiction should arise between any State and the Federal Government over nonnavigable tributaries, an amicable adjustment can be negotiated and ratified by State and Federal enactments.

The entire West, including my State of Oklahoma, and particularly my district, which is traversed by the Arkansas River, is vitally affected by flood-control legislation. The Arkansas River has many major tributaries, including the Illinois, Grand, Verdigris, Cimarron, Deep Fork, Canadian, and a number of other tributaries, which do frightful damage to farm lands, cities, homes, roads, and bridges.

Appreciating this, a flood-control conference was held in my State at Tulsa, Okla., on July 14 and 15, 1927, which was largely attended by governors, Members of Congress, representatives of the departments, engineers, and members of drainage boards who have given much thought to this important question in an effort to stimulate interest and assist in finding a proper solution.

We need the hearty cooperation and enthusiastic support of the governors of the several States affected, their drainage boards, the members of the legislatures, and the people generally. The chambers of commerce have been invited, and many of them have availed themselves of the opportunity to send representatives here, because they appreciate that every city throughout the entire country is vitally affected by flood-control legislation.

The press of the country is giving detailed study to this important question and has done much to arouse public opinion as to the necessity for the enactment of proper legislation. We need the earnest, hearty cooperation of everyone interested in the development of our matchless country if we are to succeed.

Legislation for flood control of the Arkansas and Missouri Rivers and their tributaries has been introduced in Congress, and numerous hearings have been had upon it. The delegations representing the Western States have repeatedly appeared before the Flood Control and the Rivers and Harbors Committees and urged legislation, not only for the deepening of harbors and the navigation of the larger streams but for a survey of the Arkansas and Missouri Rivers and their larger tributaries with the view of establishing reservoirs to aid in flood control. Detailed data must be secured. State organizations and chambers of commerce can be of great service in securing and furnishing data to be looked over and analyzed and submitted in our efforts to secure necessary legislation. Much of this data has been collected and presented to the committee. Other details, of course, will have to be worked out. Suggestions as to the locations of reservoirs should be made, preliminary estimates as to costs of surveys and improvements, present and potential tonnage collected and estimated. All of this data will be helpful. We must have the assistance of all those vitally interested.

The building of railroads develops tonnage. The improvement of the Arkansas River should canalize its bed and develop a wonderful potential tonnage. The valleys along its course and those of its tributaries would be veritable garden spots. The proceeds from products marketed would pour forth golden streams to the enrichment of the commerce of those sections and the Nation.

If the Arkansas River and its tributaries were to receive the legislative assistance to which they are justly entitled, all of the cities within the territory in the near future, stimulated by cheaper freight rates, would be filled with factories and the vast deposits of cheap fuel, such as coal, oil, and gas, utilized and the raw material made into the finished product.

I want to emphasize as vigorously as I may, first, the importance of a comprehensive plan of flood control, and, second, the effect permanent legislation on this subject would have upon the development of the country through which the Arkansas and Missouri Rivers and their major tributaries flow.

We have these great canals already dug, and we have the water flowing on unused to the Gulf. We of the West maintain that it is an economic crime to delay longer the utilization of these canals which nature gave to us and the water with which we are so bountifully blessed.

Of course, it is going to require the expenditure of a large sum of money. Let us not be afraid of the cost. If the money is honestly and efficiently expended, within a few years the development will be so great that we will be astonished that this great constructive improvement was not entered upon years before.

Here is a vast stretch of territory, producing some, of course, but its maximum production can not be realized without legislation along the lines which we have sought to indicate.

We want to reclaim the rich, fertile valleys of these rivers and their major tributaries for productive activities and encourage the farmers making permanent and lasting improvements to be assured that their life work is not going to be swept away by a devastating flood which may come at any time. We want reservoirs established and water impounded and the water gradually released for two purposes, for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions of the West and to maintain the gradual flow of the rivers to be used for navigation purposes. We want the banks reforested so as to protect them from erosion and to keep back the silt and sand from being poured forth into the bed of the streams and preventing navigation.

Great stretches along the main channels and their major tributaries have no protection against being destroyed by erosion. This legislation contemplates that. Again we insist that if these rivers were navigable years ago, that with the proper legislation extended over a period of years, with the assurance that adequate appropriations were to be continued, that these major streams, including the Arkansas, flowing through the State of Oklahoma, would be again made navigable and used for navigation purposes, as it was for a period of 75 years beginning in 1832. We believe that this would greatly aid in solving the question of freight rates. Few great cities are built away from water competition. We ought to have the courage to study this question and enact the proper legislation. We ought to have the vision to look into the future. The people of this Nation would regard the amount of money necessary to carry forward this plan as one of the best investments that the Federal Government ever made. For myself, I have always been a consistent and sincere advocate of the internal development of our great country. The Middle West and the West, and, in fact, the entire interior of our country in this respect has been too long neglected.

Let me again emphasize that the complaints against excessive freight rates will be solved if this comprehensive plan of flood control is enacted. It will bring factories to the interior of our country, along these streams and their tributaries, where cheap water power will be developed. The raw material grown in those sections will be woven into fabrics and utilized at home. It will stimulate the rapid growth and development of the cities and towns.

Let me close by repeating that if we have the courage and vision to enact this legislation to utilize the natural canals and water power, and reclaim these great areas, drained by these rivers and their tributaries, within a decade we will be wondering why those who have preceded had such a short-sighted policy as not to utilize it. If the countries of Europe and if the State of New York and other parts of our country can dig canals and divert the water into them and make them a commercial success, we insist that with the necessary legislation we should be able to use the great natural canals and the water flowing through them with which nature has already provided us. Inadequate appropriations are a waste and should be discouraged. Let us therefore not be afraid to provide all of the funds which may be necessary, safeguarded by legislation, in such a way as to insure that the money will be both efficiently and honestly expended.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have unanimous consent to go back to page 24 to offer an amendment. I offer the amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 24, after line 26, insert: "Bureau of Animal Industry. Inspection and quarantine: For an additional amount for inspection and quarantine work, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, $11,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just a brief explanation of this amendment. A great many small stockyards throughout the country are unable to get inspection, and as a result they are not able to ship their cattle. This $11,000 will enable them to get the inspection and will last until the 1st of July next. In the annual appropriation bill there is provision made for the future. This takes the place of $25,000 that we reported last year in the deficiency bill, which failed. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 2, line 24, in order to offer an amendment, which is very brief, and then I shall move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 2, after line 24, insert: "For folding speeches and pamphlets at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, fiscal year 1928, $4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to occupy a minute. Early this morning I promised the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that we would give the Democrats of the House the Hall at 4.30. I promised the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that we would probably finish the bill to-day, and I promised the gentlemen in favor of elevating the guns and other things that we would hear their case to-day. But we have had a great many gentlemen here who wanted to speak on different subjects, and it has taken more time than we anticipated. We can take this up to-morrow morning.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not know whether it would inconvenience anybody greatly, but can not we come in at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning?

[Cries of "No! no! no!"]

Mr. MADDEN. I think we can get this bill out of the way in an hour and a half to-morrow.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5800, the first deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereof.

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN M'DUFFIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by my colleague, Hon. JOHN MCDUFFIE, of Alabama, made yesterday before the National River and Harbor Congress in this city.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert a speech of Hon. JOHN MCDUFFIE, member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, before the Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, December 7, 1927, which is as follows:

INLAND WATERWAYS AND UNITED STATES ENGINEERS

Mr. MCDUFFIE. Mr. President, your highness the ambassador from Belgium, ladies, and gentlemen, standing before an audience of waterway advocates I do not presume to impart a great amount of special information nor to give extraordinary advice. It is a great privilege, however, to meet again with the membership of this organization, which for so many years, through its intelligent efforts, has rendered a distinct service to the Nation. Advocating no specific project but embracing a broad and comprehensive policy, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has played a significant part in educating the public mind to appreciate the value of our inland waterways, not only as commerce carriers but for the stimulation of industrial development, the multiplication of taxable values, and for national defense. Despite the time-worn cry of "pork barrel" attending legislation for the improvement of rivers and harbors of the country; despite selfish efforts to discredit the economic value of our rivers, canals, and connecting waterways, the people of America are more interested in their development to-day than ever before in the Nation's history.

The waterway enthusiasts of the country, amongst whom I count myself, are glad to believe that we have arrived at those conditions in the great scheme of transportation envisaged some 15 years ago by the great empire builder, the late James J. Hill, who with prophetic vision saw and predicted the use of our inland waterways to relieve rail congestion. The inland waterways faded from the transportation picture immediately following the great era of railway construction, but to-day are vividly reappearing. The importance of their development have so impressed the country that we find men in high places, from the President on down, rallying to their support. Mr. Hoover, within the recent past, has said, "If we were to make a survey of the opportunities that lie before us of possible physical progress in our Nation, the development of our inland waterways would stand in the forefront." And Mr. Coolidge himself, who can not be charged with wasteful ideas in public expenditures, with his characteristic New England thrift and economy, has said that "such works are productive of wealth and in the long run tend to a reduction of the tax burden."

In the light of apparent enthusiasm on the part of nearly every one clothed with responsibility in national affairs, it would seem the Government, with all of its vast wealth of more than $300,000,000,000, with a national indebtedness, small and rapidly decreasing, should not hesitate now to appropriate funds sufficient to complete the task of providing immediately a great trunk-line waterway system, treating it as a whole; a great river and connecting canal system throughout the United States, with adequate and standardized depth, in order to meet the public necessity and convenience in the quick dispatch and orderly movement of a rapidly increasing commerce, not only between the various States of the Union, but a tonnage destined for all the busy markets of the world.

It is encouraging to know that executives of great industrial enterprises, those who are manufacturing for world markets such heavy commodities as steel and iron, as well as those engaged in fuel production and in the production of other bulk commodities are already planning for the utilization of a waterway system, using standardized equipment, on which a barge of steel may be loaded at Pittsburgh or Birmingham and unloaded at Mobile, Chicago, New Orleans, Houston, or Corpus Christi, or even at the ports on the Atlantic seaboard, without breaking cargo. The same plans apply to the movement of construction material, grain, cotton, coal, oil, sulphur, and other basic commodities.

The question of cheap transportation will always loom larger than any other to the producer and consumer of the United States. The era of railway construction has passed. It has been authoritatively stated that in the year 1925 approximately 600 miles of rail lines were abandoned in the United States, probably due to the coming of the cement highway and the motor vehicle. Experts advise that the tonnage of the country doubles itself every 12 to 14 years. The Secretary of Commerce stated before the Rivers and Harbors Committee last year that the ton mileage of the rail lines has trebled within the last 30 years. We can reasonably be assured that our population will increase 40,000,000 within the next quarter of a century, and our tonnage will be multiplied many times. Assuming that these statements are correct it follows that we can no longer refuse to meet our waterway problems in a big and businesslike way and complete the job at once, if producer and consumer in America are to have and enjoy the use and benefits of the great God-given arteries of commerce. When the water lines are completed our next step is to see that they are properly coordinated with our railways and highways.

I am not one of those who may have illusions as to the attitude of the rail lines to the speedy development and establishment of the waterways. I am not one of those who would destroy successful operation of the railways in America. I have always felt that among the outstanding figures in the history of this country should be placed the names of such empire builders as Hill, Huntington, Flagler, Stanford, and Plant. Our main-line railroads are to the continuing growth and development of this Nation what the arteries are to the life and growth of the human body. A few of our rail lines have shown some disposition to cooperate with the waterways, but as Commissioner Taylor, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, very aptly said some years ago, "it is as natural for the rail to fight the water as it is for a dog to chase a cat." Until the dawn of that day when the railroads believe themselves wholly incapable of handling the Nation's tonnage, we can not expect them to embrace or welcome into the picture such keen and effective competition already developing and such as will continue to develop on the trunk-line waterways of the country. When these water lines are completed, as must inevitably be done, if our railroads still refuse to cooperate and coordinate the two services for the public good then it is encumbent upon the Congress to force such coordination, if possible, by appropriate and affirmative legislation.

Despite the niggardly, stinting, and, at times, inexcusable manner in which the Congress has treated the problem of developing our rivers and harbors, regardless of those who declare that transportation upon our rivers is a failure, even in their unfinished condition, we moved over the rivers, canals, and connecting channels during the year 1925, 204,-

569,000 tons, valued at approximately $4,000,000,000, while our harbors lifted in round figures 432,000,000 tons of the value of approximately $23,000,000,000. The Mississippi River and its tributaries carried 57,000,000 tons valued at a billion dollars, the Monongahela 24,000,000 tons, and the Tombigbee-Warrior system a million and a half tons, while the Sacramento, on the west coast, carried a vast amount, one and a half million tons of first class and much perishable tonnage with an unusually high value. All this tonnage of great value was moved at a saving many times the amount annually appropriated by Congress for maintenance and new work on all the rivers and harbors of the Nation.

In the face of such a showing, those of us interested in waterway development have a right to complain at the failure of Congress to discharge its responsibilities by refusing adequate appropriation for this purpose. Last year the sum total appropriated for the expenses of all governmental activities amounted to some four billions of dollars, and of this amount 1¼ per cent was expended on the waterways of the country. Two-thirds of the appropriations necessary to maintain the Navy Department for one year would probably complete all existing projects. Of course, we must maintain a Navy, and I believe in a Navy as large as any other navy of the world. I would not subtract from the funds necessary for other departments of the Government, which must be maintained in keeping with high standards of service, but the Congress should respond more readily in the future than it has in the past to bring about the speedy development and early completion of our river system as a whole.

We recall that the Government turned to its waterways in times of war for relief of the rail lines. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to say that river and harbor development is an integral part of our national defense. I take it that no thinking, intelligent citizen denies the necessity for the maintenance of a modern, well-equipped merchant marine. The development of our waterways is complementary and correlated with the development of a merchant marine which the people of America are demanding, a merchant fleet operated at least for the immediate future by the Government, in order to properly establish and maintain trade routes to all the markets of the world for the products of our fields and factories.

Many of our inland waterways are capable of producing untold national wealth in the generation of hydroelectric power. In the past we have developed navigation without regard to power, but within recent years we know that the same water that floats the commerce of the country on many of our navigable streams can be utilized to turn countless wheels of industry. We have just entered the electrical age. To-day approximately 60 per cent of the wheels of all the industries of the country are turned by electricity.

No one denies the coming of the day when we will need every horsepower possible to be developed on our water courses. Who knows what the potential water power of the Nation is? Various guesses have been made by Government agencies. It was estimated that on the Tennessee River there was a possible development of 1,900,000 horsepower and probably 28 dam sites. A few years ago the Congress authorized a detailed study and survey of that wonderful stream. The district engineer in charge testified before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors last year that he had found 58 dam sites and more than 3,000,000 horsepower possible to be developed outside of Muscle Shoals. Similar instances might be cited where such a survey would reveal enormous potential power. The last Congress authorized and directed the Secretary of War, through the Corps of Engineers, to make surveys of all the navigable streams and their tributaries throughout the country with a view of determining the possible power development, the control of flood hazards and the improvement of navigation, at an estimated cost of approximately $7,000,000, and this work should begin at once. This act of Congress has met with the approval of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Mississippi Valley Association, the Intracoastal Canal Association, and other organizations, as well as individuals, who appreciate the fact that in the development of our navigable streams we should see to it that wherever water power development appears feasible, every stream should be so developed as to produce the maximum of its power possibilities. Let it be understood that we do not urge the Government to embark in the business of power development on our navigable streams. It is the province of the Government, however, to take stock, as it were, in making these surveys by the Corps of Engineers, the duly constituted authority to deal with this problem, and see that dam sites are planted on streams in such a manner as to develop the maximum power of the stream as a unit or a whole. May I express the hope that this organization will lend its indorsement to this act of Congress for the conservation of the Nation's power resources and give expression of its views to the country by appropriate resolutions.

The proprieties of this occasion will certainly not be violated by directing your attention to the renewed activities of those interests and individuals who by legislative enactment would destroy the jurisdiction and functions of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army in their relation to river and harbor development. H. R. 17250 of the Sixty-ninth Congress proposed to create a department of public works and domain, supplanting the Interior Department and transferring to the new department the Bureau of Roads, the Office of the Supervising Architect, the road commissioners of Alaska, and Office of Public Buildings and Parks of the Capital, the Inland Waterways Corporation, and the river and harbor improvement, including the board of engineers, the duties of the Chief of Engineers and all other engineering construction work, including all jurisdiction in respect to navigable waters. Under the guise of simplifying and coordinating the functions of the Federal Government in its public works, the proponents of this measure, which I am glad to say has not yet received serious consideration on the part of any committee of Congress, would destroy the usefulness as well as the important peace-time functions of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. As an organization the United States Engineers have a record of more than a century of real service, unrivaled and unexcelled by any other one of the countless boards, bureaus, or commissions maintained at the expense of the Public Treasury. Far removed from politics, with no selfish ambitions to serve, striving at all times to reach a goal of patriotic service well performed, answerable only to their conscience and the flag of their country, both in peace and war the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has written a record of service and achievement of which the American people are justly proud.

The American Government has already drifted rapidly into a vast bureaucracy. Many people are justly alarmed over the top-heavy system of Government we are building up by the creation of hundreds of bureaus, boards, and commissions. And yet there are those who would intensify the situation by the creation of additional governmental agencies to be clothed with more authority and less responsibility. The establishment of a department in accordance with the terms of the bill would not improve the service to be performed by the United States Engineer, but would handicap and destroy his efficiency. In the name of economy it would serve only to add to the taxpayers' burden. Instead of being removed from political consideration as it is to-day, the Engineer Corps, with all of its high duties and patriotic purposes, would be plunged into a whirlpool of partisan politics. Instead of men selected in their youth because of their mental, physical, and moral qualifications from the top of their classes at the West Point Military Academy and other first-class colleges of technology throughout the country, we might have, under the terms of this bill, a personnel to supervise and direct our river and harbor development, selected to meet the will or political whims and inclinations of an assistant secretary of the department of public works and domain. Many reforms are doubtless necessary in the various functions of the Federal Government, but they are needed less, if at all, in our plans for the selection of men to deal with our waterway problems than anywhere else in the entire governmental structure. No organization ever existed that was more zealous in maintaining the good name, the integrity, the efficiency, and fidelity of its membership than the Corps of Engineers. No branch of the Army service is more important in times of war than the Corps of Engineers. No training during peace times is more advantageous than the practical experience of supervising a work involving the mastery and control of our great rivers, the building of railroads and bridges, the digging of canals and great harbors. Regardless of the honesty of purpose of those who advocate such a measure, they are not only striking a blow at our national defense but would add to the cost of Government and the taxpayers' burden. Congress, as well as this organization, should frown upon any movement that might endanger the efficiency and high character of the service performed by the Corps of Engineers. Of course mistakes have been made, and I do not claim that the Engineer Corps has a monopoly on the engineering brains and integrity of the Nation. There are hundreds and thousands of men of the highest type engaged in civilian engineering, yet I challenge all records everywhere to find a better type of men, taken as a whole, than those composing the Engineer Corps of the United States Army.

In the Sixty-ninth Congress there were presented many so-called relief measures. In a Government like ours we have always had, and will continue to have, great organizations and class interests and sometimes selfish interests, constantly knocking at the doors of Congress, under the guise of patriotic motives, clamoring for the enactment of legislation designed to confer special favors and extraordinary privileges. In a Nation claimed to be the wealthiest on earth the demands for relief of various kinds were never so numerous. Despite our vast wealth, everybody seemed to need some sort of relief. There were proposals for farm relief, coal relief, and oil relief. Regardless of the fact that the contractors of America do approximately 99 per cent of the public construction and probably 60 per cent to 75 per cent of the construction paid for by the Public Treasury, we had another interesting proposal which might have been properly styled "A bill for the contractors' relief." The President very aptly said in a recent address: "Those who laid the foundations here for the greatest government in the world tried to see how much they could put into it, while to-day many people are trying to find out how much they can get out of it."

The Campbell bill was sponsored by the Association of General Contractors of America, with representatives in 45 States—I do not know why there are three States missing—under the management of a very genial and distinguished gentleman, Gen. R. C. Marshall, a high officer

of the United States Army during the World War. This bill had serious consideration by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and after being very materially changed was reported to the House. Accompanying the report of the committee was a minority report presented by my colleague from Alabama, Congressman BOWLING, and signed by Congressmen TILLMAN, of Arkansas, and WEAVER, of North Carolina. I commend to your careful reading the very sound views in this minority report showing the dangers of such legislation.

While the bill is apparently drawn to affect the expenditures of funds of all construction work of the Federal Government, the hearings disclosed that the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army were the chief offenders in the eyes of the Associated General Contractors of America. It is estimated that approximately $2,000,000,000 are expended throughout the whole country for public construction by the States and the Federal Government. Since more than half the work supervised by the Corps of Engineers is done by contract, the fact is they expend by the use of day labor directly through the Government agency itself a sum of money that is hardly more than 1 per cent of the sum expended for all public construction. And yet a casual reading of the hearings would lead one to believe that the work of the engineers is destructive of sound governmental policies and that the United States engineer, more than anyone else, is encouraging and committing the Government to a policy of bringing the Public Treasury into competition with private enterprise.

It is not my purpose to impugn the motives of anyone. Belonging to that school of thought which believes the Government should not destroy initiative and individual enterprise by competing with private capital in any business, I can appreciate the attitude of those who are honestly urging the enactment of legislation seeking to restrain the strong arm of the Government, as much as possible, from using its own agencies and equipment with the hire of day labor in the field of public construction. It is difficult, however, if we are to proceed with due care for the purse strings of the Treasury, to say where the line shall be drawn. Doubtless many good citizens believe in the principles underlying the Campbell bill, but under the terms of that bill as originally presented the way was open for the contractors to fix their own prices for doing approximately 90 per cent of all the construction work of the Federal Government. To make assurance doubly sure and to tie the hands of the Government so that it could not come back into the field without a vast expenditure of public money, one section of the bill provided that the equipment now owned by the Government, valued at some fifty-five or sixty millions of dollars, should be turned over to the contractors at a reasonable rental, and the surplus equipment not so leased should be sold through competitive bidding. As a matter of fact, this provision was carried in the amended bill as reported from the committee. Another section of the bill provided that anyone who violated any provision of the act should be summarily removed from office. Of the 22 persons appearing in favor of the bill, 20 were contractors, 1 was a Member of the House, and 1 more whose interest did not appear in the hearings.

It is readily seen, therefore, that the public generally was not aroused in seeking the passage of such legislation. On the other hand, if the public generally understood the effect of such legislation there would have been in addition to the strong opposition from the Navy Department, the War Department, the Department of the Interior, and Members of both Houses of Congress many protests from every section of the country. Complaint was made by proponents of the measure of the fact that the Government had invested a large sum in equipment. In the first place there is no desire on the part of the Corps of Engineers to increase its equipment beyond the amount absolutely necessary to properly carry out its functions. In the second place there are certain types of work done by the Engineers in which contractors are not interested and on which they do not care to bid. In the third place the Engineer Corps must always be prepared for emergencies. It would be folly to say that when a levee breaks or a dam gives way or a channel is filled by silt or wreck to require advertising and to await the offering of bids to take care of such an emergency while navigation must be impeded and probably life and property destroyed. Let me remind you that many a man, woman, and child is living to-day to tell the tale of the Mississippi flood by reason of the fact that assistance in the way of equipment and provisions and life-saving devices were provided by the Engineer Corps of the United States Army. Surely the human lives saved through the agencies of the Engineer Corps are worth more than the money invested in all their equipment. It is refreshing to know that the people of the country, best advised about the Mississippi River and its flood hazards, seem willing to turn to the Corps of Engineers to find the best methods of preventing a recurrence of such a disaster on the Mississippi River.

Again, if we follow out the theory of the proponents of the Campbell bill to its conclusion, why not let a contract for many of the functions now performed by the Coast Guard; why not let by contract the care of the disabled ex-service men in the hospitals of the Veterans' Bureau; or why not let by contract the care of those afflicted by mental diseases at St. Elizabeths Hospital? Why not let a contract for the Lighthouse Service or the operation of our marine hospitals throughout the country, or our quarantine stations? There are certain functions of a great Government like ours which must be performed through Government agencies themselves. This holds true in much of the work now being done through the Corps of Engineers. There is no marked increase in the amount of work done by hired labor, nor is there likely to be. As a matter of fact much equipment authorized by the Congress to be purchased by the Corps of Engineers was never purchased because of their efforts not to compete with private enterprise and in an effort to conserve the public funds. If the limitations of this hour permitted, instances might be cited wherein it was impossible to let river and harbor work by contract. In some instances there were no bidders, while in other instances the records show that the bids from all sources were so high it was impossible to have the work done by contract. In the last analysis there exists no need for the Campbell bill even though I understand its proponents will renew their activities in the present Congress. Legislation adequate to protect the principle advocated by the proponents of this bill is already written into law. Therefore let us not handicap the work which is so important to the Nation's commerce and to its progress and development, as well as to its national defense, by the passage of legislation which, regardless of the motives of those behind it, will create a condition under which those common elements of human nature will inevitably come into play, bringing about the possibility of a general understanding amongst the general contractors of the country, who could absolutely fix the price to be paid from the Public Treasury for all of its public construction. Instead of such legislation let us appropriate sufficient funds and place them in the hands of the Corps of Engineers so that they may quickly complete for this Nation the most magnificent system of inland waterways in all the world.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to change the reference of the bill (H. R. 48) to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes, from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on the Library. Both chairmen have consented to the change.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What is that bill?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on the Library had hearings on it last session.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the Chair thinks it properly belongs to the Committee on the Library?

The SPEAKER. It does.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill (H. R. 44) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with air nitrate corporations and American Cyanamide Co., and for other purposes, was erroneously referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. As it deals with Muscle Shoals, it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 9, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

163. A letter from the office of the Attorney General, transmitting statement of the expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures.

164. A letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting report showing in detail all travel from Washington performed by officers and employees of the Tariff Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

165. A letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting report showing the exchange of typewriters and calculating machines by the Tariff Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

166. A letter from the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, transmitting report showing typewriters, adding machines, etc., exchanged by this office for new equipment during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

167. A letter from the secretary of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, transmitting statement showing the names of officers of the Federal Board for Vocational Education who traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

168. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting statement showing expense for travel of officials and employees of the Civil Service Commission from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

169. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill proposing to authorize the payment of indemnity in the amount of $500 to Victoria Mesa, of Cavite, P. I., for the death of her husband, Lucio Lupisan, in Manila Bay, April 8, 1921; to the Committee on Claims.

170. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of the summary of labor-saving machines exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

171. A letter from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting carbon copy of a letter dated November 26, 1927, addressed to the Librarian, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., also a photostat copy of the reply thereto, dated December 1, 1927; these letters refer to certain records now in storage in the United States Veterans' Bureau, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

172. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement of the Federal Power Commission showing in detail permits and licenses issued under the authority of the Federal water power act during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

173. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend paragraph 1 of section 22 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, by providing for the carrying of officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services while on leave of absence or furlough at own expenses at reduced rates"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

174. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting data relative to exchange of typewriters and adding machines in part payment for new machines for the same purpose as those exchanged, by the Panama Canal, for the period July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

175. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports of the Quartermaster General, the Chief of Engineers, the Chief Signal Officer, the United States Military Academy, and the War Department supply division, of typewriters, adding machines, and similar labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, as part payment for new labor-saving devices purchased; to the Committee on Appropriations.

176. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting detailed report from The Adjutant General of the Army, dated November 28, 1927, showing the distribution of Government publications pertaining to the War Department made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

177. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting annual report of an inspection of the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, by Col. R. C. Humber, Inspector General's department; to the Committee on Expenditures.

178. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report by the Director of the Geological Survey, with a statement showing the amount expended from the appropriation "Mineral leasing, 1927, Geological Survey," for the benefit of Indian tribes and Indian allottees; to the Committee on Expenditures.

179. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of The Adjutant General, United States Army, of his administration of section 307 of the World War veterans' adjusted compensation act so far as it pertains to the War Department (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Expenditures and ordered to be printed.

180. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement of all expenditures under the appropriation of $150,000 made for the encouragement of breeding and full particulars of means adopted and carried into effect for the encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the military service; to the Committee on Expenditures.

181. A letter from the Director of the Public Buildings and Public Parks, transmitting report showing revocable licenses, concessions, and permits for the use of public property in the District of Columbia entered into by this office during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

182. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the accumulation of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

183. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report covering publications issued by the War Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

184. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, covering statements of the cost of manufacture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, at the armory and arsenals therein named; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

185. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to relieve James O. Williams, former special disbursing agent of the Bureau of the Census, in the settlement of his account; to the Committee on Claims.

186. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting 489 reports of inspections of disbursements made by officers of the Army, which inspections were made by the Inspector General's Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

187. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting statement showing the names of persons under the appropriation "Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry, 1927," their salaries and places of employment, together with contingent expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

188. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, in the sum of $4,000, for the fiscal year 1928; to the Committee on Appropriations.

189. A letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting copy of the Seventeenth Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America, for the year 1926 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 44) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with Air Nitrates Corporation and American Cyanamid Co., and for other purposes; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 48) to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (H. R. 3894) for the relief of Charles Palmer Cornwell; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Mamie Lewis; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3980) granting a pension to David D. Woods; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3127) granting a pension to Rachel W. T. Kuntzelman; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4436) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Healy; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 6460) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6461) for the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 6462) to provide additional leave of absence to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 6463) to authorize the construction of a highway bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 6464) to restrict and limit the fares charged by street-railway companies in the District of Columbia to the maximum authorized in their charters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 6465) to amend the immigration act of 1924 by making the quota provisions thereof applicable to Mexico, Cuba, Canada, and the countries of continental America and adjacent islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 6466) granting a part of the Federal building site at Phoenix, Ariz., to the city of Phoenix for street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 6467) providing for the loan of the U. S. S. *Despatch* to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 6468) to authorize payments in advance for subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and for certain expenses of military attachés; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6469) to authorize the erection of monuments or memorials to commemorate the encampments of Spanish War organizations at Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6470) to amend section 127a, national defense act, authorizing Engineer officers to attend civil technical institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6471) to regulate the use of motor-propelled vehicles of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6472) to authorize appropriations for the contingencies of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6473) to amend an act of Congress approved July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Federal District Court for the Western Division of the Western District of Tennessee to hear and determine claims arising from the sinking of the vessel known as the *Norman;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 6474) for the relief of taxpayers having suits against Juan G. Gallardo, treasurer of Porto Rico, for the purposes of restraining the assessment or collection of taxes imposed by the laws of Porto Rico, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and in the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico affected by the act of March 4, 1927, amending the act of March 2, 1917, as amended by the act of June 7, 1924; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6475) to provide for patents on reclamation entries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 6476) granting the consent of Congress to Wabasha Bridge Committee, Wabasha, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Wabasha, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 6477) to repeal the estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) to abolish the 80 per cent estate tax credit contained in section 301 of the revenue act of 1926; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 6479) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 6480) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) to authorize construction of utilities for the storage of explosive ammunition at Fort Shafter, Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6482) to authorize the moving of explosive ammunition in Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6483) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6484) providing for a mine rescue station at Terre Haute, Ind.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6485) to provide for the naturalization of aliens in the employ of the Federal and Insular Governments; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 6486) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 6487) granting the consent of Congress to the Baton Rouge-Mississippi River Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 6488) further amending an act of March 4, 1925, as amended April 6, 1926, to provide for the relief of employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6489) to repeal the act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 6490) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6491) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 6492) to authorize the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, S. C., a certain bronze cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 6493) to repeal the law prohibiting the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6494) to reduce night work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6495) to authorize persons connected with the military forces of the United States to accept decorations and gifts from foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 6496) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Oklahoma with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Cimarron River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6497) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Texas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian or Red Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6498) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Colorado with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Arizona with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Gila and San Francisco Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6500) to provide for the enlargement of the present public building at Raton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Deming, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection thereon of a public building at Silver City, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Tucumcari, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Alamogordo, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 6505) to provide a shorter work day on Saturday for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6506) to reduce night work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6507) to permit rural letter carriers to act as agents or solicitors or engage in any other gainful occupation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 6508) for the disposition of unappropriated and unsurveyed public lands in meandered areas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 6509) to provide overtime pay for employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6510) to amend an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 6511) to protect labor in its old age; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6512) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6513) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6514) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6515) providing for the meeting of electors of President and Vice President and for the issuance and transmission of the certificates of their selection and of the result of their determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6516) to reimburse the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for expenses incurred in protecting bridges on main railroad lines and under direction of the commanding general Eastern Department, United States Army, and the commandant navy yard, Charlestown, Mass.; to the Committee of War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6517) to reimburse the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for expenses incurred in compliance with the request of the United States marshal, dated December 6, 1917, to the Governor of Massachusetts, in furnishing the State military forces for duty on and around Boston Harbor under regulation 13 of the President's proclamation; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 6518) to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of the civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6519) an act adding a new section to the La Follette Act of March 4, 1915, chapter 153, to be known as section 14a, providing side ladders for vessels, and penalty for failure to carry equipment; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 6520) to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, as warrant officers, United States Army," approved April 27, 1926, Public, No. 153, Sixty-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6521) to equalize the base pay of the enlisted men of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6522) to equalize the base pay of enlisted men of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6523) to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6524) to equalize the pay status of certain officers of the Army with corresponding officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 6525) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Houtzdale, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6526) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Kane, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6527) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Philipsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6528) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bellefonte, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clearfield, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FURLOW: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) creating a commission to study proposals for a national system of express highways; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to appoint a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the need for a new Federal building in New York City; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIROVICH: Resolution (H. Res. 49) to investigate certain charges and documents published in newspapers conducted by William Randolph Hearst; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, requesting that the War Department be authorized to expend Federal money for flood-control purposes in the Illinois River Valley along the lines followed by the Mississippi Commission on the lower Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DRANE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, regarding the starting of the vast Muscle Shoals plant to its intended work; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting the Congress of the United States to erect a suitable bronze tablet upon the grave of W. P. Duval, first Territorial governor of Florida, during the years 1822–1834; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, urging Congress to amend the income tax law of the United States to the end that a substantial reduction of the tax on incomes be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, urging liberal appropriations by Congress to prevent the crippling or handicapping of the National Guard and Organized Reserves in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will properly regulate the importation of immature fruit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 6530) granting a pension to Matilda Klopping; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting a pension to Emil August Eggers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6532) for the relief of Florence Herben; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 6533) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to Marion E. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to Ivea R. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) granting an increase of pension to Mary Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Converse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 6538) to reimburse Lieut. Col. Charles F. Sargent; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 6539) granting a pension to William H. Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 6540) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Salsbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 6541) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) granting an increase of pension to Carrie C. Stilwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6543) granting a pension to Isadora Mauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6544) to correct the military record of Clayton R. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6545) for the relief of B. I. Salinger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 6546) granting a pension to Reuben Hadden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Sellers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6548) for the relief of William A. Light; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6549) for the relief of Lewis W. Crain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6550) for the relief of Jesse A. Frost; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6551) for the relief of H. A. Griffeth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 6552) granting an increase of pension to Sarah H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6553) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6554) granting a pension to Eliza J. Rank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6555) granting an increase of pension to Maryette Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 6556) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6557) granting a pension to Theodore G. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 6558) granting a pension to Eleanor B. Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 6559) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Castle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6560) granting a pension to Ervin G. Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6561) granting an increase of pension to Harriette Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 6562) for the relief of Joseph Faneuf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6563) granting a pension to Oscar W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6564) to correct the military record of Charles B. Harrison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 6565) granting a pension to William Hinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6566) for the relief of Charles O. Schilling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) granting a pension to Ada S. Ostronder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6568) granting a pension to Sarah Hager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6569) for the relief of Frank Hartman; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) granting an increase of pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 6571) granting a pension to Emma Short; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6572) for the relief of J. F. Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6573) for the relief of the heirs of William Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 6574) granting a pension to Ida Heid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6575) granting a pension to Dora Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6576) granting a pension to Dora Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Eulalah Block; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6578) granting a pension to Anna Habich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6579) for the relief of James W. Kingon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) granting an increase of pension to Edward Dzengolewski; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Clevenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Ann Bottom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) granting an increase of pension to Otto Kuehn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) granting an increase of pension to Helena Hasenstab; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) granting an increase of pension to Sophiah H. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6587) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla Storms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6588) granting an increase of pension to Zella B. Redding; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6589) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Royer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6590) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Baldwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6591) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) for the relief of Charles H. Fullerton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting a pension to Harold A. Canon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 6594) granting a pension to Harrison H. Bradford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6595) for the relief of Mrs. Robert G. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) for the relief of Richard Collum Wiesting; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 6597) granting an increase of pension to Louisa F. Leaming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 6598) granting a pension to John Woldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6599) for the relief of Kate Canniff; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 6600) granting an increase of pension to Lillie S. Armstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6601) granting a pension to Clark Wyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 6602) for the relief of J. B. Elliott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) for the relief of Joe Griffith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6604) for the relief of J. R. Haymes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting a pension to Nannie R. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 6606) granting a pension to Mary A. Schwyhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6607) granting an increase of pension to Annie H. Hooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6608) granting an increase of pension to Mabel Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 6609) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Bolser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6610) granting an increase of pension to Isabell Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) for the relief of Irvin Leonard Garver; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 6613) for the relief of T. J. Hillman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6614) for the relief of Renaut heirs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6615) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6616) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Barcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting a pension to Julia Varney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of the estate of William Bardel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 6620) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Vanhoose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6621) for the relief of J. Edward Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6622) for the relief of Isaac Fink; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6623) for the relief of Albert A. Inman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) for the relief of Harry Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 6625) granting an increase of pension to Annie Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6626) for the relief of Albert Power; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6627) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6628) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Sheets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hertzinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 6632) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 6633) for the relief of J. K. Johansen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 6634) to authorize the appointment of Trumpeter Sol Black, retired, to the grade of first sergeant, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6635) granting an increase of pension to Temperance Whittman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6636) granting an increase of pension to Ella Koffisch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

79. Petition of the Ramapo Council, No. 51, Junior Order United American Mechanics, demanding the registration of all aliens in the United States to ascertain the number of illegally and unlawfully here, and the passage of an alien deportation law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

80. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of department of mines and mining, Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, relating to the mining industry in the State of California; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

81. Also, declaration of principles of Central Chamber of Agriculture and Commerce, at El Paso conference, relating to Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

82. Also, resolution of the Tri-Counties Reforestation Committee, Riverside, Calif., relating to the establishment and operation of forest experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

83. Also, resolution of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, relative to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

84. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of St. Brendan Society of Boston, Mass., Michael R. Murphy, secretary, 91 Marcella Street, Roxbury, Mass., protesting against enactment into law of section 11 (a. b.) known as the national origins clause of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

85. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of residents of Christiana, Lancaster County, Pa., advocating enactment by Congress of Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

86. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of pastors representing the Scandinavian people, regarding the immigration bill now before Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

87. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution of the Christian Men's Club, of Tacoma, Wash., urging investigation of a report that one Moukthar Bey, ambassador of the Turkish Government to the United States, was officially responsible for the murder by the Turks of 30,000 Armenian Christians; to the Committee on Foreign Affars.

88. Also, resolutions of the Park Avenue Improvement Club, the Federation of Improvement Clubs, Carpenters' Union No. 470, the Oakland Improvement Club, the East Seventy-second Street Improvement Club, the Manitou Improvement Club, and the West End Improvement Club, all of Tacoma, Wash., and the Thurston County Pomona Grange, No. 8, of Olympia, Wash., urging continuance of present tax rates and application of surplus tax collections to extinguishment of the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

89. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution adopted by the American Legion, department of New York, at its ninth annual convention, held at Troy, N. Y., on August 4, 5, and 6, 1927, urging upon Congress such adequate appropriations and measures as shall be sufficient to provide for the future adequate protection against a repetition of the recent disastrous floods and to provide for the relief and rehabilitation of the people and areas affected, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

90. Also, resolution adopted by the American Legion, department of New York, at its ninth annual convention, held at Troy, N. Y., on August 4, 5, and 6, 1927, to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War so as to place them on the same footing as to retirement as the other eight classes of disabled officers who are now in the retired lists, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

91. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition by sundry citizens of Minneapolis, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

92. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Central Chamber of Commerce of Agriculture and Commerce of Phoenix, Ariz., opposing the enactment of any law placing Mexico in the immigration quota; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

93. By Mr. SMITH: Memorial requesting legislation providing for the resumption of operations of the Muscle Shoals plant in Alabama to produce cheap nitrates for agricultural and national defense purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

94. Also, memorial of the State of Florida, requesting the establishment of aviation training camps on present Government fields in De Soto County, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

95. Also, senate concurrent resolution, State of Florida, expressing opposition to the Federal inheritance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

96. Also, memorial of the State of Florida, requesting legislation looking to the investigation and survey of a 9-mile sea-level water route across the State of Florida to be opened within the near future, to disclose the feasibility of its being taken over by the Federal Government for improvement, operation, and maintenance; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, *December 9, 1927*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 6, 1927)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

REPORT OF BOARD OF MEDIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Board of Mediation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of the board, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the vice chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of the commission, covering the period from March 15, 1927, to June 30, 1927, inclusive, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF BELLEAU WOOD MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Belleau Wood Memorial Association, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of said association for the year ended December 31, 1926, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities

of the said institute for the year ended December 31, 1926, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the said organization for the year ended December 31, 1926, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of travel performed by officers and employees of the board on official business during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TRAVEL EXPENSES OF BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary and chief clerk of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the names of officers of that board who traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1927, their destinations and business or work on account of which travel was made, and the total expense to the United States in each case, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the commission for the year ended December 31, 1926, and other information relative to the regulation and operation of public utilities in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of said commission, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRAVEL EXPENSES, BOTANIC GARDEN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Botanic Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of travel performed by employees of the Botanic Garden from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the exchanges of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, in part payment for new machines, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PARKS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate three communications from the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

A report showing revocable licenses, concessions, and permits for the use of public property in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A report of travel performed by employees of said office from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report showing the exchange of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices for new equipment, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two communications from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

A report showing in detail the travel of officers and employees of the Library of Congress on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropirations; and

A report showing the aggregate number of publications issued by the Library of Congress during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, together with their cost and the number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the number of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged by the commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNUAL REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of said commission for the year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF DIRECTOR OF THE VETERANS' BUREAU

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain communications from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

The annual report of the director of the bureau for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A statement of receipts and expenditures for vocational rehabilitation, Veterans' Bureau special fund, created by the war veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on Finance.

A report of expenses incurred by officers and employees of the bureau in traveling on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report showing the number of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A report showing the paper and printing cost and the total cost of all publications issued by the bureau during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers on the files of the bureau which are not needed in the transaction of the current business of the bureau, and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SIMMONS members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain communications from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

A report of the number of publications received and distributed by the General Accounting Office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, together with the cost thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

A report showing the number of typewriters, bookkeeping machines, and calculating machines exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927;

A report showing in detail the traveling expenses of certain officers and employees of the General Accounting Office on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, with recommendations for certain legislation calculated to effect greater economy and efficiency in public expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers in the files of the General Accounting Office which are not needed in the transaction of the current business of the bureau and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. WARREN and Mr. OVERMAN members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the annual report of the commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two communications from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

A report showing the sales of condemned property and waste paper, and the proceeds therefrom, since December 6, 1926; and

A report of all property in his possession and in the Senate Office Building on December 1, 1927, belonging to the United States Senate.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two communications from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

A report of receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report of all property belonging to the United States in his possession on December 5, 1927.

CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS FOR THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, transmitting, pursuant to law, a manuscript of the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain communications from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

The annual report of the said commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927;

A report showing the final valuation of properties of the Tonopah & Tidewater R. R. Co. and certain other carriers subject to the interstate commerce act; and

A report showing the employment under the appropriation for the valuation of carriers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, the names of all persons employed, the State from which each was appointed, compensation of each, and how the moneys appropriated for the fiscal years 1913 to 1927 have been expended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A report showing travel expenses of certain officers and employees of the said commission on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report showing the make, model, and serial number of each typewriting, etc., machine exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, in part payment for new machines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain communications from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

The annual report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927;

A report of expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Customs Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927;

A report showing suits arising under public vessels act in which final decrees were entered, exclusive of cases on appeal; and

A report showing suits arising under act of March 9, 1920, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty involving merchant vessels, in which final decrees were entered against the United States, exclusive of cases on appeal and club cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of a proposed bill for the relief of A. N. Ross, disbursing clerk of the commission, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the number of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged by the commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Federal Trade Commission, in response to Senate Resolution 304 (69th Cong.), agreed to December 22, 1926; together with a report of the commission on stock dividends; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, statements and reports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, as follows:

A report of the surgeon in chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, showing the expenditures of the said institution for professional and other services;

A report of the surgeon in chief of the Freedmen's Hospital, showing the receipts and expenditures of the said institution on account of pay patients; and

A report from the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, showing receipts and expenditures of the said institution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A report showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects compiled to the end of June 30, 1927;

A report of expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry among Indians of the various reservations from the appropriation "Industry among Indians, 1927";

A report of expenditures from the appropriation "Indian schools, support, 1927," together with a statement that no part of the said appropriation was used in the construction or repair of schoolhouses;

A report of expenditures at each Indian school and agency from the appropriation for the construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings;

A statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service from the appropriation "Industrial work and care of timber, 1927";

A report of expenditures from the $100,000 authorized from the funds of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians;

A report of expenditures made for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont.;

A statement of expenditures during the fiscal year for the construction of hospitals from the appropriation "Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1927";

A statement of expenditures of money carried on the books of the Interior Department under the caption "Indians moneys, proceeds of labor";

A report of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota;

A report of expenses made for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians on the Tongue River Indian Reservation, Mont.";

A report of expenditures made from the tribal funds of the Confederated Bands of Utes;

A statement of the cost of all survey and allotment work on Indian reservations;

A report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service;

A report of all moneys collected and deposited under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1927";

A report of expenditures made from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians;

A report of the Director of the Geological Survey, showing expenditures made under the act of May 10, 1926, for the benefit of any Indian tribe or allottee in connection with the administration of the laws of the operation of oil and gas leases and the mining of minerals on Indian lands; and

A report from the acting district superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, showing expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, from the appropriations "For the support and civilization of Indians"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate certain communications from the Secretary of the Interior, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

A report showing expenditures during the year ended November 27, 1927, under the war minerals relief act, approved March 2, 1919; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A report concerning buildings in square 633, District of Columbia, acquired for the extension of the Capitol Buildings and Grounds, together with a statement showing the receipts from rentals for the year ended November 27, 1927; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A report of the disbursements made for the current fiscal year to the several States and Territories under the acts approved August 30, 1890, and March 4, 1907, applying a portion of the proceeds of the sale of public lands to the more complete endowment and support of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, together with a statement of the amounts paid out to the several States and Territories since the enactment of said acts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A report of an investigation of the reasonable value of the improvements placed prior to February 1, 1926, on the lands embraced in homestead entries lying in the drained Mud Lake bottom in Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A report of the proceedings of the Pan Pacific Conference on Education, Rehabilitation, Reclamation, and Recreation, held at Honolulu, Hawaii, April 11 to 16, 1927, inclusive; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

A report showing in detail the number of documents received and distributed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report showing in detail the aggregate number of various publications issued by the Interior Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, together with the total cost and the number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

A report showing the exchanges by the Department of the Interior of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices in part payment for new machines;

A report showing in detail the expenditures made by the Department of the Interior and charged to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1927"; and

A report showing in detail the travel expenses of certain officers and employees of the department on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT REPORTS

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate certain communications from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a complete set of general rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, Steamboat Inspection Service, at the meeting of January, 1927, which regulations have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of James O. Williams, former special disbursing agent, Bureau of the Census, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two communications from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

A report of the special contract entered into between the Post Office Department and the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad for carrying the mails on its road between Hudson Terminal Station, New York, N. Y., and Journal Square, Jersey City, N. J.; and

A report showing the cost of carrying and handling the several classes of mail matter and of performing the special services for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers and documents in the Post Office Department which are not needed in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT thereupon appointed Mr. MOSES and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CONTROL OF THE EUROPEAN CORN BORER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the campaign by the Department of Agriculture for the control of the European corn borer in the United States, from March 4, 1927, to October 31, 1927, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain communications from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports which were referred to the Committee on Finance as follows:

The annual report of the state of finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927;

A report with respect to the cumulative sinking fund, showing appropriations available for certain fiscal years, together with the expenditures for each class of securities retired; and

A report of expenses of loans and expenditures from repayments on foreign loans during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

RADIO IN THE SENATE CHAMBER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 197, agreed to May 2, 1924, a report of an investigation in regard to the equipment of the Senate Chamber with electrical transmission and receiving apparatus and for the broadcasting by radio of the proceedings of the Senate; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint Resolution 9 A, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act

Whereas the voters of the State of Wisconsin at a recent referendum registered their disapproval of prohibition by a majority of approximately 176,000 votes; and

Whereas the people of Wisconsin have emphatically expressed themselves in favor of a modification of the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer; and

Whereas a nation-wide test on the question of modifying the Volstead Act would afford the means of accurately measuring the sentiment of the entire country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby goes on record as respectfully memorializing Congress to provide the necessary machinery for the holding of a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act to legalize the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution duly attested by the proper officers of the assembly and senate be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of Congress.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint Resolution 38, memorializing Congress to adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, relating to "dollar diplomacy"

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 has been introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, and

Whereas such resolution provides as follows:

"Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to direct the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, the Federal Reserve Board, and all other agencies of the Government which are or may be concerned thereunder, to refrain henceforth, without specific prior authorization of the Congress, from—

"(1) Directly or indirectly engaging the responsibility of the Government of the United States, or otherwise on its behalf to supervise the fulfilment of financial arrangements between citizens of the United States and sovereign foreign governments or political subdivisions there-

of whether or not recognized de jure or de facto by the United States Government; or

"(2) In any manner whatsoever giving official recognition to any arrangement which may commit the Government of the United States to any form of military intervention in order to compel the observance of alleged obligations of sovereign or subordinate authority, or of any corporations or individuals, or to deal with any such arrangement except to secure the settlement of claims of the United States or of United States citizens through the ordinary channels of law provided therefor in the respective foreign jurisdictions or through duly authorized and accepted arbitration agencies": Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That Congress be and is hereby respectfully petitioned and urged to adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 15; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Joint Resolution (S. 39) memorializing the National Government to submit to arbitration the Mexican and Nicaraguan controversies

Whereas difficulties have arisen between Mexico and the United States relative to the retroactive and confiscatory provisions of the land laws of Mexico as affecting the claims of certain private citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the attitude of the United States Government toward Mexico and Nicaragua has been in spirit, at least, a violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas the President of Mexico has signified his willingness to submit to arbitration the controversies arising out of the land laws of that country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Government of the United States discontinue its present policy of interference in these countries and make every effort to submit the matters in controversy between the United States and the Governments of Mexico and Nicaragua to arbitration; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and each Wisconsin Member thereof.

JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
HENRY A. HUHN,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution of the Lions Club of Thermopolis, Wyo., favoring the passage of measures to prevent the illegal use of narcotic drugs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ASHURST presented the following resolutions of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States at Winslow, Ariz., which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT,
RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Winslow, Ariz.

Resolution XI

Whereas plans for the new Veterans' Bureau hospital at Tucson do not provide for the construction of recreation and occupational therapy buildings, garage, medical officers' and attendants' quarters: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona Department of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, in annual convention assembled at Flagstaff this 10th day of September, 1927, Do hereby urge the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to make provisions to take care of the omissions outlined above; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressman.

M. H. AXLINE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Reserve,
Chairman Resolutions Committee.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT,
RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Winslow, Ariz.

Resolution X

Whereas it is sincerely felt that hospitalization should be extended to all retired, resigned, and honorably discharged soldiers of the United States Army: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona Department, Reserve Officers' Association, in convention assembled at Flagstaff this 10th day of September, 1927, Do hereby urge Congress to enact such legislation as will provide hospitalization to all retired, honorably discharged, or resigned members of the Military Establishment of the United States.

M. H. AXLINE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Reserve,
Chairman Resolutions Committee.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT,
RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Winslow, Ariz.

Resolution IX

Whereas there is pending before Congress a measure known as the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill for the retirement of World War emergency officers; and

Whereas, if passed, this measure will give to emergency officers the same rights and benefits as those enjoyed by the Regular officers: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona Department, Reserve Officers' Association, in convention assembled at Flagstaff this 10th day of September, 1927, That we do hereby request our Congressman and Senators to use their influence in the passage of this act; be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be sent to national headquarters, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and to the commanding general of the Eighth Corps Area.

M. H. AXLINE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Reserve,
Chairman Resolutions Committee.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT,
RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Winslow, Ariz.

Resolution VIII

Whereas the present allowance of 4 cents per mile to reserve officers on active duty appears to us to be an unfair discrimination; and

Whereas the present allowance is insufficient to make up to the reserve officers for certain sacrifices which they must make while on such active duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That representation be made to Congress requesting that the reserve officer on active status be placed upon the same allowance as is the Regular Army officer for like service; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished the Chief of Staff, United States Army, commanding general of the Eighth Corps Area, our Congressman, and Senators.

Passed by the third annual convention of the Arizona department, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States at Flagstaff, Ariz., September 10, 1927.

M. H. AXLINE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Reserve,
Chairman Resolutions Committee.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT,
RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Winslow, Ariz.

Resolution M

Whereas efforts have been made to decrease the personnel of the Regular Army; and

Whereas the safety of this Nation depends upon a well-organized standing Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona Department, Reserve Officers' Association, in convention assembled at Flagstaff this 10th day of September, 1927, Do hereby urge the National Congress to increase the Regular Army to the strength as authorized by national defense act; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the commanding general of the Eighth Corps Area and to the Secretary of War, also to our Congressman and Senators.

M. H. AXLINE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Reserve,
Chairman Resolutions Committee.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT,
RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Winslow, Arizona.

Resolution III

Whereas Congress has not, in the past, provided sufficient funds to train all reserve officers each year; and

Whereas, It is necessary that this training be accorded reserve officers in order to comply with the national defense act: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona Department, Reserve Officers' Association, in convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., this 10th day of September, 1927, Do hereby request and urge Congress to appropriate an additional amount sufficient to train all reserve officers each year, regardless of mileage expense; be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be sent to the commanding general of the Eighth Corps Area, to the Secretary of War, and to our Congressman and Senators.

M. H. AXLINE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Reserve,
Chairman Resolutions Committee.

Mr. ASHURST presented the following resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Arizona, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

(House of representatives, eighth State legislature, fourth special session)

House Resolution No. 4

Whereas there were nine classes of officers who fought for the United States in the World War, to wit, the officers of the Army: Emergency, provisional, regular; Navy: Emergency, provisional, regular; Marine: Emergency, provisional, regular; and

Whereas of the nine named classes of officers eight classes, to wit, the officers of the Army: * * * provisional, regular; Navy: Emergency, provisional, regular; Marine: Emergency, provisional, regular, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past seven years, under laws passed by Congress, retired on 75 per cent of their active-duty pay on account of such disability; and

Whereas the ninth class of such officers, to wit, the emergency Army officers, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been, for the past seven years, denied by Congress the retirement privileges which long ago were accorded the other eight classes of disabled officers; and

Whereas the American Legion at each of its national conventions, including the recent American Expeditionary Forces Convention held in Paris, has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of the emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War so as to place them on the same footing as the other eight classes of disabled officers who are now on the retired lists; and

Whereas practically all other veterans' organizations have voted in department and national conventions to have enacted into law legislation to accord the disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges long ago accorded by Congress to the other eight classes of officers; and

Whereas bills to grant this justice have been pending in the National Congress since the armistice; and

Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, eighth State legislature, in special session assembled, at Phoenix, Ariz., That we do favor and urge the passage of such legislation as will eliminate this injustice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Senators HENRY ASHURST and CARL HAYDEN and Hon. LEWIS W. DOUGLAS, our Representatives in Congress.

Passed the house October 31, 1927. Carried unanimously.

Mr. ASHURST also presented the following senate memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona, ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, correct, and complete copy of senate memorial No. 4, of the eighth legislature, regular session, State of Arizona, 1927, "To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, to make appropriations for roads over Indian reservations," all of which is shown by the original bill on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

Senate Memorial 4, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America in Congress assembled, to make appropriations for roads over Indian reservations

Your memorialist, the Eighth Legislature of the State of Arizona, in regular session convened, respectfully represents:

That of the 73,000,000 acres of land comprising the State of Arizona, approximately three-fifth are reserved by the Government of the United States;

That over these reserved lands the State of Arizona exercises no supervision nor jurisdiction;

That 20,000,000 acres of these lands are reserved by the Government of the United States to the use and benefit of the Indians in the State of Arizona;

That the above condition exists in many States;

That these Indian reservations are so situated as to prevent a systematic development and extension of county, State, or national highways without the cooperation and assistance of the Government of the United States;

That the Congress of the United States in enacting a most beneficent national road law has wholly failed to make any provisions for the construction and maintenance of highways over and upon the lands reserved by the Federal Government to the use and benefit of its Indian wards;

Whereas adequate transportation facilities are a vital factor in the prosperity and civilization of any country and are essential to the development of its agriculture and manufacture, to the working of its forests and mines, and to the spread of education and enlightenment among its citizens; and

Whereas the public roads of Arizona are for a large percentage of her citizens, and especially for the 42,000 Indian wards of the Federal Government, the only avenues of transportation leading from the point of production to the point of consumption or rail shipment, and these avenues are only now in the process of their development; and

Whereas a very large portion of the State of Arizona is held in reserve by the Government of the United States to the use and benefit of its Indian wards, and these reservations are so situated as to prevent any economic or systematic road-building activities on the part of the State government as continuous highways are rendered impracticable; this is especially true on the Apache Indian Reservation, as practically the entire long and important stretch of road from Rice to Springerville is on the reservation; and

Whereas a further inequity results from the fact that traffic in its development takes no account of reservation and State boundaries, and the State government is powerless to provide for the extension of its highway system through the adjoining and intervening reservations; and

Whereas the improvement of highways should be commensurate with their importance, and a system of highways upon the Indian reservations in Arizona would form the only avenue by which the Indian nations could transport their products to a market, or over which the many thousands of tourists from all parts of the United States could pass to view the marvelous beauties of our natural and historical wonders: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, That the development of the material resources of the Indians of Arizona can best be furthered, their material prosperity best enhanced, their education and civilization more readily achieved, and that close association with civilization which has proved to be the efficient means of equipping them to share in the responsibilities of life most certainly assured by means of highways constructed and maintained over and upon the lands reserved by the Government of the United States to their use and benefit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, urged to enact any legislation which may be necessary to provide adequate and continual appropriation for the construction and maintenance of highways over and upon Indian reservations in Arizona joining to and in conjunction with the system of State highways;

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to Representatives of Arizona in Congress and chambers of commerce in the State of Arizona; and that our Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to accomplish the enactment of such legislation.

(Signed) MULFORD WINSOR, *President.*
(Signed) DOROTHY BURTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. ASHURST also presented the following senate memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona, ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, correct, and complete copy of Senate Memorial 3, of the Eighth Legislature, regular session, State of Arizona, 1927, "Memorial to the Congress of the United States praying for an appropriation to provide for the construction of public roads leading into and through national forests, Indian reservations, and other public-land areas," all of which is shown by the original bill on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

Senate Memorial 3. Memorial to the Congress of the United States praying for an appropriation to provide for the construction of public roads leading into and through national forests, Indian reservations, and other public-land areas

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist, the members of the Eighth Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represent:

Whereas there are in the 13 public-land States of the Northwest 382,032,487 acres of unappropriated and unreserved public lands, Indian reservations, and national-forest areas that are nontaxable and that do not contribute to the building of public roads, except the 25 per cent of the gross proceeds of the forests, and it is only a negligible amount.

The nontaxable areas of these States are as follows:

	Acres.
Arizona	48,692,722
California	38,173,917
Colorado	24,562,927
Idaho	27,366,215
Minnesota	1,855,548
Montana	30,829,638
Nevada	58,453,899
New Mexico	30,418,359
Oregon	27,384,757
South Dakota	4,386,100
Utah	39,207,579
Washington	15,357,519
Wyoming	34,343,307
Total	382,032,487

Whereas Indian reservations, forest reserves, and other public lands stretch across county, State, and interstate highways, becoming insurmountable barriers to highway improvement, community, and State development; and

Whereas in many counties of the public-land States from 50 to 75 per cent of their area is nonassessable public-land area, affording no taxes for schools and roads; and

Whereas the public-land States, owing to large area, small population, and small valuation have not been able to participate in the 50–50 provision of the Federal highway act; and

Whereas highway projects in the public-land States initiated must halt unless appropriations are made to effect their completion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to pass such laws to make much greater appropriations for roads in and leading into national forests, in and through Indian reservations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Public Roads, the United States Senators and Members of Congress, the governors of the 13 public-land States.

(Signed) MULFORD WINSOR,
President of the Senate.
(Signed) DOROTHY BURTON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST also presented the following senate resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, complete, and correct copy of Senate Resolution 1, of the fourth special session of the Eighth Legislature, State of Arizona, all of which is shown by the original on file in this department.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 12th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

Senate Resolution 1, introduced by Messrs. Wiley, Joyner, Thornburg, Bettwy, and Nelson

Whereas there were nine classes of officers who fought for the United States in the World War, to wit: Army: Emergency, provisional, regular; Navy: Emergency, provisional, regular; Marine: Emergency, provisional, regular; and

Whereas of the nine named classes of officers, eight classes, to wit, the officers of the Army: * * *, provisional, regular; Navy: Emergency, provisional, regular; Marine: Emergency, provisional, regular, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past seven years, under laws passed by Congress, retired on 75 per cent of their active-duty pay on account of such disability; and

Whereas the ninth class of such officers, to wit, the emergency Army officers, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service have been for the past seven years denied by Congress the retirement privileges which long ago were accorded the other eight classes of disabled officers; and

Whereas the American Legion at each of its national conventions, including the recent A. E. F. Convention held in Paris, has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of the emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War, so as to place them on the same footing as the other eight classes of disabled officers who are now on the retired lists; and

Whereas practically all other veterans' organizations have voted in department and national conventions to have enacted into law legislation to accord the disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges long ago accorded by Congress to the other eight classes of officers; and

Whereas bills to grant this justice have been pending in the National Congress since the armistice; and

Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona State Senate, Eighth Arizona Legislature, in special session assembled, at Phoenix, Ariz., That we do favor and urge the passage of such legislation as will eliminate this injustice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Senators HENRY ASHURST and CARL HAYDEN and Hon. LEWIS B. DOUGLAS, our Representative in Congress.

Mr. ODDIE presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which, with related papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1927.

Hon. W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State, Carson City, Nev.

MY DEAR MR. GREATHOUSE: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, inclosing a certified copy of Assembly Joint Resolution 5, memorializing Congress to establish a Government hospital in the State of Nevada.

Your letter and the inclosure reached me after Congress had finally adjourned, and I was, therefore, unable to present it to the Senate. I shall do so at the opening of the next session.

Sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Carson City, Nev., February 28, 1927.

Hon. TASKER L. ODDIE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with the instructions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, I herewith inclose certified copy of Assembly Joint Resolution 5.

Yours truly,

W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

Assembly Joint Resolution 5, approved February 25, 1927, memorializing Congress to establish a Government hospital in the State of Nevada

Whereas the State of Nevada has always been among the foremost in furnishing men, money, and otherwise supporting the Federal Government in the defense and preservation of the Union; and

Whereas many ex-service men and women reside within the State of Nevada and vicinity; and

Whereas Nevada, due to its favorable climatic condition for the treatment of various diseases, should be considered: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada and the Senate, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to establish a Government hospital within the State of Nevada for the treatment of disabled ex-service men and women; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House, to each of our Senators, and to our Representative in Washington.

D. H. TANDY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN W. WRIGHT,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
MORLEY GRISWOLD,
President of the Senate.
V. R. MERIALDO,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Greathouse, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original Assembly Joint Resolution 5 now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 28th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TRAMMELL presented the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

House Memorial 7 to the Congress of the United States of America asking that the grave of Territorial Governor Duval be properly marked with a bronze tablet, whereon shall be given suitable credit for services rendered as Territorial Governor of Florida

Whereas W. P. Duval, Florida's first territorial governor, serving during the years 1822–1834, departed this life on the 18th day of March, 1854; and

Whereas the remains of the said W. P. Duval were buried on the 20th day of March, 1854, in the Congressional Cemetery, range 46, site 5, Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the said W. P. Duval served his country faithfully and fearlessly as the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and was a pioneer in the settling of the State of Florida; and

Whereas the faithful service rendered by the said W. P. Duval is worthy of recognition by the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectively requested to make suitable recognition of the service rendered by W. P. Duval as the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and that a suitable bronze tablet be placed upon the grave of the said W. P. Duval, and that proper inscription be made thereon, recognizing the service rendered by the said W. P. Duval as first Territorial Governor of Florida during the years 1822–1834, and that proper appropiration be made therefor.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state of Florida be requested to send a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State of Florida, to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

Approved by the governor June 6, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 7, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TRAMMELL also presented the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Joint Memorial Resolution 3

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the Federal Government has built at Muscle Shoals, Ala., at an expense of more than $150,000,000, a vast plant designated for the manufacture of nitrates for munitions in time of war and for the production of fertilizer products in time of peace; and

Whereas this plant has lain idle for more than eight years, since the close of the World War, thus disregarding one of the specific provisions of the national defense act, under which the plant was authorized, which provision was intended to result in the production of nitrates at a cost that would materially reduce the price of fertilizer to the farmers of the United States; and

Whereas the nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals representing an investment of $100,000,000, instead of being operated for the manufacture of cheaper fertilizer for the farmers of the Nation, are, and have been, idle for many years, while the Wilson Dam development is temporarily leased to private interests; and

Whereas the farmers of the United States are using more than 7,000,000 tons of fertilizer per year, costing more than $200,000,000; and the farmers of Florida alone are spending more than $14,000,000 per year for their fertiilzer; and

Whereas we have the assurance of competent authorities that the facilities of the Muscle Shoals plant are adequate for the production of ample nitrates for the needs of American agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and hereby is, memorialized to enact at its next session such legislation as will, without further costly delay, start the vast Muscle Shoals plant to its intended work, which was the manufacture of nitrates for the needs of our Nation's agriculture, the production of munitions for war and other national defense purposes, and that any power in excess of these requirements be distributed to those States within transmission distances; be it

Resolved further, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, GREENE, and YON are hereby urgently requested to use their most vigorous effort to accomplish the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of state of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States, to the Congress of this Nation, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the governor, May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Joint Memorial Resolution 3, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Memorial 5

Whereas vast annual importations of citrus fruits are made into the United States from Porto Rico, Cuba, Jamaica, and the Isle of Pines; and

Whereas much of this fruit is picked and shipped into our country while in an immature state, thus placing upon the market fruit of low quality, unpalatable, and unfit for human consumption; and

Whereas such importation of immature fruit is received into the ports of our Nation without restriction; inspection and regulation now being imposed upon our domestic production by Federal laws; and

Whereas this practice not only places fruit of doubtful healthfulness and low food value before the consuming public of the United States but likewise imposes undue, unfair, and destructive competition upon the citrus growers of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact at its next session such legislation as will properly regulate the importation of all immature fruit in such manner as to correct and eliminate the evils of the present baneful practice; be it

Resolved further, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, GREEN, and YON are hereby urgently requested to use their most vigorous efforts to accomplish the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of the State of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Joint Memorial 5 as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahasse, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TRAMMELL also presented the following concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Whereas it appears from reports of the Treasury of the United States that a surplus of funds is being accumulated; and

Whereas an excessive income tax has a strong tendency to stifle trade and causes the withdrawal of capital from active business enterprises: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress use every honorable means to amend the income tax law of the United States to the end that a substantial reduction of the tax on incomes be made.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state is hereby requested to send a copy of this resolution, under the great seal of the State, to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the press of this State.

Approved by the governor, April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Concurrent Resolution 8, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That—

Whereas the people of Florida, by an overwhelming majority, adopted a constitutional amendment prohibiting the State from levying in the future any inheritance or income tax; and

Whereas the State's finances are in such an admirable condition, that, although it has no severance tax, no corporation tax, no corporation stock transfer tax, no franchise tax, no income tax, and no inheritance tax, it has no bonded indebtedness of any kind or character, does not owe a dollar, and has, of the 1st of April, in its treasury, in excess of $11,466,280.05 in cash, thus demonstrating beyond question that the levying of an inheritance or an income tax is absolutely unnecessary in this State; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in enacting the present revenue law, providing therein for a Federal inheritance tax, but allowing those States that have inheritance taxes a credit to the extent of 80 per cent of the taxes so paid, the avowed purpose of which was to force the States of Florida, Alabama, and others similarly situated, to levy an inheritance tax; and

Whereas taxing the dead, either by Federal legislation or State legislation, is a capital levy and should not be resorted to except in time of war or other grave emergency; and

Whereas an inheritance tax, if it is to be written into law at all, is a prerogative of the State, a political question exclusively within the province of the State; and

Whereas Congress by giving to the respective States that have inheritance taxes, credit for 80 per cent of the taxes so paid, admits and concedes that the Federal Government does not need the revenue; and

Whereas the action of Congress, in endeavoring by Federal legislation to coerce a sovereign State into enacting legislation contrary to the wishes of the people of that State in a question of purely local concern, is unprecedented, arbitrary, indefensible, and contrary to the very fundamentals of our American form of government: Be it further

Resolved, That we protest against the passage of a Federal inheritance tax, and especially one in the form of that which has been passed, and we regard such action upon the part of Congress as unnecessary, uncalled for, indefensible, without justification, and contrary to the fundamental principles upon which the Republic is founded; that we reaffirm our confidence in the wisdom of the people of Florida in adopting the constitutional amendment prohibiting the Legislature of Florida in the future from ever levying any State income or inheritance taxes; and that the State of Florida declines to be coerced into repealing the constitutional provision forbidding the levying of taxes upon the estates of dead men, but avows its intention of forever maintaining and continuing the constitutional amendment in question: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to demand the repeal of the Federal inheritance tax and that they continue to take such vigorous action as may in their judgment be deemed best to bring this about: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Members of Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, the press of this State and of the Nation.

Approved by the governor April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TRAMMELL also presented the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

House Memorial 3

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the State of Florida and the counties of Dade and Monroe have caused to be dug a sea-level canal across the peninsula of Florida from the waters of the Atlantic Ocean at Miami to the waters of the Gulf of Mexico at Poinciana, saving all but 9 miles of the total distance; and

Whereas it is hoped and expected that this 9-mile gap will be completed and opened within the near future, thus establishing a sea-level water route across the State of Florida: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and hereby is, memorialized to pass the necessary legislation looking to the investigation and survey of this cross-State waterway, in order to disclose the feasibility and propriety of its being taken over by the Federal Government for improvement, operation, and maintenance, to the end—

(1) That the benefits and protection afforded by the Atlantic inside waterway route from Boston south and through the Florida East Coast Canal, now terminating at Miami, may be immediately extended across the peninsula of Florida to the Gulf of Mexico:

(2) That small shipping in passing from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico may be relieved of the necessity of rounding Cape Sable, with its attendant dangers and hazards;

(3) That the water-route distance for such shipping between points on the Atlantic Ocean and points on the Gulf of Mexico may be shortened;

(4) That this sea-level canal, which traverses the heart of the Everglades, may be developed to its maximum usefulness in serving as an artery of water transportation for this vast agricultural empire which is about to be opened; and

(5) That this canal, developed to its full capacity, with its outlets to the east and to the west, may be utilized in the draining of thousands of acres of Everglades lands and the ultimate reclamation of the Florida Peninsula south of the Tamiami Trail; be it

Resolved further, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, BREEN, and YON are hereby most earnestly requested to extend their efforts toward the accomplishment of the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of state of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State to the President of the United States, to the Congress of this Nation, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the governor May 7, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Memorial 3, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Memorial 2 to the Congress of the United States requesting an appropriation for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Johns River between Jacksonville and Palatka and Sanford, Fla.

Whereas the navigation of the St. Johns River between Jacksonville and Palatka and Sanford, Fla., is at times seriously impeded by the several bars or shoals that prevent the passage of vessels now plying said river; and

Whereas the present commerce of said river is such as to demand a deeper and safer channel and the continuous improvement thereof, and amply justifies a considerable expenditure to that end: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That it is of vital importance to the commerce of the State of Florida that the Congress of the United States should make an appropriation sufficient for the improvement, permanent as well as satisfactory, of the said river;

Resolved further, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be urged to secure the passage of the legislation necessary to accomplish this object; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Florida be requested to furnish each of the Senators and Representatives aforesaid certified copy of this memorial.

Approved by the governor, May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 2, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TRAMMELL also presented the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

House Memorial 1, directed to the President and Congress of the United States, requesting the establishment of military schools or camps for the purpose of training aviators upon the present Government fields of Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla.

Whereas the people of the State of Florida are intensely interested in welfare and maintaining the common defense of the Nation; and

Whereas the training of aviators is essential to insuring the public welfare and maintaining the common defense of the Nation; and

Whereas the people of the United States now own in the State of Florida two flying fields, to wit, Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla.; and

Whereas said fields are not being used now as aviation training camps; and

Whereas the facilities of said fields for flying are unsurpassed by any in the world, due to the region about the camps and the atmospheric conditions most conducive to the safety for flying; and

Whereas the Florida climate is equal and mild and the location of the camps naturally healthful; and

Whereas the said flying fields of Dorr and Carlstrom form an ideal location for the training of aviators: Be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the President of the United States and Congress be, and they are hereby, earnestly solicited to take such steps as may be necessary, either by the legislative or executive branches of the Federal Government, to establish at the fields of Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla., Government schools or training camps for the purpose of training and equipping aviators for the use of aerial service in the United States Army, or for other public service: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be furnished by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Approved by the governor April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 1, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Memorial 6

A joint resolution proposing a memorial to Congress indorsing the support by the Government of adequate appropriations for the support of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves

Whereas there is located in Florida two separate regiments of the Florida National Guard, which is maintained to a large extent by Federal appropriation of money; and

Whereas there is also located in the State of Florida various units of the Organized Reserves constituted under the provisions of the national defense act of 1920; and

Whereas the National Guard form an essential and necessary organization for use in peace time, as evidenced by its services during the recent hurricane disaster in Florida, as well as an adequate fighting organization in the event of war; and

Whereas the people of Florida desire to see the National Guard and the Organized Reserves of the United States supported by adequate appropriations reasonably sufficient to enable these organizations to accomplish the purpose of their organization, said appropriations to be as liberal as may be consistent with the welfare of the public and the general good: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Legislature of the State of Florida herein memorializes and requests its two Senators in the United States Senate and its four Representatives in the Congress of the United States to use all honorable means in their power to prevent the handicapping or crippling of the National Guard or Organized Reserve by the withdrawal of any existing appropriations therefrom, and that they use all honorable means in their power to secure for the use of the National Guard and Organized Reserves as liberal an appropriation for the training of such National Guard and Reserves as may be consistent with the welfare of the Government, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the United States Senators from Florida and to each of the Congressmen from Florida, to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the Chief of the Militia Bureau of the War Department, all duly certified to and under the great seal of the State of Florida.

Approved by the governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 6, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 568) granting a pension to Marie Abrahma Stoner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 569) for the relief of Caroline M. Hyde; and

A bill (S. 570) for the relief of Norman Beier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 571) granting an increase of pension to Lura E. Bolton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 572) for the relief of Guy Boggers; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 573) to amend the naval record of Kenneth A. Kellog, alias Frank Barry; and

A bill (S. 574) for the relief of John Farrell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 575) for the relief of Herman O. Kruschke;

A bill (S. 576) for the relief of Levi B. Rouse;

A bill (S. 577) for the relief of Berton F. Bronson;

A bill (S. 578) for the relief of Vincent Rutherford;

A bill (S. 579) for the relief of Thomas Huggins; and

A bill (S. 580) for the relief of William H. Grayson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 581) granting a pension to Mary J. Davis (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 582) granting an increase of pension to Stella Clark (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 583) granting a pension to Anna C. Gooder (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 584) for the relief of Frederick D. Swank (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 585) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert Dillon, deceased;

A bill (S. 586) for the relief of the McAteer Shipbuilding Co. (Inc.);

A bill (S. 587) for the relief of the Alaska Steamship Co.;

A bill (S. 588) for the relief of the Pacific Creosoting Co.;

A bill (S. 589) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert Dillon, deceased;

A bill (S. 590) for the relief of Jasper N. Hafer;

A bill (S. 591) for the relief of Nellie Harrington;

A bill (S. 592) for the relief of the M. A. Phelps Lumber Co.;

A bill (S. 593) for the relief of W. H. Presleigh;
A bill (S. 594) for the relief of Caroline M. Killough;
A bill (S. 595) for the relief of Ira M. Krutz;
A bill (S. 596) for the relief of the Sea-Coast Packing Co. (Inc.);
A bill (S. 597) for the relief of Lloyd Garretson Co.;
A bill (S. 598) for the relief of Anna Laguee;
A bill (S. 599) for the relief of Stillwell Bros. (Inc.); and
A bill (S. 600) for the relief of William O. Cutliffe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDGE:
A bill (S. 601) for the relief of James E. Van Horne;
A bill (S. 602) for the relief of the estate of Patrick F. Cooney;
A bill (S. 603) for the relief of Claude William Longstreet;
A bill (S. 604) for the relief of the estate of Ellen Smith; and
A bill (S. 605) for the relief of Capt. Clarence Barnard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:
A bill (S. 606) for the relief of Harry H. Burris; and
A bill (S. 607) for the relief of John Gorman; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 608) granting an increase of pension to Sarah T. Bradley;
A bill (S. 609) granting a pension to David J. Menard, jr.;
A bill (S. 610) granting a pension to Lenoire L. Dayton Boyd;
A bill (S. 611) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Hagerman;
A bill (S. 612) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda A. Nelson; and
A bill (S. 613) granting a pension to Bruno Knyphausen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK:
A bill (S. 614) for the relief of Cornelius E. Cagle; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRATTON:
A bill (S. 615) granting a pension to Sarah E. Boothe;
A bill (S. 616) granting a pension to Teresita Weitz;
A bill (S. 617) granting a pension to Catarino Armijo;
A bill (S. 618) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence J. Waterhouse; and
A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to John Mosley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYFIELD:
A bill (S. 620) for the relief of Russell and Tucker and certain other citizens of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas; and
A bill (S. 621) for the relief of William Thurman Enoch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS:
A bill (S. 622) for the relief of George W. Allison (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 623) for the relief of Rose Thurin; and
A bill (S. 624) for the relief of the Van Dorn Iron Works Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 625) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Draper (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Clara Lewis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:
A bill (S. 627) granting a pension to Roy A. Baird (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF:
A bill (S. 628) making Leona E. Kidwell eligible to receive the benefits of the civil service retirement act; and
A bill (S. 629) making H. C. Gibson eligible to receive the benefits of the civil service retirement act approved in 1920; to the Committee on Civil Service.
A bill (S. 630) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Mick (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 631) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Hughes (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 632) granting a pension to Eva Statler (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 633) granting a pension to Charles E. Price;
A bill (S. 634) granting a pension to Andrew J. Chapman;
A bill (S. 635) granting a pension to Stephen Williams;
A bill (S. 636) granting an increase of pension to Julia Hatcher;
A bill (S. 637) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. White;
A bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to Orien K. Tillman;
A bill (S. 639) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Smith;
A bill (S. 640) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Manear;
A bill (S. 641) granting an increase of pension to Mary Alice Belt;
A bill (S. 642) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Atherton;
A bill (S. 643) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Rogers; and
A bill (S. 644) granting a pension to Stewart Clay; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 645) for the relief of John Hood;
A bill (S. 646) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Harshberger, deceased;
A bill (S. 647) for the relief of Ruth Gore;
A bill (S. 648) for the relief of the Ansted National Bank, Ansted, W. Va.;
A bill (S. 649) for the relief of R. P. Biddle; and
A bill (S. 650) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 651) for the relief of Benjamin F. Helmick;
A bill (S. 652) for the relief of Edgar Travis, sr.; and
A bill (S. 653) for the relief of Clarence G. Stonestreet; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 654) granting compensation to Auguste C. Loiseau; and
A bill (S. 655) granting an increase of compensation to Abbie Doty; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 2, submitted by Mr. NORRIS on Monday last, opposing the seating of WILLIAM S. VARE as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	La Follette	Schall
Barkley	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Bayard	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Black	Gerry	McNary	Simmons
Blaine	Gillett	Mayfield	Smith
Blease	Glass	Metcalf	Smoot
Borah	Goff	Moses	Steck
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Steiwer
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Stephens
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Swanson
Bruce	Harris	Oddie	Thomas
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Trammell
Caraway	Hawes	Phipps	Tydings
Copeland	Hayden	Pine	Tyson
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Wagner
Curtis	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Edwards	King	Sackett	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate with as much attention and interest, I think, as the average Senator. I think that it has been placed on a very high plane. I believe that it involves one of the most delicate questions we have ever had before the Senate in my memory.

I am not able to go to the full extent of the proponents of either side of the question, meaning by that that I do not think I could subscribe to the view that the only qualifications upon which we could decide are those which are specifically mentioned in the section, limited to three. I think that is rather a strained position. However, it is backed by a great number of the strongest minds of the country in the past, and it is supported by great talent here in this body at present. I think that this body does have some latitude in going beyond mere age, citizenship, or inhabitancy, and residence. We have got to be reasonable in the interpretation or construction of any statute, or even the Constitution, of course, less important in the statute than in the Constiution, because one is fundamental law, constitutional sanction, while the other is simply an enactment which might easily be changed.

On the other hand, I can not go with those who claim that we have the latitude, upon whatever qualification we prescribe, to stop at the door and refuse recognition, in the form of an oath, to a man who comes with his credentials without fault or irregularity.

There is a background to the Senate organization which I do not believe is quite fully appreciated—I mean from the standpoint of what the fathers had in mind. There was a very bitter discussion in the Constitutional Convention which lasted for three weeks on whether this was to be a National or a Federal Government, whether it was to be based upon population and influence or wealth, or whether it was to be based upon the States. There was a school which believed that if a State was large in population and wealth it ought to have a greater influence than the State which was small in population and without wealth. That did not seem tenable any more than that we should give one who has wealth more votes than a citizen who is not wealthy. That particular provision, therefore, was not very strong. At the same time there was such a strong belief in the convention that the Government should be national, based upon population, rather than built upon States that, upon a compromise submitted to three weeks' of discussion, it was determined that the Government should be bicameral rather than unicameral, with one of the Houses based upon population and the other based upon States. That was the compromise finally reached after a very bitter discussion, resulting in a House based upon population and the other on States.

So jealous were those who believed in the rights of the States they not only made the representation equal, without regard to size, but they did the unusual thing of putting in Article V providing for amendments a clause prohibiting forever the changing of the Constitution in such a way that the equality of the States in this body should ever be interfered with. That was done in the Constitutional Convention itself; it was not an addendum; it did not come as an amendment, but came as the expression of the convention. After a discussion of this question, it was provided that in this body should forever be represented equally each State. Not only that but the framers of the Constitution provided that the Members of this body representing the States should be elected not by the people but by the States in their legislative bodies. That, of course, has been changed by the seventeenth amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to get before the Senate the attitude of the fathers on the particular question of equality in the Senate, and why that attitude was assumed. There had been at one time, as is perfectly well known to every student of history, slavery throughout all the States. Every State in the Union, at one time or another, with probably one exception, recognized slavery as an institution. Slavery gradually ceased to exist in one section of the country, but it grew in popularity in another section. It became such a distinctive institution in that section that there was fear that it might be interfered with by the Federal Government. Provision to prevent such interference was one of the things that was written into the Constitution, in Article V, relating to amendments, where this language was used:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article.

Under that provision the Constitution could not be amended to interfere with the institution of slavery prior to 1808. Slavery was the sensitive question then. Then there follows another provision:

> And that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

So, in respect only to those two subjects, did the Federal organic law forbid amendment. As to slavery, the inhibition ceased to exist after 1808, but the other is yet holding. There is a reason for this.

I wish Senators could remember a condition that probably has escaped their memory. When the Federal Constitution took effect we had 13 States, 7 of which were free belonging to the one class, and 6 of which were slave States. That resulted in a representation of 14 Senators in this body, believing in one philosophy and 12 in the other.

After the adoption of the Constitution, the first State to be admitted into the Union was Vermont. That made 16 Senators from free States and 12 Senators from slave States. The next State to be admitted was Kentucky, a slave State. The next was Tennessee, a slave State. That made the representation in this body equal on the most sensitive question that had been discussed in the Constitutional Convention, in the formation of the Government, in the State legislatures, and in the House and the Senate.

In 1803 Ohio was admitted. That gave the balance of power to the free States. In 1812 Louisiana was admitted, and that made the free and the slave States again equal in representation here. In 1816 Indiana was admitted. That gave the control of this body to the free States.

In 1817 Mississippi, a slave State, was admitted; and in 1818 Illinois, another free State, was admitted. In 1819 Alabama, another slave State, was admitted, making representation as between the free and the slave States in this body again equal.

When the sensitive question of the admission of Missouri was reached the slavery issue was still dominant. At no time in our history was there ever more bitter discussion. Finally Jesse Thomas, of Illinois, proposed a compromise, which afterwards was formulated by Henry Clay, and is known as the Missouri compromise, the author of which was the famous Kentucky Senator.

Keep in mind that then and for years previously first one and then the other party was in control of this body, and the subject of slavery was constantly discussed with deep intensity and great seriousness.

When finally a compromise as to the admission of Missouri was reached they looked for another State to overbalance Missouri, and in 1820 the upper portion of Massachusetts which had been cut off was erected into Maine, which was admitted as a State. In the following year, however, Missouri was admitted to statehood, making the representation from the free States and the slave States again equal.

Let me ask, Senators, in the face of such a contest which had obtained from our beginning what would have been the result if, when Thomas H. Benton, afterwards author of The Thirty Years' View, one of the famous publications of this country, appeared at the door of the Senate as Missouri's first Representative in this body, he had been denied the right to take the oath on some particular allegation that might have been made here? What would have been the result if such a step had been undertaken at that time or at any other time preceding that? That was in 1821. Coming down to 1836 Arkansas was admitted. Then in 1837 Michigan was admitted, and again the balance was equal. During all this time an intense debate was going on. Just prior to that time in 1832 the feeling ran so high that South Carolina had proposed to secede from the Union because of interference with State rights.

Following this episode came the admission of Texas in 1845, with a provision that the State should not be cut up into more than four States. Had Texas been so divided that would have given the slave States a majority in the Senate of three States, but the act admitting Texas provided that it should not be cut up into more than four States, and that in no event could such a division be made without its consent.

The consent of Texas was never given and Texas came into the Union with only two Senators instead of, as might have been, eight Senators. Then followed the admission of Iowa (1846), which put the slave States and the free States again on an equality. Then followed the admission of Minnesota. I should have said that Florida was admitted in 1845. As we approach 1850 we again find an equality between the slave and the free States in this body, there being as many sitting Members representing free States as there were slave States. So when the point was reached of admitting into the Union the first State—California—to be carved out of the territory which was gained as the result of the Mexican War there was a crisis.

I do not believe that those who will read a description of the appearance on the 15th day of February, 1850, of Henry Clay, when he offered his famous compromise, will ever forget it. He had spoken for two days here on the question of the compromise proposed in connection with the admission of California as a free State. The serious feature was that California, a free State, was carved from territory that belonged to the slave section of the country. He was followed by John C. Calhoun on the 4th day of March, who stepped into the Chamber wrapped in flannels, suffering from an incurable disease that it was known would soon cause his death. When for the last time in this body he rose to speak on the rights of the States he found that he had no voice, when he handed his speech, which had been carefully prepared, to a Senator from Virginia and asked him to read it for him. That was the last utterance of that great constitutional thinker of South Carolina, the greatest representative of the doctrine of State rights the Senate ever heard. That speech was followed three days later by Daniel Webster, who made his fatal 7th of March

speech in which he suggested that more or less of a compromise should be agreed upon. The outcome of this struggle was the admission of California, and the admission of that State for the first time broke for all time to come the balance between the free and the slave States. May I ask what would have been the result had a Senator from California been stopped at the door as you now propose to do?

It is not necessary for me to go any further. Everybody knows how intense the feeling ran between the two sections, which unfortunately eventuated into civil war. I repeat this question: During that unfortunate long-drawn struggle over that most intense question, which divided the Nation along geographical lines, what would have been the result if either side had excluded a Senator appearing at the door of the Senate, demanding to take the oath of office, and bearing credentials which furnished valid evidence on the part of the people back home in his State that he had been duly elected? Could a decision denying a State representation be secured free from prejudice?

There is a background that I think ought not to be overlooked, for while such a condition will hardly arise again, yet it is barely possible there might come a time when this House might be divided on geographical or upon religious lines or upon sentiment on prohibition or upon any other question as to which there could be an organization of public opinion with such volume that it would not be possible to get a clarified view free of prejudice. It is for that reason that I am so much concerned about the precedent that we are here establishing.

Mr. President, I do not condone the expenditure of money; I deplore it. I think that the expenditure of money in election contests is reaching a point where it is almost a public scandal. I am not charging anyone with doing anything that is criminal or offensive, but I do say that under our method of primary elections the expenditure of money has come to be a problem with which I hope we may deal. I do not know that we can deal in this body with the expenditure of money in primary elections. I know the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], whose judgment on matters of this kind must be respected, takes the view that we in this body and the other can legislate on primary elections in a State. I, however, have serious doubt about that.

I also can not understand how this body can interfere with a State if it decides not to elect a Senator. There are others who say, and I think the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] takes that view, that this body could step over into the State and compel the election. The Constitution says the Senate shall be made up of two Members from each State, elected originally by the legislatures thereof and now by the people.

Suppose the people of any State decline to elect a Senator? I do not see that we have any power to step over into the State and compel it to do so. In other words, that would be depriving the State of equal representation by its own consent, and that is the limitation in the Constitution—that it can not be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its consent. But if a State declines to do it, I have not seen any authority for the statement that this body has control over the people in the selection of a Member of this body or the other body.

That involves quite a delicate question. If we should proceed in the regular way of administering the oath to the Member elect, and then proceed to make an investigation, giving the Member a right as a Senator to present his case, and not only that, but vastly greater than that, giving the State its right to be represented here, in view of the fact that under the Constitution it can not be denied that right unless it itself gives the consent—if we should proceed on that basis there would not be, it seems to me, any danger to anyone. There could be none to the State whose decision was made up in an open election, with all facts at hand at the time of election. There could be none to the Nation; there certainly could be none to this body. Any such danger can be removed by our constitutional processes.

That has been the rule; and the rule, it seems to me, is wise. I know there are exceptions, but those exceptions are easily understood. There are 16 of them. In six of these the Members elect were charged with disloyalty; and when the charge was made that they were disloyal, of course that would go to the element of treason which disqualifies by force of the Constitution. It also goes to the question of taking an oath. No one doubts that in cases such as disloyalty the oath can be denied. That was done over in the House of Representatives when I was a Member there, and for that I voted. But when it is a question of prima facie evidence in the credentials unquestioned, I do not see how this body, in view not only of our past history but of the sound construction of the Constitution, can deny the right to take the oath.

Several Members who were denied the right to take the oath were denied on the basis that the States that sent them here were not regularly organized. I do not believe that is a very safe rule to follow, because that occurred immediately after the Civil War, and everybody knows the intensity of feeling prevailing at that time. The big question then was reconstruction. There was a vast difference of opinion as to how that was to be done.

Lincoln did not agree with the majority control on the plan of reconstruction. He offered in the early period of the Civil War, as early as 1862, a plan which, if it had been accepted, would have avoided the bitterness that grew out of the contest. Later, however, led by men like Thaddeus Stevens, there were other conditions named, and one of the conditions was the ratification of the fourteenth amendment, which intended to force suffrage upon the South in the colored man, or else deny representation in the House to that extent.

That was one of the fiercely resisted conditions of reconstruction; and when a State reconstructed without it and presented its Senator elect here, this body refused to accept the credentials on the ground that the State had not been properly reconstructed and was not authorized to hold such elections nor issue such certificates. I do not think that would be a safe plan to follow as a precedent, because of the intense bitterness of feeling and the inevitable dispute as to really what was a regularly organized State. It seems to me that the only plan that would be fair to the State and in consonance with what we have done heretofore would be to permit the Senator designate or Senator elect to take the oath, and then I propose to use my own judgment on what I shall do after the State has been permitted to be represented here and the person charged has a right to be heard in his own defense.

Mr. President, if I were in doubt on a great question like this, I should naturally look for some authority in whom I had confidence. When we come to a dispute of this character, fortunately we are not without great authority. I suppose every Member on the other side of the aisle will agree with me that Allen G. Thurman, of Ohio, known as the Old Roman, was one of the greatest constitutional lawyers of the country. In a controversy in this body, when a question of constitutional law came up, and James G. Blaine had made a statement and Allen G. Thurman rose and corrected it, Blaine paid him the compliment of saying, "Whenever I am in doubt on a question of constitutional law, I naturally turn to the Nestor of this body," referring to Allen G. Thurman. He is on record on this identical subject as saying that the procedure is to allow the Senator elect to take the oath and then proceed, with which opinion Blaine agreed.

The same thing is true of George F. Hoar, probably one of our greatest lawyers.

The same thing is true of Judge Cooley, certainly one of the best writers on constiutional limitations.

The same thing is true in the case of sitting Members of this body; for in two cases that I have read—MOSES and Newberry—the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] took exactly the same view, that the oath should first be administered and then we should proceed in a regular way. It seems to me that the great weight of authority is on one side of the question.

It has been stated that a question like this is to be determined largely by what the public is thinking. I recognize that it would be very easy to go with the crowd. I know what it means to announce that there has been too much money expended; that there has been corruption. I recognize, by the correspondence that reaches my desk to-day, the feeling of certain classes of people. It would be easy to go with the crowd; but I can not get my consent—and the election next year has no effect whatever—I can not get my consent to vote to deny any State its representation and a hearing in this body under the information that I have of the history of my country and the background of the maintenance of equality of State representation in this body.

When these States send their representatives here, the men who are knocking at the door of the Senate have a right to be heard not as private citizens but as elected Members of this body whose credentials are not questioned, then I am ready to go into the question in full, and reserve my right to vote in accordance with the facts that are divulged. Then I would not feel bound to limit qualifications to age, inhabitancy, and residence, but would include questions of corrupt use of money if such could be established. As we are now proceeding it is proposed to violate that part of the Constitution which secures equal representation here and find a Member guilty without a hearing as a Member—a dangerous step which may plague us in the future.

I conclude what I have to say by a reference to John Marshall, the country's greatest Chief Justice, when he sat on the famous case of Aaron Burr. It was well known that the President of the United States at that time felt that Burr was guilty of treason. It is well known that he wanted him to be convicted, and the Chief Justice fully understood it. The prosecutors proceeded to introduce evidence that was not admissible, and the Chief Justice declined to accept the evidence. It subjected him to the fiercest attack; and when the Chief Justice referred to it he did so in the language I am about to read, knowing how popular it was to find Burr guilty of treason, first because he was one of the most brilliant men in America, second because he had been Vice President and had come within 1 vote of being elected President over Thomas Jefferson; and not only that, but because he had been a great leader. The Chief Justice, in refusing to admit this evidence that was not admissible, made this statement:

> That this court dares not usurp power is most true.
>
> That this court dares not shrink from its duty is not less true.
>
> No man is desirous of placing himself in a disagreeable situation. No man is desirous of becoming the peculiar subject of calumny. No man, might he let the bitter cup pass from him without self-reproach, would drain it to the bottom. But if he has no choice in the case; if there is no alternative presented to him but a dereliction of duty, or the opprobrium of those who are denominated the world, he merits the contempt as well as the indignation of his country, who can hesitate which to embrace.

I recognize that it is popular to charge men high in position with corruption. It is a popular passion to want to punish those who have reached a certain position in public life. All these facts are well known to all of us. Before I would vote to exclude any man, however popular might be the demand, I should want to know certainly all of the facts in the case. It matters not how popular it would be to exclude him; the only course here open, as we see it, is to perform our duty. To me that duty is clear and requires of me to do what in my judgment is just to the State and in consonance with the dignity of this body and the preservation of the integrity of the institutions of the United States.

For that reason I shall vote, as I did in the Illinois case, to permit this Senator elect to take the oath. If he is permitted, I shall vote then to go fully into all the charges that are alleged against him, and reserve my right to vote to exclude him if the facts justify it. But I can not vote to take away from a State the right to be represented here; and I can not vote to find a man guilty without first giving him a trial.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have reported the following substitute for the resolution now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Strike out all after the word "resolution," on page 1, and insert the following words:

> "Whereas WILLIAM S. VARE, from the State of Pennsylvania, has presented a certificate of election in due and proper form as a Senator from said State: Therefore be it
>
> "*Resolved*, That without expressing any opinion as to the right or propriety of his retaining his seat in advance of a complete investigation thereof, the said WILLIAM S. VARE is entitled to be sworn as a Senator upon his prima facie case.
>
> "*Resolved further*, That when sworn in his credentials and all the papers in relation to his right to retain his seat be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with instructions to report thereon at the earliest practicable moment, and not in any case later than February 8, 1928."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I understand that the impression prevails, at least in the minds of some of the Senators, that our undisclosed intention in asking that Mr. VARE be sworn in now is to get his case into the Senate in such fashion that we can rely on that clause of the Constitution which requires a two-thirds vote to expel him. I want to say that that impression does not do us justice, if such an impression exists, and I want to say for Mr. VARE, for the State of Pennsylvania, as far as I am authorized to speak for it, and certainly to say for myself, that I admit now that if Mr. VARE is sworn in the Senate will have authority and power by a majority vote to declare his seat vacant in the same manner that they did in the case of Senator Lorimer.

Not only do I not think that we would be within the protection of any two-thirds rule, but I am willing now, so far as lies in my power, to stipulate for Mr. VARE and for myself that neither of us will invoke any such protection; neither of us will assert that a two-thirds vote is necessary to vacate his seat.

So that I beg Senators to believe that our reason for asking the immediate administration of the oath is not that we may trick the Senate into a position where more than a majority will be necessary to carry out its wish. The sole purpose in asking is that the State of Pennsylvania may not for 60 days, or 6 months, or for whatever time the Senate plans to spend on the matter, be deprived of the 2 votes in this body to which the Constitution entitles it.

Then I think there is an impression that our idea was that at least we might, if we got Mr. VARE sworn in, drag out the final determination of the case so that in the long run he would have served a large part of his term, whatever the Senate might do.

As the best evidence of our good faith in that regard, we have suggested that the report be returned within 60 days, so that by no possibility could the case be dragged out and Mr. VARE be given for a long period of time a seat to which, in the end, the Senate might hold he was not entitled. That is in the substitute resolution we have presented.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I gladly yield.

Mr. TRAMMELL. If Mr. VARE should be seated under the Senator's resolution, would a majority or two-thirds be required to expel him?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. A majority would have authority to declare his seat vacant, which is tantamount to expulsion.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The Senator would not contend, then, that two-thirds were necessary, if that question arose hereafter?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; I would not make that contention. I have tried to make that very clear, because some Senators have explained their antagonism to our present application by saying to their people back home who could not understand their attitude that if they voted to swear Mr. VARE in, it would have the effect of fortifying him behind the two-thirds rule. I do not believe that a two-thirds vote is necessary to declare the seat vacant.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator is aware of the fact, of course, that a number of Senators on both sides of the Chamber take that position. The Senator would not think he could estop another Senator, who believes that under the Constitution a two-thirds vote is required, from claiming the right to have it tested by the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No. Mr. President, from many experiments, I would not think I could stop any Senator from saying anything.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I hope the Senator will treat the matter seriously. If the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote in the opinion of any Senator he would be entitled to have his view of the subject passed upon by the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely. I mean to answer seriously. In the Lorimer case a majority believed that Lorimer should be expelled, and they declared his seat vacant by a majority vote. There is a precedent. If a majority of the Senate, after hearing both sides of the Vare case, should decide that they wanted to have him out of the Senate, they have the power, unquestionably, to pass a resolution declaring the seat vacant.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. As to whether a majority or two-thirds vote would be required, would depend upon the form of the resolution.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the resolution declared that the Senator was not entitled to his seat, a majority vote for the resolution would deny him the seat.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I concede that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the resolution provided that he should be expelled from the Senate, it would require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania in that.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator from Arkansas agrees with me in that. I fancy that a majority of the Senate does. If such a resolution, to declare the seat vacant, is presented, and if a point of order is made against it, the majority has power to enforce its will that the majority vote is sufficient.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. FESS. There is one question that has not been discussed, a question in which I am considerably interested. Without anything further being done on the part of Illinois, is there a vacancy in the Senatorship from that State?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I feel sure there is not.

Mr. FESS. What could the State do?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The State can not do anything. The State has commissioned Mr. SMITH, and has given him all the authority and evidence of authority that a Senator elect can have. He is now hung in mid-air. As far as we can tell, he will be knocking on the doors of the Senate for the next six years, saying, "I have in my hand a regular credential"; unless the Senate goes further and declares his seat vacant.

Mr. FESS. In case the matter is held in suspense, and the Senator designate or the Senator elect demands his salary, and the disbursing officer denies it, as he probably would, and the complainant takes the matter to the courts, can he get a decision from the Supreme Court which would involve the Senate's final right?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; he could not. I am clear on that, because under the law which is the only authority for the payment of a Senator's salary, he is entitled to his salary from the time his term begins until an opportunity is offered for taking the oath. The opportunity in the case of Mr. SMITH occurred last Monday, and therefore Mr. SMITH's pay stopped on that date and he is not entitled to any pay at the present time. That is why he could not get the matter into court, even if there were jurisdiction, and I doubt very much whether there is. I doubt if any court in the land would take jurisdiction of a disputed claim to membership in a legislative body of this character, either the Senate or the House.

Mr. FESS. I omitted to state that it appears to me on the question that is now before us that there would be required only a majority vote rather than a two-thirds vote, on the ground that it is not a question of expelling a Senator for an offense but it is a question simply of admitting a Senator designate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It goes to his fundamental right to come into the Senate, not his expulsion for something that occurred afterwards.

Mr. FESS. That has been my opinion.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I agree perfectly that if, after being sworn in, a Senator does something which his fellows consider to be immoral or otherwise improper, it then would take a two-thirds vote to expel him. Clearly that is so, under the Constitution.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Gladly.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have sent the case of Senator-elect SMITH to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. He has his credentials. Suppose the committee should report that he is not entitled to be sworn in, and the Senate should adopt that report. He would still have the certificate. Could the governor deprive him then of that certificate in any way?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not know of any way. The only way in which the certificate can be rendered nugatory is for the Senate to declare the seat vacant, or for SMITH to resign.

Mr. OVERMAN. So, if we did seat him, and then declared the seat vacant, the governor would have the right to appoint some one else in his place?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. He would. Furthermore, of course, Mr. SMITH would have the right to resign, and to run again, or seek another appointment, or follow his own discretion in the matter; but until he resigns his commission, or until we by resolution declare his seat vacant, or expel him, the governor can do nothing, the State of Illinois can do nothing, and the State has one-half of its constitutional representation.

I wanted to bring that home to Senators before they vote on this substitute, because I do not want any Senator to be able to say in good faith that he voted against this time-honored method of treating these cases because he was fearful of some trick to slide in behind that two-thirds rule and get Mr. VARE an advantage which at the moment he does not enjoy.

I want the Senate to realize, too, that there is not in our mind any intention of trying to string this matter out and to get by indirection what the Senate may hold we are not entitled to directly. That is the reason for the 60-day limitation in the substitute resolution.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May I just add this before I yield? The Senator who is the ranking member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections tells me that, in spite of the very large number of ballots concerned in the Pennsylvania election which are brought in issue in the Wilson-Vare contest, by dint of putting on extra forces and working somewhat over hours he will be able to complete the count of those ballots within this same 60-day limitation. So that neither the election contest nor the inquiry into Mr. VARE's general fitness, if that is to be made, will in any way delay this question beyond the next couple of months.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Would a report of the committee that SMITH was not entitled to his seat, approved by the action of the Senate as a whole, be tantamount to a declaration that the seat was vacant?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If that is the plain implication, then, of course, it would be tantamount to it.

Mr. BRUCE. Would it not be the necessary implication? It seems to me the irresistible implication that he is not entitled to the seat. If so, then as nobody else is entitled to it, and it seems to me as a plain syllogistic principle, the seat is vacant.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator says something that means that, I agree with the Senator it would have that effect.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Undoubtedly that is the effect of the precedent the Senator from Pennsylvania himself cited—the Lorimer case. The Senate adopted a resolution declaring that the Senator from Illinois was not entitled to his seat, and it was held to create a vacancy which could be filled under the processes known to the law.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We need not quarrel about that. It is a mere matter of the form of words, and I presume the words would be made clear by whomever offers the resolution.

Before I conclude—and I have about finished—I want to call the attention of Senators to one very recent case, which is not in any sense a compelling authority upon us, but which illustrates the construction that is put on this phrase regarding qualifications, and the method of treating those who are supposed to be disqualified in character.

In the oldest of all our Commonwealths, the oldest State in the Union which has had such a provision in its constitution longer, I understand, than we have had it in the Federal Constitution, there came up within this year a case in the Senate of the State of Virginia. Last January a senator elect was shown to have committed forgery and to have been convicted on the charge of committing forgery under two different assumed names long prior to his election to the senate. There was investigation. The facts were brought out without doubt. They turned to the constitution of Virginia, which contains this language:

> Each house shall judge of the election, qualifications, and returns of its members, may punish them for disorderly behavior and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member.

When Smith presented himself to take the oath he was stood aside, just as happened here. The matter was referred to the committee on privileges and elections of the Virginia Senate. In their report they recited the passage of the resolution, its reference to them, and said this:

> Whereas the committee, having taken time to hear evidence on the charges presented against said Alfred C. Smith, is of the opinion from the evidence, which is herewith transmitted to the senate, that the moral unfitness of the said Alfred C. Smith has been fully established and he should not be permitted to become a member of the Senate of Virginia; but upon mature consideration reports as follows:
>
> First. Under a strict construction of the word "qualification," as contained in section 47 of the constitution of Virginia, the committee is of the opinion that it means political and not moral qualifications.
>
> Second. That the evidence fully justifies the expulsion of Alfred C. Smith from the senate immediately upon his taking the oath of office, and the committee so reports and advises.

That report was adopted by a vote of 36 to 2. The journal then continues:

> Mr. Alfred C. Smith, having previously filed in the office of the clerk of the senate a certificate of his election, came forward and the clerk of the senate administered to him the oath prescribed by law. Immediately upon the administering of the oath Mr. Alfred C. Smith tendered his resignation as a member of the Senate of Virginia.

Obviously, if he had not done so he would have been expelled within the next 60 seconds. There was some debate as to

whether his resignation should be accepted, and finally he was permitted to go in that fashion.

There is the construction put on this very language, applied to this very question by the oldest State in the Union, by a vote of 36 to 2. After a study of the Constitution and this phrase, which closely resembles the phraseology of our own Constitution, they applied it in the way that we are trying to say it should, in deference to the Constitution, be applied.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. McMASTER. I simply ask for information. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] asked this question yesterday. The question was answered, but I desire further information in regard to it. The Senator from Arkansas asked the question if one presented himself at the door of the Senate with credentials from his State to the effect that he had been duly elected, that there was no question about the election, no question as to fraud or corruption, but that the Senate had in its possession absolute evidence that the Senator elect had committed an act of treason, then would the Senator from Pennsylvania vote to administer the oath?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Clearly I would not, because the amendment to the Constitution establishes loyalty as one of the qualifications.

Mr. McMASTER. One further question was suggested here last spring by a Senator on this floor. Suppose a man came to the doors of the Senate with his credentials properly executed and it was discovered by the Senate that the man was violently insane, would the Senator then vote to administer the oath?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No, Mr. President; I would not.

Mr. McMASTER. Then I wish to call the attention of the laymen of the Senate to the fact that we have been led to believe here, by certain lawyers who have argued the constitutional question, that the only matters we can question in regard to credentials are the matters of age and residential qualifications. Now we discover that there are other things we can question; that if a man is guilty of an act of treason we can question that; that if a man is violently insane we can bar him at the door of the Senate. If we can bar him upon either of these two propositions, there are probably other matters in which the Senate would have equal right to bar him at the door of the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Let me answer the Senator now. I would vote against admitting one proven to be guilty of treason because the very Constitution under which we exist makes that one of the disqualifications. Treason is a constitutional disqualification for a Senator elect. I would vote against the administration of the oath to a lunatic because it is obvious that the oath can not be administered to a lunatic. The taking of the oath involves the exercise of intellect. By the very terms of the Senator's question, the man is incapable of taking the oath. But if he had some other disqualification and if he was mentally competent to take the oath, I should vote in favor of his taking it.

May I say, in conclusion, that I think some of us are being led into error in this case by thinking too much of the individuals involved here. We are thinking too much about what is Mr. VARE's right or what is his liability. We are thinking too much about what are our rights or our duties. Can we not, for at least a moment, consider it from the other angle of the rights of that vast body of American citizens whose representative he is sent here to be? That is the important question. It is not the fate of any single one of us in this Chamber. That is relatively unimportant. What counts now and what will count in the future, when these precedents come back to haunt us, are the rights of those people, invisible to us in this Chamber, who are waiting anxiously our answer to that question of whether they can have the representation here which the Constitution promises them.

For 14 years WILLIAM S. VARE has served with credit in the other House of this Congress. How can we, without being absurd, say that the Senate can not permit him to sit in our sacred Chamber for 60 days?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator may.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator agrees we can not inquire into a man's private life, does he not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is my impression.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then why call attention to the good character of the man if that has nothing to do with it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Because it is on this theoretical bad character that the Senator is proposing to bar himself from that taint for 60 days.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; nobody said anything about his character. The Senator twice stood here and told us the Senator elect could not contaminate the Senate, and nobody said anything about his character, good or bad. That is not a question involved here. The Senator has tried to argue that the man served with credit in the other branch of Congress. Does he think that adds anything to the question one way or the other?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think it shows that the Senate is becoming rather precious when it can not accept a Member from the other House.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the Senator believe that question is involved in this vote?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I believe the question of fair play to Pennsylvania and to Mr. VARE is involved in this vote.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is not what I asked the Senator. Does the Senator believe the question of whether the Senator designate served in the other House has anything to do with this question here?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes, I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not know we had a right to inquire into that question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator wants to exclude that from his mind that is a different question.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not think the Senator would concede that we had a right to inquire into that question. I never dreamed anybody would claim we could inquire whether he served with credit in another body.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. GLASS. The fact that it does not affect the question at all is disclosed by the further fact that Mr. Lorimer served in the other House for an equally long period.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let me see whether he can point out this distinction regarding the question which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] so clearly discussed this morning and which the Senator from Pennsylvania raised about the equality of representation of the States in the Senate. Is it any more unfair to deprive a State of equal representation by having an alleged Senator elect stand aside until the question as to whether he is the chosen representative of that State can be determined and whether he is qualified under the law and entitled to a seat, than it is after he has been sworn in and taken his seat and occupied his seat here for the Senate then to say upon inquiry that he was not duly elected and was not qualified and ought never to have presented his certificate here, and then to exclude him from the Senate? There must come an intermediate time between that action and the time when his place is filled either by appointment or by election. During that time the State is just as much deprived of its equal representation here, is it not, as it would be now if the Senator designate were not allowed to take his seat?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; but that interval may be very brief. It may be as little as an hour. If the governor is ready to make the appointment the instant the vacancy occurs, the vacancy may not last for more than an hour. But here deliberately we are planning to keep this question in suspense for 60 days where it is impossible to fill the vacancy and where, during that 60 days, matters vital to the welfare of the United States may be decided.

I have not tried to argue this matter on a partisan ground at all. I am not going to resort to personalities or talk partisan politics if I can help it. But let me call the Senators' attention to the way the country is going to look at this question.

At the present moment, thanks to the expulsion or suspension of Senator-elect SMITH, the Senate of the United States, including Mr. VARE, consists of 47 Democrats, 47 Republicans, and 1 member of the Farmer-Labor Party. The suspension of Mr. VARE from taking the oath means that the Democrats will be in the majority; they will have 47 Members, while the Republicans will have 46, although 48 Republicans have been elected to the Senate.

I do not charge that the Democratic Party is trying to steal the Senate, control its organization, and, more important than that, to control what it shall do this winter, but is not the country going to think so; and is not the fact that the balance of power hangs here by so slender a hair going to discolor the action of the Senate and make all men think now and in the long-distant future that the result of this vote in throwing the majority from one side of the aisle to the other was in the minds of the Senators who voted so to throw it?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that, so far as I can say anything for this side of the Chamber, the question as to where the majority will rest after the action taken on the pending resolution is concerned does not in any wise enter into their course.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am not charging that it does. I hope the Senator will understand that.

Mr. FLETCHER. So far as I am concerned, my vote certainly will not be based upon any consideration as to whether the action taken shall give a majority to one side or the other. That is not the question involved at all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But the Senator from Florida will see that it is an unhappy time for us to establish a new precedent.

Mr. FLETCHER. We can not help that. We did not bring this trouble here. I could fill several columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with statements that would be startling in newspapers by prominent people in Pennsylvania with regard to this alleged election and in regard to the candidates that were before the people. I do not care to go into that.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks this morning the briefs which I send to the desk may be inserted in the RECORD. These are the briefs that I mentioned when the discussion of the Vare matter began.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1927.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate:

Availing myself of this opportunity, I am submitting a pamphlet prepared by Hon. Harry A. Mackey, of the Philadelphia bar, who was campaign manager of the candidates on the combined Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket.

By way of illustrating the facts set forth by Mr. Mackey, I am submitting also—

1. A statement signed by all the Congressmen elect from Philadelphia County, certifying that their entire primary-campaign expenses were borne by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee.

Similarly, affidavits from members elect of the State senate and members elect to the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania from Philadelphia County.

Similarly, affidavits from the members of the State committee from Philadelphia County, and an affidavit by Harry C. Davis as to the distribution of $50 to each of 1,465 election precincts in Philadelphia from the campaign funds of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee.

2. Sample ballot sent out to 425,000 prospective voters in the interest of all candidates in the various districts who were identified with the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket.

3. Sample watchers' certificates showing the legal form in which these watchers were appointed. In the Pittsburgh district petitions for overseers were presented to Judge Thomas Ford, who stated from the bench that he did not think overseers necessary, inasmuch as watchers would answer the same purposes. This is another illustration of the legal status and regular official character of the watchers.

4. A letter signed by WILLIAM S. VARE as typical of the letters sent out at his personal expense to the voters throughout Pennsylvania.

5. Typical letters sent out and included in "senatorial campaign expenditures," but which were in the interest of other candidates as well as Mr. VARE.

6. Samples of campaign advertising used by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee to get their candidates' messages to the more than 3,000,000 potential voters in Pennsylvania.

7. Circular showing leading business men's support of Mr. VARE.

8. A letter written by Rabbi Moses Shochet indicative of the fact that citizens from all walks of life were interested in Mr. VARE's candidacy.

9. Copies of the Progressive Labor World. Three different editions of this paper were widely circulated throughout Pennsylvania and the expense borne by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee.

10. Copy of Scranton Telegram showing the linking of the other candidates with Mr. VARE on the combination ticket.

11. Use of radio by Miss Beatrice Vare and speech as reprinted by the Progressive Labor World.

12. An argument on behalf of WILLIAM S. VARE, Senator elect from the State of Pennsylvania, submitted by Harold B. Beitler, Esq., and M. J. McEnery, Esq., of the Philadelphia bar.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE NOMINATION OF WILLIAM S. VARE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA—HISTORY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARY CAMPAIGN OF MAY 18, 1926

(By Harry A. Mackey, campaign manager for Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket)

FOREWORD

The only money expended for the personal primary campaign of WILLIAM S. VARE was the money used to circularize the voters of Pennsylvania. This form of expenditure is not limited and is legalized by both the Federal and the Pennsylvania statutes. Not one dollar of the $578,870.31 which was expended in the general State campaign was spent directly for Mr. VARE. This money was spent in the nomination of some 5,000 candidates, of which Mr. VARE was but one. This is proven by the evidence produced before the committee appointed by the United States Senate to probe these expenditures.

Mr. VARE's letter-writing campaign cost $71,435.80, which is the sum total amount that can be honestly charged as the cost of his personal campaign.

Irresponsible statements given newspaper publication are responsible for the spread of the misleading information broadcast to every corner of the country alleging that the nomination of Mr. VARE was secured by unfair means. It is to be hoped that the truth may now be given to the public.

Briefly, it has been falsely charged that:

1. A large "slush" fund was raised and expended to "buy" the nomination for Mr. VARE.

2. Employment of paid watchers was nothing but a subterfuge for vote buying.

3. Contributions were received in cash as well as by check, and money was disbursed in some instances by cash instead of by check, this fact being the basis for the insinuation that cash disbursements meant something "shady."

The facts are:

1. A large sum of money was raised and expended in behalf of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket. But it was not a "slush" fund. Every cent of it was honestly and legally expended and honestly and legally accounted for. The nomination of Mr. VARE was the result of an uprising against Volsteadism.

The best answer to the assertion that money obtained the nomination is the fact that Senator Pepper was defeated, although his campaign cost three times as much as the campaign of Mr. VARE. As an illuminating example, the Pepper expenditures in Philadelphia were two and one-half times that of the Vare ticket expenditures, while the Vare vote in Philadelphia was nearly three times that of the Pepper vote.

2. The Pennsylvania primary law, passed 20 years ago, legalizes the employment of watchers, and for 20 years it has been the custom for all candidates and all parties to employ them and to pay them. The assertion that the votes of these watchers were thus purchased was made by only one person, a Pinchot partisan, is an insult to the men and women who acted as watchers, and is utterly absurd.

3. Every dollar paid out in behalf of Mr. VARE was for a legitimate purpose and was accounted for in the proper way. Cash contributions were made to county organizations to prevent our opponents from knowledge of our movements prior to the primary, which they could have obtained had the transactions been by checks, as will be subsequently demonstrated. The proof that these transactions were honest is furnished by the fact that they were reported under oath at Harrisburg under the Pennsylvania law, had been entered in the books of the treasurer of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee and were exhibited before the investigting committee at Washington.

In the May primary the best men and women of Pennsylvania were enlisted behind one candidate or the other, the fight was openly conducted, and assertions that the nomination was a matter of barter can not be sustained by the slightest scintilla of evidence.

HARRY A. MACKEY,
Campaign Manager, Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward Ticket.

HISTORY OF THE CAMPAIGN

The nomination of WILLIAM S. VARE for United States Senator by the Republican Party of Pennsylvania on May 18, 1926, furnished a complete vindication of popular government.

Congressman VARE, when he announced his candidacy for Senator, faced an uneven battle. Arrayed against him were unlimited wealth, powerful political organizations in 65 of the 67 counties of the State, and nearly all of the newspapers.

Despite these great handicaps he emerged the victor in the bitterest primary contest in the history of Pennsylvania.

The Vare triumph was not solely a personal victory. It was an indorsement by the electorate of the platform upon which he sought the nomination and a tribute to his courage in taking a manly and unequivocal stand upon vital public problems.

RÉSUMÉ OF CONDITIONS

To really understand the obstacles which Congressman VARE faced a brief résumé of the conditions which confronted him when he announced his candidacy on March 15, 1926, will be necessary.

United States Senator George Wharton Pepper and Governor Gifford Pinchot had already entered the field. Senator Pepper had been conducting an active campaign for reelection for at least six months. Most of the newspapers of Pennsylvania, thinking in common with many of the important political factors of the State, that the contest for Senator would narrow down between Senator Pepper and Governor Pinchot, had committed themselves to the former's reelection. The papers, as part of their campaign in the interest of Senator Pepper, denied for a considerable length of time any avenue of publicity to Congressman VARE.

They attacked him editorially and closed their news columns to his campaign.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury; Joseph R. Grundy, president of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; and other powerful interests were conducting a vigorous campaign in the interest of Senator Pepper.

Their presence in the Pepper ranks brought to the aid of the senior Senator potential forces in every part of the State. Political organizations in the western Part of Pennsylvania, because of their allegiance to Secretary Mellon, stood firmly with Senator Pepper. In other sections of the State the Grundy forces were building strong local and county committees, and the dominant political organizations of the State, outside of Philadelphia and Dauphin Counties, were behind Pepper. The Pepper forces had unlimited money, and every avenue where they desired to spread propaganda in the interest of Mr. Pepper's reelection was open to them.

Behind the financial support and the newspaper aid was the powerful Republican organization of Pennsylvania, strengthened by Senator Pepper through Federal patronage.

Governor Pinchot was also a very formidable opponent. Four years ago, through a breach in the Republican Party and the expenditure of a large sum of money, Pinchot won the Republican gubernatorial nomination. He was subsequently elected as a result of support given him by regular Republicans who accepted the decision of the primary.

Mr. Pinchot has a great personal fortune. His family is also extremely wealthy. The fight of 1922 showed that the governor was ready to spend large sums of money to gratify his ambitions.

But besides his wealth, the governor had other resources. By virtue of his position as Governor of Pennsylvania, he had been enabled to build up a great political machine. Through patronage he had organizations in every county in the State. The passage by the 1923 session of the Pennsylvania Legislature of an act known as the "administration code" enabled him to appoint and fix the salaries of thousands of State employees.

In addition, Mr. Pinchot's position as governor and his facility for making lurid statements gave him "front page" publicity in the newspapers.

Governor Pinchot was a dry. The attitude of Senator Pepper was not made very clear during the campaign. He issued a statement placing himself in the Volstead group, but in various sections of the State his supporters put forth the information that advocates of modification had nothing to fear from him.

Congressman VARE in announcing his candidacy declared for modification of the Volstead Act.

The entry of VARE into the fight created consternation in the Pepper camp. Immediately he was attacked. The newspapers proceeded to ignore the issue of Volsteadism he had raised and attempted to make the issue "Vareism," so called. Those in charge of the campaign were soon convinced that they were to be the victims of a newspaper conspiracy of silence, so far as the issues were concerned, and that the only way to defeat this conspiracy and meet, in addition, the vast amount of paid publicity for Pepper was to launch an intensive publicity and advertising campaign. This meant the printing and distribution of literature, the use of the advertising columns of the newspapers of the State, of periodicals, programs, billboards, letter writing, and finally the radio.

THE ADVERTISING PROGRAM

Placards and window cards, platforms, and various other kinds of literature totaling almost 9,000,000 pieces were distributed throughout the State. Despite the great amount of literature put out a great many demands for printed matter had to be cut down and many orders remained unfilled when the campaign ended.

This entailed a great expense, but it was necessary. There was no other means whereby the voters could be informed.

It was then decided that some new method must be adopted so that the ticket's appeal could be carried directly to the people. The writer then resorted to the radio. Each night of the campaign messages were carried through the air to the voters of Pennsylvania, appealing to their sense of duty and urging them to think for themselves and give careful consideration to the platform upon which the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward candidates were seeking nomination.

THE RADIO

The people of Pennsylvania listened in on the radio. Nightly they heard the candidates and their manager. Reports received at the campaign headquarters showed that sentiment was increasing everywhere. The conspiracy of silence maintained by the big newspapers was broken.

NATIONAL INTEREST AROUSED

In this short space the importance of the Vare ticket and the great fight it was making against powerful interests attracted nation-wide interest. Great newspapers and magazines of the country outside of Pennsylvania sent special writers into the State to study the effect of the issue injected into the campaign. In every instance these experts upon national questions and public opinion predicted victory. These articles were in contradiction to the reports in Pennsylvania publications that the powerful machine arrayed against Mr. VARE would return Senator Pepper to Washington for another term. Notwithstanding these unbiased reports, based upon public sentiment, the newspapers of Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties continued up until the election to claim the nomination of Senator Pepper, and did not abandon their unfair attacks upon Mr. VARE.

It was after Mr. VARE'S victory that a cry of extravagant use of money in the Pennsylvania campaign was raised. Now, it is a well-known axiom that accusations in general terms are easy to make, require no specific proof, and, because of this, are exceedingly difficult to controvert. It is precisely this sort of campaign that has been waged against Mr. VARE with the United States Senate committee inquiry as the basis.

As a matter of fact, there was expended for the ticket headed by Mr. VARE'S chief opponent three times as much money as for the ticket headed by VARE, and yet this failed to "buy" the election, which establishes the honesty of Pennsylvania voters and election boards, and emphasizes the absurdity of the "slush" fund propaganda.

MONEY SPENT FOR MANY CANDIDATES

It must be recalled that the campaign of Congressman VARE was tied up with the candidacy of Edward E. Beidleman for governor, Arthur H. James for lieutenant governor, and James E. Woodward for secretary of internal affairs. With the exception of the money spent personally by Congressman VARE for letter writing, every cent used in the campaign was in the interest of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket.

At this point it is necessary to emphasize a situation which has apparently been overlooked. The forces allied with the Vare ticket conducted their campaigns throughout Pennsylvania under the name of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee. The fight was not for United States Senator alone but for a complete ticket.

A STATE-WIDE CONTEST

The fight made by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee was not made solely in the interest of these four candidates. Under tne name of this committee campaigns were conducted on behalf of very many candidates in the State. These included a candidate for Senator, a candidate for governor, a candidate for lieutenant governor, a candidate for secretary of internal affairs, 36 Members of Congress, 25 members of the Pennsylvania State Senate, 208 members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, 113 members of the Republican State committee, and candidates in every section of the State for membership in county committees.

In Philadelphia the Republican organization supported 3,052 candidates, exclusive of the heads of the ticket, but including 7 Members of Congress, 4 members of the State senate, 41 members of the State house of representatives, 16 members of the Republican State committee, and 2,984 candidates for membership in the 48 Republican ward committees.

It, therefore, can be seen that the money spent by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket was not spent solely in the interest of Congressman VARE or any other individual candidate. Every dollar spent was necessary, and it was spent in the interest of the entire ticket.

VARE'S CANDIDACY DID NOT ADD TO USUAL COSTS

In Philadelphia, even if Congressman VARE had not been a candidate, it would have been necessary to have spent the same amount of money as was contributed to the various ward organizations. The maintenance of competent leadership in the 48 wards of the city was of paramount importance to the Republican Party of Philadelphia, and in addition to a ticket of 3,052 candidates the workers of the Republican Party had the responsibility of passing six loan bills aggregating $54,750,000 of vital concern to the city.

CASH CONTRIBUTIONS TO COUNTY COMMITTEES

Criticism has been directed at the method employed of making contributions to county leaders in cash instead of by check. In fact, those individuals who wish Mr. VARE harm and who realize that the purposes for which we expended money can not be successfully impugned, are laying great stress on this circumstance.

The truth is that these contributions had to be made in cash. Use of this method was the result of experience and forethought. If the campaign was to be fought over again, there could be no change in this method. Why?

We were fighting a powerful combination. Its long arm stretched into every nook and corner of the State. It was strongly intrenched in financial, banking, and business circles. These Pepper leaders set out to do two things in the way of organization—to sap our strength in Philadelphia, if possible, and to prevent us from building up an organization in the rest of the State. They failed in the first part of the program, but time and again, when I thought that I had a man picked for county leader in some section of the State, information would leak out, pressure would be applied, and we would lose the services of that man before he got started. In saying this I am not making charges of irregular practices, but simply emphasizing the fact that we were in a real fight and that no quarter was being given.

It was then determined that in selecting our county leaders we would safeguard our plans in every way until they were complete and working. A county leader would come to Philadelphia and be given the money in cash to open his headquarters and pay the necessary expenses of the campaign in his county.

It was vitally essential to make these contributions in cash. Checks deposited in small local banks would have inevitably disclosed our plans, and we were determined to prevent this. There was nothing shady about these transactions. The men to whom the money was given were well known in their communities and their characters and reputations were the best guaranty that the money would be honestly expended. The final proof that there was no other intention on our part is the fact that we accounted legally for these sums in our official report filed at Harrisburg under the corrupt practices act.

The campaign which Mr. VARE's managers conducted was in striking contrast to that of his opponents. At no time did Mr. VARE or those in charge of his campaign indulge in vituperation or make a personal attack upon either Senator Pepper or Mr. Pinchot. The VARE forces were battling for an issue—modification of the Volstead Act—and upon this issue they desired a referendum. The voters of Pennsylvania answered in no uncertain terms.

The official tabulation of the vote cast for United States Senator follows:

WILLIAM S. VARE	596,928
George Wharton Pepper	515,502
Gifford Pinchot	339,127

Examination of the expenses of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee will reveal that not one cent was spent for speakers. No compensation was given to the women affiliated with the campaign. Their services were voluntary. The bulk of the money was spent in advertising, as the following summary will show:

Advertising	$163,555.21
Dissemination of information	33,645.05
Printing	81,981.16
Postage	17,720.53
Pay roll (office force)	15,410.51
Headquarters (rent, supplies, and operating expenses)	13,532.86
Multigraphing	5,610.67
Office expenses	4,261.45
Traveling and transportation	3,463.14
Telephone and telegrams	3,427.05
Badges	165.00
Banners and bill posting	4,502.68
Personal expenses of WILLIAM S. VARE in letter-writing campaign	71,435.80
Contributions to county committees	231,095.00
Total	649,806.11

In arriving at the total of expenditures on behalf of Mr. VARE and his colleagues on the ticket, the effort has been made to increase this by adding sums that can not properly be thus credited.

For example, there was reported by the Beidleman-for-governor campaign committee the expenditure of approximately $120,000. This money was expended solely in Beidleman's behalf and can in no sense be charged to VARE, and yet it is included in the total given out from the Senate committee hearing. The Beidleman-for-governor headquarters were located at Harrisburg and were unknown to us until the account was filed.

There is also a sum of $16,000 expended by Ralph Beaver Strassburger, Norristown newspaper publisher, who voluntarily wrote to thousands of voters advocating Mr. VARE's nomination. He did this in aid of the cause Mr. VARE represented and without consultation with our committee.

STATE-WIDE ENTHUSIASM

As a matter of fact, Mr. Strassburger's act only emphasizes the widespread activity in Mr. VARE's behalf. This activity came from men and women in every part of the State and every walk of life. It was spontaneous and alive with the enthusiasm of a crusade.

The business men of Philadelphia rallied to Mr. VARE's support. In less than a week after Mr. VARE had announced his candidacy 7,500 business men pledged themselves in writing to work and vote for Mr. VARE's nomination. From these men, representing every form of enterprise in the city, was selected the William S. Vare Business Men's Committee of 100, composed of leading figures in the financial, commercial, and industrial life of Philadelphia. This committee also spent money in advertising in daily newspapers. The expenditures of this committee, approximately $7,800, was also unjustly charged against us. There undoubtedly were many public-spirited men and women who as individuals spent money in Mr. VARE's interest because of their interest in Congressman VARE and his platform, but these expenditures, like those of some prominent Philadelphia lawyers in writing to their clients urging them to support the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket, can not be charged to the campaign committee.

Mr. VARE's vote represented much that is finest in American spirit, and to charge that this splendid exhibition of political vigor was the result of a "slush" fund is an insult to thousands and thousands of patriotic men and women.

EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURES

The advertising set forth in the above statement consisted of the placing of advertisements in leading newspapers throughout the State of Pennsylvania. Included in the item are also payments for advertisements in programs, souvenir booklets, and books printed and distributed by various organizations in Pennsylvania.

The charges for the dissemination of information include the cost of distributing special editions of various newspapers, the cost of reprinting articles favoring the ticket, preparation of literature and the remuneration of persons working in various sections of the State to acquaint the voters with the platform.

The printing bills cover the cost of printing nearly 9,000,000 pieces of literature.

The postage is for the sending out of various circular letters and mailing of literature.

The office pay roll, charge for the establishment of various headquarters, and office expenses embrace the cost of equipping the headquarters with furniture, purchase of office supplies, charges for envelopes, paper, twine, and other articles necessary for the shipment of literature, and the mailing of letters, together with the salaries of the mailing force and the shipping department.

The item for multigraphing is for the mailing by addressing companies of circular letters.

Telephone and telegraph charges are for the maintenance of communication between the central headquarters in Philadelphia with the leaders throughout the State and communications with the public at large.

Traveling and transportation charges are for the necessary expenses in traveling to and from Philadelphia and the cost of carrying speakers to various meeting places.

The badges were for the members of the Mothers' Committee, a group of public-spirited women who did magnificent work in the interest of the ticket. Not one of the women connected with this organization received any salary.

Mr. VARE's expenses were for the printing, addressing, and mailing of personal letters to the voters of Pennsylvania.

This explanation of the various items included in the summary shows that every dollar outside of the $231,095 distributed among the county organizations of Pennsylvania was spent for legitimate publicity.

As illustrative of the relative economies of the Vare and Pepper campaign committees, the expenditures of each in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties, and the vote of Congressman VARE and Senator Pepper are worthy of consideration. In Philadelphia Mr. VARE received 337,944 votes. Senator Pepper's vote was 113,969. The Vare ticket expenditure in Philadelphia was $73,250, and that of the Pepper forces $181,678. In Allegheny County Mr. VARE received 67,677 votes and the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward Allegheny County committee spent $108,053.72. Mr. Pepper received 80,436 votes and his State ticket spent $327,429.41.

NECESSITY FOR EXPENDITURES

The expenses of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee were small when consideration is given to certain facts. Pennsylvania is almost a nation in itself. It embraces 44,000 square miles. It has a population of more than 10,000,000, with approximately 4,000,000 men and women qualified to vote.

In order that the reader may have some conception of the mighty and intricate political problems and the cost of a primary election in Pennsylvania, it may be illuminating to present the following statistics. While I have said that Pennsylvania at this time has between 10,000,000 and 11,000,000 people, still the last authentic official census of all the States was in 1920. It is to be assumed that all the States have to some degree increased in population somewhat as Pennsylvania, but that census gives Pennsylvania's population as 8,720,017. The combined population of the five States, Missouri, Wisconsin, West Virginia, Utah, and Oregon, represented upon the investigating committee is, according to the last census, only 12,000 greater than that of Pennsylvania.

The 1920 census figures also show that the population of Pennsylvania is nearly 900,000 more than the combined population of 16 States now represented in the United States Senate by 32 Senators. These States are Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

The citizenry embraces every nationality on the globe and is comprised of men and women engaged in every known form of human activity. There are hard and soft coal mines, great iron works, steel mills, oil wells, slate quarries, and, as a matter of fact, out of the soil of Pennsylvania over 600 different metals are taken to make for the progress of the world and the happiness of mankind.

Pennsylvania's soil is tilled by 227,000 farmers and 3,500,000 men and women occupy such relationship toward their employers that they come under the terms of the workmen's compensation act. Between the seven mountains of Pennsylvania have been mobilized Pennsylvania's millions of citizens with all of their community interests and with all of their various prejudices, so that when a man addresses him-

self as a candidate to all of these people he must be thoroughly understood and his declarations must be properly and intelligently conveyed to such an electorate.

Therefore money necessarily had to be spent in order to meet the demand of the people of the State for placards, pictures, platforms, and all literature that touched upon the main issue of Congressman VARE'S campaign.

To fully understand the problem which confronted those in charge of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign it is necessary at this point to digress for a moment.

THE VARE PLATFORM

It was on March 15, 1926, that Congressman VARE, who for 14 years had represented the first Pennsylvania district in the Congress of the United States, made public announcement of his candidacy for the office of United States Senator and submitted his name to the voters of Pennsylvania at the primaries that were to be held on May 18. At the same time he published his platform, upon which he asked the Republican voters to pass judgment. He declared his loyalty to the administration of President Coolidge, his adherence to the protective-tariff policy of his party, and then added the following:

"There is, in addition, another issue of great importance upon which I submit my candidacy to the voters of the Republican Party.

"An effort is being made to force the Republican Party into an extreme position on the great question of prohibition. If successful, it would sooner or later create a fatal breach in the party. Our party has always been in the truest sense a liberal party. It believes in temperance and moderation and in law and order, but it would be false to the great liberal principles upon which it was founded if it could be maneuvered into supporting the tyranny of many features of the Volstead law.

"I shall be opposed in the primaries by two candidates who believe in and would maintain the extreme rigor of the Volstead law. I do not believe that this represents the feeling of the majority of Pennsylvania Republicans of all classes, and it is fitting that this majority should be represented in the coming primaries by a candidate who believes the time has come to modify the excesses of a law which is eating like a cancer into the physical and moral life of the American people.

"Enforcement of the Volstead Act has failed. This fact is obvious to all and needs no argument. It has failed, in my opinion, because the law is not enforceable in its present form.

"In Pennsylvania our citizens have watched its operation, backed by the full authority of the State. They have seen money poured out by millions in the Nation. They have seen espionage of the most offensive character brought into practice, and all to what avail?

"Law enforcement is breaking down everywhere. The younger generation is subjected to moral dangers which are the direct outgrowth of this condition. These are not fancied evils. They are real and everyone knows it.

"If I am not greatly mistaken, the American people are tired of this condition and of the indefensible invasion of their just rights. The laborer, at the end of a weary day in the mines or factory, finds himself a criminal if he takes a glass of beer or light wine, and yet he knows that the more favored classes find little difficulty in having well-stocked wine cellars. Against this hypocrisy and inequality I protest. My candidacy will give an opportunity to the voters of Pennsylvania to expresse their views on this question.

"The people of this State have had full opportunity to test the value of extreme prohibition and they know the result. They were promised a reign of law and they find widespread lawlessness; they were promised a contented and happy people, and they find a people profoundly discontented and justly irritated; they were promised the improvement of public morals and, instead, they find the moral restraints of life broken down. Against this destruction of law and order and true temperance my candidacy will be a protest.

"The proponents of Volsteadism everywhere throughout the country present a unanimity of attitude which is enlightening. They admit, because they must, the failure of enforcement. Their remedy is more and greater appropriations and more and more laws. I believe the time has come to admit that the present law is not enforceable and to change it so that it can be enforced.

"I stand for the greatest amount of liberty for the people that is consistent with good government, and I am opposed to the enactment of laws which unnecessarily curtail and reduce that liberty. As a matter of helpful enforcement of the real principles of the constitutional amendment, I would advocate a law permitting the sale of light wines and beer.

"I am convinced that such a liberalization of the Volstead Act will not only remedy the conditions I have described, but will, in fact, promote true temperance.

"In this statement I am confident I express the honest sentiment of all well-informed, unbiased men and women who consider this subject with an eye single to the greatest good to the greatest number."

A WAVE OF POPULAR APPROVAL

The publication of the Congressman's attitude toward the Volstead Act immediately caused a great wave of popular approval to spread over Pennsylvania. The popularity of the Vare platform was so unmistakable that his opponents were convinced that drastic steps must be taken to overcome the sentiment of the people of the State and to make the issue a personal one against Congressman VARE rather than to undertake to squarely meet the issues that he had so clearly presented.

The Congressman in his platform expressed the thoughts of the great mass of the people of the State. His attitude upon the vital public problems was so in accord with the sentiment of the electorate that men and women who had always fought the Republican organization of Philadelphia rushed to his support.

I will discuss Congressman VARE'S Philadelphia support later, but I will dismiss the subject temporarily and will say that Mr. VARE'S candidacy appealed to all classes, rich and poor, high and low, foreign and native born, soldiers and workmen, enemies of the Volstead Act, liberal-minded men and women, business and professional men.

MEN AND WOMEN VOLUNTEERED SUPPORT

As evidence of this, approximately 300,000 signatures were obtained in about eight days, touching every county of the State, in order that Mr. VARE'S name might be placed upon the official ballot. The gathering of the signatures to the petitions represented the volunteer services of men and women throughout Pennsylvania who believed in him and his platform and who desired to demonstrate their approval of a public official who had the courage to stand upon his convictions.

This enthusiasm was also evidenced by the readiness with which business men announced their support of Mr. VARE'S candidacy. Within a week after Mr. VARE announced his candidacy there were received at his headquarters pledges of support in writing from 7,500 Philadelphia business men.

WOMEN ACTIVE FOR VARE

The women were also very active in Mr. VARE'S behalf, and to them belongs a great deal of credit for his victory. They realized that the Vare platform for modification of the Volstead Act offered the best means for the protection of the health and morals of the young men and women of the State.

The Vare campaign in Philadelphia was opened with a mass meeting of women. This meeting was called by Mrs. Henry Hall Sinnamon, chairman of the women's auxiliary of the Vare campaign committee. Mrs. Sinnamon was requested by me to obtain, if possible, the signatures of 5,000 women to an indorsement of Mr. VARE'S candidacy. In 48 hours 10,050 women signed a pledge promising to work and vote for the nomination of Mr. VARE.

During the campaign Mrs. Sinnamon held many meetings and her women workers distributed large quantities of literature in industrial plants, in theaters, and on streets.

In addition to the activities of Mrs. Sinnamon, Mrs. Blanche A. Bellak, another public-spirited woman and a gold-star mother, organized the mothers' committee of Pennsylvania. This organization appealed to women throughout the State to support Mr. VARE.

Neither of these committees had any paid workers or speakers and used no money in their respective campaigns.

THE ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

Every newspaper in Pennsylvania that was unwilling to print the news of Mr. VARE'S compaign readily accepted advertising. The list of newspapers printed in this book shows that the advertisements were placed in newspapers in every section of Pennsylvania. It likewise shows that in addition to the English papers a great amount of advertising was done in the foreign-language newspapers. Advertisements were place in programs and in souvenir booklets of various organizations. Special editions of newspapers were distributed. Every means possible which would enable us to present the truth about the ticket were resorted to. If the expenses of this campaign were great, and they total less than one-third of the amount spent by the committees of Mr. VARE'S leading opponent, Senator Pepper, the fault does not lie with the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee but with the primary system.

All fair-minded people will agree that there was no other way, except in the manner the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee conducted its affairs, that the voters could be informed.

The only way in which these expenses can be cut is by re-forming the primary laws. There is no other way whereby the necessary expenses of a candidate who aspires for a public office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can be reduced.

Congressman VARE had no political organization wholly supporting him outside of the one in his own city. An appeal was made directly to the voter and the very meager and insufficient sum that the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee distributed throughout the counties was merely to interest high-minded men who would secure the services of a few watchers throughout the districts of the State to insure an approximately accurate count. I realized that in so short a

time it would be futile to attempt to organize political contacts in 65 counties of the State that could successfully compete with the Republican organization of those counties.

Therefore I will place before the reader just what was done in the way of publicity, recognized as perfectly proper under the laws of the State and of the Federal Government. The act of Congress of 1925 fixed the maximum amount of money that a candidate for Senator could contribute to a political committee or committees in Pennsylvania at $25,000. But this same act accords the privilege to a senatorial candidate of spending an unlimited sum of money for letter writing, postage, and incidental personal expenses in a campaign.

Now, let it be understood that this law applies to the general election, and that there is no law upon the Federal statutes touching a primary, which is purely a State function. But Mr. VARE desired to live not only up to the letter but within the spirit of the law, and he governed himself just as though this act of Congress applied to a primary election. He did not contribute one dollar to a political committee for political purposes. He did spend his own money in letters, personally directed to the voters and signed by himself, as shown in the appendix. Neither the legality nor the propriety of this item of expense can be questioned.

In order to carry the fight directly to the people great publicity was necessary. There went out from our headquarters 8,590,800 pieces of literature, consisting of platforms, cards, booklets, circular letters, printed indorsements, sample ballots, three special editions of the Progressive Labor World and the Sunday Dispatch.

LIST OF NEWSPAPERS

The newspapers very willingly accepted paid advertisements, so that through the Bloomingdale-Weiler Advertising Agency advertisements of the candidacy of our candidates appeared in the following newspapers throughout the campaign:

Bulletin, Philadelphia; News, Philadelphia; Inquirer, Philadelphia; Ledger, Philadelphia; Record, Philadelphia; Sun, Philadelphia; Pennsylvania Farmer, Philadelphia; Sunday Transcript, Philadelphia; Young Republican, Philadelphia; Albion News, Albion; Allentown Chronicle-News, Allentown; Allentown Call, Allentown; Altoona Mirror, Altoona; Altoona Times-Tribune, Altoona; Bangor News, Bangor; Beaver Falls Tribune, Beaver Falls; Beaver Times, Beaver; Belleville Times, Belleville; Berwick Enterprise, Berwick; Bethlehem Globe-Times, Bethlehem; Bloomsburg Press, Bloomsburg; Braddock News-Herald, Braddock; Bradford Era, Bradford; Bradford Star-Record, Bradford; Bristol Courier, Bristol; Brownsville Telegraph, Brownsville; Butler Eagle, Butler; Carbondale Leader, Carbondale; Carlisle Sentinel, Carlisle; Chambersburg Franklin-Repository, Chambersburg; Chambersburg Public Opinion, Chambersburg; Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Chambersburg; Charleroi Mail, Charleroi; Chester Times, Chester; Clearfield Progress, Clearfield; Coatesville Record, Coatesville; Columbia News, Columbia; Connellsville Courier, Connellsville; Connellsville News, Connellsville; Corry Journal, Corry; Dallas Post, Dallas; Donora Herald, Donora; Doylestown Intelligencer, Doylestown; DuBois Courier, DuBois; DuBois Express, DuBois; Easton Express, Easton; Easton Free Press, Easton; Edinboro Independent, Edinboro; Ellwood City Ledger, Ellwood City; Erie Dispatch-Herald, Erie; Erie Tageblatt, Erie; Erie Times, Erie; Franklin News-Herald, Franklin; Gettysburg Times, Gettysburg; Girard Cosmopolite, Girard; Greensburg Review and Tribune, Greensburg; Greenville Record, Greenville; Hanover Sun, Hanover; Harrisburg Independent, Harrisburg; Harrisburg Telegraph, Harrisburg; Hazleton Plain Speaker, Hazleton; Hazleton Vigilant, Hazleton; Huntingdon News, Huntingdon; Indiana Gazette, Indiana; Jeannette News-Dispatch, Jeannette; Jersey Shore Herald, Jersey Shore; Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown; Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown; Kane Republican, Kane; Kittanning Leader-Times, Kittanning; Lancaster New Era, Lancaster; Lancaster Intelligencer and Journal, Lancaster; Lansford News, Lansford; Lebanon News, Lebanon; Lehighton Leader, Lehighton; Lewistown Sentinel, Lewistown; Lock Haven Express, Lock Haven; Luzerne Press, Luzerne; McKeesport Journal, McKeesport; McKeesport News, McKeesport; Mauch Chunk News, Mauch Chunk; Mauch Chunk Times, Mauch Chunk; Mahanoy City Press, Mahanoy City; Mahanoy City Record-American, Mahanoy City; Mechanicsburg News, Mechanicsburg; Middletown Journal, Middletown; Monessen Independent, Monessen; Monongahela Republican, Monongahela; New Brighton News, New Brighton; New Castle News, New Castle; Mount Carmel News, Mount Carmel; Mount Carmel Item, Mount Carmel; Norristown Register, Norristown; Norristown Times-Herald, Norristown; Montrose Independent, Montrose; Pen Argyl Index, Pen Argyl; Phillipsburg Journal, Phillipsburg; Phoenixville Republican, Phoenixville; Pittsburgh Gazette-Times, Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh Chronicle Telegraph, Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh Post, Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh Sun, Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh; Pittston Gazette, Pittson; Pottstown News, Pottstown; Pottsville Morning Republican, Pottsville; Pottsville Evening Republican, Pottsville; Reading Eagle, Reading; Reading Times, Reading; Reading Tribune, Reading; Renovo Record, Renovo; Ridgway Record, Ridgway; St. Marys Gazette, St. Marys; St. Mary's Press, St. Marys; Sayre Times, Sayre; Scranton Dispatch, Scranton; Scranton Republican, Scranton; Scranton Scrantonian, Scranton; Scranton Telegram, Scranton; Scranton Times, Scranton; Shamokin Dispatch, Shamokin; Shamokin Herald, Shamokin; Shamokin News, Shamokin; Sharon Herald, Sharon; Sharon News-Telegram, Sharon; Shenandoah Herald, Shenandoah; Sheffield Observer, Sheffield; Stroudsburg Record-Times-Democrat, Stroudsburg; Sunbury Daily, Sunbury; Sunbury Item, Sunbury; Susquehanna Transcript, Susquehanna; Tamaqua Courier, Tamaqua; Titusville Herald, Titusville; Towanda Review, Towanda; Tyrone Herald, Tyrone; Uniontown Herald and Genius, Uniontown; Volksblatt and Freheits Freund, Pittsburgh; Warren Times-Mirror, Warren; Warren Tribune, Warren; Waynesboro Press, Waynesboro; Waynesboro Record-Herald, Waynesboro; Washington Observer-Reporter, Washington; Wilkes-Barre Critic, Wilkes-Barre; Wilkes-Barre Independent, Wilkes-Barre; Wilkes-Barre News, Wilkes-Barre; Wilkes-Barre Record, Wilkes-Barre; Wilkes-Barre Telegram, Wilkes-Barre; Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Wilkes-Barre; Williamsport Sun-Gazette-Bulletin, Williamsport; West Chester News, West Chester; York Dispatch, York; Youngsville Enterprise, Youngsville.

This amount of advertising cost $84,582.62.

Through the Inter-Racial Press of America the same advertisements were inserted in the foreign-language press of Pennsylvania, as follows:

America, Cleveland; Amerikai Magyar Nepszava, Philadelphia; Amerikansky Russky Viestnik, Homestead; Amerikansky Slovencov Glasz, Bethlehem; Amerikanske Slovensky Noviny, Pittsburgh; Bethlehem Hirado, Bethlehem; Bollettino della Sera, Philadelphia; Bratstvo, Wilkes-Barre; Corriere del Popolo, Wilkes-Barre; The Day, Philadelphia; The Day, Pittsburgh; Corriere Di Allentown, Allentown; Enakapravnost, Cleveland; Der Friedensbote, Allentown; La Gazetta di Erie, Erie; Fuggetlenseg, Philadelphia; Glas Ludu, Philadelphia; Gornik, Wilkes-Barre; Il Minatore, Scranton; Il Popolo, Reading; Il Progresso, Philadelphia; Jednosc, Philadelphia; Jednota, Middletown; Jewish American and Women's Magazine, Philadelphia; Jewish Daily News, Pittsburgh; Jewish Indicator, Pittsburgh; Jewish Times, Philadelphia; Jewish Voice, Reading; La Gazetta Calabrese, Ardmore; O'Idea, Reading; Magyar Egyharz, McKeesport; Magyar Vilag, Pittsburgh; Magyarsag, Pittsburgh; Narodny Noviny, Pittsburgh; Narodny Mesacnik, Pittsburgh; Narodna Wola, Scranton; New Life, Olyphant; New World Greek Weekly, Pittsburgh; Novoye Russkoye Slovo, Philadelphia; Obrana, Scranton; Patriota, Indiana; Pittsburczanin, Pittsburgh; Polak-Amerikanen, Reading; Praca, Wilkes-Barre; Pravda, Wilkes-Barre; Prosvita, McKeesport; Republika Gornik, Scranton; Roma, Pittsburgh; Russky Golos, Philadelphia; Saule, Mahanoy City; Slovak v Amerike, Philadelphia; Slovensky Bulletin, Bethlehem; Slovensky Hlasnik, Pittsburgh; Slovensky Obcan, Hazleton; Sokol Polski, Pittsburgh; Sonntagsbote, Pittsburgh; Srbobran, Pittsburgh; Straz, Scranton; Svit, Wilkes-Barre; Szabadsag, Pittsburg; Tageblatt, Erie; Tauta, Philadelphia; Il Trentino, Hazleton; Trinacria, Pittsburgh; Tygodnik Gorniczy, Shenandoah; Unione, Pittsburgh; Volksblatt & Freiheitsfreund, Pittsburgh; Wielkopolanin, Pittsburgh.

This advertising cost $27,712.74.

In addition to advertising in the papers listed by Bloomingdale & Weiler and by the Inter-Racial Press the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee advertised in the following papers, at a cost of $34,016.07:

Afro-American, Army and Navy Journal, Corriere D'America, Carbondale Leader, Express Worker, First Ward News, German Gazette, Germantown Review, Germantown Telegraph, the Gwizada, Il Progresso, Italo-America, Jewish Day, Jewish Morning Journal, Jewish World, La Guide Operia, La Liberta, L'Opinione, Monda Nuovo, Nanticoke News, National Industrial Review, the Observer, the Patryota, Pennsylvania Teacher, Philadelphia Herald, Philadelphia Public Journal, Philadelphia Publicant, Philadelphia Tageblatt, Pittsburgh Courier, Polish News, Progressive Labor World, St. Peter's Clavier, Scranton Telegram, the Southron, the Times, Traveling Elk.

PRINTING AND LITERATURE

The printing of cards, posters, platforms (in 14 languages), and sample ballots cost $92,806.38, divided among five Philadelphia printing houses, as follows: Marcus-Mayer Co., John R. McFetridge & Sons, the World Publishing Co., Paul W. Gibbons (Inc.), and the Dunlap Printing Co.

The item of postage alone was $17,720.53.

ECONOMY IN EXPENDITURES

Congressman VARE defeated Senator Pepper in Pennsylvania by a plurality of about 81,000. The Vare plurality in Philadelphia was 223,975; so that it was in Philadelphia that VARE won his fight.

The Philadelphia vote will, therefore, tell the story of Mr. VARE's nomination. It shows not that it was the product of a "slush" fund but that it was due to an uprising of the whole electorate of the city for VARE and against Volsteadism.

Examination of the vote in Allegheny County, given elsewhere in this account, shows that the same sentiment prevailed there and that VARE was heavily supported in all parts of the county except the organization wards of Pittsburgh, the organization in Pittsburgh being for Pepper.

THE PHILADELPHIA VOTE

Analysis of the Philadelphia vote furnishes the best evidence of the truth that the result in Pennsylvania was not due to the corrupt use of money and, in fact, was not influenced by money at all.

The Pepper ticket campaign in Philadelphia cost much more than the Vare ticket campaign, and yet VARE received in Philadelphia a plurality of 223,975 votes over Pepper. The Pepper campaign in Pennsylvania outside of Philadelphia cost more than did the Vare campaign, and Pepper obtained a plurality of the votes outside of Philadelphia. So that if the use of money brought about the result in the State outside of Philadelphia it certainly did not help VARE. Of course, the truth is that the tremendous Vare plurality in Philadelphia, which was the deciding factor in his nomination, was the fruit of the issue VARE represented and money had no effect upon it.

There are 48 wards in Philadelphia. Twenty-two of them may be fairly designated as strong organization wards. By this is meant that they are wards in which the Republican organization is usually the controlling factor. The remaining 26 wards are debatable territory in any vigorous contest. These include what are known as the independent wards, which are wards that ordinarily give antiorganization majorities whenever there is a strong independent movement on foot. In the primary election of 1926 VARE carried 47 of the 48 wards, losing only the twenty-second, which comprises Germantown, and that by a majority of but 1,649 votes. VARE's vote in this ward was 12,762, as against 14,411 for Pepper. He swept wards that an organization candidate rarely carries, and in some instances obtained majorities in independent wards that were truly astounding. In the 26 debatable wards he received 208,775 of the total of 337,994 votes given him in Philadelphia.

A REMARKABLE TURNOVER

In 1922, when Gifford Pinchot was a candidate for the Republican gubernatorial nomination against George E. Alter, Pinchot carried in the primary election nine Philadelphia wards, one of these, the eighth, being an organization ward whose leader turned in for Pinchot. The remaining eight were—the twenty-second (Germantown); the twenty-third (Frankford); the twenty-seventh, thirty-fourth, fortieth, and forty-sixth (all in West Philadelphia); the forty-first and the forty-second. These are independent wards. They gave Alter 37,332 votes and Pinchot 49,812 votes, a plurality for Pinchot of 12,480 votes. In 1926 these same eight wards gave VARE 75,525 votes and Pepper 55,443 votes, a plurality for VARE of 20,082 votes. This astounding turnover can not possibly be explained on the hypothesis that money was used to buy the election. There can be only one possible explanation for it, and that is that the people were aroused by the issue and responded to it.

Congressman VARE had declared against the Volstead Act in its present form in no uncertain terms, and in Philadelphia particularly, where the evils of Volsteadism are so plainly to be noted, the entire city turned to the leader in this movement. This is proved beyond doubt by a comparison with the result in 1922. In that primary Alter carried the city by a plurality of 87,100, the 22 organization wards enumerated above furnishing 69,468 of this plurality and the remaining 26 wards contributing but 17,632.

THE WATCHERS

There has been no greater misrepresentation in this whole matter than the unsupported charge that the employment of paid watchers in the primary election was only another method of vote buying.

To begin with, the Pennsylvania direct primary act legalizes the appointment of watchers in the following language:

(Act of 1906)

"SEC. 21. Each candidate shall be entitled to appoint two watchers at the primary in each election district, division, or precinct in which such candidate is to be voted for, who shall be qualified electors of the district, division, or precinct. Each watcher shall be provided with a certificate from the county commissioners, stating his name, the district in which he is authorized to act, and the name of the candidate appointing him, and shall have the right to remain in the room outside of the inclosed space. Watchers shall be required to show their certificates when requested to do so."

Including candidates for ward committees in Philadelphia, there were more than 3,000 regular Republican candidates, and each candidate under the law is entitled to two watchers for each district in which he was running. This would entitle the four State candidates alone to 11,936 watchers in Philadelphia, there being 1,492 election precincts. Ever since watchers have been legally recognized, it has been customary to pay them, on the theory that a man to be useful must leave his employment and is entitled to compensation when he does so. The attempt to make it appear that the payment of a watcher is a purchase of his vote is absurd on its very face, as no candidate would think of engaging a watcher of whose fidelity he was not absolutely assured. As a matter of fact, the more watchers there are at the polls the more certain it is that every candidate will get a square deal, and in this connection it might be pointed out that the Pepper-Fisher and the Democratic watchers in Philadelphia aggregated a total of 7,000. A watcher is appointed by the board of county commissioners, holds a certificate of appointment under the seal of the county, and has duties defined by law, many of which are equal to the rights of an election officer. He can challenge a voter, occupy a position in the voting place, and watch the count. It might also be pointed out that a minority inspector representing the Democratic Party is elected in each of the election divisions in the city and serves on primary election day as well as on the general election day.

In other words, every possible safeguard has been thrown about elections, and the entire absence of specific charges concerning the recent primary in Philadelphia emphasizes that it was honestly and fairly conducted.

Let me be emphatic in this matter of watchers. No man would hire an enemy to watch his property, and the thought is perfectly preposterous that the Republican organization of city or State would place certificates in the hands of doubtful voters to watch the integrity of the election.

"Watchers" and "workers" are synonymous terms in Pennsylvania. The issues involved in the election are thus explained. In Philadelphia, time and time again, these so-called "bell pullers" have so faithfully presented the issues of the campaign to the electorate that the newspapers have had no influence whatsoever. Time and time again the real issue in Philadelphia has been a test of the relative efficiency of the active worker, explaining the issues to the voters, as against the newspapers seeking to arouse the voters against the Republican Party by appealing to their prejudice through false statements and sensational publications.

These are the men who receive the watchers' certificates in Pennsylvania. In Philadelphia at the last campaign the Republican organization provided for five watchers or workers in each election precinct at $10 per day for just one day—election day. Under these circumstances is it not folly to imagine that this small sum, thus distributed, could unlawfully induce any voter to have supported the Vare ticket?

An inspection of the return sheet of Allegheny County will indicate the great rising tide of popularity of Congressman VARE's platform, where in the stronghold of the Mellon forces, fortified by a highly efficient political organization and with all the interests that the influential men behind the Pepper campaign could summon in his support, Mr. VARE carried the county with the exception of a few wards in the city of Pittsburgh, where the meager 12,000 majority was rolled up in behalf of Mr. Pepper. I consider the vote of Mr. VARE in this county as a tremendous popular indorsement, and I have no sympathy with any suggestion that would attack the integrity of the vote of our opponents in that county.

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESSMAN VARE'S PERSONAL EXPENSES

The personal expenses of Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE, as filed with the secretary of the Commonwealth at Harrisburg, Pa., shows a total expenditure of $71,435.80. This sum was expended by the Congressman in his State-wide letter-writing campaign, and the expenditures made were in conformity with both the United States and Pennsylvania laws governing elections. Copies of all of these letters were furnished by Mr. VARE to the senatorial investigating committee.

The itemized report of Congressman VARE's personal expenses follows:

March:		
31.	Franklin Photo-Engraving House, Philadelphia, cuts	$12.62
April:		
3.	American Electrotype Co., Philadelphia, cuts	39.96
6.	John F. Parrish, postmaster, Cresson, stamped envelopes	271.68
9.	Western Union Telegraph Co., Philadelphia, telegrams	94.35
9.	Westcott & Thompson, Philadelphia, signature cuts	12.50
12.	Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Cresson, scrip books	90.00
12.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	62.50
12.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	43.75
15.	Westcott & Thompson, Philadelphia, signature cuts	4.00
15.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing, etc	2,150.00
16.	W. A. Cox, Philadelphia, stamp affixers	50.00
17.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing, etc	2,150.00
17.	George D. Kinkead, postmaster, Ebensburg, posters	508.50
19.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	760.00
19.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	975.00
19.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	875.00
19.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing, etc	2,150.00
20.	J. E. Brumbaugh, postmaster, Altoona, postage	2,000.00
21.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	975.00
21.	O. K. Addressing Co., Philadelphia, letter writing	1,083.00
21.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	875.00
23.	Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Philadelphia, scrip books	90.00
23.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	975.00
23.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	875.00
23.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing, etc	2,150.00
24.	Pennsylvania Motor List Corporation, Harrisburg, addressing envelopes and expressage	2,457.97
25.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	2,150.00
26.	J. E. Brumbaugh, postmaster, Altoona, postage	4,000.00
26.	Dunlap Printing Co., Philadelphia, printing	400.00
26.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing	576.13
27.	W. A. Cox, Philadelphia, envelope sealers and stamp affixers	175.00
27.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	1,000.00

April:		
27.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing, etc	$2,150.00
27.	Whiting-Patterson Co., Philadelphia, printing	328.00
28.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	1,000.00
28.	O. K. Addressing Co., Philadelphia, letter writing	2,850.00
29.	Cresson Publishing Co., Cresson, printing, etc	2,150.00
29.	Westcott & Thompson, Philadelphia, signature cuts	7.50
29.	Ebensburg Buick Co., Ebensburg, hauling	220.00
30.	American Railway Express Co., Ebensburg, express	13.16
May:		
1.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	2,000.00
5.	O. K. Addressing Co., Philadelphia, letter writing	2,850.00
5.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	1,000.00
6.	Frank J. Myers, Ebensburg, stenographic services	275.00
7.	Dunlap Printing Co., Philadelphia, printing	1,655.00
7.	Gertrude E. Brady, Ebensburg, stenographic services	350.00
8.	Thomas L. Davis, Ebensburg, clerical services, etc	300.00
8.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	240.72
8.	American Railway Express Co., Ebensburg, express	26.34
10.	Bell Telephone Co., Ebensburg, telephone	60.00
10.	G. G. Zeta, Altoona, letter writing	5,079.21
10.	L. E. Davis, Ebensburg, stenographic services	350.00
10.	Pennsylvania Addressing & Mailing List Co., Ebensburg, voters lists, letter writing, etc	6,449.51
10.	Charlotte Urda, Ebensburg, stenographic services	150.00
11.	O. K. Addressing Co., Philadelphia, letter writing	1,966.50
11.	George E. Kemp, postmaster, Philadelphia, postage	140.00
April:		
21.	Louis A. Irwin, Harrisburg, addressing envelopes	95.00
May:		
24.	W. M. Pickering, Washington, D. C., letter writing, etc	9,675.87
29.	Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., printing	4.44
April:		
19.	Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., printing	15.49
	Total	71,435.80

EXHIBIT B

COUNTY TICKETS

The Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee did not confine its activities to the candidacies of the men named as the standard bearers of its ticket. It supported thousands of candidates. Reports submitted to the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee by its county leaders show the extent of the battle at the primary election of May 18, 1926, at which Congressman VARE was nominated for Senator. The list printed below shows the activities of the various counties and the candidates supported by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward leaders:

CANDIDATES SUPPORTED

Adams: Harry G. Stock for State legislature; Harvey A. Scott for State committeeman.

Allegheny: Congressman; State senators; members of legislature; State committeemen.

Armstrong: Hon. Nathan L. Strong for Congress; Warren Dickson for State legislature; Charles F. Armstrong for State legislature; Guy C. Christy for State committeeman.

Beaver: Dr. J. Howard Swick for Congress; Fred Patterson, Harry Richardson, and Willard Reader for State legislature; Luella Simpson for State committeeman; D. D. Boyde for prothonotary; county committeemen.

Bedford: J. Banks Kurtz for Congress; Charles H. Ealy for State senator; Howard Replogle for State legislature; Leslie Blackburn for State committeeman; Charles Smith for county committeeman.

Berks: Congressman; State committeemen; members of legislature and local committeemen.

Blair: Congressman; R. W. Williamson for State senator; Fred Bell for State legislature; Harry Deshong for State committeeman.

Bradford: L. T. McFadden for Congress; Roland Benjamin for State legislature; Mrs. Mary Hoffman for State committeeman, and local committeemen.

Bucks: Congressman; State senator; members of legislature and State committeemen.

Butler: H. Howard Swick for Congress; W. E. Cross and W. H. Bartley for State legislature; Carl Anderson for State committeeman.

Cambria: W. Russell Leech for Congress; five members of legislature; two State committeemen.

Centre: J. Mitchell Chase for Congress; Harry Scott for State senator; Laird Holmes for State legislature; Harry Scott for State committeeman; Wilson I. Fleming for county committeeman.

Chester: Congressman; Moses and White for legislature; State committeemen; local committeemen.

Clarion: N. L. Strong for Congress; James F. Quigley for State senator; Joseph G. McMillan for State legislature; Robert Thomas for State committeeman.

Columbia: Fred W. Magrady for Congress; Harry Richards for State legislature.

Elk: Thomas C. Cochran for Congress; R. S. Quigley for State senator; John M. Flynn for State legislature; E. D. Brown for State committeeman.

Erie: C. Arthur Blass for Congress; Otto Herbst and Joseph Ziesenheim for State legislature; Helen Schluraff and Charles Eastman for State committeemen; and local committeemen.

Fayette: S. A. Kendall for Congress; William L. Graham for State senator; James J. Driscoll, Harry W. Byrne, and Joseph K. Bush for State legislature; two members to State committee; two members of county committee in each of 105 election precincts.

Forest: Congressman; State senator; member of legislature; and State committeeman.

Indiana: Congressman; Elder Peelor and Charles R. Griffith for State legislature; H. C. W. Patterson for State committeeman.

Jefferson: Congressman; W. G. Buffington for State legislature; Samuel Lowry for State committeeman.

Lackawanna: L. H. Watres for Congress; Albert Davis for State senator; William T. Reynolds, F. K. Derby, R. E. Huber, George Hricko, William Munley, and Martin A. Memolo for State legislature; George W. Thomas for State committeeman.

Lehigh: Congressman; Horace W. Schantz for State senator; Robert E. Haas, Harry J. Smith, and H. Stanley Welty for State legislature; J. Sketchly Elverson and Mrs. Samuel A. Butz for State committeemen.

Lycoming: Edgar R. Kiess for Congress; Charles W. Sones for State senator; W. Clyde Harer and Charles F. Bidelspacher for State legislature; A. M. Hoagland for State committeeman.

McKean: Congressman; member of legislature; State committeeman; local committeemen.

Montgomery: H. W. Watson for Congress; James S. Boyd for State senator; John W. Storb, Minnie Stewart Just, Robert Campbell Ross, Thomas McKernan, and William J. Clark for State legislature; 300 county committeemen.

Monroe: W. R. Coyle for Congress; Dr. W. G. Bray for State senator; Fred W. Davis for State legislature; Elmer J. Walton for State committeeman; S. V. Dreher for county chairman.

Northampton: William Coyle for Congress; Floyd B. McAlee for State senator; Francis H. S. Ede, S. S. Horn, Harry Trambauer, and Harry Miller for State legislature; Joseph Brobston and Mrs. Anna Anderson for State committeemen.

Northumberland: Frederick Magrady for Congress; Dr. M. L. Harter for State legislature; Thomas W. Ramage for State committeeman; local committeemen.

Perry: Benj. K. Focht for Congress; A. L. Gelnett for State legislature; Alton Lick for State committeeman; D. C. Kell for county chairman.

Philadelphia: For Congress: James M. Hazlett, George S. Graham, Harry C. Ransley, Benjamin M. Golder, James J. Connolly, George A. Welsh, and George P. Darrow. For State senate: Samuel W. Salus, Bertram G. Frazier, George Woodward, and Thaddeus S. Krause. For State representative: Stephen C. Denning, L. Arthur Greenstein, Charles C. A. Baldi, jr., Arnold M. Blumberg, Morris J. Root, James B. Lafferty, John A. O'Neill, John J. Guerin, Clarence C. Martz, Samuel B. Hart, William H. Fuller, Thomas J. Burke, Morton Witkin, John F. Stickel, Richard D. Burns, Alexander Colville, Philip M. Myers, Matthew Patterson, August C. Metzinger, Louis Schwartz, Clinton A. Sowers, Wallace Bromley, Edwin C. Emhardt, Frederick Unrath, Sheppard H. Royle, James J. Heffernan, John Adams, Martha M. Pennock, Samuel J. Perry, Harry Greeby, Edward Haws, Samuel Lucas, William Boud Smith, Patrick Conner, Jacob Mathay, Lillie Pitts, William H. Voltz, Albert S. C. Millar, Christian Sautter, Thomas Bluett, Philip Sterling. For State committee: Flora M. Vare, Joseph C. Trainer, Brenda E. Dennis, Charles B. Hall, Thomas W. Cunningham, Mame Keel, Richard Weglein, Jean M. McDevitt, Ferd G. Zweig, Rebecca E. Sinnamon, Selena F. Shellenberger, Thomas F. Watson, Clara B. McCandless, D. Frank Black, Caroline E. Britton and Charles A. Smith.

Pike: Louis T. McFadden for Congress; E. G. Bray for State senator; A. C. Van Etten for State legislature; W. A. H. Mitchell for State committeeman; 17 county committeemen.

Snyder: Benj. K. Focht for Congress; George Erdley for State legislature; Frank Keller for State committeeman; Ammon Fisher and Chester Ludwig for county committeemen.

Somerset: Samuel A. Kendall for Congress; George A. Derrick for State senator; John W. Griffith and Harvey Shumaker for State legislature; Blaine B. Barefoot for State committeeman; Charles F. Cook for county chairman and Clara Sass for vice chairman.

Susquehanna: L. T. McFadden for Congress; member of legislature; State committeeman; county committeeman.

Union: E. M. Beers for Congress; Francis T. Baker for State legislature; Dr. O. W. H. Glover for State committeeman; M. E. Musselman for county chairman.

Venango: Congressman; State senator; member of legislature; State committeeman.

Washington: W. D. Cotterrell for State senator; William McAllister for State legislature.

Westmoreland: James Harkins, jr., Howard F. Reider, E. Katz, Peter J. Hanlon, and Paul K. McCormick for State legislature.

York: Congressman; members of legislature; State committeemen.

EXHIBIT C

THE PENNSYLVANIA LAW

Under the Pennsylvania law every expenditure made by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee was legal. Section 4 of the act of March 5, 1906, provides:

"No candidate, and no treasurer of any political committee, shall pay, give, or lend, or agree to pay, give, or lend, either directly or indirectly, any money or other valuable thing for any nomination or election expenses whatever, except for the following purposes:

"First. For printing and traveling expenses and personal expenses incident thereto, stationery, advertising, postage, expressage, freight, telegraph, telephone, and public messenger services.

"Second. For dissemination of information to the public.

"Third. For political meetings, demonstrations and conventions, and for the pay and transportation of speakers.

"Fourth. For the rent, maintenance, and furnishing of offices.

"Fifth. For the payment of clerks, typewriters, stenographers, janitors, and messengers actually employed.

"Sixth. For the employment of watchers at primary meetings and elections, to the number allowed by law.

"Seventh. For transportation of voters to and from the polls.

"Eighth. For legal expenses, bona fide, incurred in connection with any nomination or election."

DECEMBER 21, 1926.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
Chairman Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned Congressmen elect to represent our respective districts in the lower House of Congress of the United States, hereby certify that we were candidates for nomination at the spring primary on May 18 last; that our campaign expenses were all borne out of the funds of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee; that we made no personal outlay whatsoever because of our candidacies; and that the watchers who served at the said primary in our interest, under the laws of Pennsylvania, were paid out of the said funds.

JAMES M. HAZLETT,
JAMES J. CONNOLLY,
HARRY C. RANSLEY,
BENJ. M. GOLDER,
GEO. A. WELSH,
GEO. S. GRAHAM,
GEORGE P. DARROW,
Members elect in the House of Representatives in Washington from Philadelphia County.

DECEMBER 22, 1926.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
Chairman Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned senators elect to represent our respective districts in the upper house of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that we were candidates for nomination at the spring primary on May 18 last; that our campaign expenses were all borne out of the funds of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee; that we made no personal outlay whatsoever because of our candidacies; and that the watchers who served at the said primary in our interest, under the laws of Pennsylvania, were paid out of the said funds.

THADDEUS S. KRAUSE,
No. 533 East Allegheny Avenue.
ED. WOODWARD,
Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia.
SAML. W. SALUS,
614 South Eleventh Street.
Members elect of the State Senate of Pennsylvania from Philadelphia County.

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

I hereby certify that the foregoing facts are true, and that the signatures hereunto attached are the personal signatures of the parties mentioned in this statement.

SAML. W. SALUS,
President pro tempore of the Senate of Pennsylvania.

DECEMBER 21, 1926.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
Chairman Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members elect to the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that we were candidates for nomination at the spring primary on May 18 last; that our campaign expenses were all borne out of the funds of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee; that we made no personal outlay whatsoever because of our candidacies; and that the watchers who served at the said primary in our interest, under the laws of Pennsylvania, were paid out of the said funds.

Members elect to the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania from Philadelphia County: Samuel J. Perry, Matthew Patterson, Thomas J. Burke, Edward Haws, Philip M. Myers, Samuel Lucas, John Adam, William H. Voltz, John F. Stickel, Christian Sautter, Clinton Sowers, Louis Schwartz, Morton Witkin, Arnold M. Blumberg, James J. Heffernan, Charles C. C. A. Baldi, Warren Bromley, August C. Metzinger, Stephen C. Denning, Thomas Bluett, Philip Sterling, John A. O'Neill, Patrick Connor, William H. Fuller, John J. Guerin, Clarence C. Martz, Edwin C. Emhardt, L. Arthur Greenstine, Harry Greeby, Lillian H. Pitts, Alexander Colville, Martha M. Pennock, Morris J. Root, William Boud. Smith, Jacob Mathay, Richard D. Burns, Frederick Unrath (candidate at primary but was defeated), Sheppard H. Royle.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
County of Philadelphia, ss:

Harry C. Davis, being duly sworn, proposes and says that the statement hereinto attached and the signatures are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

HARRY C. DAVIS.

[SEAL.] A. ALBERT BULMER,
Notary Public.

(My commission expires March 3, 1929.)

DECEMBER 21, 1926.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
Chairman Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of the Republican State committee of the State of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that we were candidates for nomination at the spring primary on May 18 last; that our campaign expenses were all borne out of the funds of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee; that we made no personal outlay whatsoever because of our candidacies; and that the watchers who served at the said primary in our interest, under the laws of Pennsylvania, were paid out of the said funds.

REBECCA E. SINNAMON,
JOSEPH C. TRAINER,
CAROLINE E. BRITTON,
D. FRANK BLACK,
RICHARD WEGLEIN,
FERD G. ZWEIG,
THOMAS F. WATSON,
BRENDA E. DENNIS,
FLORA M. VARE,
MAME KEEL,
THOMAS W. CUNNINGHAM,
JEAN M. MCDEVITT,
CHAS. A. SMITH,
CLARA B. MCCANDLESS,
SELENA F. SHELLENBERG,
Members of the State Committee from Philadelphia County.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
County of Philadelphia, ss:

Harry C. Davis, executive director, being duly sworn, proposes and says that the statement hereunto attached and the signatures are true, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

HARRY C. DAVIS.

[SEAL.] A. ALBERT BULMER,
Notary Public.

Commission expires March 3, 1929.

DECEMBER 21, 1926.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
Chairman Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully ask permission to file my affidavit, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA COUNTY, *ss:*

Harry C. Davis, being duly sworn according to law, says that he is the executive director of the Republican Central Campaign Committee of the city and county of Philadelphia, Pa.; that during the recent spring primary he acted as an assistant to Thomas F. Watson, the treasurer of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward campaign committee in the distribution of campaign funds in the city of Philadelphia; that the said distribution consisted of $50 per election precinct in each of the 1,465 election precincts in Philadelphia; and that the said amount of money defrayed the campaign expenses of two Republican candidates for the office of ward committeeman in each of the said precincts, totaling 2,930 committeemen; and that the said candidacies were financed by the aforementioned committee and not by any other Republican committee.

HARRY C. DAVIS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 21st day of December, 1926.

[SEAL.] A. ALBERT BULMER,
Notary Public.

Commission expires March 3, 1928.

Four hundred and twenty-five thousand of these specimen ballots were sent out under 2-cent postage and containing a printed letter from Congressman VARE. At 6½ cents apiece, the cost of this particular campaign item would be $27,625.

(*Vare—Beidleman—James—Woodward*)

REGULAR REPUBLICAN SAMPLE BALLOT

Modification of the Volstead Act means the return of respect for law, an end to the crime-breeding conditions which are the product of Volsteadism, and the restoration of personal liberty.

Join in this great crusade by marking your ballot for the candidates indicated by the cross mark (X):

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Vote for 1)

Gifford Pinchot (Pike County)	
WILLIAM S. VARE (Philadelphia County)	X
George Wharton Pepper (Philadelphia County)	

GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Edward E. Beidleman (Dauphin County)	X
Thomas W. Phillips, jr. (Butler County)	
John K. Tener (Washington County)	
John S. Fisher (Indiana County)	

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Charles J. Esterly (Berks County)	
Arthur H. James (Luzerne County)	X
Charles M. Clement (Northumberland County)	
Frank P. B. Thompson (Philadelphia County)	
Ernest G. Smith (Luzerne County)	
Frances Moser Hocker (Philadelphia County)	

SECRETARY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

(Vote for 1)

Isadore H. Pilvinsky (Schuylkill County)	
Frederic A. Godcharles (Northumberland County)	
James Fleming Woodward (Allegheny County)	X

Republican.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

(Vote for 1)

HARRY C. RANSLEY (second ward)	X

SENATOR IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 1)

Samuel W. Salus (fourth ward)	X

REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 2)

Morris J. Root (third ward)	X
Arnold M. Blumberg (fifth ward)	X

Republican—3–4.

MEMBER OF THE STATE COMMITTEE

(Vote for 2)

Brenda E. Dennis (thirtieth ward)	X
Charles B. Hall (seventh ward)	X

Republican—2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 30.

Primary election day Tuesday, May 18.

Polls open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., Eastern Standard time, or from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m. daylight saving time.

(No. 233)

An act to amend section 4 of the act of the 5th day of March, 1906, (Pamphlet Laws, 78), entitled "An act to regulate nomination and election expenses, and to require accounts of nomination and election expenses to be filed, and providing penalties for the violation of this act"

ELECTIONS—SECTION 4 OF ACT OF MARCH 5, 1906 (P. L. 78), AMENDED

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 4 of the act of the 5th day of March, 1906 (P. L. 78), entitled "An act to regulate nomination and election expenses, and to require accounts of nomination and election expenses to be filed, and providing penalties for the violation of this act," be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

LAWFUL EXPENSES

SEC. 4. No candidate, and no treasurer of any political committee, shall pay, give, or lend, or agree to pay, give, or lend, either directly or indirectly, any money or other valuable thing for any nomination or election expenses whatever, except for the following purposes:

First. For printing and traveling expenses, and personal expenses incident thereto, stationery, advertising, postage, expressage, freight, telegraph, telephone, and public messenger services.

Second. For [dissemination of information to the public] the rental of radio facilities.

Third. For political meetings, demonstrations, and conventions, and for the pay and transportation of speakers.

Fourth. For the rent, maintenance, and furnishing of offices.

Fifth. For the payment of clerks, typewriters, stenographers, janitors, and messengers actually employed.

Sixth. For the employment of watchers at primary meetings and elections, to the number allowed by law, but no candidate or treasurer of any political committee shall pay any watcher, in any election district in a city, compensation in excess of $10 per diem, or to any watcher, in any other election district, compensation in excess of $5 per diem.

Seventh. For the transportation of voters to and from the polls.

Eighth. For legal expenses, bona fide incurred, in connection with any nomination or election.

Approved the 23d day of April, A. D. 1927.

JOHN S. FISHER.

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of act of the general assembly, No. 233.

CHARLES JOHNSON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

These are the watchers' certificates as given them by the county commissioners in accordance with the Pennsylvania State law:

COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

(Democratic Party)

Name, ——— ———; residence, ——— ———; ward, ——— ———; division, ——— ———; representing, ——— ———; candidate for, ——— ———.

Primary election, May 18, 1926.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

This will certify that ——— ———, residing at ———, has been regularly appointed as a watcher for the —— ward of the —— election division of Philadelphia, representing ———, candidate for ——— on the Democratic ballot, to serve at the spring primary election to be held on May 18, 1926.

Witness our hands and official seal this 17th day of May, 1926.

GEO. F. HOLMES,
HARRY KUENZEL,
JOHN O'DONNELL,
County Commissioners.

[NOTE.—Each candidate is entitled to two watchers, but no candidate shall be represented by more than one watcher in the same voting room at any one time.]

COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

(Republican Party)

Name, ——— ———; residence, ——— ———; ward, ——— ———; division, ——— ———; representing, ——— ———; candidate for, ——— ———.

Primary election, May 18, 1926.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

This will certify that ——— ———, residing at ———, has been regularly appointed as a watcher for the —— ward of the —— election division of Philadelphia, representing ———, candidate for ——— on the Republican ballot, to serve at the spring primary election to be held on May 18, 1926.

Witness our hands and official seal this 17th day of May, 1926.

GEO. F. HOLMES,
HARRY KUENZEL,
JOHN O'DONNELL,
County Commissioners.

[NOTE.—Each candidate is entitled to two watchers, but no candidate shall be represented by more than one watcher in the same voting room at any one time.]

COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

(Prohibition Party)

Name, ——— ———; residence, ——— ———; ward, ——— ———; division, ——— ———; representing, ——— ———; candidate for, ——— ———.

Primary election, May 18, 1926.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

This will certify that ——— ———, residing at ———, has been regularly appointed as a watcher for the —— ward of the —— election division of Philadelphia, representing ———, candidate for ——— on the Prohibition ballot, to serve at the spring primary election to be held on May 18, 1926.

Witness our hands and official seal this 17th day of May, 1926.

GEO. F. HOLMES,
HARRY KUENZEL,
JOHN O'DONNELL,
County Commissioners.

[NOTE.—Each candidate is entitled to two watchers, but no candidate shall be represented by more than one watcher in the same voting room at any one time.]

COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

(Socialist Party)

Name, ——— ———; residence, ——— ———; ward, ——— ———; division, ——— ———; representing, ——— ———; candidate for, ——— ———.

Primary election, May 18, 1926.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, WATCHER'S CERTIFICATE

This will certify that ——— ———, residing at ———, has been regularly appointed as a watcher for the —— ward of the —— election division of Philadelphia, representing ———, candidate for ——— on the Socialist ballot, to serve at the spring primary election to be held on May 18, 1926.

Witness our hands and official seal this 17th day of May, 1926.

GEO. F. HOLMES,
HARRY KUENZEL,
JOHN O'DONNELL,
County Commissioners.

[NOTE.—Each candidate is entitled to two watchers, but no candidate shall be represented by more than one watcher in the same voting room at any one time.]

[First district, Pennsylvania committee on appropriations. Reply address, 245 South Broad Street, Philadelphia)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1926.

Mr. ALBERT MODSELLO,
Forks, Pa.

MY DEAR SIR: Permit me to call to your attention my candidacy for the Republican nomination for the United States Senate, to be voted for at the primary on May 18. You know how utterly impossible it is for anyone to cover any considerable part of the Commonwealth, even on a speaking tour, in the space of time allotted by law for campaigning, and it is only by this means I can reach the voter.

I was born in this State and have been a constant supporter of the Republican Party since my first vote was cast. During my 14 years in Congress as a Representative from the first congressional district I have advocated all measures embodying the principles of the party. I stand unqualifiedly by the policies of President Coolidge. I believe in legislation looking toward a sincere and true relief of the farmer, the upbuilding of education, the permanent improvement of our highways by the Commonwealth, and the maintenance of such a protective tariff that will insure steady employment to the people working in our railroads, mills, manufactories, and other industries.

I also stand for the greatest amount of liberty for the people that is consistent with good government, and I am opposed to the enactment of laws which unnecessarily curtail and reduce that liberty. As a matter of helpful enforcement of the real principles of the constitutional amendment and in order to promote temperance, sobriety, and the reestablishment of respect for the law and the courts I would advocate a law permitting the sale of light wines and beers.

I sincerely trust that you will be able to aid me in my candidacy by your vote and influence.

Very truly yours,

WM. S. VARE.

Typical letters sent out and included in "Senatorial campaign expenditures," but which were in the interest of other candidates as well as Mr. VARE.

(Veterans League of Pennsylvania, composed of soldiers, sailors, and marines favoring the nomination of Edward E. Beidleman for Governor of Pennsylvania)

4428 YORK ROAD,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 12, 1926.

MY DEAR COMRADE: It is with pleasure that I call your attention to the candidacy of Edward E. Beidleman for the Republican nomination for Governor of Pennsylvania. He is one of our good friends.

As a public official he has never refused any call to further the interests of the war veterans. Times without number he has appeared as the leading speaker at meetings and banquets of various military war organizations, and by his presence and effort has done much toward making such affairs a success in putting the veterans' organizations on a solid foundation.

Furthermore, he has given time and attention to helping veterans in the matter of compensation, vocational training, and insurance. This service he never charged for.

We should all support and vote for Mr. Beidleman because he has proven himself to be a friend of the veterans, and as Governor of Pennsylvania there is no doubt that he would continue this friendship.

Fraternally yours,

LEON FELDERMAN, M. D.,
Chairman Veterans League of Pennsylvania.

LAW OFFICES OF LADNER & LADNER,
1501 Walnut Street, April 19, 1926.

Mr. L. A. SCHRIVER,
Clearfield, Pa.

DEAR SIR: On May 18 we will have an opportunity to support WILLIAM S. VARE, a candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator, and Edward E. Beidleman, a candidate for governor of this State.

Moreover, we should feel it a duty to aid men whose abilities fit them for public office.

Both these men stand foursquare on every principle on which we stand.

People are ardently desiring a return to laws which do not strip them unnecessarily of their lawful and legitimate rights; these men will labor to bring these rights to us again. They are arrayed against the lawlessness which has grown out of the present-day conditions, they resent the tyranny of those who strike down our liberties, and will do their utmost to bring a return of at least a part of those liberties back to the people.

We owe a duty to ourselves and to our country to join in a movement that will bring this about. We can only do it by electing men who will advocate these principles.

Will you go to the polls on May 18 and cast your ballot for WILLIAM S. VARE and Edward E. Beidleman, and get others to do the same?

Faithfully yours,

ALBERT H. LADNER, Jr.

(Harry A. Mackey, campaign manager, 245 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.)

WILLIAM S. VARE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 13, 1926.

Mr. THOMAS H. HARTER,
Bellefonte, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. HARTER: I am writing to you as one who is undoubtedly interested in the success of Hon. Edward E. Beidleman for governor.

May I say to you that his nomination will be brought about through the support that the Philadelphia Republican organization is giving him at the request of Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE, who is a candidate for United States Senator? Every vote polled for VARE in Philadelphia will likewise be given to Mr. Beidleman. The Philadelphia organization was never united as enthusiastically and working in such harmony as to-day. It will give Mr. Beidleman approximately 400,000 votes, which assures his nomination.

May I ask you to reciprocate? Is it not just a matter of plain political fairness with Mr. Beidleman receiving such great help from Philadelphia that Mr. VARE should receive corresponding help from Mr. Beidleman's friends in the State? This seems to me to be just a fair degree of political cooperation.

I am asking you, therefore, to give your personal vote and lend your personal influence to Mr. VARE, Mr. Beidleman, Mr. James, and Mr. Woodward.

With assurances of respect, I remain

Yours very truly,

H. A. MACKEY,
Campaign Manager for All of the Above Candidates.

(Council of Associated Building Trades of Philadelphia and Vicinity, Department American Federation of Labor. J. A. S. Bratton, president. Joseph W. Allison, secretary-treasurer. 1807 Spring Garden Street)

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 4, 1926.*

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I have been directed by the Associated Building Trades Council to forward to your local union the inclosed resolution and urge upon your organization to support the candidates mentioned therein to the fullest extent of your resources.

Fraternally yours,

———— ————, *Secretary.*

Resolution, Council of Associated Building Trades of Philadelphia and Vicinity

Whereas the American Federation of Labor, its executive council, labor officials representing all national and international unions, State federations, district and central councils, and local unions while testifying before the Senate committee on the modification of the Volstead Act, proved to any unbiased person the unreasonable and un-American aspect of the eighteenth amendment because it deprives the citizenship of the Nation of their inherent rights as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and the mandates of common justice; and

Whereas the testimony of the labor representatives was clear and concise, presented in a sane and dignified manner on behalf of the millions of working men and women who resent the violations of their fundamental rights by the sumptuary legislation of the Volstead Act; and

Whereas in our great State of Pennsylvania the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator on the Republican ballot,

and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor on the Republican ballot, concur in the viewpoint of the officials and membership of the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator, and the Hon Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, have consistently and aggressively, during their public careers, fought, worked, and voted for and initiated legislation beneficial to the interests of the working people of our city and State, and at all times during their splendid public service concurred in the principles and policies of the American Federation of Labor in a manner which has attracted the attention of the workers of city and State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the courageous stand taken by the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, is in full accord with the stand taken by the American Federation of Labor and its associated bodies, and that the elements composing the American labor movement should enter the coming political contest in Pennsylvania having in view the slogan of our late great chieftain, Samuel Gompers, to "Support our friends and administer a stinging rebuke to our enemies," and thereby reveal the solidarity of organized labor by giving concentrated support to the position taken by the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, and we solemnly make this declaration: Human rights transcend the privileges of momentary political advantage: And be it further

Resolved, That the Associated Building Trades Council of Philadelphia and Vicinity, in meeting assembled, does hereby indorse the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senate, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor of Pennsylvania: And be it further

Resolved, In view of the long and splendid records both candidates have made during their public service in support of legislation favorable to the working people of city, State, and Nation, that we call upon the working people of the city and State to be on guard against the insincerity and sophistry in the campaign propaganda emanating from the opponents of the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, and we call upon the working people of the city and State to step forward and give these men their vote. Let labor's support be the largest and sanest contribution to the solution of this most vexatious problem which is menacing the very foundation of the American Republic, and the secretary is hereby instructed to forward this resolution to every union in the State of Pennsylvania affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

With the potential voting population of Pennsylvania of more than 3,000,000, the $650,000 spent by the combined campaign committee and myself in the interest of the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward ticket represented less than 20 cents for each vote sought. Figuring the expenditure for the approximate 600,000 votes actually recorded for me, the $650,000 represented about $1.08 a vote. Twenty cents per vote to educate; three-quarters of which was spent on advertising and letters.

TYPICAL "COMBINATION-TICKET" ADVERTISEMENT ILLUSTRATING LEGITIMATE PUBLICITY EXPENDITURE FOR OTHER CANDIDATES, BUT CREDITED AS VARE EXPENSES

REPUBLICAN VOTERS OF PENNSYLVANIA: THE REGULAR REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATION OF PHILADELPHIA WILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATES AT THE PRIMARY ELECTION, TUESDAY, MAY 18. WILLIAM S. VARE FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR; EDWARD E. BEIDLEMAN FOR GOVERNOR; ARTHUR H. JAMES FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR; JAMES F. WOODWARD FOR SECRETARY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

We, the representatives of the Republican Party in the city of Philadelphia, desire at this time to publicly make known to our fellow voters throughout Pennsylvania our exact stand on the candidates for the several offices to be voted for at the primary election on Tuesday, May 18.

In adopting this method of sending our message to fellow Republicans we do so in a spirit of friendliness and good will. We owe it to ourselves and to you to make known in a definite way our choice for nomination to the important offices of United States Senator, governor, lieutenant governor, and secretary of internal affairs.

The registered Republican vote in Philadelphia is over 575,000. Based on past primary elections it is only fair to estimate that of the vote cast in Pennsylvania next Tuesday approximately 40 per cent will be cast in the city of Philadelphia. This fact, known to all political leaders in Pennsylvania, has impelled politicians interested in this or that candidate to spread false reports about the probability of a split in the Philadelphia organization; has even caused newspapers to fall into error as to what Philadelphia is going to do at the polls on Tuesday, and has led to false claims and false hopes by candidates not favored by the regular Republican organization of the city of Philadelphia.

We are for WILLIAM S. VARE for United States Senator because he is a man of the people; he has the courage of his convictions; he does not dodge, side-step or equivocate on any great question; he stands squarely pledged to do his utmost to modify the Volstead Act, which every thinking man and woman knows has brought domestic and social ruin and destruction in its wake; he has served seven terms in Congress at Washington and is experienced in legislative work; he has conducted a clean campaign and has not stooped to scurrilous tactics and misrepresentations; he is a man who if sent to Washington as your Senator will never serve a so-called interest; he voted for the nomination of President Coolidge as a delegate to the Republican National Convention and has always stood with the President; he is a good, loyal Republican.

We are for Edward E. Beidleman for governor because he knows no boss; he is qualified for the position of governor of this great Commonwealth; he gave the people of Pennsylvania splendid service as a member of the house and senate at Harrisburg and as lieutenant governor; he is human and always voted for and fought for humane legislation; he is an executive and leader; he will be governor of all the people and will favor no class or set of men to the detriment of other citizens of the State; he came from an humble beginning and is self-made in the truest sense of the word; he is honest and pledges a progressive and economical administration.

We are for Arthur H. James for lieutenant governor because he is fearless and unafraid; he has made an extraordinary record as district attorney of Luzerne County; he won a reelection to that office by the largest majority ever given a candidate in that county; he began life as a breaker boy in his home town at Plymouth, Pa.; he resides in a county that has not had a Republican nomination for a State office since 1879, notwithstanding the fact that it is the third largest county in the Commonwealth, with a voting population alone of over 150,000; he will make an ideal presiding officer of the State senate, and his experience as district attorney peculiarly fits him for membership on the board of pardons.

We are for James F. Woodward for secretary of internal affairs because he has given competent service to the people during his administration of that office; he has made the position of secretary of internal affairs a valuable part of the State government; he has introduced new methods for the securing of statistical facts that are invaluable to the people of the Commonwealth and the country at large from the standpoint of necessary information; he is a resident of the great county of Allegheny, which is entitled to representation on the Republican State ticket.

The above are a few of the many good reasons why we, the duly recognized and accredited representatives of the Republican Party in the city of Philadelphia, are for WILLIAM S. VARE for United States Senator, Edward E. Beidleman for governor, Arthur H. James for lieutenant governor, and James F. Woodward for secretary of internal affairs.

Thomas F. Watson, president twenty-second ward; Peter E. Smith, vice president forty-seventh ward; Rebecca E. Sinnamon, vice president; James B. Sheehan, secretary twelfth ward; James J. Connolly, secretary twenty-fifth ward; Clara B. McCandless, assistant secretary; Henry C. Davis, executive director; John J. McKinley, jr., treasurer thirty-third ward; John F. Dugan, twenty-seventh ward; James Irvin, forty-eighth ward; N. Edwin Lindell, forty-first ward; Charles R. Love, sixth ward; Harris Kirby, fifteenth ward; Charles Semple, forty-sixth ward; H. D. Beaston, fortieth ward; Edward J. Cooke, eighth ward; Max Mayer, thirteenth ward; Ferd G. Zweig, seventeenth ward; Sigmund J. Gans, thirty-eighth ward; Charles B. Hall, seventh ward; Oscar E. Noll, thirty-seventh ward; George E. Rowland, forty-second ward; James A. Carey, fifth ward; Harry C. Ransley, second ward; Benj. H. Fields, twenty-fourth ward; Joseph Marcus, twentieth ward; Joseph H. McArdle, sixteenth ward; C. Walter Glasgow, forty-eighth ward; Isaac D. Hetzell, eighteenth ward; Charles L. Sommers, first ward; Richard Weglein, twenty-ninth ward; Frank L. Kenworthy, twenty-first ward; Edw. T. Tennock, thirty-fourth ward; Joseph J. Kelly, forty-fourth ward; Alfred M. Waltron, thirty-first ward; Aaron Samuel, thirty-ninth ward; D. Frank Black, forty-third ward; Fred Schwarz, jr., forty-fifth ward; Henry J. Trainer, third ward; Arthur Sellers, thirty-second ward; David T. Hart, twenty-third ward; Clarence K. Crossan, thirty-fifth ward; James M. Neely, ninth ward; T. Crawford Cook, thirtieth ward; Wm. S. Vare, twenty-sixth ward; Milton H. Reedensoyer, twenty-eighth ward; Thos. W. Cunningham, tenth ward; Matthew Patterson, nineteenth ward; Sam'l W. Salus, fourth ward; Wm. F. Nickel, jr., eleventh ward; Jno. M. Larish, fourteenth ward; Frank J. Ryan, thirty-sixth ward.

Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward.

This is a sample of the expensive advertising put out by the Pepper-Fisher managers and which we were obliged to meet by similar paid newspaper advertisements.

Attention is again called to the fact that the newspapers of Pennsylvania were supporting Mr. VARE's opponent, so that paid advertis-

ing was the only form through which he could get his campaign arguments into the newspaper columns.

"The issue of this campaign is definite, clear-cut, blazoned before the public as though in words of fire—Vareism.

"The effort of a down-town political boss to grab control of the Republican Party of Pennsylvania and through his candidate for governor—Beidleman—to fasten the grip of contractor-government, of commercialized politics, upon the administration of the State and the public treasury. The senatorial candidacy is but a phase of the plan. The so-called "wet" issue is only a blind.

"Political exploitation is the real aim—power—patronage—contracts.

"VARE seeks the senatorial nomination in order to gain the State leadership, and he supports Beidleman in order to have his own governor at Harrisburg.

"Against this monstrous attempt to get control of the State government and its patronage, and especially the putting of the splendid new highway system into the hands of a plunderbund, John S. Fisher is making his fight.

"His constructive legislative record, his admirable administration of the State banking department, and his great work in organizing the good-roads movement have had their effect in the minds of the voters.

"Just as Senator Pepper has done, he has swept the State down to the Philadelphia line.

"Philadelphia is the final and decisive battle ground.

"Here the fight will be fought and won, and representative government will be sustained, or the result on May 18 will record one of the most humiliating defeats ever suffered by American citizenship.

"The decision is in your hands. On the Philadelphia vote everything depends.

"The true sentiment of the Republicanism of Philadelphia is against ballot stuffers, against fifth-ward murders, and against VARE. Let that sentiment record itself in the primary election May 18.

"With Philadelphia Republicanism voting full strength it will be shown on primary day that Philadelphia is for—

"Pepper for Senator, Fisher for governor, Smith for lieutenant governor, Woodward for secretary internal affairs.

"This is the ticket, and for it every vote is needed. Let every registered Republican in Philadelphia work and vote—for the Pepper-Fisher ticket.

"Crush contractor government.

"Pepper for Senator. Fisher for governor. W. W. Roper, chairman campaign committee, 1424 Chestnut Street; Alba B. Johnson, chairman campaign committee, 606 Finance Building."

VOTE VARE! VOTE VARE! CANDIDATE FOR REPUBLICAN NOMINATION FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR—PRIMARY ELECTION TUESDAY, MAY 18

DON'T BE MISLED

Don't be fooled by empty words and pussyfooting phrases.

There is only one big issue—for Volsteadism or against Volsteadism. I am 100 per cent against Volsteadism—and am committed to its modification.

In 1776 a group of loyal Americans signed a Declaration of Independence and threw off the yoke of tyranny.

For United States Senator: WILLIAM S. VARE.

Let history repeat itself next Tuesday. Put a cross opposite my name—sign your own declaration of independence—and

"Give an American his rights."

WM. S. VARE,
Candidate for Republican Nomination for
United States Senator,
Primary Election Tuesday, May 18.

WHAT IS VAREISM?

It is the habit, in many political campaigns, to sling mud at the other fellow. It is always a dirty trick—and is invariably an acknowledgment of impending defeat on the mud-slinger's part.

"Vareism" has been used by the political opponents of Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE as a term of reproach. Let the pictures on this page tell you a truer story.

What the word "Vare" stands for is shown here in stone and brick and mortar—monuments of unselfish endeavor directed for the good of the community.

There is the Abigail Vare Methodist-Episcopal Church, dedicated to the memory of Congressman VARE's mother—and across the street from it is the Abigail Vare Public School. Then there is the E. H. Vare Junior High School, and the George A. Vare Playgrounds.

A church—a school where the foreign-born are Americanized—a high school that better fits the boys and girls for the duties that await them—a playground where sunshine and fresh air give new life to pent-up children in congested districts. These four contributions to a community's well-being represent what "Vareism" really means!

Congressman VARE refuses to answer the vindictive slurs directed against him. And so it devolves upon his campaign committee to publish this advertisement telling you just exactly what "Vareism" means, and to ask you on May 18 next to vote for the man who, when he is Senator, will work to his uttermost to "Give an American his rights."

THE WILLIAM S. VARE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

HON. WILLIAM S. VARE

CANDIDATE FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR

Every war veteran, war widow, and dependent child knows him as their friend.

Look at Pepper's antisoldier record.

Senator Pepper's vote on May 13, 1924, was against the relief of Civil War and Spanish War veterans and their widows. They were thrown down by Pepper's deciding vote, the man who is now asking your support for reelection.

See page 8676 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1924, first session Sixty-eighth Congress.

Pepper also voted against the soldier's bonus. VARE voted for the soldier's bonus.

Vote for WILLIAM S. VARE at the primary election, May 18, 1926.

His record and votes have always been favorable to the soldiers of all wars.

(Thirty thousand of these circulars were printed and sent out in addressed envelopes under 2-cent postage.)

LEADING BUSINESS MEN SUPPORT WILLIAM S. VARE FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR

Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE has the support of leading business men in his campaign for the Republican nomination for United States Senator.

To aid in the nomination of Mr. VARE, a group of well-known Philadelphians, active in the financial, industrial, commercial, and professional life of the city has formed the William S. Vare Business Men's Campaign Committee. The committee is composed of the following:

Frank H. Tuft (chairman), president Metropolitan Trust Co., northwest corner Eighteenth and Market Streets; George F. Uber, president George F. Uber & Co., Thirteenth and Fairmount Avenue; Daniel F. Crawford, jr., president Operative Builders' Association, 3901 Chestnut Street; James J. Sullivan, president William Browne & Co., Kensington and Ontario Streets; Martin J. Powers, Esq., Real Estate Building; Daniel J. Murphy, president Murphy & Cook, Bourse Building; Hubert J. Horan, president Commercial Exchange, Bourse Building; John N. McGarvey, builder, Lincoln Building; John J. McGuirk, vice president Stanley Co., 1916 Race Street; Samuel D. Lit, Lit Bros. Department Store, Eighth and Market Streets; Joseph W. Salus, president Broad Street Trust Co., Twelfth and Arch Streets; Charles H. Kendrick, Quaker City Laundry, Forty-eighth and Chestnut Streets; Harry G. Sundheim, Esq., Sundheim, Folz & Kun, Esqs.; Leo A. Russ, real estate, Bankers Trust Building; Maurice L. Wurzel, chairman board of directors Peoples Bank & Trust Co., 18–22 South Fifteenth Street; Thomas S. Boyle, president American Bank & Trust Co., Broad and Passyunk Avenue; James J. Diamond, president James J. Diamond Co., dyers, Trenton Avenue and Cambria Street; S. C. Kraus, vice president Broad Street Trust Co., Twelfth and Arch Streets; Murtha P. Quinn, retired, 6391 Drexel Road, Overbrook; Jules E. Mastbaum, president Mastbaumm Bros. & Fleisher, 1424 South Penn Square; Patrick J. Lawler, builder, Sixty-ninth and Market Streets, Bala, etc.; Dr. William H. Long, physician, 116 South Fortieth Street; Henry J. Walter, real estate, 1218 Chestnut Street; Morton E. Snellenburg, N. Snellenburg & Co. department store, Twelfth and Market Streets; Albert M. Greenfield, president Albert M. Greenfield & Co., Walnut and Juniper Streets; Edwin Wolf, banker, Wolf Bros., 213 South Broad Street; Clarence Wolf, banker, 213 South Broad Street; J. Howard Brown, president J. Howard Brown & Co., insurance, 131 Edgewood Road, Ardmore, Pa.; Arthur L. Bunting, vice president Oval Basin Coal Co., Valley Road, Merion, Pa.; Thomas Cooper, general manager Philadelphia branch Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Thirtieth and Walnut Streets; Charles F. Bochman, president F. A. Bochman & Co., textile manufacturers, Second and Cambria Streets; F. H. Goldey, vice president Schauger-Karlen Lumber Co., Bankers Trust Building; J. N. Chamberlin, vice president Beckwith Chandler Varnish Co., Art Club Philadelphia; William Kern, Esq., Norristown, Pa.; E. C. Lindsay, president N. W. Lindsay Co., Overbrook, Pa.; Samuel Kean, tailor, 1126 Walnut Street; J. Frank McCall, president J. Frank McCall (Inc.), 1123 Walnut Street;

Robert M. Wilson, real estate, 17 Shirley Road, Narberth, Pa.; Charles R. Wannemacher, Arnold & Wannemacher, insurance, 110 South Fourth Street; W. C. Atkinson, president Commercial Banking Corporation, 1428 South Penn Square; Sydney B. Dunn, McClure & Co., brokers, 1006 Packard Building; Russell N. Shemp, druggist and chemist, Hortter and Musgrave Streets, Germantown; Frederick W. Haussmann, pharmacist, Sixth and Girard Avenues; Dr. P. A. Trau, 1520 Diamond Street; Dr. E. B. Gleason, 2033 Chestnut Street; Dr. Daniel Yates, Real Estate Trust Building; Dr. John B. Deaver, 1634 Walnut Street; Robert M. Horter, mortgages, 1210 Harrison Building; Charles M. Miller, real estate, 1217 North Twenty-ninth Street; Walter G. List, real estate, 2203 South Twenty-second Street; John J. Guerin, real estate, 1916 South Sixth Street; William Adler, real estate, Eleventh and Ellsworth Streets; Charles C. Christiansen, real estate, Real Estate Trust Building; Jules DeWaele, jr., real estate, East Newfield Way, Cynwyd, Pa.; Frederick W. Sauer, Henry C. L. Sauer & Bro., insurance, 411 Walnut Street; Lawrence Gleeson, insurance broker, Widener Building, 249 South Forty-sixth Street; A. M. Waldron, insurance, 426 Walnut Street; Paul W. Gibbons, vice president Penn Athletic Club, printer, 125 South Eleventh Street; Robert J. Berryman, Robert J. Berryman Co., refrigerating engineers, The Bourse; Henry W. Young, wholesale sea food, Reading Terminal Market; Bart Mansolino, proprietor Haddington Wagon Works, 6102 Haverford Avenue; Martin J. Cunningham, Jos. A. Cunningham (Inc.), Ford dealers, 1155 South Broad Street; Lee Nusbaum, manager Triumph Ice Machine Co., 315 Carpenter Lane, Germantown; Harry W. Savage, Lit Bros., Eighth and Market Streets; Gustav Bloch, Bloch Go-Cart Co., 701 Arch Street; George G. Meade, Curran & Meade, 1225 Market Street, president Boosters Association; Patrick J. Whelan, builder, Bankers Trust Building; De Benneville Bell, real estate, 229 South Twenty-second Street; J. Morgan Lister, real estate, Haverford, Pa.; Alex. Van Pelt, broker, 2035 Delancey Street; J. B. Councilman, insurance, 122 South Fourth Street; Louis B. Gallison, advertising, Haverford, Pa.; Daniel F. Waters, president D. F. Waters & Sons (Inc.), manufacturers, 53 Wister Street; Charles G. Erny, builder, Broad and Rockland Streets; H. Bart McHugh, theatrical producer, 11 South Sixteenth Street; William A. Hagan, president Pennsylvania Bottling & Supply Co., 2915 Kensington Avenue; Furey Ellis, general insurance, 312 North Broad Street; Edward V. O'Hanlon, builder and real estate, Kensington Avenue and Cumberland Street; Frank W. Buhler, general manager Stanley Co. of America, 1916 Race Street; Charles J. McGough, automobile dealer, 4744 Frankford Avenue, former president Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce; Joseph H. A. Decatur, president West End Sales Agency, 2517 West Girard Avenue; Edward M. Bartlett, automobile dealer, 4309 Brown Street, former president of the City Business Club; Bertram Smith, president of the Artisans Order of Mutual Protection and special agent General Motor Corporation, Twenty-third and Carpenter Streets; George I. Oberholtzer, president Team and Motor Truck Owners Association of Philadelphia, 2911 North Reese Street, drayman; Harry S. Goldstein, general manager L. Goldstein Sons, metals and smelters, Richmond and Allegheny Avenues; Thos. H. Kay, president Johnson Printing Co., Amber and Erie Avenues; Frank Feeney, 1208 Chestnut Street, publisher Progressive Labor World, president Elevator Constructors' International Union, and vice president National Civic Federation, representing the employees on executive board; Jacob Ginsburg, editor and publisher Jewish World, 233 South Fifth Street; Col. Charles J. Hendler, publisher Army and Navy Journal, 1432 North Broad Street; John P. Donohue, undertaker and head of Foresters of America, 5400 Market Street; John C. Marscher, advertising manager Daily News, Fifteenth and Cherry Streets; Robert Stewart, jr., tailer, and vice president Walnut Street Business Men's Association, 1600 Walnut Street; Charles C. Orangers, tailor, vice president Optimist Club, 219 South Seventeenth Street; Ernest H. Crowhurst, builder, Lincoln Building; G. Hamilton Colket, director Philadelphia City Passenger Railway, director Philadelphia & Darby Railway Co., director Germantown & Chestnut Hill Railway Co., Bellevue-Stratford Hotel; William L. Hirst, real estate, 1522 Walnut Street; William J. McMichael, real estate, 215 South Sixteenth Street; William J. McGuckin, jr., president Superior Chemical Products Co., 3262 North Sixth Street; Ottomar Stange, Stange Construction Co., 2031 South Broad Street; Lamar Hull, Pennsylvania Motors (Inc.), Twenty-first and Chestnut Streets.

TALMUD TORAH ADATH JESHURUN,
Philadelphia.

DEAR FRIEND: In the State of Pennsylvania we are now much interested in the coming election of a worth-while man to represent the people of Pennsylvania in the United States Senate.

Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE is one of the candidates, and it is about him I want to tell you.

I have known Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE for over a period of years, and during all that time I have never met one who was so close to the hearts of the people as Congressman WILLIAM S. VARE. He was a poor boy who became a public figure by reason of his hard work and his continual service to the people he represented. No issue was too small for him to give his time, his efforts, or his money. He was never afraid to speak or vote as he felt was best for the people. He was always one of the plain people and was never ashamed to acknowledge it or show it.

When he felt that the immigration bill was wrong he voted against it. He was not afraid to express his views.

To my mind he always has and always will represent the people—not the interests of corporations. For these reasons he should be elected as Senator from Pennsylvania, and as a personal favor to me and for the good of the people I want you to vote for him, help elect him, get your neighbors and friends to vote.

His election means that the people of Pennsylvania will have a people's choice as Senator.

Very truly yours,

Rabbi MOSES SHOCHET.

[From the Progressive Labor World, Philadelphia, Thursday, April 29, 1926]

TRADE-UNIONISTS HAVE CONFIDENCE IN BEIDLEMAN AND VARE; ASSOCIATED WORKERS INDORSE TICKET—COUNCIL OF ASSOCIATED BUILDING TRADES AND OTHER CRAFTSMEN PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO "FRIENDS WHO HAVE STOOD BY UNIONS"—INDORSE CANDIDACIES OF VARE AND BEIDLEMAN AND URGE ALL WORKING PEOPLE IN CITY AND STATE TO GIVE THEIR HEARTIEST SUPPORT IN THE PRIMARIES—LABOR THE BIG FACTOR IN VITAL CONTEST—RESOLUTION CALLS UPON TRADE-UNIONISTS OF CITY AND STATE TO FOLLOW SAMUEL GOMPERS'S ADVICE, "SUPPORT OUR FRIENDS AND GIVE A STINGING REBUKE TO OUR ENEMIES"

WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for the United States Senate, and Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for the gubernatorial nomination, in the primaries, have reason to be proud of the reception and ovation they got Monday night in Musicians' Hall, 120 North Eighteenth Street, from trade-unionists assembled in mass meeting.

The warmth of their welcome and indorsement visibly affected both candidates, and Harry A. Mackey, chairman of the Vare campaign committee, was jubilant when the significance of the ovation dawned upon him. The sentiment expressed at the meeting under the auspices of the Council of Associated Building Trades is indicative of labor's sentiment for VARE and Beidleman throughout the city and State.

When a delegation of unionists led the distinguished guests to the platform the entire meeting arose and stamped, cheered, and applauded most spontaneously for at least three minutes. The speeches of Congressman VARE and former Lieutenant Governor Beidleman were punctuated with heavy applause. When both candidates ended their talks they were again the recipients of another ovation.

It was a most auspicious night for the candidates. It was a happy night for the aroused trades-unionists. It shows the trend of labor's political thinking. It revealed the beginning of the end for the Pinchot, Pepper, Fisher ambitions.

Edward E. Beidleman is admittedly the best "vote getter" in the State, as concerns organized workingmen and women. All during his public career he has worked hard, sincerely, and intelligently for legislative measures offering betterment to the workers. Under any and all circumstances Mr. Beidleman has been fair and friendly to labor. Labor is now manifestly eager to reciprocate that faithfulness and friendliness.

Congressman VARE is in the same class as Beidleman. Any important piece of remedial legislation affecting the workers' welfare has found Congressman VARE at hand to lend support. His interest in labor legislation has been always on a par with that of the former lieutenant governor. Labor is aware of the "labor records" of both candidates and enthusiastically wants to pay the debt.

The mass meeting was probably the most successful meeting of its kind staged in the city for decades. It shows which way the political winds are blowing.

At the conclusion of the speeches of Messrs. Beidleman and VARE the following resolution was unanimously adopted by a standing vote amid a clamor of wild enthusiasm which made the candidates smile from ear to ear. They had cause to smile. Organized labor of this city gave them a tribute of confidence never before bestowed on candidates for political preferment.

[The resolution council of Associated Building Trades of Philadelphia and vicinity]

Whereas the American Federation of Labor, its executive council, labor officials representing all national and international unions, State federations, district and central councils, and local unions, while testifying before the Senate committee on the modification of the Volstead Act, proved to any unbiased person the unreasonable and un-American aspect of the eighteenth amendment because it deprives the citizenship of the Nation of their inherent rights as guaranteed by the bill of rights and the mandates of common justice; and

Whereas the testimony of the labor representatives was clear and concise, presented in a sane and dignified manner on behalf of the millions of working men and women who resent the violation of their fundamental rights by the sumptuary legislation of the Volstead Act; and

Whereas, in our great State of Pennsylvania, the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for the United States Senate on the Republican ballot, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor on the Republican ballot, concur in the viewpoint of the officials and membership of the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, have consistently and aggressively, during their public careers, fought, worked, and voted for and initiated legislation beneficial to the interests of the working people of our city and State and at all times during their splendid public service concurred in the principles and policies of the American Federation of Labor, in a manner which has attracted the attention of the workers of city and State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the courageous stand taken by the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, is in full accord with the stand taken by the American Federation of Labor and its associated bodies and that the elements composing the American labor movement should enter the coming political contest in Pennsylvania, having in view the slogan of our late great chieftain, Samuel Gompers, to "Support our friends and administer a stinging rebuke to our enemies," and thereby reveal the solidarity of organized labor by giving concentrated support to the position taken by the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for United States Senator, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, and we solemnly make this declaration: Human rights transcend the privileges of momentary political advantage; and be it further

Resolved, That the Associated Building Trades Council of Philadelphia and vicinity, in meeting assembled, does hereby indorse the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, candidate for the United States Senate, and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, In view of the long and splendid records both candidates have made during their public service in support of legislation favorable to the working people of city, State, and Nation, that we call upon the working people of the city and State to be on guard against the insincerity and sophistry in the campaign propaganda emanating from the opponents of the Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE and the Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, and we call upon the working people of the city and State to step forward and give these men their vote. Let labor's support be the largest and sanest contribution to the solution of this most vexatious problem which is menacing the very foundation of the American Republic, and the secretary is hereby instructed to forward this resolution to every union in the State of Pennsylvania affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

[From the Progressive Labor World, Philadelphia, Thursday, May 6, 1926]

VARE AND BEIDLEMAN TICKET WILL SWEEP COMMONWEALTH DESPITE THE FEVERISH CLAIMS OF THEIR OPPONENTS—RALLY AT THE ELKS SHOWS BEIDLEMAN AND VARE FORCES SPLENDIDLY UNITED; DEMONSTRATION SPELLS A SURE VICTORY—CHAIRMAN MACKEY AND HIS ASSOCIATES JUBILANT AT THE TREMENDOUS TURNOUT OF PARTY WORKERS, LABOR CHIEFS, AND OTHER LOYAL G. O. P. VOTERS—A RALLY THAT WILL BE HISTORIC—CHAIRMAN MACKEY SCATHINGLY TROUNCES THE DAILY NEWSPAPERS OF THIS AND OTHER CITIES FOR THEIR PARTIAL HANDLING OF POLITICAL NEWS OF THE DAY

For United States Senator, WILLIAM S. VARE; for governor, Edward E. Beidleman.

That's just about the way the primary elections are going to make the Republican ticket read.

The above is evidenced by the Vare-Beidleman political rally at the Elks Club Monday night. Five thousand enthusiasts tried to jam their way into the spacious Elks ballroom. At least 4,000 jammed their way in. The rest stood around the clubhouse for hours after the meeting started, hoping for a chance to break into the big show.

It was the greatest political rally in the history of the G. O. P. in Pennsylvania. There was a zeal in the meeting few meetings really have. At times the roof seemed to quiver from the applause and cheers.

The galaxy of ward leaders flanking Congressman VARE and former Lieutenant Governor Beidleman was most impressive. It was an evidence that the organization is intact for their candidacies. The political chieftains gave assurance that they are in the fight to give all they have for success.

When "Bill" Campbell, big chief of the twenty-fifth ward, made his little talk for the ticket the auditors knew that it was "all over but the shouting." The cheers were deafening when "Billy" threw down his challenge to the "reformers."

When Beidleman hit the high spots of his tremendous oratory, the house was full of thrills. His denunciation of the tricks of his opponents, his espousal of the cause of the common people, his direct shots at the hypocrisies of the campaign, his reference to the fight between the House of Have and the House of Want, electrified his hearers. There is no question where they stood for "Eddie" Biedleman.

When "BILL" VARE stepped forward to make the "best speech" of his career the yelling could be heard in "Andy" Mellon's mansions in Pittsburgh, Washington, and Miami. The reception given VARE made his cheeks flush with a justifiable pride. It was made apparent that VARE's leadership is based on his proximity to the ordinary fellow.

The senatorial candidate was in fine fettle. He jabbed, punched straight, right-crossed with a dexterity that was a delight to the big crowd. VARE's speech was more effective than are the highly polished oratorical efforts of his erudite opponents—an erudition which the anti-Vare campaign managers clumsily advertise.

It is always poor policy to brag about one's education. The Fisher-Pepper campaign managers constantly brag about the Fisher-Pepper education. That bragging has had a reaction. The common people who are not college bred resent such stuff and turn against the Fisher-Pepper combination. Fisher-Pepper camps should hire new campaign managers. The ones in charge are messing up the camps. They possess a positive genius for handling dirt, but they are mentally slow when it comes to political tactics which mean votes.

BAKER SITS IN THE FRONT ROW

A most conspicuous figure at the big rally was Harry Baker, chairman of the Republican State committee. His appearance was rightly interpreted as meaning that Baker refuses to have anything to do with the Fisher-Pepper-Grundy-Mellon aggregation. Baker always stands with those who are Republicans all of the time, not only when times are opportune. Baker was the cynosure of all eyes. His presence was eloquent of the fact that the organization goes into the final rounds of the senatorial and gubernatorial fight trained and united and confident of victory.

Harry J. Trainer—long an opponent of the Vares—won a big hand for himself when he was toted to the center of the stage. He smiled broadly and asserted his ward would be in the line-up against the common enemy.

A large group of labor chiefs also won a big round of applause when they took their seats on the Vare-Beidleman platform. The entrance of the labor chiefs made Chairman Mackey smile the smile that can't be rubbed off. Mackey knows that with labor back of the Vare-Beidleman ticket the ticket can't be licked.

Mackey's labors at the mass meeting had the fabled labors of Hercules and Atlas backed off the boards. He worked as no campaign manager ever worked before. He's a human dynamo. His legs were tottering, his hands shaking, his voice shot to bits, but he struggled through his difficult rôle like a true martyr to the faith. He has distinctly won his spurs—golden spurs—as a campaign manager. His astute handling of the meeting and everything incidental to the Vare-Beidleman campaign has been nothing less than marvelous.

Mackey gave inside information that made the big crowd sit up and take notice. Telegrams, messages, letters, etc., poured into the meeting from the highest and lowest in the State. Big names and modest names offered their backing to the ticket. It was a great show. It was a great night.

Mackey, like VARE and Beidleman, stressed the important fact that the fight is between the "common people and the aristocracy of money." Such drawing of the lines of battle brought the big crowd to its feet. It senses a something in the campaign that no G. O. P. campaign ever before possessed. It was a new note. The truth of it struck home. It's a big card in the Vare-Beidleman deck.

Congressman MORIN, of Allegheny County, was another orator who went big with the crowd. He placed the real facts of the Pittsburgh salient before the crowd. He nullified all the rosy Pittsburgh reports put out so assiduously by the Pepper-Fisher press agents. MORIN said: "Just watch our county repudiate the Mellons and the Leslies."

Congressman VARE put it over big by his direct way of treating the big issue of the fight. He scored heavily when he proved his allegiance to President Coolidge. He was a riot when he asserted he stood with his own class of people against the special interests that want to dominate Pennsylvania and the Nation.

Beidleman, too, played his four aces and his deuce of spades when he said he wanted to be governor so that he could carry on the remedial legislative work for the common people of the State.

The interests of the State don't want Beidleman in that gubernatorial chair. They know he is too close to the men and women who have to toil hard for their bread and butter. His sympathies are too near the people—his own class—to suit those who would profit by controlling the functions of government.

It was a great mass meeting.

It was an inspirational G. O. P. night.

It was indicative of which way the Pennsylvania political winds are blowing.

It means that WILLIAM S. VARE is going to be the new United States Senator.

It means that Edward E. Beidleman is going to be the next Governor of Pennsylvania.

It means that the people—the ordinary people—are fully aroused and mean to make Pennsylvania a Commonwealth of, for, and by the people.

Which, of course, means the square deal for all.

Which, naturally, is a good meaning for progress and prosperity and justice.

[From the Scranton Telegram, Sunday, April 25, 1926]

SWEEPING VARE VICTORY IS PREDICTED—MACKEY ASSAILS MELLON'S CLAIM FOR PEPPER SUPPORT—NEXT UNITED STATES SENATOR GIVEN ROUSING RECEPTION BY ADHERENTS OF "DRY" MODIFICATION AT ELKS CLUB—HON. WILLIAM SCOTT VARE, HON. ARTHUR JAMES, AND HON. HARRY A. MACKEY IN STAIGHT-FROM-THE-SHOULDER SPEECHES, TEAR DOWN WEAK DEFENSE OF OPPONENTS HIDING BEHIND MELLON WEALTH AND FANATICAL ILLUSIONS—GREAT VICTORY PREDICTED FOR CNOGRESSMAN AND HIS ENTIRE TICKET—CAMPAIGN OPENS IN EARNEST WITH SUCCESS THE ONLY GOAL

If there was ever any doubt as to how strong Congressman WILLIAM SCOTT VARE is in Lackawanna County that doubt was dispelled last night at the Elks Club when the Congressman, together with his campaign manager, Harry A. Mackey, and District Attorney Arthur James, of Wilkes-Barre, candidate for lieutenant governor, in the best group of political speeches ever heard by a local audience, waded into the candidacies of Senator George Wharton Pepper and Governor Gifford Pinchot, both opposing Mr. VARE for the office of United States Senator in such an honest, sincere manner that will lead to but one conclusion when May 18 rolls around—victory.

It was indeed a Vare-Beidleman-James night and the affair, attended by Republicans from every nook and corner in the county, spells nothing but success for the candidates who are carrying their appeal to the doorsteps of the homes of the plain people of the State.

One of the best speeches of the night was that of Hon. Harry A. Mackey. The latter, a graduate of the great Vare school of politics, told of the wonderful organization headed by VARE in Philadelphia, and who, in words that rang with the spirit of liberty and independence, resented the attacks that the moneyed interests of the State have made upon the man whose love for the plain people has made the name of VARE loved by the plain people of his native city.

Hon. Edward E. Beidleman, candidate for governor, was expected to speak here last night, but having attended a session of the State firemen at Norristown yesterday was unable to get to Scranton.

Arthur James, aspirant for the nomination for lieutenant governor, made a corking good speech. He tore right into the Mellon-Grundy crowd, pictured his opponent and neighbor, Col. Ernest G. Smith, as the part owner and editor of a Democratic daily, the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, that found delight in abusing Calvin Coolidge in 1924, and in pounding away at Joe Grundy, inveterate foe of the laboring class, until Grundy made a hurried trip from Scranton to the Westmoreland Club in Wilkes-Barre and tendered second place on the Mellon-Grundy slate to the colonel and wound up with his own way of looking at Senator Patrick F. Joyce's desertion of those who put him in the political saddle in Luzerne. Jones, as shown in another column, charged that from behind the scenes some one got the tip that it would be well for Joyce to jump aboard the Pepper-Fisher-Smith band wagon and that Joyce did a self-preservation act.

"Pennsylvania is not going to be governed by an aristocracy of wealth as represented by Mellon. Men shall continue to run for office in this State on their personal records. The Republican voters will repudiate the Mellon system of selecting State officers," Mr. James said. Pennsylvania will continue to be known as the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and not the commonwealth of Mellon, the fighting district attorney from Luzerne told the audience amidst the wildest kind of applause.

Congressman VARE was given a rousing cheer when introdueed by the toastmaster, the Rev. Dr. D. Pugh Griffith, Episcopal minister, of Jermyn. The Congressman, for the first time since the campaign started, took to task his two talkative opponents. He pictured Governor Pinchot as a politician of many spots, for the reason that when the governor ran for the office he now holds he sought for and received the support of the great political machine controlled by VARE and which he now terms "the gang."

"The distinguished Senator Pepper," the Congressman said, "who for some reason has seen fit to term me as a 'Jonah,' didn't look upon me as such when the Republican organization of Philadelphia put him in office four years ago.

"Every thoroughbred Republican who knows just what the VARE organization means to the party in the State of Pennsylvania will resent the allusion of Governor Pinchot to Philadelphia Republicans as gangsters," he said.

VARE'S SPEECH

The text of the Congressman's speech follows:

"When I submitted my candidacy for the United States Senate to the voters of Pennsylvania, I suggested a great and vital issue for the decision of the voters. Its importance no one will gainsay. The Congress of the United States so fully recognizes this that it is now, through an appropriate committee, giving hearings upon the great question whether the Volstead Act makes for temperance or intemperance. Lincoln once said that this Nation could not endure 'half slave and half free.' Similarly, it can not endure with one half of the people obeying a law and the other half openly violating it. The American people is not in spirit a lawless people. A law, which is so openly violated as the Volstead law, must have features of oppression which a free people can not accept.

"The character of the campaign presented by my two opponents for the nomination presents a curious phenomenon. Although I have consistently refrained from following their policy of personal abuse and shall continue to do so, nevertheless I think I have the right to call attention to just what they mean from the standpoint of sincerity when they say they are 'against the machine.'

PEPPER PLEASED WITH "GANG'S" HELP

"Senator Pepper was elected to his present office four years ago with the full support of the Republican organization. He was extremely grateful for that support, apparently, and quite fond of the Vares whom he now denounces. In fact, he gave a demonstration of this affection by visiting the Republican city committee and offering to 'spit' in the face of any handy bulldog to prove his devotion to the regular organization.

"His violent opposition to the Philadelphia organization did not develop until he became convinced that I intended to contest for the nomination. He has now transferred his enthusiasm for attacking the mythical bulldogs to Pittsburgh where Senator Leslie has just given perfunctory adherence to the Pepper cause.

"And so with Governor Pinchot. Four years ago, the governor was, too, quite fond of the Philadelphia organization. His friendship developed after his nomination for governor and continued right on through the general election when the Republican organization gave him a rousing majority. It continued, in fact, through the session of the legislature when he was given support on many measures, and did not cease until the Republican organization defeated him for delegate to the Republican National Convention because of his opposition to the Coolidge administration. Now Pepper wants to throw me in the river and Pinchot is broadcasting his virtuous opposition to 'the gang' all over the landscape.

"Neither of my opponents has made any attempt to meet the issue which I have raised and which concerns the welfare of the State and the supremacy of its laws. I, naturally, do not complain of their personal attacks upon each other. Governor Pinchot's one argument is to make vague and abusive charges against what he calls 'the gang.' He thus insultingly characterizes the faithful body of Republican workers, who, in season and out of season, have defended the principles of the Republican Party, which he has, throughout his political career, attempted to undermine and destroy.

WORKERS WILL RESENT CHARGE

"The faithful workers of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania will resent the oft-repeated and contemptuous allusion to them as 'the gang.' However much I may disagree with those who support Pinchot, I give them credit for the same sincerity and patriotism as I claim for those Republicans who differ with them. Certainly, I would never allude to this earnest body of men and women who, despite the patent facts, still believe that true temperance can be secured by extreme Volsteadism, as the 'lunatic fringe.' I leave the use of such choice epithets to the scholarly and distinguished senior Senator of Pennsylvania. This contemptuous reference to thousands of good men and women is not calculated to promote his candidacy.

"I have noticed with amusement that the Senator has referred to me as a 'Jonah.' As I recall the increasing majorities in Philadelphia for the principles of the Republican Party, to which I may fairly claim I have contributed by active and lifelong party service, I can not see the propriety of the scriptural analogy. Certainly, the distinguished Senator did not discover that I was a 'Jonah' as long as he had any hope for my support, and nothing was left undone by his friends to force me into the support of his candidacy.

"My only excuse for referring to these personal considerations is the fact that both my opponents seemed disposed to conduct a campaign of abuse, rather than of argument. I prefer to draw the attention of

the voters of Pennsylvania to the issue which I have raised and which seems to me vital, not only to the well-being of the American people but to the continued success of the Republican Party. The Democratic Party, reasonably assured of the electoral votes of the almost solid South on the race issue, need only capture the electoral votes of sufficient Northern States to secure power. Can anyone question that, if the Republican Party is forced in these States into the position of defending the excesses of Volsteadism, the Democratic Party will carry those States? The signs are multiplying that such is their program. Both New York and New Jersey have already elected Democratic governors and Senators upon this issue. It is to be feared that if the Republican Party is maneuvered into a false position, it may lose Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Illinois, and other States.

"Thoughtful Republicans everywhere are now perceiving this grave danger. Neither they nor I have any desire to make the question of Volsteadism a party issue, but events are rapidly bringing this about. In New York the Republicans, under the wise leadership of Elihu Root, are proposing a referendum to take the issue of Volsteadism out of party politics. In New Jersey, Senator EDGE is actively working to the same end. My candidacy is intended to do the same for Pennsylvania, for if either Mr. Pinchot or Senator Pepper, each of them an avowed 'dry,' carries this primary election, it is possible that even Pennsylvania might become, with the growing revolt against Volsteadism, a grave peril. I am trying to save the Republican Party of Pennsylvania from this danger.

"Apart from the effect upon party success, my advocacy of a reasonable modification of the Volstead law in the direction of true temperance is based upon the sincere conviction that it is for the welfare of the people. I only ask the voters of Pennsylvania to face the facts. I only ask them to compare the results of the present experiment of Volsteadism with the better methods of other countries. Take, for example, the Province of Quebec, where, under an admirable law, the use of beverages of high alcoholic content is discouraged and the use of light wines and beers is encouraged, but without in any manner restoring the saloon. I invite the voters of Pennsylvania to contrast the results of a sane policy of temperance reform, as shown in Montreal, with the results of Volsteadism in Boston. The two cities are of almost equal size. Mark the results as shown in the police statistics in the matter of drunkenness:

Boston:	
1921	30,987
1922	67,643
1923	38,988
Montreal:	
1921	5,663
1922	4,356
1923	3,761

"These startling figures disclosed not only that Boston, under Volsteadism, had eight times the drunkenness of Montreal, under a sane law, but that in Boston, notwithstanding the expenditures of millions of dollars for enforcement and the most drastic execution of extreme laws, the amount of drunkenness has increased each year from 1921 to 1923, while in Montreal, under a sane law, which permitted light wines and beers to be served with meals, the amount of drunkenness had each year steadily diminished.

"In the matter of crime the result is not less startling. In 1923 there were 4,833 arrests in Boston to each 100,000 inhabitants, and in Montreal only 627.

"A still more startling revelation of the effects of fanatical Volsteadism is a comparison of the cities of London, Paris, and Washington. London has a population of nearly 8,000,000; Paris, 3,000,000; and Washington, 450,000. It appears that the arrests for drunkenness per hundred thousand of population in these cities are as follows: London, 380; Paris, 500; Washington, 2,000. In other words, Washington, which has only a sixteenth of the population of London and about a sixth of the population of Paris, has eight times as many arrests as London and five times as many as Paris.

"These are startling figures, and it is difficult to understand how any right-minded man or woman would willingly ignore them. Yet the partisans of Volsteadism are not content with the most ruthless law that was ever put upon the statute books of America, but are now trying to get additional legislation which would destroy even the immunity of a man's dwelling house from unreasonable search and seizure. If there be one principle of liberty which is sacred to the English-speaking race, it is the immunity of the home. Even in the darkest days of absolutism in England a man's home was regarded as his "castle of asylum and defense," and even a king could not cross its threshold without the owner's permission. The founders of the Republic wrote this great principle of liberty into our Bill of Rights, but the attempt is now being made in Congress by the Volstead fanatics to break down, if such a thing were possible under our form of government, even the immunity of the home.

"These growing excesses of governmental power have only been possible by the apathy of the people. It is time that thoughtful and patriotic Americans should arise in protest, and this impelled me to announce my candidacy, so that the voters of Pennsylvania could have one candidate who would represent the growing sentiment of the best people of Pennsylvania; that the time has come to take out of our prohibition statutes the insanity of Volstead fanaticism and put a little sanity in its place. Neither I nor anyone wishes the return of the saloon. Neither I nor anyone could wish for the unregulated traffic in intoxicating liquors, but I am only one of many thousands who believe that if the cause of true temperance is to triumph it must be through laws which are reasonable in spirit and have some fair regard for that innate love of liberty which characterizes the American people."

[From the Progressive Labor World]

(A reprint from issue of May 20, 1926)

"DAD'S" DAUGHTER'S SPEECH OVER RADIO EXERTED TREMENDOUS INFLUENCE TOWARD AIDING "DAD" WIN SENATORIAL NOMINATION—MISS BEATRICE VARE DID A REMARKABLE BIT OF POLITICAL SPELLBINDING O'ER WCAU; LISTENERS-IN WERE DELIGHTED WITH THE CHARMING GIRL'S SPEECH—"THE BEST 'DADDY' IN ALL THE WORLD"—THE HOUSE OF VARE IS HAPPY AND GRATIFIED AT THE OUTCOME OF THE CLASSIC BATTLE IN WHICH "DADDY" EMERGED WITH GREAT GLORY

One part of the senatorial campaign just finished with tremendous gratification to the house of Vare was the part Miss Beatrice Vare, daughter of the primary senatorial nominee, played in the great political battle.

Miss Vare was an oasis in the desert of political vituperation and calumny. Her "speech," prior to the close of the campaign, from station WCAU, was a message of filial love, sweetness, charm, and common sense. It electrified her vast air audience. It made Miss Vare a conspicious figure in the hearts of our citizenship. It was a speech which was a sweet, gentle summer wind—fresh and fragrant—in contrast with the bitter and brutal windiness emanating from the publicity departments of the anti-Vare political camps.

The campaign was full of charge and countercharge. It developed many brazen voices. It manufactured vicious oratory. It was full of vague statements relative to Congressman VARE—all unjust and far away from the truth concerning Congressman VARE'S splendidly constructive character.

Miss Vare's "speech" therefore was a treat. It was one of the most effective touches in the great campaign. It gave a personal "close-up" of the Congressman which gave thousands a chance to get the proper perspective of the successful senatorial nominee.

It was heart message. It turned many votes in her father's direction. It was a plain tale told with magnificent courage and daughterly loyalty. It went straight to the hearts of her audience.

To-day Miss Beatrice Vare stands out beloved and respected in the community for which her father has striven so hard and for which he has been the recipient of so many unkind "knocks" and villifying charges.

Because it was a classic speech and a most timely talk we are glad to herewith reproduce the speech in full.

THE WCAU RADIO SPEECH OF MISS VARE

"Ladies and gentlemen, for several weeks, both in the newspapers and in pamphlets have been printed the most horrible and malicious falsehoods about my dear father, and I have begged of Mr. Levy, for the use of this radio station for a few moments so that I might tell you a little of the really wonderful man my father is and just why we love him so very, very dearly.

"It is a well-known fact that a man's family is his severest critic, for it is at home that he is best known.

"When a man is agreeable in the morning, when he starts his day's work, he may have a good reason for being so. It may be a customer or a client. It is his business to be pleasant.

"But when a man returns home in the evening, tired and weary from a long day of physical and mental strain, and then is pleasant and thoughtful and kind—then it is because it's the sort of stuff he is made of. And that is just the sort of man my father is, not just once in a while but every day in the year.

"Let me tell you a little incident which happened just the other morning. Our cook was away ill, in fact, at the time we were entirely without help. At 7 o'clock I went downstairs to cook father's breakfast. To my surprise, when I entered the dining room I found that he himself had prepared his own breakfast. I said, 'Why, Daddy, I had no idea you were leaving so early. Why didn't you call me?' And he just put his arm around me and kissed me and said, 'Why, that's all right, honey. You see, I am going up the State campaigning early this morning. I got along just fine for breakfast, and I wouldn't have disturbed you or mother for the world.'

"That same kindness and consideration looms forth in everything daddy ever does or says—a man with such a busy life himself—yet ever mindful of others—a big man doing big things, and remembering all the while that, although the big things make life much greater, it is the little things that often make life much sweeter.

"Last week a man stopped father on the street. He is a reporter on one of the Philadelphia newspapers that head this horrible campaign of slander. He said, 'Mr. VARE, I want you to know that I don't mean

any hard feelings by the articles I've been writing. That's the sort of stuff they want at the office, so it's our job to please them. I just want you to know, Congressman, that we boys all know you're the right sort, and we'll all be right there with our votes on the 18th.' That is the way the men who compose the obnoxious stories feel toward my father.

"Although I have always felt that my father was the dearest daddy in the world, it was six years ago, when I was 16, during a very sad summer in the Orient, that I learned to know him best. I was lying very seriously ill. In the next bed had been my dear sister, Ida May, but the fever had been too great for her and God had stepped in and called her on. Mother and Mildred were back in Honolulu and daddy and I were alone.

"Night and day he sat by my bed and wept and watched and prayed. No mother's love could have been more tender during the long period in which I was convalescing. Oh! is it any wonder I love him? And not only I. There are thousands and thousands of Philadelphians and Pennsylvanians who love him, too—for the good man that he is, for his untiring efforts in behalf of humanity, for his willingness to extend a helping hand to all who are in need, regardless of race, creed, or color.

"When my uncle, the late Edwin H. Vare, passed on to his reward these thousands of ardent supporters were a living tribute. The wealthy were there, to be sure, but in that same endless line that filed slowly by the bier for hours and hours were the poor. It required the sacrifice of their wages for the day and yet they made that journey 20 miles out into the country.

"Was it a lash that drove them into that line as the 'Philadelphia Inquirer' and other wicked papers dared to say? No, no. They went way out there into the country in order that they might pay tribute and respect to their friend; to their brother. I stood by and watched the procession. There were old ladies, cripples, and even little children in the throng, and each one paused with tear-stained eyes to bend over and kiss the hand that was cold in death; the hand that had been lifted so often to defend them in trouble; the hand that was kind and generous when they were in need.

"And these good people hold the same love for my father to-day. There is that same great army of thousands; yes, hundreds of thousands, that are rallying to his banner now, eager to show their appreciation of his services in the past and their trust in him in the future. They know that his very life is honesty itself; that his word is his bond. He has never been known to break a promise. And yet he is called a thief and a robber.

"Because prohibition has proved disastrous and my father has the courage to fight against hypocrisy he is called a tool of the liquor interests, a vicious gangster, and even a drunkard. And yet my father is a man who doesn't drink, who doesn't even smoke.

"My father does not, like another candidate I know, advertise himself as a church man. We prefer to class the fact that we attend our church and hear the word of God and receive His blessings as a privilege rather than an achievement.

"Let me ask some of you good people just who have been doing the ungodly, unrighteous slandering in this campaign? Who have been doing the mud slinging?

"The answer is very evident. And I wonder what God thinks to-night when He looks down and sees how some of His people who profess to be Christians have taken His great commandment and broken, yes, splintered it; that great commandment, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.'"

UNITED STATES SENATE.

AN ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF HON. WILLIAM S. VARE, SENATOR ELECT FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

To the honorable chairman and members of the committee:

The right of WILLIAM S. VARE to the seat in the United States Senate, to which he was elected at the general election in 1926, having been the subject of a very thorough investigation by this honorable committee, Mr. VARE desires to submit to the committee a written argument, reviewing the facts to some extent, and calling attention to such rules of law as may (it is hoped) be helpful to the committee in formulating its report as the result of its investigation.

THE PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARY

On May 18, 1926, a primary election was held in the State of Pennsylvania. The result of that election was the nomination of candidates by the respective political organizations for the offices of United States Senator, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of internal affairs, 36 Members of Congress, 25 members of the Pennsylvania State Senate, 208 members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and a long list of local offices.

In this primary election both the Republican and Democratic Parties took part for the nomination of their respective candidates for the various offices. Because perhaps of the remote chance of the election of its candidates, the primary election so far as conducted by the Democratic Party was merely perfunctory and involved the expenditure of little money and the polling of comparatively few votes.

The Republican Party contest was perhaps the most fiercely contested in the history of that State. Three candidates, each supported by powerful and numerous adherents, and each commanding enormous financial resources, waged a contest in which over 1,600,000 votes were cast, and in which each of the candidates apparently had at least a fighting chance of securing the nomination.

Senator George Wharton Pepper, then representing the State in the United States Senate, was a candidate for reelection, and had not only the prestige of office, but the support of numerous business organizations of the State, the help of perhaps a majority of the Republican political organization, and the usual number of personal adherents. His candidacy was coupled up with that of John S. Fisher, who sought the nomination for governor of the State, Ernest G. Smith for lieutenant governor, and James F. Woodward, secretary of internal affairs, and the efforts and expenditures were directed to the nomination of this coalition ticket. The amount so expended or incurred, omitting expenditures exclusively for Governor Fisher's candidacy, amounted to $1,804,979 (Report, p. 6). Senator Pepper received 515,502 votes in the primary mentioned.

Hon. Gifford Pinchot was the governor of Pennsylvania during this campaign, possessed a large patronage by reason of his office, and was financially able to contribute liberally to his own campaign fund. He was known to be opposed to any change in the national prohibition amendment to the Constitution and to the Volstead and other acts passed in pursuance thereto, and consequently had the support of church and temperance organizations in preference to Pepper, who was more or less noncommittal on that issue, and also in preference to VARE, who had proclaimed himself as opposed to national prohibition and particularly opposed to the Volstead and other similar acts. Governor Pinchot's total expenditures amounted to $187,029, of which more than 70 per cent was contributed by himself and members of his family, and he received 339,127 votes at the primary election.

Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE, the remaining Republican candidate, was a Member of Congress from the first Pennsylvania district. He was supported by a small portion of the State Republican organization and apparently very strongly supported by the local Republican organization of the city of Philadelphia. He had the support of those opposed to national prohibition, and his campaign was based largely on opposition to that policy. He received 596,928 votes, and was accordingly nominated. At the election following he was elected over his rival on the Democratic ticket by a plurality of 180,000 votes.

Being successful in the primary election, VARE'S expenditures and conduct during the course of the primary election had received the consideration of the special committee investigating expenditures in senatorial primaries and general elections appointed by the Senate. This makes necessary, or at least appropriate, a more extended investigation into the nature of his campaign fund, its collection and disbursement, than is required in the case of the defeated candidates. Lacking the organization which Governor Pinchot possessed by reason of his governorship, and the organization controlled largely by Senator Pepper, and the influence and patronage of the latter by reason of his senatorial position, VARE was more or less of a free-lance in the campaign. He had conceived the idea that public sentiment in the State of Pennsylvania was opposed to the continuance of the policy of the Government in regard to the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as set forth in the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and as exemplified by the acts of Congress pursuant thereto, and believed, as he had a right to believe, that the people of that State should have an opportunity to express their feelings on this subject by the election to the United States Senate of a candidate who would make this matter a clearly defined and unmistakable issue in the campaign. In announcing his candidacy on March 15, 1926, two months before the primary election, he expressed his views in the following language:

"There is, in addition, another issue of great importance upon which I submit my candidacy to the voters of the Republican Party.

"An effort is being made to force the Republican Party into an extreme position on the great question of prohibition. If successful, it would sooner or later create a fatal breach in the party. Our party has always been in the truest sense a liberal party. It believes in temperance and moderation and in law and order, but it would be false to the great liberal principles upon which it was founded if it could be maneuvered into supporting the tyranny of many features of the Volstead law.

"I shall be opposed in the primaries by two candidates who believe in and would maintain the extreme rigor of the Volstead law. I do not believe that this represents the feeling of the majority of Pennsylvania Republicans of all classes, and it is fitting that this majority should be represented in the coming primaries by a candidate who believes the time has come to modify the excesses of a law which is eating like a cancer into the physical and moral life of the American people.

"Enforcement of the Volstead Act has failed. This fact is obvious to all and needs no argument. It has failed, in my opinion, because the law is not enforceable in its present form.

"In Pennsylvania our citizens have watched its operation backed by the full authority of the State. They have seen money poured out by

millions in the Nation. They have seen espionage of the most offensive character brought into practice, and all to what avail?

"Law enforcement is breaking down everywhere. The younger generation is subjected to moral dangers which are the direct outgrowth of this condition. These are not fancied evils. They are real and everyone knows it.

"If I am not greatly mistaken, the American people are tired of this condition and of the indefensible invasion of their just rights. The laborer, at the end of a weary day in the mines or factory, finds himself a criminal if he takes a glass of beer or light wine, and yet he knows that the more favored classes find little difficulty in having well-stocked wine cellars. Against this hypocrisy and inequality I protest. My candidacy will give an opportunity to the voters of Pennsylvania to express their views on this question.

"The people of this State have had full opportunity to test the value of extreme prohibition and they know the result. They were promised a reign of law and they find widespread lawlessness; they were promised a contented and happy people, and they find a people profoundly discontented and justly irritated; they were promised the improvement of public morals and instead they find the moral restraints of life broken down. Against this destruction of law and order and true temperance my candidacy will be a protest.

"The proponents of Volsteadism everywhere throughout the country present a unanimity of attitude which is enlightening. They admit, because they must, the failure of enforcement. Their remedy is more and greater appropriations and more and more laws. I believe the time has come to admit that the present law is not enforceable and to change it so that it can be enforced.

"I stand for the greatest amount of liberty for the people that is consistent with good government, and I am opposed to the enactment of laws which unnecessarily curtail and reduce that liberty. As a matter of helpful enforcement of the real principles of the constitutional amendment, I would advocate a law permitting the sale of light wines and beer.

"I am convinced that such a liberalization of the Volstead Act will not only remedy the conditions I have described, but will, in fact, promote true temperance.

"In this statement I am confident I express the honest sentiment of all well-informed, unbiased men and women who consider this subject with an eye single to the greatest good to the greatest number."

Having no state-wide organization to support him, it became necessary for him to find some means of placing this issue before the public if he expected any result. The press was more or less hostile to him and his platform, and the purchase of adequate space in the newspapers to present his views and claims would have exceeded any possible resources he had at his command. There is one means of disseminating information which he did not resort to. As a Member of Congress he had the undoubted right to give utterance as a Representative to whatever views he saw fit, and he had the franking privileges which would have enabled him to flood the State of Pennsylvania with personal propaganda at the expense of the Government Printing Office and the United States mails, and had he done so perhaps no question would have been raised as to the propriety of his action, for it would not have been the first time that such methods had been employed; nor is the dissemination of knowledge to the public such a serious crime as to call down criticism when the mails are used for that purpose without the paying of postage.

However, Mr. VARE believed that he should not resort to such method for his personal ends and he prepared and sent through the mails at his own expense letters and circulars direct to the people and carrying full postage at a total cost of $71,435.80. This was a very considerable amount of money in one sense of the word, yet when viewed in connection with the result sought to be obtained, it may be said to be almost insignificant in view of the fact that there are in the State of Pennsylvania approximately 3,500,000 voters. This was the only amount he actually expended and these were the only purposes for which such expenditure was made. No law of either State or Nation was violated in this attempt to place before the people the merits of his candidacy or the statement of his political views and beliefs.

The response to this initial expenditure indicated a favorable impression on behalf of the voters of the State of Pennsylvania and a possibility of his nomination. Handicapped as he was in comparison with his opponents, the natural result of organization in increased expenditures followed. A state-wide organization was attempted and partially completed, meetings were held, speakers were sent to different parts of the State, advertising space was bought, circulars were distributed, all of which increased the demands made upon the treasury of his organization.

Funds could not be spent unless they were first collected, and contributions were gratefully accepted and we may suppose eagerly solicited.

The amount of money paid out as expenses of the Vare campaign amounted to approximately $649,800, of which $71,435.80 was expended by the candidate out of his own funds for the payment of the expense of writing and mailing letters to the voters, and the remainder was money collected on his behalf and used for his benefit by the committee having the campaign in hand.

It is far from accurate, however, to say that these amounts were expended to procure the nomination of Mr. VARE, for the campaign waged in his behalf comprehended the nominations for a great number of other officers, both State and national. His principal rival, Senator Pepper, had made a combination which included the candidacy of John S. Fisher for governor, Ernest G. Smith for lieutenant governor, and James F. Woodward for secretary of internal affairs, and also including selected candidates for Congress, for the local legislature, and for the State and local party committees.

The special committee (partial report, p. 3) is well within the facts when it states that the Pepper-Fisher combination was made before any similar coalition was attempted in behalf of Mr. VARE, and it is eminently correct when it states that the relation which existed between the gubernatorial and senatorial candidates is necessary for an understanding of the campaign contributions and expenditures considered by that committee.

Mr. VARE was practically compelled to make "an offensive and defensive alliance against and after the Pepper-Fisher coalition." (Report, supra.) It included the candidacy of Ernest E. Beidleman for governor, Arthur H. James for lieutenant governor, and James Fleming Woodward for secretary of internal affairs. It went much farther than that and comprehended the candidacy of 36 Members of Congress, 25 members of the State senate, 208 members of the State house of representatives, 113 members of the State Republican committee, and a great number of candidates for membership in the county committees.

Outside of the money personally expended by Mr. VARE, every cent collected and disbursed was spent in the election of the entire ticket. Not a dollar was spent by the committee for the exclusive benefit of Mr. VARE or any other candidate, and the charge made that $700,000 was expended to procure the nomination of Mr. VARE is just as unfounded as would be a like charge that the same amount was expended to procure the nomination of Mr. Beidleman for governor or Mr. James for lieutenant governor, or that a like amount was spent to procure the nomination of each of the 36 Members of the National House of Representatives.

One of the expenses of the campaign was the printing and circulation of sample ballots, and to show the extent and impartial operation of this campaign in favor of all the candidates, and to disprove the assertion that this money was spent on behalf of Mr. VARE, we present herewith four sample ballots, selected at random:

Vare—Beidleman—James—Woodward

REGULAR REPUBLICAN SAMPLE BALLOT

Modification of the Volstead Act means the return of respect for law, an end to the crime-breeding conditions which are the product of Volsteadism, and the restoration of personal liberty.

Join in this great crusade by marking your ballot for the candidates indicated by the cross mark (X).

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Vote for 1)

Gifford Pinchot (Pike County)	
WILLIAM S. VARE (Philadelphia County)	X
George Wharton Pepper (Philadelphia County)	

GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Edward E. Beidleman (Dauphin County)	X
Thomas W. Phillips, jr. (Butler County)	
John K. Tener (Washington County)	
John S. Fisher (Indiana County)	

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Charles J. Esterly (Berks County)	
Arthur H. James (Luzerne County)	X
Charles M. Clement (Northumberland County)	
Frank P. B. Thompson (Philadelphia County)	
Ernest G. Smith (Luzerne County)	
Frances Moser Hocker (Philadelphia County)	

SECRETARY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

(Vote for 1)

Isadore H. Pilvinsky (Schuylkill County)	
Frederic A. Godcharles (Northumberland County)	
James Fleming Woodward (Allegheny County)	X

Rep.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

(Vote for 1)

GEORGE S. GRAHAM (eighth ward)	X

REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 2)

Patrick J. McShea (fifteenth ward)	
Robert H. Moore (fifteenth ward)	
Richard D. Burns (fifteenth ward)	X
Alexander Colville (fifteenth ward)	X

Rep. 15.

MEMBER OF THE STATE COMMITTEE

(Vote for 2)

Richard Weglein (twenty-ninth ward)	X
Jean M. McDevitt (forty-seventh ward)	X

Republican 15, 28, 29, 32, 47.

WARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Vote for 2)

George W. Bradenburgh ---------- X
Robt. W. Hall ---------- X
Terry Lynch ----------
R—15—27.

Vare—Beidleman—James—Woodward

REGULAR REPUBLICAN SAMPLE BALLOT

Modification of the Volstead Act means the return of respect for law, an end to the crime-breeding conditions which are the product of Volsteadism, and the restoration of personal liberty.

Join in this great crusade by marking your ballot for the candidates indicated by the cross mark (X):

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Vote for 1)

Gifford Pinchot (Pike County) ----------
WILLIAM S. VARE (Philadelphia County) ---------- X
George Wharton Pepper (Philadelphia County) ----------

GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Edward E. Beidleman (Dauphin County) ---------- X
Thomas W. Phillips, jr. (Butler County) ----------
John K. Tener (Washington County) ----------
John S. Fisher (Indiana County) ----------

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Charles J. Esterly (Berks County) ----------
Arthur H. James (Luzerne County) ---------- X
Charles M. Clement (Northumberland County) ----------
Frank P. B. Thompson (Philadelphia County) ----------
Ernest G. Smith (Luzerne County) ----------
Frances Moser Hocker (Philadelphia County) ----------

SECRETARY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

(Vote for 1)

Isadore H. Pilvinsky (Schuylkill County) ----------
Frederic A. Godcharles (Northumberland County) ----------
James Fleming Woodward (Allegheny County) ---------- X
Rep.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

(Vote for 1)

HARRY C. RANSLEY (second ward) ---------- X

REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 2)

Morris J. Root (third ward) ---------- X
Arnold M. Blumberg (fifth ward) ---------- X
Rep. 5.

MEMBER OF THE STATE COMMITTEE

(Vote for 2)

Thomas W. Cunningham (tenth ward) ---------- X
Mame Keel (eleventh ward) ---------- X
Rep.—5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18.

Primary election day, Tuesday, May 18.

Polls open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., eastern standard time, or from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m., daylight-saving time.

Vare—Beidleman—James—Woodward

REGULAR REPUBLICAN SAMPLE BALLOT

Modification of the Volstead Act means the return of respect for law, an end to the crime-breeding conditions which are the product of Volsteadism, and the restoration of personal liberty.

Join in this great crusade by marking your ballot for the candidates indicated by the cross mark (X):

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Vote for 1)

Gifford Pinchot (Pike County) ----------
WILLIAM S. VARE (Philadelphia County) ---------- X
George Wharton Pepper (Philadelphia County) ----------

GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Edward E. Beidleman (Dauphin County) ---------- X
Thomas W. Phillips, jr. (Butler County) ----------
John K. Tener (Washington County) ----------
John S. Fisher (Indiana County) ----------

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Charles J. Esterly (Berks County) ----------
Arthur H. James (Luzerne County) ---------- X
Charles M. Clement (Northumberland County) ----------
Frank P. B. Thompson (Philadelphia County) ----------
Ernest G. Smith (Luzerne County) ----------
Frances Moser Hocker (Philadelphia County) ----------

SECRETARY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

(Vote for 1)

Isadore H. Pilvinsky (Schuylkill County) ----------
Frederic A. Godcharles (Northumberland County) ----------
James Fleming Woodward (Allegheny County) ---------- X
Rep.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

(Vote for 1)

GEORGE P. DARROW (twenty-second ward) ---------- X

SENATOR IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 1)

George Woodward (twenty-second ward) ---------- X
James Yearsley (forty-second ward) ----------

REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 1)

Wallace Bromley (twenty-first ward) ---------- X
James Verner Harold (twenty-first ward) ----------
Rep. 21.

MEMBER OF THE STATE COMMITTEE

(Vote for 2)

Elizabeth K. Groben (forty-second ward) ----------
Selena Florence Shellenberger (forty-second ward) ---------- X
Thomas F. Watson (twenty-second ward) ---------- X
Rep.—21, 22, 38, 42.

Primary election day, Tuesday, May 18.

Polls open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., eastern standard time, or from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m. daylight-saving time.

REGULAR REPUBLICAN SAMPLE BALLOT

(Vare—Beidleman—James—Woodward)

Modification of the Volstead Act means the return of respect for law, an end to the crime-breeding conditions which are the product of Volsteadism, and the restoration of personal liberty.

Joint in this great crusade by marking your ballot for the candidates indicated by the cross mark "X."

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Vote for 1)

Gifford Pinchot (Pike County) ----------
WILLIAM S. VARE (Philadelphia County) ---------- X
George Wharton Pepper (Philadelphia County) ----------

GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Edward E. Beidleman (Dauphin County) ---------- X
Thomas W. Phillips, jr. (Butler County) ----------
John K. Tener (Washington County) ----------
John S. Fisher (Indiana County) ----------

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

(Vote for 1)

Charles J. Esterly (Berks County) ----------
Arthur H. James (Luzerne County) ---------- X
Charles M. Clement (Northumberland County) ----------
Frank P. B. Thompson (Philadelphia County) ----------
Ernest G. Smith (Luzerne County) ----------
Frances Moser Hocker (Philadelphia County) ----------

SECRETARY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

(Vote for 1)

Isadore H. Pilvinsky (Schuylkill County) ----------
Frederic A. Godcharles (Northumberland County) ----------
James Fleming Woodward (Allegheny County) ---------- X
Rep.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

(Vote for 1)

James M. Hazlett (twenty-sixth ward) ---------- X
Frank X. O'Connor (forty-eighth ward) ----------
G. Edward Dickerson (thirtieth ward) ----------

SENATOR IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 1)

Samuel W. Salus (fourth ward) ---------- X

REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Vote for 1)

Samuel B. Hart (seventh ward) ---------- X
Rep. 7.

MEMBER OF THE STATE COMMITTEE

(Vote for 2)

Brenda E. Dennis (thirtieth ward) ---------- X
Charles B. Hall (seventh ward) ---------- X
Republican 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 30.

Primary election day, Tuesday, May 18.

Polls open from 7 a. m. to 7. p. m., eastern standard time, or from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m., daylight-saving time.

On these ballots appear the names of James M. Hazlett, George S. Graham, George P. Darrow, and Harry C. Ransley, all recommended for nomination as Representatives in Congress. If any of these persons were nominated and elected, would anything be more unfair than to charge that he had bought his nomination by the expenditure of more than $700,000, and therefore was unfit to represent his district in Congress? Yet, barring the greater prominence of the office and the greater extent of territory embraced, such charge would not be more unjust than when applied to Mr. VARE.

The entire amount being spent for the joint interest and benefit of an almost innumerable list of candidates, it is impossible to allot any amount to each or to measure the individual benefit each derived from it. But it is undoubtedly true that the contest for the nomination for the governorship was at least as fierce as that for the senatorship, resulting in the defeat of Mr. VARE's running mate by a small plurality. We think it clearly appears from the testimony given before the special investigating committee that the contest between Fisher and Beidleman, so far as concerned an appeal to special interests, especially these represented by the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and the consequent production of contributions and expenditures of money, greatly overshadowed the contest between the candidates for United States Senator (committee's report, p. 2).

It is therefore wholly at variance with the facts to assume that the large sums of money disbursed by the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee was expended wholly in behalf of Mr. VARE.

One of the largest items was for paid advertising in more than 250 Pennsylvania newspapers, and amounted to over $163,000. There was a printing bill of approximately $82,000, while nearly $18,000 was spent for postage alone; $15,000 was paid out to office help and nearly $14,000 for rent, supplies, and operating expenses of the office maintained as headquarters.

The largest expenditure consisted of contributions to the various local or county committees and amounted to approximately $230,000. It appears that the county committees in turn expended a greater or less amount of these contributions in the employment and payment of watchers at the election. As this item appears to be the only one to which any criticism has been leveled it will receive fuller consideration hereafter.

It is sufficient at this time to say that presumably neither Mr. VARE, nor any of his rivals, desired to expend any such sums as were actually spent. These expenditures became necessary from the very nature of the situation and the only alternative was the abandonment of the contest. If Mr. VARE had rested content with the expenditure of $71,000 of his own money in his initial effort, he might have evoked temporary enthusiasm and attracted potential support, but in the absence of a consolidation and realization of this unorganized favorable sentiment he would have run at the foot of the list instead of the head.

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of our system of primary elections, it can not be doubted or denied that it is the most expensive form of selection of candidates in existence. The people are supposed to make a choice between the conflicting claims of a long list of candidates for each of the several offices for which a nomination is to be made. Naturally the voters are uniformed as to every thing pertaining to the respective candidates—who they are, what they have done in the past, and what they promise to do in the future—and yet the most uninformed exercises an equal influence in the result as does the most enlightened. In addition to being uninformed, or as a result of their lack of information many of the voters are indifferent and this indifference has been increasing until elections now, and primary elections in particular, are ordinarily decided by a mere minority of the persons entitled to vote.

In a general election the average voter votes the ticket of his party from habit and without any great inquiry into the merits of the candidates on it. It is enough for him to know that it is his party's ticket, and he is usually willing to accept the nominees chosen by, or for, him, without question. But in a primary election the voter is required to select out of a number of candidates, all belonging to his party, the one whom he believes best fitted for the particular office or to frame or carry out the party policy. To act intelligently he must inform himself as to the merits, ability, fitness, and availability of each candidate, as well as to the views and beliefs of each.

To inform the electorate of the personality, qualifications, and sentiments of the candidate and to arouse or prod them into action utilizing such information is a thing which can not be done without the prodigal use of money. Under the primary system the candidate may be possessed of every necessary qualification, he may measure up to the intellectual capacity of Webster or Calhoun, and yet suffer defeat at the hands of a third-rate politician possessing none of his qualities, but having a firm grip on the party organization or enjoying the favor of those who control it.

In obedience to this natural and necessary tendency in primary elections the candidates are tempted by competition to bid for public favor by the expenditure of money regardless of whether such expenditure be legitimate or corrupt, and amounts undreamed of in former years may be properly and legally expended.

So far from there being anything unusual in large expenditures in the Pennsylvania primary of May 18, 1926, it would have been an incomprehensible miracle had that primary passed off without enormous expenditures. There were three candidates, each having a large actual, and a much larger potential, personal following. For example, Governor Pinchot was in favor of national prohibition, yet that mere fact would not have brought him a single vote unless information thereof was carried to the people. Mr. VARE was opposed to prohibition as a national policy, yet that fact would not have aided him in the slightest degree in the campaign unless it was forced upon the attention of the voters, and the voters could not know of the sentiments of either Mr. VARE or Governor Pinchot unless money was expended for their information.

And when to this is added the fact that combinations were made both by Senator Pepper and Mr. VARE, each combination presenting a practically complete ticket for every office in the State, the enormous total expended in that hotly contested primary may be a matter of regret or censure, but it should not be one of wonder.

Incidentally, the expenditures for paid watchmen at the polls was a natural result, or rather a part, of the competitive activities of the respective candidates. The primary law of Pennsylvania recognizes the possibility of fraudulent voting and fraudulent returns in a primary contest and permits the employment of watchers by each candidate at such election. In larger cities particularly there are election officials not as much above suspicion as Cæsar's wife was required to be. Without charging that fraud in primary or general elections is common or the general rule, there is a general belief that in certain localities the end is supposed to justify the means to such an extent that no surprise is occasioned when charges of fraud are made and evidence is brought forward to prove them.

There is always the temptation for one side or the other to claim "a fair advantage" in the conduct of the election when it can be done without fear of successful prosecution or merited punishment.

Governor Pinchot appears to have refused to employ watchers, although they were recognized and sanctioned by the primary law of Pennsylvania, and he then makes the complaint that he was defrauded in the primary. Senator Pepper's organization employed a great many watchers, and the county committees supporting Mr. VARE likewise employed a very considerable number.

While it is a reflection upon the integrity of our elections and the honesty of our citizenry that watchers should ever be necessary, the fact remains that in many localities no honest election could be held without some right in the candidates or the party organizations to watch the voting and the returns.

Money was expended for watchers to protect the interests of not only Mr. VARE but of all the hundreds of candidates with whom in common he made the race. When Pennsylvania decided upon a primary law, it considered it necessary, or at least proper, to embody therein certain provisions for the employment by the different candidates of persons who occupied quasi official positions and were called watchers. Section 21 of the act of 1906 provides:

"Each candidate shall be entitled to appoint two watchers at the primary in each election district, division, or precinct in which such candidate is to be voted for, who shall be qualified electors of the district, division, or precinct. Each watcher shall be provided with a certificate from the county commissioners, stating his name, the district in which he is authorized to act, and the name of the candidate appointing him, and shall have the right to remain in the room outside of the inclosed space. Watchers shall be required to show their certificates when requested to do so."

The right to employ watchers is thus expressly given by the statutes of that State, and the right to pay them follows by necessary implication. The inference that the employment of watchers is simply a covert method of buying their votes has no foundation other than the possibility that every honest method for securing a result may be converted into a means of dishonesty or fraud. It is possible that the corrupt purchase of advertising space in a newspaper might carry with it the sale of its influence and support to the candidate inserting the advertisement. But the mere possibility of such a result is not sufficient to prove that the press generally sells its convictions in the same way it sells its advertising space, or that any newspaper which carries political advertisements has prostituted its profession for the benefit of its business office.

If men can be induced to sell their votes for indirect benefit, they could be bought without being employed as watchers; they could be employed in other capacities upon the understanding that their services included their votes. And when the legitimacy of employing watchers is established by the State statute, and no proof is made that they were employed or paid for any purpose except for the discharge of the duties of that employment, an inference that this was merely an indirect method of purchasing votes rests solely upon a vague suspicion or upon an application of the unheard-of presumption that all men are rogues and dishonest until the contrary appears.

It clearly appears from the voluminous testimony taken before the special investigating committee that large sums of money were spent by the various candidates and combinations of candidates, but it does not appear even as a fair inference that Mr. VARE, or the Vare-Beidleman-James-Woodward committee violated any law of the United States or the State of Pennsylvania, or that WILLIAM S. VARE was not the free choice of a large plurality of the Republican electors of that State. Nor does it appear that he fails in the possession of any of the qualifications which the Constitution requires of a Senator of the United States, nor that he did not fairly receive a majority of the votes cast for Senator at the general election in 1926, or that either before or since his election he has shown any moral or legal defects that would be inconsistent with, or unfit him for, the discharge of the duties of a Senator of the United States.

The question then arises, On what conceivable theory can he be denied the right to occupy the seat to which he has been fairly elected by the people of Pennsylvania, and for which he possesses all of the qualifications required by the Constitution of the United States?

I. THE RIGHTS OF WILLIAM S. VARE

At the time of the holding of the primary election in the State of Pennsylvania, as well as the general election which followed it, WILLIAM S. VARE had attained the age of more than thirty years, had been a citizen of the United States for more than nine years, and when elected was an inhabitant of the State from which he was chosen, and he was not the holder of any office under the United States, nor had he at any time engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same or

given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof, and above all other qualifications he was elected by the people of that State to the office of United States Senator.

He thus possessed every constitutional qualification for the office of Senator, and by his election he became possessed of a legal right which could not be lawfully destroyed by any person or collection of persons acting in either their individual or official capacities.

It is a striking and noteworthy fact that one of the greatest, if not preeminently the greatest decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, involving a discussion of the powers of government under our Constitution, related to the right of a citizen to hold an office. Whether this right is denominated a vested right or a property right or whether any description or classification be made of it, it is declared to be a right of which the citizen may not be arbitrarily deprived.

In Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch, 138), decided February, 1803, the facts were that President Adams had signed commissions appointing Marbury and others as justices of the peace of the District of Columbia, the seal of the United States had been affixed to such commissions and attested by the Secretary of State. The appointments were made near the close of President Adams's term of office, and by some oversight were not delivered but came into the possession of James Madison, the newly appointed Secretary of State under Thomas Jefferson.

These offices were purely statutory and resulted from an act of Congress which provided that such number as might be necessary should be appointed as justices of the peace of the District of Columbia for a term of five years. The jurisdiction of such justices was extremely limited, being restricted to personal demands not exceeding the value of $20; their number was unlimited and the emoluments or profits accruing to each justice appointed must necessarily have been insignificant. Such an office was certainly of the lowest grade and least in importance, profit, and honor of all the offices ever created by the Congress of the United States. Yet it was not so insignificant as to be without the protection of the laws, even though it might not be vindicated by mandamus proceedings brought directly in the Supreme Court. In delivering the opinion in that case, Chief Justice Marshall said many things which time at least should not be permitted to wither and are, or ought to be, as just and true to-day as when they were uttered by that preeminent expounder of our Constitution. He said:

"The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury."

After quoting from Blackstone that "It is a settled and invariable principle in the laws of England that every right, when withheld, must have a remedy, and every injury its proper redress," the Chief Justice said:

"The Government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right.

"If this obloquy is to be cast on the jurisprudence of our country it must arise from the peculiar character of the case.

"It behooves us then to inquire whether there be in its composition any ingredient which shall exempt it from legal investigations, or exclude the injured party from legal redress. In pursuing this inquiry the first question which presents itself is, whether this can be arranged with that class of cases which come under the description of damnum absque injuria, a loss without an injury.

"This description of cases never has been considered and it is believed never can be considered, as comprehending offices of trust, of honor, or of profit. The office of justice of the peace in the District of Columbia is such an office; it is therefore worthy of the attention and guardianship of the laws. It has received that attention and guardianship. It has been created by special act of Congress, and has been secured so far as the laws can give security, to the person appointed to fill it, for five years. It is not, then, on account of the worthlessness of the thing pursued, that the injured party can be alleged to be without a remedy.

"Is it in the nature of the transaction? Is the act of delivering or withholding a commission to be considered as a mere political act, belonging to the executive department alone, for the performance of which entire confidence is placed by our Constitution in the Supreme Executive; and for any misconduct respecting which, the injured individual has no remedy?

"That there may be such cases is not to be questioned; but that every act of duty, to be performed in any of the great departments of government, constitutes such a case, is not to be admitted."

If this language is applicable to one of the most insignificant statutory offices ever created, it is at least equally applicable to the office of Senator of the United States. This latter office does not in any sense depend upon the will of the executive, judicial, or legislative departments of the Government, but constitutes part and parcel of the very framework of our national political organization and owes its existence exclusively to the Constitution.

Its term is fixed by that instrument at six years, the qualifications of the persons who may be elected are likewise prescribed by it; and the Senate thus constituted acknowledges no superior in dignity and influence among the legislative councils of the world.

If the mere act of the executive in affixing his name to a parchment commission invests his appointee with a vested right to enjoy the honors, dignities, and profits of the office of a justice of the peace, can it be said that a Senator of the United States, possessing all the qualifications required by the Constitution as well as an election by the people of his State, has no greater right to the dignity, honor, and emoluments of a Senator of the United States than his fellow members may, in their discretion, permit him to have?

It is now proposed to deprive WILLIAM S. VARE of the vested rights he has acquired to hold the office of United States Senator for six years and to strip him of all the honor attached to that office and rob him of the salary annexed to it. It is not to be supposed that the Members of the Senate of the United States are so tyrannical by nature, so arbitrary and conscienceless in the exercise of their senatorial duties that they will lend their aid to such a result merely because they are possessed of the power to do so or because a wrongful exercise of that power might make it doubtful whether the person thus injured could have any adequate remedy or redress from any other body or tribunal. It is to be assumed that every Member of the Senate of the United States recognizes the obligations and duties comprehended in the oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and that no Member would give his assent to a proceeding or a judgment of deprivation of any rights of any citizen of the United States unless good, legal, or constitutional reasons could be found for so doing.

If the Senate of the United States has power to overthrow the declared will of the people of Pennsylvania in the choice of the person selected to represent them in that body it must be found in section 5, of Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that:

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," etc.

Unless the provision that each House shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members means that the Senate has plenary power and discretion to arbitrarily determine the fitness of an elected Senator, then such section furnishes no authority or legal grounds for the deprivation of the rights, duties, honors, and salary of the person duly and legally elected.

The very language of the section itself forbids any such interpretation or construction of this section. Each House is to be the "judge" of the qualifications of its own Members; in other words, is to determine, ascertain, or decide whether the elected Member possesses the necessary qualifications. The power to determine whether certain qualifications exist are possessed by the Member is judicial in its character and is the direct opposite of the power or jurisdiction to prescribe, define, or impose qualifications under its legislative power.

Chancellor Kent, in Volume I of his Commentaries, at page 235, says:

"Each House is made the sole judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its members. The same power is vested in the British House of Commons and in the legislatures of the several States, and there is no other body known to the Constitution to which such a power might safely be trusted. It is requisite to preserve a pure and genuine representation, and to control the evils of irregular, corrupt, and tumultuous elections; and as each House acts in these cases in a judicial character, its decisions, like the decisions of any other courts of justice, ought to be regulated by known principles of law, and strictly adhered to for the safety of uniformity and certainty."

When the Senate or House of Representatives acts under the provisions of said article of the Constitution, it must necessarily act in a judicial capacity, it must be the judge and act as a judge for the purpose of determining, first, whether the Member presenting a certificate of election has in fact been elected; and incidental to this power it acts judicially in determining whether or not the returns of the election show that the Member has been in fact elected. This proceeding involves the decision of matters both of fact and of law and the result arrived at is a determination of the fact under a proper application of the law relative thereto.

In no other sense does either House act in exercise of its power to be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members. It acts judicially in ascertaining the facts as to such qualifications and applies the facts thus found to the constitutionally prescribed qualifications which the Member must possess, and to say that this provision of the Constitution means that either House may prescribe qualificaions and require conformity thereto by the elected Member is to utterly ignore the plain language and meaning of section 5, of Article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

Judicial action is the very antithesis of legislative power. Before a judge can act there must be some already existing rules, written or unwritten, statutory or constitutional, which shall serve as a rule and guide for the rendition of a proper judgment or decision upon the facts

admitted or found to exist. So when the Senate of the United States is constituted a judge of the qualifications of its own Members, this investment of judicial power presupposes the existence of some rule of law in some form, which shall govern the judicial action of the Senate in determining whether the facts found to exist indicate that the elected Member possesses the qualifications of which the Senate is to be the judge.

This logical presumption that qualifications must be prescribed before the Senate or any other body or tribunal can be the judge in respect thereto is fully realized in the various provisions of the Constitution itself. We find upon examination that the Constitution has prescribed in clear and unmistakable language the qualifications not only of Senators of the United States, but also Members of the House of Representatives, the President, and Vice President. The constitutional convention was acting as the supreme legislative body and its work, the Constitution of the United States, and the laws which should be made in pursuance thereof became "the supreme law of the land." In exercising its legitimate legislative functions, the constitutional convention prescribed the qualifications for Senators of the United States by the indirect method of enumerating certain disqualifications which would prevent the citizen possessed of the same from being elected Senator. In framing this Constitution, the people of the United States, through their representatives, were establishing a representative democratic form of government. They prohibited the granting of titles of nobility, guaranteed to every State a republican form of government, and secured to every citizen equal rights to life, liberty, and property, regardless of distinctions or qualifications.

In determining what persons might hold office of trust and profit under the United States they did not select certain classes from which such officers should be elected. They proceeded upon the theory of a presumptive right of every citizen, as a general rule, and subject to very few exceptions, to aspire to any office within the gift of the people. The exceptions by which they departed from the application of this general rule were stated as disqualifications, and in the case of Senators of the United States these disqualifications are found in section 3 of Article I, and were: First, that no person should be a Senator who had not attained the age of 30 years; second, that no person should be a Senator who had not been nine years a citizen of the United States and third, that no person should be a Senator who should not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he should be chosen.

It is perfectly logical, therefore, to say that all citizens of the United States are qualified for election as Members of the Senate unless they are subject to the specific disqualifications of section 3 of Article I, of the Constitution. Another disqualification is found in section 6 of Article I, that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

The above are all the express and specific disqualifications which could have any pertinence or relevancy to this discussion.

There is one positive qualification absolutely requisite and necessary to the right of a Senator of the United States to hold his office and that is that under the provisions of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution he shall have been "elected by the people" of his State.

All of the constitutional provisions above referred to constitute a complete and harmonious scheme for the representation of the various States by their Senators in Congress, with the right and duty imposed upon the Senate to see that none are admitted to its councils who are disqualified for any reason mentioned in the Constitution.

It is the duty of the Senate to be the judge, and, therefore, to judicially try and determine the qualifications of its own Members, i. e., to determine that each person seeking admission has attained the age of 30 years, has been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and who was at the time of his election an inhabitant of the State from which he was chosen, and that he was not holding any office under the United States, and it is likewise its right and duty to see that he was elected by the people of his State.

If WILLIAM S. VARE was elected by the people of Pennsylvania to the office of United States Senator, if at the time of his election he had attained the age of 30 years, had been nine years a citizen of the United States, and was an inhabitant of the State of Pennsylvania and was not holding any office under the United States, then he fulfilled every requirement which the people of the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution and its amendments deemed requisite to be possessed by the representative of a State in the National Senate. He thereby became possessed of a vested right entitling him to that office, a denial of which right would be a personal wrong inflicted upon him as well as a manifest infraction of the Constitution unless some other constitutional provision furnishes a ground to legally and constitutionally deprive him of this vested right or prevent him from enjoying the same.

This depends, of course, upon the meaning of the constitutional provisions above set forth. Was it the intention of the framers of the Constitution that its enumeration of disqualifications should be exclusive and that the States, upon ratifying that instrument, should rest in the security of the belief that they might be represented in the Senate by whomsoever they chose, subject only to the disqualifications found in the Constitution itself, or did they mean that the House of Representatives and the Senate should have the right by legislative act to impose other and additional qualifications or that either House should have unlimited and arbitrary discretion to reject an elected Senator who failed to possess certain other qualifications believed by the other Members to be proper and necessary?

A mere statement of this proposition ought to furnish or at least indicate its answer. A universal rule of construction is that a specific enumeration of powers granted or denied, or of qualifications required or disqualifications imposed, necessarily excludes the attaching of additional powers, qualifications, or disqualifications.

Story, in his great work on the Constitution, at section 448, makes the following remarks as to the application of the rule that affirmative or negative provision excludes or implies others in the following language:

"The truth is that in order to ascertain how far an affirmative or negative provision excludes or implies others, we must look to the nature of the provisions, the subject matter, the object and scope of the instrument. These and these alone can properly determine the rule of construction. There can be no doubt that an affirmative grant of power will, in many cases, imply an exclusion of all others. As, for instance, when the Constitution declares that the power of Congress shall extend to certain enumerated cases, this specification of particulars evidently excludes all pretensions to a general legislative authority. Why? Because an affirmative grant of special powers would be absurd as well as useless if a general authority were intended."

When the Constitutional Convention specified four specific facts constituting disqualifications for Senators of the United States it could only have meant that such enumeration of disqualifications should be exclusive.

Could it be imagined that the Constitutional Convention meant that each House should have the right to prescribe additional disqualifications to those specified in the Constitution when it expressly enumerated such disqualifications? Would it not have been absurd had the Constitution provided that no person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years, be 9 years a citizen of the United States, and an inhabitant of the State from which he is chosen, and then added "or subject to any disqualifications which the Members of the respective Houses may agree upon." If it would be nonsensical to expressly numerate certain disqualification and then expressly provide that some other body might add additional disqualifications, the same patent absurdity is manifest when the right to add other disqualifications is sought by implication.

In the celebrated case of Marbury *v.* Madison (1 Cranch, 138) it was contended that Congress had the right to confer original jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court in addition to the matters of original jurisdiction specifically enumerated in the Constitution, or to state the matter more concretely, that Congress had the right to confer upon the Supreme Court original jurisdiction in madamus where the Constitution had said that the Supreme Court should have original jurisdiction in all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and counsel, and those in which a State shall be a party, and that in all other cases it should have appellate jurisdiction with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make. In disposing of this contention the court said:

"It has been insisted at the bar that as the original grant of jurisdiction to the supreme and inferior courts is general and the clause assigning original jurisdiction to the Supreme Court contains no negative or restrictive words, the power remains in the legislature to assign original jurisdiction to that court in other cases than those specified in the article which has been recited; provided those cases belong to the judicial power of the United States.

"If it had been intended to leave to the discretion of the legislature to apportion the judicial power between the supreme and inferior courts according to the will of that body, it would certainly have been useless to have proceeded further than to have defined the judicial power and the tribunals in which it should be vested. The subsequent part of the section is mere surplusage, is entirely without meaning, if such is to be the construction. If Congress remains at liberty to give to this court appellate jurisdiction where the Constitution has declared their jurisdiction shall be original and original jurisdiction where the Constitution has declared it shall be appellate, the distribution of jurisdiction made in the Constitution is form without substance.

"Affirmative words are often in their operation negative of other objects than those affirmed; and in this case a negative or exclusive sense must be given to them or they have no operation at all."

If the Constitution intended that Congress should have any right to impose disqualifications upon Senators or Representatives it would not have committed the folly of enumerating specific disqualifications itself, and its enumeration of disqualifications, if not meant to be exclusive of all others, is simply meaningless.

And this is particularly so when considered in the light of the object sought to be obtained. The principal bone of contention in the Constitutional Convention was the method by which the States and the people should be represented in the National Congress, the smaller States contending for equal representation and voting power in both

the House of Representatives and the Senate and the larger States contending that representation should be influenced by the size, importance, and population of the various States. No controversy aroused such bitter animosities or resulted in so much wrangling or discussion as this question of the manner and method of representation. In order that this controversy should be put finally at rest, the matter was compromised by apportioning the Members of the House of Representatives according to population and providing that each State should have two Senators to be elected by the legislature of each particular State. That this right should not be subject to the will of Congress and should remain a permanent feature of the Government, this compromise was carried into the Constitution and the adoption of that Constitution was brought about by the understanding that, subject only to the restrictions of the Constitution, each State should have the right to choose whomsoever it would to represent it in its sovereign capacity in the Senate of the United States.

If the Senate has the right to change the qualifications of Senators, it has an equal right to disturb the basis of representation. If it can say that any person who spends $71,000 in circularizing his constituents is manifestly unfit to be a Senator of the United States, it has the equal right to say that a State like Nevada or New Mexico should not have the same number of Senators as a State exceeding it one hundredfold in population. If it had been understood that Congress, or either House, could add to or take away from the constitutional right of each State to representation in the Senate, the convention would never have adopted the Constitution, nor would the States ever have ratified it. Imagine Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, or New Jersey voting to ratify a constitution which left to a majority of the Senate a decision as to the basis of representation in that body or the right to prescribe the qualifications of the Senators they were entitled to elect.

It was so understood by the men who framed the Constitution and urged its adoption on the people. Madison, in No. 45 of the Federalist, answered objections of the opponents of the Constitution and allayed the fears of those who believed that the rights of the different States in the choice of their representatives in the Senate would not be sufficiently safeguarded and guaranteed, said:

"The Senate will be elected absolutely and exclusively by the State legislatures."

In none of the discussions or debates of that period is there any intimation that the provisions of section 5 of Article I, making each House the judge of the qualifications of its own Members, would give to either House the right to capriciously or arbitrarily reject a person whom his State had seen fit to honor by his election to the Senate; but fears were expressed that section 4 of Article I, giving Congress power by law to make and alter regulations in the time, manner, and places of holding elections for Senators and Representatives would enable the National Congress to dictate to the States whom they should select as their Senators or Representatives. One of the arguments was that Congress under this power (not at all under the power to judge of the qualifications of its own Members) could pass such laws as would favor the "wealthy and well born" and thus secure their election to Congress. In No. 60 of the Federalist, Hamilton answered this contention, as follows:

"The truth is that there is no method of securing to the rich the preferences apprehended but by prescribing qualifications of property either for those who may elect or be elected. But this forms no part of the power conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be restricted expressly to the regulations of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked on other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature."

Thus as to the persons who may choose it was provided in section 2 of Article I of the Constitution that the Members of the House of Representatives should be chosen by the voters in each State, who should have the qualifications of voters for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In other words, each State might prescribe the qualifications of voters for its State house of representatives, might attach any qualifications or disqualifications it might see fit as applied to such voters, and when it had done so the persons entitled to vote for a member of the State legislature became ipso facto entitled to vote for the National Representative in that district.

In like manner, Senators were to be elected by the legislature of each State, and how such legislature should be composed and what qualifications should be required of the members of the State legislature were matters entirely within the power of the people of each State in forming or amending its constitution. It was clearly the understanding of Hamilton that no power resided in Congress to impose additional restrictions or qualifications upon the individuals or bodies having the right to elect Senators or Representatives in Congress.

As to the persons to be chosen, their qualifications were "defined and fixed in the Constitution and unalterable by the legislature" and these qualifications were those found in Article I of the Constitution relative to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. It is pertinent to inquire at this point whether Congress could legally and constitutionally pass a law which would in terms disqualify a Senator who, for instance, had expended in his campaign for nomination or election more than 10 cents for each voter of the State. We do not think that anyone would contend that Congress has the power by a specific legislative act to constitutionally impose such a disqualification in addition to those enumerated in Article I of the Constitution. If it can not enact such a law, it certainly can not adopt a mere resolution which shall deprive a Senator of his office with all its honors and subject him to disgrace because of disqualifications found in neither law nor Constitution, but existing only in the moral sense of other Members of the United States Senate.

The vast claims made for the powers of the Senate under its right to be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members is assuming an importance never before attributed to it, and never imagined by the framers or expounders of the Federal Constitution. When the labors of the Constitutional Convention had ended, and the question arose as to its ratification by the several States, all kinds of fears, real and imaginary, possessed the people and found utterance in protests and objections made by an army of opponents to its adoption. Objections were made that the powers of the Executive were too extensive, that the Executive and legislative powers were blended in both the President and the Senate by the right of the Executive to veto legislation and the right of the Senate to confirm appointments of the President; objection was made that the rights of the State were not sufficiently guarded in the choice of their Representatives and that Congress might by its supervisory power over elections destroy the integrity and identity of the State governments and that the same result might be feared from the constitutional declaration of its own supremacy.

All reasonable and many unreasonable objections were answered by that great trinity of statesmen—Jay, Hamilton, and Madison—in the Federalist, and it is worthy of note that not a single word can be found anywhere in that famous exposition of the Constitution relating to the provision of the Constitution that each House shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members, except the purely perfunctory reference in No. 53, that "Each House is, as it necessarily must be, the judge of the elections, qualifications, and returns of its own Members," showing that it was understood to be merely a matter of ordinary parliamentary practice, going no further than to give each House the right to determine whether its Members had been legally elected and whether they possessed the qualifications which had been prescribed in the Constitution itself.

If it had been intimated that the Senate of the United States had the right to create disqualifications and adjudge elected Members incapable of holding the office to which they were elected, except upon the will and at the discretion of their fellow Members, the whole country would have been vocal with protest and none of the great statesmen named would have raised his voice in defense of such a construction of the power granted.

One of the earliest commentators on the Constitution was Rawle, who in his work, published in 1825, merely refers to the fact that each House possessed such power, while Story, writing his great work a few years thereafter, gave his reasons for this provision and his view of its nature, as follows:

"It is obvious that a power must be lodged somewhere to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of the Members of each House of the Legislature; for otherwise there could be no certainty as to who were legitimately chosen Members, and any intruder or usurper might claim a seat and thus trample upon the rights and privileges and liberties of the people. Indeed, elections would become, under such circumstances, a mere mockery and legislation the exercise of sovereignty by a self-constituted body. The obvious question on such a subject is as to the body in which such a power shall be lodged. If lodged in any other than the legislative body itself, its independence, its purity, and even its existence and action may be destroyed or put in imminent danger. No other body but itself can have the same motives to preserve and perpetuate these attributes; no other body can be so perpetually watchful to guard its own rights and privileges from infringement and to purify and vindicate its own character and to preserve the rights and sustain the free choice of its constituents."

But it was not necessary, only convenient, that this power to judge of the qualifications of its Members, as well as of their election, that such power should be lodged in each House; it might have been reposed in the Houses jointly, or it might have been conferred upon the Supreme Court, or a special tribunal might have been created to determine these matters. While a usual parliamentary practice, it was not a right inherent in any deliberative body which was constituted by the will of the people in such form and with such powers as the people might confer. It was conferred upon each House only to the extent and for the purpose it plainly states.

Suppose these questions had been determinable by a special body or tribunal—would anyone contend that such a body would not be bound to apply the constitutional enumeration of disqualifications in its determination as to the right of the Member to his seat?

Would anyone suppose that such a tribunal could temporarily deprive a State of its right of representation in the Senate according to its

own sense of fitness and propriety, and wholly regardless of the provisions of the Constitution? When such power is lodged in each House, purely for convenience (but with the utmost propriety), it acquired no greater rights than would a mere court established to determine the same questions under the same circumstances.

It is now claimed that this power may be employed not to ascertain who were legitimately chosen or to prevent intruders or usurpers trampling upon the rights and privileges and liberties of the people, nor to preserve the rights and sustain the free choice of its constituents, but to capriciously and arbitrarily destroy the rights and deny the freedom of choice of the voters of a State and to make the Senate by a process of rejection and elimination a self-constituted body into whose council none should be admitted except in pursuance of the arbitrary selection or approval of the Members of the Senate.

And this, too, not by reason of any legislative enactment which would declare in advance the qualifications to be possessed by him who would obtain the favor of his fellow members, but by an ex post facto prescription of qualifications arising after the election of the Member and to be applied according to the arbitrary will of the Members of the Senate as each particular occasion arose, and as the passions or interest of a majority might prompt it to determine.

Jefferson (Manual, sec. 3), after stating the arguments in favor of the power to imprison for contempt because of the publication of a libel against the Senate in the case of William Duane, expressed his views which would be applicable to the present discussion if it could be conceived that the Senate of the United States claimed the right to deprive of his seat and office a Senator elected by the people not because of the violation of any law but according to the individual sense of each Senator as to the extralegal qualifications a Senator ought to possess:

"That in requiring a previous law the Constitution had regard to the inviolability of the citizen, as well as the Member; as should one House in the regular form of a bill aim at too broad privileges, it may be checked by the other, and both by the President; and also as the law being promulgated the citizen will know how to avoid offense. But if one branch may assume its own privileges without control; if it may do it on the spur of the occasion, conceal the law in its own breast, and after the act is committed make its sentence both the law and the judgment on that fact; if the offense be kept undefined and to be declared only ex re nata, and according to the passions of the moment, and there be no limitations either in the manner or measure of the punishment, the condition of the citizen will be perilous indeed."

The condition of the citizen who aspires to the office of Senator of the United States will be equally perilous if he may be deprived of the office to which he has been fairly elected, and for which he possesses every qualification required by the Constitution, by the assumption on the part of the Senate of a right to require in his particular case such other additional qualifications as a bare majority of the membership may require.

Any action of the Senate in depriving VARE of his seat on such grounds would necessarily be based on that most typical act of despotism, an ex post facto declaration of criminality in the doing of an object innocent or lawful when done, an act abhorrent to our sense of natural justice and expressly condemned by our Constitution.

Following the Civil War the people of Missouri formed a new constitution, certain provisions of which excited attention, one being the exaction of a test oath from all persons holding any office of profit or trust, to the effect that such person had "always been truly and loyally on the side of the United States against all enemies thereof, foreign or domestic," failure to take the oath being punishable by loss of the office. By further provisions those who could not or would not take this oath were deprived of the right to vote, to hold any office, be a candidate for office, serve as a juror, practice as an attorney, be an officer of a corporation, a school-teacher, a priest or minister of the gospel. In other words, these constitutional provisions undertook to declare guilty and punish, by deprivation of civil rights, all persons who could not take the oath that they had never done certain specified things or acts which this constitution then for the first time declared unlawful.

In Cummings *v.* Missouri (4 Wall. 277, 18 Law Ed. 356) the Supreme Court, in holding such portions of the State constitution invalid, said:

"The oath could not, therefore, have been required as a means of ascertaining whether parties were qualified or not for their respective callings or the trusts with which they were charged. It was required, in order to reach the person, not the calling. It was exacted not from any notion that the several acts designated indicated unfitness for the callings but because it was thought that the several acts deserved punishment, and that for many of them there was no way to inflict punishment except by depriving the parties who had committed them of some of the rights and privileges of the citizen.

"The disabilities created by the constitution of Missouri must be regarded as penalties—they constitute punishment. We do not agree with the counsel of Missouri that 'to punish one is to deprive him of life, liberty, or property, and that to take from him anything less than these is no punishment at all.' The learned counsel does not use these terms—life, liberty, and property—as comprehending every right known to the law. He does not include under liberty freedom from outrage on the feelings as well as restraints on the person. He does not include under property those estates which one may acquire in the professions, though they are often the source of the highest emoluments and honors. The deprivation of any rights, civil or political, previously enjoyed, may be punishment; the circumstances attending and the causes of the deprivation determining the fact. Disqualification from office may be punishment, as in cases of conviction upon impeachment. Disqualification from the pursuits of a lawful avocation, or from positions of trust, or from the privilege of appearing in the courts, or acting as executor, administrator, or guardian may also, and often has been, imposed as punishment." * * *

"The theory upon which our political institutions rest is that all men have certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that in this pursuit of happiness all avocations, all honors, all positions are alike open to everyone, and that in the protection of all these rights all are equal before the law. Any deprivation or suspension of any of these rights for past conduct is punishment, and can be in no other wise defined."

The denial of the right of WILLIAM S. VARE to a seat in the Senate, for which he possesses all the constitutional qualifications and to which he has been fairly elected, is a punishment inflicted personally upon him, and it is inflicted not in pursuance of any lawful authority, or by virtue of any enactment of any legislature, but by a proceeding resulting in a judgment which can not be distinguished from an attainder, which is thus described in the opinion cited:

"A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial.

"If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. Within the meaning of the Constitution bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties. In these cases the legislative body, in addition to its legitimate functions, exercises the powers and office of judge; it assumes, in the language of the textbooks, judicial magistracy; it pronounces upon the guilt of the party without any of the forms or safeguards of trial; it determines the sufficiency of the proofs adduced, whether conformable to the rules of evidence or otherwise, and it fixes the degree of punishment in accordance with its own notions of the enormity of the offense.

"'Bills of this sort,' says Mr. Justice Story, 'have been usually passed in England in times of rebellion or gross subserviency to the Crown, or of violent political excitement; periods in which all nations are most liable (as well the free as the enslaved) to forget their duties and trample upon the rights and liberties of others' (Story, Com. sec. 1344)."

In Calder *v. Bull* (3 Dallas, 386) the term "ex post facto law" was declared to be:

"First. Every law that makes an action done before the passing of the law, and which was innocent when done, criminal, and punishes such action," etc.

WILLIAM S. VARE spent, in round numbers, $71,000 in preparing, printing, and mailing certain literature circulating through the mails to the voters of Pennsylvania. In doing so he committed no crime against any law of the United States or the State of Pennsylvania, and such conduct on his part did not have the effect of disqualifying him within the meaning of any provision of the Constitution of the United States. Not only so, but the furnishing of information to the voters of the State as to the political principles he entertained and advocated for the purpose of securing their support, if they concurred in the same, so far from being even a moral wrong or delinquency, was highly proper and laudable. To deprive him of his office because he made this expenditure for this purpose could only result from that combination in one body of the legislative powers and judicial functions which have always been held the very essence of tyranny and despotism. The Senate, acting for itself and without the concurrence of the House of Representatives or the approval of the President, would, in effect at least, enact a law in its legislative capacity that anyone who had theretofore spent $71,000 in circularizing his constituents was guilty of an act so criminal and immoral in its nature as to amount to a disqualification for the office of United States Senator; and then, immediately or concurrently, acting in its judicial capacity, it would try the fact, and, finding it to exist, would apply the newly established legislative pronouncement, and, acting both as legislator and judge, would at one and the same time create the crime and condemn the criminal. And this, too, by a law ex post facto in its nature, making that criminal which was innocent at the time it was committed and applying it to the particular case without laying down any general rule by which other aspirants in the future might avoid the commission of a like offense. If the Senate has the right to enact, to all intents and purposes, a law that no aspirant for the Senate shall spend $71,000 in disseminating literature, how could any future candidate be able to even guess the amount that might be legitimately expended without incurring the censure of that body?

If such candidate should expend only one-tenth of that amount, or $7,100, what assurance would he have that such expenditure would not be deemed sufficient in the eyes of a majority of the Members of the Senate to deprive him of the office he had obtained, particularly if such majority was politically or personally unfriendly to him?

If the Senate had the power to exclude an elected Senator because of the expenditure of $71,000, it would have exactly the same power to take the high moral ground that no Senator has the right to spend anything to influence his nomination or election, and thereupon exclude him upon proof that he had spent any amount for that purpose, however insignificant such amount might be.

The candidacy of WILLIAM S. VARE apparently evoked an enthusiastic response from among a great number of persons who evidently concurred in his political views. They organized a campaign committee, solicited contributions, received a large amount as the result of such solicitations, and disbursed it for the usual and ordinary purposes to which campaign funds are usually devoted—expense of newspaper and other forms of advertising, payment of the expenses of speakers, printing, postage, maintenance of headquarters, payment of employees, and contributions to local organizations. The amount so collected and expended in behalf of the ticket on which his name appeared amounted to from $600,000 to $700,000; the exact amount is immaterial, for the question arises whether the Senate, under its bare power to judge of the qualifications of its own Members, can deny admission to one in whose behalf a certain amount of money has been collected and expended for campaign purposes. In determining this question of right, the further question arises whether both Houses of the National Legislature, with the approval of the President, could validly and constitutionally enact a law, prospective in its operation, that thereafter the expenditure of $600,000 on behalf of the candidacy of an elected Senator should be an absolute disqualification justifying his rejection as a Senator. We do not apprehend that anyone would contend that such legislative power existed.

The several States have the undoubted primary right to make whatever regulations are necessary for maintaining the purity of the ballot, for the limiting of campaign expenses, and to prevent corrupt practices of any kind; and they have the undoubted right to punish those who violate any of such provisions which are declared to be criminal.

The Congress of the United States, by virtue of its ultimate right of regulation of elections where Senators and Representatives are chosen, may undoubtedly enact laws with the same purpose in view and declare a violation thereof punishable as a crime. But neither the National Government nor the States can add to or take away from the disqualifications or qualifications of a Senator or Representative of the United States, for these disqualifications or qualifications are fixed by the will of the people as embodied in the Constitution, which is declared to be the supreme law of the land and beyond the power of alteration by any of the departments of either State or National Government, or in any manner except by an amendment or alteration of the Constitution itself.

So clearly was it understood by the framers of the Constitution that Congress had no power to add to or take away from the qualifications of Senators or Representatives that Hamilton, in No. 60 of the Federalist, demonstrated that any attempt on the part of Congress to interfere with the free and unlimited right of the people to select anyone possessing the constitutional qualifications would be a usurpation of power and a subversion of the Constitution justifying a revolution, which would immediately take place.

As before stated, no apprehension was felt that such interference would take place under the purely parliamentary power to judge of the qualifications of its members, but fears were expressed that the right of Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of election might be used to influence or coerce the voters into favoring particular persons or classes. It was in answer to this claim that he said:

"We have seen that an incontrollable power over the elections for the Federal Government could not, without hazard, be committed to the State legislatures. Let us now see what are the dangers to be apprehended on the other side; that is, from confining the ultimate right of regulating its own elections to the Union itself. It is not pretended that this right would ever be used for the exclusion of any State from its share in the representation. The interests of all would, in this respect at least, be the security of all. But it is alleged that it might be employed in such a manner as to promote the election of some favored class of men to the exclusion of others; by confining the place of election to particular districts and rendering it impracticable for the citizens at large to partake in the choice. Of all chimerical suppositions this seems to be the most chimerical. On one hand, no rational calculation of probabilities would lead us to imagine that a disposition which a conduct so violent and extraordinary would imply, would find its way into the national council; and, on the other hand, it may be concluded with certainty that if so improper a spirit should ever gain admission into them, it would display itself in a form altogether different and far more decisive.

"The improbability of the attempt may be satisfactorily inferred from the single reflection that it will never be made without causing an immediate revolt of the great body of the people, headed and directed by the State governments. It is not difficult to conceive that this characteristic right of freedom may, in certain turbulent and factious seasons, be violated in respect to a particular class of citizens by a victorious majority, but that so fundamental a privilege in a country situated and enlightened as this is should be invaded to the prejudice of the great mass of the people, by the deliberate policy of the Government, without occasioning a popular revolution is altogether inconceivable and incredible. * * *

"As to the Senate it is impossible that any regulation of 'time and manner,' which is all that is proposed to be submitted to the National Government in respect to that body, can affect the spirit which will direct the choice of its Members."

If the Senate has the discretionary right to exclude a duly elected Senator from admission to its councils it has the right to deny to any State or to any number of States, less than a majority of all the States, representation in the National Senate. It can do exactly what Hamilton said could not be done without precipitating a popular revolution. One-third of its entire membership must apply for admission at its next regular session. If it has the right to exclude WILLIAM S. VARE, it has the same right to exclude the other thirty or more Senators whose terms of service begin with that session. Because if this right exists at all, it is absolutely discretionary; it is not exercised in pursuance of any provision of the Constitution or of any law of the United States; no limit is fixed within which it may operate and no standard is erected by which its operation may be measured.

It is simply arbitrary, uncontrolled discretion, utterly antagonistic to the fundamental principle of our political institution that we have a government of laws and not of men. If the Senate can arbitrarily, and in their uncontrolled discretion, say who shall or shall not be a Senator of the United States, then the people of the United States have no more agency in the election of their representatives in Congress than had the Roman people in the election of their emperor when the imperial office was filled by the sole election of the legions.

This utter subversion of the Constitution, this destruction of the right of the people of the respective States in their individual and collective capacity, can not be justified by the assumption of a superior virtue and intelligence on the part of the Senate. It is always the plea of despots that they can govern their subjects better than the subjects can govern themselves, and every excess of tyranny has been justified on the same ground.

It may be, it no doubt is, true that men of the education, intelligence, and patriotism of the Members of the Senate would be more able to choose fit men for high office than could the people generally. But it is not so written in the Constitution created by the people and establishing a government for the people. The people had and exercised the right to determine the frame of our National Government and to prescribe the qualifications of the persons who should represent the people in the legislative department.

In considering these qualifications Mr. Justice Story in his work on the Constitution (fifth edition, pp. 460–463) discusses this question and gives the following as his conclusion:

"It would seem but a fair reasoning upon the plainest principles of interpretation that when the Constitution so established certain qualifications as necessary for office it meant to exclude all others as prerequisites. From the very nature of such a provision the affirmation of these qualifications would seem to imply a negation of all others."

McCrary (Elections, sec. 625, p. 449) says:

"The power given to each House of Congress to 'judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members' does not authorize an inquiry into the moral character of a person elected and returned as a Member. Such an inquiry can only be made, if at all, in the prosecution of proceedings for expulsion. The term 'qualifications' as used in the Constitution means the constitutional qualifications, to wit, that the person elected and returned as a Member shall have attained the age of 25 years, been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and shall be an inhabitant of the State in which he shall be chosen."

This view of the correct interpretation of the Federal Constitution was not confined to statesmen and jurists contemporaneous with its adoption but has been stated in the Halls of the Senate by statesmen whose abilities and attainments were such as to command attention and respect.

In 1855 the right of Senator Trumbull to the seat to which he had been elected by the Legislature of Illinois was challenged on the ground that certain legislation of the State of Illinois had added to the qualifications found in the Constitution. Senator Crittenden thus answered these objections:

"According to the plain meaning of the Federal Constitution every inhabitant of a State 30 years of age, who has been 9 years a citizen of the United States, is eligible to the office of Senator. What more can be said about it? It is now supposed by those who contend that Mr. Trumbull is not entitled to his seat that it is competent for a State, by its constitution—and I suppose they would equally contend by any law which the legislature might from time to time pass—to superadd additional qualifications. The Constitution of the United States, they say, has only in part regulated the subject, and therefore it is no interference with that Constitution to make additional regulations.

"This, I think it will be plain to all, is a mere sophism when you come to consider it. If it was a power within the regulation of, and

proper to be regulated by, the Constitution of the United States, and if that Constitution has qualified it, as I have stated, prescribing the age, prescribing the residence, and prescribing the citizenship, was there anything more intended? If so, the framers of the Constitution would have said so. The very enumeration of these qualifications excludes the idea that they intended any other qualifications."

In 1907 the right of Senator SMOOT was challenged on alleged grounds of disqualifications entirely outside of those enumerated in the Constitution, and in the discussion that took place Senator Knox condensed the whole subject into a few words when, in speaking of Senator SMOOT, he said:

"He was at the time of his election over 30 years of age and had been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and when elected was an inhabitant of Utah. These are the only qualifications named in the Constitution, and it is not in our power to say to the State, 'these are not enough; we require other qualifications,' or to say that we can not trust the judgment of the States in the selection of Senators, and we, therefore, insist upon the right to disapprove them for any reason."

When we consider the great number of Senators whose right to office has been challenged because of alleged disqualifications outside of those prescribed by the Constitution—Senators Robbins, Fitch, Goldthwaite, Lamar, Ingalls, du Pont, Morgan, Grover, Smith, Lorimer, Stephenson, Newberry, Brookhart, Trumbull, and Mayfield—it might be well for no aspirant to the Senate to hereafter lay the flattering unction to his soul that his right to the office would never be questioned; for let it be established as a precedent that a majority of the Members of the Senate may exclude him for any reason, or no reason at all, he may find out that a life of probity, honesty, and integrity and a strict and literal compliance with the laws of State and Nation constitute no defense to the unrestrained will of a majority of the Senate.

WILLIAM S. VARE is not claimed to be lacking in moral fitness; no charge of violation of any law has ever been made against him in his personal relations; no dereliction of duty is claimed to exist in the performance of his official functions; no proof or even reasonable suspicion that he ever spent a cent or authorized the sperding of a cent for any purpose of corruption or bribery, or for any other illegal or criminal purpose; no claim made that any law of the United States or of the State of Pennsylvania was violated in the collection or disbursement of his campaign fund. No claim made that at the primary of March 18, 1926, the Republican voters of the State of Pennsylvania were illegally influenced to prefer him over the other candidates; no claim that he did not receive a substantial majority of the votes cast for Senator at the general election in November, 1926, and not even a pretense that he is subject to any of the disqualifications of nonage, lack of citizenship of the United States, or inhabitancy of the State of Pennsylvania at the time of his election.

He had held the office of Representative in Congress for one of the Pennsylvania districts for 14 years, presumably a tribute to efficient and honest service rendered in that capacity; he had his own independent ideas upon things political, which he wished to test by his candidacy for the nomination as United States Senator, and while he personally expended money in a very considerable amount, there is neither claim nor proof that he spent anything but what was his own and every cent of it for a legitimate purpose.

Even had he possessed none of the qualifications for United States Senator, except those enumerated in the Constitution, and had had no long term of public service as a legislator, he would have had the undoubted right as an American citizen to present his claims for election to one of the highest offices known to the civilized world. He had the right to aspire to that exalted position, which many covet, but few attain, and to submit his claims and aspirations to the people of Pennsylvania, who were the sole and exclusive judges of the propriety of his election so long as he possessed the constitutional prerequisites.

When he received the necessary majority he became entitled, as a matter of right, to the enjoyment of the office for which he was elected. He had the right to feel that a legitimate ambition had been satisfied and that he would receive the rewards of dignity and honor which accompanied it. As a citizen of the United States he is entitled to enjoy this right; he is entitled to have his qualifications measured by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and he is entitled to hold and enjoy his exalted office, not by the mere will and sufferance of his fellow Members, but because, under the Constitution, he is a duly elected Senator of the United States.

To deprive him of these rights is to inflict upon him a personal wrong, a wrong in comparison with which ordinary civil wrongs would be insignificant, a wrong which should not be, and we believe will not be, inflicted by Senators who hold their offices by the same right which he claims for himself, the exercise of the will of the people and the protection of the Constitution of the United States.

II. THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

The rejection of WILLIAM S. VARE from the exercise of an office to which he was legally elected would be a great personal wrong, depriving him of all the dignity, influence, and emoluments of a member of the most important legislative body in the world; it would deprive him of the opportunity to advocate in effective form perhaps the political principles and personal views which were ratified by a large majority of the citizens of Pennsylvania, and would deprive him of the gratification of a high, but laudable, ambition, fairly and honestly realized. In a country where every inhabitant may claim the legal right for redress for all manner of civil injuries, however unimportant or even insignificant, WILLIAM S. VARE would stand remediless for the wrongs inflicted upon him.

But WILLIAM S. VARE is only one citizen out of the millions of citizens of the United States who would suffer a loss of dignity, prestige, or profit by reason of the action of the Senate. If the Senate of the United States has the power to arbitrarily say that a person elected by the people and possessing all the qualifications required by the Constitution shall not be permitted to hold or exercise said office, then every citizen of the State of Pennsylvania has received an injury equally direct as that inflicted upon the Senator elected by that State; for while Senator-elect VARE would lose his right to hold office, the citizens of the State of Pennsylvania would be deprived of the fundamental right of an American citizen to vote at the election for Senators of the United States, and the citizens of that State collectively would be deprived of their constitutional right to be represented in the Senate by a person of their own choosing, and this wrong would be magnified in proportion to the number of citizens disfranchised.

As great or greater a wrong would be inflicted upon the citizens of the United States, in their individual and collective political capacities, because a precedent would be established which might at any election result in the disfranchisement of the voters of any State.

The right of every qualified citizen of the United States to vote for a Member of Congress or a United States Senator is a right not dependent upon the discretion or permission of either House of Congress, but is a right secured and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, which together constitute "the supreme law of the land," of which they can not be lawfully deprived at the arbitrary will of either the execuive, judicial, or legislative departments.

The seventeenth amendment to the Constitution provides:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

It has never been decided or even contended that Senators of the United States could be elected by any other agency or in any other manner than that provided by said amendment, nor that prior thereto a Senator could be elected in any other manner than by the State legislature in conformity with the Constitution as it formerly stood.

In speaking of the exclusive method of election obtaining before the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, the Senate committee, in reporting on the right of Senator Stephenson to occupy the seat to which he was elected, said:

"When we speak of the election of a United States Senator under existing constitutional and legislative provisions, we contemplate only the election by the legislature of the State."

In the case of Henry B. Payne (1885) the committee reported:

"The State should execute its laws respecting the purity of the senatorial elections by the indictment and conviction of a single person, who bribes or is bribed, whether the election is affected or not. The State should investigate as well to the end of better laws and surer execution of the laws.

"The State, too, is charged with the maintenance of 'the honor of Ohio,' and its vindication rests with its own legislature, its own judiciary, and its own people; but it can not demand this vindication at the hands of the United States Senate except as they may flow from investigations by that body within the limits of its constitutional power and duties."

It is well said in United States v. Aczel (219 Fed. 917, 929):

"The seventeenth amendment to the Constitution and the statute just quoted are too recent to have received any judicial construction or interpretation, but so far as the right to vote for a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is concerned, the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly decided that such right is fundamentally based upon and given and secured by the Constitution of the United States."

In Ex parte Yarbrough (110 U. S. 651, 4 Sup. Ct. 152, 28 L. ed. 274) there was involved the right of a negro to vote at an election for Representative of the United States and indirectly for the legislature which would select a Senator, or, as the court said:

"Stripped of its technical verbiage, the offense charged in this indictment is that the defendant conspired to intimidate Berry Saunders, a citizen of African descent, in the exercise of his right to vote for a Member of the Congress of the United States."

In holding that a single negro voter was not beneath the protection of the Constitution and laws, the court said:

"But it is not correct to say that the right to vote for a Member of Congress does not depend on the Constitution of the United States. The office, if it be properly called an office, is created by the Constitution and by that alone. It also declares how it shall be filled, namely, by election."

As to the claim made that the right to vote for Representatives in Congress depended upon the qualifications prescribed by the State legislatures for the election of members of its most numerous branch, and that therefore the right to vote for Members of Congress was given by the State and not the Nation and its violation could be punished by the State alone the court quotes Article I, section 2, of the Constitution, and proceeds:

"The States, in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress, nor do they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress. It is not true, therefore, that electors for Members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State law in any sense which makes the exercise of the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State."

Based upon this sound interpretation of the Federal Constitution as to the right of the qualified citizen to vote at elections for Members of the House of Representatives, the court upheld the conviction of nine men whose offense consisted in conspiring to deprive by intimidation a negro voter and citizen of the United States. Every citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, white or black, male or female, possessing the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature of that State had the same constitutional right to express his or her choice for Senator from that State. Can it be reasonably contended that this absolute constitutional right can be exercised effectually only when it results in the election of Members who are personae gratae to a majority of the United States Senate? Or can the specious claim be substantiated that, because this honorable body is made the judge of the questions as to whether an election actually took place and resulted in the choice of such Senator or to be the judge of the qualifications of the person so elected, the Senate therefore has the power to nullify and vitiate the exercise of this right of the elective franchise on the part of the millions of citizens taking part in the election?

In Minor *v.* Happersett (21 Wall. 178, 22 L. Ed. 631) the Supreme Court said:

"The right of suffrage, when granted, will be protected. He who has it can only be deprived of it by due process of law, but in order to claim protection he must first show that he has the right."

The Constitution itself confers upon the citizens of Pennsylvania the right to vote for Senators and Representatives, but what protection can there be to the effective exercise of that right if the Senate can nullify it under the plea that it is judging of the qualifications of its own Members?

In Wiley *v.* Sinkler (179 U. S. 58, 21 Sup. Ct. 17, 45 L. Ed. 84) the plaintiff sued an election board to recover damages for wrongfully and willfully rejecting his vote for a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States at the election held November 6, 1894, in which case the court thus describes the nature of the right of the citizen to vote:

"The right to vote for Members of the Congress of the United States is not derived merely from the constitution and laws of the State in which they are chosen, but has its foundation in the Constitution of the United States."

But how could it have availed the plaintiff in that case to be permitted to exercise the physical right of depositing his ballot if the election board had the right, in its discretion, to throw the ballot box and its contents into the fire immediately at the conclusion of the voting? Yet such an act would be no more destructive of the rights of the voter than would a determination of this body that a person duly elected, and his election properly certified, should not be permitted to hold the office for which he was elected.

The case of Swaford *v.* Templeton (185 U. S. 487, 22 Sup. Ct. 783, 46 L. Ed. 1005) was in all respects similar to the case last cited, and relying upon and affirming its doctrine the court said:

"It is manifest from the context of the opinion in the case just referred to that the conclusion that the cause was one arising under the Constitution of the United States was predicated on the conception that the action sought a vindication or protection of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, a right, as declared in Ex parte Yarbrough (110 U. S. 655), 'fundamentally based upon the Constitution (of the United States) which created the office of Member of Congress and declared that it should be elective, and pointed out the means of ascertaining who should be electors.' That is to say, the ruling was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States, whether the illegal act complained of arose from a charged violation of some specific provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States or from the violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualifications of electors for the Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State."

Referring again to United States *v.* Aczel (219 Fed., l. c. 932) there is found the following clear statement applicable to this discussion:

"The right to vote for a Member of Congress, being a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, it is perfectly plain that the right to vote for a United States Senator, since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment of the United States Constitution and the passage by Congress of the act of June 4, 1914, is also a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. If the right to vote for a Representative in Congress or a Senator of the United States is a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, then it appears that the right and privilege to serve as a member of an election board where such Representative or Senator is to be elected is likewise a right or privilege secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. If a man has a right to vote, he has a right to have his vote received and counted by the proper election officers; otherwise the right to vote is but an empty right."

Is there anything of substance, is there more than a shadow of such right to vote, if its result and effect can be completely nullified by the action of this honorable body under a claim that it is judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its Members?

The legislatures of the various States have, from time to time, attempted to add qualifications or disqualifications with respect to Senators and Representatives beyond those laid down in the Constitution. One of the most striking of these instances occurred when the Legislature of the State of Ohio passed a law fixing a limit on the amount that might be spent by candidates for office (including Representatives in Congress) and declaring that the election of any person whose expenditures exceeded the limit so fixed should be void; it also subjected the offender to a fine not exceeding $1,000.

In State *v.* Russell, 10 Ohio Dec. 255, it appeared that the defendant was the nominee of his party for National Representative and expended more than the amount limited by the act. As he was defeated, the act, of course, could not operate to void his election, but he was prosecuted under the provision relating to the imposition of a fine. The district court sustained a demurrer to the indictment in an elaborate and well-written opinion, reviewing a great number of authorities, on the ground that in so far as it related to candidates for Congress, it was unconstitutional in its entirety, because it was beyond the power of the State to add any qualifications or disqualifications to those enumerated in the Constitution. The circuit court (20 Ohio C. C. Rep. 551) likewise held that the State had no power to make the election of a National Representative dependent upon compliance with a legislative requirement of the State of Ohio, but held that the portion of the enactment so providing was distinct and separable from the provisions providing for punishment by fine, and reversed the judgment of the lower court. Its ruling and argument on the applicable portion of the question is as follows:

"And then section 1 provides as to all persons, whether Members of Congress or to a person elected to an office within the State, that his election is to be unlawful and void, and he gets no right under it.

"Now, the first question for consideration is: Does that undertake to add to the constitutional qualifications of a person who may become a Member of Congress an additional disqualification. The qualifications will be well remembered—one pertains to his age and the other to his residence, the State in which he resides, and the other as to how long he has been a citizen of the United States. It has been held as to a greater number of conditions that have been added by the different States from time to time, that they have been to add disqualifications; for instance, that he should reside within his district, has been held to add a qualification; that he must be of a certain age, of a certain belief, or that he must be of a certain wealth, or anything of that kind—all these were added qualifications undoubtedly, but here we have something that is called a qualification on one side and contended on the other that it is a mere regulation of the election. And the question is: What is it? Is it not a qualification? This is certain: It is something that disqualifies a person from accepting the office. It removes him entirely from becoming a Congressman under that regulation. And it is hard to see how a person can be disqualified by anything unless that thing disqualifies him and adds something when it clearly does not come under the qualifications required by the United States. * * *

"To our minds, the law adds a circumstance; that is, the person who is elected must have it appear. The circumstance must exist that he has not violated this law, and in that sense which seems to be a generally accepted sense, not only generally by the people, but in the legal sense as well, we think that the qualification called for by section 6 of this article is an unlawful one. It might as well prescribe that he should not have violated some other law, and required him to make an affidavit that he had never stolen a horse, and had never been a thief, never been convicted of a crime—he might be called upon to show these by affidavit before he should be allowed

to become a Member of Congress. It is perfectly apparent that a matter of that kind, or one that inheres in his character, would be adding to the constitutional requirements.

"And that being true, that part of the act would clearly be unconstitutional. But that provision that we find to be unconstitutional pertains only to those that deprive him of the office. That a person might be fined for violation of the law of the State need not exempt a Member of Congress or member of the State legislature; but, if the person has received the requisite number of votes, then for a State to step in and say whether that person should be a Member of Congress would entirely supersede the rights of that party under the United States Constitution."

The solution of the whole matter is found in the fact that the qualifications of Members of the National Congress are declared by the people, the ultimate sovereign, through the medium of the written Constitution of the United States which was agreed by the people should be the supreme law of the land. It could not be supreme if its creator, the people of the respective States, had retained power to change its provisions by the act of their State legislatures; nor would it be supreme if the power to annul or modify its provisions existed in the legislative bodies it created. The State legislature has a legitimate function in determining the qualifications of voters for its most numerous legislative body and thereby fixing the same qualifications for persons entitled to vote for representatives in both Houses of the National Congress, and it has a further legislative function in its primary duty of regulating the times, places, and manners of its election; Congress has a legitimate function to perform in supervising and regulating elections at which Members of Congress are chosen and of enacting every law that will promote the efficiency and integrity of such elections and protect every qualified voter in the exercise of his legal and constitutional rights.

But neither State legislature nor National Congress can add to or take from the plain and specific enumerations of qualifications of Representatives or Senators, for could they do so the Constitution would lose its supremacy and have no greater effect than an ordinary legislative enactment.

With the case just cited in mind, we call attention to the testimony heard by the special committee (Governor Pinchot, pp. 32, 39) describing the efforts that were made by Governor Pinchot to procure the enactment of a valid and effective corrupt practice act and his inability to do so.

Had such a law been enacted, compliance thereto could not have been compelled as a prerequisite to the right to hold the office of United States Representative or Senator without imposing qualifications within neither the letter nor spirit of the Constitution. If such a law had provided that in addition to being 30 years of age, 9 years a citizen of the United States, and an actual inhabitant of the State of Pennsylvania, the Representative or Senator must have complied with the provision of the corrupt practice act, could it be doubted that the State of Pennsylvania was making a vain and unconstitutional attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States by adding such additional qualifications.

If in order to obtain his certificate of election the newly elected Congressman would have been required to make an affidavit that he had spent no more than 10 cents per registered voter, how could it be denied that the State of Pennsylvania had added to the qualifications of Senators of the United States?

In No. 52 of the Federalist the qualifications of a Representative of the United States were stated, and would be equally applicable, with necessary changes, to Senators, and the following comment was made:

"Under these reasonable limitations the door of this part of the Federal Government is opened to merit of every description, whether native or adoptive, whether young or old, and without regard to poverty or wealth, or to any particular profession of religious faith."

Had Governor Pinchot succeeded in his just and laudable efforts to obtain a corrupt practice act for Pennsylvania, reasonably limiting the amount of campaign expenditures, we do not think it could be seriously contended that there could be annexed thereto a valid and legal condition that compliance with such act should be a prerequisite to the enjoyment of the office of Senator or Representative of the United States. But a further important and pertinent consideration is that no such law was passed; and in spending $71,000 in the distribution of literature to his constituents Mr. VARE violated no law of the State of Pennsylvania. Strictly speaking, he could have, without a statutory violation, spent ten or one hundred times that amount. And the further question arises, can the Senate of the United States make as a ground for exclusion the violation of a proposed law of the State of Pennsylvania which was never enacted? Or can it, under its power to judge of the qualifications of its members, require qualifications as to a limitation upon campaign expenses which it conceives are necessary and proper to be possessed by a Senator of the United States.

Sovereign States of the Union are not under the tutelage or guardianship of any of the departments of the National Government. They are restrained, so far as any restraint is laid upon them, by the terms of the Constitution itself, but within the sphere of their legitimate action they are as independent of the Federal Government as they are of the governments of Europe. If any State desires a corrupt practice act, it has the right to enact it and make it as drastic or lenient as it sees fit, and it has the exclusive option to remain without such a law. But its acting or failing to act in this respect has not the slightest effect or influence upon its relations to its own people in their right to constitutional representation in the National Congress, on one hand, or to the Union of States on the other, nor is it or should it be deprived of its just and proper representation in both Houses of Congress because it fails to pass or enforce a just corrupt practice act.

Representation in the National Congress is one of the most important and undoubted rights the several States possess, not only for the protection of the interest of the people of the State against Federal usurpation but in order that its own weight and influence may be felt either in the defeat or repeal of unjust laws or in the enactment of wise and salutary ones. This right of representation inheres in the very frame and structure of the Federal Constitution, which has always provided for equal representation of the States in the Senate, elected directly or indirectly by the people of each particular State.

This right is well stated in McCrary on Elections, section 188, page 139, where he quotes from the report of the committee on elections in two cases where the right of the chosen Member of the House of Representatives was challenged:

"Representation is one of the very essentials of a republican form of government, and no one doubts that the United States can not fulfill this obligation without guaranteeing that representation here."

How is it proposed in this proceeding to fulfill this obligation of guaranteeing to the State of Pennsylvania the representation to which it is entitled by the Constitution? By depriving her of the services of her duly elected and accredited Senator, whose constitutional qualifications are not denied, and who has without question been elected by the people thereof, who is charged with the commission of no crime nor any moral defect rendering him unworthy to discharge the duties of the Senatorship? His rejection would deprive Pennsylvania of half of her strength in the Senate until his successor should be appointed, for, according to the great weight of authority in this country (McCrary on Elections, pp. 247, 249), the disqualificataion of a Senator does not entitle his unsuccessful competitor to a seat.

If, then, Mr. VARE should be appointed by the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, by means entirely proper and not induced by the expenditure of a single cent, could the Senate again reject him on account of the expenditures made in the primary preceding the election which, as to him, was held void?

If such course is pursued uniformly by the United States Senate, there will necessarily occur a continual conflict between the people of the disfranchised State and the Senate, because such a conflict must result from the very nature of the controversy. Either the people of the State would be compelled to forego their right to choose their own representative or the Senate would be compelled to finally and ultimately accept a person whom they had perhaps repeatedly rejected as unfit.

In People ex rel. Leroy v. Hurlburt (24 Mich. 44) Judge Cooley, a great constitutional lawyer and judge, said:

"Mr. Justice Story has well shown that constitutional freedom means something more than liberty permitted; it consists in the civil and political rights which are absolutely guaranteed, assured, and guarded; in one's liberties as a man and a citizen—his right to vote, his right to hold office, his right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, his equality with all others who are his fellow citizens—all these guarded and protected and not held at the mercy and discretion of any one man or of any popular majority. (Story, Miscellaneous Writings, 620.) If these are not now the absolute right of the people of Michigan, they may be allowed more liberty of action and more privileges, but they are little nearer to constitutional freedom than Europe was when an imperial city sent out consuls to govern it.

"The men who framed our institutions have not so understood the facts. With them it has been an axiom that our system was one of checks and balances; that each department of the Government was a check upon the others, and each grade of government upon the rest; and they have never questioned or doubted that the corporators in each municipality were exercising their franchises under the protection of certain fundamental principles which no power in the State could override or disregard. The State may mold local institutions according to its views of policy or expediency, but local government is a matter of absolute right and the State can not take it away. It would be the boldest mockery to speak of a city as possessing municipal liberty where the State not only shaped its government but, at discretion, sent in its own agents to administer it; or to call that system one of constitutional freedom under which it should be equally admissible to allow the people full control in their local affairs or no control at all.

"What I say here is with the utmost respect and deference to the legislative department, even though the task I am called upon to perform is to give reasons why a blow aimed at the foundation of our structure of liberty should be warded off. Nevertheless, when the State reaches out and draws to itself and appropriates the powers which from time immemorial have been locally possessed and exercised and introduces into its legislation the centralizing ideas of continental Europe,

under which despotism, whether of monarch or commune, alone have flourished, we seem forced back upon and compelled to take up and defend the plainest and most primary axioms of free government, as if even in Anglican liberty, which has been gained step by step, through extorted charters and bills of rights, the punishment of kings and the overthrow of dynasties, nothing was settled and nothing established."

This language of that learned jurist was used in defense of the people of a mere municipality in its right to self-government as against the usurpation of the State legislature. It was not founded upon any constitutional right of the people of a city to govern themselves, for no such right was expressed in the constitution of the State of Michigan, but was based upon the inherent right of the people of a city to govern themselves in consonance with the genius and theory of free popular government, even when asserted as against the State legislature to whom the city owed its creation and existence.

Its applicability to the lack of power of either House of the National Congress to deprive the people of the right to representation in the national councils is magnified and emphasized by the fact that the people of a State, in their sovereign capacity, do not owe their creation to the National Legislature, and that the authority of the National Government independently arises from the same source as does the State government, in that both are the creatures and creation of the people, and the authority each may exercise within the proper sphere of its action may be found in the same written Constitution, whereby certain powers are conferred upon the National Government and all others are reserved to the States and the people. With a due regard not only to the theory of free government but to the express words of the Constitution, no more power is given to the National Legislature to deprive the people of the States of the right to representation in the National Senate and House of Representatives, or to limit their free choice of the persons to be so chosen, than is given to the States to nullify the constitutional action of the National Legislature; in either case none. It is only by a scrupulous observance of the constitutional limitations placed on each that we can have the free government intended in our supreme law. Or, as was well said by Senator Knox in the case of Senator SMOOT:

"The perfection of human liberties under law will only be attained under the American Constitution when each of the dual sovereignties within its sphere exerts its powers to the utmost limits for the human weal; when the States and the artificial bodies they have created cease to deny and resist the rightful and full exercise of the national power over national affairs; when there is no attempt to encroach upon the undeniable reserved powers of the States for the aggrandizement of national power; when the people discriminate between wise policies designed to meet the imperative needs of modern conditions and demagogic assaults upon the foundations of the Republic for political and personal purposes; when the people shall not be vexed by unnecessary legislation about their daily affairs and normal conditions are undisturbed by ceaseless agitations—agitations fomented by ignorance and insincerity and misrepresenting those just and constitutional policies of the time, which had a due beginning, have a reason for their existence, and shall have a due ending when their work is accomplished."

The whole battle for free self-government has been a struggle for actual and effective representation in the legislative body, for the two things are synonymous. It began in England in the time of Simon de Montfort and continued for centuries, and it finally triumphed over arbitrary prorogations, despotic dissolutions, the corruption of placemen, the briberies of ministers, the unequal representation of the rotten borough system, and the tyrannical exclusion of duly elected members, until to-day the people of England govern themselves through their representatives in the House of Commons and brook interference from neither king nor lord.

In France there was no sign or vestige of popular representation for 160 years without the assembling of the States General, and the despotism of the kings who were the state was broken only when the peoples' representatives in the third estate demanded and received recognition.

In America the struggle began long before the Union was formed or independence was achieved. Denial or absence of legislative representation was the sole cause of the revolution, which, reduced to its simplest terms, was a revolt against obeying laws in which the people of the colonies had no share in making and against burdens which they had never consented should be imposed.

The existence of this right of the people of each State to be represented both in the House of Representatives and Senate is, of course, not denied, nor does anyone doubt of its necessity as an elementary essential of free self-government, nor would any Member of the Senate even think of maintaining the contrary.

But if Mr. VARE can be refused a seat in the Senate as a result of the investigations of the special committee, or because of any fact disclosed by that investigation, then such essential and necessary right of representation fades away into a mere shadow from which the substance has fled. Instead of being a perfect right to choose whomsoever the people of the State will, to judge for themselves of the moral, mental, and intellectual qualities of its representatives, subject only to the disqualifications imposed by the supreme law, it is whittled down to a mere theoretical right to nominate and present its candidates to the Senate or House of Representatives for their discretionary acceptance or rejection.

If either house of the National Congress can reject a duly elected representative of the State, who possesses all the constitutional qualifications, then the State has no right of selecting its own agent to serve it in either of these bodies, for a right to select subject to rejection by some other person or body is no right at all; it is merely advisory and on a par in authority and importance with the verdict of a jury in an equity case, conclusive on no one unless adopted by the chancellor, who has the same right to reject as he has to adopt.

It would place each State, in the election of its Representatives, in the same position as is the President of the United States when he makes an appointment which, under the Constitution, requires confirmation by the Senate. Can anyone say that the President has a right to appoint whomsoever he will as minister to a foreign country, when such appointment must be submitted to the Senate for confirmation or rejection? Or can anyone say that the Senate of the United States has the same supervisory power over the selection of a Senator of a particular State that it has over the appointments made by the President? Yet if the principle be sound that the Senate is not bound by the constitutional qualifications, but may, in its discretion, exact or require others, then it has the same supreme supervisory power over the election of Senators that it has over the appointments of the President.

That it would only use this supervisory power of negation in either case only on those rare occasions when the interests of public morality or the public welfare demanded it may well be true, but that would not be a justification for clear usurpation of power impliedly, if not expressly, denied by the Constitution.

The acts of rejecting an appointment of the President and rejecting an election of a Senator are identical. The President has the right to appoint whomsoever he will, the State has the right to elect whomsoever its people choose, but neither of these rights are conclusive. The Senate has the arbitrary and discretionary right to refuse to confirm the appointment of the President, and need avouch no reason for its action, and in the event of such failure to confirm the appointment remains a nullity. The power of the Senate in such appointments is without limit, but in the case of the election of a Senator, there are certain restrictions placed upon the right of the Senate to act. It can judge whether or not the Senator was actually elected, and whether or not he is 30 years of age, a citizen of the United States for nine years and an inhabitant of the State electing him, and if he is found lacking in these qualifications, properly and constitutionally reject him.

If the Constitution meant that the Senate should have the same unlimited and discretionary power of approval or rejection of elected United States Senators that it has over presidential appointments, the seventeenth amendment would have simply read:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for six years."

Can the Senate of the United States now act exactly as though the seventeenth amendment so read? Certainly not. When that amendment says that the Senators shall be "elected by the people," it, by this affirmative declaration, negatives and excludes the right of any supervisory power in any other body, and it certainly does not mean that Senators shall be elected by the people of the State and a majority of the Senators. It clearly says and plainly means that Senators shall be elected by the people, and by the people alone, subject only to the coordinate provisions of the Constitution that each Senator shall possess the qualifications which the supreme law of the land—supreme alike over the people of the State and Members of the Senate—says they shall possess.

In the case of Senator Robbins, the majority report of 1833 took so just and true a view of the powers of the Senate in this matter that we quote:

"Causes might arise to render the election voidable, and these are enumerated in the Constitution of the United States. We might inquire, Was the person elected 30 years of age at the time of his election? Had he been nine years a citizen of the United States? Was he, at the time of his election, a citizen of the State from which he shall have been chosen? Was the election held at the time and place directed by the laws of the State? These are facts capable of clear demonstration by proof, and in the absence of the requisite qualifications in either of the specified cases, or if the existing laws of the State regulating the time and place of holding the election were violated, the Senate, acting under the power to judge of the 'elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members,' might adjudge the commission of the person elected void, although in other respects it was legal and constitutional.

"But where the sovereign will of the State is made known through the legislature and consummated through its proper official functionaries in due form, it will be a dangerous exertion of power to look behind the commission for defects in the component parts of the legis-

lature, or in the peculiar organization of the body, for reasons to justify the Senate in declaring its acts absolutely void. Such a power, if carried to its legitimate extent, would subject the entire scope of State legislation to be overruled by our decision, and even the right of suffrage of individual members of the legislature, whose elections were contested, might be set aside.

"It would also lead into investigations into the motives of members in casting their votes, for the purpose of establishing a charge of bribery or corruption in particular cases. These matters, your committee thinks, properly belongs to the tribunals of the State and can not constitute the basis on which the Senate could, without an infringement of State sovereignty, claim the right to declare the election of the Senator void, who possesses the requisite qualifications and was chosen according to the forms of law and the Constitution."

Immediately following the Civil War it was very properly thought that a person who had taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and had afterwards engaged in rebellion or insurrection against it, should be held disqualified from election as a Senator or Representative of the United States. The treasonable violation of such an oath, an attempt to destroy the Government whose Constitution he had sworn to support, was certainly as indicative of unfitness as would be the expenditure of a large amount of money in mailing letters to voters of a State whose support he sought. And the Congress of that day, actuated by a fierce partisan spirit and influenced by all the bitter hatred engendered by civil war, was disposed to apply the maxim, Vae victis, in all its rigor to the late enemies of the Government; but it did not entertain the idea that it might, by a mere exercise of arbitrary power, exclude a duly elected Senator or Representative possessed of the constitutional qualifications. It pursued the legitimate and constitutional method by applying to the people, the source of all legitimate power, for authority to exclude the foresworn, and the people conferred this authority by section 3 of the fourteenth amendment, reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House remove such disability."

This amendment added an additional disqualification to those already prescribed by the Constitution, something which was vain and useless surplusage if each House already possessed the power to exclude the very persons thus constitutionally disqualified under its power to judge of their qualifications.

Not only so, but this section of the amendment conferred on Congress the power, if it cared to exercise it, of removing such disabilities another piece of useless surplusage, if each House of Congress had the supreme, lawful power to be the sole judge of the qualifications of its Members.

We respectfully submit that this alleged supreme power to prescribe disqualifications of its own Members, as well as to judge of the existence of such qualifications in each particular instance, will not stand investigation. It is undoubtedly true that the rejected Senator or Representative might have no legal method of testing the rightfulness of the exercise of such power; that he might be deprived of his high office without any remedy at the hands of any other tribunal. But the fact remains that if the Senate of the United States is the sole judge of the qualifications a Senator should possess, then the Members of the Senate are absolved from all restraint of the Constitution they have sworn to support. If they can prescribe new constitutional requirements they can equally disregard the old ones. If they can say that a Senator shall not be permitted to take his seat because of disqualifications by reason of the fact that he has spent more than a certain amount of money in procuring his nomination, then it has equal power to say that a person 21 years old, or a nonresident of the State electing him, or an alien, shall be entitled to his seat in the Senate, notwithstanding the constitutional prohibitions, and it would have like power to say, in the face of the seventeenth amendment, that a person elected by the State legislature, instead of by the people, would be entitled to his seat.

In any of these supposed cases the Senate would have the same power to do any of these unconstitutional things as it would to deny Mr. VARE the right to his seat in the Senate because of excessive expenditures in the primary campaign. We say it would have the same power only in the sense that there would be the same lack of remedy in all of these supposed cases.

But there is a world-wide difference between the mere ability to inflict a wrong for which no remedy has been provided and a legal and constitutional power or right to do the same act. Congress has the power, in the sense of mere ability, to pass an unconstitutional and invalid statute, but it has no constitutional power or right to do so, even though the Supreme Court of the United States had not been invested with the power to declare such enactment invalid.

The rightful exercise or lawless usurpation of a power does not depend upon the question of remedy, but inheres in the thing itself, and it has always been supposed that the conscience of statesmen, who had sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, would be a sufficient guaranty that they would respect its limitations upon their action and not destroy it by the usurpation of power either impliedly or expressly withheld from them.

The power of the Senate to judge of the qualifications of its Members, as before remarked, is purely judicial in its nature, or, in the language of the Court of Appeals of New York, in People ex rel. Hatzel v. Hall (80 N. Y. 117, 123):

"The power thus given to each house of the legislature is a judicial power and each house acts in a judicial capacity when it exerts it."

There being no tribunal created with jurisdiction to review the exercise of this judicial power, the Senate of the United States, in passing upon the qualifications of its Members, is, to all intents and purposes, a supreme court, exercising the same power in this particular as is conferred upon the Supreme Court of the United States in general. The Supreme Court of the United States, within the limitations of its proper jurisdiction, whether original or appellant, is not subject or inferior to any other tribunal. Its decisions in all cases are absolutely final and conclusive, and if that court should render a decision directly contrary to the express provisions of the Constitution a party deprived of his rights thereby would be without remedy. But this mere ability to violate the Constitution of the United States has never been supposed to confer upon the Supreme Court the right or power to decide cases in violation of the Constitution and according to the individual views of the judges as to the justice of their decision. In a limited sense the Supreme Court has the power to render a decision which, in effect, would be utterly subversive of our political institutions, and its judges are restrained from so doing not by any fear of reversal of their judgment by a superior court or by its nullification from action taken by a coordinate department of the Government, but by the sense of their obligation to support and maintain the Constitution and observe its limitations, even though their individual judgments might dictate otherwise.

If the Supreme Court should by mandamus compel the Senate to recognize and seat a United States Senator whom the Senate had declared did not possess the constitutional qualifications, the Senate could not apply to any other court or to the Executive for a remedy or relief from such arbitrary and unconstitutional exercise of power by the Supreme Court, but the mere absence of a remedy would not extend the limits of constitutional jurisdiction either of the Supreme Court or of the Senate of the United States when acting judicially and sitting as a court to be "the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own Members." How long would the Government last, or what would be the value of our Constitution if the Supreme Court of the United States should disregard its provisions, limitations, and restrictions for the mere reason that they could do so without being called to account?

We have several times referred to the case of Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch, 138), the first authoritative judicial pronouncement of the supremacy of the Constitution, and we again refer to it to show how far the members of the Supreme Court considered themselves bound by the limitations of the Constitution in the absence of right of review or appeal from their decision. They had held that Marbury was entitled to his office, that his deprivation was unjust and illegal, and that he should be protected in his vested rights. The only question was whether the Supreme Court could apply the remedy which Congress had attempted to put in their hands by resort to the remedy of mandamus.

If, with or without the authorization of Congress, the Supreme Court had issued its writ of mandamus to James Madison, none could have called the court in question for having done so; had it decided the scope and extent of its jurisdiction, according to its innate sense of justice and right, it would have issued such writ, for it had been convinced that a wrong had been committed for which a remedy should exist somewhere. There was nothing to prevent it from so doing, except the Constitution of the United States and the oaths of the justices to "administer justice * * * agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States."

With this oath in mind, as well as the temptation to disregard in the particular case, the court said:

"From these, and many other selections which might be made, it is apparent that the framers of the Constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the legislature.

"Why otherwise does it direct the judges to take an oath to support it? That oath certainly applies in an especial manner to their conduct in their official character. How immoral to impose it on them, if they were to be used as the instruments, and the knowing instruments, of violating what they swear to support. * * *

"Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the Constitution of the United States, if that Constitution forms no rule for his government, if it is closed upon him and can not be inspected by him?

"If such be the real state of things, this is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath becomes equally a crime."

And may we suggest, without offense, that the oath of true men, chosen to fill the high office of a Senator of the United States, to support and maintain the Constitution, is a sufficient guaranty that they will subordinate their private judgments and individual wishes to the will of the people embodied in the instrument they have sworn to support.

If the rejection of Mr. VARE or the disfranchisement of the people of Pennsylvania, in that particular instance, was all that was involved in the present controversy it would make little difference a few years hence how the matter was settled. But the establishment of a principle that either House of Congress is the sole, arbitrary, and discretionary judge of the right of its Members to the office to which they have been elected, regardless of and unrestrained by the limitations of the Constitution, will work a revolution of our political system and will bring about results so important and far-reaching as to commend careful consideration on the part of the Members of each House before it is established.

The result what might follow the application of this principle is illustrated by a glance at the Pennsylvania elections alone. If this principle should be applied by the Senate to the exclusion of Mr. VARE, the House of Representatives would be entitled, perhaps tempted, to make a similar application of it to the 36 Members of that body elected from Pennsylvania, possibly every one of whom was a beneficiary of the campaign expenditures in that State equally with Mr. VARE or Senator Pepper, with the result that Pennsylvania would be denied one-half of its representation in the Senate and its entire representation in the House of Representatives.

Not only so, but the same principle applied by the legislative bodies of the State of Pennsylvania would nullify the election of 25 members of the State senate and 208 members of the State house of representatives who are also beneficiaries of the money spent in the Pennsylvania primaries.

This principle, if once established, would grow and increase in influence and be multiplied in the number of its applications, for it is a doctrine admirably fitted to serve the purposes of a majority in any legislative body where it obtains. Resting solely in discretion and without any limitation and not subject to review or restraint by any other body, officer, or tribunal, there would be the constant temptation to apply it to the exclusion of anyone who for reasons, personal or political, was opposed by a majority of the Senate or House of Representatives. It could be used to reject this Senator on account of his religion, to that Senator because he was in favor of prohibition, or to another because he was opposed to it. Under this assumption of power the right of three Senators elected or appointed has been challenged, and in the future it is possible that one-third of the entire Membership of the Senate might in any Congress be subjected to the same challenge.

For instance, if there existed a substantial majority in the Membership of the House in favor of the Republican Party, but by a revulsion in public feeling all of the newly elected Senators were Democrats, would it be a very difficult matter to persuade this majority that the newly elected Members suffered under some disqualifications, outside of the constitutional enumerations, which made it the patriotic duty of the Republican majority to prevent them from taking their seats? Or, if a Democratic majority was threatened in the same manner, what would be to prevent them from applying this same principle, and excluding the Members chosen, and all the appointees nominated by the governors to fill the vacancies caused by such exclusion? Because, if you once admit the principle of unrestrained, arbitrary control over the election of Senators, you can place no limit on its exercise. The recognition of this principle as a working factor of our Government is the sowing of dragon's teeth from which will spring forth armed man to destroy the contrary principle of government by the people under the restrictions and limitations of a written Constitution they have established.

We have endeavored in this argument to speak plainly, and we have no fears that what we have said will be misconstrued or distorted into any semblance of disrespect for the Senate or this committee, any more than would a proper challenge to the jurisdiction of a court be considered as contempt to the judge to whom it is addressed. We conceive it is the right of every citizen, the humblest as well as the highest, to appeal to the Constitution and invoke its protection. We believe it is the duty of every patriotic citizen to call attention to its infraction, and, if denied other remedy, he can at least appeal against the removal of the ancient landmarks and to counsel an observance of our great charter, the preservation of which is essential to the protection of the rights of the citizen; and to protest against the introduction of a principle which will deny the free choice by the people of each State of their representatives in the national councils—a power which would render the sovereign States inferior and subservient to the will of the majority of the members of any legislative body, and which would mark the beginning of the end of constitutional government in America.

It must be taken as admitted or conceded that WILLIAM S. VARE possesses all the qualifications required by the Constitution of the United States for a Member of the United States Senate, and that he was elected by the people of the State of Pennsylvania. In the defense of his own rights as a citizen of the United States and on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania, who have honored him with election, he appeals to this committee and to the Senate to judge him by the Constitution of the people of the United States—the fundamental law supreme over all its creatures and agencies—which every Senater has sworn to support and maintain.

III. THE RIGHTS OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Constitution provided, Article I, section 3:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote * * *."

The seventeenth amendment provides, Article XVII:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct."

In the Constitutional Convention it was first proposed that the legislatures of the several States should nominate a list of eligibles and that from this list of eligibles the Federal House of Representatives or the President should make the final selection. This proposal was ultimately superseded by Article I, section 3, quoted above, and as evidence of the fact that the representation of each State in the Senate was recognized as an inherent and inalienable right, the framers of the Constitution included in Article V, relating to amendments, the prohibition "and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

In the exercise of its power to judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own Members, the Senate is about to examine the returns made pursuant to the law of the State of Pennsylvania of the election held November 2, 1926. If these returns show after investigation what they now show on their face, that Mr. VARE was elected by an overwhelming majority—and we are confident that the investigation will establish this fact—then we have the case of a State which has conducted an election in accordance with its own and the Federal law and has chosen its ambassador to be one of its two representatives guaranteed to it by the Constitution.

We submit that any action by the Senate which goes beyond the determination of the election of Mr. VARE in accordance with Federal and State law, and of his qualifications as enumerated in the Constitution, would be a clear violation of the right guaranteed to the State of Pennsylvania as an entity to its full representation by two Senators in the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD B. BEITLER,
M. J. MCENERY,
Attorneys for William S. Vare.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the statement has been made that there was no valid election in Pennsylvania. I do not believe I will venture to refer to the statements which appear in the press of Pennsylvania and made by prominent people in that State; but the real question has been discussed fully, a committee of the Senate has reported evidence and findings, and it is claimed, as I have stated, that Mr. VARE has not been properly chosen as a Senator from Pennsylvania. Without going into the merits of the controversy at all there is enough before us to overcome the prima facie effect of his certificate and have those questions go to the committee to be investigated and considered and reported upon. It would, therefore, be unfair to Mr. VARE and to his friends for me to read what I have before me here on that subject, and I will not attempt to do so. That is a matter, however, that is not concluded by the certificate that has been presented to the Senate. In view of what the committee has done, in view of its report, in view of what it has ascertained with regard to the election there, the prima facie effect of the certificate is overcome, it seems to me, and the matter ought to be investigated by a committee before the certificate can be recognized and be considered as entitling Mr. VARE to a seat in the Senate.

Reference has been made to the Lorimer case, just as if a question similar to the one now pending had been raised when Mr. Lorimer was sworn in. Mr. Lorimer took the oath of office here on June 18, 1909. It was not until January 9, 1911, that Mr. Beveridge offered his resolution to the effect that Mr. Lorimer had been corruptly elected and was not entitled to a seat. Mr. Lorimer sat here for nearly two years before that question was raised in January, 1911. The Senate adopted the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections declaring that Mr. Lorimer's election was valid and that he was entitled to his seat March 1, 1911. After that the Senate

proceeded to accomplish what, in my judgment, has always been a most cruel and unjust thing. A resolution was introduced on May 20, 1912, again to the effect that Mr. Lorimer had been corruptly elected and was not entitled to his seat, and the Senate on July 12, 1912, reversed its previous action. Mr. Lorimer's seat was declared vacant, though he had been here in this body from June 18, 1909, to July 12, 1912. The Senate had once voted that he was entitled to his seat, that he had been honestly and fairly elected a Senator, but reversed its action subsequently and declared his seat vacant.

Mr. OVERMAN. Was not that on the ground of newly discovered evidence?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was on the ground of alleged newly discovered evidence, but the alleged newly discovered evidence did not develop at the hearing; there was no more proof of corruption or fraud under the second investigation than there had been on the first. I, myself, think that that case was wrongly decided by the Senate; that the Senate was correct in the first instance; and that by reason of the change of personnel in this body the action of the Senate was reversed. There was no question raised at all when Mr. Lorimer's credentials were presented here as to the validity of his election. He sat here for nearly two years before that question was raised. So we have a different situation here in this instance.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, while I generally disagree with the political opinions of the New York World, yet I generally read its editorials, because I enjoy seeing the opinions of my political opponents expressed so forcefully and clearly as they always are in its columns. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial printed this morning in the New York World on the subject of the Senate's power over these cases may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, although I dislike to take the time of the Senate, I should like to read the concluding paragraph of the editorial, which is as follows:

The ultimate question, therefore, is whether a majority of a quorum of the Senate may reverse the decision of a plurality of the voters of Illinois on a question not of law but of the proprieties. The State of Illinois has no law against the Smith-Insull transaction. The United States has no law against it. A plurality of the voters, after fair warning and full debate, have consented to it. By what right, then, does a majority of the Senate presume to declare that the offense is great enough to warrant a refusal to seat Mr. SMITH and thus to deny Illinois the representation to which it is entitled?

It is acting upon the theory of Senator REED that in admitting Members "the power is absolute." He does not merely claim, mind you, that the Senate may by law fix the qualifications of Senators. He claims that the Senate may in each instance, without previous notice, for reasons undeclared and unexplained, invent ex post facto such reasons as it chooses.

This claim to absolute power is, in our opinion, lawless in spirit, dictatorial in character, in violation of the Federal character of this Government, and a direct challenge to the principle of representative government.

The editorial entire is as follows:

[From The New York World, December 9, 1927]

"THE POWER IS ABSOLUTE"

By a vote of 53 to 28 the Senate on Wednesday refused to recognize the certificate of election presented by FRANK L. SMITH of Illinois.

Mr. SMITH was the winner of the election of 1926, in which he polled 772,467 votes against 716,389 votes which were cast for Mr. Brennan, the Democratic candidate, and 143,426 for Mr. Magill, an independent Republican candidate.

Mr. SMITH ran as the regular Republican candidate. He became the regular Republican candidate as a result of his victory in the Republican primaries, held April 13, 1926. In these primaries he defeated the late Senator William B. McKinley by a vote of, roughly, 600,000 to 475,000.

About eight days before the Illinois primaries were held Senator REED of Missouri submitted a resolution calling for a special committee of five Senators to investigate campaign expenditures in the Senatorial primaries. On May 17, a month after the Illinois primary, this committee, known as the Reed Committee, was established by the Senate. It began almost at once to investigate the Illinois primaries and had concluded its hearings by August 5, 1926. This was three months before Mr. SMITH'S election.

The Reed Committee's investigation disclosed that Senator McKinley, the loser, had spent $514,143, divided as follows:

McKinley's personal contribution	$350,000
Total minor contributions (estimated)	5,000
National Republican Committee of Cook County (known as the Deneen group)	159,143
Total	514,143

It disclosed also that FRANK L. SMITH, the winner, had spent a provisional total of $458,782. About 25 per cent of this money came from Mr. SMITH and his campaign manager. About 70 per cent came from "traction powers and public utility owners," of whom the most conspicuous was Mr. Samuel Insull. Mr. SMITH, who took this money from public-utility owners, was then "chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, which is empowered by law to fix the rates and control the operation of public utilities in the State of Illinois."

This transaction was, in our opinion, disgraceful and deserves the severest rebuke. The question is whether it disqualifies Mr. SMITH as Senator from Illinois. In answering this question it is necessary, we believe, to consider the following circumstances:

(a) The State of Illinois, according to the Reed Committee, has no statute restricting the amount which may be expended by any candidate, nor any law requiring the candidates or their committees to file a statement of such expenditures.

(b) The Federal corrupt practices act has been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Newberry case, and there is no duty imposed by Federal law to file a statement of expenditures with the United States Senate.

(c) It is not alleged, therefore, that Mr. SMITH violated either State or Federal law in accepting campaign contributions from Mr. Insull.

(d) The Reed committee produced no evidence that the money received by Mr. SMITH was corruptly spent either in the primaries or in the election.

The whole question turns, therefore, on the propriety of his having accepted money from a utility magnate in view of the fact that as chairman of the commission he had officially to fix rates on public utilities. If we are correctly informed, it is wholly a question of propriety. There is no law in Illinois and there is no Federal law on the subject. If we had as voters to decide the question of propriety, we should unqualifiedly condemn Mr. SMITH. But the question was submitted to the electorate of Illinois. It was debated for at least three months. An independent candidate was run against Mr. SMITH on this precise issue. A plurality of the voters thereupon chose Mr. SMITH at an election the honesty of which is not questioned.

The ultimate question, therefore, is whether a majority of a quorum of the Senate may reverse the decision of a plurality of the voters of Illinois on a question not of law but of the proprieties. The State of Illinois has no law against the Smith-Insull transaction. The United States has no law against it. A plurality of the voters, after fair warning and full debate, have consented to it. By what right, then, does a majority of the Senate presume to declare that the offense is great enough to warrant a refusal to seat Mr. SMITH and thus to deny Illinois the representation to which it is entitled?

It is acting upon the theory of Senator REED that in admitting Members "the power is absolute." He does not merely claim, mind you, that the Senate may by law fix the qualifications of Senators. He claims that the Senate may in each instance, without previous notice, for reasons undeclared and unexplained, invent ex post facto such reasons as it chooses.

This claim to absolute power is, in our opinion, lawless in spirit, dictatorial in character, in violation of the Federal character of this Government, and a direct challenge to the principle of representative government.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I do not know the full purport of the editorial other than the paragraphs which were read by the Senator from Massachusetts, but from those paragraphs, which were read by the Senator, it appears that the New York World, in substance, takes the position that the Senate has no right to expel a Senator even after he has once been admitted here and has taken the oath of office merely because the State has no law prescribing a limitation of campaign expenditures, as is contended in the case of the State of Illinois. I differ radically with the views of the New York World upon the issues involved. Excessive expenditures in elections, the corruption of elections, if permitted to go on in this country will be one of the most undermining evils which can threaten the Republic.

In proceeding with the Newberry case the Senate after he had been sworn investigated his election. There had been no investigation prior to the time when he took the oath. In that case the Senate declared by resolution that the expenditure of a sum in the neighborhood of $200,000, as was proven, was detrimental to good government, was demoralizing, and threatened our public institutions, and, therefore, that Mr. Newberry should not be allowed to retain his seat in the United States Senate. So far as the facts which have been developed are concerned, we have before us now cases that are not unlike the Newberry case. The difference lies merely in the matter of procedure. In both the Illinois and Pennsylvania cases, it having come to the attention of the Senate that there had been corruption or alleged corruption and that there had been excessive expenditures in connection with the campaigns, the Senate saw proper to investigate the matter following the primaries and appointed

a committee for that purpose. That committee carried on quite a thorough investigation and gave all the parties interested an opportunity to be heard as to their guilt or innocence upon the charges which had been made through the press and by individuals in those States, respectively.

It has been argued here as though we were taking snap judgment on the Senators designate that we were not giving them an opportunity here to be heard. That is contrary to the facts and to the record. As disclosed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in presenting this matter some days ago, investigations were carried on, witnesses were heard, the Senators designate were permitted to appear before the committee, were given every opportunity to present their side of the case, and after a fair, open investigation had been conducted and a fair hearing had been accorded by the Senate committee—and I do not think that anyone will charge that the hearings were not fair or that the committee did not try to ascertain the facts—the committee reached the conclusion that the Senator designate from Illinois and the Senator designate from Pennsylvania should be denied the privilege of taking the oath of office when they presented themselves to the Senate.

The committee reported the facts. So it is useless to say that the gentlemen in question have not been heard, and nobody who knows anything about these cases will so contend.

One Senator this morning talked as if he considered that the Senate is taking snap judgment on these gentlemen; that we are railroading them, and wanted to convict them without a hearing. Such a contention is not supported by the facts and the procedure in these cases. There was, I repeat, a hearing conducted by a committee authorized and directed by the Senate to act, and as a result of the investigation by that committee the facts were developed that there had been excessive expenditures in the election of these candidates. In Pennsylvania, I believe, the amount was about $800,000, and close to a million dollars in the State of Illinois.

On yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], who takes pleasure this morning in presenting an editorial from the New York World, said it is not a question of the amount of money but is merely a question of what the money is spent for; that a million dollars could better be spent for certain purposes than a hundred dollars for some other certain purpose. I admit that a hundred dollars may be corruptly used, but ordinarily small expenditures are not corrupt. On the other hand, large and excessive expenditures are always corrupt. What greater crime could there be than trying to buy public office? Of course, if we wish to set a minimum of eight hundred thousand upon campaign expenditures in this country, we will place it there if the Senate by its action accepts as proper such expenditures as those which were made in these particular instances, and if we are going to place a minimum upon campaign expenditures and say that no man may be a candidate for United States Senator unless he can spend a million dollars in the larger States and perhaps two or three hundred thousand dollars in the smaller States, we had just as well write a new provision in the Constitution in regard to the qualifications for United States Senators. We might as well say the door of opportunity for a poor man or a man of moderate means is forever closed, and that only the rich or those who will sell themselves for financial backing shall be eligible for high public office.

The security of our Republic is found in the maintenance of honest, clean, and uncorrupted elections; the administration of public office as a public trust; and the condemnation to oblivion of those who would attempt to buy public office, to corrupt elections, to use public office as a private chattel for their own enrichment and self-aggrandizement.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, just for a question?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. Does my memory fail me or not when I recall, or suppose I recall, the fact that in the Newberry case the expenditures were mainly for publications in one form or another? Is that so or is it not so?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think to quite an extent, and for what they called campaign workers and hired workers in different localities—I would call them grafters and ward heelers. I call a man a grafter and a ward heeler who says he has got to have $500 to look after the situation over in ward 1 and puts $499 in his own pocket and spends about $1 treating the other fellows to lemonade and cigars. I denounce as a grafter a man who will sell his influence for $5 or $10 a day during a campaign. There was a good deal of that carried on in the Newberry campaign, and I have no doubt a great deal of similar corruption was carried on in Pennsylvania and in Illinois elections. And, too, think of the methods of the political machine in Philadelphia. A lot of officeholders supported by the taxpayers' money. An indignant and outraged people will yet arise and smash that machine, which is as a leech on the back of the taxpayers of that city.

Mr. BRUCE. If the Senator will allow me a moment, I want to get back to the Newberry case.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I understand the Senator's point.

Mr. BRUCE. The point I make is that the expenditures in the Newberry case that were opprobriously condemned by the Senate were the very sort of expenditures that have met with the unqualified approval of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. TRAMMELL. Absolutely. Well, I disapprove very much of the class of expenditures in the Newberry case. As I recall, they hired what they called political workers. What is hiring political workers? Should not the electorate of this country be allowed to go ahead uninfluenced and unbiased as to whom they should support or vote for, without some man coming around and telling them that he will pay them $10 a day to distribute circulars, or he will pay them $10 a day or $50 a day for the use of their automobiles in going out and bringing voters to the polls, and all such expenditures as that? Large expenditures are usually to buy up—to mislead and deceive the voters—and I never knew of a single instance where the campaign bag of gold was for the public good.

I have been fighting every form of election corruption in my State all through my public career, and I am going to keep on fighting it both there and in the United States Senate. I shall continue to condemn all efforts to buy public office and those who are in office who regard public office as a private chattel.

I knew of a concrete case where a man down in my State, an old man who was fairly respected, thought to be a very good man, dropped into my office one day when I was a young lawyer down in Lakeland, Fla., my home town, and said, "TRAMMELL, I have been thinking about supporting Mr. A for a certain office," a prominent office. "In fact, I have been rather impressed that he was the right man for the office; but," he said, "you know, a fellow came to me the other day and told me that if I would take my horse and buggy"—this was before the day of the automobile and the wonderful roads we now have in Florida—"and drive down through certain precincts and distribute some of his circulars, he would give me $10 a day for five days." He said, "You know, I can't make over a dollar and a half or two dollars a day, and I think I will accept the proposition. Of course, it means that I have got to support the man that the money is coming from." So the candidate bought this old fellow in that way; and that is one of the popular methods used in different States—no doubt used in Pennsylvania, no doubt used in Illinois. I know that is one of the methods that was used in connection with the Newberry campaign. The records disclose that.

The free, uncorruptible and patriotic electors, who are in a large majority in my State, are strongly against the candidate who places the dollar above manhood and character and faithful service. They are against all forms of election corruption and abhor and despise political machines of the variety supported by the taxpayers' money or that may be fostered in any other way. The form of corruption practiced in Illinois and Pennsylvania was most reprehensible—direct buying of votes and influence; indirect buying of influence and votes, and the officeholders, political machine greased with taxpayers' money, were all in play.

What chance has an honest man who is above that kind of campaign conduct; or, on the other hand, if he is not above it, if he is a man without means, what chance has he when he is contending with money when they are carrying on such campaign procedure as that?

As far as I am concerned, I think I will do much less offense to my conscience in regard to the Constitution under the given circumstances we are dealing with by denying the oath to these Senators designate than I will by putting the stamp of approval upon the expenditures and the character of campaigns that were conducted which brought them here as Senators designate.

I believe that it will do less harm, if any harm is to be done, to exclude them, regardless of this argument about the constitutional question that we must allow a man to take his seat and then afterwards consider whether or not we will expel him from the Senate, than it will to place the stamp of approval upon the character of campaigns which resulted in them coming here and presenting themselves for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

If we are going to go ahead and approve this kind of conduct, then we can expect it to spread and get worse and worse, and completely undermine our elections and undermine our institutions. I believe the better plan is to deny the seat, and put others on notice that hereafter, whenever they seek a place

in the United States Senate, they must come here with clean hands; that they must have carried on their campaigns in an honest, open, fair, and legitimate way, without trying to purchase the seats which they are seeking in this body. Put on notice all who read that a seat in the United States Senate can not be bought as you would buy stock on the stock exchange.

As far as the political aspect is concerned, I hope nobody is being actuated from that standpoint. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] said that of course this matter ought to be handled without regard to partisan considerations; and I think so myself. "But," he said, "what will the country think when the Senate is composed of 47 Democrats and 47 Republicans with Mr. VARE, and only 46 Republicans and 47 Democrats without Mr. VARE? Will not the country think the Democrats do not want Mr. VARE in, so that they will have control of the Senate?"

If you stop there, that sounds all right; but, on the other hand, what will the country think about the Republicans trying to put Mr. VARE in a seat in the United States Senate when he comes here with such a tainted record as he has in connection with his campaign? May you not as well say that the country will say, "The Republicans are willing to approve this conduct on Mr. VARE's part. They are willing to approve these unreasonable campaign expenditures and all kinds of election corruption, so that the Republicans can control the Senate." It is just as logical to say that as it is to intimate that the country would say that the Democrats wanted to exclude him so that they could organize the Senate.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania says, I hope, of course, that the matter will be determined without reference to any partisian considerations whatever; and I do not think the country is going to think very much about the question of Republican control or Democratic control. Nor are the people going to seriously consider these hair-splitting, twilight-zone constitutional questions.

What the country is going to think about is the disposition of this question upon the basis of the large expenditures that were made and the corruption that was carried on in connection with the election. I believe that, regardless of the Republican or Democratic issue, the country at large feels that the Senate should preclude these men from having seats in the United States Senate.

In my opinion we have the constitutional right to reject them; we should do so and thus deal a staggering blow to those who would buy up and corrupt elections.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. Does not the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] altogether lose sight of the fact that the Smith resolution was largely supported by Republican Members of this body, and also the fact that not an inconsiderable number of Democrats voted against that resolution? I do not see how the action of the Senate on the Smith resolution could be possibly referred to merely partisan motives.

Mr. TRAMMELL. We must not lose sight of that fact. In fact, a Republican offered the resolution.

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] also loses sight of the fact that of course the only effect of ousting Mr. VARE or Mr. SMITH would be to give the Governors of Pennsylvania and Illinois the opportunity to send to this body two men worthy of its loftiest traditions.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I thank the Senator very much. I fully agree with his remarks on that question. I had hoped that the question would not be a partisan question at all; that we would act upon the facts and upon what we believe will be for the best interest of our country. I believe it is for the best interest of the Nation, whenever instances of this kind come to our attention, to make it plain that the United States Senate looks with disfavor upon the use of excessive sums of money for the purpose of influencing an election, and that it looks with disfavor upon any form of election corruption. We can not put the stamp of disapproval upon such conduct as that if, with the facts before us as presented by the committee, we now vote to seat Mr. VARE and take up the matter of further consideration at a later date.

For these reasons, feeling that we have ample facts, that there has been a fair investigation, and that these men have had every opportunity of a hearing, I am going to vote for the resolution denying the seat to Mr. VARE, just as I would vote to expel him if he had already gotten into the Senate.

As to this argument in regard to not having the right to preclude him from taking the oath, it seems to me, if you are going to apply that in its last analysis, that you might just as well say that after he once gets in we can not expel him. If the Senate is going to deny that he has a right to his seat after he once takes the oath, it will have to base its position entirely upon the same conditions and facts upon which we will now deny him the right of taking the oath. If we have not the right to deny him the privilege of taking the oath, then would we have the right, under the constitutional contention that is made, to expel him after he had once been seated?

I am satisfied with the facts. I am satisfied that corruption was carried on in connection with the election; that there were excessive expenditures; that there has been a fair hearing given; and an opportunity for hearing for the Senator designate. For these reasons I shall support the resolution denying him the privilege of taking the oath.

Mr. NEELY obtained the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Bingham	Gerry	McNary	Simmons
Black	Gillett	Mayfield	Smith
Blaine	Glass	Metcalf	Smoot
Blease	Goff	Moses	Steck
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Steiwer
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Stephens
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Swanson
Bruce	Harris	Oddie	Thomas
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Trammell
Caraway	Hawes	Phipps	Tydings
Copeland	Hayden	Pine	Tyson
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Wagner
Curtis	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Edwards	King	Sackett	Willis
Ferris	La Follette	Schall	

Mr. BRATTON. I rise to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HOWELL. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is ill and detained at his home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from West Virginia will proceed.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the extraordinary inconsistency of those on the other side of the aisle who oppose the pending resolution, and vehemently argue that Mr. VARE should be instantly seated deserves the attention of the Senate.

But before we consider this inconsistency let us thank the able Senator from Pennsylvania for his gratuitous warning that the country may criticize Democrats who vote for the Norris resolution on the ground that they are playing petty partisan politics. Let us remind the Senator that we shall fear no accusations of partisanship based upon the fact that we have supported the resolution offered by Mr. NORRIS, who is one of the most patriotic, able, and illustrious Republican Member of this body. Indeed, the Senator from Nebraska is such a commanding figure in his party that an important group of his Republican colleagues in the Senate have recently been impelled to urge him to be a candidate for the Republican nomination for President.

The above-mentioned inconsistency arises from the following circumstances: In January, 1926, the Senate decided what is commonly called the Nye case. Mr. NYE appeared here as a Senator designate from the State of North Dakota, armed with a certificate of appointment which had been duly executed by Governor Sorlie, and which was admittedly perfect in form.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. Always to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The question involved in that case was of the power of the governor to appoint, was it not?

Mr. NEELY. I purpose to explain what the question was. A number of reasons were assigned for the action of those who opposed the seating of Mr. NYE, and who now assert that we shall violate the Constitution and outrage the State of Pennsylvania if we refuse to seat Mr. VARE. The principal objection to the administering of the oath of office to Mr. NYE, whose reputation was spotless, whose record was perfect, and whose certificate was in due form, was based upon the contention that, although the State of North Dakota had by constitutional enactment provided that the governor of the State could, in the case of a vacancy in the State's representation in the United States Senate, fill the vacancy by appointment, yet

because the Legislature of North Dakota had not enacted a new law on the subject after the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, the governor was without authority to fill a vacancy in the Senate by appointment. In other words, it was contended that because the Legislature of North Dakota, after the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, failed to reenact a law which had been continuously in force in the State from 1889 to and including the date of the execution of Senator NYE's certificate of appointment, the certificate was invalid and the appointment was void.

The Senators who have spoken in favor of admitting Mr. VARE to the Senate now and investigating his case afterwards voted to exclude Mr. NYE without any sort of an investigation. They then said, in effect, "You will violate the Constitution if you let Mr. NYE come into the Senate." They now say, "You will violate the Constitution if you keep Mr. VARE out of the Senate." What a convenient Constitution! What a fair and logical construction of that great instrument! And let us always remember that Mr. NYE's appointment was untainted, while Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, has certified to the Senate that he does not believe that Mr. VARE was duly chosen; that he is convinced that Mr. VARE's nomination was partly bought and partly stolen.

Let me call the names of those on the other side who have spoken in favor of Mr. VARE and who voted against the seating of Mr. NYE.

Mr. EDGE, of New Jersey, voted to close the door in Mr. NYE's face.

Mr. FESS, of Ohio, who has spoken so eloquently this morning, voted to exclude Mr. NYE.

Mr. HALE, of Maine, who has spoken against this Republican resolution, voted against the seating of Mr. NYE.

Mr. MCLEAN, of Connecticut, who yesterday pleaded eloquently for the immediate admission of Mr. VARE, voted for the permanent exclusion of Mr. NYE.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] also voted against Mr. NYE's admission to the Senate.

In brief, everyone who has spoken against this resolution and in favor of letting Mr. VARE enter the Senate voted to keep Mr. NYE out of the Senate on a hair-splitting constitutional technicality. We entreat those who urge the seating of Mr. VARE to explain the consistency of arguing that the Constitution is their bulwark when they stand upon a technical question of law, but affords us no protection when we stand upon a notorious question of fact.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. With pleasure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senators to whom the Senator refers had had their way in the Nye case, how long would the State of North Dakota have been denied its equal representation in this body, under the theory they now advance?

Mr. NEELY. Until the next general election or more than 10 months from the day on which Mr. NYE's case was decided by the Senate. The eloquent Senator from Arkansas of course understands that Mr. NYE's vote was not needed on the other side to organize the Senate then, as Mr. VARE's vote is needed to organize it now, and that there was accordingly no occasion for haste in the former case.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will not the Senator put into the RECORD as a part of his remarks the entire vote on the Nye case?

Mr. NEELY. Yes. I shall be glad to do so, and now ask unanimous consent to insert it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will not the Senator read it now?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly. The record of the vote appears on page 1893 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 12th day of January, 1926.

The following are those who voted to seat Mr. NYE:

Ashurst, Borah, Bratton, Brookhart, Broussard, Capper, Copeland, Couzens, Dill, Ferris, Frazier, Harreld, Harris, Harrison, Heflin, Howell, Johnson, Kendrick, La Follette, McKellar, McMaster, McNary, Mayfield, Neely, Norris, Overman, Ransdell, Reed of Missouri, Robinson of Arkansas, Schall, Sheppard, Shipstead, Simmons, Smith, Stanfield, Stephens, Swanson, Trammell, Tyson, Underwood, Wheeler.

Those voting against seating Mr. NYE are the following:

Bayard, Bingham, Blease, Bruce, Butler, Caraway, Curtis, Dale, Deneen, Edge, Ernst, Fess, George, Gerry, Gillett, Glass, Goff, Gooding, Hale, Jones of Washington, Keyes, Lenroot, McLean, Means, Metcalf, Moses, Oddie, Pepper, Pine, Reed of Pennsylvania, Robinson of Indiana, Sackett, Shortridge, Wadsworth, Walsh, Warren, Watson, Williams, Willis.

Mr. President, let me now very briefly call attention to two or three paragraphs contained in the ingenious argument of the always resourceful Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question before he proceeds. Was the objection to Mr. NYE taking his seat at that time based upon the fact that he was not 30 years of age?

Mr. NEELY. It was not.

Mr. SIMMONS. That he was not a resident of the State of North Dakota?

Mr. NEELY. It was not.

Mr. SIMMONS. Or not a citizen of the United States for nine years?

Mr. NEELY. It was not. Such objections were never even suggested.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Was not the question of the validity of his certificate raised because of the thought that the Legislature of North Dakota had never empowered the governor to make such an appointment? The legislature had not acted since the adoption of the seventeeth amendment to the Constitution. That was the precise question, was it not?

Mr. NEELY. The Senator has correctly stated the question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It was the validity of the certificate.

Mr. NEELY. Which was perfectly regular in every respect.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But the reason why the certificate was held not to be good was that the seventeenth amendment provided that the legislature of any State could empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments, and the Legislature of North Dakota had not in fact done so.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator's statement involves an error. The certificate was held to be good and Mr. NYE was permitted to take his seat.

Mr. President, let us return to the argument of the Senator from Pennsylvania in behalf of Mr. VARE. It is the most plausible speech that has been made in Mr. VARE's favor. It is a masterpiece, considering the poor material upon which the discussion is based.

But the Senator has not been as logical as he usually is. After declaring that about $650,000 appears to be the aggregate of all the expenditures made by Mr. VARE and those associated with him, the Senator inquires, "While Mr. VARE was doing this"—that is, while he and his associates were buying up watchers at $10 apiece under the law of Pennsylvania and investing hundreds of thousands of dollars in the elevating enterprise—"while Mr. VARE was doing that what were the others doing? Mr. Pinchot, whose candidacy was coupled with no one else's, spent for his own particular private benefit in that campaign $187,000."

What do Mr. Pinchot's expenditures have to do with this case? Are we to acquit one man of rascality, corruption, and fraud in the State of Pennsylvania because some other person in that State may have done something of which we do not approve?

Again, the Senator from Pennsylvania says that it is impossible to allocate the expenditures of the vast sum of more than $800,000 in the State of Pennsylvania for the Vare cause, for the reason that there were many running with him. Because we can not convict all of the conspirators, must we set all of them free and reward the author of the conspiracy with a seat in the Senate?

The papers of the country without regard to politics have denounced this disgraceful political debauch in the State of Pennsylvania in no uncertain terms. The Literary Digest for the 26th of June, 1926, spoke to the point as follows:

From coast to coast the editorial pages of the daily press are ringing with shocked and indignant protests against the part played by money in Pennsylvania's politics. "Enough evidence that the Pennsylvania senatorial nomination was an auction has been produced to warrant the Senate in refusing to seat the nominee if elected," declares Senator CAPPER'S Topeka Capital (Republican), which believes it "impossible for the Senate or the country to remain indifferent and acquiescent to the calm story of the political debauchery of the second State in the Union." "If America can read the evidence thus far given without a shudder and a surge of indignation, it is because we are in a condition of disgusting demoralization and lacking in an ordinary sense of civic decency," avers the New York Evening World (Democratic). What chance has popular opinion to reveal itself in the dazzling glare of so much gold, wonders the Wichita Beacon (Independent Republican).

"Newberry, whose primary election expenditures shocked the country only a few years ago, was but a small potato. But who would be rash enough to predict that the lavish use of money in the Vare-Pepper-Pinchot campaign will shock Pennsylvania, or that the voters here will set the seal of their disapproval upon the investment of fabulous sums by politicians to advance their own interests at the polling places?"

The outstanding facts revealed by the candidates and their managers under the cross-questioning of Senator REED's committee are that the unsuccessful campaigns of Senator Pepper and Governor Pinchot cost, respectively, $1,620,000 and $195,102, while the nomination of Representative WILLIAM S. VARE cost $604,905. It is claimed that these sums were spent legitimately for propaganda, advertising, etc. Thus one witness was certain that "all the money spent by the Pepper-Fisher ticket was as legitimately used as money given to a church"; and one of Mr. VARE's managers declared: "I never heard of a vote being bought in Pennsylvania." But the statement of one of Governor Pinchot's lieutenants that the Vare and Pepper forces spent $494,900 in Pittsburgh for "watchers" at $10 a day draws the fire of Democratic editors. The employment of these 49,490 "watchers," insists the New York Evening World (Democrat), can only be interpreted as "a purchase of votes."

So it was, Mr. President, and I for one intend to vote against awarding to Mr. VARE or any other man a seat in the Senate obtained by bargain and sale. I intend to vote, during my continuance in this body, against the seating of any man who has notoriously debauched the voters of a State in order to procure an election. If we fail to close and fasten the door of the Senate against every man who comes here with a certificate which is based upon a purchased election we shall thereby blast the hopes, the ambitions, and the aspirations of every poor man and woman and child in the United States. God forbid that the Senate shall ever be guilty of committing such a crime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], as amended.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	La Follette	Schall
Barkley	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Bayard	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Black	Gerry	McNary	Simmons
Blaine	Gillett	Mayfield	Smith
Blease	Glass	Metcalf	Smoot
Borah	Goff	Moses	Steck
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Steiwer
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Stephens
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Swanson
Bruce	Harris	Oddie	Thomas
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Trammell
Caraway	Hawes	Phipps	Tydings
Copeland	Hayden	Pine	Tyson
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Wagner
Curtis	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Edwards	King	Sackett	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask that the question may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] for the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] as amended. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "resolution," on page 1, and to insert the following:

Whereas WILLIAM S. VARE, from the State of Pennsylvania, has presented a certificate of election in due and proper form as a Senator from said State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That without expressing any opinion as to the right or propriety of his retaining his seat in advance of a complete investigation thereof, the said WILLIAM S. VARE is entitled to be sworn in as a Senator upon his prima facie case.

Resolved further, That when sworn in his credentials and all the papers in relation to his right to retain his seat be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with instructions to report thereon at the earliest practicable moment, and not in any case later than February 8, 1928.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], who is absent on account of illness. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS (when Mr. GEORGE's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. If present he would vote "nay."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). My colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is ill and absent from the Chamber on that account. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. If the Senator from New Mexico were present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I am paired upon this question with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. HOWELL (when the name of Mr. NORRIS was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Montana was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Montana] is detained on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOODING] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], who is absent on account of illness, if present would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bingham	Gillett	Moses	Smith
Blease	Goff	Oddie	Smoot
Borah	Gould	Pine	Steck
Broussard	Greene	Ransdell	Steiwer
Curtis	Hale	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Deneen	Keyes	Sackett	Waterman
Edge	McLean	Schall	Watson
Fess	Metcalf	Shortridge	

NAYS—55

Ashurst	Edwards	Kendrick	Sheppard
Barkley	Ferris	La Follette	Shipstead
Bayard	Fletcher	McKellar	Simmons
Black	Frazier	McMaster	Stephens
Blaine	Gerry	McNary	Swanson
Bratton	Glass	Mayfield	Thomas
Brookhart	Harris	Neely	Trammell
Bruce	Harrison	Norbeck	Tydings
Capper	Hawes	Nye	Tyson
Caraway	Hayden	Overman	Wagner
Copeland	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—8

du Pont	Gooding	King	Phipps
George	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.

So the amendment of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk as a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed substitute will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "resolution" on page 1, and to insert in lieu thereof:

Whereas WILLIAM S. VARE, from the State of Pennsylvania, has presented a certificate of election in due and proper form as a Senator from said State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That without expressing any opinion as to the right or propriety of his retaining his seat in advance of a complete investigation thereof, the said WILLIAM S. VARE is entitled to be sworn in as a Senator upon his prima facie case; and

Resolved further, That when sworn in his credentials and all the papers in relation to his right to retain his seat be referred to the special committee of the Senate created by Senate Resolution 195, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, adopted May 17, 1926, to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate, and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election; and

Resolved further, That said special committee be directed to report its evidence and findings to the Senate within 60 days, if practicable, and that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to

report to the Senate within 60 days its findings in the election contest by William B. Wilson against the said WILLIAM S. VARE, heretofore referred by the Senate to said Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I may be mistaken, but I have understood that the Senator from Pennsylvania has contended that that special committee is no longer in existence.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No, Mr. President; I have not so contended since the passage of the resolution in the Frank L. Smith case, which impliedly revived it.

I call for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I make the point of order against all of the resolution preceding the reference to the special committee for the reason that it is in substance identical with the substitute resolution on which we have just voted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate I do not think a Senator is entitled to offer more than one substitute. I am not going to raise the point of order, however, and I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not press his point of order.

Mr. NEELY. If that is the way my leader feels about it, I withdraw it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think we should have the privilege of voting on the resolution as it has been offered, notwithstanding the fact that I think it would be subject to a point of order, for the reason that one substitute having already been submitted it is not in order to offer another substitute; but I do not make the point of order.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS (when Mr. GEORGE'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). I make the same announcement that I made on the previous roll call with respect to the illness of my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico], his absence, and how he would vote if present.

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who is detained from the Chamber on account of illness. Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. NORRIS] is detained by illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Montana was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH of Montana] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 31, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bingham	Fess	Metcalf	Smith
Blease	Gillett	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Goff	Oddie	Steck
Brookhart	Gould	Pine	Steiwer
Broussard	Greene	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Curtis	Hale	Sackett	Waterman
Deneen	Keyes	Schall	Watson
Edge	McLean	Shortridge	

NAYS—55

Ashurst	Ferris	La Follette	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Simmons
Black	Gerry	McNary	Stephens
Blaine	Glass	Mayfield	Swanson
Bratton	Harris	Neely	Thomas
Bruce	Harrison	Norbeck	Trammell
Capper	Hawes	Nye	Tydings
Caraway	Hayden	Overman	Tyson
Copeland	Heflin	Pittman	Wagner
Couzens	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Edwards	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—8

du Pont	Gooding	King	Phipps
George	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.

So the amendment of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. REED of Missouri and Mr. REED of Pennsylvania called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS (when Mr. GEORGE'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). My colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. If my colleague were present he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. KING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the preceding vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS'S name was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair as on the previous vote, I withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WHEELER (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Montana was called). My colleague is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—56

Ashurst	Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ind.
Barkley	Edwards	Kendrick	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	La Follette	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McKellar	Simmons
Blaine	Frazier	McMaster	Stephens
Bratton	Gerry	McNary	Swanson
Brookhart	Glass	Mayfield	Thomas
Bruce	Harris	Neely	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Tyson
Copeland	Hayden	Overman	Wagner
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Willis

NAYS—30

Bingham	Goff	Oddie	Smoot
Blease	Gould	Pine	Steck
Borah	Greene	Ransdell	Steiwer
Broussard	Hale	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Deneen	Keyes	Sackett	Waterman
Edge	McLean	Schall	Watson
Fess	Metcalf	Shortridge	
Gillett	Moses	Smith	

NOT VOTING—8

du Pont	Gooding	King	Phipps
George	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.

So Senate Resolution 2 as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas on the 17th day of May, 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to investigate and determine the improper use of money to promote the nomination or election of persons to the United States Senate, and the employment of certain other corrupt and unlawful means to secure such nomination or election; and

Whereas said committee, in the discharge of its duties, notified WILLIAM S. VARE, of Pennsylvania, then a candidate for the United States Senate from that State, of its proceeding, and the said WILLIAM S. VARE appeared in person and by attorney before said committee while it was engaged in making such investigation; and

Whereas the said committee has reported the evidence which without substantial dispute shows that at the primary election at which the said WILLIAM S. VARE is alleged to have been nominated as a candidate for the United States Senate there were numerous and various instances of fraud and corruption in behalf of the candidacy of the said WILLIAM S. VARE, and that there was spent in behalf of the said WILLIAM S. VARE in said primary election, by the said WILLIAM S. VARE and his friends, a sum of money exceeding $785,000; and

Whereas the said WILLIAM S. VARE has in no manner controverted the truth of the foregoing facts, although full and complete opportunity was given him, not only to present evidence but arguments in his behalf; and

Whereas the said official report of said committee and the sworn evidence taken by said committee is now and for many months has been on file in the Senate, and all of the said facts appear without substantial dispute; and

Whereas on the 10th day of January, 1927, there was filed in the Senate an official communication from the then Governor of Pennsylvania, made and delivered to the Senate in pursuance of law, the following certificate:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, January 8, 1927.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the returns of the election of United States Senator, held on November 2, 1926, as the law of this Commonwealth directs.

I have the honor also to inform you that I have to-day signed and by registered mail delivered to Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE a certificate, which is as follows:

"To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the face of the returns filed in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth of the election held on the 2d day of November, 1926, WILLIAM S. VARE appears to have been chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1927."

The form of words customarily used for such certificates by the governors of this Commonwealth and the form recommended by the Senate of the United States both include certification that the candidate in question has been "duly chosen by the qualified electors" of the Commonwealth.

I can not so certify, because I do not believe that Mr. VARE has been duly chosen. On the contrary, I am convinced, and have repeatedly declared, that his nomination was partly bought and partly stolen, and that frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election. But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated can not be honestly entitled to a seat.

The stealing of votes for Mr. VARE, and the amount and the sources of the money spent in his behalf, make it clear to me that the election returns do not in fact correctly represent the will of the sovereign voters of Pennsylvania.

Therefore, I have so worded the certificate required by law that I can sign it without distorting the truth.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Very respectfully yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT, *Governor.*

Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the expenditure of such a large sum of money to secure the nomination of the said WILLIAM S. VARE as a candidate for the United States Senate prima facie is contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, and, together with the charges of corruption and fraud made in the report of said committee, and substantiated by the evidence taken by said committee, and the charges of corruption and fraud officially made by the Governor of Pennsylvania, prima facie taints with fraud and corruption the credentials of the said WILLIAM S. VARE for a seat in the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the claim of the said WILLIAM S. VARE to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the said special committee of the Senate, with instructions to grant such further hearing to the said WILLIAM S. VARE and to take such further evidence on its own motion as shall be proper in the premises, and to report to the Senate within 60 days if practicable; and that until the coming in of the report of said committee and until the final action of the Senate thereon the said WILLIAM S. VARE be, and he is hereby, denied a seat in the United States Senate: *Provided*, That the said WILLIAM S. VARE shall be accorded the privileges of the floor of the Senate for the purpose of being heard touching his right to receive the oath of office and to membership in the Senate.

The preamble as modified was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, in my remarks a day or two ago I made a statement concerning the judge who had passed on the application for ballots. I find that I was in error. The case was heard by Judge Thompson. The error arose from the fact that I had been informed it was to go to Judge Kirkpatrick, and I believe it was at one time so assigned that it would have gone to him. My information was to that effect. I gladly make this statement of correction. I would have made it yesterday, but overlooked it.

INVESTIGATION OF MEXICAN PROPAGANDA

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I rise to a question of the highest possible privilege. It has nothing whatever to do with the matter just adjudicated by the Senate.

In to-day's issue of the Washington Herald occurs this headline:

One million two hundred and fifteen thousand dollars ordered paid four Senators by Mexico.

In the same newspaper appears what purports to be a photographic copy of a letter authorizing the payment of $1,200,000 to three persons whose names are marked out from the photograph, but who are represented to be United States Senators. Underneath that photograph occur these words in English:

Here is an order of treasurer general of Mexico authorizing chief clerk of the controller's department to forward $1,200,000 to nigh personages in United States. In this facsimile, the original of which is in the possession of the Hearst newspapers, the names of the three alleged beneficiaries are deleted. Their names and the amount ordered paid to them remain in the original document.

A translation of this photograph likewise is printed in the same newspaper, and the letter there in translation reads as follows:

TO THE CHIEF CLERK OF THE CONTROLLER'S DEPARTMENT:

By direction of the Citizen President of the Republic you will please order the passage of expediente No. 14396, corresponding to authorization No. 3481, issued by the Presidency of the Republic in favor of the citizen, Arturo M. Elias, financial agent of Mexico in New York, for the sum of $1,200,000 (one million two hundred thousand dollars), to be charged to secret expenditures for pro-Mexican propaganda, to be paid in the following form:

To Mr. ———, $350,000.
To Mr. ———, $500,000.
To Mr. ———, $350,000.

The total of which our said financial agent has duly delivered (or will deliver) without exacting the corresponding receipts, given the honorability and high personality of the recipients.

It is therefore ordered by superior authority that this expediente pass the auditing department without the corresponding requisites of law.

EFFECTIVE SUFFRAGE NO REELECTION.

L. MONTES DE OCA,
The Comptroller General.

MEXICO, D. F., *July 15, 1926.*

Then there is a note seeming to indicate apparently the initials of the stenographer, and underneath that translation appears in parentheses the following:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The names deleted from the foregoing text are those of United States Senators.)

On the second page of the same newspaper appear other photographs, and one of them, of which I do not find the translation, is apparently a report of expenditures made, and shows the expenditure of $1,200,000 as having been made on August 4, 1926, to three persons whose names are similarly deleted in the photograph, but underneath the photograph are these words, evidently written in by some one on the newspaper:

This is a facsimile of an actual ledger sheets from the Mexican treasury department records, showing the transfer of $1,200,000 to Elias, the financial agent in New York. The names of the men purported to be beneficiaries (deleted above) are those of United States Senators.

I will not stop to read the other translations and letters, but they appear at first sight to confirm the inference deducible from the letters I have already read.

Mr. President, as long as that story appears in print untested, uninvestigated, undenied, the honor of every Member of this body is at stake. A cloud is cast upon the integrity of every man who sits as a Member of the United States Senate, and as a matter of the highest privilege, not only personally to myself but to every other Member of the Senate, I offer the following resolution and ask that it be read, and I shall ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 7), as follows:

Whereas the Washington Herald, a newspaper published in Washington, D. C., in its issue of December 9, 1927, publishes photographic copy of a letter purporting to evidence the payment of large sums of money to three Senators of the United States, by the Government of the Republic of Mexico, for the purpose of influencing their official action, and publishes also a purported translation of said letter, as follows:

TO THE CHIEF CLERK OF THE CONTROLLER'S DEPARTMENT:

By direction of the Citizen President of the Republic you will please order the passage of expediente No. 14396, corresponding to authorization No. 3481, issued by the Presidency of the Republic in favor of the citizen, Arturo M. Elias, financial agent of Mexico in New York, for the sum of $1,200,000, to be charged to secret expenditures for pro-Mexican propaganda, to be paid in the following form:

To Mr. ———, $350,000.
To Mr. ———, $500,000.
To Mr. ———, $350,000.

The total of which our said financial agent has duly delivered (or will deliver) without exacting the corresponding receipts, given the honorability and high personality of the recipients.

It is therefore ordered by superior authority that this expediente pass the auditing department without the corresponding requisites of law.

EFFECTIVE SUFFRAGE NO REELECTION.

L. MONTES DE OCA,
The Comptroller General.

MEXICO, D. F., *July 15, 1926.*

DR-LMdeO.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The names deleted from the foregoing text are those of United States Senators.)

Now therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators shall be forthwith appointed by the President of the Senate; and the said committee is hereby authorized and instructed immediately to investigate what moneys, rewards, or things of value have been given, promised, or offered to any Senator or Senators of the United States by any government or official of any foreign power for the purpose of propaganda or the purpose of influencing the official act of such Senator or Senators.

Said committee is hereby empowered to sit and act at such time or times and at such place or places as it may deem necessary; to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents, and to do such other acts as may be necessary in the matter of said investigation.

The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee willfully makes default or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Said committee shall promptly report to the Senate the facts by it ascertained.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In order to avoid any possible question as to a point of order, I think it would be wise if I were to perfect the resolution by striking out the authorization for expenditures. That can be taken care of later by another resolution. I will strike out the authorization for the payment of expenses out of the contingent fund.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether there is any reason given in The Herald for the deletion of the names of the Senators?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No reason is suggested in that part of the article which I have read in the short time I have been able to devote to it.

Mr. GLASS. Why modify the resolution? Why does the Senator assume that any Senator would raise the point of order?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is a matter of statute, as I am informed. I do not want to expose it to any possible invalidity because of conflict with the general statute providing for its reference to a committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senate can later authorize the expenditure of the necessary funds.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We can do it this afternoon.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We can do it this afternoon after we get the appointment of a committee.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator state the date when the alleged payments were made?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The date of the ledger entry appears to be August 4, 1926. I see no evidence in the paper, so far as I have read it, of any payment, but only the assertion of some agent that he has made it. That is one of the matters which it seems to me ought to be investigated without the loss of a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as the committee the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. REED; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. ROBINSON; the Senator from Washington, Mr. JONES; the Senator from Maryland, Mr. BRUCE; and the Senator from California, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate reading of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 8) as follows:

Resolved, That the special Senate committee created pursuant to Resolution 7 agreed to this day is authorized to employ stenographic assistance, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings and proceedings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee and such clerical or other assistance as may be deemed necessary by the committee, that all expenses incurred, including costs of travel by the committee or their assistants, in furtherance of the purposes of said resolution, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers properly approved. The cost of this investigation shall not exceed $25,000.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. KEYES subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to submit a report at this time on the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEYES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution No. 8 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course it will be understood that the provision in regard to the cost of stenographic reporting work will be the same as is customarily made?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is all in the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. If that provision is in the resolution, I have no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 9), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 17 Senators.

Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 19 Senators.

Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to consist of five Senators, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same.

Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 15 Senators.

Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 11 Senators.

Committee on Claims, to consist of 13 Senators.

Committee on Commerce, to consist of 19 Senators.

Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 13 Senators.

Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 11 Senators.

Committee on Enrolled Bills, to consist of three Senators, which shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and which, or some one of which, shall examine all bills or joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and when signed by the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 7 Senators.

Committee on Finance, to consist of 20 Senators.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 18 Senators.

Committee on Immigration, to consist of 11 Senators.

Committee on Indian Affairs, to consist of 13 Senators.

Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to consist of 11 Senators.

Committee on Interstate Commerce, to consist of 19 Senators.

Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to consist of 15 Senators.

Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 17 Senators.

Committee on the Library, to consist of 7 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

Committee on Manufactures, to consist of 11 Senators.

Committee on Military Affairs, to consist of 17 Senators.

Committee on Mines and Mining, to consist of 11 Senators.

Committee on Naval Affairs, to consist of 17 Senators.

Committee on Patents, to consist of 7 Senators.

Committee on Pensions, to consist of 13 Senators.

Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to consist of 18 Senators.

Committee on Printing, to consist of 7 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

Committee on Privileges and Elections, to consist of 15 Senators.

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of 15 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to consist of 15 Senators.

Committee on Rules, to consist of 13 Senators.

Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, to consist of 15 Senators.

INVESTIGATION OF ELECTION EXPENDITURES

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and to have it immediately considered. I think it will lead to no debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be reported.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 10), as follows:

Resolved, That a resolution of the United States Senate, agreed to on May 19, 1926, numbered Senate Resolution 195, of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, creating a special committee to investigate expenditures in senatorial primary and general elections, and all subsequent resolutions dealing with the said special committee and agreed to by the United States Senate during the Sixty-ninth Congress (to wit, S. Res. 227, S. Res. 258, and S. Res. 324), have continued in full force and operation since the dates of their respective enactment by the Senate, and do now, as then, express the will of this body.

And that the said special committee appointed pursuant to said Senate Resolution 195 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, shall continue to execute the directions of the said several resolutions relating to the said committee until the Senate accepts or rejects the final report of the said special committee or otherwise orders.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have not had a chance to see it. Will the Senator let it go over under the rule and call it up later?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I could, but the Senate is here and acting on these matters. I will tell the Senator what it is. It simply reaffirms the powers of the committee and continues them without in any manner enlarging them.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator permit me five minutes to look at the resolution?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well; I will withhold it.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: Does the Senator from Missouri withdraw his resolution?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Senators are examining it. I think they will grant consent to have it considered at this time.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am very glad to offer no opposition to a resolution which will revive the special committee headed by my friend from Missouri and give it all the authority that it had during the last session, but the resolution which he has presented recites as a matter of history that the committee has continued in full force since the adoption of the original resolution. To that I can not subscribe, because I do not believe it is so. To the remainder of it, however, I have no disagreement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator give his consent for its present consideration?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. So long as the provision to which I have referred remains in it——

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will not take one line out of it unless the Senate takes it out.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Then I ask that the resolution may go over under the rule.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. The responsibility, then, for the loss of three days of time again rests upon the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senate is here; the resolution is simple and plain; it requires no debate; every Senator will understand it when he hears it read; and if the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to lose three days more after having insisted on the proceedings being shortened and early reports being made he can take the responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, a parlimentary inquiry. Is it now in order to introduce bills?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Bills can not be introduced except by unanimous consent until the next morning hour.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that all Senators be authorized to introduce bills at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that all public bills may be introduced at this time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 656) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, as amended;

A bill (S. 657) to amend paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 13 of the interstate commerce act; and

A bill (S. 658) to amend paragraph (18) of section 1 of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 659) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," approved November 9, 1921, known as the Federal highway act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 660) authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to purchase a tract of land, with sufficient water right attached, for the use and occupancy of the Temoak Band of homeless Indians, located at Ruby Valley, Nev.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 661) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Ely, Nev.;

A bill (S. 662) to increase limit of cost heretofore affixed by Congress for purchase of site and erection of building for use of post office at Fallon, Nev.; and

A bill (S. 663) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Tonopah, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 664) for the relief of Navy personnel and civilian employees of the Navy who suffered loss of household and personal effects due to the earthquake and fire in Japan in September, 1923; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 665) to authorize an exchange of lands with Eva Allred and William M. Horton; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 666) for increasing the efficiency of Army bands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 667) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 668) amending section 1 of the interstate commerce act; and

A bill (S. 669) for the protection of persons employed on railway baggage cars, railway express cars, and railway express-baggage cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 670) to permit rural letter carriers to act as agents or solicitors outside of their hours of employment; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 671) to find markets and to provide credits for financing the exportation of surplus agricultural products, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 672) for the purpose of rehabilitating farm lands in the flood areas;

A bill (S. 673) to amend section 6 of the act of May 29, 1884, entitled "An Act for the establishment of a bureau of animal industry, etc."; and

A bill (S. 674) to find markets and to provide credits for financing the exportation of surplus agricultural products, to authorize the payment of bounties on exports of agricultural surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 675) to establish the Mena National Park in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 676) to create a Board of Industrial Adjustments and to define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 677) to authorize an appropriation of $15,000 for use in dredging Ouachita River between Arkadelphia and Camden, Ark.;

A bill (S. 678) to amend the act approved March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to continue the improvement of the Mississippi River and for the control of its floods" (Public, No. 528, 67th Cong.);

A bill (S. 679) to provide for the improvement of Ouachita River; and

A bill (S. 680) to authorize the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Garland City, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 681) to provide for the erection of a public building at El Dorado, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 682) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Monticello, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 683) extending the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission for the purposes of flood prevention and control; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to George W. Robinson; and

A bill (S. 685) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Garen; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 686) for the relief of H. L. Remmel;

A bill (S. 687) for the relief of Emma Fein;

A bill (S. 688) for the relief of the city of Fordyce, Ark.;

A bill (S. 689) for the relief of the heirs of Morgan Smith, jr.;

A bill (S. 690) for the relief of James W. Green, jr.;

A bill (S. 691) for the relief of William Ramsey and others;

A bill (S. 692) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of W. W. Busby, administrator of the estate of Evelina V. Busby, deceased, against the United States; and

A bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Arkansas; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 694) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 695) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended;

A bill (S. 696) to reduce the membership of the Tariff Commission and to provide for the disqualification of members of said commission in certain cases;

A bill (S. 697) for the relief of Melvin L. Bowman; and

A bill (S. 698) to convey to the Big Rock Stone Co. a portion of the hospital reservation of the United States Veterans' Hospital No. 78 (Fort Logan H. Roots), in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 699) to repeal section 466 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico and Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 700) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to execute an agreement with the middle Rio Grande conservancy district providing for conservation, irrigation, drainage, and flood control for the Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 701) to establish a department of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 702) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911, as amended February 7, 1920; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 703) to establish the Bear River migratory-bird refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 704) to authorize the President to investigate the potential utilization of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 705) to provide compulsory licenses for unused patents; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 706) authorizing the construction of public buildings and the purchase of sites for public buildings in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 707) to cede unreserved nonmineral public lands to the several States; and

A bill (S. 708) to provide for the establishment and maintenance under the Bureau of Mines of a research station at Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 709) for the relief of the Uintah and White River Tribes of Ute Indians of Utah; and

A bill (S. 710) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the northwestern bands of Shoshone Indians may have against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 711) providing for the withdrawal of the United States from the Philippine Islands; and

A bill (S. 712) to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

A bill (S. 713) to authorize the issuance of patent for lands containing gold, silver, cinnabar, lead, tin, copper, or other valuable deposits, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 714) to amend the enlarged homestead laws by increasing the unit of entry and by abolishing the requirement of residence; and

A bill (S. 715) to amend sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes prescribing the method of obtaining patent to mining claims; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 716) to exempt American Indians born in Canada and American Indians born in Mexico of tribes formerly settled in the United States from the operation of the immigration act of 1924;

A bill (S. 717) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 718) to authorize the naturalization of aliens who entered the United States prior to May 26, 1924; referred to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 719) to amend the act approved March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 720) to enroll as citizens of the Choctaw Nation, Daisy Crockett Coleman, Agnes Irene Coleman, and Verna Ruth Coleman, of Hillsboro, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 721) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 722) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fourth judicial circuit, for the appointment of additional district judges for certain districts, providing for an annual conference of certain judges, and for other purposes," approved September 14, 1922, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 723) authorizing the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Joseph H. Landrum, a first lieutenant of Field Artillery in the Regular Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 724) to amend paragraphs 18, 19, and 20 of section 400 of the transportation act, approved February 28, 1920, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 725) to authorize the designation of depositories for public documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 726) to make it the duty of certain courts of the United States to render decisions within certain maximum limits of time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 727) authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 728) to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 729) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment;

A bill (S. 730) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant and convey to the city of Vancouver a perpetual easement for public highway purposes over and upon a portion of Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation, in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 731) defining the official salute to the flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 732) to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of section 4 of an act entitled "An act to revise and equalize rates of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the war with Mexico, to certain widows, including widows of the War of 1812, former widows, dependent parents, and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to certain Army nurses, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases," approved May 1, 1920; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 733) to aid in the erection of a monument to Indian Timothy at his grave near Alpowa, Asotin County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 734) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to grant to the State of Washington certain lands within the national forest reserves within the State of Washington in lieu of lands of which the State of Washington was deprived by Supreme Court decision on October 13, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 735) authorizing the conversion of the United States Veterans' Hospital No. 94, at American Lake, Wash., from a neuro-psychopathic hospital into a general medical and surgical hospital, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 736) placing postmasters under the civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 737) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 738) releasing and granting to the State of Washington any right, title, and interest of the United States in an island near the mouth of the Columbia River, commonly known as Sand Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 739) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 740) to amend the act of February 12, 1925 (Public, No. 402, 68th Cong.), so as to permit the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians to file suit in the Court of Claims under said act; and

A bill (S. 741) relating to contracts dealing with real estate on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 742) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 743) to make possible private ownership and operation by citizens of the United States of America of vessels operated in foreign trade;

A bill (S. 744) to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 745) to authorize the establishment of a fisheries experiment station on the coast of Washington;

A bill (S. 746) to amend section 4404 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved July 2, 1918, placing the supervising inspectors of the Steamboat Inspection Service under the classified civil service; and

A bill (S. 747) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Kettle Falls, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 748) giving preference to domestic materials in contracts and purchases for naval purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 749) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 750) to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 751) to provide more effectively for the national defense by authorizing an increase in the number of Reserve Officers' Training Corps units for the Air Corps of the United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 752) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended;

A bill (S. 753) to amend section 35 of the organic act approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes";

A bill (S. 754) for the relief of certain Porto Rican taxpayers;

A bill (S. 755) providing for the biennial appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands;

A bill (S. 756) to provide for the disposition of moneys collected as taxes upon articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands; and

A bill (S. 757) to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 758) declaring the quartermaster's volunteers to be held and considered a part of the United States Army in the Civil War and to be classified as quartermaster's volunteers, United States Volunteers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 759) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to make and publish rules in common-law actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 760) granting the consent of Congress to the Ashland Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; and

A bill (S. 761) granting the consent of Congress to Dwight P. Robinson & Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PINE:

A bill (S. 762) providing for the construction of a sanatorium and hospital at Claremore, Okla., and providing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 763) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions; and

A bill (S. 764) for the relief of J. F. Nichols; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 765) authorizing refund to certain railroads on account of interest erroneously collected; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 766) to fix the compensation of registers of local land offices, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 767) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HEFLIN:

A bill (S. 768) to authorize the Alabama Great Southern Railroad Co. to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River, at Epes, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 769) providing that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be appointed from different sections of the United States, and that not more than one member shall be appointed from any one State; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 770) to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery and fish-cultural station in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 771) providing for the loan of the U. S. S. *Dispatch* to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 772) to provide for buying, storing, processing, and marketing agricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce and especially for thus handling the exportable surplus of agriculture in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 773) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 774) to erect a Federal building in the city of Caruthersville, Mo., on the site now owned by the United States Government;

A bill (S. 775) to erect a Federal building in the city of Farmington, Mo., on the site now owned by the United States Government; and

A bill (S. 776) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Fredericktown, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 777) making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 778) to erect a Federal building in the city of Lamar, Mo., on the site now owned by the United States Government; and

A bill (S. 779) to erect a Federal building in the city of West Plains, Mo., on the site now owned by the United States Government; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLEASE:

A bill (S. 780) to regulate the employment of certain persons by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

A bill (S. 781) requiring separate accommodations for white and colored passengers on street cars in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 782) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 783) to regulate the voting of aliens who become American citizens;

A bill (S. 784) to prohibit the intermarriage of certain races;

A bill (S. 785) to enforce the laws of the United States without fear or favor or partiality; and

A bill (S. 786) to prevent double prosecution for the same offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 787) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Hastings (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Kammacher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 789) to amend the merchant marine act, 1920, approved June 5, 1920, by insuring the exemption from income taxes during the 10-year period there provided of profits on the sale of certain vessels when the proceeds of such sales are invested in new American vessels approved by the Shipping Board; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 790) providing for the promotion of certain noncommissioned officers in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 791) to incorporate the Federal reserve retirement fund, to define its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

A bill (S. 792) allowing claims for the recovery of taxes paid on distilled spirits in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 793) to remit the duty on a carillon of bells imported for Grace Church, Plainfield, N. J.; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 794) for the relief of Patrick J. Purcell; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 795) granting a pension to George W. Stout (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 796) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 797) granting the consent of Congress to the J. K. Mahone Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River;

A bill (S. 798) granting the consent of Congress to the R. V. Reger Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; and

A bill (S. 799) granting the consent of Congress to the T. W. Arnette Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 800) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in coal and to promote the general welfare dependent on the use of coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 801) to place Dr. Charles H. DeLancey on the retired list of the Navy as a lieutenant commander;

A bill (S. 802) for the relief of Frank Hanley;

A bill (S. 803) for the relief of Byron Brown Ralston; and

A bill (S. 804) for the relief of Frank Hanley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 805) donating Revolutionary cannon to the New York State conservation department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 806) for the transportation of foreign mails of the United States, the creation and maintenance of auxiliaries for the use of the Army and Navy, the defense of the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 807) to prohibit the transmission of certain matter through the mails, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 808) to establish a separate classification of mail matter and more equitable postal rates for books; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 809) to establish a council of universities and colleges in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 810) to reduce passport fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 811) to provide for regulating traffic in certain clinical thermometers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 812) to provide for research into the causes of poultry diseases, for feeding experimentation, and for an educational program to show the best means of controlling and preventing disease in poultry; and

A bill (S. 813) to retard the extermination of migratory game and legitimate sport by the reduction of bag limits and open seasons; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 814) to rearrange and reconstruct the Senate wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 815) awarding a congressional medal of honor to Lincoln Ellsworth; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 816) to amend section 2169 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, in respect of the definition of a white person; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 817) to encourage home ownership and to stimulate the buying and building of homes; to create a standard form of investment based on building-association mortgages; to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States; to furnish a market for Government bonds; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 818) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the department of conservation; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 819) defining the policy of Congress with respect to flood control, the protection and improvement of navigation, and conservation upon and along the Mississippi River, its tributaries, inlets, and outlets, consolidating certain Government activities with respect to such flood control and protection and improvement of navigation, creating the Mississippi Valley waters control commission, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 820) granting the consent of Congress to R. A. Breuer, H. L. Stolte, John M. Schermann, O. F. Nienhueser, Charles A. Egley, and George C. Eberlin, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; and

A bill (S. 821) granting the consent of Congress to O. F. Schulte, E. H. Otto, O. W. Arcularius, J. L. Calvin, and J. H. Dickbrader, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 822) to amend section 552 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 823) to divest articles made with convict labor of their character as subjects of interstate or foreign commerce; and

A bill (S. 824) to amend the interstate commerce act, being "An act to regulate commerce," as amended July 29, 1906; April 13, 1908; June 13, 1910; February 17, 1917; March 2, 1917; May 29, 1917; August 10, 1917; and February 28, 1920, by providing a more adequate system of regulation for the railroads of the United States through an extension of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the creation of seven regional commissions to cooperate with and assist the Interstate Commerce Commission in the performance of its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 825) to amend the Federal corrupt practices act, 1925, approved February 28, 1925, by prohibiting the acceptance of certain contributions, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 826) to prohibit the acceptance by any person of certain contributions for the purpose of influencing Congress as to legislation or other matters; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 827) to amend the national prohibition act, as supplemented, to conform with the eighteenth constitutional amendment by limiting the prohibition to intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes;

A bill (S. 828) to amend the national prohibition act, as supplemented, to conform with the eighteenth constitutional amendment by permitting the use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes;

A bill (S. 829) to amend the act of February 11, 1924, entitled "An act to equip the United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., for the manufacture of supplies for the use of the Government, for the compensation of prisoners for their labor, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 830) to repeal an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 831) extending the time for awarding medals of honor, distinguished-service crosses, and distinguished-service medals, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 832) relative to the acquisition of oil lands by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 833) to amend section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920;

A bill (S. 834) prohibiting the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia from fixing rates of fare for the street-railway companies in the District of Columbia at rates in excess of those stipulated in their charters; and

A bill (S. 835) prohibiting the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia from fixing rates of fare for the street-railway companies in the District of Columbia at rates in excess of those stipulated in their charters; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 836) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept certain decorations conferred upon them by the Government of Greece; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 837) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 838) to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State educational and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 839) to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 840) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved June 10, 1920, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 841) to amend the act entitled "An act to pension soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China relief expedition," approved June 5, 1920; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 842) to amend the corrupt practices act; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 843) to amend Title II of an act approved February 28, 1925, regulating postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 844) to change the title of Deputy Assistant Treasurer of the United States to Assistant Treasurer of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 845) regarding the education and naturalization of aliens and the children of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 846) to provide for the relief of certain employees of the Government who have become eligible for retirement under the provisions of the retirement act of May 22, 1920, and have thereafter been continued in the service or reemployed therein; and

A bill (S. 847) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 848) to amend section 648 of the Revised Statutes regulating the procedure in civil and criminal cases triable by jury;

A bill (S. 849) to amend section 725 of the Revised Statutes to provide a jury trial in cases of contempt committed outside the presence of the court;

A bill (S. 850) to incorporate the International Association of Rotary Clubs, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 851) to amend an act of Congress approved July 3, 1926, being private act No. 272, and entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Federal District Court for the Western Division of the Western District of Tennessee to hear and determine claims arising from the sinking of the vessel known as the *Norman*"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 852) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920;

A bill (S. 853) to equalize the promotion list of the Regular Army;

A bill (S. 854) to authorize the reinstatement of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors to former positions in Government service and restoration to eligible register of the names of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors;

A bill (S. 855) relative to discharges of certain soldiers and sailors who served in the war with Germany;

A bill (S. 856) authorizing the acquisition of land and suitably marking the site of the Battle of Franklin, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 857) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sergt. Alvin C. York as a captain in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list;

A bill (S. 858) reappointing Edgar C. Campbell as pay clerk in Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with rank of second lieutenant; and

A bill (S. 859) to provide for the paving of the Government road extending from St. Elmo, Tenn., to Rossville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 860) allowing credit to postal and substitute postal employees for time served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States;

A bill (S. 861) providing additional compensation to certain employees of the Post Office Department for overtime service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 862) for the purchase of a post-office site and the erection thereon of a suitable public building at Dickson, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 863) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Kingsport, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 864) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Trenton, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 865) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at McMinnville, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 866) for the purchase of a post-office site at Dickson, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 867) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ripley, Tenn.; and

A bill (S. 868) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Milan, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH:

A bill (S. 869) to amend section 24 of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 870) to amend and reenact the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 871) to establish a national institute of health, to authorize increased appropriations for the Hygienic Laboratory, and to authorize the Government to accept donations for use in ascertaining the cause, prevention, and cure of disease affecting human beings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 872) to standardize bales of cotton and requiring sale of cotton by the true net weight of bale; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 873) for the relief of Henry and William King; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 874) for the relief of Lillie Calvin Schooley; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 875) granting renewal and extension of patent to C. B. Haldeman; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 876) for the relief of William Whan; and

A bill (S. 877) for the relief of Henry C. Burns; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 878) for the relief of John Minister;

A bill (S. 879) for the relief of Elie Rivers;

A bill (S. 880) for the relief of Charles Rayfield;

A bill (S. 881) for the relief of Alfred Rebsamen;

A bill (S. 882) for the relief of Thomas J. Temple;

A bill (S. 883) for the relief of Harry Wingrove;

A bill (S. 884) to correct the military record of Sidney F. Jones;

A bill (S. 885) for the relief of Helen Comer;

A bill (S. 886) for the relief of James G. Buchanan;

A bill (S. 887) for the relief of Will Foring Brown;

A bill (S. 888) for the relief of Sylvester P. Hill;

A bill (S. 889) for the relief of Harry Hume Ainsworth;

A bill (S. 890) authorizing the appointment of William H. Armstrong as captain of Infantry, United States Army;

A bill (S. 891) to correct the military record of James Coughlin;

A bill (S. 892) for the relief of William H. Gage;

A bill (S. 893) to correct the military record of Hiram B. Hatton;

A bill (S. 894) for the relief of Abner W. Loomis; and

A bill (S. 895) for the relief of Wilson Warford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 896) for the relief of Adaline White;

A bill (S. 897) for the relief of Elizabeth Jane Ann West;

A bill (S. 898) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Humphrey M. Woodyard;

A bill (S. 899) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Jacob Samuel Weaver;

A bill (S. 900) for the relief of Fritz R. White;

A bill (S. 901) for the relief of Hazel E. Simms;
A bill (S. 902) for the relief of Eliza Sturgess;
A bill (S. 903) for the relief of Mrs. Theodore Sharp;
A bill (S. 904) for the relief of Rosa E. Plummer;
A bill (S. 905) for the relief of Thomas W. Morgan;
A bill (S. 906) for the relief of John W. Millar;
A bill (S. 907) for the relief of the estate of John McQuiddy, deceased;
A bill (S. 908) for the relief of Ralph Laymon;
A bill (S. 909) for the relief of Stanton and Jones;
A bill (S. 910) for the relief of John L. Hays;
A bill (S. 911) for the relief of Joseph Edmund Hanlon;
A bill (S. 912) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Lewis H. Gest;
A bill (S. 913) for the relief of James Davidson;
A bill (S. 914) for the relief of Claude Chandler;
A bill (S. 915) for the relief of Urith Hanna Culp;
A bill (S. 916) for the relief of R. W. Branson;
A bill (S. 917) for the relief of James Blakeman;
A bill (S. 918) for the relief of Sarah C. Brooks; and
A bill (S. 919) for the relief of Viola Addis; to Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 920) granting a pension to John H. Kane;
A bill (S. 921) granting a pension to Malinda Kiniston;
A bill (S. 922) granting an increase of pension to William E. Kratzer;
A bill (S. 923) granting a pension to Samuel D. Jarman;
A bill (S. 924) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilton;
A bill (S. 925) granting a pension to Eva Hood S. Watson;
A bill (S. 926) granting a pension to Arabella Williams;
A bill (S. 927) granting a pension to Katharine S. White;
A bill (S. 928) granting a pension to Emma Webb;
A bill (S. 929) granting a pension to Richard Perry Watkins;
A bill (S. 930) granting a pension to Martha E. Ward;
A bill (S. 931) granting an increase of pension to Mattie B. Wintrode;
A bill (S. 932) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Waller;
A bill (S. 933) granting a pension to Charlotte Ann Ury;
A bill (S. 934) granting a pension to Martha C. Tuttle;
A bill (S. 935) granting an increase of pension to John Siddle Thompson;
A bill (S. 936) granting a pension to Mary J. Thompson;
A bill (S. 937) granting a pension to Samuel Thompson;
A bill (S. 938) granting a pension to David S. Toland;
A bill (S. 939) granting a pension to Sue C. Tozier;
A bill (S. 940) granting an increase of pension to Minerva E. Stearns;
A bill (S. 941) granting a pension to Polk Steele;
A bill (S. 942) granting a pension to William Sommers;
A bill (S. 943) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Southard;
A bill (S. 944) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Smith;
A bill (S. 945) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Stebbins;
A bill (S. 946) granting a pension to Charles C. Spencer;
A bill (S. 947) granting a pension to Katherine Stapleton;
A bill (S. 948) granting a pension to Amanda Shannon;
A bill (S. 949) granting a pension to Nancy K. Sadler;
A bill (S. 950) granting a pension to Tillie M. Smith;
A bill (S. 951) granting a pension to Della E. Sanneman;
A bill (S. 952) granting a pension to John Thomas Snodgrass;
A bill (S. 953) granting a pension to Hattie H. Skuse;
A bill (S. 954) granting a pension to Hester A. Record or Ricketts;
A bill (S. 955) granting a pension to Melvina Roberson;
A bill (S. 956) granting a pension to M. L. Ralston;
A bill (S. 957) granting a pension to Mary F. Robinson;
A bill (S. 958) granting a pension to Arthur G. Reed;
A bill (S. 959) granting a pension to Sarah E. Ross;
A bill (S. 960) granting an increase of pension to John E. Pickard;
A bill (S. 961) granting a pension to Eva L. Powell;
A bill (S. 962) granting a pension to Albert F. Ponath;
A bill (S. 963) granting a pension to John T. Peet;
A bill (S. 964) granting a pension to Edith H. Peters;
A bill (S. 965) granting a pension to Henry Philipps;
A bill (S. 966) granting an increase of pension to Juna Powell;
A bill (S. 967) granting an increase of pension to Alexander C. Powell;
A bill (S. 968) granting an increase of pension to John Osborn;
A bill (S. 969) for the relief of Ellen Oglesby;
A bill (S. 970) granting a pension to Ellen O'Donnell;
A bill (S. 971) granting a pension to Janama Oldham;
A bill (S. 972) granting a pension to Alvin E. Owens;
A bill (S. 973) granting a pension to Charles C. Newton;
A bill (S. 974) granting a pension to Alice Noble;
A bill (S. 975) granting an increase of pension to Effie E. Milton;
A bill (S. 976) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Miller;
A bill (S. 977) granting a pension to George A. Morgan;
A bill (S. 978) granting an increase of pension to Frances Edna Morrow;
A bill (S. 979) granting an increase of pension to William J. Mester;
A bill (S. 980) granting a pension to Rhoda Mecklin;
A bill (S. 981) granting a pension to Nancy Monroe;
A bill (S. 982) granting an increase of pension to Harvey C. Myers;
A bill (S. 983) granting a pension to Charles E. Mann;
A bill (S. 984) granting a pension to James D. Martin;
A bill (S. 985) granting an increase of pension to John W. McAndrew;
A bill (S. 986) granting a pension to Mary J. Miller;
A bill (S. 987) granting a pension to Mary Miller;
A bill (S. 988) granting an increase of pension to Austin L. Myers;
A bill (S. 989) granting a pension to Lizzie Ann Morrison;
A bill (S. 990) granting a pension to James W. Murphy;
A bill (S. 991) granting an increase of pension to Melville C. Mallicoat;
A bill (S. 992) granting a pension to James Mimford;
A bill (S. 993) granting a pension to Rhoda V. Moore;
A bill (S. 994) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Logsdon;
A bill (S. 995) granting an increase of pension to George Taylor Lee and Milton Lee;
A bill (S. 996) granting a pension to Louisa Leppla;
A bill (S. 997) granting a pension to Melissa S. Lemon;
A bill (S. 998) granting an increase of pension to John O. Lind;
A bill (S. 999) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Larson;
A bill (S. 1000) granting a pension to Malinda Johnson;
A bill (S. 1001) granting a pension to Andrew Jordan;
A bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Ray D. Ingersoll;
A bill (S. 1003) granting a pension to Aggie Isince;
A bill (S. 1004) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Humphrey;
A bill (S. 1005) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Highley;
A bill (S. 1006) granting a pension to James Hickson;
A bill (S. 1007) granting an increase of pension to L. M. Hall;
A bill (S. 1008) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Hoover;
A bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Haxton;
A bill (S. 1010) granting a pension to James Hogan;
A bill (S. 1011) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Heiland;
A bill (S. 1012) granting a pension to Margaret Hardesty;
A bill (S. 1013) granting a pension to Mary J. Henry;
A bill (S. 1014) granting a pension to Robert Samuel Harris;
A bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Margaret R. Hull;
A bill (S. 1016) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hamblin;
A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Margaret E. Hutchinson;
A bill (S. 1018) granting a pension to Fannie Howard;
A bill (S. 1019) granting a pension to Harry Hawkes;
A bill (S. 1020) granting a pension to Cordelia Hazen;
A bill (S. 1021) granting a pension to James Hurt;
A bill (S. 1022) granting a pension to Hattie Gunn;
A bill (S. 1023) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Griffith;
A bill (S. 1024) granting a pension to Ethel M. Greer;
A bill (S. 1025) granting a pension to Bridget Garnett;
A bill (S. 1026) granting a pension to Charles Grunert;
A bill (S. 1027) granting an increase of pension to William A. Faulk;
A bill (S. 1028) granting a pension to Mary M. Freiberger;
A bill (S. 1029) granting an increase of pension to Matilda M. Funk;
A bill (S. 1030) granting an increase of pension to William J. Eaton;
A bill (S. 1031) granting a pension to Nannie V. Elliott;

A bill (S. 1032) granting a pension to Anthony Early;
A bill (S. 1033) granting a pension to Sarah Elmore;
A bill (S. 1034) granting an increase of pension to Frank Derflinger;
A bill (S. 1035) granting a pension to Joseph F. Dorgan;
A bill (S. 1036) granting a pension to Jesse Dobyns;
A bill (S. 1037) granting a pension to Sureno Doll;
A bill (S. 1038) granting an increase of pension to James Devine;
A bill (S. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Clifton;
A bill (S. 1040) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Cutbirth;
A bill (S. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Crouch;
A bill (S. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Calahan;
A bill (S. 1043) granting a pension to Pierre L. Curtenius;
A bill (S. 1044) granting a pension to Maggie J. Carr;
A bill (S. 1045) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Corp;
A bill (S. 1046) granting a pension to George Coghill;
A bill (S. 1047) granting a pension to George R. Carver;
A bill (S. 1048) granting a pension to William Bruce;
A bill (S. 1049) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Briggs;
A bill (S. 1050) granting an increase of pension to Ella Bailey;
A bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Lillian Bramun;
A bill (S. 1052) granting an increase of pension to Fermon L. Botkin;
A bill (S. 1053) granting a pension to Emma Braunlich;
A bill (S. 1054) granting a pension to James F. Bierly;
A bill (S. 1055) granting a pension to Emma J. Berry;
A bill (S. 1056) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Burkhart;
A bill (S. 1057) granting a pension to Mary M. Billings;
A bill (S. 1058) granting a pension to John W. Brown;
A bill (S. 1059) granting a pension to George W. Beaty;
A bill (S. 1060) granting a pension to Lucresia Burley;
A bill (S. 1061) granting a pension to Elizabeth D. Burton;
A bill (S. 1062) granting an increase of pension to Clement F. S. Aimes;
A bill (S. 1063) granting a pension to Lemuel Abbott;
A bill (S. 1064) granting a pension to Thomas Anderson;
A bill (S. 1065) granting a pension to Mary E. Allen;
A bill (S. 1066) granting a pension to Sarah M. Anderson;
A bill (S. 1067) granting a pension to Frank J. Andress, alias Frank Smith;
A bill (S. 1068) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda E. Baker (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1069) granting a pension to Mary M. Baldwin (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1070) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Butler (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1071) granting an increase of pension to Elner J. Blake (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1072) granting a pension to Ida Ellen Demo (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1073) granting a pension to Alice N. Dobbins (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Higgins (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1075) granting an increase of pension to James S. Henry (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1076) granting a pension to Jane Holding (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1077) granting a pension to Mary Isabel Lockard (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1078) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. McIlvain (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1079) granting a pension to Maggie Metley (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1080) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Milligan (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1081) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Mintjer (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1082) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Noble (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1083) granting an increase of pension to Ernestine Raub (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1084) granting a pension to Margaret Louise Shannon (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1085) granting a pension to Mary Catherine Stebbins (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1086) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Taylor (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1087) granting a pension to Lorena M. Trump (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1088) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Webb (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1089) granting a pension to Sallie N. Wolfe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1090) to authorize the construction of a highway toll bridge across the Tennessee River in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 1091) for the relief of Rhetta H. Guild; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1092) to authorize the payment of 50 per cent of the proceeds arising from the sale of timber from the national forest reserves in the State of Arkansas to the promotion of agriculture, domestic economy, animal husbandry, and dairying within the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1093) to prevent the sale of cotton and grain in future markets; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1094) to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1095) to require registration of lobbyists, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1096) to define the jurisdiction of courts in the District of Columbia in civil action against Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1097) relating to hotel charges in the district of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1098) to abolish the positions of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and to create that of city manager for the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 1099) regulating street-railroad companies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1100) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Forrest City, Ark.;

A bill (S. 1101) to increase the cost of public building at Russellville, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 1102) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1103) permitting the withdrawal of water from White River, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 1104) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Garland City, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1105) making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the Regular Army Capt. Oliver A. Barber, an officer of the United States Army during the World War, who incurred physical disability in line of duty;

A bill (S. 1106) for the relief of William Sparling; and

A bill (S. 1107) for the relief of Obadiah Simpson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1108) for the relief of Una May Arnold;

A bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Little Rock College, Little Rock, Ark.;

A bill (S. 1110) for the relief of Frank R. Garner, formerly second lieutenant, United States Army;

A bill (S. 1111) for the relief of James F. Dubberly;
A bill (S. 1112) for the relief of Chesley P. Key;
A bill (S. 1113) for the relief of O. H. Chrisp;
A bill (S. 1114) for the relief of James E. Fitzgerald;
A bill (S. 1115) for the relief of Carl L. Moore;
A bill (S. 1116) for the relief of Claude J. Church;
A bill (S. 1117) for the relief of Robert L. Martin;
A bill (S. 1118) for the relief of Mrs. H. J. Munda;
A bill (S. 1119) for the relief of James Rowland;
A bill (S. 1120) for the relief of Ella H. Smith;
A bill (S. 1121) for the relief of Grover Ashley;
A bill (S. 1122) for the relief of S. Davidson & Sons; and

A bill (S. 1123) for the relief of Clarence Winborn; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1124) granting a pension to William A. Lipscomb;
A bill (S. 1125) granting a pension to William A. Lipscomb;
A bill (S. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Holt;

A bill (S. 1127) granting an increase of pension to Martha Burley;

A bill (S. 1128) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lilley; and

A bill (S. 1129) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 1130) granting an increase of pension to Nettie I. Moffatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1131) to encourage and promote the production of livestock in connection with irrigated lands in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1132) for the relief of George Stoll and the heirs of Charles P. Regan, Marshall Turley, Edward Lannigan, James Manley, and John Hunter; and

A bill (S. 1133) for the relief of John F. White and Mary L. White; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1134) to provide for clearing, leveling, and preparing land for irrigation on Federal reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 1135) to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of the Saratoga Reclamation project;

A bill (S. 1136) to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of the Casper-Alcova reclamation project;

A bill (S. 1137) authorizing surveys and investigations to determine feasibility of irrigation project on Powder River in Wyoming; and

A bill (S. 1138) to amend certain laws relating to the submission of proof on entries within reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 1139) making an appropriation for the construction of roads and bridges on the north approach to and within the Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appripriations.

A bill (S. 1140) to amend section 4 of the Federal farm loan act, as amended, March 4, 1923; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 1141) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1142) amending the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), and other acts relating to the Yuma Auxiliary project, Arizona; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 1143) for the relief of Jesse A. Frost; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1144) for the relief of Alfred Cluff and certain other settlers at Forestdale, Apache County, Ariz., who were evicted from their homes by reason of a change in the location of the north boundary of the White Mountain or San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation; and

A bill (S. 1145) to authorize appropriations for the survey, construction, and maintenance of highways on or adjacent to untaxed Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1146) authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street, adjacent to Nogales, Ariz.;

A bill (S. 1147) to provide for the erection of a public building at Prescott, in the State of Arizona; and

A bill (S. 1148) providing for the erection and completion of a public building at Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1149) to establish an agricultural experiment station at Fort Mohave, in the county of Mohave, Ariz.; and

A bill (S. 1150) for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1151) for the relief of John B. Evans; and

A bill (S. 1152) for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1153) to appropriate $200,000 for the survey of public lands in Arizona;

A bill (S. 1154) to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1155) to grant extensions of time under oil and gas permits; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1156) granting a pension to Lois I. Marshall;

A bill (S. 1157) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Canell; and

A bill (S. 1158) granting a pension to Rachel E. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 1159) to amend the United States grain standards act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1160) providing for an emergency, and authorizing and directing the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives by advertising to procure bids to ascertain the time and the cost for the construction of levees for "the lower unit of the initial Riker spillway project for control and utilization of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers," and ramifications, and report to Congress; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 1161) to further amend an act, commonly known as the Elkins Act, entitled "An act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States," approved February 19, 1903, as heretofore amended by an act approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1162) granting the consent of Congress to the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a toll bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.; and

A bill (S. 1163) for the construction of ice piers or ice harbors in the Ohio River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1164) to provide relief for the victims of the airplane accident at Langin Field, Moundsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1165) providing for the erection of a monument over the grave of Patrick Gass, at Brooke Cemetery, Wellsburg, W. Va., a soldier of the War of 1812, and the last surviving member of the Lewis and Clarke Expedition; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1166) granting pensions to the officers and soldiers who served in the West Virginia State troops in the late Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1167) granting military status to field clerks, Signal Service at Large, American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 1168) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the collection and editing of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the national archives," approved March 3, 1925; to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 1169) to create an establishment to be known as the national archives; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1170) granting the consent of Congress to the Maysville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1171) to create a national university at the seat of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1172) to provide for the incorporation of nonprofit, nonsecret, medical or law associations of a national character, formed for professional purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1173) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the International Sunday School Association of America," approved January 31, 1907; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1174) to regulate interstate commerce in articles made by convict labor; and

A bill (S. 1175) to promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 1176) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce;

A bill (S. 1177) to authorize the designation of deputy fiscal or disbursing agents in the Department of Agriculture stationed outside of Washington;

A bill (S. 1178) to promote the agriculture of the United States by expanding in the foreign field the service now rendered by the United States Department of Agriculture in acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1179) to provide for the development of stock-watering places in the Modoc National Forest;

A bill (S. 1180) to increase the proportion of the annual receipts from national forests to be paid to the States for the benefit of the public schools and public roads;

A bill (S. 1181) authorizing an appropriation to be expended under the provisions of section 7 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers" as amended;

A bill (S. 1182) to provide for the naming of certain highways through State and Federal cooperation, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1183) to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1184) authorizing an appropriation of $25,000 for the purchase of the compilation of place names of William G. Steel; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1185) to amend an act entitled "An act declaring pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person nonmailable and providing penalty," approved February 8, 1927; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1186) to provide for the construction of the Deschutes project in Oregon, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1187) to provide for the protection and development of the Umatilla Rapids in the Columbia River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 1188) making appropriation for a loan, reimbursable from tribal assets, to provide capital and credit for the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians having tribal rights on the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon;

A bill (S. 1189) for the determination and payment of certain claims against the Choctaw Indians enrolled as Mississippi Choctaws;

A bill (S. 1190) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appraise tribal property of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1191) to amend an act of March 3, 1885, entitled "An act providing for allotment of lands in severalty to the Indians residing upon the Umatilla Reservation, in the State of Oregon, and granting patents therefor, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1192) relating to the proof of occupancy and possession of public lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1193) granting certain rocks or islands to the State of Oregon for park purposes; and

A bill (S. 1194) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent of certain lands to Truman H. Ide; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1195) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Edward M. Brown;

A bill (S. 1197) for the relief of Clay D. Barhyte; and

A bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Thomas G. Harris; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 1199) authorizing an appropriation to aid in the erection of a statue of Theodore Roosevelt on Battle Rock, in Port Orford Harbor, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1200) for the relief of W. C. Milligan; and

A bill (S. 1201) for the relief of Reed Walworth; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1202) for the relief of Alvin H. Tinker;

A bill (S. 1203) to improve the status of certain retired enlisted men who volunteered for duty and served as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the World War; and

A bill (S. 1204) to establish a military record for Bertrand Thomas Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1205) for the relief of Kate Hatton;

A bill (S. 1206) for the relief of the Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

A bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Alfred O. Huestis;

A bill (S. 1208) for the relief of the estates of Edwin G. Scott, Clyde R. Dindinger, and Ralph R. Fraley;

A bill (S. 1209) for the relief of F. J. Goodenough;

A bill (S. 1210) for the relief of John H. and C. E. Haak;

A bill (S. 1211) for the relief of Clifford J. Sanghove;

A bill (S. 1212) for the relief of J. W. Vandervelden;

A bill (S. 1213) for the relief of Mary M. Jones;

A bill (S. 1214) for the relief of Warren Construction Co.;

A bill (S. 1215) for the relief of Helen F. Griffin;

A bill (S. 1216) for the relief of Mrs. Charles D. Kicher;

A bill (S. 1217) for the relief of Albert Wood;

A bill (S. 1218) for the relief of Lincoln County, Oreg.;

A bill (S. 1219) for the relief of William Mortesen;

A bill (S. 1220) for the relief of John H. Lindstrom; and

A bill (S. 1221) for the relief of Reed Walworth; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1222) granting a pension to Aaron Schollars;

A bill (S. 1223) granting an increase of pension to John R. Ross;

A bill (S. 1224) granting an increase of pension to Belle Bush;

A bill (S. 1225) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Pelton;

A bill (S. 1226) granting an increase of pension to Sadie A. Kemp;

A bill (S. 1227) granting an increase of pension to Ina Sturdevant;

A bill (S. 1228) granting a pension to William Grace;

A bill (S. 1229) granting a pension to William S. Randall;

A bill (S. 1230) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Fisher;

A bill (S. 1231) granting a pension to Lydia Walden;

A bill (S. 1232) granting a pension to Sarah I. Booth;

A bill (S. 1233) granting a pension to William L. Curry;

A bill (S. 1234) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Tibbitts;

A bill (S. 1235) granting an increase of pension to Horace M. Patton;

A bill (S. 1236) granting an increase of pension to Marguerite Daugherty; and

A bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Roy L. Darling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1238) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Lamoureux (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla R. Wyman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1240) granting an increase of pension to Grace A. Elliott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Conway (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Florence Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1243) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Edgerly (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1244) granting an increase of pension to Sarah N. Batchelder (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1245) granting a pension to Ruth B. Ryder (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1246) granting a pension to Leila A. Steele (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1247) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Smart (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1248) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Emmott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1249) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Gott (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1250) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Underhill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 1251) to regulate the marking of platinum imported into the United States or transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1252) to regulate interstate commerce by motor vehicles operating as common carriers of persons on the public highways; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1253) to place all postmasters in certain classifications and to fix the salaries of postmasters according to such classifications; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1254) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof," approved July 3, 1926, as amended, by extending the benefits thereof to employees of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 1255) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Penns Grove, N. J.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1256) to amend the Penal Code of the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 1257) to amend the national prohibition act, as supplemented, in respect of the definition of intoxicating liquor;

A bill (S. 1258) to amend the national prohibition act, to provide for State local option, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1259) to amend the national prohibition act, as supplemented, in respect of the manufacture of liquor without a permit; and

A bill (S. 1260) to amend the national prohibition act, as supplemented, in respect to the issuance by physicians of prescriptions for intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODING:

A bill (S. 1261) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1262) to repeal section 15a of the interstate commerce act as amended; and

A bill (S. 1263) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 1264) to increase the pensions of persons who have lost the sight of both eyes in line of duty while in the military or naval service of the United States; and

A bill (S. 1265) granting a special pension to officers and enlisted men who received the medal granted to those who participated in the battle of Manila Bay, May 1, 1898; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1266) to create in the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor a Division of Safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1267) to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1268) to further amend section 4756 of the Revised Statutes; and

A bill (S. 1269) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1270) to provide for the acquisition of certain lands within the Lassen Volcanic National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 1271) to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other sources, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds; and by providing funds for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 1272) authorizing the establishment of a migratory bird refuge at Bear River Bay, Great Salt Lake, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1273) to provide for the better definition and extension of the purpose and duties of the Bureau of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1274) to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1275) to create an additional judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1276) to admit free of duty and for remission of duty on certain bells for carillon purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1277) to amend an act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes, approved May 1, 1926; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1278) to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1279) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise and settle certain suits at law resulting from the subsidence of First Street east, in the District of Columbia, occasioned by the construction of a railroad tunnel under said street;

A bill (S. 1280) providing for preservation of the Great Falls of the Potomac and the establishment there of a public park with connecting parkways, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1281) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1119) as amended by section 2 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 812), so as to provide operators' permits free of cost to enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard operating Government-owned vehicles in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1282) to increase the pay of the officers and members of the fire department and of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1283) to amend section 12 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1284) amending the act approved April 30, 1926, entitled "An act amending the act entitled 'An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital,' approved June 6, 1924"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1285) to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1286) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1287) for the relief of the Near East Relief (Inc.);

A bill (S. 1288) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Danenhower; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1289) to provide further for the national security and defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1290) granting a pension to George W. Peck (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1291) granting a pension to Andrew J. Stewart (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1292) granting an increase of pension to Lilah Ruth Figgins; and

A bill (S. 1293) granting a pension to Rose G. Bingman; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1294) to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1295) relating to the carriage of goods by sea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1296) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 1297) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Alice E. Moore; and

A bill (S. 1298) for the relief of the Weiser State Bank, of Weiser, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1299) for the relief of the Smithsonian Institution;

A bill (S. 1300) to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution; and

A bill (S. 1301) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1302) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings;

A bill (S. 1303) to increase the cost of public building at Eureka, Utah;

A bill (S. 1304) for the purchase of a post-office site at Tremonton, Utah;

A bill (S. 1305) for the purchase of a post-office site at Mount Pleasant, Utah;

A bill (S. 1306) to authorize the appropriation of $50,000 for the erection of a public building at Nephi, Utah;

A bill (S. 1307) to provide for the erection of a public building at Price, Utah;

A bill (S. 1308) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bingham Canyon, Utah;

A bill (S. 1309) for the purchase of a post-office site at Cedar City, Utah; and

A bill (S. 1310) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at St. George, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1311) to grant further extensions of time under oil and gas permits;

A bill (S. 1312) to change the name of the Utah National Park, the establishment of which is provided for by the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 593), to the "Bryce Canyon National Park," and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1313) to amend section 13, chapter 431, of an act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue trust and final patents on lands withdrawn or classified as power or reservoir sites, with a reservation of the right of the United States or its permittees to enter upon and use any part of such land for reservoir or power-site purposes; and

A bill (S. 1314) to authorize the Secretary of War to secure for the United States title to certain private lands contiguous to and within the militia target range reservation, State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1315) for the relief of the Bennion Livestock Co.;

A bill (S. 1316) for the relief of Rodney C. Allred, Eli J. Clayson, James Trinnaman, jr., Ruel Evans, and Ernest Henley;

A bill (S. 1317) for the relief of Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution;

A bill (S. 1318) for the relief of the sureties and indemnitors of William Roberts, Oren Burke, and Ralph Myers, and of Lilly J. Roberts, as administratrix of William Roberts, deceased;

A bill (S. 1319) for the relief of Ernest Mowrey;

A bill (S. 1320) for the relief of Walter M. Donnelly;

A bill (S. 1321) for the relief of David Thygerson;

A bill (S. 1322) for the relief of the estate of John Scowcroft;

A bill (S. 1323) for the relief of Joseph H. Wilson;

A bill (S. 1324) for the relief of Utah Fuel Co.; and

A bill (S. 1325) for the relief of John A. Fox; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1326) granting a pension to Alma Barney;

A bill (S. 1327) granting a pension to Evelyn Fjeldsted;

A bill (S. 1328) granting an increase of pension to Clara F. Strawn; and

A bill (S. 1329) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Meyers; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1330) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into a contract or contracts for the erection and completion of a plant suitable for the investigations of the Bureau of Mines in the city of Salt Lake, Utah; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 1331) for the relief of C. L. Charlebois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 1332) granting a pension to Frank H. Winter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1333) granting a pension to Thomas Regan;

A bill (S. 1334) granting a pension to Frank P. Smith; and

A bill (S. 1335) to amend the pension laws with reference to the terms of service of persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1336) for the relief of Benjamin F. Spates;

A bill (S. 1337) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Public Health Service;

A bill (S. 1338) for the relief of James E. Jenkins;

A bill (S. 1339) for the relief of the estate of L. Gordon Leech, bankrupt; and

A bill (S. 1340) for the relief of the Ancona Printing Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1341) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1342) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Peru decoration and diploma of the Order of the Sun, and from the Republic of Ecuador decoration and diploma of the Estralla Abdon Calderon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1343) to authorize the appropriation for use by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain funds for wool standards, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1344) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1345) to reestablish and reopen the United States land office at Elko, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1346) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women," approved September 22, 1922; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 1347) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919, as amended; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 1348) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Sparks, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1349) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Ruth, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1350) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Lovelock, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1351) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Elko, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1352) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Gardnerville, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1353) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Las Vegas, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1354) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Yerington, Nev.;

A bill (S. 1355) to authorize the remodeling of the building occupied by the United States mint and assay office at Carson City, Nev.; and

A bill (S. 1356) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Ely, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 1357) for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners, trading as Hastings Bros. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1358) for the relief of the heirs of George E. Taylor, deceased;

A bill (S. 1359) for the relief of Henry Kirn;

A bill (S. 1360) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Thomas T. Grimsley;

A bill (S. 1361) for the relief of Isabelle R. Damron, postmaster at Clintwood, Va.;

A bill (S. 1362) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Harry Simpson;

A bill (S. 1363) for the relief of the Norfolk Dredging Co.;

A bill (S. 1364) for the relief of R. Wilson Selby;

A bill (S. 1365) for the relief of Paul Scarborough;

A bill (S. 1366) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to James W. Rollins;

A bill (S. 1367) for the relief of the Seaboard Wharf & Warehouse Co. (Inc.); and

A bill (S. 1368) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Martha A. Hauch; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1369) to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1370) to provide for the erection of a post-office and customhouse building at Cape Charles, Va.;

A bill (S. 1371) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Norfolk, Va.;

A bill (S. 1372) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Boykin, Va.; and

A bill (S. 1373) for the construction of a public building at Culpeper, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1374) for the relief of Lillian B. Chisholm; and

A bill (S. 1375) to extend the benefits of the World War Veterans' act, 1924, and acts amendatory thereof to Thomas Beverly Campbell; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1376) for the relief of Clarence E. Barnes, late an ensign in the Naval Reserve Force;

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Lieut. Robert Stanley Robertson, jr., United States Navy;

A bill (S. 1378) for the relief of John E. Ross;

A bill (S. 1379) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps called into active service in World War from April 17, 1917, to November 12, 1918;

A bill (S. 1380) providing for the conveyance to the Comte de Grasse Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of site of old graveyard and church in Nelson District, county of York, State of Virginia;

A bill (S. 1381) for the relief of Claude S. Betts; and

A bill (S. 1382) making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the regular naval service Lieut. Commander William A. Hamilton, an officer of the United States Naval Reserve Force during the World War, who incurred physical disability in line of duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1383) to correct the military record of Thomas Finley;

A bill (S. 1384) for the relief of the Randolph-Macon Academy, Front Royal, Va.;

A bill (S. 1385) granting an annuity to Dr. Robert P. Cooke; and

A bill (S. 1386) to recognize the military war services of adjutants general and United States property and disbursing officers as Federal military war duty duing war period, April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, and to issue suitable testimonial of appreciation and recognition to members and former members of district and local draft boards, medical and legal advisory boards, and Government appeals agents for their services during war period, and to consider additional recommendations for awards and citations to former officers and enlisted men of the National Guard on account of World War services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1387) for the relief of J. W. Anderson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1388) granting a pension to Moses Roane;

A bill (S. 1389) granting an increase of pension to Lucile Dodson Brown; and

A bill (S. 1390) granting an increase of pension to Grace G. Dillingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1391) providing for the restoration of the old lighthouse at Cape Henry, Va., and

A bill (S. 1392) for the improvement of channel connecting the deep waters in James River with Hampton Roads, Va., and for the modification of the existing project for the improvement of said channel; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1393) granting permission to Commander Jules James, United States Navy, to accept the decoration of the Legion of Honor tendered him by the Republic of France;

A bill (S. 1394) granting permission to Lieut. Col. Harry N. Cootes, United States Army, to accept certain decorations tendered him; and

A bill (S. 1395) for the relief of W. Henry Robertson, American consul general (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1396) to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing to repeal the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) to amend subdivision A of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to amend the immigration act of 1924 by the repeal of the national origin provision; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) to permit wives and minor children of alien declarants to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) requesting the President to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) providing for hearings before a joint committee of the Senate and the House, upon the merits of the Riker spillway project for control and utilization of waters of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and ramifications, and report to Congress, and authorizing the construction of a model of said project; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) to establish a Joint Commission on Insular Reorganization; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) authorizing the making of surveys, plans, and estimates for the irrigation of certain lands in the State of Wyoming, under terms of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) to amend the census act of March 3, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) relative to the purchase of aircraft from any foreign nation, citizen, or corporation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to provide for appropriate military records for persons who, pursuant to orders, reported for military duty, but whose induction or commission into the service was not, through no fault of their own, formally completed on or prior to November 11, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration or conciliation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 15) authorizing certain funds appropriated for the reservation and monument at Wakefield, Va., to be made available for certain repairs to existing highways and lanes on said reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) for the appointment of Harry H. Holt, of Virginia, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) to amend the World War Veterans' Act, October, 1924, relative to vocational training; to the Committee on Finance.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) consenting that certain States may sue the United States, and providing for trial on the merits in any suit brought hereunder by a State to recover direct taxes alleged to have been illegally collected by the United States during the fiscal years 1866, 1867, 1868, and vesting the right in each State to sue in its own name; to the Committee on Claims.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to provide for designating the route of the Oregon Trail;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property, located in Hernando County, Fla., known as the Brooksville Plant Introduction Garden, no longer required for plant introduction purposes; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to correct section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1926; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WATSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration in 1929 and 1930 of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the conquest of the northwest territory by Gen. George Rogers Clark and his army and authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a permanent memorial of the Revolutionary War in the West, and of the accession of the Old Northwest to the United States, on the site of Fort Sackville, which was captured by George Rogers Clark and his men February 25, 1779; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. EDGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) providing for a national referendum upon the modification of the national prohibition act, and a resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. ASHURST. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to furnish the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to posts of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and to camps of the United Spanish War Veterans was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Public Printer is hereby authorized and directed to send free of charge to any post of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and to any camp of the United Spanish War Veterans the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when application is made therefor by any such post or camp.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the Public Printer, from any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such amount as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

AMENDMENT TO COOPERATIVE MARKETING BILL

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill to create a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture; to provide for the acquisition and dissemination of information pertaining to cooperation, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,900 for the construction of a swimming pool for the use of patients of the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., intended to be proposed by him to the War Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. PITTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

Mr. PITTMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That paragraph 2, Rule XXXVIII, of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows, to wit:

2. All information communicated or remarks made by a Senator when acting upon nominations concerning the character or qualifications of the person nominated shall be kept secret, but hereafter all votes upon any nomination shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD whenever the Senate by a majority vote shall so order. If, however, charges shall be made against a person nominated, the committee may, in its discretion, notify such nominee thereof, but the name of the person making such charges shall not be disclosed. The fact that a nomination has been made, or that it has been confirmed or rejected, shall not be regarded as a secret. This rule shall not apply to a Senator making public his own vote.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during and sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

FLOOD STORAGE RESERVOIR, UPPER MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. FRAZIER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas whatever may be the ultimate decision of Congress as to the plans which will be adopted for flood control and utilization of the waters of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and ramifications, it is evident that from the many plans that have been and will be advanced for consideration, much time will be consumed before any ultimate decision covering the entire subject can be arrived at; and

Whereas in the Riker Spillway project for control and utilization of the waters of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and ramifications, or in any other practicable plan which may be formulated for that purpose, the control of the floods which annually proceed from the headwaters of the Missouri River is an essential factor; and

Whereas in considering the value of this essential factor in flood control from this source to the Gulf, it becomes essential that Congress at this time ascertain from the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which has been called in special session for January 10, 1927, if that State will provide the land and premises which would be necessary and used in connection therewith, excepting Indian lands and lands owned by the United States; and

Whereas to that end it is essential that a dam be constructed across the Missouri River at a point about 80 miles northwest of Bismarck, N. Dak., which will provide a storage reservoir by the backing up of the waters of this river for about 130 miles and have a capacity of about one thousand billion cubic feet, and which would be amply sufficient to control floods equivalent to any which has ever passed that point.

Such a restraint of these flood waters, and their liberation uniformly when desired, would prevent such flood waters meeting the flood waters of the Mississippi in the future as they have in the past, and prevent the ravages that have been caused by this annual spring flood in the Missouri River below Montana, and where practicable by similar control of floods in most of its lower tributaries would permit the Missouri River to be made navigable from the Missouri to the Montana line because of the lesser inclination of the uniform flow of these waters to form bars and cause snags in the river: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be ascertained, from the State of North Dakota, if the State of North Dakota will provide the lands and premises, excepting public domain, lands belonging to the United States, and Indian lands, which will be utilized, covered, submerged, inundated, and necessary for the construction and maintenance of a dam about 200 feet high on the Missouri River, in the State of North Dakota, at a point about 80 miles northwest of the city of Bismarck.

FLOOD CONTROL OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. HAWES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that a defined national policy be established for the protection of life and property from floods of the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for the improvement of navigation, and that such policy should be—

First. That it is the duty of the Federal Government to assume entire charge and direction of flood control upon and along the Mississippi River and its tributaries;

Second. That flood control and improvement of navigation upon and along the Mississippi River and its tributaries shall be treated as connected and correlated subjects; and

Third. That the entire cost of flood control and improvement of navigation upon and along the Mississippi River and its tributaries shall be borne by the Federal Government.

ACTS ADMINISTERED BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. HAWES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby requested to prepare as soon as is practicable a manuscript, in form suitable to be printed, covering the text of those provisions of law which (1) are administered by the commission; (2) affect the commission's work, powers, or duties; and (3) the commission decides should be included so as to make available a comprehensive publication of the Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the interstate commerce act, suitably annotated, as the commission deems to be of public interest and value, with digests following each section or paragraph of pertinent decisions of the Federal courts and the commission, together with an index, the text of general rules and regulations, or appropriate reference thereto, promulgated by the commission under authority of any of said provisions of law, and such tables as may be

necessary, and to transmit such manuscript to the Secretary of the Senate upon the completion thereof. Such manuscript, when received, is authorized to be printed as transmitted as a Senate document, and shall be in lieu of the manuscript requested by Senate Resolution 334, Sixty-ninth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1927.

CATHERINE HARDESTY

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Catherine Hardesty, widow of Martin T. Hardesty, late a messenger in the employ of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas the Federal reserve act of December 23, 1913, which established the Federal reserve system, has for its principal purpose the concentration of the banking reserves of the country; and

Whereas the complete concentration of banking reserves may only be accomplished by bringing the State as well as the national banks into correlation with the Federal reserve system; and

Whereas a large proportion of the State banks have never entered the Federal reserve system and a considerable number of national banks have surrendered their charters and have been converted into State banks; and

Whereas such converted banks frequently leave the Federal reserve system at the time of their conversion, and otherwise are free to leave the Federal reserve system at any time if they so elect; and

Whereas it is claimed that banks incorporated under the banking laws of the several States are vested with corporate privileges, and exercise a latitude of discretion in their operations, which are denied to national banking associations, particularly with respect to the currency and funds available for reserves, loans upon security of real property, the exercise of certain fiduciary powers, the maintenance of branch banking offices, the acceptance of time and savings deposits; and are otherwise not subject to the same necessary restrictions as are national banking associations; and

Whereas during the past two years there have been an unprecedented number of failures of both national and State banks, the underlying causes of which have not been ascertained and the proper means for the prevention of which have not been determined; and

Whereas there is believed to be a lack of proper coordination in the examination of national and State banks in order that examinations shall be thorough and frequent, yet without unnecessary duplication; and

Whereas a conflicting competition is developing between national and State banks, the course of which will have an important effect upon the future of the Federal reserve system and of the national banking associations: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to study the relative increase in the number of State banks as contrasted with national banking association; the rights and privileges vested in State banks which are not granted, but which may be safely granted, to national banking associations; the restrictions and safeguards now imposed upon State banks which may with safety be imposed upon national banking associations; the failures of State banks and national banking associations since the enactment of the Federal reserve act, the causes thereof, and the proper means for the prevention of such failures; the character of official supervision exercised over State banks and national banking associations; the policy and economic effects of branch banking and of so-called chain banking or holding-company banking, by which an individual or a group of individual bankers or of banking or other corporations exercise a controlling interest in a number of banks; the causes, extent, and effects of bank mergers and bank consolidation; the relation between investment banking and commercial banking by State banks and national banking associations; the present status of savings deposits and the best means for protecting them; the policies of the Federal Reserve Board and their effect upon State banks and national banking associations; the general operation of the Federal reserve system, both at home and in relation to foreign central banks; whether so-called "war amendments" to the Federal reserve act ought now to be repealed; whether the Federal reserve act should be amended with respect to the composition of the Federal Reserve Board or with respect to the appointment of directors of Federal reserve banks; and to make and report findings and recommendations in the premises to the Senate.

The committee is authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ necessary clerical assistance, to sit during the session or during any recess of the Senate, and at such places as it may deem advisable. Any subcommittee duly authorized thereto may exercise the powers conferred upon the committee by this resolution.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That wherever the rule of the Senate permits a single objection to defeat action on any matter presented, the rule be changed to require every such objection to be seconded by two Members, thus requiring three objections instead of one as is the rule at present.

ROSE E. MILLARD

Mr. ODDIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Rose E. Millard, widow of Homer B. Millard, late a private of the Capitol police, under the direction of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. ODDIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

ELEVATION OF BATTLESHIP GUNS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Whereas it has been stated on the floor of the Senate by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs that "a protest has been made by another power to this country against elevating the guns of our battleships, and until that protest has been settled I do not believe we should take affirmative action and vote to appropriate for the elevation of guns"; and

Whereas it is admitted by all competent naval authorities, as well as by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, that the American Navy can not attain or maintain the 5–5–3 ratio accorded to it under the limitation-of-arms agreement without elevating the guns on these 13 battleships; and

Whereas it has been reported by the Secretary of State that there is no legal reason under the disarmament conference agreement of 1922 why our guns should not be elevated; and

Whereas it has been asserted that the protest against our elevating guns on these 13 battleships was made to this country on April 15, 1923, nearly two years ago; and

Whereas Article II of the limitation of armament treaty provides in part that: "The British Empire may, in accordance with the replace-

ment table in Chapter II, part 3, construct two new capital ships not exceeding 35,000 tons (35,560 metric tons), standard displacement each"; and

Whereas in Article VII of said treaty it is provided: "The total tonnage for aircraft carriers of each of the contracting powers shall not exceed in standard displacement, for the United States 135,000 tons (137,160 metric tons); for the British Empire 135,000 tons (137,160 metric tons)"; and

Whereas Article IX of the treaty is as follows:

"No aircraft carrier exceeding 27,000 tons (27,432 metric tons) standard displacement shall be acquired by, or constructed by, for, or within the jurisdiction of, any of the contracting powers.

"However, any of the contracting powers may, provided that its total tonnage allowance of aircraft carriers is not thereby exceeded, build not more than two aircraft carriers, each of a tonnage of not more than 33,000 tons (33,528 metric tons) standard displacement, and in order to effect economy any of the contracting powers may use for this purpose any two of their ships, whether constructed or in course of construction, which would otherwise be scrapped under the provisions of Article II. The armament of any aircraft carriers exceeding 27,000 tons (27,432 metric tons) standard displacement shall be in accordance with the requirements of Article X, except that the total number of guns to be carried in case any of such guns be of a caliber exceeding 6 inches (152 millimeters), except antiaircraft guns and guns not exceeding 5 inches (127 millimeters), shall not exceed 8"; and

Whereas Article X of the treaty provides in part as follows: "No aircraft carrier of any of the contracting powers shall carry a gun with a caliber in excess of 8 inches (203 millimeters)"; and

Whereas it has been stated on the floor of the Senate and in the public print that the new British ships called the *Nelson* and *Rodney* are vessels supposed to be the latest thing in battleships; that they will carry nine 16-inch guns, and that these guns will be placed forward, and that the after deck will be used for an airplane platform upon which they can carry airships, and that there will be no stacks: Now therefore be it

Resolved, First. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, what steps, if any, have been taken by the executive department to have said protest against the elevation of guns on 13 of our battleships settled and determined; whether any suggestion has been made by the protesting nation or by the United States that the matter be submitted for arbitration; and at what time a decision in reference to the protest may be expected.

Second. That the President of the United States is hereby further respectfully requested to obtain the information from Great Britain as provided under the terms of said treaty and inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, whether said ships, *Nelson* and *Rodney*, conform to the provisions of said treaty; whether the same are battleships or aircraft carriers; if combined battleships and aircraft carriers, whether or not such ships, as aircraft carriers, do not violate Article X of the treaty by carrying guns in excess of the caliber therein permitted; whether the said ships, as aircraft carriers, do not violate Section IX of the treaty in reference to tonnage and in reference to the number of guns carried.

STRENGTH OF NATIONAL GUARD—ALLOTMENT AND COST

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate at as early date as may be practicable the following information:

First. The total number of the National Guard and how divided in the various military branches—namely, how many in the Infantry, Cavalry, Air Service, and other services.

Second. How the National Guard troops are allotted with respect to States—namely, the number of National Guard soldiers, enlisted men and officers, in each State.

Third. What States are maintaining their allotments in whole or in part.

Fourth. The several amounts of money expended in each State for its National Guard.

Fifth. How many air squadrons in the National Guard and where located, and the numerical strength of each, officers and men.

Sixth. The total amount of money authorized by law for the National Guard during the year closing June 30, 1921, and the total amount spent during that year.

Seventh. The total amount of money spent for the Air Service in the National Guard for the year ending June 30, 1925, and the amount contemplated for the National Guard Air Service during the present fiscal year.

INVESTIGATION OF TAX REFUNDS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Vice President to investigate the subject of tax refunds involving claims for taxes of $50,000 or over. For the purpose of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit during the recess of the Congress, to employ such clerical, stenographic, or other assistance as may be necessary, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such documents and papers as it deems fit, to administer oaths, to take testimony of witnesses, and to make its report to the next session of the Senate in December, 1928. The expenses of such committee shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

COURT-MARTIAL OF COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to transmit to the Senate a full and complete transcript of the proceedings of the general court-martial convened under the provisions of Special Orders, No. 248, paragraph 17, dated October 20, 1925, for the trial of Col. William Mitchell, Air Service, United States Army, and that the proceedings of this court-martial be indexed and printed as a Senate document.

PROPOSED LOANS TO THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, First. That the United States Debt Funding Commission be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and to report to the Senate at the earliest date practicable whether there has been made or is being made any agreement, express or implied, between any United States bank, banking corporation, partnership, or individual, with the Government of France, or its agents or representatives, touching a loan or loans to be made by such bank, corporations, or firms, or individuals, to the French Government or anyone representing the French Government, which loans are directly or indirectly dependent upon the ratification of the debt settlement with France heretofore tentatively arrived at by the United States Debt Funding Commission.

Second. If there is any such agreement or understanding for a loan or loans, the said commission is directed to ascertain the amount thereof, the terms thereof, the persons or corporations negotiating the same, the amount of interest, discount, commissions, or charges therefor, and all other pertinent facts connected therewith.

Third. The commission is further directed to ascertain and report if any such loan is found to be contemplated or contracted for, then whether or not any prior loan made by such bank, corporation, or firm, or individual, to the French Government or anyone representing the French Government, or any previously existing indebtedness, is included or covered by the contemplated loan, or if such loan is entirely new money to be lent such government or its agents, and for what purposes such new money is to be loaned.

ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. BLEASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee be requested to inform the Senate whether or not a candidate who announces himself as opposed to the Constitution of the United States, or any section thereof, and is in favor of the nonenforcement of a law passed to carry into effect a section of the Constitution is eligible to a seat and qualified to be sworn in as a Member of the United States Senate.

DISPENSATION OF LIQUORS BY FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BLEASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Seymour Lowman, who is in charge of the enforcement of the Volstead Act, be requested to investigate immediately and inform the Senate whether or not whisky, wine, or beer has been served by any of the foreign ambassadors, ministers, consuls, or other agents of any other countries in Washington, D. C., since the passage of the Volstead Act, and if it is now being done; and if so, with the approval of the President of the United States or any other official whose duty it is to enforce the said law; and further, if it is true that the recent representatives of the Italian delegation to this country in reference to the settlement of its debt to the United States were permitted to bring into this country champagne, whisky, and beer, or either of them; and if so, by whose permission, and if they did, why were they not promptly arrested as American citizens would have been?

Second. That a similar request be made of Hon. James M. Doran, Commissioner of Prohibition.

Third. That a similar request be made of the Secretary of the Treasury.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXVI

Mr. BLEASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That paragraph 4 of Rule XXXVI of the standing rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding the following proviso at the end thereof:

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent any Senator from stating, when asked to do so by his constituents, or any one of them, how he voted on the confirmation of the nomination of any person or persons."

REVISION OF RULES

Mr. BLEASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Whereas there exists much difference of opinion as to the proper construction to be placed upon the various rules of the United States Senate; and

Whereas there are rules in the Senate which seemingly contradict others, causing much confusion in their construction; and

Whereas it is becoming too common a practice in the Senate to appeal from the decision of the Presiding Officer, thus leaving to a majority of the Senate the right, if they see fit, to impose their construction of the rules upon the minority: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the Senate be authorized and requested and do appoint five Members of the Senate who shall be instructed not to change, alter, or amend any present rule of the Senate, but to rewrite and present to the Senate a draft of the present rules, omitting any duplication of same, or any seeming contradiction thereof, and that they submit such draft to the Senate as early in this session as possible for such action as the Senate deems advisable to take thereon; be it further

Resolved, That the said committee shall act without compensation, but shall have their actual expenses paid and shall be empowered to employ a secretary and an expert parliamentarian, should they deem it necessary, who shall be paid such compensation as shall be fixed by the committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the sum of $——— is hereby appropriated for such purposes, which shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the United States Senate on vouchers which shall be signed by the chairman and the secretary of the committee.

THE WORLD COURT

Mr. BLEASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State be, and they are hereby, requested not to take any further action toward the United States entering into the League of Nations, or joining the so-called World Court, or taking any part therein, until further orders from the American people or the United States Senate.

AIR MAIL SERVICE TO SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. ODDIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 35), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President enter into negotiations with Mexico or any Republic of Central and South America for the purpose of concluding treaties or conventions providing for (1) the establishment of air mail service with the United States, and (2) the construction of an international highway connecting the United States with such country.

Resolved further, That the Senate expresses its readiness to participate in the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of such treaties or conventions.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is my intention to ask for an executive session and then to resume legislative session for the purpose of adopting several resolutions expressing the regret of the Senate on account of the death of late Members of the House of Representatives. In view of that, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER W. MAGEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WALTER W. MAGEE, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions and ask that they be read and acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 36) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. WALTER W. MAGEE, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE LADISLAS LAZARO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LADISLAS LAZARO, a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I submit resolutions respecting the death of Representative LAZARO, and ask for their adoption.

The resolutions (S. Res. 37) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. LADISLAS LAZARO, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE M. E. CRUMPACKER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. E. CRUMPACKER, a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask that they be adopted.

The resolutions (S. Res. 38) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. M. E. CRUMPACKER, late a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM N. VAILE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM N. VAILE, a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions, which I ask to have read and adopted.

The resolutions (S. Res. 39) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. WILLIAM N. VAILE, late a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and thirty minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously made, until Monday, December 12, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 9 (legislative day of December 6), 1927

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE

Robert E. Olds, of Minnesota, to be Undersecretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Joseph C. Grew, appointed ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Nelson T. Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Robert E. Olds, appointed Undersecretary of State.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment to the offices to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate as follows:

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Joseph C. Grew, of New Hampshire, to Turkey.
Dwight W. Morrow, of New Jersey, to Mexico.
Noble Brandon Judah, of Illinois, to Cuba.

MINISTERS RESIDENT AND CONSULS GENERAL

William T. Francis, of Minnesota, to Liberia.
Addison E. Southard, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to act as minister resident and consul general of the United States of America to Ethiopia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SECRETARIES IN DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers to be also secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, while retaining their consular rank:

Charles A. Bay, of Minnesota.
Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island.
Robert L. Buell, of New York.
John K. Davis, of Ohio.
Durward Grinstead, of Massachusetts.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.
David McK. Key, of Tennessee.
Julius G. Lay, of the District of Columbia.
David B. Macgowan, of Tennessee.
Clarence E. Macy, of Colorado.
William J. McCafferty, of California.

VICE CONSULS OF CAREER

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin.
George M. Abbott, of Ohio.
George D. Andrews, jr., of Tennessee.
Franklin B. Atwood, of Massachusetts.
La Verne Baldwin, of New York.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Sidney H. Browne, jr., of New Jersey.
Gordon L. Burke, of Georgia.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Paul C. Daniels, of New York.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.
Landreth M. Harrison, of Minnesota.
Knowlton V. Hicks, of New York.
Terry S. Hinkle, of New York.
Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa.
Perry N. Jester, of Virginia.
James C. King, of Michigan.
George D. LaMont, of New York.
Bruce Lancaster, of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Page, of Massachusetts.
J. Randolph Robinson, of New York.
Alan S. Rogers, of California.
Albert W. Scott, of Missouri.
Roger Sumner, of Massachusetts.
John T. Wainwright, of New York.
Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey.
Clifton R. Wharton, of Massachusetts.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.
George H. Winters, of Kansas.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin.
George M. Abbott, of Ohio.
George D. Andrews, jr., of Tennessee.
Franklin B. Atwood, of Massachusetts.
La Verne Baldwin, of New York.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Sidney H. Browne, jr., of New Jersey.
Gordon L. Burke, of Georgia.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Paul C. Daniels, of New York.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.
Landreth M. Harrison, of Minnesota.
Knowlton V. Hicks, of New York.
Terry S. Hinkle, of New York.
Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa.
Perry N. Jester, of Virginia.
James C. King, of Michigan.
George D. LaMont, of New York.
Bruce Lancaster, of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Page, of Massachusetts.
J. Randolph Robinson, of New York.
Alan S. Rogers, of California.
Albert W. Scott, of Missouri.
Roger Sumner, of Massachusetts.
John T. Wainwright, of New York.
Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.
George H. Winters, of Kansas.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion in rank to the offices to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

From consul to consul general

Coert du Bois, of California.
Cornelius Ferris, of Colorado.
Charles L. Hoover, of Missouri.
Leo J. Keena, of Michigan.
Frank C. Lee, of Colorado.
Irving N. Linnell, of Massachusetts.

From vice consul of career to consul

Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio.
Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
William E. De Courcy, of Texas.
Charles N. Derry, of Georgia.
Peter H. A. Flood, of New Hampshire.
George Gregg Fuller, of New York.
Anderson Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland.
Alan T. Hurd, of California.
John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island.
Julian L. Pinkerton, of Kentucky.
William W. Schott, of Kansas.
Edward E. Silvers, of New Jersey.
Robert Lacy Smyth, of California.
Edwin F. Stanton, of California.
Mason Turner, of Connecticut.
Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.

From Foreign Service officer of class 2 to Foreign Service officer of class 1

Norman Armour, of New Jersey.
Homer M. Byington, of Connecticut.
Claude I. Dawson, of South Carolina.
William Dawson, of Minnesota.
DeWitt C. Poole, of Illinois.

From Foreign Service officer of class 3 to Foreign Service officer of class 2

Ray Atherton, of Illinois.
John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky.
Louis G. Dreyfus, jr., of California.
Matthew E. Hanna, of Connecticut.
George S. Messersmith, of Ohio.
Stokeley W. Morgan, of Arkansas.
Edwin L. Neville, of Ohio.

From Foreign Service officer of class 4 to Foreign Service officer of class 3

Hamilton C. Claiborne, of Virginia.
Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia.

George K. Donald, of Alabama.
J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio.
Frank C. Lee, of Colorado.
Keith Merrill, of Minnesota.
James B. Stewart, of New Mexico.

From Foreign Service officer of class 5 to Foreign Service officer of class 4

Charles R. Cameron, of New York.
H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona.
John K. Davis, of Ohio.
Alfred W. Donegan, of Alabama.
Graham H. Kemper, of Kentucky.
Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Wallace S. Murray, of Ohio.
Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri.
Elbridge D. Rand, of California.
Emil Sauer, of Texas.
S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 5

Charles H. Albrecht, of Pennsylvania.
Algar E. Carleton, of Vermont.
Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado.
Dudley G. Dwyre, of Colorado.
Jay C. Huston, of California.
Edwin Carl Kemp, of Florida.
Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey.
John F. Simmons, of New York.
Clarence J. Spiker, of the District of Columbia.
George Wadsworth, of New York.
Henry M. Wolcott, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 7 to Foreign Service officer of class 6

Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa.
Richard F. Boyce, of Michigan.
George L. Brandt, of the District of Columbia.
Harry E. Carlson, of Illinois.
James G. Carter, of Georgia.
Nathaniel P. Davis, of New Jersey.
Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York.
Hugh S. Fullerton, of Ohio.
Jack Dewey Hickerson, of Texas.
Robert B. Macatee, of Virginia.
John R. Minter, of South Carolina.
Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.
Orsen N. Nielsen, of Wisconsin.
H. Earle Russell, of Michigan.
Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia.
William H. Taylor, of Pennsylvania.
Henry C. von Struve, of Texas.
Egmont C. von Tresckow, of South Carolina.
Harry L. Walsh, of Maryland.
Bartley F. Yost, of Kansas.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island.
Hiram A. Boucher, of Minnesota.
Lewis V. Boyle, of California.
Reginald S. Castleman, of California.
Stillman W. Eells, of New York.
Augustin W. Ferrin, of New York.
Robert Y. Jarvis, of California.
Thomas McEnelly, of New York.
J. Lee Murphy, of New York.
Earl L. Packer, of Utah.
Walter S. Reineck, of Ohio.
Leo D. Sturgeon, of Illinois.
Harold S. Tewell, of North Dakota.
Frederick L. Thomas, of New York.
Harold Shantz, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified, to Foreign Service officer of class 8

Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio.
Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
William E. DeCourcy, of Texas.
Charles H. Derry, of Georgia.
Peter H. A. Flood of New Hampshire.
George Gregg Fuller, of New York.
Anderson Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland.
Alan T. Hurd, of California.
John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island.
Julian L. Pinkerton, of Kentucky.
William W. Schott, of Kansas.
Edward E. Silvers, of New Jersey.
Robert Lacy Smyth, of California.
Edwin F. Stanton, of California.
Mason Turner, of Connecticut.
Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 7

H. Dorsey Newson, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 8

Thomas W. Voetter, of New Mexico.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE TREASURY

Seymour Lowman, of Elmira, N. Y., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Lincoln C. Andrews, resigned.

Henry Herrick Bond, of Waltham, Mass., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Charles S. Dewey, resigned.

(These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.)

REGISTER OF THE TREASURY

Walter O. Woods, of Concordia, Kans., to be Register of the Treasury, in place of Harley V. Speelman, retired. (This officer is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

GENERAL COUNSEL BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Clarence M. Charest, of Baltimore, Md., to be General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in place of Alexander W. Gregg, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Oliver G. Addleman, of Springfield, Ill., to be collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Illinois, in place of George W. Schwaner, resigned.

Louis J. Huwe, of Cincinnati, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio, in place of Charles M. Dean, resigned.

Fred O. Goodell, of Tucson, Ariz., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Arizona, in place of John R. Towles.

John R. Rogers, of Maplewood, N. J., to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of New Jersey, in place of Edward E. Gnichtel, resigned.

(These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.)

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Rear Admiral Frederick C. Billard, of the District of Columbia, to be commandant, with the rank of rear admiral, for a period of four years, to rank as such from January 11, 1928. (Reappointment.)

Engineer in Chief Quincy B. Newman to be a commander (engineering), to rank as such from December 18, 1927, as an additional number in the grade of commander (engineering). This nomination is made pursuant to a provision of section 2 of the act of January 12, 1923, which reads, in part, as follows: "And that an officer whose term of service as engineer in chief has expired may be appointed a commander (engineering), and shall be an additional number in that grade." The term of office for which Engineer in Chief Newman was appointed expires on December 17, 1927.

Commander (Engineering) Robert B. Adams, of New Hampshire, to be engineer in chief for a period of four years, to rank as such from December 18, 1927, in place of Engineer in Chief Quincy B. Newman, whose term of office will expire December 17, 1927. This nomination is made pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of the act of April 16, 1908, and section 2 of the act of January 12, 1923.

Lieut. (Temporary) Carl H. Hilton to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Lieut. (Temporary) Joseph S. Rosenthal to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Lieut. (Temporary) Frank M. Meals to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Lieut. (Temporary) John W. Kelliher to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Lieut. (Temporary) Emette B. Smith to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Lieut. (Temporary) Frank D. Higbee to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Lieut. (Temporary) Ben C. Wilcox to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 5, 1927.

Clarence F. Edge to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

William T. Schellhous to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Harold S. Maude to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Donald E. McKay to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Vernon E. Day to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Leslie B. Tollaksen to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

John L. Steinmetz to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Stanley C. Linholm to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Fred P. Vetterick to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

George M. Phannemiller to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

George F. Hicks to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Alexander L. Ford to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Stephen H. Evans to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

John A. Glynn to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

John E. Fairbank to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Joseph A. Kerrins to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

William W. Scott to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Edward H. Thiele to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Reginald H. French to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

John W. Ryssy to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

John J. Purcell to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Richard L. Burke to be an ensign, to rank as such from March 8, 1927.

Commander (Engineering) California C. McMillan to be a commander (engineering), to rank as such from July 1, 1926.

Capt. (Engineering) Albert C. Norman to be a captain (engineering), to rank as such from July 1, 1926.

Commander (Engineering) Theodore G. Lewton to be a captain (engineering), to rank as such from October 13, 1926.

Herbert F. Walsh to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from April 19, 1927.

Lieut. Commander (Engineering) George W. David to be a commander (engineering), to rank as such from October 13, 1926, in place of Commander (Engineering) Theodore G. Lewton, promoted.

Lieut. Commander (Temporary) Joseph E. Stika to be a lieutenant commander, to rank as such from July 1, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) (Temporary) Ray W. Dierlam to be a lieutenant (temporary), to rank as such from April 6, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) (Temporary) Frank H. Nelson to be a lieutenant (temporary), to rank as such from April 12, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) (Temporary) Kenneth L. Young to be a lieutenant (temporary), to rank as such from April 4, 1927.

Ensign (Temporary) Paul E. Purdy to be a lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary), to rank as such from April 5, 1927.

Louis A. Round, jr., to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from April 18, 1927.

Temporary Commander William H. Shea to be a commander, to rank as such from July 1, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) (Temporary) Arthur G. Morrill to be a lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from April 20, 1927.

Ensign (Temporary) Nathaniel S. Fulford, jr., to be an ensign, to rank as such from April 20, 1927.

Ensign (Temporary) Richard L. Horne to be an ensign, to rank as such from April 20, 1927.

Lieut. (Engineering) (temporarily a lieutenant commander (engineering)) Clinton P. Kendall to be a lieutenant commander (engineering), to rank as such from July 1, 1926.

Rutherford B. Lank, jr., to be a constructor, to rank as such from May 11, 1927.

Dale R. Simonson to be a constructor, to rank as such from May 11, 1927.

Ensign Harold S. Berdine to be a lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from February 16, 1927.

Commander Eugene Blake, jr., to be a captain, to rank as such from June 1, 1927, in place of Capt. Frederick C. Dodge, retired.

Lieut. Commander Chester H. Jones to be a commander, to rank as such from June 1, 1927, in place of Eugene Blake, jr., promoted.

Ensign (Temporary) Harry C. Howe to be a lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary), to rank as such from September 7, 1927.

Chief Quartermaster (Acting) Donald D. Hesler to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from September 15, 1927.

Charles H. Bartlett to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from October 6, 1927.

Robert S. Jackson to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from October 6, 1927.

Commander Philip H. Scott to be a captain, to rank as such from September 27, 1927, in place of Capt. Bernard H. Camden, retired.

Lieut. Commander William F. Towle to be a commander, to rank as such from September 27, 1927, in place of Commander Philip H. Scott, promoted.

Frederick G. Eastman to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from June 25, 1927.

Ensign (Temporary) Charles L. Duke to be a lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary), to rank as such from August 23, 1927.

Kenneth S. Davis to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from August 4, 1927.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Asst. Surg. Carl E. Rice to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from April 28, 1927.

Dr. Ralph Horton to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1927.

Dr. Gerald M. Kunkel to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 16, 1927.

Dr. Edmund T. Lentz to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 15, 1927.

Dr. W. J. Bryan McAuliffe to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 15, 1927.

Dr. Albert S. Irving to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 16, 1927.

Dr. William W. Nesbit to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 15, 1927.

Dr. George D. Boone to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 15, 1927.

Dr. Leon O. Parker to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 15, 1927.

Dr. Bernard J. Macauley to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 15, 1927.

Dr. John R. Murdock to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 7, 1927.

Dr. Thomas C. Kienzle to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 17, 1927.

Dr. Leo J. Hand to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1927.

Dr. George R. Welch to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1927.

Dr. Clarence D. Kosar to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1927.

Dr. Joseph F. Van Ackeren to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from June 17, 1927.

Surg. Samuel B. Grubbs to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from August 13, 1927, in place of Senior Surg. George M. Magruder, placed on "waiting orders," effective August 12, 1927.

Surg. Milton H. Foster to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 11, 1927, in place of Senior Surg. G. M. Guiteras, placed on "waiting orders," effective September 10, 1927.

Passed Asst. Surg. Lynne A. Fullerton to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 18, 1927.

(These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Walter F. Brown, of Ohio, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

SOLICITOR FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Ephraim F. Morgan, of West Virginia, to be solicitor, Department of Commerce, vice Stephen B. Davis, jr., resigned. (Mr. Morgan is now serving under a recess appointment.)

COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION

Arthur J. Tyrer, of the District of Columbia, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Commissioner of Navigation in the Department of Commerce.

SUPERVISING INSPECTORS

John L. Crone, of New Jersey, and Harry Layfield, of Pennsylvania, now holding recess appointments, to the positions of supervising inspectors, second and seventh districts, respectively, Steamboat Inspection Service, in the Department of Commerce.

EXAMINER IN CHIEF PATENT OFFICE

Eugene Landers, of New York, now holding recess appointment, to the position of examiner in chief in the United States Patent Office in the Department of Commerce.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, now holding recess appointment, to the positions indicated below:

AIDES

With relative rank of ensign in the Navy

George William Lovesee, of Colorado, vice W. M. Gibson, promoted.

Lawrence Pinkerton Sowles, of California, vice A. C. Thorson, promoted.

John Malcolm Baker, jr., of Massachusetts, vice R. L. Pfau, promoted.

Edwin Caleb Baum, of the District of Columbia, vice W. J. Turnbull, resigned.

JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

With relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy

Francis Bartholomew Quinn, of Massachusetts, vice N. B. Smith, resigned.

Bennett Green Jones, of Virginia, vice C. D. Meaney, promoted.

Ector Brooks Latham, jr., of the District of Columbia, vice H. L. Bloomberg, resigned.

John Bowie, jr., of Maryland, vice E. P. Morton, resigned.

George Riley Shelton, of Alabama, vice D. E. Pheley, retired.

Ira Taylor Sanders, of Tennessee, vice E. M. Buckingham, resigned.

Charles Roland Bush, jr., of New Jersey, vice F. H. Hough, resigned.

Edward Robert McCarthy, of Massachusetts, vice H. W. Tyler, resigned.

HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

With relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy

Augustus Peter Ratti, of Massachusetts, vice R. J. Auld, resigned.

Cornelius Daniel Meaney, of Massachusetts, vice William T. Combs, resigned.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Vincent B. May, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex., vice Mrs. Katherine D. Stoes, resigned. Appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Frank P. Light, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Lakeview, Oreg. Reappointment.

CHIEF EXAMINER CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Howard A. Edson, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Examiner of the Civil Service Commission, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate vice Herbert A. Filer, deceased.

MEMBERS OF FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Claude M. Henry, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the unexpired term of three years from July 17, 1925, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate vice C. F. McIntosh.

Edward T. Franks, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for a term of three years from July 17, 1927, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

Mrs. Bessie Parker Brueggeman, of Missouri, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of six years from March 15, 1927, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

MEMBERS OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

George R. Cooksey, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to serve out the unexpired term of Robert A. Cooper, expiring August 6, 1932.

Floyd R. Harrison, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to serve out the unexpired term of Elmer S. Landes, expiring August 6, 1930.

Eugene Meyer, of Mount Kisco, N. Y., to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to serve out the unexpired term of Edward E. Jones, expiring August 6, 1931.

(These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.)

MEMBER OF BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

Forest D. Siefkin, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Tax Appeals for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1926, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Jules G. Körner.

MEMBER OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Roy A. Young, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board for the unexpired term of 10 years from April 19, 1923, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Daniel R. Crissinger.

REGISTER OF WILLS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Theodore L. Cogswell, of the District of Columbia, to be register of wills, District of Columbia, vice James Tanner, deceased. (Mr. Cogswell is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

Augustus N. Hand, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Charles M. Hough, deceased. (Mr. Hand is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Elliott Northcott, of West Virginia, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice John C. Rose, deceased. (Mr. Northcott is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Alva Edgar Steadman, of Hawaii, to be first judge, circuit court, first circuit of Hawaii, vice Frank Andrade, resigned. (Mr. Steadman is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

William C. Coleman, of Maryland, to be United States district judge, district of Maryland, under provisions of the act approved March 3, 1927. (Mr. Coleman is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Edward J. Moinet, of Michigan, to be United States district judge, eastern district of Michigan, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1927. (Mr. Moinet is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Frederick H. Bryant, of New York, to be United States district judge, northern district of New York, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1927. (Mr. Bryant is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Frank J. Coleman, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York, vice Augustus N. Hand, nominated to be circuit judge. (Mr. Coleman is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Simon L. Adler, of New York, to be United States district judge, western district of New York, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1927. (Mr. Adler is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Ira Lloyd Letts, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge, district of Rhode Island, vice Arthur L. Brown, resigned. (Mr. Letts is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Johnson J. Hayes, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge, middle district of North Carolina, under provisions of the act approved March 2, 1927. (Mr. Hayes is now serving under a recess appointment.)

DISTRICT ATTORNEY, UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA

George Sellett, of Illinois, to be district attorney of the United States Court for China, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leonard E. Wales, of Delaware, to be United States attorney, district of Delaware, vice David J. Reinhardt, resigned. (Mr. Wales is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Charles H. Tuttle, of New York, to be United States attorney, southern district of New York, vice Emory R. Buckner, resigned. (Mr. Tuttle is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL, CANAL ZONE

John T. Barrett, of Massachusetts, to be marshal of the Canal Zone, provided for by the Panama Canal act, approved August 24, 1912, vice Irvin M. Lieser.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Charles W. Cushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal, southern district of Illinois, vice James E. McClure, resigned. (Mr. Cushing is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Martin Brown, of Michigan, to be United States marshal, western district of Michigan. A reappointment, his term having expired. (Mr. Brown is now serving under a recess appointment.)

James G. Buchanan, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal, southern district of Mississippi, vice Anslem P. Russell, resigned, who was appointed during recess to succeed James C. Tyler, term expired. (Mr. Buchanan is now serving under a recess appointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Richmond Pearson Davis, from October 4, 1927, vice Maj. Gen. Merch B. Stewart, retired October 3, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Edwin Barnch Winans, from October 18, 1927, vice Maj. Gen. Robert Alexander, retired October 17, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Dugald Leitch, from November 6, 1927, vice Maj. Gen. John M. Jenkins, retired November 5, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Quinton Donaldson, from December 11, 1927, vice Maj. Gen. Edward M. Lewis, to be retired from active service December 10, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Henry Davis Todd, jr., from December 25, 1927, vice Maj. Gen. James H. McRae, to be retired from active service December 24, 1927.

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Columbus Barnhart, Cavalry, from June 23, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Malvern-Hill Barnum, who accepted appointment as major general, June 23, 1927.

Col. Meriwether Lewis Walker, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. James C. Rhea, retired June 30, 1927.

Col. Abraham Grant Lott, Cavalry, vice Brig. Gen. Thomas Q. Donaldson, nominated for appointment as major general.

Col. Charles Roscoe Howland, Infantry, vice Brig. Gen. Henry D. Todd, jr., nominated for appointment as major general.

Col. George Hairston Jamerson, Infantry, from August 26, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Robert Alexander, who accepted appointment as major general, August 26, 1927.

Col. Henry James Hatch, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 5, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. John M. Jenkins, who accepted appointment as major general, September 5, 1927.

Col. Ralph Henry Van Deman, Infantry, from September 28, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Eli A. Helmick (major general, the Inspector General), retired September 27, 1927.

Col. James Haynes Reeves, Cavalry, from October 2, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Merch B. Stewart, who accepted appointment as major general October 2, 1927.

Col. Walter Cowen Short, Cavalry, from October 4, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Richmond P. Davis, who accepted appointment as major general October 4, 1927.

Col. Frank Sherwood Cocheu, Infantry, from October 18, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Winans, who accepted appointment as major general October 18, 1927.

Col. Otho Bane Rosenbaum, Infantry, from November 6, 1927, vice Brig. Gen. Joseph D. Leitch, who accepted appointment as major general November 6, 1927.

FIELD ARTILLERY

To be Chief of Field Artillery, with the rank of major general, for the period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from December 20, 1927

Col. Fred Thaddeus Austin, Field Artillery, vice Maj. Gen. William J. Snow, Chief of Field Artillery, to be retired from active service December 19, 1927.

SIGNAL CORPS

To be Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from January 9, 1928

Col. George Sabin Gibbs, Signal Corps, vice Maj. Gen. Charles McK. Saltzman, Chief Signal Officer, whose term of office expires January 8, 1928.

CHAPLAINS

To be Chief of Chaplains, with the rank of colonel, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from April 7, 1928

Chaplain (Lieut. Col.) Edmund Pepperell Easterbrook, vice Chaplain (Col.) John T. Axton, Chief of Chaplains, to be retired from active service April 6, 1928.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

To be The Adjutant General, with the rank of major general, for the period of four years begining July 2, 1927, with rank from July 2, 1927

Brig. Gen. Lutz Wahl, Assistant The Adjutant General, vice Maj. Gen. Robert C. Davis, The Adjutant General, retired from active service, July 1, 1927.

To be Assistant The Adjutant General, with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of four years beginning July 2, 1927, with rank from July 2, 1927

Col. Charles Higbee Bridges, Adjutant General's Department, vice Brig. Gen. Lutz Wahl, Assistant The Adjutant General, who accepted appointment as major general, The Adjutant General, July 2, 1927.

INSPECTOR GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

To be Inspector General, with the rank of major general, for the period of four years beginning September 28, 1927, with rank from September 28, 1927

Col. William Cannon Rivers, Cavalry, vice Maj. Gen. Eli A. Helmick, Inspector General, retired from active service September 27, 1927.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

To be assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of four years beginning August 2, 1927, with rank from August 2, 1927

Col. William Edward Horton, Quartermaster Corps, vice Brig. Gen. Arthur W. Yates, assistant to the Quartermaster General, retired from active service August 1, 1927.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

To be assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of four years beginning July 20, 1927, with rank from July 20, 1927

Col. Samuel Hof, Ordnance Department, vice Brig. Gen. John W. Joyes, assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, whose term of office expired July 19, 1927.

AIR CORPS

To be Chief of the Air Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from December 14, 1927

Brig. Gen. James Edmond Fechét, assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps, vice Maj. Gen. Mason M. Patrick, Chief of the Air Corps, who is to be retired from active service December 13, 1927.

To be Assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance

Lieut. Col. Benjamin Delahauf Foulois, Air Corps, vice Brig. Gen. James E. Féchet, Assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps, nominated for appointment as Chief of the Air Corps.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 14, 1927

1. Cadet Hans William Holmer.
2. Cadet Harold Albert Kurstedt.
3. Cadet Edward Grow Daly.
4. Cadet Donald Chamberlin Hawkins.
5. Cadet Theodore Addison Weyher.
6. Cadet Robert Hammiell Naylor.
8. Cadet Paul Dunn Charles Berrigan.
9. Cadet Henry Gordon Douglas.
10. Cadet Joseph Winston Cox, jr.
11. Cadet George Townsend Derby.
12. Cadet Max Sherred Johnson.
13. Cadet Lee Bird Washbourne.
14. Cadet John Robert Crume, jr.
17. Cadet Charles Albert Harrington.
18. Cadet Charles H. McNutt.
19. Cadet Herman Walter Schull, jr.
22. Cadet Garrison Holt Davidson.
23. Cadet William Henderson Minter.

SIGNAL CORPS

20. Cadet Elmer Blair Garland.
30. Cadet Alvin Louis Pachynski.
35. Cadet Fred Wallace Kunesh.
41. Cadet James Wilson Green, jr.
46. Cadet William Perry Pence.
54. Cadet Charles Brundy Brown.
59. Cadet James Wilson.
61. Cadet George Lucien Richon.
66. Cadet Julius Theodore Flock.

CAVALRY

16. Cadet John Leonard Hines, jr.
21. Cadet Loren Davis Pegg.
24. Cadet Woodbury Megrew Burgess.
25. Cadet Manuel Jose Asensio.
36. Cadet Alexander Macomb Miller, jr.
39. Cadet William Hamilton Hunter.
49. Cadet Thomas John Hall Trapnell.

51. Cadet Raymond Wiley Curtis.
65. Cadet Edward Pont Mechling.
67. Cadet Robert Graham Lowe.
75. Cadet Charles Pennoyer Bixel.
80. Cadet Howard Auguste Kelly Perrilliat.
91. Cadet Thomas Frank Trapolino.
94. Cadet Henri Anthony Luebbermann.
100. Cadet Francis Scoon Gardner.
106. Cadet Leander LaChance Doan.
108. Cadet Theodore Kalakuka.
110. Cadet Henry Magruder Zeller, jr.

FIELD ARTILLERY

15. Cadet George Woodburne McGregor.
26. Cadet Cecil Winfield Land.
28. Cadet Frederic Joseph Brown.
34. Cadet Maurice Francis Daly.
37. Cadet Gerald Francis Lillard.
40. Cadet Francis Cecil Foster.
44. Cadet Laurence Sherman Kuter.
45. Cadet Fox Brandreth Conner.
47. Cadet Thomas Morgan Watlington, jr.
53. Cadet Reynolds Condon.
55. Cadet Edward Gilbert Farrand.
56. Cadet Mason Fred Stober.
58. Cadet Benjamin Whitehouse.
62. Cadet Thomas Kessler McManus.
63. Cadet Charles Richard Hutchison.
64. Cadet Stanley Burton Bonner.
70. Cadet John Milton Burdge, jr.
71. Cadet Bertram Arthur Holtzworth.
72. Cadet Frederick Andrew Granholm.
73. Cadet Daniel Phipps Miller.
74. Cadet Samuel James Simonton.
77. Cadet Alex Norwood Williams, jr.
79. Cadet Jeremiah Paul Holland.
81. Cadet John Mills Sterling.
83. Cadet Mark Kincaid Lewis, jr.
86. Cadet James Francis Collins.
89. Cadet Herbert Bryant Kirkpatrick.
95. Cadet Harold James Coyle.
101. Cadet Forester Hampton Sinclair.
103. Cadet Harold Stanley Isaacson.
104. Cadet Willis Webb Whelchel.
107. Cadet Arthur Edwin Solem.
109. Cadet Charlie Wesner.
113. Cadet Meredith Donald Masters.
115. Cadet Lewis Hinchman Ham.
117. Cadet Milton Merrill Towner.
118. Cadet Robert Curtis White.
121. Cadet Joseph Ganahl, jr.
123. Cadet John Marion Moore.
124. Cadet Stuart Wood.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

7. Cadet Julian Montgomery West.
27. Cadet Frederick Everett Day.
29. Cadet Edwin William Chamberlain.
31. Cadet Harry Oliver Paxson.
32. Cadet Henry Joseph Hoeffer.
38. Cadet George Fenton Peirce.
42. Cadet Parmer Wiley Edwards.
48. Cadet William Lewis McNamee.
50. Cadet John Raymond Lovell.
68. Cadet Everett Charles Dunham.
78. Cadet James Douglas Curtis.
90. Cadet Joseph Coleman Timberlake.
97. Cadet Olaf Helgesen Kyster.
98. Cadet Orrin Leigh Grover.
99. Cadet Harry Forrest Townsend.
116. Cadet Virgil Miles Kimm.
120. Cadet Aloysius Joseph Lepping.
125. Cadet Lawrence Edward Shaw.
126. Cadet Matthew Kemp Deichelmann.
127. Cadet Nathan Alton McLamb.
130. Cadet Frank Thomas Ostenberg.
134. Cadet John Kochevar.
138. Cadet Joy Thomas Wrean.
139. Cadet John Joseph Holst.
140. Cadet Guy Ernest Thrams.
141. Cadet Arthur Roth.
144. Cadet John Thomas Hopper.

INFANTRY

33. Cadet Robert Kirby Perrine.
43. Cadet Francis Elliot Howard.
52. Cadet Kenneth Earl Thiebaud.
57. Cadet Willard Burton Carlock.
60. Cadet George McCoy, jr.
69. Cadet George Edward Martin.
76. Cadet Robert Griffith Turner.
82. Cadet Edward James Francis Glavin.
84. Cadet Joseph Howard Gilbreth.
87. Cadet Horace Alvord Quinn.
88. Cadet Lee Roy Williams.
92. Cadet Edward Davis McLaughlin.
93. Cadet James Virgil Thompson.
96. Cadet Paul Edwin Schewe.
102. Cadet Walter Morris Johnson.
105. Cadet Albert Harvey Dickerson.
111. Cadet Orville Melvin Hewitt.
112. Cadet Arthur Layton Cobb.
119. Cadet William Jordan Verbeck.
122. Cadet Fay Roscoe Upthegrove.
128. Cadet William Jefferson Glasgow, jr.
129. Cadet Charles Bertody Stone, 3d.
131. Cadet George Asnip, 2d.
132. Cadet Ruby Elderidge Hunter.
133. Cadet Ernest Godfrey Schmidt.
135. Cadet Ernest Benjamin Gray.
136. Cadet Douglas Campbell.
137. Cadet William Joseph Phelan.
142. Cadet Carl Sherman Graybeal.
143. Cadet David Morgan Hackman.
145. Cadet Ralph Wise Zwicker.
146. Cadet Woodson Finch Hocker.
147. Cadet James Albemarle Harron.
148. Cadet William Edgar Thomas.
149. Cadet Cyril Edward Williams.
150. Cadet Arthur Milner Burghduff, jr.
151. Cadet Joseph Woitkievicz Vincent.
152. Cadet Robert Martin Wohlforth.
153. Cadet Vachel Davis Whatley, jr.
154. Cadet George Edward Levings.
155. Cadet Harry Ellery McKinney.
156. Cadet Carl Elliott Lundquist.
157. Cadet Antullo Segarra.
158. Cadet Bernard Cecil Rose.
159. Cadet Guy Stanley Meloy, jr.
160. Cadet George Van Horn Moseley, jr.
161. Cadet Roy William Axup.
162. Cadet John Walker Kirby.
163. Cadet Forrest Anthony Hornisher.
164. Cadet Raymond Earle Bell.
165. Cadet Dudley George Strickler.
166. Cadet Dana Powers McGown.
167. Cadet Charles Boal Ewing.
168. Cadet Felix Alex Todd, jr.
169. Cadet Barney Avant Daughtry.
170. Cadet John Ogden Kilgore.
171. Cadet Philip DeWitt Ginder.
172. Cadet Ralph Edwin Doty.
173. Cadet Howell Hopson Jordan.
174. Cadet Robert Frederick Sink.
175. Cadet Elmer Matthew Webb, jr.
176. Cadet John Prame Kaylor.
177. Cadet Christian Gotthard Nelson.
178. Cadet Martin Joseph Morin.
179. Cadet Gilbert McKee Allen, jr.
180. Cadet Calvin Louis Whittle.
181. Cadet George Emericus Bender.
182. Cadet Jack Henry Griffith.
183. Cadet Robert Campbell Aloe.
184. Cadet Montgomery McKee.
185. Cadet David Stuart Loughborough.
186. Cadet Nelson Irving Fooks.
187. Cadet Malcolm Frederick Bauer.
188. Cadet Lawton Butler.
189. Cadet Marion Huggins.
190. Cadet Frederick Funston, jr.
191. Cadet Martin Moses.
192. Cadet Robert John West, jr.
193. Cadet Edgar Daniel Stark.
194. Cadet David Drew Hedekin.
195. Cadet James William Smyly, jr.
196. Cadet Raymund Gregory Stanton.
197. Cadet Neil Bosworth Harding.
198. Cadet Jesse Floyd Dressler.
199. Cadet Willis Small Matthews.
200. Cadet Robert Lewis Easton.
201. Cadet Henry Malone Bailey.
202. Cadet Fred Leroy Thorpe.
203. Cadet William Rapier Francis Bleakney.

To be second lieutenants with rank from January 22, 1927

Flying Cadet Earl Clinton Robbins, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Andrew Joseph Kerwin Malone, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Russell Keiller, Air Corps.
Sergt. Charles Clifford Coppin, jr., Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Mark Darrow Stephen Steensen, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Ernest Harold Lawson, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet John Edward Bodle, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet William Harold Doolittle, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Russell Scott, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Burton Murdock Hovey, jr., Air Corps.
Staff Sergt. Richard Eastman Cobb, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Alexander Everett Cabana, Air Corps.

To be second lieutenants with rank from January 23, 1927

Flying Cadet Dale Davis Fisher, Air Corps.
Henry Weisbrod Dorr, Air Corps.
Irvin Alberta Woodring, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Carlisle Iverson Ferris, Air Corps.
Elwood Richard Quesada, Air Corps.
Willard Roland Wolfinbarger, Air Corps.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 16, 1927

Corpl. Harold Henry Hunt, Field Artillery.
Sergt. Joseph Lawrence Dark, Infantry.
Sergt. Henry Rosser Angell, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Frank Keith Park, Air Corps.
Staff Sergt. Paul Leamon Woodruff, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Walter William Gross, Air Corps.
Corpl. Joseph George Felber, Infantry.
Flying Cadet Otto Clyde George, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Harold Arthur Wheaton, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet John N. Jones, Air Corps.
Flying Cadet Gilbert Lorenzo Tefft, Air Corps.
Sergt. Vera H. Wiseman, Infantry.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 30, 1927

Morris Miller Bauer, Corps of Engineers.
Rex Ivar Heinlein, jr., Corps of Engineers.
Frank Alfred Lightfoot, Field Artillery.
John Richmond Pitman, jr., Field Artillery.
George Selman, Infantry.
Earl Clarence Bergquist, Infantry.
Richard Chase, Infantry.
Albert Neil Hickey, Infantry.
Ronald Irving Pride, Field Artillery.
Royce Alison Drake, Cavalry.
Paul Alfred Disney, Cavalry.
Leo William Desrosiers, Air Corps.
Gordon Philip Saville, Air Corps.
Charles Bernard Overacker, jr., Air Corps.
George Henry Macnair, Air Corps.
William Barwig Blaufuss, Air Corps.
Louis Howard Foote, Corps of Engineers.
James Arthur Ellison, Air Corps.
Hoyt Leroy Prindle, Air Corps.
James Franklin Walsh, Air Corps.
George Richard Geer, Air Corps.
Forrest Lynne Neville, Air Corps.
Donald Wright Benner, Air Corps.
John Quincy Adams, Air Corps.
Harry John Flatequal, Air Corps.
Herman Franklin Woolard, Air Corps.
Lawrence Henry Douthit, Air Corps.
George Robert Acheson, Air Corps.
Harry Prime Bissell, Air Corps.
Keith Roscoe, Air Corps.
Frank Hamlet Robinson, Air Corps.
Waldine Winston Messmore, Air Corps.
Herbert Melvin Newstrom, Air Corps.
Allen Ralph Springer, Air Corps.
Franklin Calhoun Wolfe, Air Corps.
Ford Larimore Fair, Air Corps.
Ivan Maurice Palmer, Air Corps.
Harold Frederick Brown, Air Corps.
Joseph Gerard Hopkins, Air Corps.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. Donald Carl Snyder, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from April 1, 1927.

First Lieut. Rawley Ernest Chambers, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from May 2, 1927.

First Lieut. Stanton Knowlton Livingston, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from June 15, 1927.

First Lieut. Thomas Fort Bridges, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from June 30, 1927.

First Lieut. Fletcher Emory Ammons, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Lester Maris Dyke, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. William Berry Wilson, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Henry Bennett Lavery, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Harold LeRoy Stewart, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Arthur John Redland, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. William Foster Burdick, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. James Bathurst Smith, jr., Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. William Lenoir Wilson, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Carlton Duncan Goodiel, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Frank Wilburn Messer, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. William Mahlon James, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. August Wesley Spittler, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Robert Francis Bradish, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Jacob Charles Harshbarger, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Horace Page Marvin, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Kenneth Gilbert Smith, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Ralph Matthews Sloan, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Leonard Dudley Heaton, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. William Hubert Seale, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Marion Whitmell Ransone, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. William Riney Craig, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Thomas William Ellsworth Christmas, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Edward Herman Theis, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Harold Willard Glattly, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. James Pope Gill, jr., Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. Francis Elbert Council, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. John Presly Bachman, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. John Buist Chester, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. George Barnard Moore, jr., Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 3, 1927.

First Lieut. John Winchester Rich, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 17, 1927.

First Lieut. Thomas Brown Murphy, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 17, 1927.

First Lieut. Huston J. Banton, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 17, 1927.

First Lieut. Hervey Burson Porter, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 17, 1927.

DENTAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. Kenneth Pearce Fulton, Dental Corps Reserve, with rank from June 17, 1927.

First Lieut. Harold George Ott, Dental Corps Reserve, with rank from September 26, 1927.

First Lieut. Leland Stanford Mabry, Dental Corps Reserve, with rank from October 26, 1927.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Second Lieut. Charles Stunkard Greer, Veterinary Corps Reserve, with rank from October 7, 1927.

Second Lieut. John Lloyd Owens, Veterinary Corps Reserve, with rank from October 29, 1927.

APPOINTMENT IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

To be second lieutenant with rank from June 15, 1927

Bienvenido Mobo Alba, graduate Naval Academy.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. William White Dick, Infantry (detailed in Adjutant General's Department), October 19, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. William Elbridge Chickering, Infantry (detailed in Adjutant General's Department), March 12, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Perry Cole Ragan, Infantry (detailed in Adjutant General's Department), November 9, 1927, with rank from July 8, 1924.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Lee Stephen Tillotson, Infantry, June 24, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Joel Franklin Watson, Quartermaster Corps (detailed in Judge Advocate General's Department), July 12, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Thomas Waples Barnard, Infantry, October 6, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Irwin Samuel Dierking, Infantry, October 26, 1927, with rank from September 16, 1925.

First Lieut. James Courtney Browne, Cavalry, April 22, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Robert Brice Johnston, Infantry, April 6, 1927, with rank from October 3, 1926.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Horatio Grant Coykendall, Infantry (detailed in Finance Department), April 11, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Arthur James Perry, Infantry (detailed in Finance Department), May 5, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Lemuel Edwin Edwards, Quartermaster Corps (detailed in Finance Department), July 30, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. John Fidelis Connell, Quartermaster Corps (detailed in Finance Department), April 30, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lieut. Warren Nourse Underwood, Coast Artillery Corps, October 19, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1925.

Second Lieut. Herbert William Ehrgott, Field Artillery, March 30, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1926.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Frank Fenton Reed, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Ordnance Department), March 10, 1927, with rank from September 25, 1926.

First Lieut. Garland Thomas Rowland, Infantry (detailed in Ordnance Department), March 8, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Harold Mark Reedall, Infantry (detailed in Ordnance Department), March 8, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

SIGNAL CORPS

Maj. Hamner Huston, Infantry, April 12, 1927, with rank from September 5, 1923.

Capt. Gordon Cogswell Irwin, Infantry (detailed in Signal Corps), March 7, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Mark Rhoads, Cavalry (detailed in Signal Corps), October 27, 1927, with rank from November 4, 1919.

First Lieut. Percival Adams Wakeman, Infantry (detailed in Signal Corps), March 18, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. William Holmes Wenstrom, Cavalry, March 22, 1927, with rank from August 26, 1923.

CAVALRY

Capt. Thomas Grafton Hanson, jr., Quartermaster Corps, May 10, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. John O'Day Murtaugh, Infantry, April 23, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1924.

Second Lieut. Prentice Edward Yeomans, Air Corps, March 24, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1926.

FIELD ARTILLERY

Maj. Edward White Wildrick, Coast Artillery Corps, March 22, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Albert Charles Stanford, Signal Corps, June 13, 1927, with rank from April 19, 1920.

First Lieut. Ernest Thomas Hayes, Infantry, May 29, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Roswell Boyle Hart, Infantry, July 19, 1927, with rank from June 25, 1924.

First Lieut. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, Infantry, March 16, 1927, with rank from August 19, 1925.

First Lieut. Esher Claflin Burkart, Cavalry, August 1, 1927, with rank from September 17, 1925.

Second Lieut. Wilbur Ray Pierce, Infantry, September 30, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1923.

Second Lieut. William Augustus Davis Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps, July 11, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1923.

Second Lieut. James Robert Lindsay, jr., Infantry, November 15, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1923.

Second Lieut. Thomas Clagett Wood, jr., Infantry, November 7, 1927, with rank from June 15, 1924.

Second Lieut. Arthur Bliss, Infantry, June 17, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1925.

Second Lieut. John Llewellyn Lewis, Infantry, June 15, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1925.

Second Lieut. Donald Dunford, Infantry, May 19, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1925.

Second Lieut. Julien Henry Baumann, Infantry, October 17, 1927, with rank from June 30, 1925.

Second Lieut. William Murlin Creasy, jr., Air Corps, April 18, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1926.

Second Lieut. John Prichard Woodbridge, Air Corps, April 18, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1926.

Second Lieut. Gregg Miller Lindsay, Air Corps, May 24, 1927, with rank from June 30, 1926.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Maj. Willard Karle Richards, Ordnance Department, April 12, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Albert Dewitt Chipman, Cavalry, May 21, 1927, with rank from July 9, 1919.

Capt. Russell Thomas George, Cavalry, May 2, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Jesse Knox Freeman, Infantry, August 18, 1927, with rank from January 23, 1924.

First Lieut. Auston Monroe Wilson, jr., Field Artillery, September 6, 1927, with rank from January 17, 1923.

Second Lieut. John Mitchell England, Field Artillery, June 13, 1927, with rank from July 3, 1923.

Second Lieut. Frederick Cruger Pyne, Field Artillery, December 1, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Frederic Powell, Field Artillery, July 5, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1925.

Second Lieut. William Frederick Niethamer, Infantry, October 26, 1927, with rank from June 30, 1925.

Second Lieut. Holger Nelson Toftoy, Air Corps, March 9, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1926.

Second Lieut. Charles Winchell McGeehan, Air Corps, April 20, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1926.

Second Lieut. Henry Lee Hughes, Air Corps, May 9, 1927, with rank from June 13, 1926.

Second Lieut. Paul August Jaccard, Air Corps, March 28, 1927, with rank from June 30, 1926.

Second Lieut. Paul Burnham Nelson, Air Corps, June 28, 1927, with rank from June 30, 1926.

INFANTRY

Col. David Lamme Stone, Quartermaster Corps, April 26, 1927, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John Southworth Upham, Adjutant General's Department (promoted lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department, during the recess of the Senate), October 17, 1927, with rank from August 2, 1927.

Maj. Joseph James O'Hare, Coast Artillery Corps (promoted major, Coast Artillery Corps, during the recess of the Senate), September 1, 1927, with rank from June 2, 1927.

Second Lieut. Josiah Ross, Air Corps, April 21, 1927, with rank from June 13, 1926.

AIR CORPS

First Lieut. Randolph Piersol Williams, Signal Corps (detailed in Air Corps), October 25, 1927, with rank from August 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Ralph Francis Stearley, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), July 28, 1927, with rank from January 17, 1924.

First Lieut. Charles Dawson McAllister, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), September 23, 1927, with rank from March 11, 1926.

First Lieut. James Milliken Bevans, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), October 4, 1927, with rank from September 1, 1926.

First Lieut. Donald Fowler Fritch, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), April 15, 1927, with rank from January 30, 1927.

Second Lieut. Herbert William Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), November 11, 1927, with rank from July 3, 1923.

Second Lieut. George Hinkle Steel, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), April 1, 1927, with rank from June 12, 1924.

Second Lieut. William Ewing Baker, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), September 29, 1927, with rank from June 14, 1924.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be major generals, reserve

Maj. Gen. Edward Lawrence Logan, Massachusetts National Guard, from November 1, 1927.

Maj. Gen. Morris Benham Payne, Connecticut National Guard, from August 29, 1927.

To be brigadier generals, reserve

Brig. Gen. Elmore Farrington Austin, New York National Guard, from May 16, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Erland Frederick Fish, Massachusetts National Guard, from April 29, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Irving Andrews Fish, Wisconsin National Guard, from October 11, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Dudley Jackson Hard, Ohio National Guard, from April 30, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Erle Davis Luce, Minnesota National Guard, from October 27, 1927.

Brig. Gen. William Swan McLean, jr., Pennsylvania National Guard, from July 20, 1927.

Brig. Gen. George Francis O'Connell, Wisconsin National Guard, from July 9, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Allison Owen, Louisiana National Guard, from March 5, 1927.

Brig. Gen. John James Phelan, New York National Guard, from March 25, 1927.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be brigadier general, reserve

Brig. Gen. Albert Lyman Cox, reserve, from November 10, 1927.

To be brigadier generals, Auxiliary Reserve

Brig. Gen. George Edmund de Schweinitz, Auxiliary Reserve, from July 5, 1927.

Brig. Gen. William Barclay Parsons, Auxiliary Reserve, from July 5, 1927.

Brig. Gen. Henry Lewis Stimson, Auxiliary Reserve, from May 16, 1927.

To be brigadier general, Signal Corps Reserve

Brig. Gen. Clinton Goodloe Edgar, Signal Corps Reserve, from July 5, 1927.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Harris Pendleton, jr., Infantry, from March 9, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Howard Gilman Davids, Infantry, from March 19, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Infantry from March 20, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Hilden Olin, Finance Department, from May 8, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Albert Watson Foreman, Infantry, from May 17, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Perrin Lindsey Smith, Finance Department, from May 22, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Harry Lawrence Cooper, Infantry, from June 1, 1927.

Lieut. Col. William Stanley Sinclair, Infantry, from June 2, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Charles Louis Willard, Quartermaster Corps, from June 3, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Arthur Pitt Watts, Infantry, from June 23, 1927.

Lieut. Col. William Arthur Carleton, Infantry, from June 30, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Lochlin Washington Caffey, Infantry, from July 1, 1927.

Lieut. Col. William Saunders Faulkner, Infantry, from July 2, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Ernest H. Agnew, Quartermaster Corps, from July 18, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Robert Oakes Ragsdale, Infantry, from July 20, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Austin Allen Parker, Infantry, from August 2, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Fred Van Schaick Chamberlain, Infantry, from August 3, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Aubrey Lippincott, Cavalry, from August 17, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Robert Christian Humber, Infantry, from August 26, 1927.

Lieut. Col. George Luther Hicks, Adjutant General's Department, from September 7, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Parker Hitt, Infantry, from September 20, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Dennis Patrick Quinlan, Judge Advocate General's Department, from September 21, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Kyle Rucker, Judge Advocate General's Department, from September 23, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Lynn Sawyer Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 25, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Hugh Kirkpatrick Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 28, 1927.

Lieut. Col. William Henry Noble, Quartermaster Corps, from October 2, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Douglas McCaskey, Cavalry, from October 4, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Freeborn Page Holcomb, Finance Department, from October 17, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Clenard McLaughlin, Infantry, from October 18, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Edward Beall Mitchell, Infantry, from October 18, 1927.

Lieut. Col. James Henry Como, Quartermaster Corps, from October 29, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Harol Dever Coburn, Infantry from November 6, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Allen James Greer, Field Artillery, from November 11, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Robert Whitfield, Adjutant General's Department, from November 17, 1927.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. James Andrew Mars, Air Corps, from March 9, 1927.

Maj. Robert Morgan Lyon, Infantry, from March 11, 1927.

Maj. William Mechling Colvin, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 13, 1927.

Maj. Benjamin Edwards Grey, Infantry, from March 19, 1927.

Maj. Elvid Hunt, Infantry, from March 20, 1927.

Maj. Dorsey Read Rodney, Cavalry, from April 1, 1927.

Maj. Alexander Mortimer Milton, Cavalry, from April 9, 1927.

Maj. Campbell Blackshear Hodges, Infantry, from April 23, 1927.

Maj. Jacob Winfield Scott Wuest, Air Corps, from May 8, 1927.

Maj. Max Bruce Garber, Infantry, from May 13, 1927.

Maj. Corbit Strickland Hoffman, Infantry, from May 14, 1927.

Maj. Stephen Wilson Winfree, Cavalry, from May 17, 1927.

Maj. Arthur Emmett Ahrends, Infantry, from May 22, 1927.

Maj. Charles Franklin Severson, Infantry, from June 1, 1927.

Maj. Harry Surgisson Grier, Infantry, from June 2, 1927.

Maj. Charles Beatty Moore, Infantry, from June 3, 1927.

Maj. Clark Lynn, Adjutant General's Department, from June 23, 1927.

Maj. Cornelius Stockmar Bendel, Infantry, from June 30, 1927.

Maj. Ben Frazer Ristine, Infantry, from July 1, 1927.

Maj. Albert Gilmor, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 2, 1927.

Maj. Stuart Ainslee Howard, Adjutant General's Department, from July 17, 1927.

Maj. John Francis Franklin, Infantry, from July 18, 1927.

Maj. Roland Wallace Boughton, Infantry, from July 20, 1927.

Maj. Irving Monroe Madison, Infantry, from August 3, 1927.

Maj. Ellery Farmer, Infantry, from August 17, 1927.

Maj. Everett Newton Bowman, Infantry, from August 23, 1927.

Maj. Homer Neill Preston, Infantry, from August 26, 1927.

Maj. Edward Aloysius Brown, Adjutant General's Department, from August 26, 1927.

Maj. William Franklin Harrell, Infantry, from September 2, 1927.

Maj. George Edgar Nelson, Field Artillery, from September 7, 1927.

Maj. Jesse Duncan Elliott, Infantry, from September 11, 1927.

Maj. Edward Himmelwright Tarbutton, Quartermaster Corps, from September 14, 1927.

Maj. Carroll Borden Hodges, Infantry, from September 20, 1927.

Maj. Daniel Murray Cheston, jr., Infantry, from September 21, 1927.

Maj. James Madison Churchill, Infantry, from September 22, 1927.

Maj. Luther Rice James, Infantry, from September 23, 1927.

Maj. Andrew Davis Chaffin, Infantry, from September 25, 1927.
Maj. Frederick Wegener Boschen, Finance Department, from September 28, 1927.
Maj. Louis Farrell, Infantry, from September 29, 1927.
Maj. Charles Otto Schudt, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 2, 1927.
Maj. Emmett Addis, Cavalry, from October 4, 1927.
Maj. Harry Lazelle King, Cavalry, from October 5, 1927.
Maj. William Franklin Robinson, jr., Infantry, from October 17, 1927.
Maj. John James Burleigh, Infantry, from October 18, 1927.
Maj. Arthur Gerald Hixson, Cavalry, from October 18, 1927.
Maj. Augustine Aloysius Hofmann, Infantry, from October 29, 1927.
Maj. James Blyth, Infantry, from November 5, 1927.
Maj. Edwin Gunner, Quartermaster Corps, from November 6, 1927.
Maj. Resolve Potter Palmer, Adjutant General's Department, from November 11, 1927.
Maj. Edward Eugene McCammon, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
Maj. Paul Calkins Potter, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
Maj. Albert Thurston Rich, Quartermaster Corps, from November 16, 1927.
Maj. David Perry Wood, Infantry, from November 17, 1927.
Maj. Charles Bean Amory, jr., Cavalry, from November 22, 1927.

To be majors

Capt. William Earl Chambers, Infantry, from March 8, 1927.
Capt. Joseph Merit Tully, Cavalry, from March 9, 1927.
Capt. James de Barth Walbach, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 11, 1927.
Capt. Warner William Carr, Infantry, from March 13, 1927.
Capt. Hugh Mitchell, Signal Corps, from March 14, 1927.
Capt. Robert LeGrow Walsh, Air Corps, from March 19, 1927.
Capt. Richard Mar Levy, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 20, 1927.
Capt. Thomas Lyle Martin, Infantry, from April 1, 1927.
Capt. Geoffrey Prescott Baldwin, Infantry, from April 9, 1927.
Capt. Kenneth Macomb Halpine, Infantry, from April 23, 1927.
Capt. George Sidney Andrew, Cavalry, from April 26, 1927.
Capt. Roland Paget Shugg, Field Artillery, from May 8, 1927.
Capt. Ellicott Hewes Freeland, Coast Artillery Corps, from May 14, 1927.
Capt. Spencer Albert Townsend, Cavalry, from May 17, 1927.
Capt. Richard Clark Birmingham, Infantry, from May 18, 1927.
Capt. Felix Rossiter McLean, Infantry, from May 18, 1927.
Capt. James Cornelius Ruddell, Coast Artillery Corps, from May 20, 1927.
Capt. Thomas Green Peyton, Cavalry, from May 22, 1927.
Capt. Joseph Hamilton Grant, Infantry, from June 1, 1927.
Capt. Arthur Monroe Ellis, Infantry, from June 3, 1927.
Capt. Maurice Levi Miller, Infantry, from June 23, 1927.
Capt. Junius Henry Houghton, Air Corps, from June 30, 1927.
Capt. Abram Vorhees Rinearson, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1927.
Capt. Benjamin Anthony Yancey, Infantry, from July 2, 1927.
Capt. William George Patterson, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 17, 1927.
Capt. Douglas Jenkins Page, Field Artillery, from July 18, 1927.
Capt. James Nephew Caperton, Cavalry, from July 20, 1927.
Capt. Charles Compton Smith, Cavalry, from July 26, 1927.
Capt. Harrison Herman, Cavalry, from August 1, 1927.
Capt. Frank Clark Scofield, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 1, 1927.
Capt. George Joseph Newgarden, jr., Infantry, from August 1, 1927.
Capt. John David Miley, Infantry, from August 2, 1927.
Capt. John Forest Goodman, Infantry, from August 3, 1927.
Capt. Ferdinand Francis Gallagher, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 17, 1927.
Capt. Barrington Lockhart Flanigen, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 23, 1927.
Capt. Robert Kenneth Whitson, Infantry, from August 26, 1927.
Capt. Otto Frederick Lange, Infantry, from August 26, 1927.
Capt. Harlan Leslie Mumma, Infantry, from August 31, 1927.
Capt. Alexander Mathias Weyand, Infantry, from September 2, 1927.
Capt. Walter David Mangan, Field Artillery, from September 7, 1927.
Capt. Henry Parker Blanks, Infantry, from September 11, 1927.
Capt. Carl Archibald Bishop, Infantry, from September 14, 1927.
Capt. Ansel Griggs Wineman, Field Artillery, from September 20, 1927.
Capt. James Ellis Slack, Cavalry, from September 21, 1927.
Capt. Marvin Randolph Baer, Infantry, from September 21, 1927.
Capt. Marvin Conrad Heyser, Field Artillery, from September 22, 1927.
Capt. Harold Preston Kayser, Infantry, from September 23, 1927.
Capt. Basil Dennis Spalding, Infantry, from September 24, 1927.
Capt. Sidney Guthrie Brady, Field Artillery, from September 25, 1927.
Capt. Robert Sherman Barr, Ordnance Department, from September 28, 1927.
Capt. Charles Joseph Herzer, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 28, 1927.
Capt. George Lea Febiger, Infantry, from September 29, 1927.
Capt. George A. Pollin, Field Artillery, from October 2, 1927.
Capt. Claud Edward Stadtman, Infantry, from October 4, 1927.
Capt. Erwin Cobia West Davis, Field Artillery, from October 5, 1927.
Capt. Clarence Ralph Huebner, Infantry, from October 7, 1927.
Capt. Frederick McCabe, Infantry, from October 16, 1927.
Capt. Irving Howard Engleman, Infantry, from October 17, 1927.
Capt. William M. Cravens, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 18, 1927.
Capt. Frederick Joseph de Rohan, Infantry, from October 18, 1927.
Capt. Frederick Schoenfeld, Quartermaster Corps, from October 29, 1927.
Capt. Arthur Paul Thayer, Cavalry, from October 30, 1927.
Capt. Emile George De Coen, Field Artillery, from November 5, 1927.
Capt. John Boone Martin, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 6, 1927.
Capt. Paul Joseph McDonnell, Infantry, from November 11, 1927.
Capt. Eustis Leland Poland, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
Capt. Paul Hathaway, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
Capt. Hardin Cleveland Sweeney, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
Capt. Eugene Manuel Landrum, Adjutant General's Department, from November 16, 1927.
Capt. Frank Glenister Ringland, Cavalry, from November 17, 1927.
Capt. John Barber Harper, Finance Department, from November 22, 1927.
Capt. Edwin Charles Mead, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 22, 1927.
Capt. William Fenton Lee, Infantry, from November 23, 1927.
Capt. George Worthen Teachout, Infantry, from November 30, 1927.

To be captains

First Lieut. William McCaskey Chapman, Infantry, from March 8, 1927.
First Lieut. Norman McNeill, Infantry, from March 9, 1927.
First Lieut. Glen Henry Anderson, Infantry, from March 11, 1927.
First Lieut. Bryant Edward Moore, Infantry, from March 11, 1927.
First Lieut. Leo Vincent Warner, Field Artillery, from March 13, 1927.
First Lieut. Alston Deas, Infantry, from March 14, 1927.
First Lieut. Henry William Bobrink, Quartermaster Corps, from March 19, 1927.
First Lieut. Onslow Sherburne Rolfe, Infantry, from March 20, 1927.
First Lieut. Henry Perkins Gantt, Field Artillery, from April 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Jesse Brooke Matlack, Field Artillery, from April 6, 1927.
First Lieut. Parry Weaver Lewis, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 8, 1927.

First Lieut. Edward Wrenne Timberlake, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 9, 1927.
First Lieut. William Wallace Jenna, Infantry, from April 16, 1927.
First Lieut. William Richard Fleming, Infantry, from April 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Francis Porter Simpson, Infantry, from April 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Harry Cooper Barnes, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from April 24, 1927.
First Lieut. Robert John Hoffman, Infantry, from April 26, 1927.
First Lieut. Clare Wallace Woodward, Infantry, from April 29, 1927.
First Lieut. John Stevenson Mallory, Field Artillery, from May 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Frederick Dent Sharp, Field Artillery, from May 3, 1927.
First Lieut. William Sydney Barrett, Chemical Warfare Service, from May 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Paul Ryan Goode, Infantry, from May 7, 1927.
First Lieut. Henry Niles Rising, Ordnance Department, from May 8, 1927.
First Lieut. Henry Cornelius Demuth, Field Artillery, from May 13, 1927.
First Lieut. Lowell Meeker Riley, Field Artillery, from May 14, 1927.
First Lieut. Emil Krause, Infantry, from May 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Robert Lynn Bacon, Infantry, from May 18, 1927.
First Lieut. Edwin Jacob House, Air Corps, from May 18, 1927.
First Lieut. Arthur Charles Purvis, Infantry, from May 18, 1927.
First Lieut. James Jackson Hea, Infantry, from May 20, 1927.
First Lieut. Carlisle Brittannia Wilson, Infantry, from May 21, 1927.
First Lieut. Harold Lewis Milan, Infantry, from May 22, 1927.
First Lieut. Horace Harding, Field Artillery, from May 22, 1927.
First Lieut. Fred Ernest Davis, Quartermaster Corps, from May 26, 1927.
First Lieut. George Darryll Gamble, Quartermaster Corps, from May 31, 1927.
First Lieut. Edmund Graham West, Quartermaster Corps, from June 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Joseph Idus Lambert, Cavalry, from June 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Clarence Nelson Iry, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Joseph Worth Timmons, jr., Quartermaster Corps, from June 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Hugh Whitt, Finance Department, from June 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Charles Frederick Wilson, Quartermaster Corps, from June 5, 1927.
First Lieut. Ray Aloysious Dunn, Air Corps, from June 15, 1927.
First Lieut. Irwin Wilson Guth, Quartermaster Corps, from June 16, 1927.
First Lieut. Crawford McMann Kellogg, Chemical Warfare Service, from June 21, 1927.
First Lieut. William Frank Johnson, Infantry, from June 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Frank Dennison Wheeler, Quartermaster Corps, from June 30, 1927.
First Lieut. Herbert Allen Gardner, Quartermaster Corps, from July 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Albert Lobitz, Quartermaster Corps, from July 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Simon Jacobson, Quartermaster Corps, from July 9, 1927.
First Lieut. Edward William Lachmiller, Quartermaster Corps, from July 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Talmage Phillips, Quartermaster Corps, from July 18, 1927.
First Lieut. John Paul Tillman, Quartermaster Corps, from July 18, 1927.
First Lieut. George Wilbur McEntire, Air Corps, from July 20, 1927.
First Lieut. John Newport Greene, Cavalry, from July 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Charles Harrison Brammell, Field Artillery, from July 26, 1927.
First Lieut. Frank Arthur Mertz, Quartermaster Corps, from August 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Asa Jeremiah Etheridge, Air Corps, from August 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Earl Spiker Schofield, Air Corps, from August 1, 1927.
First Lieut. Henry James Conner, Quartermaster Corps, from August 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Arthur Emel Simonin, Air Corps, from August 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Frank O'Driscoll Hunter, Air Corps, from August 3, 1927.
First Lieut. Harold Huston George, Air Corps, from August 10, 1927.
First Lieut. Alden Harry Waitt, Chemical Warfare Service, from August 13, 1927.
First Lieut. Sterling Clifton Robertson, Infantry, from August 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Charles Walton Cameron, Quartermaster Corps, from August 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Arthur Edwin Danielson, Quartermaster Corps, from August 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Paul Lindsay Beard, Quartermaster Corps, from August 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Joseph Lawrence Aman, Ordnance Department, from August 26, 1927.
First Lieut. Walter Jay Reed, Air Corps, from August 26, 1927.
First Lieut. St. Clair Streett, Air Corps, from August 31, 1927.
First Lieut. Ranald Trevor Adams, Field Artillery, from August 31, 1927.
First Lieut. Andrew Jackson Nichols, Infantry, from August 31, 1927.
First Lieut. Archie Donald Cameron, Infantry, from September 1, 1927.
First Lieut. John Conrad Christophel, Quartermaster Corps, from September 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Roger Shaw McCullough, Air Corps, from September 3, 1927.
First Lieut. Frank Morell, Quartermaster Corps, from September 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Peter Shemonsky, Quartermaster Corps, from September 7, 1927.
First Lieut. William Hunt Roach, Quartermaster Corps, from September 10, 1927.
First Lieut. Carl Bierwirth Searing, Infantry, from September 11, 1927.
First Lieut. Robert Lake Miller, Quartermaster Corps, from September 14, 1927.
First Lieut. Ralph E.i Fleischer, Quartermaster Corps, from September 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Robert Oliver White, Quartermaster Corps, from September 18, 1927.
First Lieut. William Foelsing, Quartermaster Corps, from September 20, 1927.
First Lieut. Charles William Dietz, Quartermaster Corps, from September 21, 1927.
First Lieut. Walter Lane Shearman, Quartermaster Corps, from September 21, 1927.
First Lieut. Roy Marsh McCutchen, Corps of Engineers, from September 22, 1927.
First Lieut. Aubrey Hoodenpyl Bond, Corps of Engineers, from September 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Hubert Walter Collins, Corps of Engineers, from September 24, 1927.
First Lieut. Frank Bowman Hastie, Corps of Engineers, from September 25, 1927.
First Lieut. Bennett Hart Bowley, jr., Corps of Engineers, from September 27, 1927.
First Lieut. Robert Dorrance Ingalls, Corps of Engineers, from September 28, 1927.
First Lieut. Walter Lyman Medding, Corps of Engineers, from September 28, 1927.
First Lieut. Albert Carl Lieber, jr., Corps of Engineers, from September 29, 1927.
First Lieut. George Jacob Nold, Corps of Engineers, from October 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Samuel Howes Baker, Quartermaster Corps, from October 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Elisha Kenneth Henson, Quartermaster Corps, from October 5, 1927.
First Lieut. John Isham Moore, Air Corps, from October 7, 1927.
First Lieut. Lloyd Milton Garner, Quartermaster Corps, from October 9, 1927.
First Lieut. Vance Lawton Richmond, Infantry, from October 11, 1927.
First Lieut. Earle Trask Loucks, Infantry, from October 11 1927.

First Lieut. Harris Markham Findley, Field Artillery, from October 16, 1927.
First Lieut. Russell Crayden Winchester, Cavalry, from October 17, 1927.
First Lieut. George Hunter Passmore, Infantry, from October 18, 1927.
First Lieut. James Stevenson Rodwell, Cavalry, from October 18, 1927.
First Lieut. George Orenthus Allen Daughtry, Infantry, from October 20, 1927.
First Lieut. Kirk Broaddus, Cavalry, from October 23, 1927.
First Lieut. Newton Gale Bush, Infantry, from October 28, 1927.
First Lieut. Paolo Hoffoss Sperati, Infantry, from October 29, 1927.
First Lieut. LeRoy Welling Nichols, Infantry, from October 30, 1927.
First Lieut. Charles Martin Chamberlain, jr., Infantry, from November 1, 1927.
First Lieut. LeRoy Allen Whittaker, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 2, 1927.
First Lieut. Harry Barnes Sepulveda, Infantry, from November 5, 1927.
First Lieut. Samuel Charles Skemp, Air Corps, from November 5, 1927.
First Lieut. John Robert Hubbard, Quartermaster Corps, from November 6, 1927.
First Lieut. Robert Gale Breene, Air Corps, from November 6, 1927.
First Lieut. George Abe Woody, Ordnance Department, from November 6, 1927.
First Lieut. Thomas Kenneth Vincent, Ordnance Department, from November 11, 1927.
First Lieut. Samuel Littler Metcalfe, Infantry, from November 13, 1927.
First Lieut. Geoffrey Maurice O'Connell, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 15, 1927.
First Lieut. Frank Wilbur Halsey, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
First Lieut. Kirby Green, Infantry, from November 15, 1927.
First Lieut. Myron Joseph Conway, Infantry, from November 16, 1927.
First Lieut. Hollis Benjamin Hoyt, Infantry, from November 17, 1927.
First Lieut. Arthur Foster Gilmore, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 18, 1927.
First Lieut. John August Otto, Infantry, from November 22, 1927.
First Lieut. Joseph Burton Sweet, Infantry, from November 22, 1927.
First Lieut. William Quinntillus Jeffords, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from November 22, 1927.
First Lieut. Garland Cuzorte Black, Signal Corps, from November 23, 1927.
First Lieut. George Anthony Patrick, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 26, 1927.
First Lieut. Joseph Andral Nichols, Infantry, from November 28, 1927.
First Lieut. Leon Lightner Kotzebue, Infantry, from November 30, 1927.
First Lieut. Walter Christian Thee, Quartermaster Corps, from November 30, 1927.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. George Work Marvin, Corps of Engineers, from February 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Joseph Barrett, jr., Field Artillery, from February 20, 1927.
Second Lieut. Otto Spaulding Tinkel, Corps of Engineers, from February 24, 1927.
Second Lieut. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, Field Artillery, from February 24, 1927.
Second Lieut. Henry James Woodbury, Corps of Engineers, from February 25, 1927.
Second Lieut. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, Corps of Engineers, from February 27, 1927.
Second Lieut. Edmund Clayton Lynch, Air Corps, from February 27, 1927.
Second Lieut. Francis Jennings Wilson, Corps of Engineers, from March 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. Alfred August Kessler, jr., Air Corps, from March 8, 1927.
Second Lieut. Paschal Neilson Strong, jr., Corps of Engineers, from March 9, 1927.
Second Lieut. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Lawrence Coy Leonard, Ordnance Department, from March 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Mervin Eugene Gross, Air Corps, from March 12, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Wayne Raynsford, Signal Corps, from March 14, 1927.
Second Lieut. LeRoy Judson Stewart, Field Artillery, from March 16, 1927.
Second Lieut. Edward Shelley Gibson, Infantry, from March 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Francis Uncles, Field Artillery, from March 19, 1927.
Second Lieut. Giles Richard Carpenter, Field Artillery, from March 20, 1927.
Second Lieut. David James Crawford, Field Artillery, from March 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Field Sadtler, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Earl Foster Thomson, Cavalry, from April 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Newsom Branham, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. Francis Borgia Kane, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Stevens Lawton, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 8, 1927.
Second Lieut. Albert Svihra, Field Artillery, from April 8, 1927.
Second Lieut. Slator Marcellus Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 9, 1927.
Second Lieut. Granger Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 16, 1927.
Second Lieut. Alfred Eugene Kastner, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. Edwin Paul Crandell, Cavalry, from April 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. Mark McClure, Field Artillery, from April 24, 1927.
Second Lieut. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, Air Corps, from April 26, 1927.
Second Lieut. Myron Leedy, Ordnance Department, from April 29, 1927.
Second Lieut. Alba Carlton Spalding, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 29, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Landon Taylor, Field Artillery, from May 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Stephen Cecil Lombard, Field Artillery, from May 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Howard Gillespie Davidson, Air Corps, from May 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Fred James Woods, Coast Artillery Corps, from May 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Kenneth Francis Pughe, Infantry, from May 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Smith McClenaghan, Field Artillery, from May 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. Francis Xavier Mulvihill, Infantry, from May 7, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Hancock Reed, Cavalry, from May 8, 1927.
Second Lieut. Walter Russell Hensey, jr., Field Artillery, from May 13, 1927.
Second Lieut. Orval Ray Cook, Air Corps, from May 14, 1927.
Second Lieut. Perry McCoy Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from May 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Wrathall Spry, Air Corps, from May 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Gordon Sherman Armes, Cavalry, from May 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Frederick William Hein, Infantry, from May 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Raymond Balliet Bosserman, Cavalry, from May 20, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Rufus Smith, Infantry, from May 21, 1927.
Second Lieut. Harold Alfred Meyer, Infantry, from May 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Earle Blair, Infantry, from May 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. Harold Thomas Molloy, Field Artillery, from May 26, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Dunne O'Connell, Infantry, from May 31, 1927.
Second Lieut. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, Cavalry, from June 1, 1927.

Second Lieut. Leonard Edwin Stephens, Infantry, from June 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Numa Augustin Watson, Infantry, from June 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Wesley Woodworth Yale, Cavalry, from June 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Wilkins Douglass, jr., Air Corps, from June 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Oscar Louis Beal, Infantry, from June 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Oliver Wendell Hughes, Infantry, from June 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Vincent Murphy, Infantry, from June 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Aloysius Eugene O'Flaherty, jr., Infantry, from June 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Melville Fuller Grant, Infantry, from June 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Edward Rees, Infantry, from June 12, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Robinson Pierce, Infantry, from June 15, 1927.
Second Lieut. Lemuel Mathewson, Field Artillery, from June 16, 1927.
Second Lieut. George Harold Carmouche, Infantry, from June 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. Thomas Varon Webb, Infantry, from June 21, 1927.
Second Lieut. George Edward Mitchell, jr., Field Artillery, from June 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Henry Schildroth, Infantry, from June 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. George Arthur Taylor, Infantry, from June 30, 1927.
Second Lieut. Alfred Lawrence Price, Field Artillery, from July 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Frank Llewellyn Beadle, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Gilbert Hayden, Signal Corps, from July 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Francis Eugene Cothran, Corps of Engineers, from July 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Thomas Herbert Maddocks, Signal Corps, from July 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Perry Holweger, Field Artillery, from July 7, 1927.
Second Lieut. David Marion Fowler, Infantry, from July 9, 1927.
Second Lieut. Edward Arthur Kleinman, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, jr., Field Artillery, from July 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Lawson Ballantyne, Cavalry, from July 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Hilbert Milton Wittkop, Air Corps, from July 20, 1927.
Second Lieut. Donald Quitman Harris, Field Artillery, from July 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Percy Kennedy, jr., Field Artillery, from July 26, 1927.
Second Lieut. Townsend Griffiss, Air Corps, from August 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Andrew Wedemeyer, Field Artillery, from August 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Edwin Carlo Greiner, Cavalry, from August 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Philip Howard Raymond, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Oliver Perry Newman, Infantry, from August 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Roscoe Gorea MacDonald, Infantry, from August 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Hughes Stodter, Cavalry, from August 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Thomas Edward Lewis, Field Artillery, from August 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Stewart Tiffany Vincent, Infantry, from August 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Paul Henry Mahoney, Infantry, from August 7, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Clyde Fry, Infantry, from August 10, 1927.
Second Lieut. Austin Folger Gilmartin, Infantry, from August 10, 1927.
Second Lieut. Elbert Kelly, Infantry, from August 13, 1927.
Second Lieut. Orestes Cleveland, Infantry, from August 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Harrison Dickie, Field Artillery, from August 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Llewellyn Gorman, Quartermaster Corps, from August 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. Joseph Perry Catte, Infantry, from August 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. Albert Carroll Morgan, Infantry, from August 26, 1927.
Second Lieut. Perley Bernard Sancomb, Cavalry, from August 26, 1927.
Second Lieut. John LaValle Graves, Field Artillery, from August 31, 1927.
Second Lieut. Herbert William Kruger, Field Artillery, from August 31, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Earl Watters, Field Artillery, from August 31, 1927.
Second Lieut. Leo Henry Dawson, Air Corps, from September 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Milton John Smith, Air Corps, from September 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Carl Budd Wahle, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 3, 1927.
Second Lieut. Leonard Loyd Hilliard, Infantry, from September 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Lester Vocke, Field Artillery, from September 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Fish, 3d, Infantry, from September 7, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Leon Dicks, Infantry, from September 9, 1927.
Second Lieut. Lester Mavity Rouch, Field Artillery, from September 10, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Owen Colonna, Corps of Engineers, from September 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Herman William Fairbrother, Infantry, from September 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Grover Cleveland Kinney, Infantry, from September 14, 1927.
Second Lieut. Thomas Edward Meyer, Field Artillery, from September 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Cavalry, from September 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Harry Edwin Magnuson, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 20, 1927.
Second Lieut. LaRoy Sanders Graham, Infantry, from September 20, 1927.
Second Lieut. Francis Lavelle Ready, Cavalry, from September 21, 1927.
Second Lieut. David Hottenstein, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 21, 1927.
Second Lieut. George John Kelley, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 21, 1927.
Second Lieut. Ray Brooks Floyd, Infantry, from September 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. Ray Eugene Marshall, Infantry, from September 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. George Cabell Carrington, Infantry, from September 24, 1927.
Second Lieut. Harland Fremont Burgess, Infantry, from September 25, 1927.
Second Lieut. Karl Clifford Frank, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 25, 1927
Second Lieut. Clyde Anderson Burcham, Cavalry, from September 25, 1927.
Second Lieut. Walter Raymond Miller, Infantry, from September 25, 1927.
Second Lieut. Randall James Hogan, Ordnance Department, from September 27, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Nicholas Young, Infantry, from September 28, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Frederick Phillips, Corps of Engineers, from September 28, 1927.
Second Lieut. Douglas Valentine Johnson, Field Artillery, from September 29, 1927.
Second Lieut. Frederick Williams Watrous, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles Elford Smith, Infantry, from October 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Raymond Edward Culbertson, Air Corps (transferred from Field Artillery during the recess of the Senate), from October 4, 1927.
Second Lieut. Maynard Harper Carter, Infantry, from October 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. LeGrande Albert Diller, Infantry, from October 7, 1927.

Second Lieut. Robert Parker Hollis, Field Artillery, from October 7, 1927.
Second Lieut. Isaac Davis White, Cavalry, from October 9, 1927.
Second Lieut. Louis Edward Roemer, Infantry, from October 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Max Hesner Gooler, Infantry, from October 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Joseph Howard Harper, Infantry, from October 16, 1927.
Second Lieut. Emerald Foster Sloan, Infantry, from October 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. Newton Farragut McCurdey, Cavalry, from October 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Julius Dubbelde, jr., Infantry, from October 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. Joe Ford Simmons, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 20, 1927
Second Lieut. Clarence Turner Hulett, Infantry, from October 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. Daniel Powell Poteet, Field Artillery, from October 27, 1927.
Second Lieut. Ord Gariche Chrisman, Infantry, from October 28, 1927.
Second Lieut. Gerson Kirkland Heiss, Ordnance Department, from October 29, 1927.
Second Lieut. Ransom George Amlong, Quartermaster Corps, from October 30, 1927.
Second Lieut. Paul Lawrence Martin, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Walter Howard DeLange, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Kelsey Haskell, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1927.
Second Lieut. Ralph Adel Snavely, Air Corps, from November 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Claude Armenius Thorp, Cavalry, from November 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. Rowland Reid Street, Infantry, from November 2, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Marquiss Whistler, Field Artillery, from November 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. James Howard Leusley, Field Artillery, from November 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Henry Drummond, Field Artillery, from November 5, 1927.
Second Lieut. Viking Torsten Ohrbom, Infantry, from November 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. Glen Trice Lampton, Air Corps, from November 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. Howard Miller Fey, Air Corps, from November 6, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Boyd Williams, Air Corps, from November 11, 1927.
Second Lieut. Francis Rarick Johnson, Corps of Engineers, from November 13, 1927, subject to examination required by law.
Second Lieut. Glenn Hunter Palmer, Signal Corps, from November 15, 1927.
Second Lieut. Royal Bertrand Lord, Corps of Engineers, from November 15, 1927.
Second Lieut. Kenner Fisher Hertford, Corps of Engineers, from November 15, 1927.
Second Lieut. Steven Livesay Conner, Corps of Engineers, from November 16, 1927.
Second Lieut. Miles Reber, Corps of Engineers, from November 16, 1927.
Second Lieut. Charles West Stewart, jr., Corps of Engineers, from November 17, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Francis Merwin Longwell, Corps of Engineers, from November 18, 1927.
Second Lieut. John Rutherford Noyes, Corps of Engineers, from November 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. Lyle Rosenberg, Corps of Engineers, from November 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Randolph Winslow, Corps of Engineers, from November 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. William Newton Leaf, Corps of Engineers, from November 22, 1927.
Second Lieut. David Morris Dunne, jr., Corps of Engineers, from November 23, 1927.
Second Lieut. Frank McAdams Albrecht, Corps of Engineers, from November 26, 1927.
Second Lieut. Theodore Morrison Clarence Osborne, Corps of Engineers, from November 27, 1927.
Second Lieut. Ralph Arnold Tudor, Corps of Engineers, from November 28, 1927.
Second Lieut. Robert Farnsworth Hallock, Field Artillery, from November 29, 1927.
Second Lieut. Stuart Alfred Beckley, Field Artillery, from November 30, 1927.
Second Lieut. Harold David Kehm, Field Artillery, from November 30, 1927.

PROMOTION IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

To be major

Capt. Rafael Larrosa Garcia, Philippine Scouts, from May 13, 1927.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Jay Ralph Shook, Medical Corps, from March 11, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Henry Halcolm Rutherford, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Ernest Lewis Ruffner, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Patrick Henry McAndrew, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. George Macy Ekwurzel, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Carroll Deforest Buck, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. John Howard Allen, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Robert Urie Patterson, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Roger Brooke, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Wallace De Witt, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Matthew Augustus DeLaney, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Paul Stacy Halloran, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Kent Nelson, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Peter Conover Field, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Herbert Goss Shaw, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Louis Brechemin, jr., Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Clement Colfax Whitcomb, Medical Corps, from June 29, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Cosam Julian Bartlett, Medical Corps, from September 21, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Reuben Boyd Miller, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1927.
Lieut. Col. James Frank Hall, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Raymond Franklin Metcalfe, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1927.
Lieut. Col. Perry Lee Boyer, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1927.
Lieut. Col. James Matthew Phalen, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1927.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Guy Victor Rukke, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1927.
Maj. Henry Church Pillsbury, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1927.
Maj. Edgar King, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1927.
Maj. Ray Woodman Bryan, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1927.
Maj. William Hadley Richardson, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1927.
Maj. William Kay Bartlett, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1927.

To be captains

First Lieut. Otis Blaine Schreuder, Medical Corps, from March 29, 1927.
First Lieut. Edward John Kallus, Medical Corps, from April 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Arthur David Hawkins, Medical Corps, from April 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Howland Allan Gibson, Medical Corps, from April 4, 1927.
First Lieut. Paul Ashland Brickey, Medical Corps, from June 14, 1927.
First Lieut. Berna Thomas Bowers, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1927.

First Lieut. Leon Lloyd Gardner, Medical Corps, from August 11, 1927.

First Lieut. Prentice Lauri Moore, Medical Corps, from September 5, 1927.

First Lieut. John Paul Russell, Medical Corps, from October 1, 1927.

First Lieut. John Morris Hargreaves, Medical Corps, from October 1, 1927.

First Lieut. Don Longfellow, Medical Corps, from October 20, 1927.

First Lieut. Ray Hamilton Skaggs, Medical Corps, from November 11, 1927.

First Lieut. William Frank DeWitt, Medical Corps, from November 15, 1927.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lieut. James Melvin Epperly, Dental Corps, from March 8, 1927.

First Lieut. James Harvey Pence, Dental Corps, from April 1, 1927.

First Lieut. Everitte Favor Arnold, Dental Corps, from July 5, 1927.

First Lieut. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, Dental Corps, from September 9, 1927.

First Lieut. Hugh David Phillips, Dental Corps, from October 9, 1927.

First Lieut. Walter Edwin Chase, Dental Corps (appointed first lieutenant in the Dental Corps during the recess of the Senate), from November 12, 1927.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Jules Henry Uri, Veterinary Corps, from October 9, 1927.

To be majors

Capt. Jacob Edward Behney, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. William Henry Houston, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Clell Bricker Perkins, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Horace Samuel Eakins, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Isaac Owen Gladish, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Jesse Daniel Derrick, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Jean Rossman Underwood, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Raymond Alexander Kelser, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Clifford Caswell Whitney, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Christian William Greenlee, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

Capt. Harold Edward Egan, Veterinary Corps, from July 1, 1927.

To be captain

First Lieut. Frank Marion Lee, Veterinary Corps, from May 16, 1927.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Herbert Morris Cox, Veterinary Corps, from August 29, 1927.

Second Lieut. Laurence Robert Bower, Veterinary Corps, from August 29, 1927.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captains

First Lieut. Thomas Grimsley Hester, Medical Administrative Corps, from November 10, 1927.

First Lieut. John Dennis Foley, Medical Administrative Corps, from November 30, 1927.

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplains with the rank of major

Chaplain William Richard Arnold, from April 29, 1927.

Chaplain Alexander Daniel Sutherland, from November 23, 1927.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Charles F. Hughes, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of four years, from the 14th day of November, 1927.

Capt. William D. Leahy, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years, from the 14th day of October, 1927.

Capt. Reginald R. Belknap, United States Navy, retired, to be a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy, from the 3d day of March, 1927.

The following captains to be rear admirals in the Navy from the 17th day of February, 1927:

Edward H. Campbell.

Walter S. Crosley, an additional number in grade.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Frank B. Upham.
Ridley McLean.
David F. Sellers.
Joseph M. Reeves, an additional number in grade.

Capt. Frank H. Brumby to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 18th day of September, 1927.

Capt. Harris Laning to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 2d day of October, 1927.

Capt. Henry V. Butler to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 7th day of October, 1927.

Capt. James J. Raby to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1927.

Capt. William H. Standley to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 14th day of November, 1927.

Commander John S. Abbott to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1926.

Commander Nathan W. Post to be a captain in the Navy from the 7th day of December, 1926.

Commander Roscoe F. Dillen to be a captain in the Navy from the 17th day of February, 1927.

Commander Herbert H. Michael to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1927.

Commander Allen B. Reed to be a captain in the Navy from the 16th day of March, 1927.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Christopher R. P. Rodgers.
Lewis Coxe.
Cleon W. Mauldin.
Isaac C. Johnson, jr.
David W. Bagley.
Fred H. Poteet.
George M. Baum, an additional number in grade.
Richard P. McCullough.
Ormond L. Cox, an additional number in grade.
Max M. Frucht.
Herbert F. Leary.
Reuben B. Coffey.
Albert T. Church, an additional number in grade.
Charles S. Joyce.
Royal E. Ingersoll.
Chester W. Nimitz.
Joseph V. Ogan.
John N. Ferguson.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1927:

Arthur C. Stott.
Byron McCandless.
William S. McClintic.
Roscoe C. MacFall.

Commander Edmund S. Root to be a captain in the Navy from the 18th day of September, 1927.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 2d day of October, 1927:

Arthur B. Cook.
George C. Pegram.

Lieut. Commander Edmund S. R. Brandt to be a commander in the Navy from the 16th day of February, 1927.

Lieut. Commander James D. Maloney to be a commander in the Navy from the 17th day of February, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Alan G. Kirk to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Granville B. Hoey to be a commander in the Navy from the 16th day of March, 1927.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Francis W. Scanland.
Max B. DeMott.
Harold C. Train.
Lee P. Johnson.
Marion C. Robertson.
Edward C. Raguet.
Robert R. Paunack.
Williams C. Wickham.
Hugh V. McCabe.
William C. Faus.
John H. S. Dessez.
Joel W. Bunkley.
Ernest J. Blankenship.
Wallace L. Lind.
Monroe Kelly.
Leo L. Lindley.
Charles C. Davis.
Frank D. Manock.
Freeland A. Daubin.
Claude S. Gillette.
Thomas E. Van Metre.
Stuart S. Brown.
Comfort B. Platt.
Chauncey A. Lucas.
Paul H. Rice.
Holbrook Gibson.
Howard H. J. Benson.
George N. Reeves, jr.
Sherman S. Kennedy.
Charles H. Morrison.
Robert G. Coman.
Charles E. Reordan.
Hugo W. Koehler.
Virgil J. Dixon.
James B. Glennon.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1927:

Franklin Van Valkenburgh.
Vance D. Chapline.
Frank A. Braisted.

Lieut. Commander Raleigh C. Williams to be a commander in the Navy from the 2d day of September, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Thalbert N. Alford to be a commander in the Navy from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Eugene M. Woodson to be a commander in the Navy from the 18th day of September, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Wilbur J. Carver to be a commander in the Navy from the 2d day of October, 1927.

Lieut. Carroll W. Hamill to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 2d day of October, 1926.

Lieut. Lyman K. Swenson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of October, 1926.

Lieut. Thorvald A. Solberg to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 7th day of December, 1926.

Lieut. Edward P. Sauer to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 15th day of December, 1926.

Lieut. John H. Carson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1927.

Lieut. Robert B. Carney to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of February, 1927.

Lieut. Arthur W. Radford to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 17th day of February, 1927.

Lieut. William D. Thomas to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1927.

Lieut. George F. Martin to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1927.

Lieut. Bernard F. Jenkins to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of March, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of April, 1927:

Boyd R. Alexander.
Edwin S. Earnhardt.
John E. Williams.

Lieut. Jesse L. Kenworthy, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of April, 1927.

Lieut. Webster M. Thompson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of May, 1927.

Lieut. Albert E. Schrader to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of June, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Louis R. Vail.
Harry V. Baugh.
Andrew D. Mayer.
Charles T. Joy.
Nelson N. Gates.
Arnold H. Bateman.
John A. Terhune.
Theodore T. Patterson.
Samuel P. Ginder.
Adolph J. Merkt.
John Wilkes.
Robert B. Twining.
William P. Bacon.
Bruce P. Flood.
Fred D. Kirtland.
Arthur D. Burhans.
Paul W. Rutledge.
Charles P. Cecil.
Humbert W. Ziroli.
William E. Miller.
William J. Forrestel.
John D. Price.
Sidney W. Kirtland.
Edwin F. Cochrane.
Paul S. Goen.
Dennis L. Ryan.
Charles G. Halpine.
Walter W. Webb.
Henry L. Phelps.
John E. Reinburg.
Charles J. Wheeler.
George P. Brewster.
Henry B. Broadfoot.
Van H. Ragsdale.
Robert J. Walker.
Homer L. Grosskopf.
Wilbur W. Feineman.
Oscar W. Erickson.
James M. Steele.
Thomas D. Warner.
T. DeWitt Carr.
Calvin T. Durgin.
James A. Scott.
George F. Chapline.
John S. Roberts.
James B. Ryan.
Richard E. Webb.
Thomas V. Cooper.
Roy K. Jones.
Heman J. Redfield.
Andrew C. McFall.
Herbert J. Grassie.
James K. Davis.
Cassin Young.
Knefler McGinnis.
Fred W. Connor.
John E. Ostrander, jr.
Houston L. Maples.
Colin Campbell.
Frank G. Fahrion.
Ingolf N. Kiland.
Edward A. Mitchell.
Alexander D. Douglas.
Martin B. Stonestreet.
Lowell Cooper.
Herbert S. Jones.
Isaiah Parker.
George D. Price.
Carlyle Craig.
James P. Compton.
Dallas Wait.
Linton Herndon.
Randall E. Dees.
Paul W. F. Huschke.
Albert G. Noble.
Frank H. Dean.
Harold S. Klein.
Lawrence Wainwright.

Lieut. Donald B. Duncan to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1927.

Lieut. Earle E. Muschlitz to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 22d day of June, 1927.

Lieut. Robert B. Dashiell to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1927:

John O'D. Richmond.
Simon P. Fullinwider, jr.
William P. O. Clarke.
George T. Howard.
Andrew G. Shepard.
Lisle F. Small.
Nicholas Vytlacil.
Robert G. Tobin.

Lieut. Theodore M. Waldschmidt to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of August, 1927.

Lieut. Carl F. Holden to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 13th day of November, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 16th day of November, 1925:

Rowland D. Hill, jr.
Amariah B. Cartwright.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William J. Medusky to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 18th day of February, 1926.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1926:

Glenn F. DeGrave.
Frederick H. Ottaway.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William G. Buch to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of June, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Herbert V. Perron to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of December, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John E. Pixton to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of July, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ralph B. Hunt to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of August, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William B. Jackson, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 12th day of September, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Kinloch N. Gardner to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of September, 1926.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 2d day of October, 1926:

Harry A. Guthrie.
William S. G. Davis.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 6th day of October, 1926:

Sydney S. Bunting.
Arnold E. True.
Grover B. H. Hall.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 12th day of October, 1926:

Linfield L. Hunt.
Sterling T. Cloughley.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Wayne A. McDowell to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of November, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William B. McHugh to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 14th day of November, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Rodger W. Simpson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of November, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frederick D. Kime to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of December, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Roy M. Signer to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 10th day of December, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry A. Brandenburger to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Rufus G. Thayer to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1926.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John G. Burrow to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William F. Ramsey to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 6th day of January, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 18th day of January, 1927:

Donald R. Tallman.
Eugene P. Sherman.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Benjamin L. Hailey to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 26th day of January, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Gerald D. Linke to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 10th day of February, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 16th day of February, 1927:

Malcolm E. Selby.
William F. Fitzgerald, jr.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas J. Kelly to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 17th day of February, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Bruce Settle to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of February, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James C. Pollock to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 2d day of March, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John J. Curley, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harold W. Eaton to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harold E. McCarthy to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Morton C. Hutchinson, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of March, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of April, 1927:

Paul E. Roswall.
William W. Juvenal.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Wilson D. Leggett, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of April, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Delamer L. Jones to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of April, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William G. Lalor to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William W. Cone to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of April, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Elmon B. Guernsey to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of April, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1927:

John P. Womble, jr.
Bryan C. Harper.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ralph O. Myers to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 29th day of April, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Samuel W. Du Bois to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of April, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Paul E. Howard to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of May, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of June, 1927:

George S. Young.
Thomas F. Darden, jr.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Ralph R. Stogsdall, jr.	William G. Fewel.
Alexander S. Edward.	John H. Willis.
Paul J. Register.	Byron H. Hanlon.
Joseph C. Hubbard.	Carl H. Bushnell.
DeLong Mills.	William E. Makosky.
Forrest H. Wells.	Laurence A. Abercrombie.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1927:

William L. Drybread.	Robert W. Berry.
Dashiell L. Madeira.	William S. Price.
Silas B. Moore.	August J. Detzer, jr.
Nicholas B. Van Bergen.	Donald T. Giles.
Joe E. Rucker.	Donald F. Smith.
George D. Martin.	Campbell D. Emory.
Boynton L. Braun.	Jasper T. Acuff.
Everett E. Pettee.	Hugh Peters.
Walter S. Dufton.	Lawrence E. Divoll.
Carl H. Sanders.	John F. Madden.
Paul E. Howell.	Louis G. McGlone.
Fort H. Callahan.	John W. Rice.
Herbert W. Taylor, jr.	William A. Griswold.
Carl S. Drischler.	George G. Herring, jr.
Charles F. M. S. Quinby.	Morris J. Westfall.
Parke G. Young.	Marion C. Thompson.
Elmer A. Tarbutton.	Edward C. Ewen.
Harry L. Bixby.	John E. Rezner.
Irving D. Wiltsie.	Ward C. Gilbert.
Elwood D. Poole.	Frederick S. Steinbauer
Frank R. Talbot.	Thomas M. Dell, jr.
Joseph C. Cronin.	Julius A. McNamar.
Wyatt Craig.	Apollo Soucek.
Keith R. Belch.	Thomas Lee McCann.
William G. Forbes.	Edmund C. Mahoney.
Walfrid Nyquist.	Geoffrey E. Sage.
Rogers S. Ransehousen.	Edmund Kirby-Smith, jr.
George D. Lyon.	George C. Miller.
Herbert A. Tellman.	William V. Hamilton.
Charles O. Glisson.	Dewey G. Porter.
Walter R. Jones.	Charles W. Gray, jr.
Everard M. Heim.	George C. Crawford.
James S. Freeman.	Lorenzo S. Sabin, jr.
Stephen B. Cooke.	Joseph A. Connolly.
George H. Lyttle.	William R. Cooke, jr.
Wakeman B. Thorp.	Charles H. Judson.
Charles W. Roland.	Charles F. Macklin, jr.
Ralston B. Vanzant.	Alex M. Loker.
Francis J. Firth.	Walter J. Lee.
Arthur H. McCollum.	James V. Carney.
Lawrence C. Grannis.	Wiley N. Hand.
Bernard J. Skahill.	Edwin H. Crouch.
Melville E. Eaton.	Oral R. Swigart.
Walter G. Schindler.	Buell F. Brandt.
Howard N. Coulter.	Robert G. Willis.
Edward P. Moore.	Leo J. McGowan.
Donald L. Erwin.	John P. Heath.
Elmer P. Abernethy.	Herman Barter.
Eugene B. Oliver.	Charles F. Greber.
Ernest H. Webb.	John S. Crenshaw.
Edward I. McQuiston.	Walton B. Pendleton.
Robert E. Canty.	Charles J. Marshall.
Casper H. Eicks.	William C. Gray.
Joel Newsom.	Frederick I. Entwistle.
Ralph E. Hanson.	Burtnett K. Culver.
Willard R. Gaines.	John J. Lenhart.
Angus M. Cohan.	John A. Upshur.
Harold A. Carlisle.	Justin H. Dickins.
Delwyn Hyatt.	William D. Johnson, jr.
Clarence E. Aldrich.	Leslie K. Pollard.
George L. Russell.	Charles S. Alexander.
Lawrence F. Connolly.	Philip G. Nichols.
Leo B. Farrell.	Robert E. Jasperson.
Walter S. Keller.	Daniel A. Frost.
Peter M. Moncy.	Joseph M. Began.
Walter F. Weidner.	William D. Hoover.
Lamar M. Wise.	John M. Campbell, jr.
Clinton A. Misson.	Walter P. Ramsey, jr.
Thomas L. Lewis.	Lester R. Reiter.
Thomas A. Parfitt.	Harold A. Houser.
Joseph R. Barbaro.	Julius L. Thompson.
Charles R. Lamdin.	Francis J. Bridget.
Horace L. de Rivera.	

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert F. Hickey to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 10th day of June, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Theodore R. Wirth to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of June, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James A. Roberts, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1927.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James H. McWilliams to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1927:

Charles R. Brown.	John M. Hoskins.
Lowden Jessup, jr.	Joseph P. Rockwell.
Myron E. Thomas.	Lionel L. Rowe.
Jennings Courts.	Floyd F. Ferris.

Ensign Carlisle H. Thompson to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1925.

Ensign Farrington L. Barr to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1926.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1926:

Frederick Moosbrugger.
Matthew L. Kelly.
Samuel P. Comly, jr.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1927:

Irving T. Duke.	Claude B. Reese.
Chester C. Wood.	George C. Towner.
William G. Fisher.	Ralph E. Wilson.
Edmund A. Cunningham.	Thomas H. Dyer.
Orville F. Gregor.	Leo A. Bachman.
Charles W. Wilkins.	William F. Simmons.
Robert L. Campbell, jr.	Edward W. Rawlins.
William N. Mansfield.	Elmer E. Yeomans.
William A. Hickey.	Elmer E. Berthold.
Louis W. Nuesse.	Francis J. Grandfield.
Merle A. Sawyer.	Hallsted L. Hopping.
William M. Cole.	Joseph H. Garvin.
Clifford A. Fines.	Lester K. Rice.
James W. Smith.	William P. Tammany.
Edward F. Crowe.	William C. France.
William G. Michelet.	Bob O. Mathews.
Wallace M. Beakley.	Walter V. R. Vieweg.
Maurice M. Bradley.	Willford M. Hyman.
Truman J. Hedding.	Joseph M. P. Wright.
Clarence E. Ekstrom.	Norman W. Ellis.
John A. Hayes.	Joseph E. Wolowsky.
Rufus E. Rose, jr.	Paul K. Bryant.
Lee R. Herring.	George W. Patterson, jr.
Eugene C. Rook.	Joseph A. Callaghan.

Howard L. Collins.
Adrian M. Hurst.
William V. Davis, jr.
Ezra M. Ellis.
William J. Mitchell.
John F. Addoms.
Harold H. Tiemroth.
Emory W. Stephens.
Howell C. Fish.
John M. Kennaday.
Thomas H. Templeton.
Roger E. Perry.
William D. Brown.
Warren D. Wilkin.
Wayne N. Gamet.
Paul L. F. Weaver.
Theodore J. Shultz.
Stephen G. Barchet.
Shirley Y. Cutler.
Rae E. Arison.
Ephraim R. McLean, jr.
Richard F. Stout.
Bernard L. Austin.
Albert Handly.
John T. Shannon.
James R. Pahl.
William J. Longfellow.
Donald B. Bennett.
James D. Lovejoy.
James S. Laidlaw.
John W. C. Brand.
John N. Opie, 3d.
Aurelius B. Vosseller.
John R. Ruhsenberger.
Gordon M. Stoddard.
Marcel E. A. Gouin.
Donald F. McLean.
Alfred J. Bolton.
Philip M. Boltz.
Edwin R. Wilkinson.
Sumner K. MacLean.
Paul Graf.
Arthur W. Bass.
Everett W. Abdill.
Willis E. Cleaves.
Edwin T. Layton.
Roger D. Phillips.
Robert C. Sutliff.
Frederick R. Furth.
Frank C. Layne.
George W. Stott.
George A. Sinclair.
Kenneth Earl.
John A. Marsh.
Samuel E. Latimer.
Forrest R. Bunker.
William B. Bailey.
Sherman E. Burroughs, jr.
Joseph P. Thew.
Daniel J. McCallum.
Forrest Close.
Frank W. MacDonald.
Herman Sall.
Herbert K. Gates.
Thomas J. Kirkland, jr.
Tillman T. Dantzler.
Crutchfield Adair.
Stephen R. Bedford.
John D. Hayes.
Harold P. Smith.
Robert G. Lockhart.
Preston V. Mercer.
Jose M. Cabanillas.
Audley L. Warburton.
Jack B. Williams.
Robert S. Carr.
Thomas A. Turner, jr.
Adolph H. Oswald.
Robert L. Swart.
Eugene C. Burchett.
Thomas A. Huckins.
Dale Harris.
James B. Ricketts.
LeRoi B. Blaylock.
Harold B. Miller.
Virginius R. Roane.
Henry C. Daniel.
Jere D. Hyde.
John P. Cromwell.
Herrmann G. Page.
Herbert R. Ballinger.
Hammond J. Dugan.
Charles A. Legg.
Solomon F. Oden.
Myron S. Teller.
Robert O. Minter.
Bertrand D. Quinn.
George W. Evans, jr.
Max Schreiner.
Austen V. Magly.
Thomas C. Ragan.
Robert Goldthwaite.
Carl E. Cullen.
Colby G. Rucker.
James R. Dancy.
Warren W. Harvey.
Harold R. Demarest.
William W. Weeden, jr.
Elton C. Parker.
Ethelbert Watts.
William H. Duvall.
John C. Harris.
Donald J. Ramsey.
Frank E. Deam.
Leon W. Johnson.
Howard V. Hopkins.
Neill Phillips.
Richard C. Webb, jr.
Joseph S. Lillard.
John A. Holbrook.
Richard S. Moss.
Archibald G. W. McFadden.
Harrison B. Southworth.
Joseph F. Johnson.
Thomas S. Cameron.
Charles W. Oexle.
Dewey H. Collins.
Charles C. McDonald.
Arnold R. Kline.
Leslie H. Hawkinson.
Edgar T. Neale.
Ira H. Nunn.
Erskine A. Seay.
John K. Hyatt.
James H. McIntosh.
Francis M. Hook.
Samuel M. Bailey.
Roy D. Williams.
Lawrence J. McPeake.
Howell Armor.
Minor C. Heine.
Henry E. Richter.
Richard J. Bourke, jr.
Charles H. Callaway.
Herbert P. Sheldon.
Harry Burris.
Walter M. Graesser.
Arthur D. Barnes.
William B. Thompson.
William R. McCaleb.
Joseph I. Taylor, jr.
George C. Montgomery.
Thomas E. Fraser.
Russell J. Bellerby.
Edwin J. Taylor, jr.
Wallis F. Peterson.
Robert E. Sayre.
William V. Deutermann.
Lloyd H. Thomas.
Ted C. Marshall.
Louis Roedel.
Joseph W. Fowler.
John H. Morrill.
Elliott W. Shanklin.
Albert N. Perkins.
John E. Spahn.
Rufus C. Young, jr.
Edgar L. Witmer.
Frederick J. Bell.
William A. Evans, jr.
Frank R. Davis.
William S. Hays.
Richard F. Johnson, jr.
Dennis L. Francis.
Henry W. Goodall.
Charles A. Ferriter.
William L. Erdmann.
Wilfred E. Lankenau.
John C. Waldron.
Arthur M. Townsend.
George Edmund Peterson.
Cameron M. Winslow, jr.
Burton L. Doggett.
Hampton M. Ericsson.
Brainerd N. Bock.
John C. Daniel.
Joseph W. Adams, jr.
Robert S. Bertschy.
Hugh J. Martin.
Clarence L. Winecoff.
Joseph A. Farrell, jr.
Stockton B. Colt, jr.
Bromfield B. Nichol.
Hugh B. McLean.
Chester E. Carroll.
Louis H. Gwinn.
John B. Rooney.
Frank H. Ball.
George M. Brydon, jr.
Charles E. McDonald.
Max C. Stormes.
Charles B. Cross, jr.
John S. Holtzclaw.
Louis B. Edwards.
Harry B. Temple.
Clyde J. Nesser.
John M. Sweeney.
Frederick J. Ilsemann.
Raymond R. Waller.
Richard S. Baron.
Elijah W. Irish.
Ralph T. McDaniel.
Harrell W. Hall.
Lewis E. Coley.
Joseph J. Woodward.
Henry T. Read.
Thomas J. Ball.
George C. King.
Charles J. Stuart.
Arthur B. Leverett.
Bernard T. Zelenka.
Walter C. Dey.
Eugene T. Seaward.
Joshua C. Shively.
Francis H. Gardner.
James C. Landstreet.
Joseph M. Worthington.
Elliott M. Moore.
Sidney King.
Burnice L. Rutt.
Robert H. G. Johnson.
Noble W. Abrahams.
William A. Kanakanui.
Theodoric C. Linthicum.
John T. Warren.
Fitzhugh L. Rhea.
John F. Cooke.
Edward F. Gallagher.
Ralph V. Baldwin.
Arthur B. Dickie.
Robley W. Clark.
Charles L. Lee.
George Edward Peterson.
Robert W. Larson.
Arthur C. Wood.
James F. McDonough.
Ralph E. Mills.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Ferol D. Overfelt.
Walter H. Albach.
Allan L. Dunning.
John W. Bays.
Herbert C. Zitzewitz.
Joseph F. Jelley, jr.
Lawrence R. Daspit.
Kenneth A. Knowles.
Paul D. Miles.
Charles M. Tooke.
James H. Hogg.
Henry T. Koonce.
Warren F. Graf.
Albert B. Scoles.
Jack S. Holtwick, jr.
Eliot Olsen.
John C. Bernet.
Welton D. Rowley.
Francis C. Manville.
James V. Rigby.
Jacob C. Schwab.
Leonard S. Mewhinney.
Clifford S. Cooper.
William M. Nation.
William T. McGarry.
Earl B. Patterson.
Edwin R. Van Sickle.
Wallace B. Mechling.
Ernest W. Lamons.
Philip W. Snyder.
Robert A. Hinners.
Herbert J. Pfingstag.
Herbert M. Neuhaus.
Robert D. Conrad.
Thomas L. Davey.
Samuel H. Crittenden, jr.
Richard Wagner.
Joseph S. Detwiler.
Melvyn H. McCoy.
Paul H. Ramsey.
George W. Anderson, jr.
John E. Faigle.
David W. Tolson.
Harold F. Traua.
Wesley H. Randig.
John W. Slayden.
Shirley S. Miller.
Allen M. Zollars.
James E. Cohn.
Richard H. Phillips.
Warner R. Edsall.
William P. Chilton.
William H. Organ.
Selman S. Bowling.
Cornelius S. Seabring.
William C. Bryson.
Henry H. Caldwell.
Cecil T. Caufield.
Joseph R. Hamley.
John C. Broach.
Charles M. Heberton.
David B. Overfield.
Hunt V. Martin.
Harold S. Harnly.
Arthur E. Loeser.
Robert H. Rice.
Van Leo Wanselow.
Harlan M. Thorpe.
John B. Smyth.
Carl F. Stillman.
Leonard C. Chamberlin.
George B. Tuggle.
James A. Haley, jr.
Henry B. Stanley.
Halle C. Allan, jr.
Theodore C. Fauntz.
Earl K. Swearingen.
Harry J. Ward.
Roger F. Scott.
Herbert F. Eckberg.
Frederic F. Agens.
James A. Jordan.
Miles H. Hubbard.
John C. Zahm.
Robert C. Winters.
Charles D. Griffin.

Jack Maginnis.
Edward M. Condra, jr.
Carroll F. Johnson.
Joseph N. Murphy.
Leroy V. Honsinger.
Archibald D. Hunter.
Charles E. Clutts.
Alan B. Sutherland, jr.
Ralph Hickox.
William H. Leahy.
James A. Lucier.
Bloomfield M. Cornell.
James F. Benson.
Charles C. Pyne.
Benjamin E. Moore, jr.
Delbert F. Williamson.
Harold L. Tallman.
Thomas J. Hamilton.
Frederick L. Litty, jr.
Frederic A. Berry, jr.
Loren A. Morris.
Carl J. Pfingstag.
David B. Young.
Frederick Funke, jr.
William C. Specht.
Carl W. Flesher.
John W. White.
George L. Heath.
Harry R. Horney.
Daniel T. Eddy.
Samuel G. Mitchell.
Edward H. Eckelmeyer, jr.
Brooke Schumm.
John W. Malley.
Jack H. Lewis.
George K. Fraser.
Hilfort C. Owen.
Arthur S. Born.
Thomas B. Klakring.
Alexander M. Kowalzyk, jr.
Timothy F. Donohue.
Alden D. Schwarz.
Jesse Blackwell.
Rawson Bennett, 2d.
Thomas L. Mayo.
Eldon C. Mayer.
Harold M. Briggs.
Seymour A. Johnson.
Wellington A. Hammond.
Hubert G. Wall.
Fritz Gleim, jr.
Raymond J. Moore.
Robert C. Brixner.
Christian H. Duborg.
Lannie Conn.
Clifford L. Wickman.
William R. Sands, jr.
Martin J. Lawrence.
Edmund T. Napier, jr.
Martin R. Stone.
George B. Gilbertson.
Leland R. Lampman.
Herbert L. Hoerner.
Noble W. Lowrie.
Lee W. Parke.
Richard W. Smith.
Carl L. Steiner.
Kenton E. Price.
Allen Smith.
William Loveland.
John L. Ewing, jr.
James M. Roberts.
James G. Holloway, jr.
Vernon Dortch.
Sylvius Gazze.
Howard W. Taylor.
James J. McKinstry.
Perry K. Jeanes.
Carl R. Midtlyng.
Lester J. Geiger.
Martin P. Hottel.
Andrew H. Bergeson.
Jere H. Stofflet.
Otis C. Gregg.
James R. McCormick.
Paul W. Card.

Jack F. Bowling, jr.
William E. Ferrall.
Robert S. Quackenbush, jr.
Walter H. Price.
Daniel J. Weintraub.
Robert L. Densford.
Jack P. Monroe.
Edward K. Shanahan.
Charles P. Hill, jr.
Harry F. Bauer.
John F. Henkel.
Argyll E. Buckley.
Joseph T. Hazen.
Charles B. Beasley.
Clayton R. Dudley.
Joseph W. Kern.
John L. De Tar.
Leonard W. Bailey.
Myron T. Evans.
Charles J. Zondorak.
James A. Prichard.
James L. Shank.
George B. Coale.
Howard W. Gordon, jr.
Peter K. Wells.
Creed C. Burlingame.
Arthur K. Ehle.
James W. Blanchard.
Philip C. Olin.
John W. Schmidt.
Harold T. Deutermann.
Charles L. Melson.
Thomas O. Oberrender, jr.
Wendell G. Osborn.
Howard C. Adams.
Harold M. Zemmer.
Robert I. F. Fravel.
Theodore O. Dahl.
David C. White.
Lawrence M. Jensen.
Joe W. Boulware.
Harry E. Day.
Gill M. Richardson.
Leon J. Barbot.
John T. Corwin.
Edward N. Teall, jr.
Richard D. Zern.
John A. Edwards.
Robert B. Alderman.
Thomas L. Greene.
William L. Knickerbocker.
Tyrrell D. Jacobs.
Emmanuel T. Goyette.
John F. Hines, jr.
Paul R. Drouilhet.
Eugene E. Davis.
Robert H. Speck.
Henry R. Dozier.
William Y. C. Humes, jr.
Arthur C. W. Baskin.
Robert M. Barnes.
Harold P. Richards.
Edwin W. Herron.
Harold A. Henry.
Arnold W. McKechnie.
Ross R. Kellerman.
Paul S. Depew.
Hugh A. R. Keiran.
Liles W. Creighton.
Harry R. England.
Gerald R. Dyson.
Emmett J. Sullivan.
Charles K. Bergin.
Georgie L. Hansen.
Frank Turner.
Robert A. Johnson.
Philip A. Tague, jr.
Leo W. Nilon.
Wayne T. Stukey.
Monro M. Riker.
Louis P. Fairlamb.
Robert Brodie, jr.
Robert F. Martin.
Farar B. C. Martin.
John T. Dimon.
Gregory A. Ladd.

Philip S. Griffith.
Richard C. Collins.
George G. Mead.
John C. Woelfel.
Blinn Van Mater.
Theodore S. Dukeshire.
George D. Dickey.
Thomas B. Neblett.
Thomas M. Dykers.
Arthur G. Bruner.
William H. Ashford, jr.
Clarence E. Coffin, jr.
Frederick C. Marggraff, jr.
Thomas J. Flynn.
Alfred R. Truslow, jr.
Water C. Winn.
Frank T. Corbin.
Robert E. Dixon.
Richard B. Levin.
Ulysses S. G. Sharp, jr.
Eugene E. Lindsey.
Roy Scott.
Robie E. Palmer.
George M. B. Smith.
James S. Willis.
Abram H. Afong, jr.
Frederic S. Habecker.
William T. Romizer.
Randolph B. Boyer.
Paul L. High.
Hysell P. Cooper.
Howell J. Dyson.
Edward S. Addison.
George D. Sullivan.
Willard A. Saunders.
Loring O. Shook.
Tom C. King.
William F. Royall.
Newlin Neuhauser.
Lewis J. Sheaffer.
Floyd C. Camp.
Mitchell D. Matthews.
Frank Bruner.
Eugene B. McKinney.
Harold R. Sheehan.
Selden G. Hooper.
William C. Jennings.
Milton A. Nation.
John M. Madison.
Edmund E. Garcia.
Albert R. Heckey.
James W. Lucas, jr.
John E. Fitzgibbon.
Joseph Carey.
Louis J. Malone.
Eugene F. McDaniel.
Courtney Shands.
George Knuepfer.
Herbert D. Riley.
Jules F. Schumacher.
Roland F. Pryce.
Eugene L. Lugibihl.
Robert V. Hull.
Dick R. Downer.
Robert K. Brown.
Arthur D. Marks.
Albert E. Fitzwilliam.
Ernest J. Sabol.
William R. Caruthers.
Joe Taylor.
Spalding Trafton, jr.
Renwick S. Calderhead.
Gordon S. Ashley.
Morton S. Cressy, jr.
David J. Walsh.
Theodore G. Schirmeyer.
William R. D. Nickelson, jr.
Emile R. Winterhaler.
Robert J. Foley.
John Eldridge, jr.
Harry H. McIlhenny.
Edwin B. Robinson.
Lucius H. Chappell, jr.
Levi J. Knight, jr.
Wayne R. Loud.
John R. Waterman.

Louis H. Hunte.
Monroe B. Duffill.
Stanley E. Judson.
Charles K. Hewins.
Edward D. Lindell.
Henry T. Jarrell.
Edwin K. Ponvert.
Adoniram J. Hill.
Edward J. Drew.
Francis W. McCann.
Julian D. Greer.
Nathaniel T. Roberts.
Marshall L. Smith.
Joseph B. Danhoff.
Joseph A. Corwin.
Cyrus T. Clendening.
Philip H. Ross.
Chesley M. Hardison.
Thomas H. Massie.
Leonard B. Southerland.
Frank Virden.
Myron W. Graybill.
Francis S. Kirk.
Ernest Blake.
William H. Cuzner.
David B. Coleman.
Maurice E. Goudge.
Peery L. Stinson.
William S. Harris.
Edward P. Hagan.
Claren E. Duke.
William H. Brockman, jr.
John G. McClaughry.
Bosquet N. Wev.
Howard A. Yeager.
Arthur H. Taylor.
William E. Kaitner.
Howard E. Purdy.
Leonidas W. Pancoast.
Alan R. Montgomery.
Alvin Robinson.
Harry J. Hardwick.
Harry M. Denty.
Francis E. Cromwell.
John Bailey.
Gus B. Lofberg, jr.
Robert B. Morgan, jr.
Robert N. Downes.
Richard E. Fenton.
Veryl F. Frye.
Byron C. Gwinn.
James J. McRoberts.
Marion M. Byrd.
Harry D. Hale.
Harry L. Hicks.
Henry J. Armstrong, jr.
Charles L. Freeman.
Frank M. Hammitt.
Carl M. Dalton.
Robert T. Symes.
William H. Potts.
Lee F. Keys.
Philip B. Tankard.
William R. Ignatius.
James W. Hager.
Charles J. Skelly.
Bernard M. Gates.
George A. Lewis.
Doyle G. Donaho.
William A. Deam.
William E. Balfrey.
Malen Durski.
Joshua W. Cooper.
Michael P. Russillo.
Granville A. Moore.
Clinton S. Rounds.
Joseph B. Maher.
Edward P. Southwick.
Gordon S. Everett.
John C. Atkeson.
Elmer G. Cooper.
John E. Clark.
Ray A. Mitchell.
Harry R. Hummer, jr.
Jack O. Wheat.
William A. Sutherland, jr.

John O. R. Coll.
Francis R. Jones.
John A. Milburn.
Andrew B. Buttrey.
Ethan W. Allen.
Francis C. B. McCune.
John S. Tracy.
William D. Irvin.
Fred J. Leatherman.
Daniel W. Latimore.
Alex McL. Patterson.
David W. Shafer.
Claude L. Weigle.
Robert E. Braddy, jr.
Lester B. Mye.
Milton T. Dayton.
James K. Averill.
Albert B. Mayfield, jr.
Albert J. Devany.
Glenn W. Legwen, jr.
Glynn R. Donaho.
Alston Ramsay.
Paul D. Gross.
Raymond L. Harrell.
John T. Brown, jr.
Edward R. Johnson.
John W. Chittenden.
Charles J. Starkus.
Paul F. Johnston.
Elmer C. Powell.
Oddie W. Anderson.
Thomas C. Green.
John S. Thach.
Henry M. Marshall.
Robert A. Allen.
Arthur F. Anders.
Donald G. Burt.
Sam Pickering.
George B. H. Stallings.
Roscoe D. Hughes.
Gardner K. Grout, 2d.
Charles W. Parker.
Clarence E. Boyd.
Patrick Henry, jr.
Gordon L. Caswell.
William W. Outerbridge.
Joseph A. Flynn.
Julius F. Way.
Curtis A. Myers.
George A. Lange.
Clarence E. Cortner.
William O. Burch, jr.
Oscar W. Pate, jr.
Reamer E. De La Barre.
Oscar H. Dodson.
George L. Jones, jr.
James P. Walker.
Theodore R. Stansbury.
Henry F. Gorski.
Charles E. Harrison.
Charles J. Hardesty, jr.
William M. Gullett.
John H. Cross.
Richard E. Myers.
Jimmie R. Simpson.
John J. Branson.
Calvin E. Wakeman.
Joseph D. McKinney.
Herbert T. Tortorich.
Thurston B. Clark.
Albert S. Carter.
Richard P. Wilkinson, jr.
Wilton S. Heald.
Robert S. Ford.
Walton B. Hinds.
George W. Willcox.
Joseph R. Rubins.
Frank D. Giambattista.
Samuel H. Griffin, jr.
Winston I. Quattlebaum.
John William Murphy.

Chief Machinist Elmer O. Davis to be an ensign in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1927.

Machinist William S. Maxwell to be an ensign in the Navy from the 15th day of September, 1927.

Medical Inspector William Seeman to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 3d day of June, 1921.

Medical Inspector James S. Woodward to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 5th day of June, 1924.

Medical Director Samuel S. Rodman to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 4th day of October, 1925, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Medical Inspector John B. Mears to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 1st day of July, 1926.

The following-named medical inspectors to be medical directors in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Thomas W. Raison.
Curtis B. Munger.
Ausey H. Robnett.
James M. Minter.
Edward U. Reed.
Reynolds Hayden.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of January, 1925:

Sankey Bacon.
George A. Riker.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy with the rank of commanders from the 28th day of August, 1926:

Harry E. Jenkins.
John F. Riordan.
Walter C. Espach.

Passed Asst. Surg. George D. Thompson to be a surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 4th day of June, 1925.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 1st day of July, 1926:

Albert G. Wenzell.
Norman Roberts.
Edward L. McDermott.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Wendell P. Blake.
Roger D. Mackey.
James B. Moloney.
Charles P. Archambeault.
Paul P. Maher.
Warren E. Bradbury.
Lea B. Sartin.
William W. Hall.
Rex H. White.
Francis P. Gardner.
Carl J. Robertson.
Eustace H. Prescott.
Maurice S. Mathis.
Herbert L. Barbour.
Jesse W. Smith.
James E. Andrews.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Caldwell J. Stuart.
Bruce M. Summers.
Edward P. Kunkel.
Edward M. Harris, jr.
Herman Seal.
Robert M. Gillett.
Herbert L. Pugh.
Oliver A. Smith.
Peter C. Supan.
Walter L. Bach.
Winfred P. Dana.
George F. Cooper.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1927:

John M. Bachulus.
Charlie H. Allman.
Dwight J. Wharton.
Harvey E. Robins.
Charles H. Bitner.
Joseph I. Porter.
John R. Smith.
George C. Thomas.
Thomas H. Hayes.
Harry D. Templeton.
William E. Pinner.
Oliver R. Nees.
Carl D. Middlestadt.
Charles C. Yanquell.
Henry M. Weber.
Thomas F. Cooper.
Leonard L. Wilson.
Everett H. Dickinson.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 6th day of June, 1927:

Carl H. McMillan, a citizen of Ohio.
James H. Wall, a citizen of South Carolina.
William A. DeMonbreun, a citizen of Tennessee.
George H. Fondé, jr., a citizen of Alabama.
Clarence C. Myers, a citizen of Ohio.
Irwin L. Norman, a citizen of Minnesota.
Charles S. Paddock, a citizen of Tennessee.
Irby B. Ballenger, a citizen of Arkansas.
Emmett D. Hightower, a citizen of Tennessee.
William H. Algie, a citizen of Kansas.
Harold G. Young, a citizen of Illinois.
Wendell H. Musselman, a citizen of California.
Hubert H. Carroll, a citizen of Minnesota.
Ernest D. Davis, jr., a citizen of Virginia.
Harry H. Haight, a citizen of Michigan.
Courtney G. Clegg, a citizen of California.
William J. Hogue, a citizen of Illinois.
Leslie K. MacClatchie, a citizen of Illinois.
David J. Cracovaner, a citizen of New York.
Joseph E. Evans, a citizen of Tennessee.
Paul E. RePass, a citizen of Colorado.
Jesse W. Miller, a citizen of Nebraska.
John L. Enyart, a citizen of Missouri.
John H. Korb, a citizen of Kansas.
Leland J. Belding, a citizen of Iowa.
Claude R. Ball, a citizen of West Virginia.
Robert S. Simpson, a citizen of Michigan.
Norman A. Ross, a citizen of Iowa.
Cecil C. Welch, a citizen of South Dakota.
Julian Love, a citizen of Colorado.
Roy R. Kracke, a citizen of Georgia.
Carl K. Youngkin, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Adolph P. von Hungen, a citizen of Oregon.
William E. Carskadon, a citizen of Indiana.
Germain J. Cotta, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Rupert H. Draeger, a citizen of California.
Douglas T. Prehn, a citizen of Wisconsin.
Charles E. Fitzgerald, a citizen of Illinois.
Charles J. Cooney, a citizen of Iowa.
Frederick C. Meyers, a citizen of New York.
Oscar W. Thoeny, a citizen of Wisconsin.
Robert C. Luckey, a citizen of Indiana.
James T. Parker, a citizen of California.
Herbert C. Walker, a citizen of Tennessee.
Joseph G. Schnebly, a citizen of Kansas.
Cly H. Hatcher, a citizen of California.
Jay F. Miller, a citizen of Oregon.
Gordon B. Tayloe, a citizen of North Carolina.
John B. Clark, a citizen of California.

Henry C. Wass, a citizen of Michigan.
Dirk M. te Groen, a citizen of California.
Ransome O. Jackson, a citizen of Indiana.
Clyde L. Bozarth, a citizen of Missouri.
Jesse G. Wright, a citizen of Indiana.
Charles W. Shilling, a citizen of Indiana.
Farra L. Read, a citizen of Oregon.
Clark W. Virtue, a citizen of Ohio.
Charles W. Stelle, a citizen of Kansas.
Bernhardt I. Wulff, a citizen of Connecticut.
Fred H. Hartshorn, a citizen of Colorado.
Albert J. Kelley, a citizen of Illinois.
Thomas J. Carter, a citizen of Kansas.
Henry T. Cox, a citizen of Texas.
Marion J. Eaton, a citizen of Indiana.
William E. Walsh, a citizen of Wisconsin.
DeCoy Marchand, a citizen of Indiana.
Otto W. Wickstrom, a citizen of Indiana.
John P. Wood, a citizen of Texas.
Clifford W. Moore, a citizen of Oklahoma.
John F. Moore, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Joseph S. Green, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The following-named dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 28th day of August, 1926:

Ernest W. Lacy.
Lucien C. Williams.
Paul G. White.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of July, 1926:

John J. Haas.
Howard C. Wickham.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Edward B. Howell.	Daniel A. Doherty.
Francis G. Ulen.	Allen H. Hetler.
Adolphus R. Gleitsman.	Francis J. Long.
Clarence E. Garcia.	

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Joseph Connolly.	Ralph B. Putnam.
Francis R. Hittinger.	Frank A. Richison.
Robert R. Crees.	Alfred R. Harris.
Jesse W. Miller, jr.	

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1927:

Virgil H. Traxler.	Francis W. Lepeska.
Wadsworth C. C. Trojakowski.	Otto V. Rogstad.
George H. Rice.	Otis A. Peterson.
Sidney P. Vail.	Leon M. Billings.
Theodore DeW. Allan.	John M. Thompson.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 5th day of March, 1927:

Frank K. Sullivan, a citizen of Utah.
Arthur Siegel, a citizen of Maryland.
Hector J. A. MacInnis, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Alfred Dinsmore, a citizen of New Jersey.
Edward H. Delaney, a citizen of Connecticut.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 6th day of October, 1927:

Louis D. Mitchell, jr., a citizen of Georgia.
James L. Frisby, a citizen of Illinois.
Robert P. Irons, a citizen of Illinois.
Edwin D. Foulk, a citizen of Colorado.

Edward O. Andersen, a citizen of Florida, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 21st day of November, 1927.

The following-named pay inspectors to be pay directors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 4th day of October, 1925:

John D. Robnett.	James F. Kutz.
Felix R. Holt.	Walter D. Sharp.
Chester G. Mayo.	

The following-named pay inspectors to be pay directors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 1st day of July, 1926:

William G. Neill.
Roland W. Schumann.

The following-named pay inspectors to be pay directors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Dallas B. Wainwright, jr.	John F. O'Mara.
George P. Shamer.	Manning H. Philbrick.
Frank Baldwin.	Edward R. Wilson.
David G. McRitchie.	Everett G. Morsell.
William H. Wilterdink.	

The following-named paymasters to be pay inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 1st day of January, 1925:

Thomas J. Bright.
Robert K. Van Mater.
Major C. Shirley.

Pay Inspector Charles E. Parsons to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 1st day of January, 1925, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Paymaster Harold C. Gwynne to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 28th day of August, 1926.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Chauncey R. Murray to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of July, 1926.

Assistant Paymaster William E. Tripp to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 16th day of March, 1926.

Assistant Paymaster Nicholas J. Halpine to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 4th day of June, 1926.

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Frederic W. Hesser.	Charles G. DeKay.
Kenneth R. Miller.	Donald B. Hilton.
J. D. Parks.	Roland W. Rickertts.
Frederick L. Hetter.	

Pay Clerk Calvin B. White to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 20th day of September, 1927.

Chief Pay Clerk Louie L. Lindenmayer to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 20th day of September, 1927.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Roy W. Ryden.
Waldo P. Druley.

The following-named assistant naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 27th day of August, 1927:

Joseph W. Paige.	William R. Nichols.
James E. J. Kiernan.	Richard McK. Rush.
James R. Allen.	Paul W. Hains.
Leslie C. Stevens.	Thomas P. Wynkoop.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June, 1924:

Armand M. Morgan.	Robert S. Hatcher.
Edward W. Clexton.	Edward V. Dockweiler.
Wendell E. Kraft.	John J. Scheibeler.

Civil Engineer Frank T. Chambers to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, from the 6th day of April, 1927.

Civil Engineer Clinton D. Thurber to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 2d day of June, 1927.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June, 1924:

William L. Richards.	Wallace B. Short.
Richard P. Carlson.	Harold MacT. Sylvester.
Walter T. Eckberg.	

Chief Boatswain Hubert George to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 20th day of March, 1924, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Boatswain Russell L. Kaetzel to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 20th day of December, 1924.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1926:

Ivan E. Pitman.
David L. Ullman.
Robert H. Merryman.

Boatswain George W. Meyer to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 28th day of January, 1927.

Gunner Francis J. Kaiss to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 20th day of December, 1924.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1926:

Arthur S. Fenton.
Antonio G. Aquatero.

The following-named electricians to be chief electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1926:

Merion E. Hair.
Albert J. Petrasek.

The following-named radio electricians to be chief radio electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1926:

William H. Frost.
George W. Almour.

Machinist Anthony Iannucci to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 25th day of June, 1926.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1926:

Edward J. Sherry.	Meares B. Cartmell.
Virgil D. Duke.	Raymond G. Shively.
Harry F. Meachen.	Clarence J. P. Buckey.

Machinist Irvin J. Heckman to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 9th day of January, 1927.

Pay Clerk Cecil O. Hamrick to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 20th day of February, 1925.

Pay Clerk William D. Wilkinson to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of April, 1925.

Pay Clerk Elmer Stephenson to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 21st day of February, 1926.

The following-named pay clerks to be chief pay clerks in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 20th day of November, 1926:

James H. Parish.	Robert Nelson.
Charles E. Coleman.	Leroy Alexander.
Charles C. Hiles.	Harold R. Darling.
Benn A. Fairchild.	Ted B. Daly.
Garret Boer.	

Pay Clerk Raymond Ciesluk to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 22nd day of December, 1926.

Pay Clerk William D. Burroughs to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 22d day of June, 1927.

Pay Clerk Irvin L. Ludlam to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 18th day of July, 1927.

The following-named medical directors to be medical directors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 4th day of October, 1925, to correct the date from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Ralph W. Plummer.
Robert G. Heiner.

The following-named medical inspectors to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 1st day of January, 1925, to correct the date from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Edwin L. Jones.	Harry R. Hermesch.
William H. Short.	Alexander B. Hayward.
Gordon D. Hale.	Reginald B. Henry.
Lawrence M. Schmidt.	Walter A. Bloedorn.
Chandler W. Smith.	George R. W. French.
Edward V. Valz.	

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1927:

Frederick A. L. Dartsch.	Douglas T. Day, jr.
Richard G. Ganahl.	Henry C. Doan.

Medical Inspector Spencer L. Higgins to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 2d day of June, 1927.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Warwick T. Brown.
Max Silverman.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1927:

Robert K. Y. Dusinberre.	Lloyd R. Newhouser.
John R. Lynas.	Carl M. Dumbauld.

Asst. Dental Surg. Frederic McK. Ingersoll to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 2d day of June, 1927.

The following-named assistant naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 27th day of August, 1927:

Charles A. Nicholson, 2d.
Charles H. Cushman.

Ensign Henry F. Mulloy to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 9th day of February, 1927.

Lieut. Joseph H. Lawson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927.

Ensign Thomas C. Ritchie to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1927.

MARINE CORPS

Lieut. Col. Presley M. Rixey, jr., to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of July, 1927.

Lieut. Col. Theodore E. Backstrom to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Lieut. Col. William H. Pritchett to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Maj. Frederick A. Barker to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June, 1927.

Maj. William T. Hoadley to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of July, 1927.

Maj. Emile P. Moses to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Maj. Harold F. Wirgman to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Capt. John B. Sebree to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 27th day of September, 1925.

Capt. Louis E. Fagan to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October, 1926.

Capt. Allen H. Turnage to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June, 1927.

Capt. Louis M. Bourne, jr., to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of July, 1927.

Capt. Matthew H. Kingman to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

First Lieut. Edward A. Fellowes to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of July, 1926.

First Lieut. Andrew L. W. Gordon to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October, 1926.

First Lieut. Leland S. Swindler to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of November, 1926.

First Lieut. Howard N. Stent to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of December, 1926.

First Lieut. Donald Spicer to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of January, 1927.

First Lieut. Ford O. Rogers to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 9th day of April, 1927.

First Lieut. Walter G. Farrell to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of April, 1927.

First Lieut. William L. Harding, jr., to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of May, 1927.

First Lieut. John B. Neill, jr., to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 17th day of May, 1927.

First Lieut. Ralph R. Robinson to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June, 1927.

First Lieut. Walter E. Bilisoly to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of July, 1927.

First Lieut. John K. Martenstein to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

First Lieut. Hamilton M. H. Fleming to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of September, 1927.

First Lieut. Frederick E. Stack to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of November, 1927.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Raymond P. Rutledge.	Marion L. Dawson, jr.
Samuel S. Jack.	Harold G. Newhart.
Henry R. Paige.	Frank M. June.
Guy DeW. Chappell.	George H. Potter.
Joseph W. Earnshaw.	Earl S. Piper.
Walter L. J. Bayler.	Robert A. Olson.

Francis M. McAllister.
Jack P. Juhan.
Harold D. Hansen.
Jesse S. Cook, jr.
Miles S. Newton.
Archie E. O'Neil.
Allen C. Koonce.
Alan Shapley.
Jefferson G. Dreyspring.
David F. O'Neill.
John C. Munn.
Jaime Sabater.
Richard P. Ross, jr.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps (probationary for two years) from the 25th day of July, 1927:

Elmer G. Marks, a citizen of North Dakota.
Mercade A. Cramer, a citizen of North Dakota.
Roger T. Carleson, a citizen of Michigan.
John S. Letcher, a citizen of Virginia.
Frank H. Wirsig, a citizen of Nebraska.
Frank G. Dailey, a citizen of Nebraska.
William R. Williams, a citizen of Maryland.
Robert B. Luckey, a citizen of Maryland.

Marine Gunner James W. Lattin to be a chief marine gunner in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 10th day of June, 1926.

Quartermaster Clerk John Strong to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 10th day of June, 1926.

Quartermaster Clerk Holmes J. Smith to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 10th day of June, 1926.

Quartermaster Clerk Harry S. Young to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 10th day of June, 1926.

Pay Clerk John W. Lytle to be a chief pay clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 10th day of June, 1926.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Robert S. Cartledge to be postmaster at Mobile, Ala., in place of H. G. Reiser. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1927.

John W. Brasfield to be postmaster at Dora, Ala., in place of Grova Grace. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1927.

William V. Dodd to be postmaster at Carbon Hill, Ala., in place of J. D. Segars. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Anna H. Kinney to be postmaster at Elberta, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Violet A. Brooks to be postmaster at Chickasaw, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Luke Bates to be postmaster at Rogersville, Ala., in place of H. C. Warren, resigned.

Thelma Slone to be postmaster at Cedar Bluff, Ala., in place of J. F. Slone, jr., removed.

ALASKA

James H. Anderson to be postmaster at Nome, Alaska, in place of M. A. Winkler, resigned.

Earl T. Stannard to be postmaster at Latouche, Alaska, in place of Guy Job, resigned.

ARIZONA

Henry M. Hall to be postmaster at Mesa, Ariz., in place of D. C. Babbitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Winchester Dickerson to be postmaster at Ashfork, Ariz., in place of Winchester Dickerson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1926.

Anna L. Rybon to be postmaster at Humboldt, Ariz. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Chester A. Williamson to be postmaster at Willcox, Ariz., in place of H. O. Parks, resigned.

George H. Staiger to be postmaster at Ray, Ariz., in place of W. E. Mullen, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Carleton H. Denslow to be postmaster at Stuttgart, Ark., in place of J. Y. Sayre. Incumbent's commission expired August 12, 1926.

Edgar G. Gunnels to be postmaster at Emerson, Ark., in place of A. R. Mullins. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Lena G. Bundren to be postmaster at Biggers, Ark., in place of L. G. Bundren. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Edward S. Miller to be postmaster at Bentonville, Ark., in place of E. S. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1927.

Pauline Prescott to be postmaster at Rosston, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

James L. Willson to be postmaster at Moro, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Thelma Jones to be postmaster at Elkins, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Peter K. Wylie to be postmaster at Carthage, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Berry Ozbirn to be postmaster at Ash Flat, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Claude E. Spyres to be postmaster at Sheridan, Ark., in place of W. O. Roberts, removed.

Thomas W. Steel, jr., to be postmaster at Scott, Ark., in place of H. T. Brown, resigned.

Leah W. Harkey to be postmaster at Plainview, Ark., in place of B. C. Willard, deceased.

Adolph O. Border to be postmaster at Knobel, Ark., in place of E. R. Clark, resigned.

James O. Crunk to be postmaster at Hughes, Ark., in place of H. F. Crunk, removed.

Larkin A. McLin to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Ark., in place of C. R. French, removed.

CALIFORNIA

Fred E. Laxdal to be postmaster at Inglewood, Calif., in place of C. P. Mosher. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1926.

George L. Clare to be postmaster at Guerneville, Calif., in place of G. L. Clare. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1927.

Chelso A. Maghetti to be postmaster at Davis, Calif., in place of G. T. Fissell. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1927.

Charles E. Wood to be postmaster at Compton, Calif., in place of A. F. Hann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

Richard G. Power to be postmaster at Colusa, Calif., in place of M. A. Dempsey. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1927.

Earl D. Cline to be postmaster at Zelzah, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Edith M. Kennedy to be postmaster at Weimar, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mathilda Busch to be postmaster at Verdugo City, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Addie E. Waits to be postmaster at Solana Beach, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Josephine Zucca to be postmaster at Selby, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary K. Davis to be postmaster at San Carlos, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Edgar L. Etter to be postmaster at Palos Verdes Estates, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Fadette T. Gossard to be postmaster at Olive View, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Flora Dahl to be postmaster at Mokelumne Hill, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Frank Challand to be postmaster at Mission Beach, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Grace D. Perkins to be postmaster at Los Nietos, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Gyda K. Holmboe to be postmaster at Loma Portal, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Minnie E. Dewar to be postmaster at Hueneme, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

James W. Hyatt to be postmaster at Emigrant Gap, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George H. Burk to be postmaster at Elk, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John L. Olson to be postmaster at Decoto, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Hazel E. Avise to be postmaster at Walnut Creek, Calif., in place of T. D. Walker, deceased.

Cinderella L. Phiney to be postmaster at Tustin, Calif., in place of N. H. Phiney, deceased.

Granville N. Purington to be postmaster at Trona, Calif., in place of F. W. Urch, resigned.

Richard L. Mason to be postmaster at South Pasadena, Calif. Office reestablished April 1, 1927.

Florence E. Buckner to be postmaster at Pacific Palisades, Calif., in place of Henry Barnbrock, resigned.

Jacob J. Shroy to be postmaster at Newman, Calif., in place of F. M. Eachus, removed.

Theodore J. Brown to be postmaster at Hynes, Calif., in place of Ethel Rockwell, resigned.

Charles C. Jenkins to be postmaster at El Centro, Calif., in place of C. W. Collins, deceased.

Walter E. Hyer to be postmaster at Del Mar, Calif., in place of J. F. Conner, resigned.

James E. Stroud to be postmaster at Arvin, Calif., in place of L. E. Patterson, declined.

COLORADO

Ethel M. DeBerry to be postmaster at Keenesburg, Colo., in place of E. M. DeBerry. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1926.

Leona E. Backus to be postmaster at Two Buttes, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Thomas E. Amick to be postmaster at McPhee, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Victor L. Waters to be postmaster at Kim, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

CONNECTICUT

Wilson T. Johnson to be postmaster at Silver Lane, Conn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Minnie Rosenblatt to be postmaster at Newington, Conn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Henry R. Carignan to be postmaster at North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., in place of J. E. O'Clare, resigned.

Albert G. Spiers to be postmaster at Glenbrook, Conn., in place of W. H. S. McEwen, resigned.

Clifford B. Reed to be postmaster at Collinsville, Conn., in place of W. P. English, resigned.

DELAWARE

Lulu M. Chambers to be postmaster at Stanton, Del. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John P. Betts to be postmaster at Clarksville, Del. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ethel Reynolds to be postmaster at Townsend, Del., in place of S. B. Hutchinson, deceased.

FLORIDA

Lera H. Taylor to be postmaster at Mayo, Fla., in place of L. H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1927.

Albert H. Maxwell to be postmaster at Eastport, Fla., in place of A. H. Maxwell. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1927.

Vitano W. Baggott to be postmaster at Sherman, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Josiah P. Wilbar to be postmaster at Salerno, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Willie Felts to be postmaster at Pinellas Park, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1926.

Burdett Loomis, jr., to be postmaster at Pierce, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Pauline Wylie to be postmaster at Orange Park, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

James A. Pitt to be postmaster at Minneola, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Coy K. Duff to be postmaster at Mims, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles I. Matthews to be postmaster at Longwood, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Jessie N. James to be postmaster at Lantana, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Carrie Bowers to be postmaster at Lake Placid, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Edward J. Raub to be postmaster at Gull Point, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Luther L. Callaway to be postmaster at Chiefland, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Sarah J. Burns to be postmaster at Benson Springs, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Robert Bulthuis to be postmaster at Baldwin, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Stephen R. Mallory to be postmaster at Wellborn, Fla., in place of W. P. Moore, removed.

James S. Huselton to be postmaster at Venice, Fla., in place of Kate Welliver, declined.

Max V. Robinson to be postmaster at Melbourne, Fla., in place of F. M. Wackerle, resigned.

Robert A. Boucher to be postmaster at Eau Gallie, Fla., in place of G. W. Gleason, resigned.

Benjamin Burnett to be postmaster at Brewster, Fla., in place of L. W. Greason, removed.

GEORGIA

Clarence G. Hardigree to be postmaster at Watkinsville, Ga., in place of C. G. Hardigree. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1926.

Cicero F. Duffee to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Ga., in place of C. F. Duffee. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Rufus H. Johnson to be postmaster at Hogansville, Ga., in place of R. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1927.

James P. Pirkle to be postmaster at Hoschton, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Alma Bustle to be postmaster at Coolidge, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Roxie B. Goza to be postmaster at Chamblee, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Richard G. Mansfield to be postmaster at Bluffton, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Roger E. Fulcher to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Ga., in place of Edgar Bargeron, resigned.

Pet L. Cooke to be postmaster at Sparks, Ga., in place of F. C. Lovett, resigned.

Irene W. Field to be postmaster at Monroe, Ga., in place of W. A. Sheats, resigned.

HAWAII

Antone F. Costa to be postmaster at Wailuku, Hawaii, in place of A. F. Costa. Incumbent's commission expired July 20, 1926.

Antone Fernandez to be postmaster at Kekaha, Hawaii. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Thomas C. White to be postmaster at Kealakekua, Hawaii, in place of J. D. Ackerman, resigned.

IDAHO

Ray W. Banbury to be postmaster at Buhl, Idaho, in place of A. G. Constant. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1927.

Alford E. Pederson to be postmaster at Pierce, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles A. Wagner to be postmaster at Gifford, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Vida I. Perry to be postmaster at Elk City, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles W. Craney to be postmaster at St. Maries, Idaho, in place of Charles Brebner, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Lloyd R. Winn to be postmaster at White Hall, Ill., in place of R. B. Pearce. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

William C. Karr to be postmaster at Vermont, Ill., in place of H. M. Leighty. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1926.

William M. Repine to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, Ill., in place of B. A. Blake. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Leonard F. Richardson to be postmaster at Sheffield, Ill., in place of E. M. Klock. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1926.

Lina S. Paschal to be postmaster at St. Charles, Ill., in place of T. J. Jordan. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1926.

Alonzo M. Spaeth to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of O. A. Unbehauen. Incumbent's commission expired November 23, 1925.

Katherine Dickson to be postmaster at Minier, Ill., in place of W. H. Lower. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Enno A. Karstens to be postmaster at Mascoutah, Ill., in place of R. W. Pfeifer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Clifford C. Wimpress to be postmaster at Lombard, Ill., in place of A. L. Kobisk. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

William P. Volz to be postmaster at Lockport, Ill., in place of J. E. Mackin. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1924.

Lawrence J. Boyd to be postmaster at Lewistown, Ill., in place of L. J. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Leo H. Borgelt to be postmaster at Havana, Ill., in place of L. H. Borgelt. Incumbent's commission expired July 31, 1926.

Eugene Saunders to be postmaster at Harvard, Ill., in place of B. F. Manley. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1926.

Mamie A. Eisenmayer to be postmaster at Granite City, Ill., in place of William Champion. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1927.

Robert E. Stephen to be postmaster at Frankfort, Ill., in place of R. E. Stephen. Incumbent's commission expired November 9, 1925.

William F. Temple to be postmaster at Fairmount, Ill., in place of B. D. Yeazel. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1927.

Aaron K. Hirstein to be postmaster at Fairbury, Ill., in place of J. F. Odell. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Forrest E. Peterson to be postmaster at Depue, Ill., in place of F. E. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1926.

Fred E. Rose to be postmaster at Crystal Lake, Ill., in place of H. C. Shales. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1927.

Ernest L. Crain to be postmaster at Villa Ridge, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Robert W. Zumwalt to be postmaster at Taylor Springs, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bond B. Blackman to be postmaster at Stonefort, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Mary C. Guest to be postmaster at Reddick, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Oliver E. Ray to be postmaster at Poplar Grove, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John S. Burnett to be postmaster at Pittsburg, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

James H. Cawthon to be postmaster at Oakwood, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Roland K. Cumming to be postmaster at Midlothian, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George E. Hull to be postmaster at Kinderhook, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Walter J. Fagan to be postmaster at Flossmoor, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Elizabeth B. Wetmore to be postmaster at Cola, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Martha K. Fredrickson to be postmaster at Bureau, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Fred Humm to be postmaster at Bethalto, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Herbert Tucker to be postmaster at Williamsfield, Ill., in place of C. H. Pulver, deceased.

James T. Livingston to be postmaster at Royalton, Ill., in place of H. H. Pierce, removed.

Bernie N. Griffin to be postmaster at Patoka, Ill., in place of J. W. Alexander, resigned.

William E. Tharp to be postmaster at Nashville, Ill., in place of W. C. Henley, resigned.

Earl Cory to be postmaster at Hazel Crest, Ill., in place of A. J. Zilligen, resigned.

George F. Sutton to be postmaster at Harvey, Ill., in place of W. H. Pease, deceased.

Edith M. Tuxhorn to be postmaster at Edwardsville, Ill., in place of C. H. Spilman, resigned.

Luther M. Kimmel to be postmaster at De Soto, Ill., in place of C. D. Ragsdale, removed.

William C. Lewnan to be postmaster at Danville, Ill., in place of L. M. Birch, deceased.

John M. Bradley to be postmaster at Cypress, Ill., in place of Ruby Moak, removed.

Clarence Duckles to be postmaster at Chesterfield, Ill., in place of W. R. Barnstable, deceased.

Raymond C. Moon to be postmaster at Annawan, Ill., in place of A. G. Ferguson, resigned.

INDIANA

Charles L. Grishaw to be postmaster at Tipton, Ind., in place of L. F. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired September 14, 1926.

John G. Martin to be postmaster at Lynn, Ind., in place of C. A. McClintock. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Robert H. Bryson to be postmaster at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of R. H. Bryson. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1926.

George F. Freeman to be postmaster at Franklin, Ind., in place of J. M. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

Charles G. Covert to be postmaster at Evansville, Ind., in place of C. G. Covert. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

Lola E. Lippard to be postmaster at Clermont, Ind., in place of Maudaline Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired September 14, 1926.

Helen P. Roetzel to be postmaster at Boonville, Ind., in place of J. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1926.

Charles O. Harper to be postmaster at Somerville, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Winbern H. Dillon to be postmaster at Pittsboro, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ruth I. Trapp to be postmaster at Grovertown, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Luther K. Abel to be postmaster at Fairland, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William Teutemacher to be postmaster at Dyer, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William P. Hays to be postmaster at Burns City, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles E. Ballance to be postmaster at Oaktown, Ind., in place of M. C. Bond, resigned.

William H. Wright to be postmaster at Montezuma, Ind., in place of M. A. Dooley, deceased.

Olin M. Bagby to be postmaster at Greenwood, Ind., in place of K. A. Brewer, removed.

Clyde W. Ward to be postmaster at Gas City, Ind., in place of J. E. Ward, deceased.

Neil D. McCallum to be postmaster at Batesville, Ind., in place of W. G. Greemann, deceased.

IOWA

Eunice M. Bute to be postmaster at Stanhope, Iowa, in place of E. M. Bute. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1927.

William D. Lorensen to be postmaster at McCallsburg, Iowa, in place of W. D. Lorensen. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

Letha Doughten to be postmaster at Woolstock, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bessie M. Rice to be postmaster at Urbana, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary F. Park to be postmaster at Tracy, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Libbie L. Lockhart to be postmaster at Packwood, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Albert L. Meredith to be postmaster at Lynnville, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Martin O. Evans to be postmaster at Joice, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Robert D. Adey to be postmaster at Granger, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Alfred E. P. Gillette to be postmaster at Geneva, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary Chilcote to be postmaster at Conway, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Aaron W. Monroe to be postmaster at Clemons, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Hattie Stanley to be postmaster at Castalia, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Roscoe W. Petersen to be postmaster at Bettendorf, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1927.

John A. Schmitz to be postmaster at Storm Lake, Iowa, in place of A. M. Foster, deceased.

Frank H. Davis to be postmaster at Ionia, Iowa, in place of J. F. Cagley, deceased.

William C. Upham to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, Iowa, in place of H. L. Upham, resigned.

Herbert B. Arnold to be postmaster at Blakesburg, Iowa, in place of M. T. Jacobson, removed.

KANSAS

Oliver R. Durham to be postmaster at Udall, Kans., in place of O. R. Durham. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

Arthur F. Rader to be postmaster at Smith Center, Kans., in place of A. F. Rader. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1927.

C. Harold Keiter to be postmaster at Scammon, Kans., in place of J. P. Fern. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Earl R. Ipson to be postmaster at Rolla, Kans., in place of E. A. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1925.

Everett G. Gillidett to be postmaster at Plains, Kans., in place of E. G. Gillidett. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

John A. Bryan to be postmaster at Leoti, Kans., in place of Lee Oldham. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

Charles S. Smith to be postmaster at Lakin, Kans., in place of E. V. Coerber. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1926.

Charles A. Connelly to be postmaster at Independence, Kans., in place of C. A. Connelly. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1925.

Gertrude M. Blair to be postmaster at West Mineral, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Esther Wetterau to be postmaster at Princeton, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Goldia E. Smith to be postmaster at Hudson, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Charles R. Braden to be postmaster at Elsmore, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Reuben H. Funk to be postmaster at Durham, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charlie Gray to be postmaster at Pretty Prairie, Kans., in place of G. D. Smith, deceased.

John Quin to be postmaster at Ottawa, Kans., in place of W. S. Clark, resigned.

Harold R. Starbuck to be postmaster at Lincoln, Kans., in place of C. R. Abbott, removed.

Walter A. Carlile to be postmaster at Jamestown, Kans., in place of E. N. Carlile, resigned.

James W. Way to be postmaster at Elmdale, Kans., in place of G. E. Campbell, resigned.

Thomas A. Biggs to be postmaster at Barnard, Kans., in place of Samuel Barber, removed.

KENTUCKY

Charles L. Tartar to be postmaster at Somerset, Ky., in place of R. B. Waddle. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1926.

Fred L. Sears to be postmaster at Nicholasville, Ky., in place of W. B. Buford. Incumbent's commission expired November 23, 1925.

Claude P. Freeman to be postmaster at Fulton, Ky., in place of R. B. Beadles. Incumbent's commission expired December 30, 1926.

Mildred Ramage to be postmaster at Hickman, Ky., in place of H. C. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1927.

Amos G. Bryant to be postmaster at Fleming, Ky., in place of D. H. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1926.

James H. Turner to be postmaster at Evarts, Ky., in place of H. B. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

George D. Montfort to be postmaster at Campbellsburg, Ky., in place of G. D. Montfort. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1926.

Chester A. Combs to be postmaster at Vicco, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ella M. Geddes to be postmaster at Pippapass, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Willie M. Quillen to be postmaster at Neon, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Carl A. Reis to be postmaster at Mogg, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

York Hatfield to be postmaster at McVeigh, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mike Staley to be postmaster at Lackey, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George L. Jarboe to be postmaster at Glen Dean, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Lula Hall to be postmaster at Gilbertsville, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Troy Arnett to be postmaster at Dunham, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ella Dabney to be postmaster at Coxton, Ky. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Andrew J. Boatwright to be postmaster at Beech Creek, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Roy Fraim to be postmaster at Alva, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

James S. Trosper to be postmaster at Allais, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Byrd Wicker to be postmaster at Wayland, Ky., in place of James Osborne, resigned.

Lillie M. Jackson to be postmaster at Lebanon, Ky., in place of W. B. Timmons, declined.

Mary O. Manby to be postmaster at La Grange, Ky., in place of W. J. Manby, deceased.

Mary L. Easum to be postmaster at Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of M. F. Potts, removed.

Catherine E. Ransdell to be postmaster at Eminence, Ky., in place of W. B. Crabb, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Ella M. Perot to be postmaster at Campti, La., in place of F. J. Maricelli. Incumbent's commission expired November 8, 1925.

John T. Boyett to be postmaster at Sarepta, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Moise E. Chenevert to be postmaster at Plaucheville, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William E. Phillips to be postmaster at Greensburg, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Rufus W. Echols to be postmaster at Converse, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mildred M. Gleason to be postmaster at Belcher, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Regina D. Melanson to be postmaster at Arnaudville, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Frank Warren to be postmaster at Merryville, La., in place of C. E. Roberts, resigned.

Alvin C. Brunson to be postmaster at Mangham, La., in place of A. R. Smith, removed.

Henry S. Adams to be postmaster at Good Pine, La., in place of J. O. Adams, deceased.

MAINE

Marjorie R. Dudley to be postmaster at West Enfield, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Henry G. Swett to be postmaster at Weld, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George A. Palmer to be postmaster at Monroe, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Sarah J. Jordan to be postmaster at Ellsworth Falls, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Robert L. Cyr to be postmaster at Van Buren, Me., in place of F. J. Murphy, removed.

Clarice O. Small to be postmaster at Ridlonville, Me., in place of L. M. Small, resigned.

Leslie D. Ames to be postmaster at Camden, Me., in place of Reuel Robinson, deceased.

Perry J. Murphy to be postmaster at Bridgton, Me., in place of H. W. Jones, deceased.

Donald W. Stackpole to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Me., in place of E. O. Collins, resigned.

MARYLAND

Nettie Fowler to be postmaster at Bowie, Md., in place of Nettie Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1926.

Mary B. Workman to be postmaster at Fort Howard, Md., in place of M. B. Workman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1926.

Beatryce B. Bounds to be postmaster at Fruitland, Md., in place of B. B. Bounds. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1927.

George E. Lane to be postmaster at Queenstown, Md., in place of G. E. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1926.

Robert H. Phillips to be postmaster at Salisbury, Md., in place of R. H. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1926.

Victor F. Cullen to be postmaster at State Sanatorium, Md., in place of V. F. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1926.

Anna B. Bowie to be postmaster at Kensington, Md., in place of A. B. Bowie. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1926.

George W. Stevens to be postmaster at Sudlersville, Md., in place of G. W. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Leon Clifton to be postmaster at Stockton, Md., in place of Leon Clifton. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1926.

Howard R. Damuth to be postmaster at Thurmont, Md., in place of M. L. Rouzer. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1926.

Joseph P. Cooper to be postmaster at Sharptown, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Jacob H. Reinhardt to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Samuel T. Ragan to be postmaster at Conowingo, Md. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Aureila Day to be postmaster at Marion Station, Md., in place of C. R. Day, deceased.

Julian M. Richardson to be postmaster at East New Market, Md., in place of C. W. Meyer, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Osgood L. Small to be postmaster at Sagamore, Mass., in place of O. L. Small. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1926.

William R. Farrington to be postmaster at Middleboro, Mass., in place of W. R. Farrington. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Charles E. Hamblin to be postmaster at Huntington, Mass., in place of S. G. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1927.

Arthur F. Cahoon to be postmaster at Harwich, Mass., in place of A. F. Cahoon. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Joseph J. Tebo to be postmaster at Fisherville, Mass., in place of E. J. LeMaire. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Godefroy de Tonnancour to be postmaster at Fall River, Mass., in place of Godefroy de Tonnancour. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Russell B. DeWolf to be postmaster at Duxbury, Mass., in place of R. B. DeWolf. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Eugene B. Tobey to be postmaster at West Hanover, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ella M. Ovenden to be postmaster at West Boylston, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George M. Campbell to be postmaster at Rutland Heights, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charlotte M. Everett to be postmaster at Bolton, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Gertrude A. Davis to be postmaster at Assonet, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Stanley H. Matthews to be postmaster at Yarmouth Port, Mass., in place of C. W. Swift, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Fred H. Johnson to be postmaster at St. Ignace, Mich., in place of F. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Dana Stowell to be postmaster at Comstock Park, Mich., in place of Dana Stowell. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1926.

Emile J. Crete to be postmaster at Caspian, Mich., in place of E. J. Crete. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Claud E. Ford to be postmaster at Caledonia, Mich., in place of C. E. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1926.

Addie F. Martindale to be postmaster at Southbranch, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Louis A. Lowen to be postmaster at Roseville, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1926.

Napoleon Valrance to be postmaster at Rockwood, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mattie D. Read to be postmaster at Richland, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary E. Morrison to be postmaster at Rapid City, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Victor Gustafson to be postmaster at Nahma, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Kathryn I. Stanley to be postmaster at Morrice, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Kate Turner to be postmaster at Michigan Center, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Cornelius G. Schuur to be postmaster at Marne, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Linton E. Cosand to be postmaster at Lupton, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ray C. Wood to be postmaster at Highland, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Christena T. Murphy to be postmaster at Gaines, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Stanislaus M. Keenan to be postmaster at Eloise, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Lila Botsford to be postmaster at Comstock, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Carrie B. Daly to be postmaster at Carrollton, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Clara Kellsy to be postmaster at Bannister, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Maurice Kenel to be postmaster at Ahmeek, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Otto L. Sprague to be postmaster at Owosso, Mich., in place of C. M. Dewey, deceased.

Gwendolyn E. Stockman to be postmaster at Oscoda, Mich., in place of H. W. Stockman, deceased.

Mac W. Thomas to be postmaster at Lawrence, Mich., in place of C. E. Benedict, resigned.

George H. Florian to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Mich., in place of W. H. Florian, resigned.

Gladys E. Daniells to be postmaster at Coleman, Mich., in place of C. H. Haley, resigned.

Martin Donohue to be postmaster at Center Line, Mich., in place of Carl Van Valkenburgh, removed.

Hilda M. Hammer to be postmaster at Carney, Mich., in place of R. O. Olson, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Milda Rieman to be postmaster at Vergas, Minn., in place of Bernhard Stangenes. Incumbent's commission expired August 24, 1925.

Abraham L. Ober to be postmaster at Palisade, Minn., in place of A. W. Isaacson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1927.

Olga P. Hatling to be postmaster at Dalton, Minn., in place of O. P. Hatling. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1925.

Alice K. Hill to be postmaster at Upsala, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Nils B. Gustafson to be postmaster at Stacy, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Grace R. Perry to be postmaster at St. Vincent, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary C. Anderson to be postmaster at Lake Lillian, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Olive C. Hall to be postmaster at Hollandale, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Frank H. Groetsch to be postmaster at Green Isle, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Cora E. Cook to be postmaster at Chandler, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Josephine E. Brockman to be postmaster at Triumph, Minn., in place of C. N. Brockman, deceased.

Roy Coleman to be postmaster at Lancaster, Minn., in place of Harry Coleman, deceased.

John M. Johnson to be postmaster at Hills, Minn., in place of M. M. Rogness, resigned.

Charles A. Anderson to be postmaster at Greenbush, Minn., in place of C. L. Engelhorn, resigned.

Edward B. Anderson to be postmaster at Elbow Lake, Minn., in place of R. E. Anderson, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Thomas L. Cotten to be postmaster at Summit, Miss., in place of T. L. Cotten. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

J. D. Hale to be postmaster at Scott, Miss., in place of J. D. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Kathleen M. Baker to be postmaster at Scooba, Miss., in place of T. H. Nicholson. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1926.

Myra P. Varnado to be postmaster at Osyka, Miss., in place of M. P. Varnado. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Nathan B. Williams to be postmaster at Fernwood, Miss., in place of N. B. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

Nancy A. Murphey to be postmaster at Doddsville, Miss., in place of W. D. Fields. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Anne D. Powers to be postmaster at Cary, Miss., in place of A. D. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Katie M. Beavers to be postmaster at Boyle, Miss., in place of A. K. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1926.

Etoyle S. Countiss to be postmaster at Pittsboro, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Daniel F. Hitt to be postmaster at Louin, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Willie M. Windham to be postmaster at Lena, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William D. Myers to be postmaster at Deemer, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bessie Gay to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Scott H. Speck to be postmaster at Blue Springs, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William A. Miller to be postmaster at Wiggins, Miss., in place of James Chamberlain, removed.

Annie K. Woods to be postmaster at Water Valley, Miss., in place of J. L. Kirby, deceased.

George F. McLelland to be postmaster at Newton, Miss., in place of G. F. McLelland, resigned.

Albert S. Russell to be postmaster at Magee, Miss., in place of A. P. Russell, resigned.

Bessie F. Truly to be postmaster at Fayette, Miss., in place of E. A. Truly, deceased.

Everet M. Chilcoat to be postmaster at Amory, Miss., in place of W. T. Pearce, removed.

MISSOURI

Wallace Frederick to be postmaster at Sloutsville, Mo., in place of C. T. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1926.

Alfred O. Lowman to be postmaster at Smithville, Mo., in place of A. O. Lowman. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1926.

George T. Holybee, jr., to be postmaster at Platte City, Mo., in place of J. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired August 12, 1923.

Charles S. Dickson to be postmaster at Milan, Mo., in place of A. C. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1927.

Charles N. Williamson to be postmaster at Gentry, Mo., in place of M. B. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Merton M. Meador to be postmaster at Exeter, Mo., in place of W. H. Yarnall. Incumbent's commission expired August 30, 1926.

John J. Kennon to be postmaster at Doniphan, Mo., in place of E. C. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1927.

Frank W. Dunn to be postmaster at Chaffee, Mo., in place of Leah Abernathy. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

James R. Simmons to be postmaster at Stotts City, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Edwin G. Karstedt to be postmaster at Rosebud, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Virginia Young to be postmaster at Osage City, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Henry W. Schupp to be postmaster at Fremont, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Florence E. Gilbert to be postmaster at Fillmore, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William L. Shipp to be postmaster at Centerview, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Thomas J. Bryant to be postmaster at Anglum, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Annie N. Johnson to be postmaster at Winston, Mo., in place of H. L. Johnson, deceased.

Wyatt B. Little to be postmaster at Steele, Mo., in place of W. S. Copeland, deceased.

John E. Bauer to be postmaster at Osborn, Mo., in place of P. C. Campbell, resigned.

Ada J. Barker to be postmaster at Marquand, Mo., in place of E. E. Lett, resigned.

Estella D. Seaton to be postmaster at Lathrop, Mo., in place of A. D. Walker, resigned.

Robert G. Teague to be postmaster at Frankford, Mo., in place of E. S. Bradley, removed.

Alice I. Dixon to be postmaster at Creighton, Mo., in place of K. C. Dixon, removed.

Walter B. Ashbaugh to be postmaster at Clarkton, Mo., in place of M. D. Brooks, resigned.

MONTANA

George D. Dutro to be postmaster at Dodson, Mont., in place of G. D. Dutro. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harly J. Stephenson to be postmaster at Belgrade, Mont., in place of H. J. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1927.

Donald A. Petrie to be postmaster at Martinsdale, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Joseph Keeler to be postmaster at Crow Agency, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Selma N. Hauge to be postmaster at Paradise, Mont., in place of I. J. Rhoades, resigned.

Fred W. Handel to be postmaster at Musselshell, Mont., in place of Lunsford Miles, resigned.

Henry B. Chambers to be postmaster at Manhattan, Mont., in place of C. L. Cayle, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Harry H. Jordan to be postmaster at Wilcox, Nebr., in place of H. H. Jordan. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1927.

Roy Hauke to be postmaster at Shelton, Nebr., in place of C. S. Burkerd. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1926.

Catherine Honey to be postmaster at Uehling, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Helmuth A. J. Paul to be postmaster at Millard, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Otto C. Smith to be postmaster at Lyman, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Robert E. Templin to be postmaster at Hoskins, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Elmer W. Couch to be postmaster at Henry, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Lynn F. Cunningham to be postmaster at Gurley, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Fred C. Beach to be postmaster at Eagle, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Lawrence A. Kibbee to be postmaster at Winnebago, Nebr., in place of F. N. Thomson, resigned.

Zenas E. Decker to be postmaster at Wauneta, Nebr., in place of C. C. Colbert, resigned.

Augusta Robb to be postmaster at Union, Nebr., in place of S. I. Barritt, resigned.

Merle A. Brady to be postmaster at Kimball, Nebr., in place of L. R. Nastman, resigned.

Albert L. Hepp to be postmaster at Greeley, Nebr., in place of J. J. McCarthy, deceased.

Harvey E. Poole to be postmaster at Dunning, Nebr., in place of N. L. Fink, resigned.

Gus Johnson to be postmaster at Ceresco, Nebr., in place of Theodore Nordgren, resigned.

Dolph L. Houser to be postmaster at Campbell, Nebr., in place of W. N. Brooks, removed.

NEVADA

Fred L. Littell to be postmaster at Yerington, Nev., in place of M. B. Allenwood, resigned.

Isaac L. Stone to be postmaster at McGill, Nev., in place of R. G. Jessen, removed.

Philomena Borrego to be postmaster at Austin, Nev., in place of T. H. Dalton, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James A. Reed to be postmaster at Union, N. H., in place of J. A. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired November 19, 1925.

Herman P. Gleason to be postmaster at Ossipee, N. H., Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Frank E. Webster to be postmaster at Farmington, N. H., in place of C. E. Ayers, deceased.

Willard R. Heath to be postmaster at Concord, N. H., in place of W. D. Chandler, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

William B. Havens to be postmaster at Toms River, N. J., in place of W. B. Havens. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1926.

Forrest Green to be postmaster at Long Branch, N. J., in place of Forrest Green. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Dallas G. Young to be postmaster at Keyport, N. J., in place of R. O. Walling. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

Charles W. Foster to be postmaster at Grenloch, N. J., in place of C. W. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1926.

Reuben Coyte to be postmaster at Coytesville, N. J., in place of Reuben Coyte. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1927.

Daisy R. Beekman to be postmaster at Towaco, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Winfield L. Smith to be postmaster at Mantua, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Weston Rice to be postmaster at Lake Como, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Clarence W. Gaskill to be postmaster at Bridgeboro, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George Schultz to be postmaster at Waldwick, N. J., in place of W. A. Cullen, removed.

John S. Inman to be postmaster at New Egypt, N. J., in place of G. W. Ivins, deceased.

George C. Kloss to be postmaster at Manasquan, N. J., in place of Oscar Drake, deceased.

Harold R. Fife to be postmaster at Linwood, N. J., in place of M. T. Cavileer, resigned.

Thomas J. Willis to be postmaster at Lake Hopatcong, N. J., in place of William Hockenjos, jr., resigned.

George Oberle to be postmaster at Edgewater, N. J., in place of I. D. B. Spatz, removed.

Emma Heus to be postmaster at Demarest, N. J., in place of Frank Achilles, resigned.

William T. Birkhead to be postmaster at Beverly, N. J., in place of D. B. Rodman, removed.

NEW MEXICO

Dennis J. Walsh to be postmaster at Santa Rita, N. Mex., in place of D. J. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Bert C. Wright to be postmaster at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., in place of V. B. Brittingham. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Angelo Frazzini to be postmaster at Dawson, N. Mex., in place of Harvey Springer. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Agnes C. Evans to be postmaster at Shiprock, N. Mex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Leroy H. Brock to be postmaster at Mosquero, N. Mex., in place of Malaquias Baca, removed.

NEW YORK

George W. Harris to be postmaster at Richmondville, N. Y., in place of G. W. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1927.

J. Edward Uline to be postmaster at Ransomville, N. Y., in place of J. E. Uline. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Ruby C. Williams to be postmaster at New Lebanon, N. Y., in place of A. H. Tilden. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Maud E. Butterfield to be postmaster at New Berlin, N. Y., in place of M. E. Butterfield. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1926.

Walter J. Burke to be postmaster at Mineville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1926.

Etta Merritt to be postmaster at Brewerton, N. Y., in place of Etta Merritt. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1927.

Irving Barrett to be postmaster at Bedford Hills, N. Y., in place of Irving Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Harold G. Haines to be postmaster at Urlton, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

William L. Bouchard to be postmaster at Surmound, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bert P. Wood to be postmaster at Springfield Center, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Otto F. Schuler to be postmaster at Snyder, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John J. Lynch to be postmaster at Oscawana, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Emsley V. Pepper to be postmaster at Middle Granville, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

William T. Finn to be postmaster at Madison, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John J. Cole to be postmaster at Jamesport, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Frank E. Vail to be postmaster at Howells, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

James E. Colgan to be postmaster at Hamden, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Harris Kass to be postmaster at Greenfield, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William J. Snyder to be postmaster at Conifer, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Edna Frisbee to be postmaster at Conewango Valley, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Grace A. Harrington to be postmaster at West Point, N. Y., in place of M. R. Newlands, resigned.

Vernon Vaughn to be postmaster at Water Mill, N. Y., in place of M. W. LeFevre, resigned.

William H. Topps to be postmaster at Syosset, N. Y., in place of C. A. Van Sise, resigned.

Clarence P. Varian to be postmaster at Scarsdale, N. Y., in place of D. R. Dunn, resigned.

Harlow G. VanNamee to be postmaster at Richville, N. Y., in place of F. A. Buck, resigned.

Phelps Smith to be postmaster at Paul Smiths, N. Y., in place of A. A. Smith, deceased.

Charles F. Fowler to be postmaster at Iona Island, N. Y., in place of R. B. Hoag, deceased.

Rosa H. Warner to be postmaster at Hampton Bays, N. Y., in place of H. T. Meschutt, removed.

Sadie M. Henderson to be postmaster at Garnerville, N. Y., in place of G. H. Burres, resigned.

William W. Baldwin to be postmaster at Downsville, N. Y., in place of G. W. Hulbert, removed.

Carrie J. Johnson to be postmaster at De Kalb Junction, N. Y., in place of E. O. Hurlbut, deceased.

William S. Keene to be postmaster at Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y., in place of W. M. Heaney, removed.

James T. McLain to be postmaster at Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of R. T. Dayton, removed.

Elizabeth H. Oschmann to be postmaster at Broad Channel, N. Y., in place of W. R. Kase, removed.

Charles J. Amsden to be postmaster at Bolivar, N. Y., in place of E. D. Walters, removed.

Henry W. Ware to be postmaster at Batavia, N. Y., in place of J. E. Gubb, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Grogan to be postmaster at Spray, N. C., in place of C. C. Rowe. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1926.

James C. Stanell to be postmaster at Smithfield, N. C., in place of S. A. Lunceford. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

John A. Klein to be postmaster at Morehead City, N. C., in place of C. L. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1926.

Chester C. Lord to be postmaster at Montreat, N. C., in place of C. C. Lord. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1926.

Thomas E. Sparrow to be postmaster at Hillsboro, N. C., in place of T. E. Sparrow. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Sam J. Smith to be postmaster at Erlanger, N. C., in place of S. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

William C. Thorne to be postmaster at Elm City, N. C., in place of R. A. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1927.

Ruth F. White to be postmaster at Colerain, N. C., in place of W. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1927.

Charles E. Boone to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, N. C., in place of J. P. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Lester G. Hales to be postmaster at Bladenboro, N. C., in place of A. R. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1927.

Salathiel F. Gordon to be postmaster at Badin, N. C., in place of R. C. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired September 22, 1926.

Mae A. Elliott to be postmaster at Union Mills, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary E. Liles to be postmaster at Naples, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Christopher C. Whitaker to be postmaster at Landis, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Claudia L. York to be postmaster at Harmony, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Roscoe Hill to be postmaster at Eure, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John B. Lonon to be postmaster at Ashford, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

David M. Cloninger to be postmaster at Newton, N. C., in place of W. A. Reinhardt, removed.

Lester H. Haymes to be postmaster at Milton, N. C., in place of C. R. Thomas, resigned.

Nugent B. Hester to be postmaster at Fuquay Springs, N. C., in place of W. W. Seawell, deceased.

William T. Fletcher to be postmaster at Booneville, N. C., in place of B. E. Clemens, resigned.

Albert T. Davidson to be postmaster at Biltmore, N. C., in place of W. B. Hemphill, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Knut O. Abrahamson to be postmaster at Kathryn, N. Dak., in place of Flora Walker. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1926.

Lena L. Hintz to be postmaster at Dunn Center, N. Dak., in place of L. L. Hintz. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1926.

Rudolph G. W. Anderson to be postmaster at Ambrose, N. Dak., in place of R. D. Hand. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Bridget A. H. Hennessy to be postmaster at Tolna, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Rose A. Boardman to be postmaster at Overly, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Oscar M. Thompson to be postmaster at Rolette, N. Dak., in place of S. M. Vrem, appointee not commissioned.

Jens B. Dyrud to be postmaster at Maddock, N. Dak., in place of D. L. Haugen, resigned.

Alice Stewart to be postmaster at Linton, N. Dak., in place of Henrietta Rooks, removed.

Leo Rolle to be postmaster at Brinsmade, N. Dak., in place of R. E. Stevens, resigned.

Anton A. Ficker to be postmaster at Amidon, N. Dak., in place of J. J. Saddler, removed.

OHIO

John A. Gatchell to be postmaster at Wharton, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Elva L. Gauch to be postmaster at West Manchester, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Raymond M. Swank to be postmaster at Trotwood, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Harry W. Hayes to be postmaster at Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Karl S. Schiller to be postmaster at Petersburg, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Nellie Maddock to be postmaster at North Ridgeville, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Jerry F. Koster to be postmaster at Mayfields Heights, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Elmyra L. Griswold to be postmaster at Macedonia, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Anna J. Pyle to be postmaster at Lansing, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Florence Hilgefort to be postmaster at Fort Loramie, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Lawrence W. Hall to be postmaster at East Sparta, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Janet Boster to be postmaster at Chesapeake, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Joseph T. Scheutle to be postmaster at Beaver, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

Robert O. Cady to be postmaster at Bay Village, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Will P. McNary to be postmaster at Bannock, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Florence M. Brakeman to be postmaster at Warrensville, Ohio, in place of Leora Morris, resigned.

Dora A. Kramer to be postmaster at West Alexandria, Ohio, in place of J. D. Kramer, deceased.

Arthur W. Cummings to be postmaster at Uhrichsville, Ohio, in place of W. W. Keepers, deceased.

Wilbur R. Meredith to be postmaster at Painesville, Ohio, in place of R. G. Goff, deceased.

Harry E. Coil to be postmaster at Mendon, Ohio, in place of S. F. Davis, removed.

Wilber S. Bush to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of C. D. Bush, resigned.

John W. Darling to be postmaster at Elmore, Ohio, in place of K. K. Witte. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1926.

George P. Ewing to be postmaster at Vinton, Ohio, in place of Isaac Evans. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas J. Winters to be postmaster at Stringtown, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Robert F. Rind to be postmaster at Pine Valley, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Viola Smith to be postmaster at Clemscot, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Fred Hudson to be postmaster at Webb City, Okla., in place of R. W. Small, removed.

James M. Adkinson to be postmaster at Tulsa, Okla., in place of O. K. Benedict, resigned.

Bruce W. Hutton to be postmaster at Oakwood, Okla., in place of W. F. Hutton, deceased.

William S. Wilhite to be postmaster at Butler, Okla., in place of C. L. Logan, resigned.

Otto S. Allred to be postmaster at Boynton, Okla., in place of R. E. Sutton, resigned.

John R. Hibbard to be postmaster at Asher, Okla., in place of F. T. Laster, resigned.

Myrtle E. Harrell to be postmaster at Apperson, Okla., in place of F. S. Nipper, resigned.

John W. Dagenhart to be postmaster at Gage, Okla., in place of E. C. Baxter. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Lynn McDonald to be postmaster at Goodwell, Okla., in place of L. A. Avenett. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1926.

Jean C. Buell to be postmaster at Holdenville, Okla., in place of J. M. Sappington. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Andrew G. D. Elswick to be postmaster at Manchester, Okla., in place of C. E. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1926.

William R. Casteel to be postmaster at Sapulpa, Okla., in place of W. R. Casteel. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1926.

James B. Cox to be postmaster at Stilwell, Okla., in place of A. L. Shannon. Incumbent's commission expired September 8, 1926.

Alvin L. Derby to be postmaster at Shidler, Okla., in place of G. C. Hill, resigned.

Etta B. Sellers to be postmaster at Quapaw, Okla., in place of C. C. Sellers, resigned.

OREGON

Walter E. Zumwalt to be postmaster at Wamic, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Annie O. Johnson to be postmaster at Odell, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Edward C. Michelsen to be postmaster at Kerry, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Elizabeth J. Morgan to be postmaster at Corbett, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ann B. Heydon to be postmaster at Valsetz, Oreg., in place of F. K. Baker, resigned.

Harold R. McIsaac to be postmaster at Parkdale, Oreg., in place of R. J. McIsaac, resigned.

George W. Johnson to be postmaster at Lakeview, Oreg., in place of W. A. Massingill, deceased.

Fred C. Matches to be postmaster at Dayton, Oreg., in place of M. G. Miller, deceased.

Alice K. Gallier to be postmaster at Bandon, Oreg., in place of H. J. McDiarmid, removed.

Thomas R. MacMillan to be postmaster at Lebanon, Oreg., in place of W. C. De Pew. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1926.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edwin K. Bedortha to be postmaster at Woodville, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Elmer E. Grover to be postmaster at Wapwallopen, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Temple K. Gregg to be postmaster at Strafford, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Calvin S. Leitner to be postmaster at Sheridan, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Milton H. Vanness to be postmaster at Rummerfield, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Anna B. McCully to be postmaster at Ramey, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bertha G. Thomas to be postmaster at Port Kennedy, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Anna C. Young to be postmaster at North Glenside, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mary R. Clapper to be postmaster at New Enterprise, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

M. Irene Workman to be postmaster at Mingoville, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

William J. Lytle to be postmaster at Mayview, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ethel H. Palmer to be postmaster at Linwood, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1927.

Anna W. Kerr to be postmaster at Lincoln Place, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Caddie L. Greth to be postmaster at Laureldale, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Walter W. Gilmore to be postmaster at Hillsville, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Edwin B. Heckler to be postmaster at Harleysville, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Margaret M. Callaham to be postmaster at Glen Mills, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mildred E. Henn to be postmaster at Freemansburg, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Haydn E. Lupold to be postmaster at East Petersburg, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

George V. Glenn to be postmaster at East Butler, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John E. Cronk to be postmaster at Duke Center, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bennett H. Light to be postmaster at Avon, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Harold Coburn to be postmaster at Allison, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Samuel H. Wigton to be postmaster at Philipsburg, Pa., in place of F. B. Wythe, deceased.

Edwin Zimmerman to be postmaster at Newmanstown, Pa., in place of C. B. Lengel, deceased.

Edwin W. Crawford to be postmaster at New Castle, Pa., in place of J. C. Norris, deceased.

Albert W. Watts to be postmaster at McVeytown, Pa., in place of F. W. Kiefhaber, deceased.

Arthur D. Garber to be postmaster at Florin, Pa., in place of E. F. Heiner, deceased.

Wallace W. Scowden to be postmaster at Farrell, Pa., in place of J. J. Nolan, deceased.

Cletus L. Goodling to be postmaster at Farm School, Pa., in place of Bernhard Ostrolenk, resigned.

John M. Thompson to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Pa., in place of C. W. Hart, resigned.

August Neimeyer to be postmaster at Drexel Hill, Pa., in place of M. E. Healy, resigned.

Willa F. Beall to be postmaster at Beallsville, Pa., in place of C. W. Foster, resigned.

John D. Gerhart to be postmaster at East Greenville, Pa., in place of J. D. Gerhart. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1927.

John S. Windle to be postmaster at Fernwood, Pa., in place of J. S. Windle. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1926.

Rhea L. Moyer to be postmaster at Macungie, Pa., in place of F. E. Lukens. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1926.

James B. Flounders to be postmaster at Media, Pa., in place of F. J. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1927.

Howard C. Emigh to be postmaster at Morrisdale, Pa., in place of H. C. Emigh. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

William M. O. Edwards to be postmaster at Pencoyd, Pa., in place of W. M. O. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1927.

George E. McGlennen to be postmaster at Sharon Hill, Pa., in place of M. E. Leavitt. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1927.

David K. Angle to be postmaster at Shippensburg, Pa., in place of Q. T. Mickey. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

John S. Butterworth to be postmaster at Wallingford, Pa., in place of M. H. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1926.

Karl M. Lyons to be postmaster at Warren, Pa., in place of M. C. Parshall. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1926.

RHODE ISLAND

Lillian G. Hoxie to be postmaster at Shannock, R. I. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

James H. Riley to be postmaster at Harrisville, R. I., in place of J. H. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1927.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elijah Lee to be postmaster at Pacolet, S. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Robert E. Ragsdale to be postmaster at Pelzer, S. C., in place of J. B. Pelzer, resigned.

George B. Patrick to be postmaster at Bowman, S. C., in place of Alice Singletary. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1926.

Roy L. Hurst to be postmaster at Chesterfield, S. C., in place of Parnell Meehan. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1926.

Walter L. Gettys to be postmaster at Clover, S. C., in place of W. L. Gettys. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert H. McCullagh to be postmaster at Sanator, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Richard Whalen to be postmaster at Pine Ridge, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Gustavus M. Finotti to be postmaster at Missionhill, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Myrta M. Lund to be postmaster at Erwin, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Eugene M. Coffield to be postmaster at Oelrichs, S. Dak., in place of I. G. Jones, resigned.

Catherine M. Knehl to be postmaster at Mound City, S. Dak., in place of E. E. Vroman, deceased.

Henry Swindler to be postmaster at Mitchell, S. Dak., in place of T. C. Burns, deceased.

George A. DeWalt to be postmaster at McLaughlin, S. Dak., in place of Frank Dennerly, resigned.

Clyde H. Cotton to be postmaster at Hitchcock, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Webb, deceased.

Truman C. Knott to be postmaster at Bristol, S. Dak., in place of T. C. Knott. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1927.

John Schafer to be postmaster at Delmont, S. Dak., in place of Harriet Pope. Incumbent's commission expired November 8, 1925.

Earl J. Meredith to be postmaster at Groton, S. Dak., in place of O. I. Bierman. Incumbent's commission expired August 16, 1925.

TENNESSEE

Nona C. Armstrong to be postmaster at Martel, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Jean Brient to be postmaster at Friendsville, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

David H. Hughes to be postmaster at Eagleville, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Weyman I. Dooly to be postmaster at Conasauga, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Pleas P. Campbell to be postmaster at Calderwood, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

James G. Jones to be postmaster at Ardmore, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

E. Dan Smith to be postmaster at Mountpleasant, Tenn., in place of S. A. Vest, resigned.

Edna Conway to be postmaster at Mosheim, Tenn., in place of W. N Craft, deceased.

Anthony R. Atkerson to be postmaster at Columbia, Tenn., in place of J. W. Jackson, removed.

Bessie J. Clark to be postmaster at Christiana, Tenn., in place of H. H. Clark, resigned.

John V. Lady to be postmaster at Blountville, Tenn., in place of H. F. Marion, resigned.

Joseph R. Lane to be postmaster at Church Hill, Tenn., in place of J. R. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Lavella Bratschi to be postmaster at Erin, Tenn., in place of Zeph Roby. Incumbent's commission expired September 22, 1926.

Byrd P. Allison to be postmaster at Gallatin, Tenn., in place of B. P. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

William E. Richardson, jr., to be postmaster at Halls, Tenn., in place of I. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Elmer T. Sparks to be postmaster at McKenzie, Tenn., in place of P. M. Ware. Incumbent's commission expired September 8, 1926.

George T. Taylor to be postmaster at Memphis, Tenn., in place of Solomon Seches. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1926.

Mathew M. Huling to be postmaster at Winchester, Tenn., in place of J. C. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1927.

TEXAS

Laura E. Tidwell to be postmaster at Whittenburg, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1927.

Julia E. Fones to be postmaster at Village Mills, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

D. Calvin Hutton to be postmaster at Truscott, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

John E. Kimsey to be postmaster at Texon, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Minnie L. E. Walton to be postmaster at Swenson, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Daniel W. Thurman to be postmaster at Stinnett, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Efren M. Ramirez to be postmaster at Roma, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Andrew J. Bushong to be postmaster at Rankin, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Andrew J. Sitton to be postmaster at Pyote, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Belle H. Shelly to be postmaster at Plemons, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Neeta Shaw to be postmaster at Ovalo, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Joseph F. Wiles to be postmaster at Olton, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Tryon Lewis to be postmaster at McCamey, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1926.

Jessie L. Kay to be postmaster at Lytle, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

John H. Anderson to be postmaster at Lawn, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Alex E. Jungmann to be postmaster at Lacoste, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

James T. Davis to be postmaster at Kopperl, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Clara C. Redford to be postmaster at Johnson City, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Wiley Fox to be postmaster at Dumas, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William F. Manning to be postmaster at Crossett, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1927.

Claude H. Martin to be postmaster at Crane, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Harold Rothschild to be postmaster at Borger, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1926.

William R. Black to be postmaster at Bessmay, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Antonia R. Garcia to be postmaster at Benavides, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

Eugene C. Arnold to be postmaster at Agua Dulce, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Thomas W. McCormick to be postmaster at Tuscola, Tex., in place of C. H. Branton, resigned.

Ira B. Davidson to be postmaster at Strawn, Tex., in place of J. M. Campbell, removed.

Thomas C. Murray to be postmaster at Sonora, Tex., in place of May Murray, resigned.

George W. Leonard to be postmaster at Shiro, Tex., in place of H. B. Young, removed.

Willie L. Casey to be postmaster at Olney, Tex., in place of G. T. Wood, deceased.

Charlsie S. Witham to be postmaster at New Braunsfels, Tex., in place of William Tays, deceased.

Elmer J. Mayo to be postmaster at Nevada, Tex., in place of C. H. Rucker, resigned.

Joel D. Cranford to be postmaster at Mineral Wells, Tex., in place of A. J. Thomas, resigned.

Oscar J. Adcock to be postmaster at Merkel, Tex., in place of T. F. Davis, deceased.

Dudley L. Gibbs to be postmaster at Manning, Tex., in place of F. A. Ragan, resigned.

Newton L. Craven to be postmaster at Leander, Tex., in place of R. M. Hazlewood, resigned.

Lillie Brinkley to be postmaster at Howe, Tex., in place of Marshall Callaway, resigned.

Fred R. Ridley to be postmaster at Campbell, Tex., in place of H. M. Bridges, removed.

John T. Watson to be postmaster at Caddo Mills, Tex., in place of A. S. Morgan, deceased.

Ray C. Kelley to be postmaster at Caddo, Tex., in place of I. J. Gumm, resigned.

Charles S. Myers to be postmaster at Bryan, Tex., in place of M. F. Carroll, removed.

Pearl G. Boynton to be postmaster at Bronte, Tex., in place of N. M. Boynton, deceased.

John A. Meyer to be postmaster at Archer City, Tex., in place of J. D. Powell, removed.

George W. Ragland to be postmaster at Abernathy, Tex., in place of A. G. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1927.

John K. Ford to be postmaster at Bogata, Tex., in place of J. K. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1926.

Frederick V. Blesse to be postmaster at Dilley, Tex., in place of T. E. Cavender. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Ferman Carpenter to be postmaster at Franklin, Tex., in place of Ferman Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

Clifford C. Burrows to be postmaster at Iowa Park, Tex., in place of C. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1927.

William R. Wagle to be postmaster at Lampasas, Tex., in place of W. R. Wagle. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Fannie H. Miller to be postmaster at Newton, Tex., in place of F. H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1927.

Jesse R. Davis to be postmaster at Pearsall, Tex., in place of J. R. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1926.

Thomas E. Franklin to be postmaster at Poteet, Tex., in place of T. E. Franklin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1926.

Henry L. Goodwin to be postmaster at Roaring Springs, Tex., in place of P. L. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired October 4, 1925.

Nicholas K. Lidstone to be postmaster at San Saba, Tex., in place of J. E. Carson. Incumbent's commission expired August 10, 1926.

Turner H. Perry to be postmaster at Stephenville, Tex., in place of E. S. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1926.

Winfred C. Wilson to be postmaster at Sunset, Tex., in place of R. E. Hollingsworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1927.

Miles B. Earnheart to be postmaster at Trenton, Tex., in place of M. B. Earnheart. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1926.

Alfred S. Maddox to be postmaster at Valley View, Tex., in place of Edna Highfill. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1927.

UTAH

Verona G. Fullmer to be postmaster at Orangeville, Utah. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Corty D. Larsen to be postmaster at Mammoth, Utah. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles E. Torgerson to be postmaster at Emery, Utah. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Wallace L. Holst to be postmaster at Brigham, Utah, in place of R. A. Madsen, resigned.

John H. Hall to be postmaster at Hurricane, Utah, in place of M. W. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

T. J. Wadsworth, jr., to be postmaster at Santaquin, Utah, in place of T. J. Wadsworth, jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

VERMONT

Lewis H. Higgins to be postmaster at Newfane, Vt. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William F. Braley to be postmaster at Hartford, Vt. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

VIRGINIA

Emmett W. Brittle to be postmaster at Wakefield, Va., in place of E. W. Brittle. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1927.

Edward P. Schultz to be postmaster at Onancock, Va., in place of E. P. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Ruth O. Griffin to be postmaster at Newsoms, Va., in place of H. E. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Ernest M. Williams to be postmaster at Ivanhoe, Va., in place of Samuel McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1926.

Neville L. Adams to be postmaster at Gretna, Va., in place of O. M. Colbert. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1926.

James O. Humphreys to be postmaster at Goshen, Va., in place of F. L. Armentrout. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1927.

Charles W. Kilgore to be postmaster at Coeburn, Va., in place of C. W. Kilgore. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1927.

William H. Haney to be postmaster at Claremont, Va., in place of W. H. Haney. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1926.

Charles R. Whitmore to be postmaster at Broadway, Va., in place of C. R. Whitmore. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1927.

Virgie C. Goode to be postmaster at Bassetts, Va., in place of V. C. Goode. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Robert M. Bradshaw to be postmaster at Rice, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Harrison H. Dodge to be postmaster at Mount Vernon on the Potomac, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

William E. Shaver to be postmaster at Maurertown, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Henry A. Storm to be postmaster at McLean, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Thomas L. Waters to be postmaster at Konnarock, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Emmett L. Allen to be postmaster at Glenallen, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ralph W. Teates to be postmaster at Bealeton, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

G. Buford Bralley to be postmaster at Austinville, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Richard D. Holland to be postmaster at Windsor, Va., in place of C. E. Fulgham, resigned.

Walter E. Richmond to be postmaster at Rural Retreat, Va., in place of J. W. De Boe, removed.

Alice M. Welch to be postmaster at Phoebus, Va., in place of C. E. Welch, deceased.

Frank M. Brown to be postmaster at National Soldiers' Home, Va., in place of Margaret Woodward, resigned.

Charles M. Saunders to be postmaster at Milford, Va., in place of E. G. Thornton, resigned.

Caroline E. Bristow to be postmaster at Ivor, Va., in place of R. E. Bristow, deceased.

Gilmer T. Slusser to be postmaster at Fincastle, Va., in place of G. T. Slusser, resigned.

John R. Jones to be postmaster at Cleveland, Va., in place of W. P. Gilbert, removed.

Ella E. Ames to be postmaster at Belle Haven, Va., in place of J. W. Smith, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Paul K. Walton to be postmaster at Veradale, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Alphonse F. Learned to be postmaster at Port Ludlow, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Daniel L. Jackson to be postmaster at Port Gamble, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Alvin R. Lehmann to be postmaster at Parkland, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Frances E. McDermott to be postmaster at Monitor, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

Mary A. Brimmer to be postmaster at Alderwood Manor, Wash. Office become presidential July 1, 1927.

Hubert L. Lockhart to be postmaster at Marcus, Wash., in place of H. H. Lair, resigned.

Florence P. Cooper to be postmaster at Long Beach, Wash., in place of C. K. Cooper, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick M. Hippert to be postmaster at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., in place of W. B. Hines. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Oscar S. Lindamood to be postmaster at Omar, W. Va., in place of J. B. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

William A. F. Smith to be postmaster at Vienna, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Eugene B. Keenan to be postmaster at Nellis, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George H. Hornickel to be postmaster at Highcoal, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Anna Lowe to be postmaster at Hastings, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

J. Valentine Hinshelwood to be postmaster at Dundon, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Ora S. Brown to be postmaster at Brownton, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Effie B. Landers to be postmaster at Boomer, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Jesse M. Wood to be postmaster at Worthington, W. Va., in place of Finley Oakes, removed.

James H. Trail to be postmaster at Winding Gulf, W. Va., in place of R. R. Church, resigned.

Robert B. Mesmer to be postmaster at Slab Fork, W. Va., in place of J. H. Reid, resigned.

Ernest E. Ritter to be postmaster at Red Jacket, W. Va., in place of W. N. Cummins, resigned.

Bonnie L. Hanshaw to be postmaster at Peach Creek, W. Va., in place of O. O. Tope, removed.

Austin H. Brown to be postmaster at Newell, W. Va., in place of A. M. Pittinger, deceased.

James D. Charlton to be postmaster at Mannington, W. Va., in place of G. B. McNeely, deceased.

Ada F. Rush to be postmaster at Hundred, W. Va., in place of R. E. Curtis, removed.

Thelma Taylor to be postmaster at Gauley Bridge, W. Va., in place of M. B. Taylor, resigned.

Daisy I. Valley to be postmaster at Coalwood, W. Va., in place of W. A. King, removed.

C. Earl Mullins to be postmaster at Blair, W. Va., in place of N. A. Holman, removed.

Otto Sharitz to be postmaster at Berwind, W. Va., in place of C. L. Pinckard, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ernest W. Meredith to be postmaster at Union Grove, Wis., in place of J. C. Colby. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Walter F. Dietlein to be postmaster at Sheldon, Wis., in place of C. W. Hebard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1926.

Albert C. Holmes to be postmaster at Evansville, Wis., in place of F. T. Durner. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1927.

Robert L. Raymond to be postmaster at Campbellsport, Wis., in place of William Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1927.

Mae Wittmann to be postmaster at Arpin, Wis., in place of H. F. Roehrig. Incumbent's commission expired November 18, 1925.

Merton J. Dickinson to be postmaster at Tipler, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Russell E. Burlingame to be postmaster at Statesan, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

LeRoy H. Ardern to be postmaster at Springbrook, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Alma Colt to be postmaster at Poy Sippi, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Peter D. Harris to be postmaster at Oneida, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Effie Hanna to be postmaster at Ogdensburg, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Lawrence W. Daniels to be postmaster at Kansasville, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Theresa J. Keyes to be postmaster at Cobb, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Jules G. Pierre to be postmaster at Brussels, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Mildred Werner to be postmaster at Pittsville, Wis., in place of E. G. Werner, resigned.

Frank A. Hanson to be postmaster at Kewaunee, Wis., in place of O. J. Ahnert, deceased.

Norma C. Rheingans to be postmaster at Jackson, Wis., in place of Jacob Gunn, deceased.

Edward C. Rehfeld to be postmaster at Horicon, Wis., in place of D. L. Mann, removed.

Harry E. Garbisch to be postmaster at Dorchester, Wis., in place of L. E. Homsted, resigned.

Jerry J. Jerabek to be postmaster at Algoma, Wis., in place of William White, deceased.

WYOMING

Daniel C. Carson to be postmaster at Pinedale, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

George F. Seeman to be postmaster at Kaycee, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles P. West to be postmaster at Bairoil, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 9 (legislative day of December 6), 1927

POSTMASTER

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Willard R. Heath, Concord.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate December 9 (legislative day of December 6), 1927

POSTMASTER

NORTH DAKOTA

Lena L. Hintz to be postmaster at Dunn Center in the State of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *December 9, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou gracious God, out of the depths of our needs, out of the depths of our hopes, out of the depths of our failures we would say: Oh, give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good and His mercy endureth forever. Favored as we are by the constancy of Divine care, impress us that he alone deserves Thy mercy who does his best to conform to Thy law. May our conduct this day proceed from right convictions and from belief in the truth. To him who does what in him lies, God will not deny His grace. Bring our minds humbly to the thought that Thou art above all and over all. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EFFICIENCY OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, Admiral Magruder has called attention to a situation that exists in this Nation with respect to the expenditures of appropriations in the Navy that should demand some attention from this Congress. He has made the statement in substance that out of every $300,000,000 expended, $100,000,000 is wasted. Therefore I am sending to the Clerk's desk a resolution which I propose to introduce and which I desire to have read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Admiral Magruder has caused to be published in the Saturday Evening Post certain articles which relate to the efficiency of the United States Navy; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy has seen fit because of the publication of such articles to relieve Admiral Magruder from his position of responsibility at the Philadelphia Navy Yard; and

Whereas the precedent has been established that any officer giving out information, whether true or otherwise, will either be reprimanded, court-martialed, shelved, or dismissed from the service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of the House a select committee of nine persons, none of whom represent districts wherein naval activities are located, and which committee is hereby authorized and directed to inquire into the allegations made by Admiral Magruder; and, in addition, said inquiry shall include an investigation of the letters, expenditures, reports, receipts, or other documents in any way connected with any activity of the Navy affected by the articles written by Admiral Magruder.

For the purpose of said inquiry the committee, or any subcommittee designated by it, shall have the power to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, affirmations, to take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House or during any recess of the House, and may hold its sessions at such places as the committee may determine.

Such committee shall have the right at any time to report to the House in one or more reports the result of its inquiry, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

The Speaker is hereby empowered to issue subpœnaes to witnesses upon the request of the chairman of said committee at any time, including any recess of the House, during the inquiry of the committee, and the Sergeant at Arms is hereby empowered and directed to serve all subpœnaes and other processes transferred to him by the said committee.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I shall drop the resolution in the basket and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Rules, where it ought to go.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I do not think references should be made by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. It is the duty of the Chair to make the reference.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I withdraw the request, and I ask unanimous consent that the articles referred to in that resolution and certain newspaper comments thereon be included in my remarks and extended in the RECORD.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. The other day they would not permit me to put in the Government's defense.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, here is a question coming before the American people in which a high official in the Navy says that out of every $3 expended $1 is wasted, to the extent of $100,000,000 per year. He caused to be published in the Saturday Evening Post an article which calls attention to the excess number of officers in the Navy, and I have heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], before our committee say on a good many occasions that we have an excess number of officers, and he expressed the wish that we had some way of disposing of them.

Mr. BUTLER rose.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not yield now. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs objects to allowing the articles to be published in the RECORD upon which this resolution is based, but I maintain that this House has a right to know that which has been published affecting the United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think we better not discuss this question at this time.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, let him have two minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not object to the gentleman having two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman having two minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am only doing my duty. Every man here is charged with following the dictates of his own conscience. It does not matter whether you gentlemen vote with me or do not vote with me, I am going to bring matters of this kind to your attention, because we alone—I mean the Members of this House—do not pay the expenses of running the Navy. The taxpayers of the United States pay for it, and if their money is being wasted as is charged by a high official on the inside, then it is the duty of this body to take the kind of steps that are necessary to protect our Treasury in the future.

I do not want to be a member of this proposed investigating committee, if it should be ordered, and I make that statement now. I do not think any member of the Committee on Naval Affairs or any Member who has naval activities in his district ought to be a member of this investigating committee. I do not care who fathers an investigation of this kind. You may take my name off the resolution if you desire. I simply want this subject brought to the attention of the American public in the proper way, and this is the only way that I know how to get proper consideration of it.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Not now. I have tried in a proper way to bring this to the attention of the Congress. Admiral Magruder has called attention to the excess navy yards and the amount of money they are wasting year after year, and it is a matter that ought to be looked into.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing the statements in the RECORD over which this controversy arose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing Admiral Magruder's statement. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not believe we want to extend the privileges of the RECORD to Admiral Magruder or anybody else outside the floor of the House; and as I have taken that stand, I propose to stick to it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Then I will ask unanimous consent to publish the articles that I have written relative to this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing articles written by himself on this subject. Is there objection?

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman——

Mr. McCLINTIC. Let gentlemen object if they desire. It is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. DARROW. I would never object to my colleague printing statements, but we want to know what goes in.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Texas declined to allow me to publish matter the other day.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman says they are his own articles——

Mr. McCLINTIC. Let the representatives of the Navy object if they want to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. We will do what is right. I have lived here practically all my life, and I am not subject to anybody. I will do what is right.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I want to bring it to the attention of the public in a proper way.

Mr. BUTLER. The public will get all of this within three weeks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DARROW. I object.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER

Mr. WRIGHT, of Georgia, presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5800.

The motion was agreed to;

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5800, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5800, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 37, after line 21, insert a new item, as follows: "To be expended under the articles in the provisions of the act of Congress (H. R. 5218, 69th Cong.) entitled 'An act to carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Shawnee Tribe of Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868,' the sum of $463,752.49."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. Let the gentleman make such explanation as he thinks proper, and I reserve the right to reply.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. This matter grows out of a bill passed by the House and Senate to pay these Indians, which went to the President on the last day of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. The bill was not vetoed or approved nor returned to Congress. The question went to the Judiciary Committee of the House upon a resolution declaring that it had become a law notwithstanding the fact that it had not been signed nor returned to the Congress. The question turned on the language in the Constitution that a bill will become a law if withheld by the President for 10 days unless the Congress by its adjournment prevents its return. The contention in the case is that the adjournment contemplated by the Constitution of the United States is the final adjournment of Congress. The adjournment of a session is not a final adjournment and does not preclude the President from returning a bill with his objection to the House, so that Congress may have an opportunity to say whether it agrees with the President or disagrees with him. For 60 years under our Government every bill was either vetoed or signed by the President of the United States. The habit has grown up in recent years, especially under Mr. Cleveland's administration in regard to pension bills, where there was what was called a pocket veto.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will.

Mr. ALMON. Did the Committee on the Judiciary make a report to the House on that resolution?

Mr. McKEOWN. They held unanimously the bill had become a law. Now as to the merits of this bill, in order that the House may understand fully the righteousness of the bill. These Shawnee Indians were once located in the State of Ohio. The United States Government made a treaty with the Shawnees by which they were transferred down into southeastern Kansas before the Civil War, and in order that they might not have trouble with the settlers it was agreed on the part of the Indians that in the event any settlers or marauders came in and took their property they should desist from retaliation, desist from making any raids on white settlers in that country, and in consideration of that the Government agreed that it would recompense them for any cattle or horses or other property lost.

They moved into that district, which then became the vortex in the struggle between slavery and antislavery in the Territory of Kansas. They suffered losses, and the United States Government, in compliance with the treaty of 1854, paid them up to that time for those losses. When the Civil War broke out in 1861 these Indians took the side of the Union. They stayed with the Union side of the conflict while the Indians south of them in the Indian Territory joined the Confederacy, and because these Indians refused to go on the side of the Confederacy and remained on the side of the Union they were made objects of raids by the Indians of the Indian Territory. They were hemmed in between Missouri and the Indian Territory, where they suffered tremendous losses at the hands of soldiers on both sides. Two hundred and eight of their warriors fought on the Union side in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has used five minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. May I have three minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOWN. So the Government of the United States said at Fort Smith, in a treaty of amity with the western tribes, that in consideration of the loyalty of the Shawnee Indians it would pay them the damages suffered, and agreed with them to send to them two men picked by the Government to ascertain and pay the damages. In accordance with that, the Government sent down to that country two picked men, highly qualified to perform that duty, Jonathan Richards and Mr. Pickering, and they went down there and examined each and every claim, disallowed claims that were not justified, cut down others, and fixed the amounts as specified; and these claims are set out and itemized in every particular.

There were Senecas, mixed Senecas, and Quapaws, and the Congress of the United States, on the recommendation of the Department of the Interior, paid all the claims of the other tribes but these, and owing to the fact that these people moved into the Indian Territory, where they had no Representative in Congress, and although different Secretaries of the Interior since 1874 have recommended that these claims be paid by the United States, they have not been paid.

This is a claim due to these Indians for 50 long years, and without a cent of interest. They were loyal to the United States. The bill went through the Senate of the United States three times and through the House at a different time, and finally passed, and upon the whole the claim is simply an honest, just claim against the United States which ought to be settled.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. How many of these Indians are there now?

Mr. McKEOWN. There are not many of them, but there are a lot of their descendants left down there. The Government has a list of them.

Mr. MILLER. Approximately about how many?

Mr. McKEOWN. Two or three hundred; probably not more than that.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman tell us about what are the financial and living conditions of these Indians at the present time?

Mr. McKEOWN. These Indians are known as absentee Shawnees. They have very little property now. They are not wards of the Government in the sense that the Government must pay them anything. As shown by the records of the commissioner, they were the most prosperous tribe of Indians before the war.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it not a fact that other tribes who had claims exactly like this were all paid by the Government?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. They were all paid.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the point of order be disposed of.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, on the ground that there is no law authorizing the expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order on the ground that there is no law authorizing the payment of the claim. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The matter was fully presented to the House at a former session of Congress. The Judiciary Committee found unanimously that it is an existing law. A former Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has ruled to that effect. We have an established precedent already in the House on that subject, and there are Members here who were on the Committee on the Judiciary who would like to present the matter, if desired.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma please cite to the Chair the law authorizing this expenditure?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes. The great Committee on the Judiciary of the House has passed upon that and found that it is the law, and for the guidance of the House the opinion of that Judiciary Committee certainly ought to be highly persuasive. The question has already been passed upon by Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole. On February 26, 1927, when the same question was presented, it was there held that it was the law governing the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is it a fact that the House adopted the report of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McKEOWN. The committee report was not adopted at that time because this matter came up before the report of the committee could be acted upon. The Chairman held that it was in order and that it was the law. It is the law so far as this House is concerned.

At that time the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who, I think, is one of the ablest lawyers, not only in this House but in the United States, took the position that it had become a law and that we were bound by it; and there are other members of the Committee on the Judiciary who are eminent lawyers, among them Judge TUCKER, who is a great constitutional lawyer, who agrees that it became a law and is binding upon this House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was not the question whether it had become a law already, and the question was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for that purpose?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; and the Committee on the Judiciary were unanimous on that proposition, that it had become a law. The resolution was put in the RECORD, and we stand on the proposition that, so far as the House is concerned, the great Judiciary Committee of the House, composed of some of the most eminent lawyers of this Nation, have decided that it is a law, and the Chairman, I contend, is bound to give great respect to this precedent and to now hold that it is in order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The purpose of the resolution was to have the House informed. If it had provided otherwise, the gentleman could have brought in additional legislation?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes. Otherwise we could have proceeded to take other action.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The decision precluded other action from being taken?

Mr. McKEOWN. I desired to leave the question to the Judiciary Committee as to whether I should reintroduce the bill in another Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the decision of the committee precluded any other action being taken because they decided the law was in existence?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not also true that, acting on the acceptance of this as a law, this was included as an item in the deficiency bill which passed the House in the last session?

Mr. McKEOWN. It was. It has already been passed and the item was carried in this deficiency bill at the last session of the Congress. At that time the same point of order was made, and we insist, Mr. Chairman, that this is in order.

The matter having once been decided, the precedent, of course, ought to be very persuasive upon the Chairman. The committee has found that so far as this House is concerned it is a law. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole ruled at one time that it was in order and overruled the point of order. Then the matter was carried in the bill and left this House in the appropriation bill.

I will say this to the Chair: There is not any question in my mind—of course, there may be a question in the minds of some lawyers about it—but that when the first session of a Congress adjourns everything in the House stands in status quo until the next session. It was a long time before we reached that conclusion in the proceedings of this House, as the history of the House will show, and that now a bill not signed by the Speaker may be signed at the next session, and that a bill signed by the Speaker and also by the President of the Senate and not presented to the President still remains in status quo.

The language of the Constitution is that unless a Congress by its adjournment prevents the return of a bill it shall become a law if it is not vetoed or if it is not signed. The fact that it has not been enrolled among the bills at the State Department and made a law, of course, does not change the question as to whether it is a law. The House is not doing anything here except pass upon the question so far as this House is concerned and for the purpose of this legislation. The legislation was passed by both the House and the Senate, but the President did not, for some reason, return the bill. Therefore he let it become a law because he was not prevented by the adjournment of the first session from returning the bill at the succeeding session, because the whole transactions of the House were in abeyance during the time of the recess of the Congress from the first session to the second session.

The Members of Congress have the right under the Constitution to pass upon the question as to whether or not they agree with the grounds upon which the President objects to legislation. The Constitution does not give the President the right to forbid legislation but simply the right to veto legislation; that is, to say, "I object to this bill for the following reasons."

Suppose some great bill of great importance—not a bill of this character, but some great bill of great importance, upon which there would be great party division—had gone to the President upon the last day of the first session of the Congress? Of course, Congress can not deprive the President of his ten days in which to consider a bill, and it has already been determined by the Supreme Court——

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. Are there cases on record where the President has returned bills at a subsequent session?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; there are bills. Mr. Madison was the first to return a bill, and Attorney General Miller, in his opinion to President Hayes, I believe it was, recommended that all bills be returned to the Congress, upon which the President disagreed.

As I say, if this had been some bill involving some great question in this country, and the President of the United States should hold that bill and not return it, then the Congress that passed that great measure would be deprived of the opportunity of expressing to the country its opinion as to whether or not it approved or disapproved of the President's action.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will ask the gentleman if this matter was not referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and if that committee did not have exhaustive hearings as to whether or not H. R. 5218 had become a law? Then I will ask the gentleman whether the Committee on the Judiciary did not unanimously, after an exhaustive hearing upon it, find as follows:

That H. R. 5218, "An act to carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Shawnee Tribe of Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868," has become a law of the United States.

I ask the gentleman whether that was not the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary after an exhaustive hearing?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman contend that because the Judiciary Committee reached a unanimous conclusion on the question that that made it a law?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; but I say this, that when this matter was exhaustively presented a year ago to the then Chairman of the Whole House on the state of the Union, he said that was persuasive, and based upon that he held this amendment in order. Then the House adopted the amendment and it was

placed in the deficiency appropriation bill which went to the Senate and which we know was defeated there because of the filibuster.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for one question?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. As I understand the situation the gentleman from Oklahoma is pursuing the only method by which the legality of this proposition could be determined.

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. You can not bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States to mandamus anybody because the Supreme Court can not mandamus Congress into making an appropriation.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is right.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And the gentleman is taking the only possible course to determine the legality of the matter?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Would not the court, upon a proper showing, mandamus the Secretary of State?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. You possibly might reach it that way.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the gentleman beg the question when he talks about mandamusing Congress?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I do not, because the Indians can not secure any relief under the law until Congress has made an appropriation, and the gentleman from Oklahoma is pursuing the only legal way.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But the alleged law, under which you are claiming the right to have this appropriation made, being brought into question, you propose now by getting this appropriation in this bill to legalize an alleged act of Congress which has not yet been placed in the form of a law of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Not to legalize it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. How are you going to test its legality except in this way?

Mr. SABATH. It is an act of Congress now. They are trying to proceed under an act which the highest authority here has ruled on and has found to be the law of the land.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to my colleague from Illinois that he misapprehends the issue. The question is whether the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall now determine whether that alleged enactment is a law.

Mr. SABATH. And the committee that investigated the matter carefully, composed of the best legal minds of the House, has stated to the House that it is the law.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman, suppose they did, and suppose every Member of this House is convinced that the Judiciary Committee was correct in its construction, it is a legal question as to whether what has been done made that enactment a law, and yet you want the chairman to sit up there and determine whether it is a law or not.

Mr. SABATH. No; a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House has already ruled on it, and the House has acted upon it and decided that it is the law.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. I agree with the gentleman that it is a legal question as to whether this bill upon which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] is relying has become a law. Now, how is the gentleman from Oklahoma ever going to test that out, and what opportunity is he going to have to test it out except in the very way that he is bringing it now before the House?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. How is any citizen of the United States——

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman further, the gentleman asked a question of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] a moment ago, I do not see how a suit in the courts undertaking to mandamus the Secretary of State would lie, because this is only an act of authorization, and even if it was the law, Congress does not have to make an appropriation to satisfy it. It seems to me the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] is pursuing the only course open to him.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; we are discussing the rules of the House and what the Chairman of the Committee should do now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit a question?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Secretary of State can not determine this question. Ultimately, the question will have to be determined by the courts.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Exactly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Before we will know positively what the law is.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am only suggesting the procedure.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. With respect to any action of the Secretary of State, what sort of mandamus could they issue?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman misunderstood me. I was suggesting a remedy or a method of procedure by which the question might be determined by the courts as to whether under the circumstances such as these an enactment of Congress becomes a law, and in my opinion, I think the procedure would be by way of a mandamus proceeding.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. A mandamus to do what?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But that has nothing to do with the question of whether the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall now determine whether this alleged enactment is in fact a law.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will permit, who could attack the legality of that law—any taxpayer?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is not a question of attacking the legality.

Mr. SABATH. Then it is the law.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman apparently takes the position that anything that is printed is the law unless somebody attacks it.

Mr. SABATH. It remains the law of the land until it is repealed or until it has been declared to be not the law.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I had not finished my statement. The proposition is now before the House on the question of legislation authorizing this appropriation. I offer an amendment to this bill in the form of carrying out an act of Congress.

The matter has been referred to the highest legal authority of the House, as I take it, the Committee on the Judiciary. After a very exhaustive examination of the authorities they have found that this is the law. This is for the guidance of this House, and this matter comes here upon a point of order where I can rely upon a former ruling, which is a precedent to guide the Chairman and I feel the Chairman in this case wants to follow the precedent. We are not here attacking anything at all. The House is exercising its authority to legislate as one of the branches of the National Government. The proper committee has advised the House that this is a law.

The Government is entirely protected, whereas my constituents would not be protected. The Government can protect itself when it comes to paying this amount of money, if it is not the law, but there is no other way in which I can test this question.

I have gone to the labor of presenting the matter to the great Judiciary Committee, and the chairman of that committee, Judge Graham, took the floor last year and made an eloquent speech and a convincing speech, and so did other members of that committee, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON]. These gentlemen have presented this question and I want to say to the Chair I am willing to stake whatever opinion I have upon constitutional law upon the finding of this committee, which was absolutely unanimous, that it has become a law, and I will yield the floor——

Mr. HASTINGS. Before yielding the floor, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I simply want the gentleman to yield to me long enough to quote the following, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4931, which was part of the remarks of Chairman GRAHAM when this matter was up before on the same point of order a year ago. The Chair will find this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of February 26, 1927, wnere Chairman GRAHAM, speaking upon this question, said:

> I respectfully suggest to the Chair that a competent committee of the House unanimously came to this conclusion, a conclusion in which I cordially concur and about which I have not even the vestige of a doubt, and in the opinion of the committee this bill became a law and is a sufficient ground for overruling the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I can conceive of no reason which the House had in mind at the time it referred this question to the Judiciary Committee and authorized and required a report, except that should the report be to the effect that the act had become a law it would proceed in the very manner in which it is now being attempted to proceed by this amendment. There could have been no other intelligent

reason, to my mind, for asking for a report of a committee of this House on this subject. Of course we did not ask for a report as advice to the courts, for the courts do not need any advice from the House. They may need it, but they do not take it. [Laughter.] The purpose of referring such a resolution and asking for an opinion from one of the arms of this House was to enable the House to prepare and carry out its own function. It is attempting to function now by making an appropriation, and it lies within the power of the House to initiate it.

We have had the report from the Judiciary Committee. It was the unanimous report—a unanimous report from an agency of this House made for the purpose of enabling the House itself to take action. I confess that the reasoning in the report of that committee appeals to my judgment. I believe that if this matter shall go to the court, as we anticipate it may do, if not on this bill then on some other bill, the court will hold with the Judiciary Committee of the House that it is the law. In any event, it does seem to me that the report of this agency of the House, made in response to a demand of the House, is binding on the House, or at least on the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, under a situation of this sort. I respectfully submit that the point of order should be overruled.

Mr. LUCE. There is one angle that has not in the debate been brought to the attention of the Chair. It happens that when I came down here just before the session opened I learned of a proposal to change the size of the Committee on the Library. The size of that committee is fixed by statute, and the question arose in my mind as to whether the House could by changing the rules modify a statute.

In such time as I could give to the study of the precedents, I refreshed my memory to the effect that it has been ruled on several occasions that the presiding officer may not pass judgment on the constitutionality of action by the House, but I could find no precedent on the question of whether a presiding officer may pass judgment on the legality, in contradistinction to the constitutionality, of action. May the Chair, under circumstances like these, deny consideration because a printed statute can not be produced? This raises legal questions in addition to those that are constitutional. In this respect as far as my study has gone it would lead me to think that here is a case of novel impression and that the ruling of the Chair may be of considerable consequence at some time in the future.

I confess a doubt in my own mind as to what the ruling ought to be on that particular point, but I should be sorry to have the debate concluded without having brought to the attention of the Chair that there is here a question if the presiding officer may pass judgment upon matters of legality.

I think when this subject was up last year the point was not brought to the attention of the Chair, and so it could not be said that a precedent was established, but it may be as well to bear in mind that one of importance may now be created if the Chair should decide that while the Chair is forbidden by precedent to pass on the constitutional effect of a proposal he may pass on its legal aspect.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that a long line of precedents of the House and under all the rules of the House and the practice of the House it has always been clear that the proponents of a measure similar to this, and under circumstances similar to this, where the question is raised, must be able to produce the law upon which he bases his right to act. I take it that the gentleman from Oklahoma admits that he can not produce the law. The mere fact that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary were unanimous in their conclusion that it is a law is not binding on the House. The Judiciary Committee is not authorized to make law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. The gentleman would not contend that the mere fact that the Secretary of State neglected to publish a law would vitiate it?

Mr. MADDEN. I would not say that, but there is no question that the Judiciary Committee has no power to make a law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the stand taken by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], that the burden is upon the proponents of the amendment to produce the law, I submit that the physical production of the law is not necessary. Reference or demand has been made for the production of the "printed law." Courts take judicial notice of our laws, and we certainly take judicial notice of our own laws and acts.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to a question from the Chair?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is that law printed? How could the Chair refer anyone to it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not necessary. The gentleman from Oklahoma gave the Chair the reference. He referred to a law passed by the House and Senate, signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate and submitted to the President of the United States, who failed to sign it. The Chair must take judicial notice of the action of the House and Senate. The physical production of the printed law is not necessary. Courts require you to make physical production of foreign laws and proof if it is sought to establish them as such. The Chair must take judicial notice of the action of the House. It being before the Chair, the Chair must take notice that this House and the Senate passed the law referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma and likewise the Chair must take notice of the subsequent action of the House and the report of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Chair is not passing on the constitutionality of this proposition or upon the legality of the law. The only question before the Chair is whether there is a law which justifies or forms the basis of an appropriation. That is all there is to it.

The constitutionality or the legality of the law may be tested in court if we make the appropriation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] is in error when he says that anyone may mandamus the Secretary of State to certify whether this is a law or not. Such an action would not lie. An official may be mandamused to do a specific act which by law he is obliged to do and which he fails or refuses to do. You can not mandamus the Secretary of State to certify whether a law exists or not. That is not the way to judicially determine whether the law in question is valid or not. The only way in which this law may be tested is by this House making an appropriation of the money, and then if the Secretary of the Interior or of the Treasury or whoever has charge of the payment of the money, refuses to pay it, an interested party may mandamus that official then and the validity of the law would be before the court and question determined.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The report of the Judiciary Committee in which the law is specifically mentioned is a part of the record of this House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Both the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself and, I assume, the Journal of the last Congress show that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was for the purpose of informing and guiding this House and of that the Chair takes notice.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, the rule does not apply to an extraordinary case of this sort. To be sure one can not go to the statute book and find the law, because the law is not in the statute books. The very question involved is whether it is a law, and it is embodied in the official records of the House of Representatives. It is a part of the official records of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. And the record of this House is our own record.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Chairman may take judicial notice of that just as the court will take judicial notice of existing statutes. The point of order, I respectfully submit, should be overruled.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I had some part in the discussion of this question when it was before the Committee of the Whole on February 26, last. Stripped of all its verbiage, stripped of all the niceties and refinements of discussion, the question is whether we will pass on the issue of whether the President may employ the so-called pocket veto.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Why should we not pass upon it? It is only a question of order of the House.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, no.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, yes; it is. The Appropriations Committee would have authority to make this appropriation, even if there were no law upon the subject.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It would be subject to a point of order if it did.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I submit that it would not be; that if the Committee on Appropriations under its jurisdiction in the House should see fit to embody this in an appropriation bill it could not be stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me answer there that I think the gentleman is mistaken and will upon reflection, I believe, agree

with me. If there is no law upon which an appropriation may be based, whether the Appropriations Committee puts it in a bill or the provision is offered by way of an amendment, then it is subject to a point of order. There must be a law upon which an appropriation is predicated, a law which authorizes the appropriation.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. There is rarely ever an appropriation bill, as I recall, but carries appropriations where the only possible basis that could have justified them is the general welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States. If a Member undertakes to offer an amendment from the floor of the House, we have a rule which says that there must be a law authorizing the appropriation, and, therefore, it is within the prerogative of the House to decide whether there is a law that justifies the amendment or not.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me suggest in all deference that the gentleman is confusing in his own mind the rule with respect to germaneness.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; I have yielded so much now that I have not been able to say anything that is in my own mind.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. The gentleman made a statement in regard to a pocket veto which I would like to have him explain.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I say it is a question whether the President by holding a bill and not reporting it to the Secretary of State may veto the bill. That is the question, and we are endeavoring to pass upon that. More than that, we are endeavoring to induce the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House to pass upon it and determine that question.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Is there any reason why we should permit the Executive to extend the right of pocket veto beyond the provisions of the Constitution?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There is no reason why this House, in Committee of the Whole, by ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, should endeavor to pass upon that legal question.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. How are you going to pass upon it in any way?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is not our business to pass upon it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. It certainly is, and these people have a right to have it passed upon.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then, Mr. Chairman, I suggest the gentleman introduce a bill or resolution to the effect that what he says is the law shall be the law, notwithstanding the fact that the President held an act and did not send it to the Secretary of State within the 10 days.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman to state that after all the question involved was whether the President can use a pocket veto.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think so.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is not the gentleman somewhat inaccurate? There is no dispute that the President may, at a certain time use the pocket veto, which the Constitution provides.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But what about other times?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The question is whether the President may use a pocket veto at a time when it is not in order to do so.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman says "at certain times." Very well; are we not, then, passing on the question of the President using a pocket veto? I would like to get the judgment of the gentleman from Tennessee. Are we not still passing upon the question of whether the President can use a pocket veto? If the President in employing a pocket veto in this case was within his right, we are legalizing something which would not otherwise be legal.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me suggest to the gentleman. There are certain rights of the Congress just as high as the right of the President. He has the right to veto a bill. The Congress has a right after his vetoing that bill, except in the contingency provided for in the Constitution, to say whether or not it stood for his reasons of action. In this case we have not that opportunity. We could not have, although there were three months of Congress after this legislation passed. I am not quarreling with the President's course which he took upon it, but does not the gentleman from Illinois see the legislative branch has some rights in such cases as well as the Executive brauch, and does the gentleman from Illinois mean to hold to the doctrine that during a recess of the Congress that the President might pocket-veto a bill and estop the legislative branch from any possibility of passing upon the veto?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This body may pass all the legislation it will, but this body certainly can not pass upon constitutional questions as to the power of the President. That will be passed upon by the courts and must be. I submit that there is room here for argument and difference of opinion. Here is the provision of the Constitution which says:

> If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

Now, when does Congress by its adjournment prevent its return? Congress expires biennially by limitation. The only time, it would seem, Congress by its adjournment might prevent the return of a bill is when Congress does deliberately adjourn. As I say, there is room for argument. That is the language of the Constitution, "unless Congress by adjournment prevents its return." As I say, there is room for doubt as to whether that is the correct construction, notwithstanding my high regard for the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Now, if I may be permitted to proceed for a moment, in the last discussion upon the case I propounded an inquiry to the very distinguished gentleman, one of the greatest lawyers in this body, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania, and he answered in this wise:

> If the gentleman will permit by the amendment introduced, it shows clearly what the purpose was; an expression of opinion.

And he states with reference to the Judiciary Committee:

> The committee has no power to say that the act was legal or illegal, but it could inform the House, after research and examination, what the opinion of the committee was.

He admits that we can not pass upon the legality or illegality of the act. I submit that the House has not even adopted or approved of that report, and has not acted upon the report. So far as the report goes, it is only an expression of the opinion of the Judiciary Committee. I might agree with the opinion of the Judiciary Committee in its construction of the Constitution, but I still contend that the chairman of this committee should not be required to pass upon the question of the legality of the enactment, which some people say is a law and which others say is not a law.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes, but I wish to conclude. I do not like to refuse the gentleman, however.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. How does the gentleman know but what the President agrees with the views of the Judiciary Committee, and that the action he took was in conformity therewith? Did he veto it, aside from the pocket veto? How does the gentleman know but that the President agrees with the Judiciary Committee and did not mean to veto the bill?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the bar, and I will ask the gentleman what is his opinion?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If there is no disagreement with the President, what is there to talk about?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the President deliberately failed to send a bill to the Secretary of State, he apparently thought that the effect would be to veto it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The presumption is that the President would agree with this great outstanding lawyer on that Judiciary Committee. The presumption is that the President knows the law just as the presumption is that every citizen knows the law. Every time a point of order is raised it is the duty of this House and of the Chairman of the committee to say whether or not a statute is the law. The presumption in the Supreme Court is that a law is a law unless it is unconstitutional. The gentleman knows that the President did not intend to veto it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not know what the President intended. Now just one word more in conclusion. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on February 26 said:

> The question presented by the point of order is somewhat doubtful and has been a subject of much discussion. It probably never will be definitely and finally settled until a decision is rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Without referring to the ruling made by the distinguished Chairman of the committee, his language is pertinent at this time:

It probably never will be definitely and finally settled until a decision is rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I submit that the Chairman of the committee should not now be required to pass upon, and should not pass upon a question relating to the legality of the passage of an enactment which may or may not be the law. The question which he is called upon to decide is whether there is a law on which this appropriation may be predicated.

Mr. SABATH. What is the ruling of the Chairman of the committee for unless it is to serve as a precedent?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, had the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], who has just taken his seat, concluded the reading of the decision of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House when this particular question was up for consideration at a former session?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I did not intend to leave out anything.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not charge the gentleman with intending to leave out anything, but he stopped suddenly in the reading.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that the present occupant of the chair is not a lawyer, and this question naturally presents to him a matter of difficulty. But I want to suggest to the Chairman that there are two compelling reasons in my opinion that should induce the Chairman to overrule this point of order. As has well been presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], the Chair, not being a lawyer, is in possession, by virtue of the records of this House, of a well-considered and deliberate judicial opinion upon the character of this very question by the ablest legal minds of this House, seeking to find a correct interpretation of this peculiar legal proposition. That, to a Chairman of the committee who is not a lawyer by profession, ought to be extremely persuasive, in my opinion. No doubt that is a question that the Chairman is revolving in his own mind, and he will give careful consideration to that opinion. The most controlling reason, in my opinion, why the Chair should overrule the point of order is that the Chair has before him a guide or opinion in the form of a decision of a former Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] partially read, and of which I desire to conclude the reading, which is sufficient to suggest a doubt and which may be, as the gentleman said, a quasi first impression, but not necessarily so. But this decision of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on this question ought to be conclusive, all other things being equal; ought to be conclusive to the mind of the Chair. Mr. GREEN says:

> While the resolution reported by the Judiciary Committee is merely the expression of that committee, it is an opinion rendered by attorneys of the highest standing and reputation. The Chair has had only a brief interval in which to examine this complicated question. The Judiciary Committee had all the time necessary and rendered a unanimous opinion that the statute in question had been legally enacted.
>
> The opinion, therefore, although not binding on the House or binding on the Chair, is very persuasive at this time. Accordingly the Chair overrules the point of order.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that by parity of reasoning, where there might be possible doubt in the mind of the Chair as to the legality of the question, the only orderly way in which the legality can be determined is the decision of this House upon the judicial question as well as the parliamentary question involved. Therefore I respectfully suggest that the Chair overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair well appreciates the fact that this is one of the most technical questions that has arisen for some time in the Committee of the Whole. If the Chair were considering this question for the first time and following his own method of reasoning, he would undoubtedly reach a different conclusion.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN] has presented the following amendment:

> To be expended in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress (H. R. 5218) entitled "An act to carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Shawnee Tribe of Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868."

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has made a point of order against this amendment on the ground it is not authorized by law. Under all decisions by Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole thus far it has been incumbent upon the proponents of an amendment to furnish the authority of law for the proposed appropriation. The Chair has asked the gentleman from Oklahoma to furnish that authority. In the opinion of the Chair that authority has not been furnished in the way considered necessary in the past, namely, by referring to the specific statute.

Another question that has disturbed the Chair considerably in regard to this proposition is that the department of the Government which, during the entire legislative history of our Government, is charged with promulgating the statutes of the country has not listed this law among the statutes or laws passed by the Sixty-ninth Congress. It is also evident the President did not consider it a law, as he did not send it to the State Department.

Furthermore, the Chair is in doubt as to whether one branch of Congress, or even a committee of Congress, can make a law by mere declaration that a certain bill has become a law. The Chair feels that at least such a declaration should be made by both Houses of Congress.

Then the Chair is up against the proposition that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] presented, which has had especial force with the present occupant of the Chair, namely, that the House itself was in doubt on this whole proposition and referred it to the Judiciary Committee, which is the highest judicial authority of the House itself, and this committee has unanimously reported that this legislation had become a law. If he were ruling de novo on the proposition, the Chair would sustain the point of order, but taking into consideration the fact that the highest judicial committee of the House has ruled the other way, and as he knows of no higher authority at the present time, the Chair overrules the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call attention to a matter which I think may be worth something to other departments of the Government.

The Chair has just indicated in his ruling that one of the troubles in his mind was that the Department of State, which has been charged from the beginning of the Government with the promulgation of the acts of Congress, had not promulgated this as a law. This brought to my mind a recollection, the accuracy of which I have just verified, a very interesting historical event in connection with the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

While that constitutional amendment was pending there were two States, namely New Jersey and Ohio, that ratified it, who before the proclamation usually issued by the Secretary of State in such cases, had been issued, withdrew their assent and undertook to recall their ratifications.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, issued a proclamation simply stating the facts and not proclaiming the fourteenth amendment as a part of the Constitution. Thereupon the Congress took notice of the matter and took another whirl at this amendment and passed a resolution, the effect of which was to hold that a State could not reconsider a question of ratification even before promulgation of the proclamation by the Secretary of State. Mr. Seward accepted this act of Congress and declared the fourteenth amendment ratified.

So there was a case in which the Congress took an action possibly somewhat on all fours with the one which we have here to-day.

Now, if I may say just one other word, if I am not mistaken one of the acts that was in question before the Judiciary Committee, not the one that we have passed on here, but one of the acts that was in question—and I call this to the attention of my Oklahoma friends—was an act authorizing somebody to bring a suit in the Court of Claims. If the gentlemen want to get a real test of this thing in the courts, if I am correct in my recollection, there is a mighty good chance to do it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, in the case to which the gentleman refers with reference to the ratification of the fourteenth amendment, the action was taken by the Congress—both Houses of Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Not by the House of Representatives only.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the action will be taken here by both Houses.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, no; the two Houses of Congress will not pass upon the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But they will pass upon the appropriation which refers specifically to the act.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Certainly. We could put that in the bill without any law, if we wanted to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma ought not to prevail. In the first place I maintain that there is no law, notwithstanding the ruling of the Chair. I maintain that the refusal to incorporate the item suggested by this amendment in the report of the Appropriations Committee of the House was the thing which the Committee on Appropriations should have done under the authority that exists; that without any authority to appropriate we, as members of the Appropriations Committee, were barred from the right to recommend the appropriation. Of course, I realize that the ruling of the Chair places the question before the House on its merits. I do not consider that we, notwithstanding the arguments made or the ruling just enunciated, should vote to insert this four hundred and sixty-odd thousand dollars into the bill. It has not come to us with any recommendation from the President of the United States, who, under the Budget Act, is required to submit for the consideration of the House recommendations for such appropriations as he believes are justified to be made. It is true that irrespective of whether the President submits the matter or not, it is within the power of this committee to insert the item in the bill, but I sincerely hope that until we have more certainty as to what the law is and where the authority for the appropriation resides we will postpone favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I always regret very much to differ with my distinguished friend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and I usually follow his leadership, but I can not agree with him with reference to this particular amendment.

It seems to me it is a question as to whether or not the United States Government is going to deal justly with these Indians, to whom this claim is due. The Congress of the United States, both the Senate and the House, have formally and regularly decided that this is a just claim and should be paid. It did so when it enacted the law or the bill which was introduced by my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN]. Congress, as I say, has said already that this money is due to the Indians. As I understand, in at least two or three other cases Congress has made appropriations to pay claims similar to this.

Mr. HASTINGS. In three other cases, arising out of the same provisions of the treaty.

Mr. BYRNS. In three other cases, my friend suggests.

Here is a claim not asking for interest but simply asking for the principal due, and it seems to me that under these circumstances, when Congress is on record as having said that these poor Indians are entitled to this money, this Congress ought to go ahead and make the appropriation and pay them what has been already declared to be an honest debt.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, before the vote is taken, that this matter has been considered three times by the House on its merits. It was first brought before the House on a favorable report by the Committee on Indian Affairs; it was passed by the House, and it passed the Senate. A point of order was raised against its inclusion in the appropriation bill last year, just as it was raised to-day, and the House at that time again considered it on its merits and included it in the deficiency bill of a year ago. It is now being considered on its merits again, and, in my opinion, from a study of it, the justice of it, and the fact that no one questions that this money is owed to these Indians, as a matter of equity and justice, we should vote for the inclusion of this in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN), there were—ayes 102, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 28 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 28, after line 23, add the following: "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the act entitled 'An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the South Carolina experiment station,' approved March 3, 1927, including the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, fiscal year 1928, and to remain available until June 30, 1929, $25,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress passed an act last year to cooperate with the State of South Carolina in the development of its agricultural problems in connection with which there will be required to be constructed an agricultural station. The purchase of a lot of land was involved. The construction of the station, the purchase of the land, and all matters of that sort are to be paid for by the State of South Carolina. The cooperation of the Government is on the basis of experimental work.

The bill that was passed was unfortunate for it allowed a total expenditure under the act of $50,000. The Committee on Appropriations was favorable to the appropriation, but in a study of the law and the facts in the case, it was clear to the committee that to expend $50,000 and stop would be of no use; but the law provided that $50,000 was all that could be expended and the Secretary of Agriculture advised the committee that it would be better not to make any appropriation than to make an appropriation for $50,000 and then stop the work.

Since that time the committee has been advised that it would be better to give them $25,000 and let them begin the work while an effort is made to remedy the defect in the legislation which was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, we have an agreement under which we are to go back to page 54 of the bill on the item for the alteration to naval vessels. There will be more or less desire for discussion of this question and if I may I should like to get an agreement as to the amount of time to be consumed. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the committee to take very much time, and as I understand it, there is no serious desire on the part of those who differ with the committee to want a great deal of time. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTLER, who is the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, and who will have charge of the opposition to the position of the committee, that we make the time not to exceed 30 minutes in discussing this question, with 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. BUTLER. That will suit. I only want two or three minutes myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time for debate on this paragraph of the bill and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. BUTLER. Make it 40 minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I wonder if I can get three or four minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Then I will make no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I represent, in a sense, the minority that is against the provisions in this bill. In the last session of Congress I had charge of a portion of the time.

Mr. MADDEN. How much time does the gentleman want himself?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I have two amendments, and I should say 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. That would not be a fair proportion, would it? Suppose we make the time 40 minutes, 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. How are you going to divide it?

Mr. MADDEN. We will be satisfied with 15 minutes, and give the gentleman 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania 15 minutes. That ought to be a fair division.

Mr. BUTLER. I should think it would be for him. [Laughter.] I am willing to vote without any debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 22, page 55 after the word "provided" strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The alterations to the capital ships herein authorized shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in the treaty limiting naval armaments ratified August 17, 1923."

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Would an amendment to strike out the paragraph have precedence over an amendment to amend?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph will first be perfected and then the gentleman can offer an amendment to strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it seems to me that the main objection to the elevation of the turret guns on the *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, in the minds of some Members, is the apprehension that to do so will be a violation of the treaty.

In the bill that we passed last February, authorizing the modernization of these ships, it was distinctly written into the law that no modernization should take place that was not subject to the provisions of the treaty, and in the amendment that I have offered I have used the very language in the authorization act.

> The alterations to the capital ships herein authorized shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in the treaty limiting naval armaments ratified August 17, 1923.

Therefore, it can be readily seen that in the authorization act, as well as by the amendment I have submitted, if the elevation of the guns is not in accordance with the terms of the treaty they will not be elevated.

As everyone knows, it is not a legislative prerogative for us to seek to interpret treaties that this Government has with other nations. The jurisdiction of that subject matter is one left to the Executive, and no Executive, it makes no difference who it is, is ever going to embark upon a program that violates either the letter or spirit of any treaty that this Government has with other nations.

If, upon an examination by the Executive of this subject matter, he determines that it is a violation of the treaty, it naturally follows that these guns will not be elevated, but if it is not a violation of the treaty, it likewise follows that the mandate of Congress with reference to this work will be undertaken.

We are leaving to the Executive the prerogative that belongs to him to determine whether or not we are within our treaty rights in doing this.

No doubt a great deal will be said as to what England and Japan have done with reference to the elevation of their guns. I am not so much concerned with what England and Japan have done as I am with what it is our duty to do within our treaty rights.

Why debate what England and Japan are doing? That is beside the question. The question is, What is our duty in this matter to our country? Our duty is to elevate the guns if we are within our rights, thereby increasing the efficiency of the Navy, which in turn affords a more adequate national defense. There is no Member of this House who does not at all times desire that the Navy of his country be in the highest state of efficiency, and if it increases the efficiency of the Navy to elevate these guns, which there can be no doubt about it doing, they should be elevated if it is not contrary to the treaty, even though other nations signatory to the treatry have not seen fit to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to go into a lengthy discussion as to the great benefit it will be to the Navy to elevate these guns and the other guns of our Battle Fleet, for the House has heard this matter discussed in much detail on many occasions.

At the last session of Congress, by a two-thirds vote, after a lengthy discussion and with the opposition to the measure led by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN, by a vote of 245 to 111, this House went on record to modernize these ships and to elevate the guns. Suffice it to say, by the elevation of the turret guns 15°, the range will be increased from 21,000 to 24,000 yards. By the elevation of the guns of the *Oklahoma* and *Nevada* to 30°, it will increase the maximum range to 34,000 yards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, it is rather embarrassing to find one's self the only member of a great committee to take a certain stand on a public question. I have given this subject a great deal of thought. I have never importuned a single individual or asked him to vote with me. I feel that each person should be in charge of his own conscience, and he should look at this question from every angle. Then if he thinks that we should elevate these guns, as they no doubt will be elevated if this amendment should prevail, he ought to vote with my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

I look at this question in a little different way. Since the last session of Congress Lindbergh has flown across the ocean and Byrd, Maitland, Goebel, and possibly four or five others have shown to the Nation what aviation means in the future. If we can use a battleship in any of our wars in the future, then we ought to elevate the guns on these ships and we ought to repair them in the manner in which they need repairing. However, some of the leading experts of the Nation say that we can not use battleships any more. We know that in the last war, for a considerable portion of time, this type of ship was parked up one of our great rivers, and some leading authorities say that if we should ever have another war we would have to put these ships as far up the river as possible, in order to save them. One 1,100-pound bomb sank the U. S. S. *Virginia*, and one great bomb sank H. M. S. *Ostfriesland*. A 4,000-pound bomb, if you please, will blow a hole some 68 feet wide and 28 feet deep, and there is no man to-day in America who is an authority on the subject who will not say to you that we could sink every battleship we have in 15 minutes unless they are properly protected against aircraft. No person up to date who has had a knowledge of this subject of the air will tell you that we can ever use a battleship in any war against modern nations. If that is true, and it has been testified to under oath, why waste this money in elevating the guns, particularly when there is no nation to-day that has a ship with guns that will shoot any further than some of the ships owned by this country. What does this mean? It means that the guns on every ship in the world belonging to major nations, the minute we start to elevate our guns, will have their guns elevated so that they may be able to shoot as far as the guns on the ships of the United States. Perhaps it does not violate the terms of the treaty, but it does violate the spirit of the treaty, and that is the reason I am standing here making the best fight that I know how. What about shooting a projectile 30 miles when you can not see the target. It will have to describe an arc. Do you think that a projectile shot 30 miles could hit a target the size of a ship? Experts say that it will take 50,000 shots to ever strike the target. Of course, if we could anchor that target, and then could have observers overhead who would radio back whether the projectile went to the side or over or short of the target we might be able to hit it finally, but you remember during the World War when those great German guns fired into Paris? I do not think any two projectiles fell within half a mile of each other.

If I am correctly informed, no Member of Congress has any personal knowledge concerning the proposed expenditure of $13,150,000 on the battleships U. S. S. *Oklahoma* and U. S. S. *Nevada*. I have pending before the Rules Committee a resolution that proposes to authorize a committee to make a full investigation of this subject. This Congress should know something about the facts in the case. I defy any Member to point out the character of the proposed repairs from the information given in the hearings, other than the elevation of certain guns.

What about our battleships? Can they be utilized as an asset in time of war, or will they be a liability?

No war in the future will be concluded without aircraft playing a big part, and the nation having a superiority in modern lines of offense and defense will be successful. There are certain officers in the Navy who dislike aircraft more than the devil does holy water. How many remember the fine example of deception and four-flushing that took place in connection with the sinking of the *Washington*? Who remembers Admiral Hillary Jones's great effort when he read into the record of the Lambert committee all the poison he and his coconspirators could concoct against aircraft?

Did any Member ever hear of the six planes that made practically perfect scores at Guantanamo in dropping bombs at targets much smaller than battleships? What about the record made by the Fifth Fighting Squadron on October 17 last at altitudes of 500 feet, 1,000 feet, 1,500 feet, and 2,000 feet? These planes were flown by Lieutenants Dillon, Warwick, Feher, Ackers, Barmer, and Rice. Some 250 bombs were dropped. The report is that the record of hits was so fine that the Navy fears to give out the results on account of having a disastrous effect on its ship-building program.

At this point I desire to incorporate in my remarks a short article written by Owen L. Scott and distributed by the Consolidated Press:

BATTLESHIP'S DOOM SEEN AT ARMY AVIATION FIELD

By Owen L. Scott

WRIGHT FIELD, DAYTON, OHIO, October 27.—This country can rest snug and content, unafraid of any possible attack from foreign warships. The Air Corps is sure of that, now that the brand new type of bombers are withstanding the tests here at Wright Field.

"Not a battleship afloat can stand up under one 2,000-pound bomb dropped from an airplane and properly aimed," they advise you here. And the new bombing ships being put through the paces right now will carry a 4,000-pound bomb with ease. They also can carry two of the 2,000-pound variety.

It took just one 1,100-pound bomb to sink the U. S. S. *Virginia* during the trial tests, and on the basis of that performance, Brig. Gen. William Mitchell made his claims about the effectiveness of airship bombing on warships. These new planes and the new bombs up to the 4,000-pound kind are a big step forward from General Mitchell's time.

But the Air Corps not only is getting ready for sea fights. Battles in the next war often will be fought out up at the ceiling of the sky, out of sight of the earth, the planners expect.

Victory in air fighting goes usually to the highest and fastest fliers. Working with the supercharger principle, developed at the Air Corps laboratory here, American fighting planes now fly as high and as fast as any. But it is expected that before long very long another type plane will come out of the laboratory to fly even higher than any before.

If the next big war were fought now there would be observation planes flying 175 miles an hour doing reconnaissance. Bombers carrying tremendous loads of "eggs" would trail along at 125 miles an hour. Back of them and above in formation would be pursuit planes capable of doing 200 miles an hour and of flying 30,000 feet and more.

Once an enemy showed, these little ships would have to gauge him. Instead of the "dog fights" on a single-handed scale such as in the last war, these new air battles would be in formation. Pilots maneuver in squad groups just as on the ground, and they are in constant communication by telephone with one another. Maneuvering for an air battle would carry them up as high as they could go, with the advantage on the side of the highest fliers.

Reserve pursuit planes would come up to protect the bombers. Dropping of these destructive projectiles is no longer a haphazard matter. Sighting is down to a science and the actual dropping of the bomb, once the proper position is obtained, is automatic. Hits on a small target are assured 50 per cent of the time at 10,000 feet.

One 4,000-pound bomb when dropped creates a crater in the earth 65 feet across and 28 feet deep. It would almost demolish a small town or big manufacturing plant. Gas bombs would do the rest.

In their sky battles the pursuit planes would use new 50-caliber machine guns, shooting projectiles about twice as large as the ordinary machine-gun bullet and much more destructive.

They have developed an airplane muffler which could be used on observation planes. Flying up above the clouds so high as to be out of sight of land and with muffler which would keep the enemy from hearing their approach, these observation planes could photograph enemy territory with thoroughness. The Air Corps' long-range camera shoots through fog or clouds.

No sensible person will deny that a battleship can be sunk or put out of commission by aircraft. Every aviator that I ever heard testify was positive of this fact. Yet there are those who are living in the past, who represent the ideas of the "whiskered" age and want to go to heaven standing on the bridge of one of these old "mud turtles." A fleet is no faster than its slowest ship. Battleships have to be protected by submarines, cruisers, destroyers, and supply ships. Such a squadron would have to hover together for protection like a covey of quail, and a few lucky pot shots from the enemy would about end a war.

The old cry of the Navy was for ships to protect our cities; now it is our sea lanes and foreign commerce. I would like to have some one tell me how battleships could be efficiently used when their maximum speed, taking fuel-oil consumption into consideration, is less than 12 knots. What this country needs is some new blood in the Navy. When you train men up along certain lines their minds become concreted and there is no room for new ideas. The greatest blessing that could come to this country would be the dropping of the retirement age so that those who are married to the battleship idea could forever rest at peace at the expense of the Government.

The U. S. S. *Oklahoma* and U. S. S. *Nevada* have a replacement date of 1936 in the disarmament agreement. It will be 1930 before these ships can be reconditioned. The amount asked for in this legislation would build one new cruiser, having a speed of more than 30 knots. The President of the United States, in his message to Congress at the beginning of this session, called attention to the need for additional aircraft, submarines, and cruisers, having nothing to say concerning battleships. I am of the opinion that he realized the importance of basing our national defense for the future on speedier crafts and new appliances used in war.

It seems to me that the time has come to stop wasting money on useless expenditures. If I am correctly informed our Budget estimate for 1929 is more than $4,000,000,000. We have confronting this Congress the need of a great flood-control appropriation. The farm legislation should not be sidetracked, and, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to vote away the taxpayers' money on a type of ship which will cost approximately $50,000,000 to construct, when 90 per cent of our people know that such a ship can be sunk in a few minutes by aircraft.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this side will have but one speech and we want to use that to close the debate.

Mr. BUTLER. Where is the burden resting?

Mr. MADDEN. The burden rests on the side that makes the proposition.

Mr. BUTLER. Then having the burden, we should have the conclusion.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no; the committee has the conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to speak now, but I would like to know what I have to answer. I yield three minutes to Mr. TABER.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I believe in the strictest economy in Government expenditures consistent with keeping our equipment and plant in shape. The position that I am going to take to-day is right in line with that. Of the ships of our Navy, 18 capital battleships, 9 have a range which either exceeds or is comparable to the range of the guns on ships of Great Britain and other countries, but 9 more have a range which is from 2,000 to 3,500 yards short of the range of the ships which Great Britain has. The *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada* are two of the ships which have this short range. Their range is somewhere around 21,000 yards. In action these ships would be merely targets. That is all that we could expect. What is the use of spending $13,000,000 to build a little bit bigger and a little bit better target? Why not spend $940,000 more and have ships that can hit? When I want to fight I want to be able to hit the other fellow before he hits me or at least as quickly, and that is the reason why we need to elevate these guns, so as to increase the range of the ships from 3,000 to 4,000 yards and put them where they belong. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, considering the distinguished Republican source from which I got my time my conscience troubles me about the remarks I intend to make. It is the most distressing thing to me that in all debates on naval bills the Republican Party falls to pieces and have presented nothing but engagements between the leaders of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Republicans promised a party government, and yet on this important question of the Navy they are always in disagreement.

The Republicans have bragged so much about the Washington disarmament conference that it has taken five years to make them realize that it was a great blunder. The Republican press agents in 1922 had the people believing that we had a naval parity with Great Britain and only recently Republicans on the floor of this House have conceded the faults of this ballyhoo. It is commendable of the Republican chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that he has been brave enough to try to redeem the Navy from its low state brought about by Republican administrations. His attitude and that of the Speaker are entirely different from the attitude of the administration which has made frantic efforts to get the other powers of the world to disarm, offering blue prints and obsolete vessels for the scrap heap if Great Britain and Japan would destroy new construction.

Some fear that the amendment may violate the sacred disarmament treaty. Other powers have violated it by post-conference auxiliary construction. If the 5-5-3 ratio to capital ships was to be a constant, then there should have been maintained a status quo as to auxiliaries. To agree with some statesmen it would have to be understood that in a war with Great Britain only the tonnage of capital ships would get into action and the other naval vessels would carry the spectators.

Hughes failed in Washington and Balfour triumphed. Poor old Hughes. It was one of the few times in his life he was trimmed. The brains of the Republican party in 1922 were too busy stealing oil reserves, robbing veterans, playing poker, and getting out labor injunctions to pay attention to the naval conference. The diplomatic destruction of the Navy at the conference was followed by a guerrilla warfare on the Navy under the leadership of Admiral Economy. Economy has become another word for stupidity. When we cease to have an Army and Navy we cease to have a country. Here is an opportunity for the administration to make amends to the country. Listening to some American statesmen arguing not to build against Great Britain, one would think Great Britain was building a great navy because it fears Switzerland. I do not

choose to accept the good intentions of Great Britain toward us when they refused to adjust their naval situation with a view to parity as they were given an opportunity at Geneva.

It only costs us 11½ cents per capita to operate our Army and Navy, or about $6 per year. Great Britain spends about $15 a year per capita. We have three times the wealth of Great Britain and six times the wealth of Japan. We have to preserve the self-government of 115,000,000 people and the rights of 12,000,000 people in our outlying possessions. We have a transoceanic and a coastwise commerce larger than Great Britain. Our foreign trade is about ten billions annually. Our investments abroad amount to twenty-five billions.

While we could feed ourselves in case of war, there are a great number of essentials in industry and in essential drugs that we must procure from abroad so that we must have a Navy to protect our ships on the sea.

There is nothing in the minutes of the disarmament conference to indicate that we can not elevate our guns. There are a great many things to indicate that Great Britain should not have increased its auxiliary forces. We must depend on a strong Navy. Harbor forts are not strong, and on the fate of this amendment may rest the fate of this country as a leading power of the world. A vote against the amendment is a vote to send 2,500 American officers and sailors to certain death. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House has not inferred that the Committee on Appropriations is hostile to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and by any vote taken in committee had indicated that the appropriation therefor should not be made. The fact is when the vote is taken I think you will find that a substantial majority of the Committee on Appropriations feel that this amendment and the appropriation incident thereto should be approved. Congress at its last session directed that this should be done. The President has submitted in his report to Congress a recommendation that it be done, and just why there should now be any refusal to carry out the recommendation of the President in this regard is more than I can understand. No Congress in the past, no Congress in the future, will refuse appropriations necessary to keep in commission the battleships we now have, and so long as we vote appropriations to keep these battleships in commission you must be willing to vote such sums as those best qualified to speak say are absolutely required to make those ships efficient within the limitations of the treaty. That is the purpose of this amendment, and it is folly to expend millions of dollars in maintaining a personnel on those battleships and refuse to follow the advice of the experts in placing the ships in such condition that they will be efficient if called on for action. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time the opposition has?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 5 minutes, the gentleman from Illinois 12 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, this is an age of progress. Speed will be the determining factor in all military engagements in the future. Speed on the water, speed on the land, and speed in the air, and the nation that depends upon old, antiquated, obsolete equipment, which were in order during the Civil War, is liable to bow its head in humility. You can do just as you please in this particular instance, but as long as I am charged with any responsibility I am going to lift my voice in favor of these modern up-to-date appliances in order that the people of this Nation may have the best protection and best fighting units on the sea, and when it comes to those who are qualified to speak, as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has said, I place very little, if any, credence on a lot of old superannuated officers whose minds have become concreted to the extent that they could not accept a new idea. Have not they done everything on earth possible to kill aircraft? Have not they tried to hide the records made relative to efficiency in this great branch of the service?

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, has made a very entertaining speech for the purpose of showing this House why a suitable appropriation should be made available to be used in the elevation of guns on battleships. He laid special stress on the fact that certain other ships of this same type, belonging to other nations, have a superior speed to our battleships and this may be true, yet he did not say that other ships had a superior range to our own. To my mind this speech would have been a remarkable disclosure had it been delivered along about the Civil War period. It would have been appropos to the situation; it would have dealt with matters that then affected the kind of naval equipment that are called the backbone of the Navy.

It may be true that certain battleships belonging to other nations can speed a few knots faster than our ships, but when it is taken into consideration that we have a type of fighting ship that can make a speed of more than five times that of a battleship and drop a bomb that would blow one of these monsters off the face of the sea, to me it seems foolish that we should waste so much time on such a measure.

Much has been said about the disarmament conference. Nearly everyone believes that this was a colossal mistake; yet the intent was good; and if our representatives had received the proper advice from the Navy, we would not have sunk all of the new ships and retained a lot of old hulks that are now obsolete. Those who participated in the disarmament conference had to depend upon naval officials for advice, and the same kind of advice that was given on that occasion is now being given to certain Members of Congress in asking that they vote to patch up a lot of old ships that can only be used in peace times.

It is to be regretted that the example of Lindbergh, Chamberlain, Byrd, Goebel, Maitland, Hegenberger, and others who have startled the world with their demonstration of air navigation, have not apparently in any way influenced a certain board that has jurisdiction over matters affecting the Navy. Why waste this money? Has not the President called attention to the need of aircraft, submarines, and cruisers? You can build one of the new cruisers with the amount asked for in this bill that has a speed many times faster than any of our battleships. Do you know that a fleet can not be faster than its slowest ship? If we have the fleet retarded by one of the old-fashioned fighting ships, one that requires a whole fleet of different kind of fast ships to protect it from being sunk, why waste the money in this manner?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCLINTIC. In a moment. Let us put our money in up-to-date appliances. Let us follow the direction of the best minds in this country, and when we have done that we shall have put our Navy into a state of efficiency that will enable it to take care of every situation in the future. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, what we really have to decide to-day is whether or not this House will support the spirit of the Washington conference. The spirit of that conference was, so far as battleships were concerned, that we should have a fleet equal to that of Great Britain and which would stand in the ratio of 5 to 3 with that of Japan.

The realities of that conference, as we subsequently discovered, were that our fleet was left inferior in number, tonnage, speed, and in the range of its guns. We came out of that conference with 18 battleships as against 22 of Great Britain. Our total displacement was about 525,000 tons as compared with Great Britain's 600,000 tons. Every one of our battleships was exceeded in speed by all of the British battleships, and 13 of our battleships were outranged by all of the 22 ships of the British fleet. We can not change, according to the terms agreed upon by the conference, the number of our ships or their tonnage, nor is it possible for us to change their speed; but we can remedy the defect, in so far as the range of guns is concerned, so that in the event of an engagement we should not be riddled by their fire without being able to exchange a shot.

There were five signatories to the treaty—Great Britain, Japan, France, Italy, and the United States. Japan sees no objection. Neither does France or Italy. Secretary Hughes, our delegate at the conference, says that we can raise the elevation of our guns without contravention of the treaty's terms. Secretary Kellogg also agrees. Only Great Britain protests. The line of our duty could not be more clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one-half a minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. I think that will give me one minute and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not so much concerned about the Washington treaty while we have a Department of State to interpret it, but I am concerned about this one fact: I am thinking of the 2,500 officers and men who will man these two ships a couple of years from now, and certain members of the Committee on Appropriations are attempting to muzzle their guns. They are saying to these 2,500 officers and men, "Go in and do the best you can with guns that can not shoot."

Every big gun in the British Navy and every big gun in the Japanese Navy outshoots every big gun on the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada* by from 2 miles to 6 miles, and yet these gentlemen seriously come before us and suggest an expenditure of nearly $13,000,000 to recondition these ships. Make them as nearly first class as it is humanly possible to do, in every essential, but the most important one—the right to be able to hit the target. They will not be worth "a tinker's damn" if we muzzle their guns, and that is what this bill does. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, future naval engagements will be fought at long ranges, where nations will stake everything upon the issue of a single battle and the hitting force of its most powerful ships. Unless the guns on the *Oklahoma* and *Nevada* are elevated, they can never hope to get into the battle in its early stages. They and their 2,500 officers and men will be targets for any enemy. What a horrible thing to comprehend!

Much uncertainty prevails in the House as to when and if the Japanese and British big guns were actually increased in elevation. When the time for battle arrives it will make little difference whether the enemy's guns were elevated before or after the Washington conference. It will be a fight to a finish, and our men should therefore be equipped with fighting material that will crush the enemy before he has a chance to get set. We assign men to certain fighting positions. They have no personal choice. To deny them at least the same rights and protection that their enemy has would be disgraceful. Let us vote to elevate the guns. More power to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for one and one-half minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I never lied to this House since I became its Member long ago. I have never misled it knowingly. Great Britain does not care whether we raise these guns or not. I defy any man to contradict my statement or to controvert it, but I will not suffer anyone to compel me to state my authority. Moreover, it has come from the present Secretary of State that what is proposed here is not a violation of the Washington treaty. Secretary Hughes wrote a similar opinion a few years ago. I am to blame for the changing opinion the House is in. I thought in 1924 the guns on our great ships should not be elevated because it might break the spirit of this conference. The British have broken the spirit of that conference now, and are proposing to build cruisers which will cost us millions of dollars to strengthen our sea defenses. Hence the spirit of the conference is gone. No one stands anywhere to deny it.

My friend declines to proceed. If he says anything that needs denial I shall ask permission to answer him. The Japanese have elevated their guns. The British have elevated their guns in the fleet on two ships that they have finished since the treaty was made. I say to you that the British care nothing whatever whether our guns are elevated. "Give our men who sail them the same chance in a contest that the men on other ships opposed to them will have." [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in a few moments you will be called upon to determine whether or not you will put into the appropriation bill an amendment providing for the elevation of the guns upon two of the battleships of the American Navy, the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada*, two ships whose overhaul will occur during the coming year.

The Committee on Appropriations omitted such provision and the chairman of the committee has asked me to outline to you the point of view of the majority of the members of the committee. The vote that you will take is probably one of the most important votes that you will be called upon to give during the Seventieth Congress.

The question is not a personal one with me, nor is it a personal matter with any member of the committee. The question is one that must be met in good conscience by every Member of the House as he realizes the responsibility of his vote.

Whether or not we shall provide for the elevation of the guns upon several of the battleships of the American Navy is of some importance because it involves money. For the two ships that you are now considering the amount involved will aggregate $940,000. Even so, and while I believe that the needs of the Navy in other lines are so great that this amount of money could be better expended for the Navy, I am going to ask you in the few minutes at my disposal to consider the question from other points of view.

On August 17, 1923, the last of the nations that were parties to the Limitation of Armaments Conference that was held in Washington ratified that agreement. The treaty that was then entered into sought to limit naval programs of the leading nations of the world. The problem that you are now called upon to consider is whether or not under that treaty you have the right to do that which is proposed. The most valuable possession of any Member of this House as he aspires to leadership and effectiveness in the House is his good name, the faith, and the confidence that the Members of this Chamber repose in him. So, too, the good name of a nation is its most powerful tower of strength among the nations of the world.

The limitation of armaments treaty deals with battleships and it contains a provision that renders altogether doubtful the right of the United States under the treaty to elevate the guns upon our battleships as you are asked to do.

Now, let us consider some of the matters with which the conference dealt. The conference dealt with the number of battleships and the tonnage that might be maintained by the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and other nations. But when the treaty was drafted the battleships of these several nations were not of equal age or of equal strength. As a result, while a theoretical tonnage was fixed for each nation, the treaty had regard for the status of the ships of the several nations, and the United States was authorized to maintain 18 battleships and to substitute for 2 that were at that time the oldest of our ships 2 other battleships upon their completion. Great Britain was permitted to retain for a time 18 battleships and 4 battle cruisers, 4 of the ships of this type to be replaced by the *Rodney* and the *Nelson* upon their completion. This replacement has just occurred.

I mention the foregoing that you may understand that an effort was made to provide equal strength in battleships, though the number of ships and the tonnage were not exactly alike.

When the question of strengthening the hulls of the ships was reached it was provided that blisters could be added. For the protection of decks of ships against aircraft, it was provided that decks could be strengthened. When the question of guns, involving number of guns and caliber, was reached, it was well known that the ships of Great Britain and the ships of the United States did not have the same number of guns nor guns of the same caliber.

For instance, the United States had twenty-four 16-inch guns and Great Britain 18. Of 15-inch guns, the United States had none and Great Britain 100. Of 14-inch guns, the United States had 60 and Great Britain none. And so with guns of other caliber the navies were not alike. Even so, the representatives of the United States at the conference must have felt that by and large the strength of the guns of the battleships of the United States approximately matched the strength of the guns of Great Britain.

On all the subjects to which I have just referred definite provision was made within the treaty.

Not one of those questions is involved here. The problem before you is whether or not under the treaty the United States has the right to elevate the guns upon our battleships.

Now, let us see whether or not the treaty contains any statement that will assist us in the problem.

In chapter 2, part 9, subdivision "d" of section 1, we find this language:

> No alterations in side armor, in caliber, number, or general type of main armament shall be permitted.

You will notice that there is nothing in the language I have just read that specifically sets forth whether or not the elevation of guns may be modified. Some four years ago allegation came to our Navy Department that Great Britain had elevated the guns upon some of her battleships. This assertion was immediately conveyed to the Congress by the Navy Department, and on the strength of it the Congress passed an act appropriating money for the elevation of guns upon the battleships of the United States.

Great Britain at once informed our Government that the representations that had been made touching gun elevation were not true; that she had not elevated her guns following the Washington conference; and more than that, she filed with the State Department of our Government a protest against the

elevation of guns by the United States, resting her protest upon her contention that it was in violation of the limitation of armaments treaty.

The Congress had adjourned by the time the protest was received and the Navy Department decided it should not proceed with elevation of guns upon American ships until the question could be submitted again to the Congress. Upon the reconvening of Congress the provision that had been passed for gun elevation was repealed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield right now.

Since that time the Navy Department has been anxious for reenactment of authority for increasing the elevation of our guns upon the theory that such action upon our part is not in conflict with the limitations treaty and upon the theory that by reason of the difference of gun elevation upon the part of the ships of Great Britain and the ships of the United States, the Navy of Great Britain is superior in gun power to the gun power of our own Navy.

Now, let us see what there is to this contention.

In gun range, I am not able to give definite information on the *Rodney* and the *Nelson*, the two new capital ships of Great Britain. Our Navy Department believes they are in the class with our ships of longest range. Among other capital ships the range of gunfire is not the same. Five of our ships excel in range all the ships of Great Britain whose range we know, while in others our ships are inferior.

And may I say that the figures that I am quoting are figures that have been furnished by our Navy Department to the committees of the Congress.

The United States has three battleships, each of which will shoot 34,500 yards; one that will shoot 30,500 yards; and one, 30,700 yards. On the other hand, the *Hood*, of Great Britain, will shoot 30,300 yards, while the two new ships that have just come into commission, the *Rodney* and the *Nelson*, our Navy Department to-day has been unable to advise me definitely upon, but I am advised that it is believed these two ships have the gun range of our greatest ships.

When a lawyer wants to determine the meaning of language that is ambiguous, he endeavors to ascertain what was in the minds of those who shaped the language. With this thought I have endeavored to ascertain what was in the minds of the members of the conference that made the treaty. I was advised upon the authority of the chairman of the conference when he was Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, that the subject of range of guns in a comparative way was not discussed by the conference and that the language used in the treaty was not intended purposely either to prohibit or to permit gun elevation.

So, then, we must determine the question from the language itself.

In doing that may I bring to your attention this thought: We ought to do nothing that will cause any other nation that is party to the treaty to doubt the good faith of the United States. In following that course I insist before the Members of this Congress and the country that there is no occasion for raising the elevation of our guns or for even discussing the question. We are superior in part, and in part we fall below; in short, we here have a situation that is somewhat similar to the situation that exists in the matter of number of guns, caliber, and tonnage.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has said this has the approval of the former Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Not now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has referred to my argument, and I think he should yield.

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield now.

As a matter of fact, Secretary Hughes, in the letter that was read the other day, did not say he favored the elevation of guns, but he expressed himself as believing that nothing in the treaty was in conflict. But what else did he say? He declared such a course would provoke competition, which we seek to avoid. Here is his language:

> I am of opinion, however, that while such changes as would be contemplated in the case of American ships would not constitute a violation of the terms of the treaty, they would tend to evoke the competition which it has been the policy of this Government to mitigate.

Consider then this factor: If the United States shall elevate the guns on all our capital ships, then an inequality of unreasonable degree in gun range would exist in favor of the United States.

Finally, then, we are not going to have war with Great Britain. Nobody believes that. When it comes to the general condition of the capital ships of the Navy of the United States, having in mind the extensive overhauling that we have given six of them, we have a Navy that is stronger in capital ships than it was the day the limitation of armaments conference treaty was signed.

There is one other thought I must leave with you. The Navy of the United States needs cruisers; it needs submarines of the larger type, and while the money involved in the program of elevation of guns is not large when compared with the total of naval budgets, I submit the money should be applied where it is needed and where we clearly have a right to strengthen the Navy under the treaty. More than that, under the limitation treaty, an orderly process has been outlined under which replacement of battleships will be commenced. That program for the United States will begin in 1931 and the program as to the two ships that are involved in the pending amendment will come up in orderly way for replacement in 1936.

Gentlemen, I submit that with so little to be gained as it is urged would be gained through the elevation of guns, and with the conscious realization that we at least will cause the Government of the United States to be suspected of placing an arbitrary interpretation upon a doubtful clause of a treaty and thereby of doing an act that will to some extent disturb good will that ought to hold for us, the amendment proposed by the gentleman should not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided and there were—ayes 215, noes 75.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have a further amendment to offer, on page 54, line 21, strike out the figures "$5,635,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$6,575,000."

Mr. MADDEN. The committee accepts that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: On page 54, line 21, strike out the figures "$5,635,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$6,575,000."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this merely corrects the figures of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks a separate vote on the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 78, after line 14, insert as a new paragraph the following:
>
> "For transportation of the Army and its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department

appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditures in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $578,110."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM)—ayes 112, noes 190.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important measure and there have been a great many requests for copies of this bill by outside people who are interested in the tax measure. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Oregon that the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD in order that the country generally may have an opportunity to read its provisions.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD without being read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall be unusually brief in submitting the bill at the outset. The most important features of the bill are perfectly well understood. The technical provisions, in my judgment, might well be permitted to stand until the time when it is read for amendment, except as Members may see fit to make some inquiry at the conclusion of my remarks on the general features of the bill.

I will ask that you kindly do not interrupt during my general statement, but at the conclusion I shall be pleased to answer any questions that gentlemen may see fit to propound with reference to the tax provisions of the bill or any other question to which they may wish to make inquiry.

Mr. Chairman, the country and Congress is to be congratulated that under the wise management of our public affairs and careful supervision of our national expenditures the revenues of the Government have produced a surplus above expenditures. While this surplus will decrease, it is likely to continue in sufficient amounts to make it advisable to reduce taxation. The Committee on Ways and Means therefore presents this bill.

Reduction of taxation is a much more pleasant task than increasing it. I sincerely hope that we may never have to increase taxation, yet if we had yielded to the importunities of many of the parties who appeared before us I am quite certain that in the near future we would not only have been compelled to restore some of the old taxes or levy new ones but would find it necessary to issue bonds to make up for the ensuing deficit.

It is unfortunate that those who appear before the committee at the hearings or otherwise make demands upon it are either working for their own pecuniary interests or represent those who have a personal and pecuniary interest in the proposition they favor. As a result there are few to speak for the people at large. The committee hears mostly parties that are liable to be biased or prejudiced, and the committee must endeavor to take care of the public.

Some of the persons who appeared before us seemed to care little whether a deficit was created if they got what they wanted. I consider this the worst possible policy. We have heretofore been pointing with pride to the fact that our Nation had each year a surplus in its Treasury and at the same time our taxes were not oppressive and did not prevent a general condition of prosperity. Under these conditions, with our national debt being rapidly reduced, there is no other nation in the world whose credit stands so high and which can fund its debts at so low a rate of interest. If we adopted a policy which even occasionally produced a deficit, in the long run it would be extremely disastrous and costly to the taxpayers, for it would increase the rate of interest in all our new obligations, which are used to take up our bonds now outstanding. If new taxes were levied, it would have a bad effect on business. If bonds were issued it would impair our credit. More than all this, it would injure our standing as a nation of power and financial strength unequalled in the world, alike prepared for war and leading in peaceful prosperity, a condition which defies aggression and invites the friendship of all nations.

During the war and for many years thereafter we were in an abnormal condition. The currency was inflated and profits were high; expenditures were enormous, and we were compelled to levy taxes accordingly. The inevitable reaction followed the war. A period of business depression set in which reached its lowest point in 1921. As usual in such cases the pendulum swung too far, and gradually conditions improved until they seemed to reach the peak in 1926. They receded somewhat this year and probably will improve to some extent in 1928, but business is now fairly well stabilized and the only changes that we are to expect are from its ebb and flow. That being the case, the rates carried in the bill should be as low as will permit the Government to be properly administered and provide for the ultimate payment of our great debt. No more should be taken than is necessary, but enough should be provided so that there will be no reasonable anticipation of a deficit.

Three principles were followed by the committee. First, that the reduction should not be such as would produce a deficit in the Treasury; second, that the reductions should be distributed where relief appeared to be more necessary and advisable; and, third, that the taxes that had not been reduced since the war should be given special attention. Obviously this required that the committee should first determine the amount of reduction. This amount was necessarily somewhat indefinite, but the majority of the committee agreed that in no event should it exceed $250,000,000. The amount recommended by the Treasury was $225,000,000, and the majority endeavored to keep as close to that amount as was possible. I shall not go into details as to these figures. That matter will be taken up and discussed fully to-morrow by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

In considering the subjects of taxation where there had been no reduction since the war, our attention was first called to the case of corporations. It seemed to be generally considered that the corporations were entitled to a reduction, and the question before the committee was as to how much that reduction should be. Corporation taxes have not been reduced since the war. In fact, there has been a claim made that they were raised, but that is not correct. The first tax levied in war time upon corporations was 10 per cent, but besides this tax there was also levied an excess-profits tax, from which we derived an enormous revenue during the war. Subsequently the excess-profits tax was repealed, and in order to in part make up for it, the corporation tax was increased from 10 to 12½ per cent. In the last revenue bill the tax on the value of corporate stocks was repealed, and in the place of that tax an additional 1 per cent was added to the corporation-income tax, making it 13½ per cent. The committee reduced this rate from 13½ per cent to 11½ per cent, or a reduction of two points—not 2 per cent, as some might say, because that is not the correct way of figuring it—but a reduction of two points in the tax. This was made applicable to all corporations, including insurance companies, and it was also made applicable to the taxes of the year 1927.

Before I overlook it I want to say that there has been some claim that the rates on corporations should substantially correspond to the rates on individuals. I think this is a great mistake. Corporations have always been regarded as proper subjects of taxation on account of the peculiar advantages which are given them in their creation. Among the privileges granted a corporation first, no personal liability to the stockholders, second, that the transfer of property in a corporation is easily effected by the transfer of shares, and, lastly, there is a special advantage in the corporate form which has seldom been considered. It consists in the fact that these two first privileges I have mentioned which are peculiar to corporations creates the additional advantage of being capable of attracting large accumulations of capital. People are far more ready to invest their money in a corporation than they are in a copartnership, where they are liable to become responsible for all of the debts of the concern. In this way corporations like the steel trust or the automobile corporations, and like others that I could mention, have been built up with immense advantages, owing to the great amount of capital they have been able to attract. This in my judgment constitutes a special feature which makes it hard to say just where the corporation tax should stop or even where it should begin.

In this connection I might say that the corporation tax is especially burdensome to small corporations. There is no question but that the stockholders of small corporations are more heavily burdened by taxation than they would be if they were doing business as individuals or in the form of a copartnership. The committee took this into consideration, but it is difficult to get an agreement as to just how relief should be granted.

A proposal was made by the Treasury with reference to corporations which comprised only 10 members. The committee did not think this would give relief to a very large number of small corporations, meaning by the term "small corporations" corporations that had small profits that were equally entitled to relief as well as those with a smaller number of members. Finally it agreed to give an additional $1,000 of exemption to corporations which had an income of less than $25,000. This may seem small, but take a corporation whose net income after paying all expenses, including the salaries of officers, is only $10,000. It would reduce their tax 12½ per cent, and in a corresponding sum, according to the amount of profit, up to $25,000.

Some question has been raised as to why the corporation tax is made applicable to incomes of this year, 1927, and payable in the year 1928. We incorporated this provision in the bill, following provisions which we had made in a previous bill with reference to individual income taxes, and I think the same reason applies. I do not care to go into a discussion of that at any length at this time, but will say this, that the sole and only reason given at the hearings for making the reduction applicable to the taxes of 1927, payable in 1928, indeed the sole and only reason given for reducing the corporation tax at all, was because this tax bore on the stockholders, and yet the claim is made that the reduction ought not to be given to the income for 1927 because the tax has been passed on to the public. It is perfectly obvious to all Members of the House that the tax can not be both passed on to the general public and also bear on the stockholders; I might also say there is a large number of corporations which everyone will agree can not pass on the tax, such as corporations publishing newspapers, which are obliged to keep an almost invariable rate, at least a rate not influenced by taxation, no matter what the tax may be. Besides these, there are mining corporations producing lead, copper, silver, gold, and other metals, whose value is always determined by the general market price.

Then there are all of those corporations whose products are sold under competitive conditions or where the price is fixed by a public exchange, and small corporations generally. They are absolutely unable to pass on the tax as nearly everyone will agree. In fact, the economists generally agree that a tax can not be passed on by any corporation except a monopoly, other than in exceptional cases, and that corporations, like individuals and partnerships, sell for the highest price they can obtain consistent with the broadest market where it will bring the most profit, regardless of the tax. This question has been recently investigated by an English commission, which reached a conclusion in accord with the view just stated. The national conference board some years ago in one of its reports made similar statements. It has recently been making a more elaborate investigation and I understand its experts have reached the same conclusion. If corporations could fix the price to suit themselves there would be no occasion for losing money. Yet the facts are that 41 per cent in 1925 actually operated at a loss. And an additional 51 per cent made a profit of less than $25,000. Over 90 per cent of our corporate revenue comes from only 8 per cent of the corporations operated. The fact is a very considerable proportion of the sales by manufacturing companies are made at a loss, and a still larger proportion at a small profit. The trend of profits follows the trend of prices.

So much at this time for the corporation tax. We have made no change whatever in the individual income tax. The Treasury suggested we make changes in what is called the intermediate surtax brackets. The committee finally concluded to make no change in this respect for the reason that the matter had been gone over very carefully in the last revenue bill.

As originally proposed in the House the last bill had what might be called a bend in the line of surtax rates which did not correspond to the general graduation of those rates. Afterwards when the bill went to the Senate a change was made that this break in the curve might be corrected, and this change was in the intermediate surtax brackets. The committee believed that the surtax as now adjusted is fair and equitable.

There was another matter upon which the committee has given much consideration which has never before directly occupied its attention. It related to a simplification of the law. Members will remember in the last bill there was a provision for the creation of a joint committee of the House and Senate on internal revenue taxation. The duties of this committee were, speaking in a general way, two. First in the investigation of the operations of the law, and second the simplification of the income tax. This joint committee has been working at various times since it has been fully organized. There was some delay in the organization of this committee owing to the fact the House and Senate could not agree upon a chairman. Eventually they finally concluded that the chairmanship belonged to the House, and the Member now addressing you was made chairman of that committee. [Applause.] The work of the committee was divided into two divisions. One division, called the division of investigation, and the other, the division of simplification. The first-named division has been at work for more than a year. The latter was not organized until last spring for various reasons, owing to the difficulty of getting the proper personnel. The division of simplification has worked all summer, and together with this division a number of distinguished experts, lawyers, and economists, have collaborated without receiving any compensation for their services. A committee was thus formed, called the advisory committee, which submitted a report to the joint committee. The greater part of this report was approved by the joint committee in a report to the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate.

I would recommend to Members who wish to delve in the difficulties of the income tax that they read the report of this joint committee sometime when they have time to consider it. As I have said, the joint committee recommended certain recommendations of the advisory committee be incorporated into the law; that is, they made that recommendation to the Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee did not adopt all the recommendations of the joint committee, but they adopted a greater portion, and they are now found in the bill.

Among those recommendations of the joint committee which were adopted was one in regard to the rearrangement of the law, and I want to call especial attention to the Members of the committee to the form of the rearrangement. The bill in this respect differs very materially from bills heretofore introduced in 1918, 1921, 1924, and 1926. Each of those former acts reenacted all the provisions of the preceding acts which were intended to be preserved together with such changes and omissions as were made by new laws, and then repealed the preceding act with certain exceptions.

Now, this method resulted in the greatest complication, and it resulted also in a continual extension of our law. The law was getting longer every year, and more complicated, as the result of this plan. Every time you wished to turn to a certain provision in the law you found there not only provision for the year for which you were going to compute the income, but provisions relating to back years, from 1916 clear on to the time the bill was enacted. If this process is continued with each new bill, our revenue act will continue to be longer and their complexities will be continued. The committee thought we ought to make a fresh start. Under the new plan the taxpayers in 1927 and succeeding years will not be compelled to wade through the many complexities of prior acts. Now you will have before you, in looking at this bill, the provisions of the income tax for only the taxable year 1927 and succeeding years, which will have no effect on taxes imposed in prior fiscal years.

The income tax title of the 1926 act is not repealed by the bill and remains in force for the collection of taxes for 1925 and 1926, as well as taxes under prior acts, except as modified by Title III of the present bill, containing express amendments to such title, and by Title IV, containing various administrative provisions, and by Title V, containing a few retroactive provisions intended to relieve certain cases of hardship under prior acts.

The estate tax title of the 1926 act is neither repeated nor repealed in the present bill, which, in Title II (Sec. 401–403) contains three amendments to that title. Similarly the reductions recommended by the bill in the automobile, admissions, club dues, and stamp taxes are accomplished by express amendments to the 1926 act, instead of the old method of repetition and repeal. The adoption of the new method in the bill will, it is believed, materially save time in the House, inasmuch as the bill is 50 pages shorter than the bill in 1926, even though the new style of printing, on account of the headings and indentions, increases the number of lines necessary to embody any given number of words.

The second matter concerning the structure of the bill to which I desire to refer is the fact that it embodies a proposed new arrangement for the income tax title. The income tax

title of the 1926 act, which follows closely the arrangement of the acts of 1918, 1921, and 1924, is the result of a gradual growth and accretion, with the result that the ordinary taxpayer has great difficulty in finding the matters of interest to him among the great mass of complicated provisions relating to special classes of taxpayers or to peculiar and exceptional circumstances. The committee has endeavored to simplify the income tax by distributing it to two main parts—general provisions and supplemental provisions—prefaced by a few introductory provisions.

The general provisions are those which apply to the ordinary transactions of the ordinary class of taxpayers. It is believed that approximately 80 per cent of the taxpayers who file returns under the new act will find in the general provisions practically all the information necessary for them to make out their returns.

The supplemental provisions comprise all provisions of the income tax title other than the general provisions and the introductory provisions. In the main, the supplemental provisions are those which apply only to extraordinary classes of taxpayers or which apply only to the extraordinary transactions of ordinary classes of taxpayers. The provisions are so arranged, it is believed, that the taxpayer may safely rely on making out his return on the basis of the general provisions without reading further, unless he is led to another portion of the bill by a cross reference.

Coming to the particular arrangement chosen for the general provisions, it is apparent that no one arrangement will be satisfactory to all. No two men probably would ever agree to what is the best arrangement. After considering the matter it seemed that the arrangement most likely to be convenient to the taxpayer is that adopted in the bill. It starts out, after a few introductory provisions, by imposing in section 11 a normal tax equal to a certain percentage "of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income." After the section imposing the taxes on individuals and corporations, is section 21 defining "net income" as meaning the gross income less the deductions. The next section (sec. 22) tells what the gross income is, and the next section (sec. 23) tells what the deductions are, followed by section 24, which tells him specifically the things he can not deduct. The taxpayer now having found what his net income is, next desires to know what are the credits against net income which are referred to in the section imposing the tax. So he finds in the very next section (sec. 25) a statement of these credits—personal exemption, credit for dependents, and so forth.

The taxpayer has now computed his tax and the next part of the bill (secs. 31–34) tells him what are his credits against the tax, most important of which is the earned income credit in section 31. The bill next contains Part IV (secs. 41–48), containing provisions relating to the accounting period and methods of accounting on the basis of which net income is computed. Strict logic might require these sections to be injected into the midst of the section relating to the computation of gross income, but it seems to the committee more desirable to segregate these provisions, inasmuch as many of them are of importance in a relatively smaller number of cases.

The next question is, How is the tax returned and when is it paid? These questions are answered by the bill in the sections immediately following (secs. 51–56).

The taxpayer has now completed his task and unless a deficiency is assessed against him in the future, he need never read any more of the bill.

The provisions just referred to which the ordinary taxpayer must examine are contained in less than 36 pages. In the case of the bill introduced in the House in 1926, the income tax title consisted of 140 pages, at least 113 of which the ordinary taxpayer was obliged to read in order to extract the provisions necessary for his information in computing his tax and making out his return.

This will explain some of the reasons and considerations upon which the committee acted in making up the form of the bill. Now I will come to some of the other particular provisions of the bill, and I desire to leave time, so that Members may propound such questions as they desire.

The earned income provision, which was incorporated in the bill of 1926, has occasioned many of the taxpayers and the collectors of taxes a great deal of difficulty. Some persons have found a great deal of trouble in computing their returns under it, and we have been informed by some of the collectors that about 50 per cent of the errors in the returns were made in computations under this provision.

The committee worked for a considerable time in endeavoring to simplify the provision. The joint committee recommended a provision in place of the one in the bill, but it was not entirely satisfactory to the committee, so the committee finally passed this over without adopting any change in it. It remains the same in the present bill as before. I had myself, in connection with some of the members of the staff of the joint committee and upon the suggestion of some other parties, suggested a method which I thought would greatly simplify this vexing provision, but, unfortunately, I was unable to bring it before the committee until it was too late for the committee to give it further consideration and the committee preferred to let the matter stand as it was.

As I have said I shall pass over the technical provisions except to answer questions which may be propounded to me by Members of the House with reference to them.

There are one or two matters which are contained in the bill concerning which I wish to speak briefly at this time and may, perhaps, speak again in relation to them. We made a provision providing for an increase in the salaries of certain higher officials of the Treasury Department. We did this because we found that in the last six years the personnel of the department in the upper divisions had almost entirely changed. The experienced men had withdrawn and gone into the commercial field where they could get better salaries. The turnover was immense. Men who received very small salaries were going before the Board of Tax Appeals and other courts against men who would get $50,000 and sometimes $100,000 out of a single case, cases that involved millions of dollars.

Mr. Nash, one of the head officials in the Treasury Department, who has this matter especially in hand, told us that the increases we have provided for would not require him, if they were preserved, to ask for any additional appropriations; that he would undertake to get along with fewer men if he could only keep the good men he had. The trouble was he could not keep them. I have been told that owing to the fact that these men have such an enormous number of cases to attend to—somewhere from 200 to 500 a month going up to the Board of Tax Appeals—they have been obliged to assign men who were inexperienced and did not have the necessary familiarity with the matter, with the result that in one case the Government probably lost somewhere from $300,000 to $500,000 because the case was not properly presented. So in the minds of the committee it appears it would be far cheaper to keep these good men and prevent this turnover.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman leaves that one subject will he yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman surely would not expect the Government to embark upon a policy of paying its officials salaries commensurate with the compensation that skillful attorneys receive who sit on the other side of the table from them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; and we have not—not a tenth part.

Mr. BLANTON. We have prosecuting attorneys on the other side of the table from attorneys who receive several hundred times as much compensation, and that has always been the fact existing in Government business.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. All the committee wants to do——

Mr. BLANTON. The Government can only expect its officials to do their duty based upon loyalty and nothing else—not upon compensation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It can not keep them where outside parties offer more. All the committee desired was that they be paid salaries which would keep men who were competent to handle the cases, and the commissioner believes if the provisions of the bill were granted it could be done.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Did the committee retain the provision which was put in the last revenue bill preventing ex-officials of the department from practicing before the department within two years after their resignations?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no change in this bill, so that would remain.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In a test case the Supreme Court recently handed down a decision fixing the statute of limitations as to the collection of claims, and I understand the Government will lose several millions of dollars under that decision. What was the cause of the delay in the department in fixing the tax in so many cases?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Of course, I do not know definitely to what case the gentleman refers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The lighterage case.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, that is taken care of in this bill. However, I will say this, that many of the delays in the department are caused far more by the taxpayers than

they are by the Treasury itself. The taxpayers get additional time, and the Treasury Department officials took a different view of the law than the Supreme Court, I presume, believing that they would be safe.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In the meantime the statute of limitations ran.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. So the Supreme Court held.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit, I would make the suggestion that if the gentleman from New York will get the document referred to by the chairman, the report of the advisory committee, or, rather the staff of the joint committee, he will find an admission on the part of the Treasury Department that they have been very inefficient in administering this, and I think that is one of the reasons we lost this money.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not disposed to agree with statements made by the gentleman from Texas generally, and in that particular case I certainly do not agree with him. I should have thought myself that the Treasury Department was correct in its construction of the law, but the Supreme Court held differently.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Did I understand the gentleman to say it is the intention of Mr. Nash to conduct his office now with fewer men in the event we pass the proposed increase in salaries?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He told the committee that he would ask no additional appropriation, and that if he could keep competent employees he could get along with fewer men.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It seems to me that would conflict with the statement made by the gentleman that some of these men have several hundred cases to attend to, which means that they must sometimes assign inexperienced men to handle some of the cases. I do not see how the gentleman is going to reconcile his two statements.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do you think if we have less competent men they will be able to dispose of as many cases as more competent men? Certainly not; if the older men down there—the men familiar with these matters and best able to deal with them—remain, they will dispose of more cases than if such men leave and new men have to be brought in. What Mr. Nash contended was that he was going to lose these experienced men unless the salaries were increased.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JONES. What limitation is placed in the law in reference to additional assessments on individuals in later years? For instance, up until the last two or three years there was no limitation on the time within which an additional assessment might be made by the Government when they reviewed a man's returns; and later I think they put on a limitation of three or four years. I think this was in the bill of last year or the year before. Is that provision retained in this bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not entirely. There is a limitation of three years under the provisions of this bill applicable to the taxes from now on; and the old law stands as to prior taxes.

Mr. JONES. I will say in that connection that for some time there was a great deal of complaint on the part of taxpayers because they would make payment of their taxes and then some two or three years later some special representative would come along and assess additional taxes, and then maybe some other man would come along two or three years later and again assess additional taxes, and the taxpayer would never know when he was through paying his taxes for a specific year, because all of these three or four reviews would be of the same year.

An effort was made a time or two in the enactment of the law to provide that the taxpayer would some time or other know when he was through paying taxes; of course, in the absence of any fraud or deception.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He does now, and did under the last revenue bill. Three years is the limit under this bill, and as to former taxes, it stays the same that it was before.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will state to the chairman that I have not had time to read all the provisions of the bill, and I have had a number of inquiries from my constituents who have written me and whose letters I found when I reached here upon the convening of Congress. I heard the gentleman state there was a reduction in the corporation taxes, and I want to ask if that was made applicable in this bill to 1927?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; applicable to the taxes of 1927 payable in 1928.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The people who wrote me desired that that should be done.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does that apply to individual taxes?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no change as to individual incomes, but we used the same principle in the last bill when we reduced the tax on individual incomes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I notice the bill reduces taxes on automobile chassis and bodies to 1½ per cent, and there is excepted from the law automobile truck chassis and bodies.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is the same as the present law.

Mr. DENISON. We have removed the tax on all common carriers except automobile busses. Did the committee have that in mind, and did the committee intend to retain the tax on automobile busses alone among all the common carriers?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What the committee intended to do and did do was to cut the rate in half and leave the other provisions just as they were.

Mr. DENISON. So that now we only tax one common carrier and that is the automobile bus. We have removed the tax from all other common carriers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, that was done by the last bill.

Mr. DENISON. I was not raising the point as to when it was done, but I wanted to know if that was the intention of the committee originally, and if the committee still intends that it shall remain that way.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly, the committee intended that or it would not leave it that way in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Aside from the lowering of the percentage of the levy on corporations is any relief given to small corporations?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The only relief given to small corporations is to increase the exemption $1,000. This amounts to practically nothing to the large corporations, but does help the small corporations.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is no other relief, aside from that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And, of course, the lowering of the general tax, that is all.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. What was the attitude of the committee meeting the objection concerning the payments or collections on installment business? I have not been able to get quite clearly from your report how you met that proposition.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not state it any better than it is stated in the report. It is an extremely technical provision, and if the gentleman will read the explanation in the report, I am sure he will understand it.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Will the gentleman kindly give us the reason the committee did not follow the recommendations of the administration on the reduction of rates for the middle brackets?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The reason we did not do that was because we thought the proper line or curve of the gradation of the surtaxes is in the law now and that if we changed those rates in the middle brackets it would also affect those of the higher brackets, reducing the taxes on the higher incomes inevitably—that is, reduce the amount of taxes—although it does not reduce the rates above. On the whole the committee thought the rates ought to stand as they are.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Would it not have been more nearly just, perhaps, if the rates in the middle brackets had been heavier than those in the lower end of the brackets?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not think so. I think we have a very good schedule there as it its. This is my opinion, and I think it is the view of a majority of the committee.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for one additional question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman state about the amount that would be involved if automobile busses were excepted as well as automobile trucks?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I can not give that, but it would not be very much.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. There seems to be some complaint on the part of savings banks and others with reference to the exemption permitted building and loan associations.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman want to strike out that provision?

Mr. BURTNESS. No; but I want to ask the gentleman what was the appealing reason to the committee for retaining the

provision and not granting similar reductions for interest that may be received where the funds are used for some other purposes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We think that the building and loan associations are helpful to the people and induce them to deposit money.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And the banks make money.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. While the building and loan associations are not for profit, but only pay expenses.

Mr. BURTNESS. Another question in reference to women's organizations and hospital and some other organizations who are very anxious to have an exemption for single persons raised so it will be half as much as the exemption for the married persons with only a wife and no dependents.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am inclined to think the gentleman can answer that question as well as I. I think he can tell whether the expenses of a married couple are not more than double the expenses of a single man.

Mr. BURTNESS. I did not entertain the notion that a single person ought to have an exemption that would amount to as much as married men, but I was in hopes that the committee would make it half as much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The question of the simplification of the law was one that I was very much interested in, because I have heard so much criticism on account of its complexity. I have read with interest an article by the gentleman who now has the floor in regard to the difficulties of the elimination of provisions simplifying the law.

I want to call attention to this result of the law that came under my observation. I do not know whether it is due to the incompetency of the employees in the field or due to the uncertainty of the law. Last summer in my district there were four different individuals who came to me complaining about the fact that some representative of the department had been to see them with reference to the reassessment of their income tax, and this individual made a change of his figures three or four different times; one day it was one set of figures, and another day another, and another another.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That was one of the cases where the salary paid was not sufficient to get a competent man, but I think there will not be so much trouble in the future, because the audit is better kept.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know whether it was because the man was incompetent or whether it was due to the uncertainty of the law. It is unfortunate for the Government to send a representative who changed the amount three different times.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That will never be changed until we pay better salaries.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Section 104, dealing with the accumulation of surplus; does that provision in any way affect the situation where the earnings were used to pay stock dividends?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is nothing in the bill affecting stock dividends.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I have not been able to get the hearings, as they are not printed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; they are printed.

Mr. HUDSPETH. They are not available.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They are available to Members.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is there any change made in this bill from the bill passed three years ago, with reference to the exemption of married men?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Nothing whatever.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Was there any evidence before the committee in relation to it? Does not the gentleman think that an exemption of a married man with a family ought to be raised to $5,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the exemptions are quite large enough now. I think we have provided liberally for married men.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Was there any evidence before the committee regarding the exemption for married men and raising that exemption in order that they may live and support their families?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Two million three hundred thousand taxpayers were taken off of the list by increased exemptions in the present law. We have got the law now so that a very small proportion of our total population pays any income tax whatever.

Mr. HUDSPETH. A married man has an exemption of $3,500, but owing to the high cost of living and the other expenses he is obliged to submit to, does not the gentleman think the exemption should be raised to $5,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A poor man pays no tax.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Well, but the man who pays the tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Up to $5,000 a married man does not pay a tax that amounts to anything.

Mr. HUDSPETH. He does over $3,500. He has an exemption of only $3,500.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but it is very little that he pays.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Can the gentleman state what proportion of the total population paid individual income taxes? He just mentioned a moment ago that a very small proportion of the population pay income taxes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not give the gentleman the figures offhand. I will get them later on.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think it would be interesting to know.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, is this bill designed to consume all of the surplus predicted for the end of this year and the next?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. It is hoped that this bill will not consume all of the surplus. So far as the surplus for this fiscal year is concerned, we will have quite a large amount at the end of it for the reason that less than half of the reductions apply to this fiscal year. Consequently we will have quite a large surplus for the fiscal year 1928. There is no way of avoiding that.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. How is that to be used?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That will be applied toward extinguishment of the national debt. For 1929 there will be some surplus, but the provisions of the bill do not in any way include anything for extraordinary expenses, like flood control, Muscle Shoals, Boulder Dam, farm relief, new cruisers, and all sorts of things that I might mention, some of which will probably be granted considerable appropriations. We had to leave a margin for those matters.

Mr. PEERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PEERY. Has any change been made with reference to taxing the surplus of corporations allowed to accumulate beyond the reasonable need of the corporation?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We undertake to reach that by a new provision in the bill, which I shall explain especially when we get to that part of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Was there any change made in the law with reference to exemption from income tax for mutual benefit associations—that is, community affairs—where they assess in case of death, just so much?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no change in that respect; no, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now arise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. Some time ago the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] at the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asked unanimous consent that House bill No. 1 be printed in the RECORD. Since then the Chair has been informed by the Public Printer that it would be physically impossible not only on account of the size of the bill, but the type in which it is printed to print it in the RECORD. The Chair has spoken to the gentleman from Texas about it, and he is willing to have the proceedings vacated.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings with reference to printing the bill in the RECORD be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. FREE, a Representative from the eighth district of California, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath prescribed by law.

REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] if we can not agree upon a limitation of general debate. I have not had many requests for time.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let us close general debate to-morrow.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to the bill, that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and myself and that general debate be closed not later than the close of the session to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate on the House bill No. 1 be confined to the bill, that the time be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], and that debate shall be concluded when the House adjourns to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question for my own information. I have no objection to vacating the order to print the revenue bill in the RECORD. It is a long bill, and I understood that one reason was on account of the type that it is printed in.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was informed that it was not in the usual type that these bills are printed in and that it would be impossible to get it on the linotype machine?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The titles and subtitles are totally different.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I merely wanted it printed in the RECORD so that the people of the country could read it so that it could go into the different congressional districts.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD upon an amendment that I propose to offer to the pending revenue bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, at the proper place, when the revenue bill is under consideration, I propose to offer an amendment in the following manner.

On page 26, after line 11, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(r) Medical, surgical, hospital, or funeral expenses: The actual and necessary expenses paid by the head of a family for himself or for any dependent member of the family, including only spouse or children, for medical, surgical, hospital, or funeral services, not exceeding $1,000 for any individual person in any separate tax year, all such payments to be allowed and deducted only at the usual and ordinary rates in such cases; and the commissioner is empowered to judge as to the reasonableness of any such charges under the facts and circumstances of particular cases.

This same idea has been advanced by me during the consideration of the two preceding revenue bills, and my conviction of its justice and righteousness has increased with the passage of time and with further reflection and consideration.

My efforts along this line were called to the attention of the South Carolina Medical Society by Dr. J. W. Jervey, an eminent physician, of Greenville, S. C., and that body, during its last meeting, heartily indorsed the proposal. Thereafter the same thought was brought to the attention of the American Medical Association by Dr. E. A. Hines, of Seneca, S. C., and that body at its session in May, 1927, at Washington, D. C., took the following action:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL SESSION HELD AT WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16–20, 1927

(From page 38 or 527)

Resolutions on income-tax exemptions

Dr. E. A. Hines, South Carolina, read the following resolutions, which were referred to the reference committee on miscellaneous business:

"Whereas when the last two revenue bills were pending in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress two years ago and four years ago, respectively, Hon. J. J. McSWAIN, of South Carolina, offered amendments providing and stipulating that any taxpayer should be privileged to deduct from his income his expenses for himself and family incurred from medical treatment, surgical operations, and hospital and funeral expenses, and medical treatment to include professional service, nurse hire, and drugs; and

"Whereas the reason for this exemption is stronger than the present exemption permitted for losses by fire and storm, and the breaking and wearing out of machinery and bad debts, inasmuch as the human body is the greatest factor in the earning of income, and the expense of keeping it in good order, and of correcting disorder should, in good conscience and sound logic, be legally deductible; and

"Whereas the only argument made against the amendment was that it might lead to fraud on the Government, though the same argument could be made as against all deductions now allowed even with greater force, for no man could falsify his return by claiming that he had an operation or a death in his family, and even a claim of medical services, including drugs and nurse hire, could be so easily checked that fraud would be impossible: Now it is

"*Resolved*, That the South Carolina Medical Association by its house of delegates in convention assembled does hereby memorialize and pray the house of delegates of the American Medical Association to adopt resolutions indorsing this proposed amendment to the United States revenue bill relating to income taxes and to take immediate steps to invoke the interest and indorsement of every constituent State medical association for this important movement, urging each such association, and through it each county association, to adopt strong resolutions of indorsement and to advise its respective State Congressmen of its action: And be it further

"*Resolved*, That the delegates from the South Carolina Medical Association to the American Medical Association are hereby instructed to present the preamble and resolutions to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at its coming meeting in Washington, D. C., and to make every effort to have inaugurated and prosecuted the suggested movement for the attainment of the ends hereinbefore set forth."

Report of reference committee on miscellaneous business. (Taken from page 52)

SEC. 3. Your committee feels that the preamble and resolutions introduced by Dr. E. A. Hines, South Carolina, with respect to income-tax exemptions, is of sufficient importance to warrant careful and favorable consideration by the Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association, and it recommends that the board of trustees transmit these resolutions to the constituent State associations for action. (38.)

Respectively submitted,

ALBERT SOILAND, *Chairman*.
T. O. FREEMAN.
S. M. BLACKSHEAR.
D. E. SULLIVAN.
CHARLES O'DONOVAN.

On motion of Doctor Soiland, duly seconded and carried, section 3 of the report, recommending that the resolutions on income-tax exemptions introduced by Dr. E. A. Hines, South Carolina, be referred to the board of trustees, was adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on account of my health, being confined in a hospital, I was unable to come to Washington before the beginning of the session of Congress, and, therefore, unable to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means while it had under consideration the pending revenue bill. When the amendment heretofore offered along this line and under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the opposition to the amendment was based upon the statement that the provision would be impracticable and unworkable and would lead to fraud and to the causing of additional expense in the collection of taxes. I do not recall to have ever heard any argument in opposition to the merits of the proposition. Accordingly, on December 7, 1927, I sent a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, asking him to express an opinion as to the workability and practicability of such a provision in the law, if enacted by Congress.

I asked the Secretary for an immediate reply, assuming that it was a very small proposition and that he could immediately detail two or three experts to go over the proposition and that they could come to a conclusion in a very short while and could write up their conclusions and send them to me by a messenger, so that I could have received the answer by this time. I regret to say that I have yet received no answer from the Secretary of the Treasury, and think that the proposition is more complex and difficult than I had assumed. I here insert the letter for the information of the House:

DECEMBER 7, 1927.

Hon. ANDREW W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please be advised that I propose to offer as an amendment to the pending revenue bill the inclosed typewritten matter.

I wish to ask you to advise me immediately—the very day that you receive this letter if possible—if, in your opinion, there is any unusual and special difficulty in the administration of such a provision. I am not asking your opinion as the advisability or justice or merit of the proposal. I am merely asking for your expert opinion as to its workability and practicability.

It seems to me, I respectively submit, that it is susceptible of very much easier administration than such provisions as business expenses, business losses, bad debts, depreciation in value, depletion of mineral

deposits, and expenses in case of casual sales of real estate. There are elements of uncertainty and difficulty of proof in the particulars just mentioned.

But in the case of the proposed deduction for medical, surgical, hospital, or funeral services it is only a matter of producing a receipt to show that the money was paid. In order to prevent unreasonable charges, it is provided that the charges must be the usual and ordinary rates, and the commissioner is empowered to decide the facts of the reasonableness or unreasonableness of any charge under the facts and circumstances of any particular case. This will prevent anything like collusion between the taxpayer and the physician, surgeon, hospital, or mortician. Of course, if there should be such a case of collusion, it is made a criminal offense and penalized accordingly under the general provisions of the law, constituting a conspiracy to defraud the Government.

I therefore respectively submit that from the point of view of administration the proposal is workable. I am respectfully asking your opinion, and should your opinion differ from mine I shall be very glad for you to state the reasons for your conclusions.

Again respectfully requesting an immediate reply, as the bill is now under consideration, I am,

Yours very respectfully,

J. J. McSWAIN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 10, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

190. A letter from the chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the forty-first annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Expenditures.

191. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting report of inspectors who investigated the burglary of the post office at Kearney, Nebr., and the claim of the acting postmaster for credit on account of loss sustained by such robbery, September 23, 1926, in the sum of $17,204.83; to the Committee on Claims.

192. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting report of inspectors who investigated the burglary of the post office at Pawtucket, R. I., on February 1, 1926, and the claim of the postmaster for credit on account of loss sustained in the sum of $225.231.86; to the Committee on Claims.

193. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting report of inspectors who investigated the burglary of the post office at Fort Collins, Colo., and the claim of the postmaster on account of loss sustained by the robbery, July 24, 1927, in the sum of $34,934.90; to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4821) granting a pension to Sarah G. Graveline, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 6637) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 6638) granting the consent of Congress to the Randolph Bridge & Terminal Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6639) granting the consent of Congress to the Centennial Bridge Co. of Independence, Mo. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6640) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at La Grange, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6641) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Hallettsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6642) for the erection of a public building at Kaufman, Kaufman County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6643) for the erection of a public building at Wills Point, Van Zandt County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6644) for the erection of a public building at Mineola, Wood County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6645) for the erection of a public building at Athens, Henderson County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6646) for the erection of a public building at Henderson, Rusk County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 6647) to credit the crews of the U. S. S. *Harvard* and U. S. S. *Yale* with services performed during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6648) to control the distribution of military arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 6649) to amend paragraph 4 of section 308 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6650) to amend the World War veterans' act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6651) to exempt the constructing quartermaster at the Military Academy from the laws governing employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6652) to fix the pay and allowances of chaplain at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) to authorize appropriations for pay of the Military Academy to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6654) to authorize the United States Military Academy to make expenditures without advertising; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) to authorize the transfer of surplus materials for construction of buildings at West Point; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEGER: A bill (H. R. 6656) to regulate working conditions in the custodial service in the District of Columbia and in the field, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 6658) to amend an act entitled, "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting the salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 6659) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) to amend subdivision (c) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) to amend subdivision A of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) to amend certain sections of the immigration act of 1924; to the committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 6663) to regulate exhibition flights by the Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6664) to establish a woman's bureau in the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6665) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 6666) to increase the minimum salary of deputy United States marshals to $2,000 per annum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6667) to repeal the so-called flexible tariff provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 6668) authorizing appropriations for construction of a highway in the Hawaiian Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 6669) fixing the salary of the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 6670) to tender the thanks and appreciation of the Congress of the United States for heroic service rendered by the officers and crews of the steamships *President Roosevelt*, *President Harding*, *American Trader*, *Republic*, and *Cameronia*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) to create a board of industrial adjustments and to define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) to permit certain aliens to proceed to the United States when annual quota for certain groups has not been exhausted in year immediately preceding; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) to amend the United States Judicial Code and to prescribe a penalty for encroaching on or restricting the constitutional right of freedom of worship or religious belief or conviction of faith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) to provide commutation of transportation on common carriers for certain persons traveling thereon for the sole purpose of visiting war veterans in hospitals, sanitariums, or similar institutions; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6676) to provide a means of recognizing heroic conduct, devotion to duty, and skill in upholding the high traditions of the United States merchant marine, on the part of the officers and crews of the steamship *Republic*, the steamship *President Harding*, and the steamship *American Trader;* to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 6677) to establish a fish hatchery in Chicot County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6678) to establish a fish hatchery in Hempstead County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6679) to amend the first paragraph of section 24 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6680) to amend section 1 of the interstate commerce act, as amended by the transportation act of 1920, and expressly recognizing the jurisdiction and power of the several States to regulate intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6681) to prevent the sale of cotton in future markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 6682) for the acquisition of lands for an addition to the Bessey Nursery, Nebraska National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6683) to protect trade-marks used in commerce, to authorize the registration of such trade-marks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 6684) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, relating to isolated tracts of public land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6685) to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6686) relating to the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 6687) to change the title of the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 6688) to amend the act entitled "World War veterans act, 1924," as amended, approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6689) for the purchase of additional ground and the enlargement of the Federal building at Savannah, Ga., or the purchase of a new site and the erection of a new Federal building at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULMER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) for the amendment of the act of March 3, 1927, by authorizing an annual appropriation to carry out the cooperative experiments contemplated by the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) declaring October 12 a legal public holiday, to be known as Columbus day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Resolution (H. Res. 50) directing the Speaker to appoint a committee to inquire into articles published by Admiral Magruder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, with reference to appropriations in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 6690) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 6691) providing for the examination and survey of Gloucester Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 6692) for the relief of George Patterson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) for the relief of Felix W. White; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) for the relief of Frank John Kazenski; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. Bachmann: A bill (H. R. 6695) granting a pension to Mary E. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Donley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) making Nancy J. Litman eligible to receive the benefits of the civil service retirement act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 6698) for the relief of William C. Schmitt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6699) for the relief of Catherine A. Lapp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6700) for the relief of William Meyer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) for the relief of David Dawson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 6702) granting a pension to Louisa Koons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 6703) for the relief of Mrs. Pasquale Nicolitti; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 6704) for the relief of Harry Pincus; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6705) for the relief of Clotilda Freund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 6706) to adjust the retirement pay of Edward L. Woodruff; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 6707) granting a pension to James Scanlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6708) granting a pension to Joseph Irving; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) granting a pension to Mary Goldberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) granting a pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6711) granting a pension to Caroline Healy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) granting a pension to Ida A. MacNish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6713) granting a pension to Gertrude Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) granting a pension to May C. Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) granting a pension to Flora Bell Beegle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) granting a pension to Annie E. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6717) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6718) granting a pension to Judson Heard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6719) granting a pension to Mike Bogovich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) granting a pension to Pabli Billi; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) granting a pension to Major Blasdel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) granting an increase of pension to August Naperstek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bolte; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6725) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hahn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) granting an increase of pension to Catharine L. Foote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6727) granting an increase of pension to Belle Dieter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6728) granting an increase of pension to Mary Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6729) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6730) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Flood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin J. Close; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6732) for the relief of Michael J. McNulty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6733) for the relief of Joseph McDonnell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6734) for the relief of Joseph W. Macnamara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6735) for the relief of Otto C. Fredericks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6736) for the relief of Richard T. Butler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6737) for the relief of Squire Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6738) for the relief of Michael Kelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6739) for the relief of Carl Siele; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) for the relief of Patrick Shaughnessy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6741) for the relief of Edgar S. Webb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6742) for the correction of the military record of Frank Johnston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6743) for the correction of the naval record of Morgan Wolcott; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) for the correction of the military record of Joseph N. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6745) to authorize the appointment of Joseph M. Berman to the grade of lieutenant commander, retired, in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 6746) granting a pension to Nina Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6747) for the relief of Nora Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 6748) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of C. W. King growing out of the death of his minor son, Carl Calder King; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6750) for the relief of Capt. J. Fleming Bel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6751) for the relief of John A. Woods; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6752) for the relief of Joseph L. Crowley; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6753) for the relief of Ambrose A. Campbell; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) for the relief of the city of Waynesboro, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) for the relief of Raymond L. Silva; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) for the relief of the lawful heirs of Francis M. Stone, of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) for the relief of W. C. Moye and Nannie Moye; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of John B. McLamb; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) for the relief of Samuel J. Graham; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) for the relief of Plezzie M. Wilson; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) for the relief of William L. Morris; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) for the relief of and granting compensation to Mrs. Arling Tootle, widow of deceased ex-service man; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) granting a pension to Florence Brunner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act to Melvin J. Oppenheim; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) granting a medal or other recognition to Arnold Irish, former quartermaster sergeant Company C, Ninth Infantry, United States Army, at Balangiga, Samar, P. I., September 28, 1901; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6766) to authorize the reappointment of George Edwin Penton as second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 6767) granting a pension to Julia A. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6768) granting a pension to Harry H. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6769) granting an increase of pension to Johnanna E. Mouser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6771) granting a pension to Edward Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6772) granting an increase of pension to Nellie B. Paddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6773) granting an increase of pension to Eva L. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6774) for the relief of Pitt Smith; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6775) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Fuqua; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 6776) for the relief of George Fischer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 6777) to authorize surveys, investigations, and the preparation of plans and estimates for construction for irrigation works on the island of Molokai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6778) granting a pension to Arthur V. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Gaston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6780) for the relief of David J. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 6781) for the relief of Ina Mae Elkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 6782) for the relief of George F. Newhart, Clyde Hahn, and David McCormick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 6783) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Cramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Dively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6786) granting an increase of pension to Annie McNamara; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6787) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Alley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6788) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Doss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYON: A bill (H. R. 6789) to correct the naval record of Simon A. Richardson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6790) granting an increase of pension to Lura E. Lathrop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6791) granting an increase of pension to E. Adelia Dann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6792) granting an increase of pension to Ursula R. Van Sice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of John Wesley Jones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 6794) granting a pension to Julia A. Foltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6795) granting a pension to Susie C. Bales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 6796) granting a pension to Phoebe Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6797) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McCord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6798) for the relief of Frank B. Lawton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6799) for the relief of Bertha Plummer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6800) granting an increase of pension to Magdelena Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6801) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Sanborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 6802) for the relief of the First National Bank of Junction City, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6803) for the relief of the First National Bank, El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6804) for the relief of the National Bank of Commerce, El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6805) for the relief of the Merchants & Farmers Bank, Junction City, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEERY: A bill (H. R. 6806) granting a pension to Samantha Elliott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 6807) granting a pension to Joseph Mielke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 6808) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda I. Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6809) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6810) granting an increase of pension to John C. Holsapple; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6811) granting an increase of pension to Dudley R. Sloan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6812) granting an increase of pension to Litia Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6813) granting a pension to Mary Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6814) granting a pension to James Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6815) granting a pension to Lula Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6816) granting a pension to Zelia Dixon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 6817) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6818) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 6819) granting a pension to Sara R. Brewster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 6820) granting a pension to Meta Sorenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6821) granting an increase of pension to Lena Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6822) granting an increase of pension to Jane Christian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6823) granting a pension to Mattie M. Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 6824) granting a pension to Hannah M. Mattley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6825) granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6826) for the relief of M. W. Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6827) granting an increase of pension to Emily Mapes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6828) granting an increase of pension to Delia M. Storie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6829) granting an increase of pension to Bridget M. Brashna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6830) for the relief of Joseph J. McCallister; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 6831) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Wenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6832) granting a pension to Creed F. Casteel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 6833) granting an increase of pension to James H. McGlasson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 6834) granting an increase of pension to Mary DeRusha; to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6835) for the relief of William John Greaves; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6836) granting a pension to Charles H. Prescott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6837) granting an increase of pension to Philena Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6838) granting an increase of pension to Cyrena Younkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6839) to remove the charge of desertion against Irsael Brown and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 6840) granting a pension to Jack J. McLawhorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 6841) granting an increase of pension to Rockel Mydlorsch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6842) for the relief of Joseph F. Friend; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6843) for the relief of Arthur J. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

97. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., opposing the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

98. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition from firemen employed at Ellis Island power house, relative to an increase in salary; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

99. By Mr. GARBER: Resolution of the Central Chamber of Agriculture and Commerce, of Phoenix, Ariz., protesting against any legislative action having for its purpose restriction of immigration of Mexican common labor to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

100. Also, resolution of the chamber of commerce at Woodward, Okla., urging flood control of the Mississippi River and its tributaries and turn the storm waters of the plains States from a liability into an asset; to the Committee on Flood Control.

101. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by citizens of Neligh, Nebr., and vicinity, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill or any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath or any resolution that would suggest such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

102. By Mr. KERR: Petition of the chamber of commerce and radio broadcasting committee of Raleigh, N. C., and the mayors of the following towns and cities, Woodland, Kinston, Rich Square, Windsor, Roanoke Rapids, La Grange, Tarboro, and Scotland Neck, in respect to the broadcasting station at Raleigh, N. C., operated by the Durham Life Insurance Co., Durham, N. C.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

103. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

104. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of New York State Farm Bureau Federation, indorsing the proposals of the American Cyanamid Co. for the lease of the Government properties at Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

105. By Mr. THOMPSON: Resolutions of the County Corn Borer Association, of Paulding County, Ohio, approving the attempts to control the corn borer; indorsing a 98 per cent

clean-up where infestation is 1 per cent; suggesting that more of the appropriations available be paid to farmers who do the work, less for impracticable machinery; urging adequate compensation for farmers in quarantine district for losses incident to campaign; requesting greater tariff protection on farm products; and asking for reduction of freight rates on farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, *December 10, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thy presence, O God, is meant to enrich and beautify all life. We praise Thee that the light of Thy Providence folds us in its sure embrace. Thy power is all about us. We breathe Thy air, we are warmed by Thy sun, we are awed by Thy glory, and we are kept by Thy daily care. We recall memories which we can not define and satisfactions which we can not analyze; yet we bless Thee. Clothed with the insignia of a great responsibility, God forbid that we should be untrue to our best selves. If greed and injustice exist, may it be said that they exist in defiance of our cherished principles. By fortitude, by patience, by a conscientious devotion to our country's welfare, help us to discharge the supreme claims which are upon us. Make our understanding a fortress safe and secure. Oh, may we give ourselves up to Thy wise and gentle guidance, through Christ.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECESS

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, we are honored to-day in having as a visitor in the Capitol a distinguished young American who has thrilled the world by a notable achievement. I refer to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh. [Applause.] In order that the membership of the House may have the privilege of meeting Colonel Lindbergh, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker, and that the Speaker appoint a committee of two to wait upon Colonel Lindbergh and escort him to the Hall of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, to escort Colonel Lindbergh to the Hall of the House.

Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess.

DURING THE RECESS

Mr. TILSON and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee escorted Colonel Lindbergh to the well of the House.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen and gentlewomen of the House, I have the extreme pleasure now of presenting to you America's most attractive citizen. [Prolonged applause.]

Colonel Lindbergh assumed a stand on the Speaker's rostrum, and the Members and officials of the House were presented to him by Mr. TILSON.

AFTER THE RECESS

At 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR FOR COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, there is only one more honor that this House can do to that lovable young man who has just been our guest, and that is at this time to pass the bill conferring upon him the Congressional Medal of Honor. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, United States Army Air Corps Reserve, for displaying heroic courage and skill as a navigator, at the risk of his life, by his nonstop flight in his plane, the *Spirit of St. Louis*, from New York to Paris, France, on May 20, 1927, by which he not only achieved the greatest individual triumph of any American citizen but demonstrated that travel across the ocean by aircraft was possible.

The SPEAKER. The bill is passed. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 36

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. WALTER W. MAGEE, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 37

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. LADISLAS LAZARO, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 38

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. M. E. CRUMPACKER, late a Representative from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 39

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. WILLIAM N. VAILE, late a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CRUMPACKER

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an article from the Boston Transcript of August 8, 1927, regarding my deceased colleague, the late Representative MAURICE EDGAR CRUMPACKER, of Portland, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Boston Transcript of August 8, 1927:

The sudden passing on of MAURICE EDGAR CRUMPACKER, of Portland, Oreg., Congressman, in late July, was a tragedy and a calamity. It was inexplicable to those who did not know the inside man. He was in his forty-first year. He had served one term in Congress. There his father had served before him, though from Indiana, where the family then lived. Hence the younger Crumpacker did not go to Washington as Congressman as a stranger. He knew the town. He was educated at the grade schools at Valparaiso, in Indiana, and the District of Columbia and at Culver. He was graduated from the University of Michigan. There he was a greater athlete than student. This is no reflection on his academic standing, for he is remembered there as one of its great figures on the gridiron. For wherever "Stub," so known because of his thick-knit build, saw virile life, there it was his nature to plunge in, head over heels. He was as much at home in a scrimmage as a young lawyer in an empty office, where the footprints of a client on the mat before the door provoke the same thrill as when Mr. R. Crusoe discovered the tracks of the savage, "Friday," upon his bathing beach.

CRUMPACKER was graduated at the Harvard Law School in 1912. He opened an office in Portland, Oreg. There his capacity was recognized. He was made special deputy district attorney. He was a captain in the World War. He was elected to Congress in 1924. His plurality was decisive. Even his neighbors voted for him. This is the last, hardest vote to win in a world which the Episcopal ritual intimates abounds in envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. So do they vote for another Congressman, of Gloucester, in Massachu-

setts, a race of fishermen, who is a St. Andrew, preeminent for his big hauls at the polls. Likely CRUMPACKER would have gone to the Senate. A wife and three young sons survive him.

While the life of CRUMPACKER was short as measured in years, it was long as measured by substantial accomplishment. In Congress he was a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which the noted Mr. DEMPSEY, of Lockport, N. Y., is chairman. The merits of the positions which CRUMPACKER pressed in Congress were augmented by his personal charm, when others in this way less gifted than he would have made less progress with them. While in an estimate of the man this substantial accomplishment is recognized, it is not emphasized. This is not only because there are others in Congress who stand up to this test, and so he is not unique, but it is also because he was in another way preeminent and alone and as such only to be understood.

CRUMPACKER qualifies for a New England weekly, first because of his three years' residence in Cambridge at the law school. Then he came to be known by men prominent thereabouts to-day. These he held in strong bonds. For to see him was to fancy him. On his part, he wound his tentacles around the hearts of those who crossed his path. To them his loss to-day is almost as one of their own kin. CRUMPACKER again qualifies in a New England weekly because of his appearance before the Middlesex Club in the spring of 1925. He was the oasis of that dinner to all, whether they looked for the solidity of foundation matter or for the lighter touch of the turrets. To do this was to do much, for at the Middlesex Club, since the days of Sam Powers, of versatility and wit, and of the student, Louis Arthur Coolidge, the best talent of the country has appeared. President Proctor, who has kept the pace, will tell you this of CRUMPACKER, whether you ask him or not. Then CRUMPACKER sat for me, my first Washington portrait. This I was asked to do because of that dinner. I remember his caution: "Don't make your vivid colors of me that of a comedy."

CRUMPACKER, besides his substantial qualifications, was an entertainer, not the product of artifice, but so born. It was unavoidable. Nevertheless, he was keenly sensitive to its political dangers, from the days it destroyed Sunset Cox and defeated Job Hedges for Governor of New York. So he put the entertainer in his proper place. So this never jeopardized his political position. And one who has the power of amusement and controls it is greater than he who taketh a city. This CRUMPACKER did, but cheer oozed out of his system and made very many people very happy. He was an adept at the piano, which augmented his efficacy as an entertainer. There his fingers reached out into the top octaves with the same facility as those of a child in a large family for the too scarce cream at breakfast. He did not dissipate his energies on fugues in B minor, such as satiate the pretended tastes of many at Symphony Hall, but he was human enough to cling to the stuff that cheers those who propose to be honestly happy. All remember, now with peculiar significance, his greatest song, a tonic to the tired, Rolling to the Sea. So far this is the story of CRUMPACKER as known to many men; that is, to those who thought they knew him. Now, the key to the inside CRUMPACKER.

The following anecdote may not have been heard by some one, somewhere, for some time. It seems to fit. A depressed man once sought an appointment with a neurologist. No one should do this who has not a fair control of his trouble, for this branch of the profession, as yet, sails in seas pretty much uncharted. "I can not give you an appointment this side of a week," his secretary said. "I can wait a month," the sufferer replied. The secretary marveled at his patience. The sufferer continued: "Yours is a 10-year cure, I know, if at all. With an annual salary, a month looks small." When they met, the neurologist, after some sparring, said, "Why not read Jones; he is a great spreader of cheer?" "I am Jones," said the sufferer. The neurologist finds his hayfields often among those who entertain others. This is the key to the inside CRUMPACKER.

CRUMPACKER was looked upon by most men at the risk of the tenth commandment. This is an often and easy mistake in the contrasts of life, when men forget that they see only the show side of those whom they think more fortunate than themselves. For could those who people the streets be seen as they are, then would walk there often not men and women but heroes and heroines. The only sure test of anyone is to see him in his own house, alone with his own family, where only is he himself. There he is often an extra tire, though he may be the life of the clubhouse. There, on the other hand, he may be vital to happiness, though an unsought hermit in public places. The home life of CRUMPACKER could not have been more sympathetic—they with him, he with them.

CRUMPACKER was apparently a synonym of life worth while. He was, in fact, a productive member of the community. He was beyond money cares. He had, apparently, health, and was apparently the first man made without a nervous system. To get to the essence of the man as he appeared to the bleachers of life, it is a temperate statement that there has been no man in Congress who has added more to its cheer, and it was apparently automatic and not the product of a forced draft. Civilization is under a great, too often forgotten obligation to this class, for the ponderous too often precede in the distribution of its prizes. Such men as CRUMPACKER lift men out of the shadowed valleys of discouragement in which life abounds up onto the mountains of hope, sunlit by their cheer. This is seen in the city of Worcester in that brilliant raconteur, Mr. William Bacon Scofield, to the discriminating its most vital citizen. There was no man in Congress more sought by the most sought for than CRUMPACKER, by such men as LONGWORTH; ROBERT BACON, a brother of Jamaica Plain's own pride, Gaspar Bacon; and RICHARD ALDRICH, a son of former Senator Nelson W. Aldrich. With these men he often played golf or walked in Rock Creek Park on Sunday. He was the axis about which his associates revolved.

CRUMPACKER was, apparently, the concentrated essence of vigor and vivacity, whether in hours of avocation, in "shorts," or in the lobby of the House. This is, however, a high-priced commodity to those who have it in the market of life. This price CRUMPACKER paid. He went to bed a debtor to his nervous system. His nervous account was overdrawn. While he sowed cheer, like many others, he reaped little in his last years. His deposits were scarce, for he gave more than he got, because of his disability. By the law of averages and the swinging of the pendulum, as those who knew tell us, the heights which he attained in the spreading of cheer when spurred by society he paid for in the depths which he reached when alone with himself. It was the same way with Lincoln, whose sense of humor, however, carried his load, where that of CRUMPACKER could not because of the burden. The growing trouble which he had long mastered then mastered him. At the end, his last Sunday, he knew not what he was or where he was, and so he died as irresponsible and innocent, in the manner of his death, as though from the disabilities of old age.

Of such was CRUMPACKER. In him the House has lost not only a Member of performance, who did much in his first term, and of promise, but also one who as a spur to the spirit of its Members is unsurpassed in its history. This is a too scarce quality in days when accomplishment is happily almost commonplace. CRUMPACKER loved life. Life loved CRUMPACKER. In him life and death were never set off in contrast more sharp. He will live among his associates more vividly than many who remain. He died, and a host long will mourn him. It is a wise man who sets his heart not on health, wealth, or fame but on affection. This CRUMPACKER had. This he reciprocated at home and abroad. Requiescat!

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD—AUTOMOBILES FOR THE NAVY

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes, in order to make a correction in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, some one has introduced a bill, and has signed my name to it, which, if enacted into law, would allow the Secretary of the Navy to buy for every officer of the Navy, a Cadillac, a Packard, or a Rolls-Royce automobile. Everyone knows that such an idea is foreign to that which would be expressed by me. I do not know who did this. I do not know where it came from. I never saw the bill before.

Mr. SNELL. Does it include Members of the House?

Mr. McCLINTIC. It refers only to the Navy. I feel that it is only due to myself to make the RECORD clear, so that in the future some one may not rise on some public platform and say of me: "Look here, he has introduced a bill that absolutely will teach the naval officers how to navigate automobiles rather than ships." [Laughter and applause.]

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that some of the naval officers ought to learn a little more about navigating ships. We all remember out on the California coast that $11,000,000 worth of vessels was destroyed because of bad operation, and down at Melbourne, Australia, a little over three years ago, in perfectly smooth water, a naval officer ran a destroyer into a fishing smack and sunk it. If I could have my way I would cause all of our destroyers to be taken out of their berths for 30 days each year in order to teach the naval officers how to operate them, rather than to give them automobiles, as this bill would do.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected so as to show that I did not introduce this piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why not ask unanimous consent that the bill be withdrawn?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I thank my colleague for the suggestion, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be withdrawn, so that if the real author wants to introduce such legislation he may do it in his own name.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to be withdrawn. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the privileges of the Whole House a matter of that great importance

ought not to stop with merely the denial by the gentleman from Oklahoma that he introduced any such bill. If somebody put in the hopper in the name of the gentleman from Oklahoma a bill without authority, the House ought to know something more about it, in my judgment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order——

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I will be satisfied with the granting of my request.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, if the gentleman is satisfied I am.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in pursuance of the order entered by the House yesterday, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before beginning the remarks I have planned upon the reductions in taxes and revenue in the pending bill, the reasons therefor and the limit to be placed upon the diminution of revenue, I will refer to some remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who had the floor last evening, lest from the general course of his remarks the impression might have been left upon the House that the Committee on Ways and Means in preparing and reporting the pending bill had been under the domination of the Treasury. It is important that the Treasury present its views, for the information and experience it has gained from the administration of the revenue laws, its contact with taxpayers, and the discovery of needed amendments make its conclusions and recommendations of the first importance. The public interest is represented by its experienced officials. But to the House is committed the responsibility of proposing revenue legislation, and it is our duty and responsibility, after due consideration, as representatives of the people who are taxed, to determine the policies to be pursued, the objects to be taxed, and the rates of such taxation. The committee gave the views of the Treasury careful and extended consideration. In matters of taxation the committee differed from the Treasury. The Treasury recommended a reduction of the corporation tax to 12 per cent. The committee cut the tax to 11½—a change in the recommendation. They recommended that corporations having $25,000 or less capital stock and not more than 10 stockholders should be allowed to report as individuals or partnerships. The committee rejected that. They also had a plan for the rearrangement of the so-called intermediate brackets of the surtax. We disagreed. They proposed an elimination of the estate tax. The committee retains the present law. They proposed the elimination of certain taxes on acceptances. We agreed with them on that. They proposed no reduction in the stamp tax. We propose to reduce the tax on the sale or transfer of capital stock from 2 cents to 1 cent, and to repeal the tax on sales on produce on exchanges. They proposed no reduction on admission and dues. We cut them in half. They proposed no reduction on automobiles. We cut that tax in half. That is, the committee after full and comprehensive consideration of the information presented from all sources on the conditions of trade and business reached its own conclusion and make in the pending bill a report of legislation and adjustment of revenue in accordance with what it believed from the testimony and all the evidence available and from its former knowledge was to the best interests of the country and of the taxpayers. These reductions in revenue——

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will.

Mr. CRISP. I think the gentleman inadvertently made an incorrect statement relative to the tax on admissions. We did not cut it in half, but increased the exemptions from 75 cents to $1.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thank the gentleman for the correction. This item is estimated to earn for the Treasury $18,000,000 in 1928 and 1929. We raised the exemption on tickets, so that a ticket costing $1 or less will not be taxed. This will cause an estimated loss of revenue of $8,000,000—not quite one half. In order to ascertain how much the corporation tax should be reduced we took the estimates for the coming year 1928 and 1929 and found that on that basis each 1 per cent of the 13½ per cent of the tax was about $83,000,000 in taxes a year. We saw our way clear to reduce that tax 2 per cent, making it 11½ per cent. It reduced the corporation tax on that item $164,600,000. The Treasury had recommended relief for the smaller corporations and especially those coming in competition with individuals and partnerships. The committee rejected the Treasury recommendation, but raised the credit for the small corporations having $25,000 or less of annual income from $2,000 to $3,000. That accounts for another reduction of $12,000,000, making the total for corporations $176,600,000.

In addition to what was said by the chairman yesterday in defense of this action, I refer to three items. As to the corporations of the country, out of the 27,000,000 people who obtain their living by employment other than that of their own business, from 16,000,000 to 18,000,000 obtain it from employment arising out of corporate activities, and so any reduction in the burdens on the corporations that will promote their welfare will also directly and indirectly aid two-thirds of the wage earners of the United States.

There are 3,000,000 stockholders in the corporations of the country, and these 3,000,000 stockholders pay now 13½ per cent on part or all the money they receive as dividends from the corporations. It is paid before they get the dividends.

If a widow has an income of $1,000 from dividends received from a corporation, and that is her sole income, before she receives it $135 is deducted from it under the present law, and there will be $115 deducted from it under the pending bill; that is, that amount of tax is collectible on that amount of money distributed as dividends. A person having an income of $1,000 from other sources and having no other income pays no tax.

Furthermore, there are only 2,500,000 individual taxpayers left on the tax rolls who pay tax, and their average tax is only 4.2 per cent, and only 9,000 of them out of the 2,500,000 pay taxes equal to the corporation tax, and only then when their income is $110,000 or more. So manifestly an injustice has been done to business done in corporate form. We are attempting now to go part way in relieving or adjusting that inequitable distribution of the burden of taxation.

The next reduction was $8,000,000 on admissions and $5,000,000 on dues. Tickets costing $1 or less are to be tax free, while in existing law such exemption applies to tickets costing not to exceed 75 cents. This will take care of persons of ordinary means. They can get seats in the theaters or moving-picture houses where in some part of the house they can see any kind of performance that is put on the boards. Dues or fees not exceeding $10 per year are exempt from tax.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. In the matter of corporation taxes, before you leave that point, can you explain why you could not follow the Treasury recommendation on that?

Mr. HAWLEY. I have not the time just now; that will be discussed under the five-minute rule. It would take more time now than I have at my disposal to make an explanation of that.

We have cut the automobile tax, which is reduced from 3 per cent to 1½ per cent, by $33,000,000. We repeal the cereal-beverage tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent in the present law, since it was imposed in aid of prohibition enforcement, and it is not now needed for that purpose. We have imposed reduced rates in the wine taxes to the extent of $930,000 to place them on a parity with other similar products. On stamp taxes we have reduced the revenues by $11,800,000. This makes in all a reduction of $235,515,000.

In the working out of the administrative problem it was found that under the existing law, unless the tax is retained at the source, nonresident aliens and foreign corporations do not pay the amount of tax they ought to pay upon the sums which they receive, and an amendment is incorporated in the law requiring them to pay the amount intended that they should pay before the money leaves this country. If the money ever leaves the United States it is practically impossible to recover the tax. That involves an increase of $2,000,000 in the revenue.

We raise the tax on prize fights and such exhibitions to 25 per cent on admissions of $5 and over. This is not inteded to legalize prize fighting, but they exist under State law. They

are the source of considerable revenue and there is no reason why the Government should not tax them as a distinct luxury.

We have increased the annual tax on yachts and foreign-built boats contracted for after December 1, 1927, by $30,000.

In all we recover back by these additional taxes $2,780,000, making a net reduction of revenue in the bill $232,735,000, or $7,735,000 more than the Treasury proposes.

I insert here a table showing these changes for convenience in study:

Estimated loss in revenue

(Changes proposed by the revenue act of 1928)

Reductions:			
Corporations—			
Reduction in rate of tax—			
Estimated revenue under present law: 13½ per cent on all corporations except insurance; 12½ per cent on these corporations		$1,120,000,000	
Estimated revenue as proposed:			
Insurance	$18,400,000		
Other	937,000,000		
		955,400,000	
Loss		$164,600,000	
Increased credit (from $2,000 to $3,000 on corporations with net income of $25,000 or less)		12,000,000	
Total loss, corporations			$176,600,000
Admissions tax (increased exemption to $1 admission)			8,000,000
Dues tax (reduced from 10 to 5 per cent)			5,000,000
Automobile tax (reduced from 3 to 1½ per cent)			33,000,000
Cereal beverage tax (repealed)			185,000
Wine taxes (reduced rates)			930,000
Stamp taxes—			
Sale or transfer of capital stock (reduced from 2 cents to 1 cent)		$8,800,000	
Sales of produce on exchanges (repealed)		3,000,000	
			11,800,000
Total			235,515,000
Increases:			
Withholding of tax at source on tax-free covenant bonds (nonresident aliens and foreign corporations)		$2,000,000	
Prize fights (tax of 25 per cent on admissions of $5 and over)		750,000	
Foreign-built boats (increased annual tax on boats contracted for after Dec. 1, 1927)		30,000	
Total			2,780,000
Net loss in revenue			232,735,000

Less than half of this loss will be felt in the fiscal year of 1928, ending June 30 of that year. Consequently there will be a large surplus for that fiscal year which under the law will be applied to the public debt.

Now, the question arises, Why did the committee limit the amount of reduction as it has done? It is reported that there will be a surplus of $635,000,000 for the fiscal year 1927. Then, that being so, why not reduce the taxes $450,000,000 or $500,000,000? I think we will all agree that the Government should live from regular and recurrent sources if there is to be any stability in business or a healthful development of enterprise. The sudden fluctuation caused by increasing taxes one year to meet an unexpected deficit in the Treasury and lowering them another year, with no regularity or certainty as to what the taxes will be, would be a great detriment to business. Consequently, in the Committee on Ways and Means ever since tax reduction bills have been reported it has always been held in mind that the tax reduction should not exceed the surplus revenue from regular sources except that wherever we knew that there would be great resources, such as from the sales of war supplies, which were held by the Treasury in hundreds of millions of dollars immediately after the war, or where there would be great income from excess-profits taxes of previous years which were due but had not been and could not be collected on account of questions involving examinations or suits at law extending over many years, and where there were other sources of unusual revenue of large amounts, we did make reductions, where such sources existed, in excess of the surplus from ordinary receipts. It was expected that reduced taxes would stimulate business and industry, increasing taxable amounts, and so increase the receipts of revenue, and this occurred. We knew we could dispose of the war material, the Federal farm-loan bonds that the Government bought in order to prevent the Farm Loan Board from issuing separate securities under a Government agency at the time a Liberty bond drive was on, and also other properties held by the Treasury. We also knew that the expenses of government were being reduced.

But these unusual resources are practically exhausted. We are now dependent for surpluses available for tax reduction on the excess of ordinary receipts over expenditures. Governmental expenses have practically become stabilized, with a tendency toward increase owing to unusual conditions in the country such as floods. But we have had in mind that these unusual resources are largely capital assets—the last I have mentioned are capital assets—and that as such they are the cause of a part of the public debt of the United States and upon realization should be used in reducing the public debt.

In the last five years we have reduced the debt $2,000,000,000 from surplus revenues of all kinds. Of this $2,000,000,000, $1,700,000,000 was from nonrecurrent sources, and out of current revenues from regular sources there has been used in the last five years only $300,000,000 in the reduction of the public debt. Also out of this $1,700,000,000 received from other than regular sources and applied to the debt no less than $900,000,000 came from the sale of capital assets.

This reduction of $2,000,000,000 in the public debt during the past five years has reduced the interest charge more than $80,000,000 annually. This saving in interest payments has been a material factor in the surpluses on which tax reductions are based.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Capital assets and not taxes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; capital assets but not taxes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman spoke on January 14 last, as I recall, with reference to the reasons why taxes should not be reduced, making the same character of argument he is now making. If the gentleman will refer to his remarks he will see he said that if the bill I proposed were enacted into law they would have a deficit of $185,000,000 in this fiscal year, while it appears from the statement of the Treasury Department there is $455,000,000 in the Treasury as a surplus.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will come to that directly. There are no more Federal farm-loan bonds in the possession of the Treasury. There is only $4,000,000 worth left of surplus war materials. There can not be collected from back taxes, on the average, after the refunds have been deducted, over $50,000,000 a year hereafter, approximately $50,000,000 a year. The railroad securities, which were of large amount, have now been reduced to only $49,000,000, and these are the securities of the weaker roads, having only problematical value, so that no one knows what those $49,000,000 face value of securities will finally sell for. Consequently, we are down to this point, the extraordinary, irregular sources of revenue are dried up and practically all gone. The only one of any amount is the amount to be received from back taxes, and as some taxes due in one year are not for various reasons collected until another year we have an average of $50,000,000 a year that may be counted as a regular source of revenue. Payments received from foreign governments are included in regular receipts in the amount of approximately $200,000,000 yearly.

The Treasury estimates the net revenue from regular, recurrent sources to be $137,000,000 for the year 1928 and $199,000,000 for 1929. I append a table on this subject for the information of the House.

Principal receipt items of a nonrecurring or temporary type increasing the surplus in the fiscal years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928,[1] and 1929[1]

	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928[1]	1929[1]
Back income and profits tax collections[2]	$300,000,000	$300,000,000	$276,000,000	$295,000,000	$331,000,000	$280,000,000	$180,000,000
Less internal-revenue refunds	125,000,000	127,000,000	147,000,000	182,000,000	117,000,000	151,000,000	138,000,000
Net	175,000,000	173,000,000	129,000,000	113,000,000	214,000,000	129,000,000	42,000,000
Railroad securities, less railroad payments	[3] 14,000,000	58,000,000	136,000,000	36,000,000	89,000,000	169,000,000	24,000,000
Federal farm-loan bonds and other minor securities	46,000,000	9,000,000	19,000,000	34,000,000	63,000,000	1,500,000	5,000,000
War Finance Corporation assets	109,000,000	52,000,000	43,000,000	19,000,000	27,000,000		
Capital stock tax					8,000,000		
Sale of surplus war supplies	82,000,000	44,000,000	16,000,000	13,000,000	8,000,000	5,500,000	4,000,000
Navy oil judgment					[4] 5,000,000	13,000,000	
Total	398,000,000	336,000,000	343,000,000	215,000,000	414,000,000	318,000,000	75,000,000
Surplus	309,000,000	505,000,000	250,000,000	377,000,000	635,000,000	455,000,000	274,000,000
Surplus exclusive of above net receipts		169,000,000		162,000,000	221,000,000	137,000,000	199,000,000
Deficit exclusive of above net receipts	89,000,000		93,000,000				

[1] Estimated.
[2] Back income tax collections for fiscal years 1923 and 1924 are best available estimates. Figures of actual collections were not kept separate for those years.
[3] Excess payments.
[4] Exclusive of amount paid in Liberty bonds aggregating $5,500,000 principal amount.

For the fiscal year 1928 there will be revenues accruing before the reductions in this bill become effective which will provide for that year. But in 1929, with the unusual receipts, including back taxes, estimated at only $75,000,000, we have a different situation. The estimated excess of regular receipts are $199,000,000, to which may be added $50,000,000 of back taxes as a regular item. The surplus will be $249,000,000. There will be also $25,000,000 from irregular sources. The Bureau of the Budget, however, in its statement, made subsequent to the statement made by the Treasury, estimates that the amount of expenditures will be $22,000,000 more than the Treasury had contemplated. Consequently the surplus from regular sources will be $177,000,000, which, by adding $50,000,000 more, will make $227,000,000. So the proposed bill, with its $232,735,000 reduction, comes down pretty nearly to the line where the surplus will be exhausted. It is also necessary that there should be available an unobligated surplus. We practically exhaust in this reduction the surplus from regular sources of revenue. Future surpluses will depend upon the development of the country so increasing the taxable amounts and upon the increase of receipts from foreign governments.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asked me how there came to be this large amount of money in the Treasury for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentlemen have a copy of the report of the committee and will turn to page 8 [see table given above], they will find that for the year 1923, after deducting from the total surplus of revenue that from nonrecurrent or extraordinary sources, there was a deficit of $89,000,000; that is, if it had not been for these extraordinary sources of revenue the Government would have had a deficit of $89,000,000 that year. In 1924, after deducting receipts from extraordinary sources, the surplus was $169,000,000. In 1925, after deducting from the total surplus the amount of money received from the nonrecurrent sources, there was a deficit of $93,000,000—that is to say, the regular and recurrent sources were $93,000,000 less than the expenditures of that year. In 1926 the net surplus, subtracting from the total surplus the nonrecurrent receipts, was $162,000,000. In 1927 it was $221,000,000. In 1928 it was estimated there will only be $137,000,000, but we will have a surplus coming over from this year, as the chairman explained yesterday. In 1929 the Treasury estimates, after making these reductions, only $199,000,000 and the Bureau of the Budget estimates $177,000,000.

Now, a special drive was made by the Treasury to close up all the excess-profit tax years. They had been held up for a long period. They were unable to reach agreements, or reach settlements. Suits were pending. A special drive was made by the Treasury to collect the back taxes and bring the work up current, so that taxpayers would not have the right to complain that their cases were not promptly heard and promptly settled. As a result of that, in the year 1927, the amount obtained from nonrecurrent sources was $414,000,000, of which $214,000,000 was from back taxes—$331,000,000 collected less $117,000,000 refunds leaves a net of $214,000,000. After subtracting these unusual nonrecurrent receipts of $414,000,000 from the $635,000,000 total surplus, we have $224,000,000, practically the amount of the reduction proposed in the bill.

I am urging the House to consider, before it proposes to increase the amount of reduction, the fact that we are now down to the point where we do not have these adventitious receipts. We have disposed of them. We have paid them on the public debt, and every billion of dollars paid on the public debt is a saving of $40,000,000 a year to the taxpayers in interest, as that interest has to be paid out of taxes. Not one dollar of former surpluses has been wasted. Applied on the debt, they have directly aided in reducing the amount of taxes necessary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Treasury last year overestimated the receipts from taxes, and the only error there has been is in these nonrecurrent items.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I happen to have received this morning, as I think all the Members did, the daily statement of the United States Treasury for December 7, 1927. This shows that on that date the balance of cash on hand in the General Treasury of the United States was $23,878,282.62. So the surplus is not in the Treasury.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me call your attention also to this fact. Taking the combined surpluses for the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927, the total amount of those surpluses of all kinds was $2,079,000,000; but the receipts from nonrecurrent sources for the same years total $1,706,000,000. So that in those five years the aggregate surplus from normal or regular sources was only $373,000,000. I append a table giving this information in detail.

THE SURPLUS

Since 1920 each fiscal year has shown an excess in the ordinary receipts of the Government over expenditures chargeable against those receipts. This excess, called "the surplus," in the eight-year period since 1920 has totaled $2,692,000,000. For the fiscal year just passed it amounted to $635,000,000, the largest surplus in any one year from the operations of this Government. The following table presents the figures for each year since 1920:

Ordinary receipts and expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts, 1920 to 1926

[On basis of daily Treasury statements (unrevised)]

Fiscal year	Total ordinary receipts	Expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts	Surplus
1920	$6,694,565,388	$6,482,090,191	$212,475,197
1921	5,624,932,960	5,538,209,189	86,723,771
1922	4,109,104,150	3,795,302,499	313,801,651
1923	4,007,135,480	3,697,478,020	309,657,460
1924	4,012,044,701	3,506,677,715	505,366,986
1925	3,780,148,684	3,529,643,446	250,505,238
1926	3,962,755,690	3,584,987,873	377,767,817
1927	4,120,394,441	3,493,584,519	635,809,922

Given in millions of dollars, we have this comparison:

Surplus for:		
1923	$310,000,000	
1924	505,000,000	
1925	250,000,000	
1926	378,000,000	
1927	636,000,000	
		$2,079,000,000
Receipts from nonrecurrent sources:		
1923	398,000,000	
1924	336,000,000	
1925	343,000,000	
1926	215,000,000	
1927	414,000,000	
		1,706,000,000
Total surplus for five years from regular sources		373,000,000

We are not now legislating only for 1928 and 1929. This bill goes on the statute books as permanent legislation, unless it is changed for 1931, 1932, 1933, and subsequent years. When those years come there will be none of these unusual receipts to take the place of any failure in the current receipts.

We have been growing in this country, but there is a limit upon the growth of any country. Business expansion is assured only to the extent of the normal development of the country. Trading, if it grows faster than the normal development of the country, becomes topheavy and crises occur. We are proceeding in this bill on the supposition that the country will continue in a normal growth and that the foreign governments will continue to meet their payments. If we reduce the taxes too low, then there will come a time when there is a deficit in the Treasury and we will be asked in time of peace to either raise taxes or sell securities to obtain the necessary money.

RECEIPTS FOR 1926 AND 1927 COMPARED WITH ESTIMATES FOR 1928 AND 1929

For the information of the House there is given below a table showing the sources of the revenue, the receipts for 1926 and 1927, and the estimates of the Treasury for 1928 and 1929, if the present law were to remain in force. The action of the committee in making reductions was based upon the receipts and estimates given in the table.

Income for the fiscal years 1926 and 1927 compared with estimated income for 1928 and 1929

Sources of income	1926	1927	1928	1929
Corporations	$1,094,980,000	$1,308,013,000	$1,120,000,000	$1,120,000,000
Individuals	879,124,000	911,940,000	765,000,000	765,000,000
Back taxes	[1] 295,000,000	[1] 331,000,000	280,000,000	180,000,000
Estates	116,041,000	100,340,000	80,000,000	65,000,000
Alcoholic spirits	26,436,000	21,195,000	18,000,000	17,000,000
Admissions and dues	34,055,000	28,377,000	28,000,000	28,000,000
Tobacco	370,666,000	376,170,000	400,000,000	420,000,000
Automobiles	113,133,000	66,438,000	60,000,000	65,000,000
Small taxes			345,000	345,000
Stamp taxes, playing cards	54,014,000	37,345,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
Oleomargarine, etc	3,071,000	3,164,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Miscellaneous taxes	[2] 144,479,892	12,701,000	10,000,000	3,000,000
Total	2,835,999,892	2,865,683,000	2,803,545,000	2,705,545,000

[1] Back taxes for 1926 and 1927 were not segregated as separate items, but included in the corporation and individual items. But back taxes are segregated in the estimates for 1928 and 1929.

[2] This amount of $144,479,892 includes among other items the following:

Gift tax	$3,175,000
Capital-stock tax	97,386,000
Brokers	4,324,000
Other excise taxes	11,938,000

which were either discontinued or included in other items in subsequent years.

ESTIMATES FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1928 AND 1929 COMPARED WITH ACTUAL AMOUNTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1927

The following table summarizes cash receipts and expenditures during the fiscal year 1927 and the estimated receipts and expenditures for the fiscal years 1928 and 1929 on the basis of the latest information received from the Bureau of the Budget:

Summary of receipts and expenditures on the basis of daily Treasury statements (unrevised)

	Actual, fiscal year 1927	Estimated, fiscal year 1928	Estimated, fiscal year 1929
Net balance in the general fund at the beginning of fiscal year	$210,002,027	$234,057,410	$210,002,027
Receipts:			
Ordinary	4,129,394,441	4,075,598,091	3,809,497,314
Public debt	[1] 2,756,410,766	3,238,115,237	1,319,176,323
Total	7,095,807,234	7,547,770,738	5,338,675,664
Expenditures:			
Ordinary	2,974,029,675	3,085,129,211	3,015,333,637
Public debt chargeable against ordinary receipts	519,554,845	536,185,074	541,623,394
Other public debt	[1] 3,368,165,304	3,716,454,426	1,571,716,606
Net balance in the general fund at close of fiscal year	234,057,410	210,002,027	210,002,027
Total	7,095,807,234	7,547,770,738	5,338,675,664
POSTAL SERVICE			
Postal receipts	683,121,989	710,500,000	753,000,000
Postal expenditures	710,385,180	740,870,400	768,270,042
Deficiency in postal receipts [2]	27,263,191	30,370,400	15,270,042

[1] Other public-debt expenditures and public-debt receipts, as shown in this statement, are exclusive of $2,428,673,500 Treasury certificates issued and retired within the same fiscal year.

[2] The postal deficiency for 1927 and the estimated postal deficiencies for 1928 and 1929 are included in the ordinary expenditures shown above and in the general classification of ordinary expenditures and estimated ordinary expenditures on p. 31.

Nonrecurrent revenues have been an important factor in recent surpluses, as the following table indicates:

Fiscal year	Surplus	Recurrent income	Irregular or nonrecurrent income
1926	$377,000,000	$162,000,000	$215,000,000
1927	635,000,000	221,000,000	414,000,000
1928 (estimated)	455,000,000	137,000,000	318,000,000
1929 (estimated)	274,000,000	199,000,000	75,000,000
1929 estimate based on Bureau of the Budget's figures	252,000,000	177,000,000	75,000,000

These irregular and nonrecurring items are estimated to decline $96,000,000 in 1928 below the 1927 receipts, and $243,000,000 in 1929 below estimated receipts for 1928, leaving total receipts from these sources in that year (1929) of only $75,000,000.

Since 1920 surpluses have generally resulted because the reductions in expenditures have exceeded the reductions in receipts under the several revenue acts, because assets acquired during the war have been gradually disposed of and the moneys received therefrom covered into the Treasury, and because reductions in taxes have stimulated business and industry. In 1925 the expenditures increased and receipts declined, with the result that the surplus in that year was less than half that of the preceding year. In 1927, when the largest surplus occurred, receipts increased and expenditures diminished.

The following table compares the estimates of receipts for the fiscal year 1927 with the actual collections:

Comparison of estimates with collections for the fiscal year 1927

[Estimates made October, 1926]

Item	Estimates	Collections	Over-estimate	Under-estimate
Corporation tax	$1,120,000,000	$1,125,000,000		$5,000,000
Miscellaneous revenue	619,000,000	646,000,000		27,000,000
Individual income	820,000,000	763,000,000	$57,000,000	
Back-tax collections	250,000,000	331,000,000		81,000,000
Total	[1] 2,809,000,000	2,865,000,000	57,000,000	113,000,000

[1] Making the net overestimate $56,000,000 in internal-revenue collections.

This table shows that the corporation tax was underestimated only $5,000,000, while the collections from individual income taxes were overestimated $57,000,000. The miscellaneous revenue was underestimated by $27,000,000, largely due to the greatly increased consumption of cigarettes, and is not likely to be repeated. There was also about $9,000,000 collected on final returns from the capital-stock tax, which has been repealed.

The back-tax collections were underestimated $81,000,000. This was caused by a special drive made by the Treasury. It has heretofore been shown that the receipts from back taxes from now on will greatly decrease. The whole matter may be summed up by saying that the sources of revenue have now reached a normal condition and that estimates can be made with approximate accuracy, and reductions can be properly made only in accordance with these estimates.

HOW THE ESTIMATES WERE MADE

The Treasury's estimates as to expenditures are based on the figures furnished by the Budget Bureau, which submits them after a careful survey of the needs of all departments and bureaus and with complete knowledge of the appropriations to be recommended to the Congress for the year in question. It must be noted that the estimates of expenditures submitted to the Ways and Means Committee did not include increased expenditures which may result from new legislation such as flood relief. The present Treasury estimates of receipts are based on a careful analysis of (1) probable receipts from miscellaneous sources in the light of past experience and taking into consideration the periods in which the proceeds of capital assets still in hand are likely to be realized; (2) a careful study of probable future tax collections on account of previous years, commonly known as back-tax collections, based on the number of cases on hand, the current monthly rate of yield from this source, and an estimate of the amount involved in unsettled cases; and (3) in so far as current tax and customs receipts are concerned, on the assumption that neither in 1928 nor in 1929 will the yield fall substantially below that of the fiscal year 1927, in spite of the fact that business in the calendar year 1927 has not apparently reached the high level of 1926, a fact that must affect tax receipts for the last half of the fiscal year 1928 and the first half of the fiscal year 1929.

Three experts in the Treasury, Mr. Charles R. Nash, Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Joseph S. McCoy, Government Actuary, and Mr. John F. Ebersole, statistician of the Treasury, acting independently, prepared estimates on the several items of revenue. Then, in conference with Hon. Ogden L. Mills, Undersecretary of the Treasury, the official estimates were agreed upon, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. During the time the estimates were in course of preparation conference was had with General Lord, Chief of the Budget. These estimates are as follows:

Revised estimates of receipts on account of customs and internal revenue for the fiscal years 1928 and 1929

[In thousands of dollars]

	Mr. Nash		Mr. McCoy		Mr. Ebersole		Mr. Camp		Official estimate	
	1928	1929	1928	1929	1928	1929	1928	1929	1928	1929
Customs			601,000	591,000	600,000	610,000	601,500	586,500	600,000	600,000
Income tax:										
Corporations	1,152,000	1,095,000	1,127,500	1,110,000	1,038,000	965,000			1,120,000	1,120,000
Individuals	728,000	725,000	765,300	760,000	810,000	816,000			765,000	765,000
Back taxes	278,800	180,000	255,000	175,000	290,000	280,000			280,000	180,000
Total	2,158,800	2,000,000	2,147,800	2,045,000	2,138,000	2,061,000			2,165,000	2,065,000
Miscellaneous internal revenue (see details below)	654,545	618,545	633,500	610,000	633,000	647,000			638,545	640,545
Total internal revenue	2,813,345	2,618,545	2,781,300	2,655,000	2,771,000	2,708,000			2,803,545	2,705,545
DETAILS										
Estate tax	96,000	60,000	75,000	63,000	80,000	70,000			80,000	65,000
Alcoholic spirits, etc	18,000	17,000	18,000	15,000	17,000	14,000			18,000	17,000
Tobacco manufactures	400,000	410,000	396,000	400,000	399,000	423,000			400,000	420,000
Admissions	15,000	15,000	18,000	16,000	29,000	29,000			18,000	18,000
Club dues	10,000	10,000	11,000	10,000					10,000	10,000
Automobiles, etc	60,000	60,000	67,000	65,000	57,000	65,000			60,000	65,000
Pistols and revolvers	150	150							150	150
Cereal beverages	185	185							185	185
Yachts, etc. (use)	10	10							10	10
Stamp taxes, including playing cards	40,000	40,000	37,000	37,000	39,000	38,000			39,000	39,000
Oleomargarine, process butter, etc	3,200	3,200			3,200	3,200			3,200	3,200
Miscellaneous, including prohibition and narcotic taxes, delinquent taxes under repealed laws, etc	12,000	3,000	11,500	4,000	8,800	4,800			10,000	3,000
Total miscellaneous	654,545	618,545	633,500	610,000	633,000	647,000			638,545	640,545

OCTOBER 18, 1927.

Average 1928, $2,821,348,000; 1929, $2,660,515,000.

Comparison of estimates with collections for the fiscal year 1926

[Last estimates were made just prior to the passage of the revenue act of 1926]

Itemization	Estimates	Collections	Overestimate	Underestimate
Corporation tax	$987,200,000	$932,189,604	$55,010,396	
Miscellaneous revenue	841,500,000	861,895,751		$20,395,751
Individual income	603,800,000	745,932,481		142,132,481
Back-tax collections [1]	180,000,000	295,982,056		115,982,056
Total	2,612,500,000	2,835,999,892	55,010,396	278,490,288

[1] That is the increase in back-tax collections, which is a diminishing source of revenue, accounted for more than half the net underestimate of $278,490,288.

Comparison of estimates with collections for the fiscal year 1927

[Estimates made October, 1926]

Itemization	Estimates	Collections	Overestimate	Underestimate
Corporation tax	$1,120,000,000	$1,125,000,000		$5,000,000
Miscellaneous revenue	619,000,000	646,000,000		27,000,000
Individual income	820,000,000	763,000,000	$57,000,000	
Back-tax collections	250,000,000	331,000,000		81,000,000
Total	[1]2,809,000,000	2,865,000,000	57,000,000	113,000,000

[1] Making the net underestimate $56,000,000 in internal-revenue collections.

The following tables from official sources are important:

Ordinary receipts, fiscal years 1920 to 1927

[On basis of daily Treasury statements (unrevised)]

Year ending June 30—	Customs	Income and profits taxes	Miscellaneous internal revenue	Miscellaneous revenues, including Panama Canal		Total
				Proceeds from foreign obligations	All other	
1920	$322,902,650	$3,944,949,288	$1,460,082,287	$74,296,622	$892,334,542	$6,694,565,389
1921	308,564,391	3,206,046,158	1,390,379,823	114,821,206	605,121,383	5,624,932,961
1922	356,443,387	2,068,128,193	1,145,125,064	75,222,068	464,185,439	4,109,104,151
1923	561,928,867	1,678,607,428	945,865,333	232,989,156	587,744,697	4,007,135,481
1924	545,637,504	1,842,144,418	953,012,618	221,774,675	449,475,487	4,012,044,702
1925	547,561,226	1,760,537,823	828,638,068	183,637,677	459,773,890	3,780,148,684
1926	579,430,093	1,982,040,088	855,599,289	194,237,957	351,448,263	3,962,755,690
1927	605,490,983	2,224,992,800	644,421,542	206,089,173	448,390,943	4,129,394,441

Miscellaneous receipts, 1920 to 1927

[On basis of daily Treasury statements (unrevised); in millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Proceeds from Government-owned obligations			Sale of surplus supplies	Panama Canal tolls	All other	Total
	Foreign	Railroad	All other				
1920	74.3	(1)	(1)	309.3	5.6	[2] 577.4	966.6
1921	114.8	(1)	(1)	183.7	12.3	[2] 409.1	719.9
1922	75.2	(3)	[2] 26.1	113.6	11.7	312.8	539.4
1923	233.0	99.3	46.3	91.7	17.3	333.1	820.7
1924	221.8	94.4	9.6	46.8	27.1	271.6	671.3
1925	183.6	143.9	19.8	23.8	23.1	249.2	643.4
1926	194.2	36.7	34.6	25.6	24.7	229.9	545.7
1927	206.1	89.7	63.5	18.1	25.8	251.3	654.5

[1] Receipts on account of securities other than foreign-owned not shown separately for 1920 and 1921.
[2] Includes in 1920 $350,000,000 and in 1921 $100,000,000 from liquidation of the U. S. Grain Corporation.
[3] Receipts on account of railroad securities not segregated.

Principal change in ordinary receipts and expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts in the fiscal year 1927 over 1926

[On basis of daily Treasury statements (unrevised)]

Receipts—increases		Expenditures			
		Decreases		Increases	
Customs	$26,000,000	Interest payments	$45,000,000	General expenditures	$31,000,000
Internal revenue (largely income taxes)	32,000,000	Customs and internal-revenue funds	72,000,000	Government life-insurance fund	9,000,000
Foreign repayments	11,000,000	Postal deficiency	12,000,000	Debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts	32,000,000
Railroads (primarily securities sold)	53,000,000	Civil service retirement fund	11,000,000		
Federal farm loan bonds, etc	29,000,000	Other items	15,000,000		
Miscellaneous (net)	16,000,000				

The existence of a surplus does not prove that the Government has a continuing revenue in excess of its normal requirements. Estimates for coming years must take into account temporary and nonrecurring revenues, the business conditions of the country, the increase of expenditures incident to the growth of the country, and that unexpected demands may be made such as those arising out of the recent floods and other expenditures for purposes authorized by Congress in legislation enacted subsequent to the date of the estimates. The surplus arising from the excess of earnings from recurrent sources over the yearly expenditures forms the real basis of safe and sane tax reduction.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FURLOW). The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE].

ESTATE TAX AS APPLIED TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said in regard to the State of Florida in connection with inheritance taxes, so much jealousy has been shown by one part of the public, so much misapprehension has been indulged in by others, so much misinformation has been disseminated by others, either willfully or through ignorance as to the truth in the application of a great question to a great State, that it seems only right and proper that a correct history of the constitutional amendment to the constitution of the State of Florida should be given, so that those who sincerely seek the truth may be informed.

HISTORY OF THE STATE

This, the southernmost of all the States—the first in settlement, the last in development—has a history of romance, adventure, and achievement such as to compel the admiration of all the world. It has been successively under the flags of Spain, France, England, for a brief session under the flag of the Republic of Florida—a historical event almost forgotten—then the flag of the United States, then the Confederate States, and again, thank God, under the flag of the United States, where it will float until flags shall be no more.

THE FLAGS

The Spanish flag planted on Florida soil by Juan Ponce de Leon in the year 1513, bearing the quartered arms of Castile and Leon on a red and white field, is generally accepted as having been the first European standard flown on American soil. It was used by Columbus in 1492, Panfilo de Narvaez in 1528, and Hernando de Soto in 1539.

The French flag, unfurled over Fort Caroline on the St. Johns River by René Goulaine de Laudonnière in the year 1564, bearing three golden fleur-de-lis on a blue field, had its origin in the legendary blue cloak of St. Martin, which he shared with a beggar at Amiens and was familiarly known as the chape de Martin. This standard was used as the national French flag until the birth of the tricolor during the revolution.

The British flag, unfurled over Florida during the British dominion, 1763 to 1783, bearing on a blue field the combined crosses of St. George and St. Andrew—the patron saints of England and Scotland—became the first union jack of Great Britain by proclamation of James I of England upon the union of Scotland and England in the year 1603, and was the only flag used over forts and public buildings in the English colonies.

The battle flag of the Confederacy, adopted in 1861, was unfurled over Florida after her secession from the Union on the 10th day of January, 1861.

The Stars and Stripes of the United States, bearing the 23 stars for the 23 States of the Union, was unfurled over St. Augustine on the 16th day of July, over Pensacola on the 21st day of July, 1821, upon the ceding of Florida to the United States by Spain.

It was ceded to the United States by Spain in 1819, and its first Territorial governor was Andrew Jackson, who had fought the Battle of New Orleans only a little while before, and who thereby made it possible for the United States to come into possession not only of all the country in the Mississippi Valley and beyond, but of this, the fairest of all the land of this continent.

The Territory of Florida became a State in 1845; went out of the Union in January, 1861, only to return again in 1865.

The State began its real development into the modern Florida, as the public knows it, with the advent of the railroad about 40 years ago. Its growth was sure and its development was along lines of conservatism. In 1894–95 a disastrous freeze swept over the citrus country, as it then existed in the north and central portions of the State, as a result of which the industry was transferred to the lower peninsula, with Polk County and the ridge section as the center, and there was an influx of settlers into south Florida from the Gulf to the Atlantic coast, resulting in a phenomenal development for a number of years with a consequent increase in values of property. The people were conservative, progressive, happy, and prosperous. About 1923 some evil genius from outside the State started an era of speculation, running prices beyond the bounds of reason and causing a very saturnalia of unwise investment and fictitious values. The conservative people of the State deplored this and had but little part in it, but it was impossible to stop it until the peak of unwise speculation was reached, and then in 1926 came the inevitable reaction—thus ended the so-called "Florida boom." After a few months of confusion and dismay the better people—those who had wrought and builded through all the years of a generation—set their houses in order, charged off their losses, and are again enjoying peace and prosperity. They have worked out their own salvation, while those who came only to gamble and lost are heaping anathemas on the State, which hopes to see them no more.

HISTORY OF TAXATION

From the beginning of her statehood Florida has had only two forms of taxation; viz, ad valorem taxes, based upon a very low valuation of real and personal property, and license taxes. No other tax has ever been applied. She has no income tax, no inheritance tax, no stock-transfer tax, no tax on intangibles, no severance tax—just a plain, unmistakable tax on real and personal property and a license tax for the privilege of doing business. The form of taxation is simple and easily understood. This form of taxation has existed certainly since 1860 and probably for many years prior thereto.

About the year 1911 a gentleman of very great prominence, now deceased, an advocate of many ideas which to the conservative people of Florida seemed strange doctrines, upon coming to the State began an agitation for new forms of taxation, and in the course of time some of his theories as to taxation, in the form of litigation, came before the supreme court of the State. The court, in a decision handed down in January, 1911, which decision is to be found on page 65, in the Sixty-first Florida Reports, contained the following language:

> The defendant says that under the provisions of sections 1 and 5 of article 9 of the State constitution only two classes of taxes can be levied in this State; an ad valorem tax and a tax upon licenses. The correctness of this contention may be conceded.

That, Mr. Chairman, was a clear declaration from our highest judicial tribunal, but the agitation continued, from the same source, with the specious argument which has often been used as to our highest courts, to the effect "that courts change their minds as they change their personnel." This has been applied even to the Supreme Court of the United States. The legislature was then in session, and in order to forever settle the question a constitutional amendment was adopted, submitted to the people, and ratified by an overwhelming majority. This was a number of years before the so-called "boom" in Florida.

That is the history of the constitutional amendment in Florida, and there has never been the least desire on the part of her people to make a bid for tax dodgers or men of great wealth except as men of great wealth, properly used, are welcome in any other State.

The constitution of the State sets forth that there shall never be, after the adoption of the amendment referred to, a levy of an income or inheritance tax. We have no desire to change the constitution in this respect. We will not be coerced by an act of Congress into changing our constitution. There are, if I am not in error, 46 States which have some form of estate tax. There are two States which have none—Alabama and Florida. Florida prohibits it by her constitution.

It is a very specious argument on the part of the proponents of this tax to offer to refund to the several 46 States "80 per cent of the tax due the Government of the United States." It is hard to resist, of course, and the result is a combination of 46 States against 2.

If the gentlemen on this floor, representing the 46 States, would only stop and think, they would realize that by eliminating the Federal inheritance tax in its entirety, thereby preserving the principles of State rights, their States would pay no inheritance tax at all and the Federal Government would have to raise its revenues by some other method, leaving to the States the right to conduct their own fiscal systems, as was intended by the Constitution when originally written, and where it rightfully belongs.

The Constitution of the United States originally provided for three forms of taxation—a tax on imports, an excise tax, and a direct tax on property. The two forms first mentioned still exist, and the Government has found the third to be impracticable and unworkable. This remained unchanged until the Federal income tax amendment, and even then the amendment never contemplated a tax on inheritance.

The Constitution of the United States clearly contemplated that every State should have its own system of taxation without Federal interference, and that the Federal Government should raise its revenues by the two methods hereinbefore mentioned.

I realize, of course, from the debates and the record votes heretofore taken on this question that I am making a hopeless appeal; that I am waging a losing fight; but that will not relieve me of doing my duty as I see it by the people of my State, and for that reason I am entering this solemn protest. The State has been the target of malice and misrepresentation until it has become a public scandal, and the people there are beginning to wonder if they are still a part of the American Union. All we desire is a square deal, and we are not getting it.

Realizing that we are for the moment under an unlucky star, I do not expect that what I say here will have great weight or change a vote. I merely say it by way of protest and in order that the people of my State may understand how hopeless is their cause under present conditions. I expect at the proper time to offer an amendment to the pending bill which, if adopted, will have the effect of a repeal of the inheritance-tax feature of the present law, and upon this I shall ask for a record vote.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the repeal of the Federal estate tax is a subject that has been discussed from time to time. It is a subject that our Committee on Ways and Means saw fit to exclude by an almost unanimous vote. It is a subject, however, that more than half of the States of the Union have seen fit to request the Congress to give relief on in this bill. More than half the legislatures of the States have seen fit to pass resolutions and memorials urging the Congress to repeal it. A majority of the people of the United States have requested, by legislative act and otherwise, that the Federal estate tax be repealed.

I do not believe there is a member of the committee or a Member of the House that really believes that this tax is now collected for revenue purposes. I do not believe there is a member of the committee that believes, really and sincerely, that States should be compelled to have their laws in tax matters governed and regulated by the Federal power; this is a power which rightfully belongs to the several States. It is time for the Federal Government to retire from the estate field of taxation, leaving it with the respective States. The people of the Nation demand it, and we should heed this demand.

Gentlemen of the committee, I believe it is time to wake up and join with a majority of the people of our country and by your vote, when the Florida delegation submits a motion to recommit, which at the proper time it will do, to the Committee on Ways and Means with the instructions that the Federal estate tax be repealed, stand with us and vote with us on this motion and help us to faithfully represent the will of the majority and at the same time protect the rights of the sovereign States. Centralization and the encroachment of the Federal power is a dangerous enemy to the ultimate welfare of the individuals of our great Nation's population.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I do not believe there are many people who understand the fact that 80 per cent of this tax collected by the Federal Government is returned to the States if they have such a tax provided by their statutes. I wonder if Florida could collect an inheritance tax for 20 per cent, or one-fifth. Does the gentleman think any of the States could?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. The fact of the matter is, as the gentleman knows, Florida's State constitution enjoins us from collecting an inheritance or income tax, and I have not looked into the matter indicated by my friend. However, I do know that inasmuch as this tax is collected just for the supposed purposes of making the laws in taxation uniform it is nothing more or less, gentlemen of the committee, than a mockery. Here we represent our States and make a mockery of this issue under the guise of making normal or making regular all tax assessment in the respective States. I do not believe we should hold ourselves out as exemplars to carry the mockery any further. I fear my colleagues are deceived as to the real importance now attached to this matter by the several States.

If the States desire the estate tax, surely they should collect it. My State does not desire this tax. It says tax the living, not the dead. We do not believe in a death tax. If we are taxed all of our lives, then should we pay a tax after death?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Yes; to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman think he is altogether consistent in the statement he has made——

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that his State's legislature, realizing the facts about this 80 per cent credit, passed a law which gave that State 80 per cent of the amount collected by the Federal Government, and the State received nothing except that 80 per cent; after all Georgia can not be said to really have a State inheritance law; it has only challenged the Federal statute and formed its State law in order to reap the benefits from the Federal law.

Mr. COX. But I thought I understood the gentleman to say that he was of the conviction that there was no purpose or intention on the part of the committee reporting this bill to influence States whatsoever in their tax policies.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I am sorry I did not make myself clear, I will say to my friend from Georgia. I think the absolute purpose of this committee is to undertake to coerce all

States into passing laws like the Federal Government wants them to pass in their tax matters; and I can speak for the State of Florida when I say it is not going to repeal its inheritance tax amendment of its constitution. Florida is not going to assess an estate tax. [Applause.] Gentlemen of the committee, time is too limited to fully discuss this all-important subject to-day, but before the final vote is reached on this bill I expect to address you at length on the subject.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON].

Mr. YON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am a new Member, and I recognize that I am kind of out of place by taking the floor so soon after coming here; but, gentlemen, this is a question of vital interest to my State. I am not going to take up much of your time.

This question was brought to the fore about two years ago when the matter was under consideration in your bill. I am coming to you to-day to call to your mind the reasons that were given about two years ago. I know that some of you were somewhat frightened about the consequences of investments that you or your friends made in my State. There was a boom on in Florida and everybody wanted to go to Florida or were talking about Florida. Since then conditions have changed, and you ought to feel a little different about Florida. Some of you or your friends made investments when they thought they were going to get rich quick; but the boom failed.

Florida was not responsible for that; it was the speculators. Has Florida changed? No; she has not changed. We have gone on with the greatest road development; one that is wonderful. I believe we are carrying on the most gigantic road program of any State in the Union, considering the wealth, population, and mileage.

What we have done is regardless of the boom consequences. Florida is the oldest and the newest State of the Union. Gentlemen of the House, you ought to reconsider your action. We have no fight with the other Membership of this House, but as a Democrat, a natural-born Democrat, for if I lived in Maine or any rock-ribbed Republican State in the Union with my nature, I would have been a Democrat. [Applause.] I believe in the rights of the people to govern themselves. I believe my State has a right to govern itself and that the Federal Government has no right to say we will take from you that right.

Now, in the legislation two years ago you did not name Florida. You remember what the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said about Florida two years ago. If he has forgotten, if he will go back to the RECORD of two years ago, he will see what he did say. I think he cast an aspersion on the State, a small State, great in possibilities, but small in population and yet great in population. We say to you gentlemen this State of ours has only 4 Representatives, and you 431 Members throughout the United States passed this legislation. We did not pass the constitutional amendment trying to subvert the Capital of the National Government from getting what was due it. You can pass any kind of legislation, but give us our right to say whether Florida wants an inheritance tax or an income tax or not.

That is what I say, and I hate to take issue with you Democrats because your fathers fought, bled, and died to defend the rights of the citizens of the States. The State of Florida is a sovereign part of this great Government.

Now, you Democrats from our neighboring States in the Southland and scattering Democrats from other States, I hate to take issue with you, for I expect to live with you at least two sessions. I may not come back, but I came here to fight for the rights of my State, and I say I would not vote for a bill or any provision in a bill that takes away the right of my State to govern itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. YON. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YON. Of course, the people of Florida did not vote this inheritance and income tax provision in the constitution to protect the rich of our State, but as we have between a fourth and a fifth of the total of the seacoast of the Nation, and thousands of wonderful home sites, also with the hills and lakes of the interior of the State and with millions of acres of arable, fertile soil that needs no irrigation or drainage, except, maybe, local, we thought of withdrawing some items of taxation to attract to these vacant and unpopulated areas. Of course, gentlemen, you can override our constitution, but with Florida's proximity to the centers of population, and with our climate, with our fishing, hunting, bathing, fertile soil, and hospitable people Florida will ever act as a magnet to draw ever-increasing thousands from less hospitable climate than is Florida's and to till her fertile soil and enjoy her luscious fruits and general agricultural products. Verily, gentlemen, Florida will continue to go forward morally, intellectually, and economically. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to consider two phases of the bill which has been presented for the action of the House on revenue reduction: First, the changes in language and administrative details which have resulted from the work of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; second, the effect of the bill on the average taxpayer.

BRIEF REASONS FOR COMPLICATED LAW

The Underwood Tariff Act of 1913 carried the first general income tax provision following the adoption of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. Rates were later increased during the Wilson administration until this country entered the war, when it became necessary to raise enormous sums by all forms of taxation, including heavy levies on income. The peak was reached in 1920 when, under the act of 1918, the stupendous sum of $4,000,000,000 was collected in income and profits taxes, comprising 59 per cent of all ordinary receipts. Since then the revisions downward have been almost as rapid as the revisions upward between 1914 and 1918.

The primary purpose of this bill is to reduce the tax burden still further and to apportion it more equitably among taxpayers. The reductions in the tax rates and the steps taken to equalize the burden are explained in detail in the report accompanying the bill.

This is the seventh revenue bill before Congress in the past 12 years. During that short period the income tax has become the principal source of Federal revenue. It has dwarfed the once important customs duties. In 1914 the income tax produced less revenue than the tobacco tax. In 1920 it produced $4,000,000,000 and it produces currently over one and one-half billions. The income tax has doubtless grown faster in point of importance than any other known in modern times.

During the high tax years, 1917 to 1921, it was important in the act to emphasize fairness and equity. An unfair distribution of the tax burden might ruin a business or an industry. As a consequence, special provisions, limitation, exceptions, and qualifications came into the law. It was important also to make the law as certain and clear-cut as it could be made, so that business men might know definitely what their tax obligations would be. Detailed provisions by the score were written into the revenue acts for this purpose.

Of late years, with greatly reduced rates, the primary emphasis has been shifted to simplification. There is no doubt that the law is complex. Each successive revenue act during the past decade has been more bulky than its predecessor and less easy to understand. Contrary, perhaps, to public opinion, this complexity has not resulted from lack of interest on the part of Congress or a lack of desire to phrase the law in more simple language. The circumstance that the income tax laws of most foreign countries and of many of the States are as complicated as the Federal law should give food for thought. It is not merely a coincidence that almost all the modern income tax laws are complicated.

The fact is that any law which provides in detail for the computation of the net income of three and one-half millions of individuals and corporations must be more or less complicated. Nevertheless, with sufficient time to work out the problem, a measurable degree of simplification is possible and important steps toward simplification have been taken in this bill.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXATION

While in general the details of the appointment of the joint committee may be fairly well known to the membership of the House, it may not be out of place to refer to the conditions which brought about the creation of the committee, its present studies, and the advantages which will accrue from its continuance.

In passing the revenue act of 1926, Congress made provision for a joint committee on internal revenue taxation, the duties of which, as outlined in section 1203, are to investigate the operation and effects of the internal-revenue tax system and to devise measures and methods for simplification, particularly of the income tax. It was thought that the time had come to make inquiry into the causes for the complications in the law. It was believed that sufficient experience had accumulated to afford valuable lessons in drafting and administering an income tax law.

The committee, which is composed of members of the Finance Committee of the Senate and Ways and Means Committee of the House, is assisted in its labors by an advisory group of the recognized leading tax experts of the country who generously responded to the appeal of the chairman for their aid in solving the many problems.

The joint committee is composed of two divisions—the division of simplification and the division of investigation. Both divisions are splendidly manned by efficient staffs.

A very large part of the work of the Ways and Means Committee during the past month has consisted of studying the recommendations of the joint committee, shaping into proper form the policies which have been accepted and including them in the bill now before the House for its consideration.

REARRANGEMENT OF NEW BILL

The most important step toward simplification, perhaps, is the rearrangement of the sections in the act. There are certain fundamental sections, such as those which define gross income, deductions, and net income, and those which impose the normal tax, the surtax, and the corporation tax, which are or may be applicable to the cases of very large groups of taxpayers.

On the other hand, there are provisions in the law, such as those relating to appeals to the Board of Tax Appeals, the taxation of nonresident aliens, foreign corporations, insurance companies, and so forth, which are of practically no interest to taxpayers generally.

In all of the preceding acts these general provisions and special provisions were mixed with each other at various places in the law, so that it was impossible at any one place to find a clear statement of the basic principles of the income tax.

A scheme of rearrangement has been worked out by which the provisions of general interest to the great body of taxpayers have been grouped together in sections 11 to 65 of the bill. There is thus gathered together for the first time in a Federal income tax measure a simple statement of the basic principles of the tax as applied to the average taxpayer.

The remaining provisions in the act are placed in supplements, which include sections 101 to 322 of the bill. It will be seen that the supplements correspond with the arrangement of the general provisions at the beginning of the bill—that is, Supplement A corresponds with Part I, both dealing with rates of tax; Supplement B with Part II, both dealing with the computation of net income; Supplement C with Part III, and so on.

The provisions peculiarly applicable to estates and trusts have been collected in Supplement E, those relating to partnerships in Supplement F, those relating to insurance companies in Supplement G, those relating to nonresident aliens in Supplement H, and so forth.

Supplement L is devoted to sections relating to the assessment and collection of deficiencies, which includes the procedure leading up to an appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals. Supplement M relates to interest and additions to the tax, Supplement N to claims against transferees and fiduciaries, and Supplement O to overpayments.

It has often been suggested that the income tax law should be arranged on some "logical" basis. As a matter of fact, such a rearrangement was prepared but was rejected in favor of the present form of rearrangement on the ground that the present form is more practical. There is good reason to believe that as a result of this rearrangement once taxpayers have become accustomed to its use, the finding of any particular part of the law will be made more easy and more simple.

A marked change in the method of handling the language in the law applicable to both individuals and corporations has been adopted. Formerly there were separate provisions containing general rules for individuals and corporations in Titles II and III. Now these are all combined into one subtitle, B, appearing in the new print on pages 9 to 47. This new method will prove very much more convenient to both the individual and the corporation.

From an examination of the bill it will readily be seen that there are more changes in the suggested new language than have appeared in any bill since the first downward revision. The greatest accomplishment toward simplification is the rearrangement of the text, both in form and in substance. In this rearrangement the various related sections have been grouped together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Particular attention is directed to the table of contents under Title I, income tax. This is entirely new in any legislative draft and will be found most convenient for reference purposes.

The sections of the bill are arranged very much as the taxpayer is likely to have to refer to them. By reference to the table of contents it will be seen that the various subtitles and supplements cover all the subjects contained in the act and that they are arranged in the most convenient manner for the use of the taxpayer.

CROSS REFERENCE

Formerly the cross references in the act required a taxpayer to familiarize himself in large measure with various features scattered throughout the law. The majority of individual taxpayers now will only need to understand sections 11 to 65 of the bill. Then, if other items are applicable to a taxpayer in making out his return, the places where such items are to be found appear directly following the paragraphs concerned.

Take, for instance, Part II, computation of net income. Net income is to be computed under section 22, less deductions allowed in section 23, so that to ascertain his actual net income the ordinary taxpayer has only two sections to consider, the one covering gross income and the other covering allowable deductions, the difference between the two representing the net income. You will find these references throughout the bill, but the very disagreeable cross references have been very largely eliminated.

Where it has been necessary to retain cross references, a new scheme is used whereby each reference gives on its face a summary of the contents of the provision to which the reader is referred.

The following are examples:

For corporations exempt from tax, see section 103, page 13.
For use of inventories, see section 22(c), page 33.
Closing of taxable year in case of jeopardy, see section 146, page 38.
For provision as to consolidated returns of affiliated corporations, see section 141, page 41.

You will also note that section 64 indicates where to find the taxes imposed by this title under Title II of the revenue act of 1926, and the section numbers used in this bill are shown in lieu of those in the 1926 act.

REPETITION

The former acts contained much repetition. Section 234 of the 1926 act repeats much of section 214, and this is true of many other sections. A considerable amount of this repetition is avoided by consolidating these provisions in the new bill. The work is such an intricate one and so extensive in its ramifications that time is a very large element in solving the problems that have grown up.

STABILIZATION OF LAW

The income-tax system is becoming more and more stabilized both as to the form of the law and its administration. The present language will, we think, be fairly permanent. My plea has continually been to have the language of the act sufficiently plain to enable the taxpayer to make an honest return of his tax indebtedness without the employment of an expert accountant or a lawyer specializing in tax matters. This purpose may not have been entirely accomplished in the present revision, but certainly marked progress has been made.

The results of the changes in the law as suggested in the bill now before the House will not be apparent in the form of the blank issued by the Treasury on which returns are made, but the advantages to the taxpayer will be reflected in plainer language in the law and in the manner of grouping related items.

There is, of course, no certainty as to when further changes can be recommended by the joint committee with a view to correcting complicated sections not dealt with in this bill. It is, however, fair to say that the work of the joint committee can be carried on very advantageously for some time. By having sufficient time to make corrections in the language of the law and recommending changes in its administrative details much more benefit will later accrue to the taxpayer than appears from the present revision.

When the revised law is printed in the form of an act there will be marked reduction in the number of pages. It is to be regretted that it seemed advisable to add several pages of new matter, but these have been added for the purpose of better administration and clarification. It can also be said that the additions are not general in nature and will not be a source of study or investigation by any large number of taxpayers. As a rule, they apply only to special cases and therefore people affected by them are very limited in number. As an illustration, I call attention to sections 607, 608, 609, and 610. These replace section 1106 (a) of the old law, but they refer only to a narrow class of cases falling under the statute of limitations.

SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS

Among the recommendations of the joint committee which have been carried into the new bill, other than those heretofore mentioned, may be listed the following:

The estate tax and other miscellaneous tax titles of the 1926 act have not been repeated in this act, as was the custom in former years. Changes have been made by appropriate amendments which will be found at the back of the bill. In other words, the present bill is, for all practical purposes, solely an income tax act. In view of the limited interest in the estate and miscellaneous taxes, this is believed to be an important simplification.

The recommendation of the joint committee with respect to consolidated returns was adopted in substance, and it should result for future years in simplifying considerably the administration of the law to the cases of affiliated corporations.

The recommendation of the joint committee with respect to Federal tax liens was adopted, which simplifies and makes more flexible the present law.

The recommendations with respect to the bar of the statute of limitations made by the joint committee were adopted in so far as they relate to section 1106 (a). Though the result does not simplify particularly the wording of the statute, it does clarify a very muddled situation.

The joint committee's recommendation with respect to the basis for gain or loss on sale by an executor was adopted, as was also its recommendations with respect to interest on overpayments of taxes and closing agreements.

The survey of administration prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the joint committee provided the basis for a study which should result in considerable simplification of the administration of the law.

DELAYS IN DISPUTED CASES

One of the chief sources of complaint from taxpayers in the past has been the delays in settlement of disputed cases. First, the Board of Tax Appeals was set up, in the hope of overcoming some of this trouble. The board has been successful in its work, but cases have been accumulating so rapidly before the board that it is getting more and more behind in its work. In other words, more cases are coming to the board than it is able to dispose of currently.

Various efforts have been made to cure this situation. Section 704 of the new bill will, in the opinion of the department, accomplish much good. The difficulty in the past has been the impossibility of retaining experienced men at the salaries paid. As soon as men became proficient and competent the lure of outside salaries would bring about their resignations.

Paragraph (a) establishes a new rate of compensation for assistants to the general counsel and administrative and technical employees. Men who are selected for these special positions can feel a permanency of employment and have an independence of action which was impossible under the old conditions.

We look to see the appeal cases settled with greater expedition than in the past. The contrast of our bureau with that of Great Britain is most marked. There men start in subordinate or minor positions in anticipation of making Government tax business their life work, which results in a personnel skilled in the subject matter. Our system has produced just the opposite result, the turnover in the personnel being very large among the men who have reached the point of usefulness in the bureau.

FUTURE WORK OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Under section 1203 of the act of 1926 the joint committee is required to make a definite report to Congress not later than December 31, 1927, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable. It is to be expected that this report will in large measure be reflected in the language of the bill now before the House. It will, therefore, be apparent that this bill is in a sense a report of progress, because it is well recognized that there are many more items which will need further study by the joint committee.

As illustrations, I call attention to section 24 (b), entitled "Holders of life or terminable interest." Very likely there are Members of the House capable of explaining just what that paragraph is intended to accomplish so far as holders of life or terminable interest are concerned, but this is the sort of language which has been, in the language of the street, considered "good picking" for expert accountants and high-priced lawyers.

Another paragraph beyond the comprehension of the ordinary brain is section 143, "The withholding of tax at source," and the following pages.

It may be asked why such items as these appear in the revised bill. The reply is perfectly simple, that there has not been sufficient time to rewrite all such paragraphs in an effort to secure plainer language.

In my opinion the joint committee, by the adoption of the rearrangement which has been approved by the Ways and Means Committee, has fully justified its creation, and the many additional changes that have been made will also prove their value as taxpayers have occasion to use the new law.

There are a number of things, in addition to those mentioned above, which should be done to simplify the law still further. Though a discussion of these measures is not in point in the present connection, it may be said that the compilation of a code which will contain all of the administrative provisions now governing the determination, assessment, and collection of taxes is a vital necessity. These provisions at the present time are scattered throughout the various revenue acts and the general statutes. The compilation of such a code is a large undertaking, but is well worth while.

An analysis must be made section by section of the entire act in order to develop simpler basic principles. The entire scheme of taxing nonresident aliens and foreign corporations needs revision, and it is fraught with difficulties to him who undertakes the task. It is likely that careful study will disclose the possibility of stating many of the provisions now in the law in a more simple and direct manner. The extent of the simplification achieved will be a matter of conjecture until the work is completed.

EFFECT OF REDUCTIONS ON AVERAGE TAXPAYER

In speaking relative to previous revisions it has been my custom to show the effect of tax reductions upon the average man. One result of the revision of 1926 was the elimination as taxpayers of practically 2,000,000 citizens. This was brought about by increased exemptions, both for single and married men; the increase of the earned-income provision; and the removal of numerous special taxes. It perhaps would be more accurate to refer to the effect of the present law upon the average taxpayer than upon the average man.

Before the passage of the 1926 act, 4,500,000 individuals paid taxes. That act reduced the number to about 2,500,000. Of the total tax collected from individuals for 1925, amounting to $734,000,000, 327,018 individuals contributed $701,000,000, while 2,174,148 individuals contributed the balance of $33,000,000. In other words, 2.2 per cent of the population paid practically the entire income tax, and the remaining 97.8 per cent of the population paid almost no tax.

Therefore the benefit to the average man is represented by the reduction in the tax on the corporation of which he may be a stockholder, and also by the increased circulation of money in business and trade, because by removing $236,000,000 from the tax payments into the Federal Treasury there is just that much more in circulation for business purposes—just that additional stimulation to the general business welfare of the country.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Are not these intricacies to which the gentleman called attention kept in the law because of the fact that these selfsame experts framed the bill largely for the committee?

Mr. TREADWAY. There are a few men, and one of them has recently retired from the Government service—Mr. Gregg, of Texas, the son of a former member from the gentleman's own State——

Mr. BLANTON. And than whom there is no better expert——

Mr. TREADWAY. Just a moment—whose mental capacity to regard phrases as simple that the gentleman and I would regard as most intricate, is astounding. When a gentleman like Mr. Gregg comes before the Ways and Means Committee, for the time being his explanation goes, and we can understand him, but the moment he gets out of the room I defy even the brilliant chairman of our committee to carry with him the explanation that such a man as Mr. Gregg has made to us. We simply can not comprehend him, and, further than that, even if he or men like him did draw up this complicated language, the matter itself is so complicated and intricate that we can not write it into plain, primer English.

Mr. BLANTON. And the result of that is that every business man in the gentleman's district in Massachusetts and everyone in my district in Texas must hire a high-class expert tax lawyer, who charges big fees, to make his tax returns for him.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have said hundreds of times that the law ought to be such that the average man need not employ high-priced counsel in order that he may be honest with the Federal Government. On the other hand, any tax bill is bound to be complicated. You can not get away from that

feature of it. When you get into some of these exceptional things, such as we are referring to, the best man that you can employ is cheap at the charge he may make you. On the other hand, the great majority of income-tax payers do not have to deal with these complicated sections and so do not need attorneys or accountants.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was just about to say to the gentleman from Texas that a Government expert is provided for those who want to have an expert to make out their returns for them.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, we have our expert down here in the Sergeant at Arm's office to fix our reports for us, and he is easily accessible, but take a ranchman out in JOHN GARNER'S district——

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, he can go to JOHN. He would explain it to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Or in CLAUDE HUDSPETH'S district, for instance, where there are counties perhaps 200 miles across them, hence sometimes he has a long way to go in order to get an expert.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I might suggest in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers out in my district do not have much income tax to pay. It is evidently different down in Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, there are some rich ranchmen in Texas who have pretty good income taxes to pay, for some of them own big ranches not only in Texas but in New Mexico, Wyoming, and even in old Mexico.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And those that have incomes under $5,000 a year can use the short form, and anybody can fill that out.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of the ones I am talking about pay several times $5,000 in income taxes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. I come from a farming district, and I know one man there who before he could get his tax reports in shape paid a fee of $9,000. It seems to me that the law could be simplified, and it ought to be simplified, so that such a thing would not be necessary.

Mr. TREADWAY. The joint committee has, in my opinion, done wonders which will result in correcting such cases as that to which the gentleman refers, and if he will examine the sections to which I have referred he can readily see that in a brief period of a year much has been done to reduce the complications. It is our desire to iron them all out when time permits.

Mr. REED of New York. It is unfortunate, however, because it causes much criticism against the Government and against Congress.

Mr. TREADWAY. We feel that when the present bill is enacted into law and the people become accustomed to the arrangement and find how much easier it is to find sections one is interested in everyone will feel very much better toward the tax law.

Mr. REED of New York. I hope so.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think that will be demonstrated in the use of the new law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will remember that two years ago when we made an unusual effort to simplify and clarify these matters experts from the Treasury told us that they had written and rewritten many of these sections as many as fifty times in order to make them simpler and more easily understood.

Mr. TREADWAY. And that on top of that the more they rewrite them the more they find things that will crop up to bother them in the future.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Ought not the gentleman to state to the House in connection with the simplification that the testimony before the committee was—and I am not certain that it is not in the report of the advisory committee—that 10 per cent of the errors existing in the last recommendation are attributable to the earned-income provision, and that you could strike the earned-income provision out, strike off the one-half per cent on the normal tax, and your loss to the Treasury would be about the same and the benefit about the same, and thus do away with 10 per cent of the errors now coming into the Treasury Department?

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, the revised law when adopted will do away with a great deal more than the labor of preparation.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to say, because we are now interested in this particular subject, that I intend to put in the RECORD this afternoon, to which I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree as to the authority, that the annual toll to the taxpayers of the country is $100,000,000 of toll for returning, $300,000,000 for accounting, making $400,000,000 of toll paid under this form of levying a tax.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will be glad to yield such part of my time as I can spare.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If it is just so simple that they would come up and pay the taxes claimed by the Treasury Department, they would save this $400,000,000. Most of the spending of the money is for the obtaining of reductions, and so forth.

Mr. TREADWAY. The levying of a tax bill is always objectionable to people.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Can you make the law any more simple than business? Is not the American business highly intricate with combinations and subsidiaries, so intricate that people have to get a lawyer? It is against the law to kill a dog, but that does not settle a lawsuit. You have got to get a lawyer to see whether the dog was in the way or not.

CORPORATION TAX

Mr. TREADWAY. The corporation-tax cut is the largest single reduction, being estimated at $166,000,000, and when such an enormous sum as this is kept in the general channels of business rather than paid into the Treasury of the United States, its effect is bound to be felt in the home of the average man.

We have also increased the exemption for small corporations from $2,000 to $3,000. This will be of material benefit to the average man who may be conducting his business with a partner or partners under corporate form rather than as a partnership. This arrangement appears to be more equitable for the small business concern than would have been possible under some form of partnership return.

AUTOMOBILE TAX

The next largest item of reduction is the automobile tax, which has been reduced one-half, or about $33,000,000. The committee and the House recognize the fact that there has been a great effort made to influence the Ways and Means Committee to remove the entire automobile tax. The reductions made in the 1926 act and in the present proposed revision comprise such a large part of the entire income tax that fair criticism can not be raised against the Committee for the item as it now appears.

While it is recognized that there are only a few makes of cars that can be classed as luxuries, the automobile-tax rates have never deterred a prospective purchaser from buying either a luxurious car or the cheapest make in the market, according to his ability to pay. The chief agitation for the entire removal of this tax comes from the manufacturers and the dealers on account of the inconvenience it causes them, and not from the actual purchaser of the machine.

The amount that will be raised from the sale of new cars in 1928 under the proposed revision is a large one, about $35,000,000, but the individual payment is so small that it can in no way be regarded as a handicap to any purchaser.

In connection with the effort which it is anticipated will be made to amend this item, let me call the attention of the Members to two factors. The annual Federal appropriation for good roads is $75,000,000. If no Federal tax should be paid by the automobile owner there would at once arise a clamor for the repeal of the good roads appropriation. Furthermore, the reduction in taxes proposed by the committee is between eleven and twelve million dollars in excess of the Treasury recommendation. If you undertake to increase this reduction by the sum of $33,000,000, you will imperil the enactment into law of the entire measure. My friend the average man will, I am glad to say, willingly contribute the small payment he will be required to make to the Federal Government if he has the means of purchasing a new car while this law is in effect.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall finish within that time.

Mr. HUDSON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if appropriations for better roads came before or after the levying of the automobile tax?

Mr. TREADWAY. Like all such things, the road appropriation started modestly, but has grown to large figures. The automobile tax was levied for war purposes, and the war is not paid for by the country yet. I am sorry now, but if the gentleman will pardon me, I will be glad to discuss the automobile item when we reach it under the reading of the bill. I would like to complete my statement in the time which the Chairman has courteously given me.

To show how small this automobile tax is to each purchaser, I append hereto a statement showing the taxes that will be paid on cars of various prices under the proposed rate of 1½ per cent:

Ford sedan	$6.14
Dodge sedan	9.84
Hudson sedan	15.58
Buick brougham	21.66
Hupmobile sedan	24.70
Pierce Arrow runabout	28.07
Franklin limousine	33.08
Marmon sedan	40.95
Cadillac sedan	46.06
Lincoln sedan	54.00
Locomobile touring	67.50
Locomobile sedan	82.12
Pierce Arrow landeau	90.00

It therefore appears that a tax that brings to the Government $33,000,000 in the aggregate means that a purchaser of the cheapest priced car would contribute only $6.14 to the Treasury, and the purchaser of the highest priced American-made car $90. The taxes on the low-priced cars will all be under $25, and those on the higher priced cars will all be under $100.

These figures are proof positive that the business is not injured, that no burden is laid on the buyer, and that the industry is not discriminated against by the retention of the 1½ per cent tax rate.

While there occasionally has been an effort to remove the tax on cigars and cigarettes, the people have become so thoroughly accustomed to contributing toward the revenues of the country under the tobacco schedule that little attempt has been made to have these taxes reduced below the present figures. They are recognized as a part of our general tax system. The automobile tax should be considered to some degree in the same light.

Another factor enters into this matter in the refusal of the committee to recommend the repeal of the Federal inheritance or estate tax. A very large body of our citizens feels that this tax is outside the scope of the Federal Government.

For one, I have voted to repeal the Federal estate tax in previous bills. However, this not having been done, I feel that the money that would have been saved to the taxpayers by such repeal will, under the proposed reduction of the automobile tax, be credited to the purchasers of new cars.

OTHER REDUCTIONS

Another item of reduction in a sense beneficial to the average man is the lowering of the tax on admissions, the minimum taxable admission being placed at $1 instead of 75 cents. This will reduce the expense of the average man's attendance at various entertainments.

Club dues have been treated in the same manner as the automobile tax; that is, reduced by one-half. At first it might be said that this is of no material benefit to the average man, but statistics show to what a very large extent the wage earner is a club member, either for social or physical purposes.

AGGREGATE REDUCTION

The aggregate amount of reduction represents the maximum figure that the Committee on Ways and Means feels justified in recommending to the House for adoption. There are several other possible suggestions, such as a change in the middle surtax brackets, but all these items I have enumerated must be regarded in the general program. There have been many advocates of a reduction of the corporation tax to 10 per cent, but this recommendation, like so many others, is made by those who are concerned only with that particular item and who fail to consider the aggregate amount of reduction when all other items have been included. As each 1 per cent is estimated to cause a reduction in receipts of $83,000,000, to have accepted the recommendation of many people that the corporation tax rate should be reduced to 10 per cent would have increased the reduction by $125,000,000, which will be seen to be beyond the limit of possibility. If the committee should add together all the requests for reductions, we would exceed the expected surplus by at least $200,000,000.

CONCLUSION

This bill has been conscientiously prepared by the Ways and Means Committee, and in most of the changes partisanship did not enter. There are, however, some items which do not have the united support of the committee, but the majority is confident that it represents the very highest reduction possible consistent with safety to the finances of the country. Larger reductions would imperil financial security and invite the danger of a deficit. The majority of the Ways and Means Committee, therefore, appeals to the House to accept the bill as presented.

Undoubtedly claims will be made that larger reductions are possible and very likely motions will be made that will cover such claims. If such action is taken it will be contrary to the weight of evidence before the Ways and Means Committee, which has been acting as your jury. A Member must either be a very rabid partisan or inconsiderate of the country's finances who will disregard the evidence that has been presented and, by a vote to override the provisions of this bill, jeopardize the sound basis on which the governmental financial structure rests. By such action the Member sets up his own opinion as being of more value than those of the financial experts of the country and the officials of the administration who are responsible for the proper conduct of the business affairs of the Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I had not intended to take any time in general debate, but to reserve whatever time I desire for debate under the five-minute rule. However, Mr. TREADWAY, one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, has called attention to the fact that some members of the committee will probably offer amendments for increased reductions. I think that the statement of the gentleman is entirely correct. I think an amendment will be offered to take all the tax off of automobiles, and I think nearly all on our side over here, if not all of them, will vote for the amendment, and I dare say a great many Republican Members of the House will vote for the amendment. Most Members of this House are opposed to a sales tax on principle. When you have a sales tax you are taxing people upon their necessities, on what they have to have in order to live decently. But when you are taxing them on their income you are taxing them on their ability to pay taxes.

Therefore I hope every Democrat and every Republican, for that matter, will vote for the amendment when it is presented on the floor. I hope all Members on our side will vote to take off the admission tax, another sales tax that we think is not necessary; also club-dues taxes. Therefore I call on the Members for action when this bill is discussed next week under the five-minute rule. If I knew that there would be a deficit created in the Treasury by such action, I would not favor these amendments. But I do not think there will be a deficit. On the other hand, I think we will have a large surplus after these amendments are adopted. Secretary Mellon in his estimates for the last five years has been mistaken in the aggregate the huge amount of $1,081,000,000. Hence, we on this side of the House do not place much credence or dependence in Secretary Mellon's estimates about surpluses and deficits.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did the gentleman hear the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] this morning?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes; I heard Mr. HAWLEY; and Secretary Mellon has come before our committee for five years, and when he wanted to defeat the bonus or anything else he would predict that we would have a deficit. But he has cried "Wolf!" too often for me to think that he is sincere when he says these estimates show this or that those estimates show that.

Mr. BLANTON. And on all these various nuisance taxes he has also heard the voice of the people?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts said only the automobile manufacturers and dealers are interested in the remission of the tax. That is not correct. About 5,000,000 purchasers of automobiles every year are interested in the repeal of this automobile tax. The purchasers of automobiles pay every dollar of automobile taxes. Hence they are greatly interested.

I think also an amendment will be offered on our side of the House to decrease the corporation tax from 11½ per cent to 11 per cent. I think we will still have a surplus after this reduction. Yet Secretary Mellon wants to make out that there will be a deficit. He does not have Mr. McCoy to make the estimate; he will have some one else do it, because we know that McCoy for many years has guessed right, and he

wants somebody else to guess to suit him. Hence when the Secretary wants to show a deficit he has some one other than McCoy to make his estimates.

Now, you have heard a great deal about section 220, touching undistributed profits. Some years ago the corporations decided to issue stock dividends so that their stockholders could avoid paying these high surtaxes. The great corporations of the country who did not want to distribute the profits paid, up to 1920, according to an estimate, $1,800,000,000 in stock dividends. That was found out by the Federal Trade Commission. That, I believe, was 1918, when we attempted to tax stock dividends; and the Supreme Court held that it would be unconstitutional, and therefore we could not do that. Immediately after that the great corporations of the country issued stock dividends, and now it amounts to $6,500,000,000, and they have issued those stock dividends to avoid taxation. Our committee talked about it many times informally, and the committee wanted to find some provision to prevent these fellows from avoiding and escaping taxation. Therefore the advisory committee of the joint committee on internal-revenue taxation decided on a provision that would do the job, and it was a simple proposition. They said the amount distributed should be taxed a less percentage than the amount not distributed. This joint committee, including Doctor Adams—you have heard their names mentioned here, and they are upright and honorable men, and they know what they are talking about—said in effect, "If you will just tax the undistributed profits 1 or 2 per cent, 10 per cent on the distributed and 12 per cent on the undistributed profits, that would hold out an inducement. If they want the privilege of withholding accumulated surpluses in the corporation for any purpose other than legitimate purposes, let them pay for the privilege. Let us tax them a little more on that which they do not distribute than on that which they distribute. That would get them. That would stop up the hole. Every man in this House knows it, and especially every man on the Committee on Ways and Means knows it.

But what did they do? They had the experts draft a provision to take the place of section 220, and the experts themselves said they drafted it under the supervision of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], the chairman. I think it is better than the present law. But we wanted to find out on the committee whether or not this would stop a gap. I asked Mr. Beaman, our chief expert, whether this would do the job we wanted done; that is, whether it would prevent those fellows from avoiding the tax. He said:

No; there are many ways by which they can get around this.

I do not think it is fair to put in a provision that everybody knows will not do the work. I just wanted to call your attention to that.

I rose, however, mainly to read this letter which I have received from the Civil Service Commission. Everybody knows, and the advisory committee to the joint revenue taxation committee knew, that it would not create a deficit to do what the advisory report advised us to do, but on account of politics they were afraid. You Republicans were afraid you would lose office in some of these States. They were so afraid that some Republicans in Arkansas or in Minnesota or some other State might lose office that they voted unanimously to undo what we had done, and we had done it on the recommendation of the Treasury Department. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Mills, who is one of the greatest partisans I have ever known in this House, and Mr. Mellon, who is also an intense partisan, advised us to do this thing on account of the efficiency of the service, as they said. Now, I want to read that letter that I have just received from the Civil Service Commission, dated to-day and received by special messenger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for another minute.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I read:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 10, 1927.

Hon. WILLIAM A. OLDFIELD,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. OLDFIELD: The commission respectfully asks consideration of the following brief statement. If more detailed information is desired, that will be promptly furnished.

On page 8, volume 1, of the report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is recommendation as to reorganization, especially of the field branches of the Internal Revenue Service. The statement is made in the report that such reorganization would result in saving approximately $2,000,000 per annum. This recommendation is accompanied by the statement, "To accomplish this purpose it will be necessary that all employees in the field service be under the civil service."

It has been demonstrated repeatedly in the Government service, and also in private industry, that the application of the examination system to employment of personnel results in savings in actual expenditures and in bringing about increased efficiency. Instances may be cited, if you desire them.

If favorable action is taken by Congress on this recommendation of the joint committee, it may be stated that the incumbents of positions of deputy collector of internal revenue, which positions are not now classified, will automatically be given a competitive classified status under existing civil service laws and rules, unless Congress specifically provides otherwise.

The commission is most earnest in urging that Congress place the entire tax-collecting agencies of the Government within the purview of the merit system.

By direction of the commission.

Very respectfully,

JOHN T. DOYLE, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Certain gentleman on the Ways and Means Committee thought these men were going to lose their positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. OLDFIELD. But this letter says they would not; that they will be automaticaly put in the classified service; and that their jobs will be secure to them. So there can be no excuse for our not going along and doing the right thing about this matter; that is, placing these gentlemen under civil service.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman insert the whole letter?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I have inserted the whole letter.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Was it sent to the gentleman at his request?

Mr. OLDFIELD. No. I did not know anything about it and did not know it was to be sent to me at all. It was sent by special messenger. I do not know why they sent it to me, but I presume it was because it was sent to all of the other Members.

Mr. TREADWAY. They probably recognized that the gentleman is such a partisan, as he has just been referring to partisanship.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They know I am not a partisan. If the letter was sent on that ground, it would have been sent to some other gentleman. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], for example.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This is the first time I ever heard that the Civil Service Commission is a partisan body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the report of the joint committee, as well as pamphlet No. 1, being the advisory committee's report. I have had many requests for this pamphlet to-day, but I am not able to supply the copies, so I am asking unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would it not cover the wishes of the gentleman if additional copies of this report should be printed in a separate volume? I think such an arrangement could be made with the Committee on Printing.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If that were done Members of the House would not be able to get copies in time, because the copies would have to be distributed through the folding room, and it would take 10 days to do that. We are going to take up this bill under the five-minute rule on Monday next, and if the Members are to have the benefit of the recommendations made by the advisory committee and the staff that has worked on this proposition all summer, the report will have to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so they can look it over. Otherwise the Members will not get the benefit of it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman mean more than Volume I?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I mean Volume I, that little thin pamphlet.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has referred to it as a thin volume, when, as a matter of fact, there are 86 pages in it, together with tables and other matter.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. There are not 86 pages.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am holding it in my hand, sir.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I do not care what the gentleman is holding in his hand. I will assert there are not 86 pages in that volume.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman can look at it if he questions my word. There is the end of it, and that is page 86.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That is not Volume I at all.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; that is Volume I.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might suggest that it is his offhand opinion that this probably ought to be done in the House rather than in the committee.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This is Volume III. The gentleman did not look at it himself. He is speaking about the entire volume. This is Part III, while I am only asking to have printed in the RECORD the first portion of it, which contains the recommendations.

Mr. TREADWAY. Just the pages covering the recommendation?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That is all I am asking, and that will cover about——

Mr. TREADWAY. There are 26 pages of that.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. No; 16 pages.

Mr. TREADWAY. Personally I have not the slightest objection to the request other than the matter of expense. We pad the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with such a tremendous lot of useless matter that it seems to me a pity, when the report is available and can be reprinted in any number of copies, to ask that this be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because every page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD means an expense to the Treasury.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will be good enough to send out and get 400 copies of that for the benefit of the membership of the House I will withdraw my request.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will be very glad to see if the chairman of the Printing Committee can not reprint it and have copies available by Monday.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman does not have any copies and can not get them.

Mr. TREADWAY. I know I have no copies and I have no authority to ask for them.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But the gentleman said they were available.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not say there were 400 copies available.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman said there were available copies for every Member of the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. There are or can be. The gentleman, I am sure, does not want to pad the RECORD any more than I do.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If gentlemen did not print more in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than I do, the RECORD would be very small, indeed.

Mr. TREADWAY. I know that, and sometimes the gentleman does not print his own speeches.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. All I want is to have the Members of the House secure this information, and I have had so many requests for this information to-day that I think it should be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TREADWAY. The chairman of the committee is now here. I understand the gentleman from Texas to say that if 400 copies of the recommendations of the joint committee are available by Monday he will withdraw his request to have this pamphlet printed in the RECORD. Why not withdraw your request until the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee can consult with the chairman of the Committee on Printing and see whether that can be arranged or not?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will let the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from Iowa object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I had not intended to speak in general debate on this revenue bill, preferring rather to speak under the five-minute rule on a specific proposal in the form of an amendment.

However, in view of the fact that our able leader on revenue measures, Mr. GARNER of Texas, made reference in his speech yesterday to my proposal, and provoked comment on it, I feel that I ought to take a little time to-day to explain and elaborate the amendment which will be offered at the appropriate time.

The two great parties are not in any keen conflict over this revenue bill. There seems to be no fundamental difference of opinion on any large principle.

There is, however, one point of difference between various groups and interests in the country, and that centers about the Treasury surplus, its probable amount, and its disposition.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman speaks of an amendment which he proposes to offer.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. At the present time I do not know just what that amendment will be.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That is why I am here now. I want to explain some of the ideas which I shall embody in an amendment with reference to the corporation income tax.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It was stated yesterday the gentleman proposed that provision should be made by which any further surplus in the Treasury might be used for a further reduction of the rate of the corporation income tax.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Exactly.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman, conversely, propose that if the revenue becomes smaller there shall be an increase of the corporation income tax?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I do not, and I shall be very glad to explain that question in due time. I want the Members of the House who are here to know the full import of the recommendation I shall embody in my amendment.

I say the crux of the whole debate, if there is a debate at all on the revenue bill, centers about the question as to what we ought to do with the surplus when it occurs. If there were no surplus, if there were no excess of ordinary receipts over regular expenditures, there would be no question of tax reduction; but in view of the fact that there have been recurring surpluses from year to year, totaling some $2,000,000,000 in the last five or six years, the question always arises, Shall we use the surplus to retire the public debt or shall we use it for tax reduction?

This is a question of principle. This is not a question of political expediency. It is not a question of administration of law, but is a question of fiscal policy.

These estimates of surplus are made 18 months in advance. We are now, for instance, enacting legislation for the fiscal year ending 1929, which is contingent upon the revenues which will be received up to 18 months from the time when these estimates were made. I am not surprised that there are variations in the actual amount received as against the estimated amount predicted in the name of a surplus.

My proposition tries to take the guesswork out of the surplus problem in this way. My amendment will propose that at the close of the fiscal year, June 30 of the next year—1928—if the Treasury finds it has on hand a bookkeeping entry of a sum of money over and above that which it needs for the ordinary running expenses of the Government, then that excess or surplus shall be used for further tax relief for the benefit of a large group of taxpayers. My proposition is that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be directed by this Congress to use at least some of that surplus in a further reduction of the corporation income tax.

I will explain later why I confine it to the corporation income tax; but first let me make this clear. If the Treasurer has more money than he needs to pay the running expenses of the Government, to whom should that money go? What shall he do with it? At the present time he can do only one of two things with it. He can either retire some of the indebtedness of our floating debt or retire some of our public debt beyond the requirements of our statutory provisions.

The Secretary of the Treasury did exactly what any one of us would have done under such circumstances. He used the money to retire the public debt because he was not directed to use it in any other way. Now, all my amendment proposes to do is to direct him to give some of it back to the taxpayers from whom he collected it. If the size of the surplus warrants it, the Secretary of the Treasury will be directed to reduce the tax on corporation income which will fall due at the two subsequent quarterly periods following June 30—namely, September 15 and December 15. So that if the corporation income-tax rate were thus reduced by virtue of a Treasury surplus, the corporations which began to pay at the rate of 11½ per cent—if the pending bill becomes a law—and have paid on the basis of 11½ per cent on March 15 and June 15, would pay on a lower rate on the payment dates September 15 and Decem-

ber 15. There is no guess work about it. The tax will not be based upon an esitmate, but will be based upon the actual amount of surplus in hand on the Treasury books on June 30, 1928, which is the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At what time?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. At the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1928.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the finances of the Treasury Department are not handled in that way.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes; they are handled in just that way. On June 30 the Secretary of the Treasury will announce to the country that the surplus for the fiscal year was a certain amount, when the books were closed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then each quarter, instead of the Secretary retiring outstanding indebtedness as he does now, you would hold that in abeyance?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No; not necessarily. That is a banking or financing operation which I would like to explain after I get through explaining the provisions of my amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That balance at the end of the fiscal year on June 30, of course, is only the book balance.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Exactly; that is why I distinguished that from a current financing operation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And during the course of the year the Government is constantly financing its operations by short-term loans.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I understand that to be the case; yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And when there is money enough in the Treasury so they do not need to negotiate a short-term loan, they simply desist from borrowing, and in that way the money is applied upon the indebtedness.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I understand that to be the case, and my proposal would not change this procedure.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So at no time is the money in the Treasury.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. When I speak of surplus I do not mean cash, if that is what the gentleman has in mind.

The daily report of the Treasury Department two days ago announced it had only $20,000,000 on hand, but the surplus for the year is estimated to be $455,000,000. The point is that this estimated "surplus," $455,000,000, is used as a basis for reducing taxes. But what will happen if the estimated surplus turns out to be not that figure but $555,000,000? Unless the law makes specific provision as to what shall be done, the Secretary of the Treasury will again proceed to reduce the public debt or the floating debt. You are going to reduce taxes; why not reduce them all you can?

If we thought we had enough money on hand to reduce the corporation tax to 10 per cent, would not the administration do it? The implication is that it would. The answer given by the Secretary of the Treasury to the United States Chamber of Commerce is that we can not reduce the corporation tax further because the surplus will not be large enough to permit it. When I say surplus I mean the actual bookkeeping surplus not cash on hand. If the Secretary of the Treasury has faith in his own estimates, he ought not to oppose my proposal, since there would be no further surplus to distribute. If those who seek a larger tax reduction think Mr. Mellon may be mistaken and that a greater surplus may be available, then these people should welcome an opportunity such as my amendment affords.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is not quite what the Treasury says. The Treasury says the permanent surplus will not permit—that is, the surplus on ordinary receipts—not on the nonrecurrent receipts.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Whatever enters into the surplus, whatever the method of calculation used by Mr. Mellon in arriving at the $455,000,000, I assume will continue to be the method used up to the close of the fiscal year June 30, 1928, and again in 1929.

If what I say is true, that there is a difference of opinion in this country as to what we ought to do with the surplus, the solution lies, at least in a degree, in the amendment I shall propose.

The Congress of the United States directs the Treasurer of the United States how to use that surplus. I do not see how the Treasurer of the United States can object to it. When he has more money than he needs, why should he not give it back to the taxpayers? If the taxpayers are insisting on a larger reduction than the Treasury can afford to give them, of course they should not have it. So the tax reduction would depend on the state of the finances at the close of the fiscal year on June 30, 1928, or June 30, 1929.

For instance, if after allowing for a safety margin of, say, $50,000,000, the Treasurer has $25,000,000 more than he needs for all ordinary operations of government, then the corporation tax drops to 11¼ per cent. If he has $50,000,000 more than he needs, the tax will drop to 11 per cent. I propose to have a sliding scale, a graduated corporation tax from 11½ per cent down to 10 per cent, but never to go lower than 10 per cent. If the Treasury situation permits it the corporations ought to be given this reduction down to 10 per cent, but not lower.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not see how the gentleman figures that. The Treasurer would have to have the money on hand at the end of the fiscal year if he is going to do that. If he does not hold that at the end of the first quarter he will not have it at the end of the year.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. There are two things involved in the gentleman's question. Let us assume that an error was made of an underestimate of $100,000,000 and suppose the surplus is $555,000,000.

The Secretary of the Treasury has $100,000,000 to apply to tax reduction. He can retire the floating indebtedness, he can apply it to the public debt, or he can apply it on tax reduction. He does not have to go into the Treasury and take out the money. When the quarterly returns are due, say, in September, he notifies the corporations that instead of paying on a basis of 11½ per cent, they will have to pay on the newly announced rate of, say, 10½ per cent.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would result in holding the surplus of the first quarter for six months.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No; it is a very simple operation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not a simple operation.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I think it could be done. The Treasurer would not need to lose one penny of interest. He goes into the market and buys certificates when he has a surplus and refinances the operation in order to prepare for the new situation created by the lower tax rate on corporation incomes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I will.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. He would not need to lose a cent of interest, because he could turn it over into United States bonds. But let me ask the gentleman a question while I am on my feet. If we had a permanent system of taxation in this country satisfactory to the entire Nation and we had an automatic scale such as the gentleman speaks of—say he had $50,000,000 surplus, could not he give notice that he was going to collect on a basis of a $50,000,000 surplus in December? In other words, the tax would go up or come down according to the state of the Treasury.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes. And that principle of elasticity is actually in operation in my State.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It is in my own State of Texas.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. In my State the tax rate on general property is levied in accordance with the needs of the government within certain limits. The only difference is that in my proposal I apply the tax rate retroactively.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But that is made up in advance.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes; and this proposition of mine is better. My proposition has no guesswork in it. If you make it up in advance it has to have an element of guesswork. You could go wrong then, but under my proposition you can not go wrong.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. You could not go right because you would lose the interest on it.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I hope that is the gentleman's only objection to my plan, for his objection can be met. It is not a valid objection, I contend.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not the only objection.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. It is the only one the gentleman has raised. If at the close of the calendar year I have more money in my corporation than is needed to pay expenses I can issue more dividends. That is what is done in private business and that is all I am asking for in the Government financial policy. I am asking the Congress of the United States to lay down a fiscal policy which is absolutely sound, a policy which says that we will give back to the taxpayers that which we do not need, instead of allowing the Treasury Department to use its own discretion as to its disposition.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. What is the gentleman's idea? Does he contemplate that the present rates of taxation are perfect and should remain at their present figures, either now or when the new bill is passed? Why should this be given to the corporations?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I think I have a good reason for limiting this proposition to the corporation tax, and perhaps I had better explain that now, since two gentlemen have asked that question. In the first place, I am interested in getting the Congress to see the need of such a policy, and its operation becomes simpler if I confine it to one source of revenue. If I try to cover all taxes, then it will become very much involved, and you would get up against the question of the refund. Take the question of the automobile tax. Who would get the refund on an automobile tax? Understand, that under the pending bill the tax is retroactive for the calendar year 1927 on the corporation income tax. Let us say that a man bought a Ford or a Chevrolet last year and he had to pay the tax on it. The tax was paid in the first instance by the company, but it was paid actually by the man who bought the automobile. The refund would have to be made to the man who sold the automobile, because he paid the tax to the Government. Is that man going to look for the man who bought the automobile from him? I doubt it. You could not require that by law, and therefore it is not fair to refund excise taxes to the manufacturer which have already been passed on to the consumer.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But the gentleman is stating the case wrongly. We are not making the automobile tax retroactive.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I understand that, and I say that is why I can not apply my flexible sliding scale tax proposal to the excise tax; but it can be applied to the corporation tax. You can not recover an excise tax which has already been paid and passed on to the consumer, but in the case of a stockholder in a corporation, it is quite different. If any of you gentlemen own any stock in a corporation, your corporation will at the close of this year get a bill from the Secretary of the Treasury calling for a certain tax by June 30, 1928. How much of a tax should you pay? Under the pending bill your corporation would pay 11½ per cent. My proposal is that it should pay anywhere from 11½ per cent to 10 per cent, depending on the size of the "surplus" at the close of the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman give me a few minutes more?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will five minutes do the gentleman?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I highly value the gentleman's opinion as a financier and an authority on economics. Can the gentleman justify his position? I may vote for a reduction of the tax on corporations. Can the gentleman justify his position in reducing the corporation tax to, say, 10 per cent—and I am not against corporations—and leave the exemption to the head of a family at only $3,500, when the head of a family must educate his children and provide a living at the present high cost of living. There are corporations in my district where they just stick a pick in the soil and get oil, and drill down a thousand feet and get thousands of barrels of oil a day. Can the gentleman justify reducing the corporation tax to 10 per cent and leaving exemption for the head of a family at only $3,500?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I think so. The gentleman raises a very pertinent question. The question is, If we had a surplus, which we know we could anticipate with absolute certainty, then there might be a debatable question as to whether or not you ought not to raise further the exemption to married men; and I advocated an exemption to cover hospital and doctor bills for married men, but the committee turned that down two years ago. The surplus being an uncertain factor——

Mr. HUDSPETH. But the gentleman is going to make it certain when it reaches a certain amount.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The facts are that we eliminated from the tax rolls over 2,000,000 taxpayers by our 1926 act. If we increase the exemptions still further, we reduce the tax-paying list to such a narrow base that it endangers the very foundation of the income-tax structure. I believe Mr. Mills, now Undersecretary of the Treasury, was right when he said on the floor of this House that we may destroy the very structure of our income tax in the United States if we push the exemption too far.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman think that the exemption for married men should stand at $3,500 as it is in this bill?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. We must get out of our heads the idea that when we reduce the corporation tax we are reducing taxes for a few people. We used to have the idea that a reduction of the corporation tax benefited only a few people. I want the gentleman to listen to some telegrams which I just got to-day.

In my home city of Rochester, N. Y., is one corporation which has 10,000 stockholders in that city alone. Then there is another corporation that has over 12,000 stockholders. So you have there 22,000 stockholders, and that is an answer to the gentleman's question. If you reduce the corporation tax to 10 per cent, you spread the benefit of tax reduction to a large number of people without endangering the permanent structure of our income-tax system. The reduction of the corporation tax is affecting the average man to-day as never before in the history of the country because of the wide distribution of wealth through the medium of stock ownership. One of the most important economic developments in the last few years is this wide distribution of wealth throughout the country through stock ownership. The corporation has become an agency for the distribution of wealth and national income. Do not let anyone frighten you by the idea that when you talk about the reduction of corporation tax, you are doing it for the rich. We are doing it for the average man—for all classes—since all classes are rapidly becoming—indeed have become—stockholders.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But you are doing it for a great many rich corporations.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But you are also benefiting the rank and file of the people who have now become stockholders to the extent of 3,000,000 people in the United States. There are more people in the United States paying income taxes as stockholders in corporations than are paying taxes on the individual income basis. For this reason I believe the committee very wisely directed its tax reduction to the field of the corporation income tax.

My estimate is that 75 per cent of the aggregate reduction—that is, 75 per cent of $232,735,000—goes to the stockholders of corporations. It goes to 3,000,000 people. I think it is a good bill, and I am going to vote for it. But while I think it is a good bill, I want to make it a better bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman agrees with the theory of the Ways and Means Committee in drafting the bill.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I agree; absolutely. When the taxes are reduced they will flow back or be allowed to remain in the pockets of the stockholders. That is why I want to reduce the tax on corporations still further if the surplus warrants it. I am glad, of course, the automobile tax is being cut in half—from 3 per cent to 1½ per cent.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. How does the gentleman justify the reduction he contemplates when we still have outstanding a quantity of short-time indebtedness, which could be paid out of the surplus. Is there not an enormous amount of short-time indebtedness which we could pay from the surplus and which the Secretary of the Treasury does pay?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The gentleman has raised the question I began with. Why not use the surplus to retire these loans? If we had done that we would have had no tax reductions in the last five years. Two billion dollars could be applied to the reduction of the public debt if he chooses to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Texas inquired about the report of the joint committee. I have just made arrangements with Mr. Brown, the clerk of the joint committee, who will put in each Member's post-office box a copy of this report this evening.

Mr. GARNER of .Texas. That will be very satisfactory, because they can get the information in there for which various Members of the House have been asking.

Mr. HUDSPETH. How will we get it?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. In all the post-office boxes this afternoon.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, before beginning a discussion of the various features of this bill, I want to stop a moment to refer to the very able presentation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN]. I do not know in what respect his proposal differs from that which was made some years ago, tentatively, by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who, at one time at least, suggested the consideration of a system by which tax reduction might be automatic and depend-

ent upon conditions of the Treasury from time to time. It seems to me, however, if we base such a system upon our experience in reference to local taxation, we are likely to fall into error. In all the States, I think, State, county, and municipal taxes are predicated upon the revenue needs of the various taxing bodies levying the tax or adopting resolutions which determine the amount of tax or revenues which they will need for a given year, and thereupon some official or some governmental agency, frequently a county clerk in our western communities, takes all of these tax levies, computes them, and fixes the tax rate upon the valuations which have been made upon property, real and personal, by the assessing authorities. But there you have an annual budget and an annual valuation of property which is to be assessed. In other words, on the one hand you have the amount of revenue, the amount of money, that will be needed for the purposes of the various governments included in the levy, and on the other hand you have an annual valuation of the property, personal or real, which is to be subject to the tax, and all that the county clerk, or whoever the officer may be who determines the amount of the tax, has to do is to compare the amount of revenue needed with the valuation of the property assessed and determine upon the rate of taxation or assessment.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The total tax levied at the end of the fiscal year and the total surplus, one divided by the other, gives the rate per dollar of taxation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But we have this difficulty, I will say to the gentleman, that when we come to the Congress of the United States that Congress will not, and should not, delegate to anybody else to determine, first, how much money shall be expended, and secondly, what shall be the rate of taxation. I do not think we are willing to delegate the methods by which money shall be raised—certainly not without a great deal of discussion and consideration—nor do I think the Congress will be willing to delegate to an administrative officer the authority to levy an additional tax or to reduce the tax already fixed by the Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does that reason apply to the flexible tariff?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Well, the flexible tariff is based upon a different theory. It is based upon the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and on the changing conditions attending production.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is delegating the say-so or the decision to some one other than Congress.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; it is delegating to some one else the ascertainment of facts.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I yield.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This does not delegate anything whatever to the Secretary of the Treasury. It says if the money is there on the 1st day of July, he shall take off so much tax, or levy so much tax, as the case may be. He has no discretion in the premises, whereas in a flexible tariff the ascertainment of the fact is imposed on the Executive instead of on the Congress.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not admit that is an analogous case, although, of course, it is injected here for purposes of argument.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I think the corporations are like Joseph when he was given the coat of many colors. But what I want to ask is: Did the committee consider the advisability or feasibility of substituting the graduated tax for the flat tax that has been in operation and which this bill retains?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes. The committee considered it this time, although it had been considered many times before. But that raises a question which is involved in the excess-profits taxation, namely, the valuation of the capital assets of a corporation.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman will be given an opportunity to vote for a graduated tax. It is based on the same principle as the corporation tax; that is, the net income for the taxable year.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The corporation that has a capitalization of $100,000 and an income of $25,000 will be taxed on exactly the same basis as a corporation having a capitalization of $1,000,000 and a net income of only $25,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. If there is anything on earth that is going to differentiate this side—the Democratic side—from that side—the Republican side—on the corporation tax, it is contained in the suggestion of the lamented Claude Kitchin, namely, that relief be given 375 corporations which are barely getting on while the remaining 25,000, or a few more, are enjoying big returns.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I shall be very glad to give attention to that matter when we come to the discussion of that section of the bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. I suggest that if we give them a little more time they may hand us what we expect, something to show that the corporation tax is not passed on to the consumer. Before we take off the tax on the corporation let us see that they hand the relief on to the consumer.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, this matter of tax reduction is a subject that is in the public mind and properly receives large attention on the part of the House and on the part of the people of the country. Still tax reduction is not the important matter in the bill that is before the House to-day.

The important matters in this bill relate to the administration of the law. I hope they will receive consideration during the reading of the bill.

This is the fourth revenue bill which has been presented to the Congress since the termination of the war and during my term of office here. The previous bills were largely for the purpose of tax reduction. The acts of 1921, 1924, and 1926 made a total tax reduction of $1,529,000,000. It happens that we at this time have a surplus which we think can only be safely estimated at approximately $225,000,000, and we are able to use that surplus for the purpose of tax reduction. But this surplus is not sufficient at this time to warrant the adoption of an ideal system of taxation. I had been dreaming and hoping that when we came to a revision of the internal revenue laws at this time it might be possible to evolve an ideal and permanent system of Federal taxation. I was hoping that we might determine definitely whether we should continue the excise taxes and the sales taxes and taxes of that special character——

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does it relate to this particular matter?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes. The gentleman said he had been dreaming. I wonder if he had been dreaming about those who are heads of families, most of them?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes. I think the biggest mistake this Congress ever made was when it raised the exemption to heads of families to $3,500.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think the gentleman is correct on that. Do you want to reduce it?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; not now. I would not hesitate to reduce it, however, under certain conditions.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman is willing to remit taxes from the big oil companies and other big corporations and still leave the tax on the heads of families?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The surtaxes are not paid by the masses of the people.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But they are paid indirectly by the masses of the people.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think it would be well that every man with a substantial income should pay something to the support of the Government. I think if we had stopped at $3,000 the last time in the matter of exemption for the heads of families we might be able to do something in the way of tax reduction that we would like to do now.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I know the gentleman would like to follow the leaders. But if they would give us the reduction that a married man should have in the case of sickness and misfortune we would be satisfied. Will the gentleman explain why these deductions should not be allowed? I would be very glad to hear him.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As to deductions it always becomes a matter of opinion whether deductions as claimed should be allowed, and it becomes a matter of continually auditing the returns. The committee believes it is better to make a flat reduction and make that uniform than to leave it dependent on conditions as they arise.

Mr. McSWAIN. Is it a matter of opinion whether a man was operated on or not, or whether his wife had died and was buried, and whether a man had been in the hospital for a month? Would there be any doubt or uncertainty about that?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That depends on what standard a man would follow in the employment of a physician or a surgeon. One surgeon might charge a man a thousand dollars for an operation and another surgeon might charge him only $50. In the matter of burial expenses I want to suggest to my friend that there may be a great many differences of opinion as to what are proper expenses in the conduct of a funeral. Besides, the present high exemptions are designed to cover contingencies of this kind.

Now, I do not want to be diverted by everybody——

Mr. HUDSPETH. How much money do you hand back to corporations?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The reduction for corporations is $178,000,000 out of the $236,000,000 carried in this bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Most of it goes back to the corporations?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Then the gentleman says he does not believe the exemption should be extended to $3,500 to the head of a family?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not believe we should now raise it beyond the $3,500. I will say this to the gentleman. If the gentleman will read the remarks I made when we passed the last bill, he will find I said I thought $3,500 went too far. But we are now discussing this bill. One hundred and seventy-eight million dollars of these reductions go to the corporations. The other $58,000,000 go to the special taxes, the excise and sales taxes of various kinds.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And the gentlemen in the lower brackets get nothing out of this bill?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What does the gentleman mean by gentlemen in the lower brackets?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I mean men who are heads of families and who are in what we call the lower brackets. They get no reduction, but it stands as it has stood at $3,500 and the corporations get $178,000,000? That is the bill, is it not?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This bill does not touch the matter of the exemption of the individual.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is what I am objecting to. I think it should touch him, and I belong to a few corporations myself.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The question before the committee was whether at this time the $225,000,000 available for surplus should be applied upon one of two classes or upon both. Of course, the gentleman brings in an entirely new element. He would go back now and revise the individual income-tax rate, but that was not the design of the committee.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Did the committee consider the matter of applying this money upon the floating indebtedness of the Government rather than to tax reductions? Was that considered?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The committee determined to proceed to the preparation of a bill which would provide for a reduction in taxation not to exceed $250,000,000.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Rather than to apply that $250,000,000 upon the indebtedness of the country.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Well, if the committee had determined to apply the surplus to the payment of the debt of the United States, of course there would not be any tax reduction bill before the House.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But the committee did not report a bill providing that the Secretary of the Treasury should apply the money to the indebtedness of the country.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That would not be necessary. I will state to the gentleman, as I stated to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] a moment ago, that that process is automatic, it is self-operating. When money comes into the Treasury and certificates of indebtedness become due it is a question whether the Treasury Department will use the money thus on hand for the purpose of paying such loans or will borrow new money and issue new certificates instead of them; and if the money is available it is, of course, used and automatically operates toward tax reduction.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question as to the admission tax?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I had not intended to come to that; but what is the question?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I notice in subdivision 1 that—

A tax of 1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof of the amount paid for admission to any place, including admission by season ticket or subscription—

And so forth.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me suggest to the gentleman that we take up these separate matters when we come to them in the bill. That will be the much better way.

It has already been suggested that the bill gives three-fourths of the tax reduction to the corporations. Let me say one word about the corporations. A corporation is more or less of a fiction. It is merely a piece of machinery. It is merely a legal entity by which business is conducted. It consists of nothing but its stockholders. There seems to be an idea that something is being presented to the corporations. Who are the corporations? Nothing but the stockholders. When you reduce the tax on a corporation's income from thirteen and a half per cent to eleven and a half per cent, as the committee recommends, making a total reduction of $166,000,000, that money will go to the men and women who own the stock in the corporation. It does not benefit the corporation itself. It benefits the stockholders in the corporation.

In addition to the 2 per cent reduction, we have increased the exemption for corporations which have an income of $25,000 or less, from $2,000 to $3,000, and that creates a loss in the Treasury of $12,000,000. The effect of that provision will be that with a rate of 11½ per cent each corporation in that class will have a flat reduction of $115 in its tax.

I said a moment ago that our individual income tax has become a class tax and is no longer a popular tax. Less than three-tenths of 1 per cent of our entire population now pay more than 95 per cent of the total individual income taxes, and 97.8 per cent of the people pay no Federal individual income tax whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the chairman of the committee, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. When the gentleman gives these figures and percentages, does he include the number of stockholders in corporations that are paying the tax through the corporations or only individual taxpayers?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am including the individuals who pay the individual income tax. Of course, these same individuals, or most of them, pay the surtax upon the incomes of corporations that comes to them. These same individuals, also, being stockholders, through the corporations, pay 13½ per cent, which is now in force, upon the income of their corporations.

The Federal tax structure, so far as internal-revenue taxes are concerned, may be divided about as follows:

About $545,000,000 is collected annually upon excise and sales taxes, what we ordinarily call special taxes and sometimes nuisance taxes. That includes the tax on the manufactures of tobacco, which are by far the largest source of the income of our internal-revenue system and amounts to $376,000,000. It includes the tax on cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, and snuff.

The individual income tax yields approximately $912,000,000. The corporation income tax yields about $1,308,000,000, and the estate tax about $100,000,000.

For some reason, when we made the previous reductions in taxes, principally on the incomes of individuals, no great attention was given to the matter of the income tax upon corporations. There is a reason for it, of course. The more urgent need was to bring the tax upon individual incomes down to a basis where they not only would no longer be burdensome to the individuals who pay these taxes, but where the reduction of the taxes would improve our economic and financial conditions, and the results which have been obtained have shown conclusively that the reductions that were made brought the Government larger income by reason of the reduced taxes.

So far as the corporations are concerned, it is doubtful whether approximately the same result will be attained in the case of the reduction of their tax rates, because the corporations do not furnish the amount of capital for investment which is furnished by the individual whose tax rates are reduced.

I might say something with reference to the time for the application of the reduction of the corporation tax.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What is the question?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he figures that three-tenths of 1 per cent of the population pay income taxes?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Less than three-tenths of 1 per cent of our population now pay more than 95 per cent of the total individual income taxes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Does that carry the implication that the wealth of this country is controlled by less than three-tenths of 1 per cent of the population of our country?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am not carrying any implication with the statement. I am simply stating the fact.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Do not the figures of the gentleman carry that implication?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am simply stating the figures.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Would that cause anyone to believe that there is a wise and healthy distribution of the wealth of the country?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Ninety-seven and eight-tenths per cent of the people pay no individual income tax whatever.

The committee recommends that the reduction of the corporation income tax shall become effective for the income for the year 1927.

One hears a great deal of argument as to whether the tax of a corporation is passed on. It seems to me the reply to that question may be made in this wise: A corporation at the beginning of the year no doubt makes an effort to strike a balance, to make a budget of its incomes and expenditures, and probably will try to include in that budget the amounts which it is required to pay for taxes; but very soon after the beginning of the year a corporation which attempted to run its business upon that basis would discover that the price which it was receiving for the goods it produced or sold was not determined by its budget, was not determined by its balance sheet, but was determined by the conditions of business, by the competition which it encountered in the sale of its goods, by the condition of the money market, by the exchange rate in the banks, and by the general prosperity of the people of the United States. I think it is futile to argue that it is possible for any corporation in advance to pass on its taxes to the consumers who purchase its goods or who deal with it, whatever its operations may be.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The gentleman, of course, would not include in that statement monopolies.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; I would not include monopolies, because they can in some cases fix their own prices.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Therefore they can pass the tax along to the consumer. I do not mean that they necessarily do that, but they are in a position where they may do that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They can do it, but, of course, they have other conditions to meet. They must make their sales popular.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. This really protects the gentleman's statement. The gentleman did not want this to apply to all corporations.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; I am not applying it to a monopoly. One does not have to be an economist to realize that the monopolies might possibly pass on the tax.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. This is reaching back into the very interesting portion of the gentleman's address which we hoped to hear. If there is any justification for the income tax, or rather the good thing about the tax, it is that they can not pass it on. It is a tax on the profits in the case of public utilities, for instance, and not a fixed charge on the running of that business. Much as one might like to talk against the tax, I think we ought to justify it in that way more than any other—it can not be passed on.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman suggests, to my mind, some of the correspondence which we have had during recent months. We get letters from people who object to every form of taxation. I have had the most violent abuse of the income-tax system, in correspondence recently, that I have ever seen, and still I conceive there is no fairer tax in the world than a tax upon the income of the individual or of a corporation.

We have had taxes upon nearly every form of activity; and money must be raised for the needs of the Government. The Congress in the exercise of the duty which is imposed upon it must seek to place taxation upon as equitable a basis as possible.

No taxing system will ever be perfect. We can never arrive at a situation where we do exact justice. We will be fortunate if we do approximate justice; and the committee considered how this tax reduction should be applied, whether it should be given to the corporations, whether any of it should be given to the individual taxpayers who got practically all the reduction in prior years, or whether it should be given to those people who are paying these special taxes—sales taxes and excise taxes—and at the same time are themselves subject to the income-tax schedules. The committee after much discussion and deliberation concluded, there being only a limited amount of surplus available, to try to apply the surplus pretty generally throughout the entire scope of taxation and to give the reductions to classes of taxpayers who had received less benefit or practically no benefit from the previous laws; and while Members of the House, of course, will be importuned to support this proposition and that, if we are going to support them all, or if we are going to support any of them, we will eventually find ourselves with a tax bill which will go way beyond the available resources and the available surplus of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the bill now pending does not raise any very fundamental questions; it does bring to our attention in a general way the entire field of taxation, expenditure, and debt.

In 1926 the total tax revenues of the Federal, State, and local governments were $8,500,000,000. The total expenditures of the Federal, State, and local governments for the fiscal year 1925 were $11,124,000,000. The total indebtedness of the Federal, State, and local governments is around $32,000,000,000. The Federal, State, and local governments should cooperate to make equitable these aggregate burdens common to 118,000,000 people. During the present period there is a singular difference between the methods of financing by the States and the Federal Government which is very noticeable. We would hesitate long at Washington, for instance, before deliberately creating a deficit in current receipts and expenditures. The States and localities, on the other hand, are deliberately issuing many hundred millions of dollars of bonds or notes each year to supplement their tax revenues and other treasury receipts. This, however, is mainly for long-delayed road construction and other urgent needs.

I think an unfortunate trend of public sentiment during recent years in regard to taxes is the growing dislike, not to say hate, on the part of the taxpayer with respect to the payment of any kind of tax. Many or most citizens have fallen into a state of mind which causes them to look upon taxes almost as they would look upon blood money. And yet, Mr. Chairman, no expenditure of the citizen, no contribution he can possibly make, assuming that it is judiciously expended, brings back to him more valuable and lasting benefits and blessings than the tax he pays to his Government—Federal, State, and local. [Applause.] I think those in the public service would render valuable service to the country if on suitable occasions they would recount before the people some of the manifold benefits that come back immediately to the taxpayer in return for his taxes. Sad to say, most citizens rarely think of taxes in terms of their benefits and blessings, but only with a view to secure their reduction or their shifting to the shoulders of other classes of taxpayers, regardless of equity or ability to pay.

Until recently, at least, we were spending around 49 per cent of State and local revenues for education and construction and maintenance of public highways. Who would begrudge the payment of taxes for these invaluable and indispensable purposes? We expend $439,000,000 for the protection of the person and property. Every dollar that goes into this expenditure for the protection of person and property—for police, fire protection, for local militia, and those other wonderful agencies that guarantee the security of the person and the family and the property of the American people—yields benefits that are incalculable. We expend $216,000,000 for health and sanitation. Suppose every citizen was obliged to bear the expense of protecting himself and family from contagious diseases, from impure food due to lack of public inspection, and to maintain all those other safeguards that protect the health and sanitation of the American people to-day, his expenses would be staggering compared with his taxes. We expend for charity in hospitals $303,000,000. That money goes to take care of the sick, the feeble, the insane, and the helpless. What taxpayer could be so miserly as to begrudge any of this tax money? These are only a few illustrations of the astonishing benefits and advantages that should not be forgotten by us when we come to pay taxes.

May I for a moment call attention to the genesis of the trouble we are now experiencing about the adjustment downward of the corporation tax rates as I see it? In February, 1919, the peak of the war-tax levies was deliberately fixed at

an estimated yield of $6,000,000,000, based primarily on the calendar year 1918. For 1919 and subsequent years this level of war taxes was lowered to an estimated amount of $4,000,000,000. In 1921 there was a general movement over the country to substitute a sales tax for most of the graduated rates of the income tax and for the entire Federal inheritance tax. The question of normal tax reduction on corporations was not seriously pressed at this time, but the fight was waged to repeal the excess-profits tax on corporations. The outcome was the revenue act of 1921, which repealed the excess-profits provisions and increased the normal tax on corporations to 12½ per cent, from which it had been reduced to 10 per cent for the years 1919 and following. The capital-stock tax of 1 per cent also remained.

Following this relief from the excess-profits tax, the large stockholders of corporations decided that they preferred to wage their next fight to reduce their individual surtax, leaving undisturbed the normal tax of 12½ per cent on corporations. This movement culminated in the act of 1926, granting large surtax reductions. The result has been that most all other classes of taxpayers have secured all in the way of tax reductions they were not ashamed to ask for, while the normal tax on corporations has been shoved along in front without reduction. We are now about to adopt a permanent peace level of taxation, and the corporations are finding real difficulty on account of revenue demands in securing reductions of the normal rate to what many or most people might consider a permanent peace level. We are even retaining some war hangover taxes in response to the Treasury's demands for adequate peace-time revenue.

There is, of course, room for unlimited discussion as to how soon after a war taxation should be placed on a permanent peace level—that is to say, how soon will the Government be content to allow the sinking fund and other earmarked receipts to take care of the public debt and proceed to fix the tax rates with respect to current expenditures? I recall that after the Civil War the taxes were brought down to what was considered a peace level within some 9 or 10 years following the war. We were then able to pay off the public debt, except that portion needed for banking purposes, within a period of 20 years after the Civil War. I think the time is practically here when we should undertake to reach a level of what we might call normal taxation—that is, rates of taxation which applied to the average business year would yield the necessary amount of revenue to pay the current expenses of the Government. We at present start the fiscal year in with a working balance in the Treasury of around $212,000,000. We might well figure on an excess of ordinary receipts over ordinary expenses chargeable against ordinary receipts of, say, $50,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year. Then that amount, together with any sporadic or nonrecurring receipts that may come into the Treasury, could be applied on the public debt in addition to the sinking fund and other items specially provided by law, and in addition, whenever a business year becomes more prosperous than normal years, the swollen receipts that are swept into the Treasury under our permanent stable level of taxation in excess of current expenditures would properly go in payment of the public debt in addition to the sinking fund.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think that would be a very proper policy, as it would provide for the payment of the debt in years when we were prosperous.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. That is the way an individual deals with his indebtedness.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is the way an individual regulates his business.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to one phase of the tax situation before I undertake a few minutes comment on the conditions of our debt and expenditures. I read from a well-known college authority:

> As administered to-day the general property tax is a social and economic scourge which is striking at the foundations of the American home and American agricultural life. The dishonesty, injustice, and innumerable other evils which inevitably attend the general property tax have led one State after another to adopt newer and sounder types of taxation.

We have in bonds and notes alone—omitting stocks of $76,000,000,000 valued at $93,000,000,000 in 1925—around $115,000,000,000 of intangible personalty in this country. The report of the Federal estate tax bureau shows that 65 per cent of the property comprising large estates consists of these and similar intangibles which manifestly escape taxation in whole or in large part during the life of the decedent. There are two ways—and only two ways as I see it—by which these billions of intangibles can be reached for adequate taxation, and that is through the agency of income and inheritance tax methods.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am profoundly interested and admire the gentleman so much, I am sure that if he knew how much I did——

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am very glad that I yielded.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to ask the gentleman, because he condemns the general tax theory so thoroughly, this question. The income-tax theory has been applied in New York, 1 per cent on $10,000, 2 per cent on $20,000, 3 per cent on $50,000, and taken away absolutely from the assessors. Would the gentleman apply the income tax to relieve all this wealth from taxation, as they have done in the city of New York?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, two years ago I addressed the House and undertook then to set out in detail what I conceived to be a good, modernized system of taxation, Federal, State, county, and municipal, and not having the time now to enter into a discussion of the details with the gentleman, I would respectfully refer him to that address, if he would do me the honor to read it. Collection at the source as in England will solve the particular trouble about which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. GIFFORD. I followed the statements of the gentleman very carefully in the hearings, as they relate to his efforts to bring about uniformity in estate taxation by holding on to Federal taxes. I hope that he will say something about some effort that might be made by the Federal Government to have some uniformity in the income tax in the States, before he condemns what Ohio, Illinois, and most of the States still hold onto—the general property tax.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I dealt liberally with that point two years ago, and I would gladly repeat it if I had the time now. My view is that this estate-tax controversy really raises the question of whether one favors the principle of estate taxation to the extent of a substantial levy in this country. If one has this view it would be most inconsistent, while most of the States are striving for uniformity and to succeed need all the aid possible—it would be most inconsistent to deny them the temporary uniformity afforded by the present Federal law, which they so urgently need.

I shall not discuss at any length the question of whether corporation income taxes are shifted or passed on. Most all economic authorities hold that in normal conditions income taxes are not shifted to any important extent. Unlike gross sales or general property taxes, which must be paid whether a concern has derived a profit or suffered a loss at the end of the year, and which enter into the cost of production, the income tax only accrues in the event of profits and is measured by the profits, which are not ascertainable until the end of the year.

It is true that during abnormal business conditions it is possible to visualize earnings which one can with plausibility construe as either profits or taxes that are being passed on. The raising, lowering, or repeal of income-tax rates, on the contrary, does not result in any appreciable raising or lowering of prices to the American people. The law of supply and demand and other considerations govern, as a rule. Business seeks the maximum amount of profits consistent with the maximum amount of business, tax or no tax.

But I did not rise, Mr. Chairman, to discuss in any detail the income-tax situation. I did this two years ago. I do wish to emphasize the belief, however, that during the next few years there will come another fight on both the graduated income and inheritance tax systems, very much as the fight was waged in 1921. If we desire to promote and maintain equitable taxation in this country I warn the friends of these two tax methods to be on their guard. We are even now passing through the throes of what is equivalent to a second deadly assault on the principle of inheritance taxation. The chief line of division of political opinion on internal taxation involves the question of graduated income taxes and substantial inheritance taxation with reasonably graduated rates. May I also say that there can be no fair equitable tax reduction at present unless our exorbitant, iniquitous, and embargo tariff taxes are included.

Some Republican leaders are constantly endeavoring to so represent and dramatize reduction of taxes, expenditures, and debt since the World War as to secure much-hoped-for political favor. In order to keep the official records entirely straight, I shall offer certain facts and figures relating to these phases of taxes, expenditures, and debt in order that both credit and blame may be properly placed: Internal taxes, as stated, were reduced from the war peak of $6,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 by the Democratic Congress in February, 1919. The so-called tax reduction acts of 1921, 1924, and 1926 effected tax reduc-

tions in the estimated amount of $1,604,000,000. The Harding and Coolidge administrations at the same time imposed tariff tax increases of $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000. And furthermore, a matter that is very important to the taxpaying public is the fact that the reduction of the Federal tax burdens since 1921 has been more apparent than real; theoretical rather than actual.

The full figures reveal the aggregate amount of tax revenues, including customs, that have gone into the Treasury each fiscal year, beginning with 1922 and ending with 1927, as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1922	$3,569,000,000
1923	3,186,000,000
1924	3,340,000,000
1925	3,196,000,000
1926	3,417,000,000
1927	3,474,000,000

It appears from the official figures on tax receipts that the level of taxes for 1927—the end of the past six-year period—is $3,474,000,000, as compared with the similar level in 1922 of $3,569,000,000, or an actual as distinguished from a theoretical reduction of $95,000,000. The country, doped almost to death as it has been during the past seven years with propaganda about economy and tax reduction, has in mind an entirely different picture of the relative volume of taxes collected the past year as compared with that of six years ago. What has really happened since 1922 was that the corporation profits in this country declined from $10,700,000,000 in 1917, the highest in history, to about $4,330,000,000 in 1921—but little more than one-third of the amount in 1917. Is it any wonder that individual surtax payers declined? Naturally corporate taxes, too, declined. Since 1921 corporation profits have been generally increasing each year, as business came out from under the effects of the panic of 1921–22, with the result that Congress has simply been paring down the tax rates as corporate profits came back toward normal, so that they continue to pay into the Treasury about the same volume as in some of the prior periods, and hence almost the same burden.

Perhaps never before has so much effort been put forth to impress the country with Federal economy. The average citizen has no doubt that since 1922 Federal expenditures have, through rigid economy, been reduced to the extent of billions of dollars, and yet the official figures of annual expenditures payable out of ordinary receipts, but excluding postal expenditures, for the fiscal years 1922 to the fiscal year 1928, inclusive, speak for themselves and best tell the true story.

United States expenditures

Fiscal year:	
1922	$3,775,000,000
1923	3,677,000,000
1924	3,506,000,000
1925	3,529,000,000
1926	3,584,000,000
1927	3,493,000,000
1928	3,626,000,000

Here is offered the striking revelation that the level of Federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1922 was $3,795,000,000, while the level for 1928, the end of a seven-year period, is $3,626,000,000, or a net reduction of $169,000,000. There has been so much propaganda about "Coolidge economy" that attention might be called to the fact that he came to the presidency in August, 1923, and that the Government expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, was $3,506,000,000, whereas the same estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, is $3,626,000,000, or a net increase during this five-year period of $120,000,000. Further comment is unnecessary.

Almost as much propaganda about reduction of the public debt and the credit due Republican administrations has been indulged in. Again, the official figures should speak for themselves. President Coolidge, in his recent message transmitting the Budget, said:

> From the peak of more than $26,500,000,000 the debt had been reduced on June 30, 1927, by $8,084,794,716.

General Lord and most Republican speakers when on the stump invariably present this picture of debt reduction from its peak in 1919. They also compute interest deductions from the peak of the debt. They also agree that it was necessary to contract this peak volume of debt in 1919. When, however, they attempt to minimize credit due the recent Democratic administration for debt reduction, they about face at the Treasury and pretend that the true peak of the debt was around $25,500,000,000, upon the theory that a large balance was in the Treasury at the time. They might just as logically have gone further and alleged that a large quantity of other assets readily convertible into cash were in existence at the time, and that therefore the true amount of the debt on March 4, 1921, was correspondingly less than the actual or official figures. This is the first instance in which the Treasury has attempted in its annual report to confuse the true status of the debt for partisan purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. We have recently heard much talk about the amount derived by the Treasury from nonrecurring receipts. I have gone into that subject with some care and am confident that in the $3,750,000,000 calculation I have not mistaken the accurate figures more than $100,000,000 in either direction. The following are the net amounts that have actually gone into the Treasury and constitute a part either of our regular expenditures or payment on public debt, which is the same thing.

Practically, cash assets inherited by Harding-Coolidge administrations and amount of net receipts to Treasury, fiscal years 1922 to 1927, inclusive:

War Finance Corporation	$157,247,000
Receipt from sale of Federal farm-loan bonds	199,928,000
Railroads	442,652,000
Grain Corporation	7,000,000
Total	806,827,000
Add:	
Foreign debt interest and repayments	841,000,000
Back taxes collected after 1920 for 1917–20 net	1,300,000,000
German payments for army occupation	25,000,000
Sale of surplus war supplies, including transfers and withdrawals	492,949,000
Reduction of balance in general fund on June 30, 1921	321,000,000
Total	3,776,776,000
Public debt reduction prior to Mar. 3, 1921	2,545,000,000
Grand total	6,321,776,000
Debt of the Federal Government when at its peak Aug. 31, 1919, was	26,596,000,000
Feb. 28, 1921, it was	24,051,000,000
Reduction	2,545,000,000
Total gross debt Feb. 28, 1921	24,051,000,000
June 30, 1927, it was	18,512,000,000
Reduction	5,539,000,000
Grand total reduction from Aug. 31, 1919, to July 1, 1927	8,084,000,000
The amount of reduction prior to Mar. 4, 1921, $2,545,000,000, plus Treasury receipts from cash assets left by Wilson administration, $3,786,000,000	6,332,000,000
Total reduction for which Harding-Coolidge administrations supplied the money	1,752,000,000

Mr. Chairman, these are net receipts from practically cash assets bequeathed by the Wilson administration to the Harding-Coolidge administration.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Pardon me; you mean not due to economy?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Not due to economy or taxes since March 4, 1921. I wanted to have these exaggerated points made just as clear and complete as possible, and I think I have made them so. In addition to this huge volume of net receipts, the Treasury still has on hand the following amounts of securities that were turned over by the Wilson administration March 4, 1921. Before reading them I should say that the Treasury has the presumption to reduce the German debt for Army occupation to its present worth of $156,000,000, although the Harding administration, by the grossest negligence, failed until it was almost too late to take any step to collect this German debt of nearly $255,000,000, with the result that in order to get it recognized at all in the Paris agreement distributing reparations our Government was obliged to remit all interest.

Railroads	$230,454,000
Germany, for Army occupation	224,000,000
War obligations of foreign governments, less Russia and Liberia	9,778,780,000
Securities for foreign governments for war supplies, but omitting those of Russia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Nicaragua, the Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes, $53,143,000; also relief securities, $23,308,000	457,695,000
Securities from sales of war surplus property	12,140,000
Total	10,704,099,000
Deduct from gross debt of June 30, 1927	18,512,000,000
The amount of above securities	10,704,000,000
Leaves net balance of debt	7,808,000,000

There has been much Republican propaganda about the extent to which they have reduced the average interest rate on the war debt. This accomplishment is so infinitesimal that it only serves to remind the country of the wisest and most wonderful war financing by the Wilson administration to be found in the history of any country in any war. The Wilson administration

in 1917 stabilized the total long-term war debt of near $17,000,000,000 on a maximum basis of 4¼ per cent interest rate. Our Civil War rates were from 5 to 7 per cent. In accomplishing this tremendous feat over the protest of almost all the great financial institutions to the effect that the rate must be as high as 4½ per cent at least, the American taxpayers were literally saved billions of dollars compared with the saving of millions by the slight interest reductions which Republican administrations have been able to effect eight years after the war. What really happened was that the peak of the amount paid for interest was not reached until the fiscal year 1923, when the Harding administration paid $1,056,000,000 interest as compared with $1,020,000,000 for 1920. The Harding and Coolidge administrations have permitted the banks to fix prices of Government securities. The result was that the peak of interest rates, which was 4.29 per cent on the average, was not passed until after the fiscal year 1922. Under this loose policy of financing we see even long-term bond issues of $762,000,000, at 4¼ per cent, callable in 1947, standing to-day in the markets at the price of 115¼. Another refunding operation comprised a bond issue of 4 per cent, callable in 1944, amounting to $1,042,000,000, which bears a price to-day of 110¼. Naturally, everyone during periods at all normal would have Government securities at par or a slight premium, but the sort of financing just illustrated will cost the American taxpayers a vast amount of the alleged interest saving. In order that everyone can see, I read the average interest rates on the public debt beginning with the fiscal year 1919 and ending with the fiscal year 1927, as follows:

	Per cent		Per cent
1919	4.10	1924	4.21
1920	4.19	1925	4.14
1921	4.29	1926	4.09
1922	4.29	1927	3.96
1923	4.22		

The anomalous condition that first attracts attention is that with America rolling in wealth and having mountains of idle gold and credit, the Republican administrations have not been able to bring the average interest rate on the public debt, comprising the most gilt-edged securities in existence, down to as much as 4 per cent until 1927, or more than eight years after the war. What a wonderful tribute to the wise financing of the Wilson administration!

The Harding and Coolidge administrations not only fell heir to the huge assets already described but to such great financial and economic agencies as the Federal reserve system, which has stabilized money, credit, and business, and constitutes the outstanding factor in such business improvement as has occurred since 1921–22; the War Finance Corporation, which, as a general utility agency, has served many invaluable financial ends; the farm-loan system, which has been a godsend to agriculture and has reduced the average interest rate to farmers near $200,000,000 per annum; a thoroughly modernized sinking fund law that will wipe out more than $10,000,000,000 of debt within 25 years from 1921; a personnel in the Treasury highly expert in Government financing, and all the technicalities relating to refunding operations and the scientific handling of the technical questions relating to the debt; a great merchant marine.

In the face of these astonishing bequests received by the Harding and Coolidge administrations, and in the face of the official figures relating to reductions of taxes, expenditures, and debt under the respective party administrations, it surpasses the human imagination to see Republican spokesmen endeavor to exalt the accomplishments of Secretary Mellon to the level of those of Alexander Hamilton. Secretary Mellon is recognized by all as one of the great heads of finance and industry in this country. The honest truth, as a matter of ordinary decency, should be acknowledged, however, that the tasks and problems of Secretary Mellon since 1921 have been not only easy but simple in the light of the conditions and facilities with which he was gratuitously presented. I challenge any unbiased person to point to a single problem the solution of which entitled Secretary Mellon to any unusual credit. He should frankly be conceded the fullest measure of credit for any and every accomplishment. It is not necessary for the purposes of my statement that his record should be minimized in the least. But let the official facts and figures speak for themselves.

The public debt, in the light of our national wealth, is not relatively so great as the debt following the Civil War. Nor have we paid on it more rapidly thus far than they paid on the Civil War debt during the years that followed. I am rather strong on debt payment in accordance with the well-established traditions and policies of the American Government in the past. I believe not only in utilizing the sinking fund but, as stated, any important nonrecurring receipts and surpluses arising under normal peace tax rates during years more prosperous than ordinary should be applied to debt payments. I am, in conclusion, prepared to vote for certain amendments to the pending bill, and whether or not they are adopted I shall support the bill on its final passage. I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think that the present law, and particularly the bill, takes care of the reductions that are proper and desirable as against men who derive their incomes from business or industry or commerce, but I submit very respectfully that it does not take care of that large class of men who derive their income from their own labor or personal efforts. It does not take care of lawyers and doctors and architects and engineers and preachers and teachers. These men and, of course, many others who may be named, whose labor, whose personal initiative, and whose brain power are the source of their revenues, are not protected against emergency expenses.

Now, what do we find? Under the law and under the bill, if a man's factory is burned, either totally or partially, there is a deduction. If a man in business contracts bad debts, against which he could insure if he were prudent, yet those bad debts are allowed as a deduction. There is a deduction also for depreciation in the machinery and in the plant generally from which he derives his revenue. There is also a deduction for depletion of mines, oil, gas, other natural deposits, timber, and so on; and we have two additional factors of protection allowed in this bill that have never been in any bill before. One of these is a deduction, on page 24, for future expenses in case of a casual sale of real property, a mere guess as to whether or not a man who sells real estate will have to take it back on foreclosure or something like that; a mere guess.

And again there is a deduction allowed to members of a cooperative apartment house for expenses incident to that apartment, as for taxes, insurance, repairs, and so on. These are deductions as against material things of men who own property. Now, I believe this is the second time or the third time when a revenue bill has been under consideration that I have referred to this matter, and I want to appeal to the men on both sides to take care of those casual, unexpected, and unavoidable emergency expenses which the individual professional man may suffer, against which no amount of forethought on his part can provide, such as sickness and the like.

When a man whose income comes from his own labor is sick not only does the source of revenue stop but there is an expense on top of that—surgical, medical, and hospital. If he dies, or if a member of his family dies, there is a fixed and unavoidable expense. I submit, gentlemen, the reasons which have been submitted heretofore why this should not be allowed are not well founded. There has never been an argument made against the justice and the fairness of it. A man whose income is derived from his factory is allowed a deduction if the factory is partially destroyed or if it is worn out by depreciation. But if his human machine is destroyed by disease, in whole or in part, if through the constant struggle and effort to put over his professional career, he needs the repairs by medicine and surgery and by the hospital for nerve and brain rest, he is not allowed one copper cent as deduction. The excuse that has been made all the time was this: It is unworkable and impracticable. Now, gentlemen, that is the only point I am going to talk about. They say it is impracticable. As I asked my good friend from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], Can there be any fraud worked upon the Government as to whether or not a man was operated on? Is there not a scar on his body to show it? Can there be any doubt as to whether or not some member of his family has been buried? Is there not a fresh grave to mark the fact? Can there be any doubt as to whether or not a man was lain up in a hospital away from his office? There must be a host of witnesses to show that he was not at his office and that he was in the hospital. The only other answer—and that was skillfully given by the gentleman [Mr. CHINDBLOM]—was this: It is impossible to arrive at the measure of expense. Some doctors are expensive and some are not; some hospitals are expensive and some are not.

I will answer just like they answer on this matter of the depletion of minerals. What do they say as to who shall decide how much oil has been drawn out; how much coal has been removed; what depreciation has been made on the machinery; or what loss has been suffered by a partial fire? Who

decides that? Not the taxpayer nor any absolute standard of arithmetic, geometry, logic, or anything else; nothing save the discretion of the commissioner.

In the amendment I shall propose at the proper time there will be conferred upon the commissioner the power to say that these deductions shall be made upon the basis of the ordinary and current value of such expenses, and he shall have the power to decide whether or not the charges for a burial, the charges for an operation, the charges for medical services, and the charges for hospitalization are reasonable and fair. Is not that a hundred times simpler? Is not that one hundred times more certain of ascertainment, and therefore not one-hundredth part of the chance of fraud being committed upon the Government as there is in reference to this matter of the future expense in cases of the casual sales of real property, as found on page 24 of the bill? I would like to know whose guess, whose surmise, and whose estimate shall determine what shall be the deduction as to future expenses arising from the casual sales of real estate. Who shall determine what has been the depreciation in a manufacturing plant, and who shall ascertain and determine by any certain process what has been the depletion from mines, such as oil, coal, gas, or any such mineral product as that, against which deductions for depletion are allowed? Always and only the commissioner.

I submit, gentlemen, that here is the chance and duty of this Congress to say that the human machine is a more important factor in the production of income in this country than the steel machine, and that if we can take care of the material machine, if we can take care of the machine made of iron and of steel, with its essential parts of rubber belting and leather belting and wooden mountings, then we can certainly take care of the human machine that made the material machine. And we ought to do it, so that the taxpayer, finding that he is being worn, that the stress of professional obligations and duties are bearing down on him, will not be compelled to say, "Well, I dare not stop; I must go on to the breaking point, because if I stop running my expenses continue; if I go to a hospital to rest, my expense there will be equal to the losses sustained by a failure to carry on business in the office, and I will be taxed upon my hospital expenses." There is no doubt about this. If a member of my family should die or should have to undergo a serious operation or have to have medical treatment, I pay a tax upon the very money that is paid out for that essential and unavoidable element of expense. There is no doubt about that. I pay a tax on it, and I submit, gentlemen, that we ought not in this act to discriminate against the human machine and the initiative, energy, and enterprise of men and women in favor of the dead machinery which men themselves do make and use to produce wealth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the discussion of this tax bill, following so closely upon the discussion of the appropriation bill, reminds me of the boy who said to his father, "Dad, what is a Congressman?" His father answered, "A Congressman, my son, is a man who is sent to Washington to reduce taxes and vote for all our favorite appropriation bills." [Laughter.]

The question of taxation has been a troublesome one ever since the beginning of time, as was suggested by the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], and although they are nearly always extremely capable officials, the assessors and tax collectors never enjoy a very marked degree of popularity in any community. You will remember that way back in Bible days, when the multitude said, "Master, what shall we render unto Caesar?" That also was a problem of taxation; but in those days taxation was more in the nature of tribute. They did not receive very much material benefit for the money they paid. To-day, as has been suggested, we enjoy many valuable improvements and many wonderful benefits for the money we pay as taxes.

I am not a lawyer and I am not capable of discussing the technical sections of the bill; in fact the few of us who are not lawyers, in the midst of this turmoil, being engulfed by the tremendous technical discussions of the Members of the legal profession, are obliged occasionally to leave the room and get a little air. We find ourselves completely submerged by a flood of legal nomenclature. Possibly the work of the simplification specialists will remedy this condition.

However, we commenced this program of taxation in 1909 in a very modest sort of way with a 1 per cent tax on corporations with an income in excess of $5,000.

The rates were raised again in 1913, and we passed an income tax amendment. The present policy was really begun in 1916, and after our entry into the World War normal rates were doubled and surtaxes increased to 63 per cent. In 1919 the act was passed increasing normal and surtaxes to a total of 77 per cent. Revisions occurred in 1921, 1924, and 1926, and we are now taking the fourth step down the rate ladder after taking five steps up.

In 1924 we had the so-called Mellon plan under discussion in the House, and at that time you will remember "politics was not adjourned." Although many Members suggested that taxation was an economic question and should never be colored with political debate or influenced by political expediency, still politics did creep in, and as we had some Members on the Republican side who did not quite agree with us who united with the Members on the Democratic side of the House, the combination succeeded in preventing the adoption of the 25 per cent surtax, and we were forced to compromise at 40 per cent.

When some of the Democratic Members arrived home after the session of 1924, after the combination filibuster against the Mellon plan, they were not met with outstretched hands and a hearty welcome by many of their constituents. I think they were told in their home territory that they had made a grievous error in throwing away the opportunity they had to improve business conditions by placing the surtax at a figure that would discourage investment in nontaxable securities.

They returned after the next election in quite a different frame of mind and showed a very strong inclination to go along with us, and helped to write a bill that I think met with the universal approbation of the country.

There has been something said about the exemptions provided in 1926, and you gentlemen have all been Members here long enough to know that legislation of this character is obtained by compromise, and the increase in the amount of the exemptions made at that time of $1,500 to single folks and $3,500 to married folks was made in a spirit of compromise because the members of our committee who are on the Democratic side would not go along with us in a reduction of the surtax unless we made this reduction to the individuals, and so we yielded in the matter of the exemptions for the so-called little fellows—as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] denominated them—and then the minority agreed to our rate on surtax.

Now, before answering some of the statements made yesterday by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] I want to say Mr. GARNER sometimes attempts to be very sincere. I might entertain you with a description of many things that happened in the committee, but it is my personal opinion that the ethics of the situation absolutely preclude a Member of the House repeating on the floor statements from the record of executive sessions. This may not be the opinion of all the members of the committee, but even if it becomes merely a tradition I shall continue to respect and observe it.

It is my candid opinion that if the gentleman's party was in power, he would be just as conservative regarding the amount of tax reduction as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is. One advantage of being politically prominent in the minority membership is that you can be vociferously for a policy that you would not countenance or consider if the responsibility rested upon you. The gentleman from Texas, if he were chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, would not be for a reduction in taxes of from four to five hundred million dollars.

Those of us who remember the placement of a duty on goat hair can easily see the reference to the same animal in the newspaper statement that he had decided it was "useless to butt his head against a stone wall," and that he thought three hundred million reduction was about all he could get. The gentleman from Texas has a keen intellect and an engaging personality, but when he starts out on a political rampage he is forgetful of everything except political advantage.

Now if you will take the record, page 167, and read that statement that was made before the committee, I think you will find an absolute answer to the charge made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in his speech. I think you will have no doubt as to the situation, and you will be convinced that we did not take the low estimates because we wanted them to be low, but in many cases we took some higher than the highest estimates of Mr. Nash, Mr. Ebersole, and Mr. McCoy.

I am sure that every member of the committee was anxious to come here to Washington this fall and write a peace-time tax bill. I think there is a great deal of substance in what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] said, that it was time we did so.

I dare say there was a general disposition among Members to do away with the so-called nuisance taxes, but there was

some logic in the argument that as they were put on as a war emergency they should remain through the period of the debt.

But, gentlemen, when you cut your coat you must know how much cloth you have. And we were guided by the Treasury statements as to probable surpluses in future years.

Now, in relation to the error that they say was made in 1927, I refer you to pages 5 and 6 of the record in the Treasurer's report, in which Mr. Mills says that the nonrecurring items amount in 1926 to $215,000,000 and in 1927 to $414,000,000. The loss of these assets must be taken into consideration in the discussion of this bill.

The hearings are very complete and you will find there a discussion of the broad basis of taxation that should be adopted.

One gentleman, who represented the manufacturers of automobiles, in protesting against the tax said that if you wanted a broad basis of taxation you ought to tax bathtubs, because they were used as much as automobiles and a good deal more on Saturdays and Sundays. [Laughter.] Whether that is a sound argument for a broad basis of taxation I leave to your judgment.

Now, on pages 167 and 168 you will find the figures giving the statements of Mr. Nash, Mr. Ebersole, and Mr. McCoy, and I think you will find the interrogations by members of the committee of Mr. Mills particularly interesting. I do not think there is anything so valuable and which will give so much information as this portion of the hearings on the bill and the colloquy between Mr. Mills and the committee.

I should like to have seen the so-called nuisance taxes entirely removed and the corporation tax reduced to 10 per cent, but we were not justified in making greater reductions than this bill contains.

It is possible that with continuing prosperity the reduction in corporation tax may not produce the loss in revenue that the plain arithmetic demonstrates. However, I believe we have about reached the limit of tax reduction, and it might be wise in the future to apply surplus, if there is any, to reduction of the national debt, which, as President Coolidge has said, is "also tax reduction."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the easiest things for a Member of Congress to do is to vote for the reduction of taxes, to offer amendments for reduction, and then go home and tell his constituents how much he did to reduce Federal taxes. It is as easy for the United States Chamber of Commerce to have a referendum among its members as to whether or not they wanted tax reduction. Of course, the answer came back unanimously that they were in favor of tax reduction and demanding a reduction of $400,000,000.

I am one Member of the House who is of the opinion that this is no time to reduce taxes to any great extent. I do not believe that we should reduce taxes this year more than $100,000,000, if we reduce them at all. We must look ahead for the best interest of the country. We must consider 1938 and 1958, not only 1928. We must consider the best economic interest of the whole country and not only the best political expedient for one congressional district.

We hear so much talk about the surplus in the Treasury.

The word "surplus" is handed out as a figure of speech, as if we had every year actually on hand in the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars. Actually, the surplus is only a bookkeeping item. No man has a surplus as long as he is in debt. If you stop and consider, gentlemen, that we have an outstanding public debt of $19,654,886,579.13, you will realize that an excess of receipts over expenditures of a few hundred million dollars amounts to absolutely nothing. In talking about a surplus in connection with taxes or in considering the amount of surplus as reported by the Secretary of the Treasury, it must be remembered that the word "surplus" is used in its technical sense and must be strictly construed. Surplus in public finance is simply an excess of receipts over the ordinary disbursements. Surplus in its general term and as commonly understood conveys the idea of something which remains when use or need is satisfied; something in excess of every need, use, or requirement. In speaking of the surplus of a corporation the word has a much broader meaning, for such a surplus is all moneys in excess of expenditures, outstanding liabilities, and in excess of the total face value of its shares; when we speak of a surplus in connection with an insurance company it means the assets in excess of all the capital required to meet its entire liabilities. In public finance it has no such broad meaning, and I believe that a great deal of the confusion and misunderstanding which has resulted in a demand for excessive tax reduction this year is entirely based on a misapprehension of the true condition of the Treasury. I am sure that if the individual members who voted in favor of tax reduction on the United States Chamber of Commerce referendum had stopped to realize the enormous debt service, such as interest and sinking fund, required to take care of the present outstanding public debt, they would not have joined in the ridiculous demand for a tax reduction resulting in a loss of four hundred million annually in Treasury receipts.

Besides the belief generally, even on the floor of this House, as I pointed out during the last tax reduction bill and on other occasions, the excess of receipts over expenditures called surplus in the Treasury is not really physically available, but is supplied quarterly in redeeming outstanding obligations and as the available cash exceeds the requirements of governmental expenditures the debt is thereby reduced. The situation works out this way: The Treasury has maturities to meet on the 15th of the month in March, June, September, and December. Normally a part of these maturities have to be refunded. In determining how much refunding is necessary the Treasury considers its cash on hand, its expected receipts for the succeeding quarter, and its expected expenditures for that period, and borrows for refunding purposes only enough to carry it to the next quarterly date. The reason for this is obvious, since it is undesirable for the Treasury to borrow money at 3¼ per cent and then to leave it in the banks where it receives 2 per cent interest. An example of how surplus goes into debt reduction can be seen by the Treasury's activities on the 15th day of the month of each quarter. Let us assume that on the 15th day of December there are $400,000,000 of certificates mature. The Treasury takes into account its cash. Let us assume that it is $50,000,000 on that day. It then estimates its expected receipts from taxes and other sources during the next three months in excess of expenditures, and then determines that it must sell, let us assume, $200,000,000 of new certificates. It has thereby indebted for $200,000,000, but has reduced the public debt by $400,000,000, so that automatically the public debt would be reduced by $200,000,000. The situation is, as Mr. Winston, former Undersecretary of the Treasury describes, similar to that of a man who owed considerable money to his bank on a 90-day note. As the maturity comes around he uses his extra cash to reduce his indebtedness and renews for the balance. If the situation should be reversed and it is determined that the expenditures for a quarter would exceed the receipts, then the Treasury would be compelled to sell a larger amount of securities than it paid off and the debt would correspondingly increase. The operation is entirely automatic. Now, gentlemen, how can we talk of surpluses when there is a debt big enough to absorb every cent available each quarter?

In the appropriation bills for the next fiscal year it will be necessary for Congress to provide $369,209,093 as the year's increment to the sinking fund for the redemption of the public debt, and an item of no less than $670,000,000 to pay accruing interest on the public debt. Is it not simply ridiculous to talk about and most unstatesmanlike to urge the wiping away of a surplus by reducing taxes when the debt requires an appropriation of $670,000,000 to take care of interest? I want to remind my progressive friends who were active in the 1924 tax bill—and I am not at all ashamed of my part in the fight on the 1924 tax bill, for I consider the compromise amendments adopted by the House, the surtax on incomes in the last brackets, and the inheritance features of that bill as it passed the House an ideal tax policy for this country to follow—that we must not get away from the policy of taxation, and that there is grave danger of so doing if we support by voting for excess reduction of present taxes. I want to say to my colleagues and friends who represent the farmers and to my friends of the South that they can not consistently, conscientiously, and honestly, if you please, stand on the floor of this House and vote for further reduction of taxes to the tune of three or four hundred million dollars, and then next week come in and demand appropriations for farm relief, appropriations to take care of necessary flood relief. It just can not be done. I repeat, as I said before, any reduction at this time is dangerous, and we should not exceed $100,000,000, which is $132,735,000 less than the bill before us provides.

I want to point out to my friends who are stanch supporters of the income-tax system and a permanent policy of inheritance tax that if we ever permit taxes to run so low as to create a deficit in the Treasury, then it will play right into the hands of those who seek to do away with the income-tax system and who will say, "See, it has broken down; it will not work, and we will abolish it entirely," and substitute for it, of course, the sales tax, thereby relieving the big fellow and putting more burden on the wage earner.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take much of a depression in business, we do not have to get into any great industrial or financial crisis in order to see a material decrease in the re-

ceipt of taxes. A simple standstill of business for a while will make such a difference in the receipts of taxes as to bring us very near the red ink line of Uncle Sam's ledger. At the present time there is not a great margin to play with, as has been suggested on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Another feature of this bill the elimination of which it seems has become popular is the automobile tax. The automobile tax is simply a part of our tax system for the purpose of raising revenue. It has no other purpose. Unlike other provisions of our tax laws, as for instance taxes on narcotics, which gives the Federal Government supervision and control of the traffic, the inheritance tax, if you please, and the surtaxes on enormous incomes as was originally intended, which tends to prevent the concentration and centralization of wealth in the hands of a few families, or of a high tariff on a given article to prevent its importation, the automobile tax had no other purpose than that of raising money and it has accomplished that purpose most satisfactorily. It is easily collected, there is absolute control and can not be evaded, and it is pretty well distributed. I have not heard of one single solitary complaint on the part of an automobile purchaser. As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, the old rate on a cheap car amounted to about $12, and that on the most expensive car sold in this country to about $180. I repeat, I have not heard any complaints from any purchasers of automobiles. From certain quarters a determined movement has been inspired and it has become popular to demand the removal of the automobile tax and to classify it as one of the war-time nuisance taxes. It is not a nuisance tax in any sense of the word. The paying of the tax at the time of the purchase of the automobile can not be compared with other so-called nuisance taxes, most of which have already been abolished.

I can readily understand and I have no fault to find with my colleagues coming from the automobile-producing sections of the country in seeking to abolish entirely the automobile tax, but for the world I can not see how this tax in any way affects the manufacturer. It is not paid by the manufacturers. It is paid by the purchasers. It can not be said that a tax of 3 per cent has in any way curtailed the sale of automobiles. I admit I am at a loss to see why the manufacturers should insist and make so much noise about this tax when very little has been heard from the purchasers. It has been intimated and the House was given notice that an amendment will be offered to abolish the automobile tax entirely. I serve notice now that I will not only oppose such as amendment but if no other Member of the House will, I shall offer a substitute keeping the automobile tax at the present rate. The difference in the present rate and the reduced rate contained in the present bill amounts to a loss in revenue of $33,000,000.

I come from a city that pays a large percentage of the total taxes to the United States Treasury. It would be easier for me to "yes" every demand for tax reduction, to vote for every tax reduction bill and to make myself a good fellow at the expense of the country. We realize in New York City that New York City is New York City because the whole United States is back of it. A few greedy people who think only of their own present taxes can not rush me off my feet to disregard what I conscientiously believe to be the best interest of the country.

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], was pointing out to-day the great benefits that people derive from the money which they have paid to the Government in the form of taxes. That is quite true. But most of the direct benefit, that which the citizen sees in his every day life, comes mostly from his municipal or State government. The functions of city government are daily increasing and care of health, care of children, schools, transportation, light, and heat in many instances are looked after entirely by municipal governments. By the very nature of our form of government the Federal or National Government is limited in its sphere of activities. Yet there are a great many people who believe the Federal Government is wasting money, and when they read of the annual appropriations made by Congress, now reaching the three and four billion dollar mark, the idea becomes general that such an enormous amount is spent by the Government for current needs. The country ought to know, the information should be sent out that over 65 per cent of what we spend annually is spent because of the cost of past wars and the insistence on the part of a great many for the preparation for future wars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, more than that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; more than that, I should say it is nearer 75 per cent. Just look, out of the present Budget of $3,505,000,000, excluding the Post Office, because that practically takes care of itself, with the exception of a few million dollars of deficit, $2,265,000,000 go for past wars and for preparation for future wars. The War Department takes $390,000,000, the Navy Department $362,000,000, and I do not think that includes construction of new ships, the Veterans' Bureau $612,000,000, the Pension Bureau $231,000,000, and interest on your last war $670,000,000. I do not include the sinking fund, because that reduces your debt and interest correspondingly.

Only yesterday we saw this House stupidly stand up here and vote appropriations for $6,000,000 on two tubs that are not worth keeping afloat, when you know—and if you do not know it you should know it, and if you have not been told by the Navy Department the information is available—that we will never as an American Congress ever vote another cent for the building of a new battleship. Naval experts will never ask us to build more battleships. They know they are obsolete. They know they do not want them any more. Yet the department asked you to spend over $6,000,000 on these old tubs. And why? To tie up two ships in a drydock for two years and keep the floating hotels agoing as long as they can. It is easy to go home and say, "I have reduced your taxes," but if you want to maintain the policy of an income tax and an inheritance tax, and if you are sincere that you want farm relief and you want to appropriate funds to take care of conditions brought about by floods, then do not vote one increase in the amount of reductions in this bill but vote to reduce those reductions and continue to reduce the national debt at the rate we are now going. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Chairman, in 1924, when the tax bill was under consideration, I proposed an amendment to strike out section 1101, which delegated to the Internal Revenue Department a blanket grant of power to make rules and regulations that have the binding force of law. This was promptly voted down. I offered the same amendment to the tax bill of 1926, and this was also voted down. My contention being that Congress alone has the power to make law, and that the regulations of the Internal Revenue Department are in fact law. Yielding for a question, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asked if I did not know the courts had held that Congress had this right, and a friend of mine facetiously remarked that my argument was all right, "but, unfortunately, the Supreme Court does not agree with you." It is to this phase of the subject, its effect and results, therefore, to which I now propose to address the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not mean any reflection or offense in any way.

Mr. DEAL. I do not think the gentleman intended any offense and I did not so intend to imply. But what I want to say is, I do not agree with either gentleman.

After having analyzed every decision of the Supreme Court bearing upon this subject, I do not concede to my friend that the Supreme Court disagrees entirely with my view. On the contrary, the courts have in every decision I have found iterated and reiterated the axiom that Congress can not delegate its power to make law. The question which we have to consider, therefore, is not the right of Congress to delegate the law-making power, but as to whether by using another name or exercising a play upon words, it in effect does delegate the right to make law. In Craig *v.* Missouri (U. S. 29, 408) Chief Justice Marshall handing down the decision for the court said in part:

> The Constitution is not to be evaded by giving a new name to an old thing.

In the matter under consideration Congress has drifted into the habit of using the phrase that an executive branch shall have the right to make "rules and regulations," which rules and regulations have the binding force of law, and undoubtedly come within the inhibition, the—

> Constitution is not to be evaded by giving a new name to an old thing.

This decision has not been reversed. There may be a distinction as to a rule or regulation for carrying into effect a law enacted by Congress, but a rule or regulation that is in effect and to all intents and purposes law, is inhibited, and a change of name does not alter the fact.

None will deny that it is a duty of the administration, as a constitutional mandate, to execute the law as enacted by Congress; this involves the necessity for it first to interpret the law and then make such administrative regulations as it may deem necessary to guide its subordinates in carrying out the mandates of the law. It has this right without any statutory law delegating such powers; there is no objection to this; then

why write it into a statute? That very act in itself is a delegation of legislative powers, otherwise why should the administration seek to have such a paragraph incorporated in all of the revenue bills? The Internal Revenue Department has, by its interpretations and regulations, changed our statutory laws, resulting in the grossest injustice to taxpayers and to the plan and system devised for the conduct of the Nation's business. Congress knows that the internal revenue has done these things. If we do not know it, we ought to know it, and when we delegate this blanket grant of power, knowing that the Internal Revenue Department has violated, extended, and contracted the provisions of statutes enacted by Congress, it is equivalent to consenting that the Internal Revenue Department may do these things and is therefore a delegation of the legislative power not warranted either by the Constitution or any decision of the courts that I have been able to find.

In United States, Dallas 2, 409, the Attorney General moved for a mandamus to be directed to the Circuit Court for the District of Pennsylvania commanding the said court to proceed under a certain petition of William Hayburn, who had applied to be put on the pension list of the United States as an invalid pensioner. The case arose out of an act of Congress passed March 23, 1792. The Attorney General stated to the court that the motion was made ex officio without an application from any person, but to secure the execution of an act of Congress. The court was divided and the motion was not allowed. The Attorney General then changed the ground for his motion, declaring it to be at the instance and in behalf of William Hayburn, a party in interest. Still the court held the motion under advisement and no decision was ever rendered, as the reasons assigned by the judges for declining to execute this act of Congress involved a great constitutional question.

The Circuit Court of Pennsylvania had refused the motion on the ground that—

> neither the legislative nor executive branches can constitutionally assign to the judiciary any duties but such as are properly judicial; that the duties assigned to the circuit court by this act were not of that description.

This court, consisting of Justices Wilson and Blair, of the Supreme Court, and Peters, district judge, declared in a letter to the President, that it—

> could not act because Congress was delegating to it powers not judicial.

The Circuit Court of New York and that of North Carolina took the same position, claiming, in substance, that Congress could not delegate to them such powers. At this early date in the history of our Federal Government no judge or court had the temerity to say that Congress could delegate to the Executive or judiciary the right to makes rules or regulations that had the binding force of law.

In Field *v.* Clark (143 U. S. 649), October term, 1891, just 100 years after the Hayburn case was sidetracked.

This was a test case as to the constitutionality of the so-called "reciprocity law," in which the President was authorized to suspend the tax on the importation of certain commodities, upon the condition that the importing country would suspend duties on corresponding exports from our country.

The Supreme Court held:

> The true distinction is between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and in conferring authority and discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first can not be done. To the latter no valid objection can be raised.

The proper distinction, the court said, was this: The legislature can not delegate its powers to make law, but it can make a law to delegate a power to determine some fact or state of things on which the law makes, or intends to make, its own action depend.

The case does not parallel that of the question of rules and regulations of the Internal Revenue Department, no penalties being involved. Mr. Justice Lamar and Chief Justice Fuller, however, dissented in so far that the third section is valid and constitutional legislation, saying:

> We think that this particular provision is repugnant to the first section of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States," and that no part of this legislative power can be delegated by Congress to any other part of the Government, executive or judiciary, is an axiom in constitutional law and is universally recognized as the principle essential to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution. The legislative power must remain in the organ where it is lodged by that instrument. We think that the section in question does delegate legislative power to the executive department. (In Union Bridge Co. *v.* United States, 204 U. S. 364; Monongahela Bridge Co. *v.* United States, 216 U. S. 177; Hannibal Bridge Co. *v.* United States, 221 U. S. 194; St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railway Co. *v.* Taylor, 210 U. S. 281; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Goodrich Transit Co., 224 U. S. 194 et al.)

The court restates the principle advanced in Field against Clark in practically the same language. I should say that there is a material difference, however, in these cases and that of the rules and regulations promulgated by the Internal Revenue Department bearing upon the taxing power. In these cases the individuals clearly encroached upon the rights of others wherein the general public suffered or would suffer in consequence an encroachment upon their property rights. For instance, if a bridge spanning a river impeded navigation, every individual or company engaged in the transportation business would have his rights on navigable rivers impaired. In a sense it would be a confiscation of his rights, and, therefore, the minority enjoying a privilege should in the very nature of things give way to the majority.

The rules and regulations of the Internal Revenue Department, however, affect a great mass of people who in no sense encroach upon the rights of others, but realize a confiscation of their rights, guaranteed by the Constitution, incident to the invasion of the legislative powers by the Internal Revenue Department as a result of the delegation of power by the Congress of the United States to make rules and regulations that have the binding force of law.

In United States *v.* Grimaud (216 U. S. 614, 220 U. S. 506) we find a penalty involved, and the courts seem to have had some difficulty in enunciating a reason for its decision.

This was a writ of error to the District Court of Southern California under the criminal appeals act of March 2, 1907, as defendant in error was indicated for grazing sheep upon the Sierra Forest Reserves without a permit. In violation of regulation 45 established by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning stock grazing upon forest reserves, under the act of June 4, 1897. The district court sustained the demurrer on the ground that the act of 1897 delegated legislative power to an executive officer, and that the act is unconstitutional because it empowers an executive officer to create a criminal offense. There was no appearance for the defendant in error. The judgment was affirmed by a divided court. A petition for rehearing was granted and the cases restored to the docket. The court said, among other things:

> Congress can not delegate legislative power, but the authority to make administrative rules is not a delegation of legislative power, and such rules do not become legislation because violations thereof are punished as public offenses.
>
> While it is difficult to define the line which separates legislative power to make laws, and administrative authority to make regulations, Congress may delegate power to fill up details where it has indicated its will in the statute, and it may make violations of such regulations punishable as indicated in the statute.

And so held that regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture as to grazing sheep on forest reserves have the force of law and that violations thereof are punishable under the act of June 4, 1897.

> The Secretary of Agriculture could not make rules and regulations for any and every purpose. (Williamson *v.* United States, 207 U. S. 425.) As to those here involved, they all relate to matters clearly indicated and authorized by Congress. The subjects as to which the Secretary can regulate are defined. The lands are set apart as a forest reserve. He is required to make provision to protect them from depredation and from harmful uses. He is authorized "to regulate the occupancy and use to preserve the forests from destruction." A violation of reasonable rules regulating the use and occupancy of the property is made a crime, not by the Secretary but by Congress. The statute, not the Secretary, fixes the penalty.
>
> The indictment charges, and the demurrer admits that rule 45 was promulgated for the purpose of regulating the occupancy and use of the public forest reservation and preserving the forest. The Secretary did not exercise the legislative power of declaring the penalty or fixing the punishment for grazing sheep without a permit, but the punishment is imposed by the act itself. The offense is not against the Secretary, but, as the indictment properly concludes, "contrary to the laws of the United States and the peace and dignity thereof." The demurrers should have been overruled. The affirmances by a divided court heretofore entered are set aside and the judgments in both cases reversed by a divided court.

It will be observed in this decision that the Secretary of Agriculture was limited in the matter of regulation to a specific purpose which involved a specific protection to Government

property. It was not broad in its scope, nor did it affect any save those who willfully trespassed upon the property of the United States. It is not parallel in any sense with the unlimited blanket grant of power to the Internal Revenue Department, affecting all kinds of relations of the individual taxpayer with the Government. Nevertheless the language of the court is changed to some extent, and it is not clear really as to what it does mean.

The taxing power is the most vital question upon which a government functions. In analyzing these decisions of the majority and minority members of the court we find the majority laboring in a confused effort to warrant the very thing that it specifically says can not be done, while the opinion of the minority admits of no uncertainty. The majority has led us and itself into the twilight zone, the no man's land, as between a regulation and a law; it admits the difficulty of determining the line of demarcation as between a law and an administrative regulation. It has invited Congress away from the moorings of our fathers; it has led us upon strange waters and then left us in a fog without a chart or a compass with the admonition, "You can not delegate legislative power, but the authority to make administrative rules is not a delegation of legislative power. It is difficult to find the line which separates legislative power to make laws, and administrative authority to make regulations. Congress may delegate power to fill up details, where it has indicated its will in the statute, and it may make violations of such regulations punishable as indicated in the Statute."

Shades of our fathers, what does the court mean? Thank God there were four judges who did not subscribe to this conglomeration of words. I think that monuments in brass should be erected to their momery. Since I can not erect monuments, I will write into the RECORD the names of Justices Fuller, Lamar, Peckham, and Brewer, that the people may reverence the memory of these patriots who so faithfully wore the robes of Marshall and Story. James Madison prophesied during the debates in the Constitutional Convention, and 20 years later while Secretary of State, that if our "Government should ever fall within itself, it would be because of the assumption of authority by the legislative branch." He did not have the vision to see that partisan government would bring together and coordinate the three branches of the Government to this end. For 100 years our Government functioned without executive rules and regulations; the Nation grew in power, in strength, and in wealth. Congress made the laws and the executive enforced them. The rights of the people were secure. This brings us to the question of what is a law, a legislative power that Congress may not delegate. How may we determine this thing that "is not to be evaded by giving a new name to an old thing"? The courts have not marked the dividing line so we can find the administration invading the functions of Congress. By reference to Webster we find the definition of law to be—

A rule of conduct or action which is prescribed, or is formally recognized as binding by the supreme governing authority and is enforced by a sanction. In this sense the term includes any edict, decree, rescript, order, ordinance, statute, resolution, rule, judicial decision, usage, etc., which is made or recognized and enforced by the controlling authority.

The Encyclopedia Britannica defines law as—

From an old Teutonic root, lag, lie, what lies fixed or evenly. A word used in English in two main senses: (1) As a rule prescribed by authority for human action; (2) as a uniform order of sequence.

Black's Law Dictionary defines law as—

(1) That which is laid down, ordained, or established as a rule or method, according to which phenomena or actions coexist or follow each other; (2) a system of principles and rules of human conduct, etc. Law is also divided into substantive and adjective. Substantive law is that which creates rights and obligations. Adjective law provides a method of enforcing and protecting them—in other words, the law of procedure.

It would seem, therefore, that any rule, regulation, decision, edict, decree, rescript, order, ordinance, or resolution is a law, and the court has invariably declared that Congress can not delegate the power to make law. Clearly this brings the rules and regulations and decisions, another "new name for an old thing," of the Internal Revenue Department within the sphere of lawmaking. It can not be successfully disputed. Since Congress has repeatedly reenacted this delegation of power after many of the department regulations have been made, with which it is supposed to be familiar, it clearly does vacate, in part, its legislative powers, knowingly, willfully, and intentionally. The bill under consideration provides in section 62 that—

The commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe and publish all the rules and regulations for the enforcement of this title.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a long concession that has been made by somebody with respect to these rules and regulations. I am not so egotistical as to feel that any act of mine, or even that of the gentleman from South Carolina, has influenced this change in the bill, but I do think that it resulted from an investigation by the Senate committee known as the Couzens committee in developing some things that have been done by the Internal Revenue Department under the grant of power delegated by this section to make rules and regulations.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEAL. I will yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Section 1101 reads exactly in the bill as the gentleman has read.

Mr. DEAL. Does it say "published"?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It says promulgate and publish.

Mr. DEAL. Promulgate the rules?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It says—

shall prescribe and publish all needful rules and regulations for the enforcement of this title.

There has been no change.

Mr. DEAL. It appears that the gentleman from Illinois is correct, but this still further emphasizes the fact that the Internal Revenue Department has little respect for the mandates of Congress.

I have here the published decisions and regulations of the Internal Revenue Department. I shall not attempt to quote them; there are too many, 1,263 pages. They were evolved by: (1) The solicitor; (2) tax advisory board; (3) committee on appeals and review; (4) rules and regulations section of the Internal Revenue Department. There are 3,163 of them. Is this all? Oh, no. There are 17,143 more of these laws that have not been published, according to the report of the Couzens's investigating committee—17,143 laws known only on the inside. No man on the outside knows what they are, no one has seen them, no one has access to them. No lawyer can advise his client, no accountant can make out a tax return that can not be upset, and yet for the violation of any one of the 17,143 unpublished laws any American citizen may be imprisoned. Twenty thousand three hundred and eleven laws enacted by four separate units in the Internal Revenue Department, without concert of action, coordination of effort, or responsibility, these appointees of the Executive, who can not be reached by the votes of the people, are secretly making laws at will, laws not to be published, laws that can be changed in an hour. Under this condition or plan or system, this department has assumed to increase taxes, exempt from taxes, write law, unwrite law, apply the laws of Congress, or ignore the laws of Congress according to the whims, fancies, enmities, or favoritisms of somebody in the Internal Revenue Department, unknown to and unreachable by the voters of the United States. Do not understand me, Mr. Chairman, to reflect, or intend to reflect, upon the Secretary of the Treasury, or the efficient honest employees in this service. I am not. It is the system that I criticize, a system that invites corruption, injustice, oppression, destruction. A vicious system unworthy of any civilized nation. It is the duty of Congress to wipe out the system, and this may be done in part by withholding the blanket grant of power to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make rules and regulations. In debating my amendment to strike out section 1101 in the revenue bill of 1926 I ventured the suggestion that the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee would no doubt contend that the Internal Revenue Department would be unable to collect taxes without this unlimited grant of power. Oh, no—said the gentleman in reply—

the department could collect the taxes all right, but the taxpayer would not know where he was at.

In the name of high heaven how can the "taxpayer know where he is at" with 17,143 unpublished laws of which he knows nothing and can not know anything.

Speaking for my constituents, and, I think, for the American people, I ask that we be delivered from the system of "knowing where we are at." Three years ago, when I first offered to amend by striking out this blanket grant of power to the Internal Revenue Department, I had five minutes under the rules of this House in which to present my objections. I asked unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, to which my distinguished colleague from Iowa objected. Under protest, however, he withdrew the objection, but moved that all debate end in five minutes. Ten minutes in which to debate a grant of power that has led to a promulgation of 20,311 unlawful laws affecting the collection of billions of dollars in taxes and the refund of hundreds of millions more. When the lengthy debate of 10 minutes upon the most vital question

affecting American citizens ended, my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN], whom I esteem, because he, like myself, is simple enough to think the Constitution ought to be obeyed, offered to amend by requiring the Internal Revenue Department to publish its rulings and submit them to Congress. This amendment seemed so innocent, so harmless, so inoffensive that it passed without debate. Little did he think, little did I think, little did any seem to think of what vast import it was. Mr. Chairman, it would have sent to the junk heap 17,143 secret laws that ought to be junked. But the Internal Revenue Department saw to it that the Senate amended this amendment out of the bill, and when it went to conference, having no friends, it died. On March 25, 1927, the press announced that—

Another income-tax reduction is a possibility. Revised estimates at the Treasury place the total collections for the year June 30, 1928, at approximately $4,800,000,000. The first quarterly income-tax receipts this year exceeded by more than $40,000,000 those obtaining last March.

Implying, I suppose, that the reduced income-tax rate is responsible for the gain; but why not? Under its system the department can make the tax any amount it pleases, irrespective of the rate fixed by Congress. The Couzens committee report shows wherein hundreds of millions of dollars have been lost to the Government by these rulings. Conversely, it could increase the revenue at will. My colleague from Texas insists upon graduated income taxes as a means of preventing swollen fortunes, and rules and regulations by which to get them. It is a dream. He defeats his own ends. There are many ways to beat him to it. The above is one. By the graduated income tax we invite the big fellow to chip into the campaign fund of the party that will protect him. We invite and pave the way to corruption in its worst form. Even so, he still passes the load on to the consumer by fixing his prices for commodities sold.

Small business can not fix prices; neither can the retired business man, no longer a menace to society, widows, or orphans. The system punishes the helpless. The big fellow can and does protect himself. It does not pay to do wrong. Do right and we will not have to apologize. Cut out the delegation of the power to the executive to make rules and regulations and we will have honesty and decency and order in our tax system. As a warrant for my strictures I quote from the—

COUZENS INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

On March 12, 1924, this committee was appointed by the United States Senate and directed to investigate the Internal Revenue Department and report its findings, with recommendations for corrective legislation. The committee found it necessary to employ legal, engineering, accounting, and clerical assistance authorized by Senate Resolution 211. I can in the time at my disposal only refer briefly to a few of the conclusions of the committee. Every Member of Congress should read these reports.

AMORTIZATION OF WAR FACILITIES

Notwithstanding—

Says the committee—

the tremendous amounts involved, the regulations have contained no adequate statements of the principles to be observed in determining amortization allowances. No ruling or instructions for the guidance of either the engineers of the Income Tax Unit or taxpayers were published until after the expiration of the time fixed by law for the redetermination of claims. The only published ruling of the solicitor on this subject prior to October, 1925, has been completely ignored, and there has been a total lack of supervision over the work of the engineers of the Income Tax Unit engaged in passing on amortization claims.

The failure to observe any well-defined principles as to either the kind of property, the cost of which is amortizable, or in measuring the allowance has resulted in the grossest kind of dicrimination among taxpayers.

While the purpose of the amortization provision was to encourage the acquisition of facilities for the production of war necessities, a large part of the allowances are upon facilities acquired by contract entered into before April, 1917.

There has been gross discrimination in arbitrarily allowing amortization for reduced postwar cost of replacement in some cases and in denying it in others similarly situated, in allowing amortization to some transportation companies while it is generally denied others, and in allowing amortization on land.

COMPROMISE OF TAXES AND PENALTIES

It has been the consistent policy of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to exceed the authority delegated by Congress to compromise taxes. The commissioner, in compromising taxes, has followed the policy of giving the unsecured creditors and stockholders of insolvent corporations precedence over the Government's claim for taxes.

As administered by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the fraud penalty fixed by Congress is never enforced but is treated as a maximum penalty.

REFUNDS, CREDITS, AND ABATEMENTS

Tax refunds amounting to $459,090,825 were made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue from July 1, 1921, to April 30, 1925.

The refunds, credits, and abatements exceeding $250,000 aggregate $171,546,416.59. An analysis, based upon the ground of allowance, is given in this report. This analysis shows that the two principal grounds for these allowances are increased allowances for invested capital and taxing by special assessments. These two grounds account for $73,842,115.35, or 43.04 per cent, of all the refunds, credits, and abatements exceeding $250,000.

A list of refunds, credits, and abatements exceeding $1,000,000, which aggregate $85,929,697.99, is contained in this report at page 195.

DIVISION HEADS SUPREME

The practically unlimited discretionary power vested in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is actually exercised by the division heads. These division heads are governed by no adequate rules or instructions and unless a taxpayer is dissatisfied with the determination of his tax, or unless a refund exceeding $50,000 is involved, there is no review of the work done under a division head.

Under the procedure of the Bureau of Internal Revenue there is no way for any tax determination which is satisfactory to the taxpayer and which does not involve a refund of $50,000 or more to be brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or any other superior of a division head, except by the protest or complaint of a subordinate of such division head.

All communications from subordinates of division heads to superiors of division heads are forwarded through the division heads. Communications from section chiefs to the commissioner and solicitor relating to official business have been suppressed. It is the policy of the Income Tax Unit to discourage complaints and protests by subordinates. This policy leaves the division heads supreme and their superiors in ignorance of how the law is really administered.

PUBLICITY OF PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES

Many of the principles, practices, methods, and formulas applied in the determination of tax have never been reduced to writing, and only 15½ per cent of the formal written rulings applicable to income taxes have been published.

This failure to promulgate and publish the principles and practices to be followed in the determination of tax liability has had the following results:

(1) Information for the guidance of the employees of the Income Tax Unit is so incomplete that gross discrimination results from the failure to apply uniform principles to similar cases.

(2) Taxpayers in many instances have failed to claim allowances granted others similarly situated.

(3) To secure the benefit of unpublished precedents taxpayers are forced to employ former employees of the Income Tax Unit to advise and represent them in tax cases.

(4) Their exclusive possession of information as to the unpublished precedents and practices of the Income Tax Unit has placed an artificial value upon the services of ex-employees which enables them to demand and receive immense fees for information which should be freely available to everybody.

(5) This artificial premium thus placed upon the exclusive information possessed by the employees of the Income Tax Unit and the opportunity thus afforded for highly lucrative outside employment is the cause of the extraordinary turnover among the employees of the unit and of the difficulty experienced by the unit in retaining the services of competent employees at salaries within the range of the salaries paid by the Government for comparable service.

(6) The failure to consider closed cases as precedents and to publish the principles and practices followed in closed cases as precedents has deterred the formation of a body of settled law and practice. The unsettled state of the law and practice has encouraged the filing of claims for allowances and require the constant rediscussion and reconsideration of questions which should be settled by precedents established by closed cases.

(7) The fact that a ruling will be published and the benefit of its principles claimed by taxpayers similarly situated is the strongest possible deterrent against making unsound rulings.

(8) During the course of the hearings there has been a great deal of evidence tending to show that it is the policy of the bureau to fix taxes by bargain rather than by principle. Rul-

ings based upon bargains can not be published as precedents. The best and most persistent trader gets the lowest tax and gross discrimination is the inevitable result of such a policy.

PUBLICITY OF RECORDS

The unsatisfactory condition developed by this investigation are the inevitable result of the delegation of almost unlimited discretion to be secretly exercised. It is believed that but few of the unsound settlements to which attention has been called would have been made if it were not for the belief that they would never become public.

Congress in imposing a system of taxation, the administration of which necessarily involves the exercise of so much discretion, assumes some duty to the public to see that such discretion is not abused.

DISCRIMINATIONS

(1) The bureau has, without authority, made retroactive the provisions of sections 327 and 328 of the 1918 revenue act in regard to abnormalities of invested capital and income in determining taxes for the year 1917.

(2) No scientific basis has been set up by the bureau for determining when a company is entitled to special assessment.

(3) The grounds for special assessment granted by the bureau are in some cases economically unsound and in other cases result in nullifying those provisions of the act limiting the allowance of good-will values in invested capital, excluding borrowed capital from invested capital, providing for the taxation of gains due to appreciation after March 1, 1913, and providing for the valuations of stock issued on reorganization. In certain cases the results which would be obtained from the application of the war-profits tax are also nullified.

(4) The bureau's methods in administering the special assessment provision of the act have resulted in gross discrimination between taxpayers.

Section 326 of the revenue act of 1918, page 198, qualified the restriction upon the value of property exchanged for stock to its par value. Examples: Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Pond Creek Coal Co., United States Graphite Co., Union Sulphur Co.

BORROWED CAPITAL ILLEGALLY INCLUDED IN INVESTED CAPITAL

Both the 1917 and 1918 acts specifically provide that borrowed capital on property can not be included in invested capital. The 1918 act and the published rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue provide that liabilities carried in open book account are borrowed capital within the meaning of that term as used in the act.

Section 207 of the act of October 3, 1917, provides that—

As used in this title, "invested capital" does not include * * * money or other property borrowed * * *.

Section 326 (c) of the revenue act of 1918 provides that—

As used in this title, the term "invested capital" does not include borrowed capital.

Five cases are cited in which the taxpayer included borrowed capital as invested capital, all of which were disallowed by the tax units or commissioners and sustained by the board of appeals.

That these published rulings can not be accepted as conclusive of the practice of the Income Tax Unit and that there is gross discrimination in dealing with this subject is shown by the allowances to the Star Co., of New York.

APPRECIATION INCLUDED IN INVESTED CAPITAL

The published regulations and rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as well as the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, construe the term "invested capital," as defined in section 207 of the revenue act of 1917 and section 326 of the revenue act of 1918, as meaning the capital contributed to or paid into an enterprise plus any net profits earned but not drawn out of the business. (Secs. 831–840, Regulations 45, A. R. R. 517, Cumulative Bulletin No. 4, La Belle Iron Works *v.* United States, 256 U. S. 377.)

These rulings and regulations specifically hold that in determining the earned surplus to be included in invested capital due deduction from operating earnings must be made to cover sustained depletion, and that appreciation in the value of the property can not be offset against depletion sustained in determining invested capital is held by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case above cited.

That the decision of the Supreme Court, as well as its own rulings, were ignored is illustrated in the case of Anaconda Copper Co. It will be seen that the Internal Revenue Department has manifested an utter disregard as to a uniform method of taxation, but has willfully, knowingly, and intentionally shown favoritism and discrmimination, laying the foundation for corruption and fraud. Verily the power to tax is the power to destroy.

EXPIRED PATENTS AS INVESTED CAPITAL

The Pressed Steel Car Co. was organized in 1899 to take over the assets and business of the Schoen Pressed Steel Co. and Fox Pressed Steel Equipment Co. The authorized capital stock was $25,000,000, of which $1,500,000 was sold for working capital and $23,500,000 was exchanged for the property and business of the old concerns, consisting of patents, $10,000,000; good will, $5,000,000; other assets, $8,500,000. The invested capital for 1917 was determined to be $37,000,000, consisting of $25,000,000 paid-in capital and earned surplus of $12,000,000. In computing the earned surplus no deduction was made to cover depreciation of the patents, all of which expired in 1917. Under the 1918 act patents are made intangible property, and intangible property acquired for stock is limited by congressional statute to 25 per cent of the outstanding capital stock for invested capital purposes. Under these specific provisions the patents and good will as invested capital, to the amount of $15,000,000, could not be included in the revenue bill in 1918 as invested capital for an amount in excess of $6,250,000.

Mr. Gregg stated that the practice followed in this case had been followed in thousands and thousands of cases.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

The committee says (p. 219), considered from every angle:

We contend that the policy of granting corporations relief by special assessments because the said corporations pay its officers too small salaries, is unsound, illegal, and ridiculous. Efficient management of a corporation is not an abnormal condition demanding relief from taxation. The bureau contends this is a correct basis. The revenue act of 1918, section 200, sets up certain restrictions concerning the right of assessment under the name of personal-service corporation. The bureau evidently considers this provision of the statute too strict, so it proceeds to nullify the effect of these restrictions by special assessment. Why did the bureau not ask Congress to amend this section 200 if it was unjust, instead of trying to accomplish that purpose by applying the special assessment? Ask the commissioner.

From the decisions of the United States Supreme Court I have quoted those that have gone the farthest and strongest with respect to the delegation of legislative power, upon which those desiring to make such grants can base their claims. The Couzens investigating committee has developed that under the grant of power to make rules and regulations the Internal Revenue Department has had but little respect for the statutes as enacted by Congress, or even for its own rules. It has acted upon its own momentary whims and desires. The cases cited by the Couzens committee refer only to large incomes. The millions of small taxpayers who can not employ expert advice and help, because it would be cheaper to pay the increased assessment than to pay the expert, as usual, go unnoticed and bear their burden in silence.

Mr. Chairman, I want right here to answer Senator COUZENS and his committee and put it into the RECORD where they can see it, and I want my colleagues on this floor to pay attention thereto, especially the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, chairman of Ways and Means Committee. Why should the bureau come to Congress, why should it not have changed the law to meet its ideas? Has not Congress abdicated to it the right to do these things?

Has not the gentleman from Iowa twitted me because of my ignorance in not knowing that Congress had this right? Did he not deny to Congressmen the right to debate the question? Did not the Senate which authorized Senator COUZENS's committee to make this investigation strike from the House revenue bill the requirement that the Internal Revenue Department should publish their rulings and report them to Congress?

Mr. Chairman, what they should have done was to have joined me in 1924 in striking from the bill section 1101. Are we, as a whole, afraid of the Internal Revenue Department? Unless a halt is called, unless Congress soon asserts and reassumes its powers, it will not be long ere the executive branch will not take the trouble to ask us to rubber stamp its wishes even in part.

Mr. Chairman, there are more than 50 cases cited by the committee with explanations. For want of time these have not been intelligently and fully discussed. This investigation has fully justified the position that I have heretofore taken and now take, that Congress should write its own laws and quit granting blanket delegations of power to the executive branch to make rules and regulations that have the binding force of law. If Congress expects ever to reestablish itself in the confidence of the public it must stop passing the buck. It must function and function in the interest of the general public. It must stand upon its hind legs and tell special interest to stand aside. By special interest I do not mean only big capital, I mean any person or coterie of persons, any minute organ-

ization or combination of organizations that may chance to hang around the lobbies demanding that the Treasury door be opened to them by direct or indirect methods.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do about it? The court says Congress can not delegate its legislative power. Does Congress intend to admit its inability to function and abdicate to the executive branch the lawmaking power? We enact an average of 400 to 500 statutes annually, or 6,500 laws in the past 13 years, during which time the executive branch has gotten into full swing in the lawmaking business. By the 85 departments, bureaus, boards, and commissions, to all of which Congress has abdicated, in part, its power to make rules and regulations and decisions, "New names for an old thing," there have been promulgated in the same period of time a probable 100,000 or more laws, all carrying penalties upon American citizens for violation. Many of them unwritten and unpublished by men unknown to the taxpayer, appointed, some under civil service, who can not be reached by the voter. Unintentionally perhaps somebody has violated his oath of office, somebody has betrayed the trust of the people, somebody has neglected his duty. It seems to me that every man in every branch of the Government in any manner responsible for and indorsing this system should be held to account. The people ought to know what we are doing to them in order that one or both of the great political parties may at their next national conventions write into their platforms a plank condemning this practice as unwarranted and unlawful. Some Congressmen seem to think that because the Supreme Court declares that a thing may be done we are bound to do it, but we are not. We are supreme within our delegated powers, and self-respect should prompt us to do our duty. The taxing power should be held rigidly to laws written by Congress. The Ways and Means Committee should be enlarged and divided into subcommittees. The Appropriations Committee should be abolished and responsibility distributed. Oh, I know the arguments for its existence.

Mr. Chairman, my answer is that the representatives of 8,400,000 people appropriate all of the money of 115,000,000, the representatives of 106,000,000 of whom, practically have no voice in the matter. The creation of the Budget Commission has been hailed as the greatest piece of constructive legislation of the century; in my opinion it is the first step in turning over to a single head the taxing power, which though useful at the moment, will in time lead to the greatest abuse, for history teaches that the man intrusted with vast powers in any field of endeavor is an exception who has not abused that power. Indeed the Congress has, I believe, reduced in some measure the appropriations recommended in every Budget that has been presented, and yet the Congress has been censured for its extravagance, while the President has been lauded for his economy. Following the example of Congress, of the courts, and its own practices, this Budget stepping-stone will sooner or later lead to the demand as a right by the Executive to exercise the taxing power without restraint or check by Congress. Even now it is almost impossible to get a congressional committee to report a bill authorizing the payment of an honest debt by the Government unless agreeable to the executive branch. Already Congress has delegated to the Executive the right to raise or lower duties at will, to fix through the Budget Commission that which we may spend. In short, the power to reward his friends and punish his enemies. Where are the friends of the people? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], in a speech upon this floor, aptly said, "The people have no representation." Congress has surrendered under whip and lash to the Executive, representing big interests on one hand and loud-mouthed minorities seeking special interest on the other. The masses are ignored except to pay the bill.

What ought to be done? Mr. Chairman, the self-respect of congressmen should prompt them to change the rules of this House which hamstring and hog-tie its Members as a whole to the dominance of a very few. Responsibility should be distributed as a means of checking the concentration of power and to preserve the reserved rights of those whom we are supposed to represent.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I yield to no one in my admiration for the great city of New York, one of the wonder cities of the world and one that history will always record as a marvel of the existing civilization. It will always have a place with the great metropolises which have secured the admiration of past ages and with those even mightier cities that are yet to come.

In the main I agree with the views expressed by Mr. LAGUARDIA, but I can not agree with that gentleman entirely when he suggests that New York ought to be given a great deal of credit for paying enormously of the revenues of the Federal Government. New York, and I repeat we all have an admiration and an affection for the imperial city of the Western Continent, only pays upon the income which she derives from all parts of the United States. The suit of clothes on my back, the shoes that I wear, the underclothes I have on, and the hat I have out there in the cloakroom, all came from New York, although I live in the city of New Orleans. That same thing may be said by millions of people who reside in all parts of the United States.

For many reasons and from many standpoints New York is well situated and is a great and populous city and will long remain so, and we are proud of it. We are not envious of it

But there are a great many reasons which are not necessary for me to dwell upon, but which are clearly obvious, why we should not give undue consideration to the claims of the big cities but should correctly appraise the metropolis and the taxes paid to the Federal Government from there as a collecting agency, as it were, for incomes, revenues, and returns from all parts of the United States. I might mention, however, that her banking houses are aided enormously by the balances that business and financial concerns carry there and that insurance rate premiums, fire and life, and railroad rates derived from every village and town from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian line to the Gulf, give her an artificial advantage which combined with her natural advantages makes her invincible. She occupies a magnificent position, and for that reason is the legal domicile of many large corporations and industries that drain the country of vast wealth, and therefore ought to pay the income taxes upon the prodigious revenues it derives from all parts of the United States of America.

But what I really rose to say, Mr. Chairman, was that a few weeks ago there appeared an article in a magazine published in Chicago, called "Liberty," which is beginning to enjoy a tremendous vogue. It is probably a rival of the Saturday Evening Post. Its editorials are short, pithy, and contain a great deal of information. And this editorial to which I refer received the commendatory approval of all the newspapers of the United States, judging from the excerpts that I have seen in the New Orleans papers that I have read. It states that it is more important to have a surplus which might be invested in public works than to grant a tax reduction.

That paper represents in all probability the conservative thought of some of the biggest financial interests of the United States. It is suggested that the great danger this country wanted to guard against was nonemployment; that it is more important to keep our workmen employed, those who toil and earn their bread by the sweat of their brow—it is far more important that millions and millions of our countrymen should know where they are going to lay their heads, and know that they are going to have something of a revenue to sustain them in life, than to be concerned over the reduction of taxes to men who, to use an old expression, not offensively, were born with silver spoons in their mouths, were rocked in golden cradles, and who dwell in palaces of wealth during their lifetime. We have to concern ourselves with the vast majority who can not pay income taxes. According to the returns of our Department of Labor, our countrymen, 9 out of 10 of them, have nothing with which to meet a rainy day; so that I say, I think, never having been a worshiper of Mammon, believing that those able to pile up millions and millions and who come into the world so equipped as to make for success in that direction are not in need of our special concern, that that editorial contains more human wisdom, understanding of life, governmental philosophy, and economic knowledge than anything your Committee on Ways and Means heard during their entire session, and I say that most respectfully of the committee. I believe the Government need not concern itself too seriously over those fortunate few who pick apples of gold from pictures of silver. I would like to give my unqualified and admiring approval to that editorial and say that I believe it is far more important for our country to use a surplus so as to relieve the woes and miseries of the humbler classes in the United States, and far more important to pass and grant a flood relief bill than to fret about a reduction which sum might be profitably invested by our country in the manner I have suggested.

My friends, it would be merely a repetition of a sad story for me to tell you about the great suffering of the people of the Mississippi Valley during the recent devastating flood, when 700,000 people were rendered homeless and hundreds of mil-

lions of property destroyed. I know that it is almost unnecessary for me to say that if we are not given the protection we are entitled to, we might as well abandon the valley and seek other homes, for our efforts to secure the fruits of our labor and toil will be fruitless. That grim terror of leaving our homes forever, that specter of the flood wiping us out, country and city, has been with us night and day for more than two generations. If the Nation through the Federal Government does not do its full duty some historian of the future ought to entitle that chapter "The Nation's disgrace."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. But during the period of the slow but sure evacuation of the valley, industry, finance, agriculture, and commerce would feel the tremendous loss of that vast purchasing power which lies in that vast region and which to a large extent makes for the prosperity of the North and South Atlantic Coast States. New England and other sections of the North which sell to the river States their goods would feel the tragic result. It is far more necessary and wiser to use any surplus as an aid to the disheartened agriculturists and the workers and enough to keep up our river and harbor work and our public-building work and road work, to provide for flood relief and against those disasters and calamities which attack all nations soon or late, than to add a few dollars more to coffers that are bursting full. I repeat, I am more concerned in keeping the masses of our people employed than in granting a reduction of taxes to those who have more money than they know what to do with at this moment, even though that may be deemed desirable by financiers and economists. [Applause.] Use the surplus to take up the slack in dull times, in periods of industrial depression, by putting men who would otherwise be out of employment to work on public works, and when industry revives slow up on public work and return to activity in that direction at the next cycle of depression.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has called my attention to an error in my statement with respect to the publication of the rules and regulations. I find he is correct; but it emphasizes the fact that the Internal Revenue Department, in withholding the publication of 17,143 rules and regulations, has not followed the mandate of the law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the few remarks which I have to make are on the general tax bill. None of us seem to be disappointed with, or disaffected in particular about, what the committee has reported, and as I have listened to the remarks this afternoon I have heard of only one or two amendments that may possibly be offered, showing our satisfaction in the main with the committee's work on the particular bill. But at this time we ought to have an opportunity of expressing ourselves if we do not fully agree with the underlying idea of raising our money by this particular method of taxation. It is very interesting for me—as one of those who has never been fully in harmony with this method—to read what those who are the friends or the fathers of the bill have to say about it. I have been very much interested in reading in the hearings during the last week the many warnings of our friend from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], who, I think, is indeed very sound on the matter of income taxation, although I sometimes have the suspicion—having seen it work—that the only purpose of having an income tax in a State was simply to relieve intangibles from paying that share of the burden which they ought to pay, knowing that it must remain for real property to pay that vicious property tax. So you can not blame us for sometimes having that suspicion, even about those whom you are apt to follow and who you know really are sincere in the matter of the income tax.

Yesterday a tribute was paid here by the leader of the Democratic Party to our friend, as we sometimes familiarly call him, "Tommy" Adams. I have known of him for many years. We all value his opinions. He was one of the founders and is certainly one of the friends of the income tax. One of the purposes of my rising here is to insert in the RECORD the words of Professor Adams, which appeared in the press of yesterday:

> The administration of the Bureau of Internal Revenue he criticized as a "standing indictment against our political intelligence and our capacity for efficient administration."
>
> He asserted that on June 30, 1927, there were 18,313 cases pending before the Board of Tax Appeals, and it would take the board four years to clear its docket even though no new cases should come before it.
>
> He said this congestion was due to the "legalistic idolatry" of the American mind and the constant change in personnel due to low wages. The remedy, he said, lay in a few simple changes that the business men or the engineer would recognize after even a superficial study.

I am inclined, however, to disagree with his last statement. There are 226 pages in this bill, and there are many pages, I am sure, that are exceedingly complicated and difficult to understand, although they may be necessary. We have, indeed, adopted a method of determining net incomes which is itself difficult and complicated.

I have here a statement from a prominent official of the Federal Government—one who is a recognized authority in the matter of the income tax—a statement that is a terrible indictment of this method of raising money, and I want this to go in the RECORD:

> Already suffering from technical "congestion of the brain," the Federal tax law must either be simplified or die of complications. Four hundred million dollars, the annual toll paid by private citizens and corporations for advice and accounting merely to prepare returns, exceeds fourth of total tax yield.

If that is not indictment enough, and if it does not carry a suggestion that we ought to try to think of some other method of raising money, I do not know what is or would.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would be something of an indictment if it were so.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will enlarge upon that statement by saying that $100,000,000 was estimated for the hiring of attorneys; $300,000,000 for accounting and the time of officials of corporations and individuals in keeping their books in such a condition that they could properly make a tax return. I do not think the gentleman's imagination would be overdrawn in believing that it costs individuals and corporations combined this sum of $400,000,000.

The one who made this assertion is the man who had charge of our income tax in Massachusetts, and was recognized by us to be easily the foremost man on the subject of income tax in our State. We could not pay him salary enough, and for the last several years he has represented private individuals and corporations, with offices both in Boston and Washington. He states here that he realizes it costs the citizens of Boston at least $3,000,000, and he goes on to explain that it is reasonably easy to get a proportional cost for the whole country.

I do not know what better authority we could get, but I do not care if it were only $200,000,000, half of the amount he suggests; we all know that the total sum is outrageously high and that there ought to be some other and simpler method which would not place so great a burden on the taxpayer.

You can not fairly determine net income, and you know you can not determine it. When the gentleman from Illinois answered the question about providing a deduction on account of sickness or on account of the education of children, he said that the taxpayers would abuse such permission, that they would enlarge on such bills, and it would be impossible to determine the truth. Think of the risk the Government must run on the deductions allowed upon tremendous and complicated business transactions. He has to take the word of the department down there on those big things, but the department can not be trusted to O. K. and dissect a doctor's bill or a bill for the education of children.

Criticisms of this nature should be welcome in a general discussion, for if they were not made the impression might prevail that we have the best method available to meet the expenses of our Government.

Many think the income tax law ought to be reserved for the States. However, we have made such a mess of it the States have not seen fit to take any leaves out of our copybook recently and enact more income tax laws. They have learned that the procedure is too complicated.

Some day, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will be able to frame a bill that we may merely ask the taxpayer, "How much are you worth? What is the market value of what you are worth," and not force him to go through the very complicated procedure

of trying to determine—something which you can not determine in many cases—his net income, and that at a great cost to him.

I do not believe in an exemption of $3,500. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] that there should be fewer exemptions but that we should have more liberal deductions. Everybody should pay something, his proportionate share of the expenses of his government, so that we may have a broad base on which to stand. The present method is altogether too unfair. Even politically speaking, it is not wise to have too many exemptions and place the whole burden on 4.2 per cent of the people.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes, certainly.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, the gentleman understands that the suggestions made when I had the floor were that these deductions should be in addition to the present exemptions. The gentleman does not think for a moment that any of the gentlemen who made those suggestions propose to reduce the exemptions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is much else I would like to say. I have waited five years for an opportunity to say this. [Laughter and applause.] I have waited all the afternoon to say what I have said; and on the general proposition I want to say to you, sir, that some of us outside of the committee are thinking very deeply about it, and some day we hope to find a different and more equitable method. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will take only a moment. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has just taken his seat, I want to say that the same line upon which he has already spoken has been repeated here and still more often in the press and elsewhere. The difficulties with reference to the income tax are great, but people do not pay any attention to the hardships under ordinary taxation. They do not think about the hardships under a State property tax taking away the property of the poor man for improvements. The income tax takes nothing except out of the profits. The property tax sometimes takes the whole property. The poor man working for wages is taxed for public improvement and often his property is entirely consumed, although it does him no good. He gets out of work, is making nothing, but he must pay the tax just the same. He, perhaps, holds simply the title to the property. It is mortgaged for nearly its whole value, and in almost every State he has to pay the tax on the whole property, although he owns nothing but an equity. All of these hardships we hear nothing about; they talk about the hardships of the tax that is taken out of the profits that people have made, and it is the easiest tax that is paid. I am not finding fault with the gentleman from Massachusetts as much as I am with gentlemen on the outside.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have no objection to the amount that is paid under the income tax. I want to get at it in a different way. It is not the amount, it is the irritation and the expense of paying it is my objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I understood the gentleman's remedy would be to go out and ask the individual how much he was worth. How easy it would be to take 50,000,000 people and find out how much each individual was worth. That would be a simple matter; there would be no trouble about it—find out what each individual was worth and then levy a tax; that would be a simple matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. I would have a sworn return as you do to-day under the income tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER].

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and if I have any time remaining I yield it to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER].

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, all of the Members of the House who have had the floor so far have spoken for the men and women who are paying the income tax. They have spoken for the well to do and the rich.

HOW ABOUT THE OTHERS?

Now I want to say a few words for the men and women who do not earn enough to pay an income tax. I may be the only one to speak in their behalf—although they are the people without whose toil and effort the income-tax payers could not exist for a single day—they are the people without whom civilization could not exist for a single day.

I could not get a copy of the bill until yesterday, and therefore I shall not go into details, some of which require considerable study and can not be understood offhand. Furthermore, copies of the hearings on the bill did not become available until last night, and I did not have the time, of course, to read through 1,014 pages since last night.

Nevertheless, I found it extremely interesting as far as I went, and I hope that all you gentlemen will read it. To me it was as interesting as a novel. However, not having had sufficient time to read the bill or study the hearings, I can not make as extended a speech as I would like to. [Laughter.]

We do things on a grand scale in our country. We dispose of $4,000,000,000 in five hours' general debate.

ELEPHANT AND DONKEY VIE IN SERVING THEIR MASTER

There is one remarkable circumstance that must impress itself even upon a casual observer, and that is this: It is simply wonderful how you Republicans and Democrats agree. We again have a coalition revenue bill as we had two years ago. This bipartisan harmony is simply wonderful. [Laughter.]

The elephant and the donkey both agree to serve their plutocratic masters. This is so much the more remarkable since this could be the time, if ever, that my friends of the Democratic side could have a chance to show some reason for their existence. But they do not want to show any reason. Evidently they have no reason. [Laughter.]

As for the Republican Party, that is surely the capitalist party par excellence. And Mr. Mellon is its leader in financial matters and makes it do his bidding. And it does his bidding well. [Laughter.]

THE STEADY DRIVE TO UNTAX THE PROFITEER

Ever since the war both old parties have made a drive to untax wealth and untax the profiteers.

They have done this in various ways. They have done it by the repeal of the excess-profits tax. By the reduction of the supertaxes. By the substitution of a flat rate of 12½ per cent on "unearned increment," which flat rate is to be further reduced in the bill before us. By the virtual repeal of the estate tax two years ago. By the huge Treasury refunds to individuals and corporations of great wealth.

According to the well-known statistician, Mr. Basil Manly—the Republican-Democratic coalition has reduced taxation upon great wealth and profiteering corporations by the enormous sum of $2,885,357,155 during the years 1922, 1923, and 1924. This is not counting the effects of the revenue bill of 1926, which was more favorable to the plutocrats than any of the previous revenue bills.

The revenue bill of 1926 reduced the surtaxes on incomes of over $50,000 by $108,000,000, according to the estimates of the Treasury Department. It reduced the estate tax by almost one-half and allowed a credit of 80 per cent of State inheritance taxes. This saved the big fortunes of our country at least $75,000,000 a year. The same bill also provided for making a retroactive repeal of the high tax rates of 1924 and refunding all taxes paid under them.

To this should be added the huge refunds allowed to individuals and corporations by the Mellon administration. From July 1, 1921, to April 30, 1925, these refunds amounted to $459,000,000. Of these refunds the Couzens committee has reported that its investigations indicated that $308,000,000 represented improper allowances.

PLUTOCRATS SAVE MORE THAN THREE BILLION DOLLARS

Thus the aggregate amount saved to our plutocracy by the Harding-Coolidge administration, under the leadership of Secretary Andrew Mellon, and with the help of the Democratic Party, is more than $3,000,000,000. The plutocrats in turn showed their appreciation by contributing liberally to the campaign funds of both old parties, as shown in Supplement A of this speech.

The bill before us is still going ahead with the program of untaxing wealth.

In all of this time that the Republican administration, aided by the Democratic group in Congress, were lifting the burden from the shoulders of the wealthy profiteers—the interests of the working class and of the poor people in general were not considered at all. That class does not seem to exist in the minds of our rulers. But even the middle class is not taken care of, as one can readily see by examining the hearings.

MR. MELLON'S MELON FLAVORED BY DEMOCRATIC LEMON

The bill before us is simply another melon which Mr. Mellon, of the Republican Party, proposes to cut for the benefit of plutocracy. And the Democratic Party is simply willing to go Mr. Mellon one better.

There is my distinguished and brilliant friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. He was willing to accede to the demands of the

United States Chamber of Commerce and reduce the taxes of our ruling class by $400,000,000. In other words, the Republican melon that is to be cut to the tune of $225,000,000 is to be flavored by the Democratic lemon to the amount of $400,000,000. [Laughter.]

EVEN MIDDLE CLASS IS NOT PROTECTED IN OUR CONGRESS

I said that even the middle class is not represented as it should be. Of course the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], did put up some resistance against the United States Chamber of Commerce and against the so-called Taxpayers League, which, as a matter of fact, is a tax dodgers' and tax liars' league.

My friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], helped Mr. GREEN to oppose the demands of these groups. But their opposition was feeble, very feeble, indeed. So on the whole even the middle class is not protected at all in this Congress.

It is important, to fully understand the tax question, that we realize that there are two opposite theories of taxation contending in our country.

GRADUATED INCOME TAX PREVENTS SHIFTING OF TAXES

One is the progressive theory of taxation, which is that the largest share of Federal revenues be raised by direct taxes in proportion to the ability of the individuals and corporations to pay them, and in such manner that they can not be shifted to the shoulders of the public.

This is the principle of the graduated income tax, of the graduated estate tax, and of the graduated tax upon excess profits. This principle has been tried out in the modern countries of western Europe and has been found to be scientific, practical, and efficient. And it is advocated not only by the socialists but also by the progressives of all parties in every country.

THE TAX THEORY OF THE PRIVILEGED CLASS

Then there is the opposite theory of taxation—the reactionary theory—which holds that the greatest possible share of the Federal revenue should be raised by indirect taxation. It is the old theory of the privileged classes. Under the pretext of imposing a flat rate upon the rich and poor alike—they can easily shift the tax on the backs of the masses, since the masses naturally consume the largest quantities.

This is the principle of the high tariff, of the sales tax, of the tobacco tax, and also of the flat tax rate on corporations in our country. All of these taxes can easily be shifted onto the great mass of American consumers. This method of taxation is out of date, unscientific, and unjust. It has been discarded by every modern and truly civilized nation of Europe. It is now only advocated by those who seek to relieve wealth of its just burden.

This reactionary system of taxation, however, is still advocated in the bill before us. It is the result of the alliance between the conservative Republicans and the conservative Democrats, just as the bill two years ago was the result of the same compact.

THE MEANING OF THE TERM "NATIONAL INCOME"

Now, we are told that this is the richest country on earth. Undoubtedly that is true. The gross income last year was $90,000,000,000. This was the national income. It was the value of our production.

In other words, that means the income of Mr. Ford, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Mellon, of the General Motors, of the gentleman from Texas, myself, and 117,000,000 others constituting our population.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman better correct that statement.

Mr. BERGER. Why?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The report shows what the income is. The production of this country was $90,000,000,000, not the income.

Mr. BERGER. Exactly. Economists use the words "national income" to cover what are really the gross annual receipts of the people of the United States. It is the gross income. It is the general production, controlled by General Motors, Mr. Ford, and the entire capitalist class. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and myself do not control much of it.

BUT WHO HAVE THE RICHES?

And that is exactly where the other side of the question comes in. How is this gross income distributed; how is it divided?

Now, gentlemen, I will give you some official figures.

According to the reports of the Department of Labor, of the 117,000,000 people the "poorest" class alone comprises 76,000,000 people, and they receive about 38.6 per cent of the national income—less than $460 per person. This class includes not only manual and office workers but also the small business man, many managers, engineers, and the like.

According to Prof. Irving Fisher, who, in order to make the figures as favorable as possible, accepts the highest estimate of our national income as $90,000,000,000 for 1926, 93,000,000 people out of the 117,000,000 people comprising our population in 1926 had about $500 income each.

These 93,000,000 people comprise the combined "poorest" and "lower middle-class" groups in the study made in Prof. Willford I. King's Four Population Groups.

FOUR-FIFTHS OF NATION HARDLY MAKE EXPENSES

This means that, according to Professor Fisher, professor of economics at Yale University—the American people as a whole are not prosperous.

In fact, an examination of our living costs will show that four-fifths of our people, or more than 90,000,000 people out of our 117,000,000, are hardly making necessary expenses.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has prepared a budget which it states represents a "minimum of health and decency." The average cost in several cities of this minimum budget in 1926 was found to be $2,432.39.

Assuming the income of those in this class of 93,000,000 to be on an average $500 each, or $2,500 for a family of five—and these are the most favorable figures—the overwhelming majority of our people—93,000,000 out of 117,000,000—get no more than enough to afford them the very "minimum of health and decency."

TWO-THIRDS OF PEOPLE DO NOT GET "MINIMUM OF HEALTH AND DECENCY"

The situation grows worse, of course, when the "lower middle-class" group is left out and the "poorest" group alone is considered. That group, representing 76,000,000, had an average income of $2,300 in 1926. That income, the National Industrial Conference Board has estimated, would be little more than enough to buy the minimum requirements of an average family of five among industrial or office workers. And the conference board's budget allows nothing for emergencies—for a vacation, for unemployment, for old-age savings of any kind, for sickness.

So that is how much 76,000,000 out of our 117,000,000 people get from the prosperity and our national income—not enough to allow for a vacation, or for unemployment, or for old-age savings of any kind, or for sickness.

But that is not the worst feature of this so-called prosperity.

BETWEEN TEN AND TWELVE MILLION PEOPLE ALWAYS ON VERGE OF STARVATION

Besides and below these 76,000,000 people who get so little of our great national income, there is the "submerged tenth"—from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 people—who are on the verge of starvation all the time.

Is it not a tragic joke that we are the most prosperous country on the face of the earth, that we are so rich that we do not know what to do with our money, but that of the approximate 90,000,000 of the poor class, 76,000,000 can not get enough for more than a bare living, and that about 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 are always on the verge of starvation?

The joke will probably appeal strongly to these people when they read President Coolidge's statement that "the test which now confronts the Nation is prosperity."

MR. EDGERTON'S GREATEST FEAR

And then comes Mr. Edgerton, president of the Manufacturers Association, and says:

> The abnormally high wages and the low living costs of the so-called working classes are a danger to our country.

Get that? "The so-called working classes." And did you get "the abnormally high wages"?

Let us quote a few illustrations.

SOME INSTANCES OF "ABNORMALLY HIGH WAGES" CITED

In the steel mills of Chicago workers earn $3.12 a day when they are employed—and they are not always employed.

Railroad workers in 1926 had an average income of $17 a week; and there are 200,000 such laborers.

In the lumber industry of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Oregon the average earnings were $17.77 per week, and the lowest-paid laborers get only $10.48 a week. "Abnormally high wages."

In the mining industry the average wage was $22.78 a week, but the lowest paid received $10.34 a week; and many of them did not work half of the time. "Abnormally high wages," of the "so-called working classes."

THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF THIS CONDITION

The obvious results in the case of these 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 people, who do not get enough to live on, it was said at a recent conference of social agencies, are "sickness, either chronic or acute, probably malnourishment, tuberculosis, delinquency."

One of the serious social effects of such low earnings as those referred to is the effect upon poor health. Numerous studies recently made by the United States Public Health Service indicate clearly that both sickness and death are more frequent among those with low incomes than among those with incomes adequate to comfortable living.

A study of infant mortality made by the United States Children's Bureau, which gives the mortality rates by earnings of the father, shows that there is a general decrease in mortality as the earnings of the family increase.

That, gentlemen, is the state of prosperity with which no less than 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 American people were "blessed" in 1926.

WHERE THE RICHES OF THE RICHEST COUNTRY GO

But where do these $90,000,000,000—our national income—go to? Let us see.

The tax on incomes was lower in 1925 than in 1924, but though the rate was lower, the sum collected by the Government was 6 per cent greater in 1925 than in 1924.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BERGER. Give me 15 minutes more?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes; just as long as the gentleman wants.

Mr. BERGER. Oh, I could go on for an hour, but I doubt whether you would have the patience to listen to me that long. In any event, Mr. Chairman, somebody ought to say these things in this House.

I just remarked that the tax rate was lower in 1925 than in the year before, yet the sum collected was larger. That sounds impossible, but the reason is simple.

SMALL INCOMES BECOME SMALLER; LARGE INCOMES GROW LARGER

The big decrease was in the number of those that had less than $5,000 income. They paid little or no tax. But the big incomes had increased so much more.

In 1924, 75 men paid on incomes of $1,000,000 or more. In 1925, 207 paid on incomes of $1,000,000 or over.

Forty and five-tenths per cent of the total income tax was paid by people with incomes of more than $100,000 each.

Ten thousand persons on the top of the list paid as much as 2,337,000 taxpayers at the bottom of the list. As a matter of fact, 0.29 of 1 per cent paid more tax in total than some 95 per cent of the total number paying a Federal income tax.

THE THREE CLASSES

Of course, these incomes are reinvested. That is how the concentration of wealth proceeds.

In 1915 the Commission on Industrial Relations divided our people into the following classes: The "rich," 2 per cent of the people, own 60 per cent of the wealth. The "middle class," 33 per cent of the people, own 35 per cent of the wealth. The "poor," 65 per cent of the people, own 5 per cent of the wealth.

This statement was based on an extensive study of available information made by Prof. Willford I. King, a statistician of conservative views, and published as a report of that commission.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What department?

Mr. BERGER. It was a special commission on industrial relations.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. A Government commission?

Mr. BERGER. Yes; it was a Government commission.

Now, these conditions have not been improved since in favor of the poor classes. We had a war since, as you all know, and you also know what that war meant. The war created 23,000 millionaires which we did not have in 1915.

DEFINITION OF "INCOME" BENEFICIAL TO RICH

Moreover, this classification is simply more or less a matter of definition. The word "income" as applied to individuals is given both in law and custom different meanings which is rather unjust to the individual.

INCOME FOR CORPORATIONS MEANS INCOME AFTER DEDUCTIONS ARE ALLOWED

Income as defined for corporations and business establishments generally means net profit—means the profit after liberal deductions for expenses of operation, maintenance, depreciation, replacements, and all other items have been made. This is considered an absolutely correct procedure. It should be a legitimate means of insuring the conservation of the property devoted to the business, although it is now being used to a large extent by public-utility corporations and other capitalist interests to conceal a considerable share of their profits.

DEFINITION OF "INCOME" FOR WAGE EARNERS ALLOWS FOR NO DEDUCTION

Income as defined for individuals, however, and especially income for wage and salary earners, means gross earnings with no deductions for the maintenance and the replacement of the human machine. In the accounting of individual income there are no allowances for expenses of operation, or replacement, or depreciation, or preservation of the human machine. Everything that comes into the possession of the wage or salary earner during the year is counted as income.

This difference in definition is not only a matter of custom but has become embedded in law. And because of this fact, the income tax bill before us and all the income tax laws that we have had until now discriminate grossly against individuals—particularly against workmen, salary earners, and professional men.

In order to put individual income accounting on the same basis as corporation accounting, we should count as income only the surplus over the earnings necessary for the support of a family of the average size, together with savings sufficient to provide for his old age and the rearing of a family and the wear off that comes with old age and death. Thus we would insure the maintenance and replacement of the human machine.

CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH HASTENS DOWNFALL OF PRESENT SYSTEM

I hear some gentlemen saying, "All of that may be true—it is probably true—but what's the use of saying it."

The answer is simple. Policies and methods as are in use in our country can have only one result—they will hasten the concentration of wealth in a few hands and surely bring about the downfall of the entire system. And it may bring about a catastrophe similar to the revolution in France at the end of the eighteenth century or similar to the revolution which took place in Russia 10 years ago.

WE WANT A CHANGE, BUT NO CATASTROPHE

We Socialists desire, of course, that the capitalist system disappear. We expect to replace it by a more reasonable and more beneficial organization of society. But we Socialists want to avoid a sudden catastrophe—if it be possible to avoid it.

Remember, gentlemen, our ruling class had "good times" when the surtax was 60 per cent. Why not restore the 60 per cent again and prevent the abnormal concentration?

The fact remains that unless you find some way to stop this fearful concentration of wealth in a few hands, you are bound to have a revolution that will destroy not only capitalism and the capitalist class, but it may destroy civilization.

The best evidence of the concentration going on at the present times is the fact that we now have no less than ten billion-dollar corporations.

They are the United States Steel Corporation, the Southern Pacific Railroad, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the New York Central Railroad, the Union Pacific Railroad, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, the General Motors Co., the Ford Motor Co., and the American Telegraph & Telephone Co.

And this in face of the fact that 82 per cent of our people do not earn enough money to pay an income tax at all, although the exemptions are only $1,500 for a single person and $3,500 for a married couple.

Now, if we had a real opposition party in this country, such a party would advocate the abolition of all nuisance taxes, including the tax on the automobile, including the taxes on tickets, and any and all sales taxes, but would demand the doubling of the taxation on the incomes in the higher brackets.

TRYING TO OUT-MELLON MELLON

However, instead of that, this afternoon we were told in a speech by a prominent Democrat, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN], that we should still further lower the taxes on the corporations. He even proposed an amendment to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to give back some of the money already collected from the corporations.

He said:

> We must get out of our heads the idea that when we reduce the corporation tax we are reducing taxes for a few people. We used to have the idea that a reduction of the corporation tax benefited only a few people. My estimate is that 75 per cent of the aggregate reduction goes to the stockholders of corporations. It goes to 3,000,000 people.

ALLEGED DIFFUSION OF STOCK OWNERSHIP A MYTH

I disagree with the gentleman from New York in this respect. Stockholders do not number 3,000,000, and the bulk of them own only a small percentage of the total stock of the big corporations of our country.

The report of the Federal Trade Commission on "National wealth and income," issued in 1926, tells us about the holdings of common and preferred stock by the employees in the various manufacturing companies. We are told that "of the total value of stock of all companies reporting employees had 1.5 per cent of the common stock and 1.9 of the preferred stock."

In the United States Steel Corporation, for instance, which has a comparatively very large distribution of its stock among its employees, 1.5 per cent of the stockholders hold 57 per cent of the stock. And in the International Harvester Co., which also makes a great showing of selling stock to employees, 207 stockholders have 83 per cent of the stock.

So much for the stock ownership by employees, which has been advertised very extensively during the last few years.

Employees, of course, represented a much larger proportion of the total number of stockholders than they did in the total value of the stock. In other words, the average holding of the employee stockholder was very small.

NOR DOES MIDDLE CLASS OWN MUCH STOCK

But the middle class of our Nation does not own any considerable share either.

The concentration of ownership goes on in spite of the so-called stockholding schemes. For instance, 1.3 per cent of the number of stockholders in the railroads of this country hold more than one-half of the outstanding stock.

In the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey 1 per cent of the stockholders own 64.2 per cent of the stock.

All the figures published invariably show that a very small percentage of the stockholders own more than half of all the stock in the big corporations of our country.

MIDDLE CLASS FURNISHES THE LAMBS TO BE FLEECED

The middle class may occasionally furnish some of the lambs to be fleeced in Wall Street by venturing in stock speculations, but the middle class does not share in the control of our big corporations.

In the United States there are probably not more than one or two million belonging to the stockholding class if duplications are eliminated. The rest of the 110,000,000 people own no stocks or bonds.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. How about the inheritance tax?

Mr. BERGER. I would double that.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I thought your party believed in it.

Mr. BERGER. It does.

Your Florida politicians and capitalists will bust the State of Florida. Very soon you will not have money enough to build roads, and not money enough to keep your working people in the poorhouses when they get old.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. There are only four States that pay more inheritance taxes than Florida.

Mr. BERGER. They still must pay the Federal inheritance tax, of course. But all the millionaires who want to defraud their respective States of the legitimate estate tax go down to Florida and register there—very much in the same manner as the same people break the Mann Act and register in another State for another illegitimate purpose.

MONEY NEEDED FOR SOLUTION OF MANY PROBLEMS

Again, I say, we ought to abolish nuisance taxes and double the taxes in the higher brackets. We then would have money enough to pay an old-age pension for the needy workers of 55 and over. We would have money enough to take care of the Mississippi and all other rivers. We would have money enough for reforestation, and even money enough to do away with illiteracy in the United States. And if we did not want to do anything else, we could pay our war debts, at least.

POVERTY IS NO LONGER NECESSARY

Dean Kimball, of Cornell University, in a speech to the American Society of Engineers, said:

For the first time since the world began we are in touch with the abolition of poverty through the tremendous output of our products.

In other words, that means that for the first time in the history of the world we can produce nearly enough of everything for everybody. All we have to do is advance the science of distribution sufficiently that it will parallel the science of production. Then for the first time in the history of the world we could, in our country at least, give and assure every willing worker the full value of his product—and the full satisfaction of all his reasonable needs.

APPENDIXES

Under the privilege of the House, I incorporate the following two supplements in elucidation of my argument:

SUPPLEMENT A

ELEVEN MILLION DOLLARS FOR TWENTY MILLIONAIRES

The greatest beneficiaries of the revenue bill of 1926 were the multimillionaires with incomes of $1,000,000 a year.

The following statement showing the amounts saved for 20 of these very wealthy men and women has been compiled from the returns of 1924, as published in the New York Times.

Amount of tax reduction received by 20 millionaires through coalition tax bill

Name	State or city	Tax paid, 1925	Amount saved by 1926 tax bill	Amount contributed to Republican campaign fund, 1924
J. D. Rockefeller, jr	New York	$6,277,669	$2,762,174	$10,000
Henry Ford	Detroit	2,608,808	1,147,875	(?)
Edsel Ford	do	2,158,055	949,544	3,000
Andrew W. Mellon	Washington	1,882,609	828,348	10,000
Payne Whitney	New York	1,676,626	737,715	15,000
Edward Harkness	do	1,351,708	594,751	(?)
Marshall Field estate and 3 heirs.	Chicago	1,197,605	526,946	5,000
Clinton H. Crane	New York	1,066,716	469,355	(?)
Anna M. Harkness	do	1,061,537	467,076	(?)
F. W. Vanderbilt	do	792,986	348,909	(?)
Subtotal for first 10		20,074,319	8,832,693	
Geo. F. Baker, sr	New York	792,076	348,513	7,500
Thomas F. Ryan	do	791,851	348,414	(1)
George F. Baker, jr	do	783,406	344,698	5,000
Vincent Astor	do	642,600	282,744	10,000
J. B. Duke (deceased)	New Jersey	641,250	282,150	12,500
Julius Fleischmann (deceased).	New York	625,996	275,438	10,000
Cyrus H. K. Curtis	Philadelphia	583,872	256,903	3,000
J. Pierpont Morgan	New York	574,379	252,726	(?)
Joseph E. Widener	Philadelphia	488,106	214,766	25,000
Thomas W. Lamont	New York	480,741	211,526	(2)
Grand total for 20		26,478,596	11,650,571	

[1] Contributed $50,000 to Democratic campaign fund.
[2] Contributed $2,500 to Democratic campaign fund.

SUPPLEMENT B

The ten billion-dollar corporations of America

(Figures for 1926, where available, are given, otherwise for 1925)

Company	Total assets	Market value of securities (Dow Jones)[1]	Value of physical properties	Gross sales or revenues	Net profit	Dividends paid	Number of stockholders	Number of employees	Date founded
1. U. S. Steel Corporation	$2,446,000,000	$1,779,000,000	$1,692,000,000	$928,000,000	$117,000,000	$61,000,000	150,000	250,000	1901
2. Southern Pacific R. R.	2,147,000,000	[2] 1,565,000,000	1,341,000,000	297,000,000	36,000,000	23,000,000	57,000	[3] 71,000	1884
3. Pennsylvania R. R.	1,819,000,000	1,184,000,000	1,010,000,000	710,000,000	62,000,000	30,000,000	140,000	214,000	1845
4. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	1,646,000,000	[2] 2,066,000,000	197,000,000	180,000,000	107,000,000	81,000,000	362,000	293,000	1885
5. New York Central R. R.	1,449,000,000	1,251,000,000	1,020,000,000	399,000,000	49,000,000	27,000,000	64,000	[3] 162,000	[3] 1914
6. Standard Oil of New Jersey	1,369,000,000	1,072,000,000	520,000,000	1,123,000,000	111,000,000	34,000,000	80,000	91,000	1882
7. Union Pacific R. R.	1,140,000,000	869,000,000	819,000,000	205,000,000	38,000,000	26,000,000	51,000	60,000	[3] 1897
8. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R. R.	1,071,000,000	792,000,000	945,000,000	259,000,000	46,000,000	22,000,000	63,000	60,000	[3] 1895
9. General Motors Corporation	915,000,000	1,521,000,000	400,000,000	[2] 1,000,000,000	[2] 180,000,000	70,000,000	51,000	83,000	1908
10. Ford Motor Co.	[2] 800,000,000	1,000,000,000	[2] 300,000,000	751,000,000	[2] 100,000,000		3	192,000	1903

[1] Includes market value to stocks and par value of bonds. [2] Estimated. [3] Date of present corporation, following reorganization.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that

committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 7

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed with illustrations 10,000 additional copies of House Document No. 90, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a letter from the Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, transmitting with favorable recommendation the report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, containing the plan of the Army engineers for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, 3,000 for the use of the House document room, and 2,000 for the use of the Senate document room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 12, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

194. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with a report dated November 12, 1927, of a special board of officers on the construction and maintenance of controlled and regulated spillways in the lower Mississippi River (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

195. A letter from the chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting list of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Appropriations.

196. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting reports made by the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and the Major General Commandant United States Marine Corps, relative to the administration of section 307 of the World War adjusted compensation act by the Navy Department up to date; to the Committee on Expenditures.

197. A letter from the Librarian of the Library of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 12); to the Committee on the Library.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4229) for the relief of Jennie Wyant and others, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6844) concerning liability for participation in breaches of fiduciary obligations and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 6845) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 6846) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a building thereon at Bamberg, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) to make additions, extensions, and improvements to the post-office building at Aiken, S. C., to be used as post office and courthouse; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 6848) to create in the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor a division of safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6849) readjusting the cost of furnishing water to lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6850) to establish a marine fish-cultural station on the coast of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6851) for the erection of a Federal building at Texas City, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6852) to extend the jurisdiction and territory of the judicial district of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 6853) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6854) to add certain lands to the Montezuma National Forest, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 6855) relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction, without fault of their own, was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6856) relating to the payment or delivery by banks or other persons or institutions in the District of Columbia of deposits of moneys and property held in the names of two or more persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6857) to provide armory facilities for the National Guard of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 6858) to prohibit hotels and railway-terminal companies from granting certain exclusive rights; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 6859) to prohibit the importation into the United States of immature oranges and grapefruit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6860) to levy an import duty on crude feldspar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6861) to authorize final rolls of certain bands of Sioux Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6862) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, hear, and determine the claims of individual members of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against tribal funds or against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 6863) to facilitate awards of contracts for the purchase of motor vehicles for the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 6864) to authorize the Postmaster General to require steamship companies to carry the mail when tendered; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6865) to prescribe more definitely the rates of compensation payable to steamships of United States registry for transportation of foreign mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 86) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved March 4, 1927; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) authorizing the printing of 10,000 copies of the hearings on flood control; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FISH: Resolution (H. Res. 52) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives a copy of the proposal made by the French minister of foreign affairs to the Government of the United States to agree to renounce war between the two nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 6866) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. McClinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6867) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Fliege; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6868) granting a pension to Sarah E. Herron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 6869) for the relief of George C. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 6870) granting an increase of pension to Susanna Provance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 6871) granting a pension to Alice Bullock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6872) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Hackman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 6873) for the relief of Albert Armstrong; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6874) granting an increase of pension to John A. Ruddell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6875) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 6876) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6877) for the relief of Olivia Mary Miller; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 6878) for the relief of Robert W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 6879) for the relief of Samuel W. Tyson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Gavin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6881) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hurt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6882) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6883) granting a pension to Hattie J. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6884) for the relief of Thomas F. Sutton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6885) granting an increase of pension to Vernon L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6886) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Brubaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6887) authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Capt. Frank O'Driscoll Hunter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6888) authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, medals of honor to Lieuts. Carlton C. Champion and William V. Davis, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6889) granting a pension to Sarah B. Arnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6890) granting a pension to Anna E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6891) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Longworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6892) for the relief of Martha J. Tonguet; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 6893) for the relief of Charley R. Saylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6894) granting a pension to Ellen M. Dyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6895) granting a pension to Mariette Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 6896) for the relief of Alaska Products Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6897) granting a pension to Elizabeth Agnes Axson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 6898) granting a pension to Perry O. Buck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6899) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jane Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Shroyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 6901) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Cade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6902) granting a pension to Lizzie Fenton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6903) granting a pension to Charles Exera Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6904) granting a pension to Elizabeth Coarding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6905) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe M. Apgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6906) for the relief of Kurt Falb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6907) for the relief of John Marks, alias John Bell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 6908) for the relief of Michael Ilitz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 6909) granting an increase of pension to Louise B. Otis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6910) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Weaks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to William P. Grimm; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6912) granting a pension to Elisha H. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6913) for the relief of Theodore Reynders; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6914) granting an increase of pension to Bernard J. Boldemann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6915) granting an increase of pension to Charlotta E. Hammitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 6916) to correct the military record of Charles B. Holmes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6917) to correct the military record of Sylvester DeForest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6918) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bentley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 6919) providing for the examination and survey of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pa.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 6920) granting a pension to Martha J. Turpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6921) granting an increase of pension to Kate Coffee McDougal; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 6922) granting a pension to Nannie Ogle Bird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6923) granting a pension to Maria J. McShane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6924) granting an increase of pension to William Bieber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6925) for the relief of Mary J. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6926) granting a pension to Albert S. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) granting a pension to George C. Ezell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6928) for the relief of Dobson Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6929) for the relief of Union Bleachery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6930) for the relief of E. C. Howze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to Alice R. Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 6932) granting an increase of pension to Nettie S. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 6933) granting a pension to Emma S. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6934) granting a pension to Mary H. Maulsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6935) granting a pension to Ellen Jane Dick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6936) granting a pension to Susana Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6937) granting a pension to Nettie Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6938) granting a pension to Eliza Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6939) for the relief of Thomas T. Grimsley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 6940) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Arburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 6941) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6942) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bayette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6943) granting a pension to Ephriam K. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6944) to correct the military record of Peter Christy, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 6945) granting an increase of pension to Allia Mitcheltree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6946) granting an increase of pension to Catherine M. Schriver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 6947) granting a pension to Adelbert Bigelow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6948) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Gregory; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6949) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 6950) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6951) granting an increase of pension to Addie H. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6952) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Holliday; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) granting an increase of pension to Nora Furey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6954) granting a pension to M. Cummins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6955) granting a pension to John Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) granting a pension to John Jensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: Resolution (H. Res. 51) providing compensation for extra clerical labor performed in computing and distributing mileage for the first session of the Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

106. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Frank Nicholson and other citizens of the United States Customs Sugar Corps, of 641 Washington Street, New York City, N. Y., petitioning for more compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

107. By Mr. FULMER: Petition of the American Legion, South Carolina, No. 1, favoring the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

108. Also, petition of the American Legion, South Carolina, No. 2, favoring legislation which will provide for the payment of a lump sum to dependents of those veterans who died or were killed in service, as provided in the adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

109. Also, petition of the American Legion, South Carolina, No. 4, favoring the passage of such legislation providing for a complete survey of the situation and for adequate hospital facilities for those entitled to treatment under provisions of existing law; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

110. Also, petition of the American Legion, South Carolina, No. 3, favoring such legislation as will remove all limits as to time within which claims may be filed and evidence submitted and considered for the securing of benefits provided by the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

111. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Judge J. Albert Brackett, 11 Pemberton Square, room 602, Boston, Mass., urging abolition of tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

112. By Mr. GARBER: Letter from L. E. Wood, Tulsa, Okla., urging the merit of bill providing for retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

113. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Memorial of sundry citizens of Castroville, Tex., relative to conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

114. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 37 residents of Allegan, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

115. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of secretary Theatrical Managers' Association, Auditorium Theater, Baltimore, urging elimination of tax on theater tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

116. Also, petitions of Hon. J. Ronald Horsey, Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of the Federal estate tax, and John C. Hill, secretary Typothetæ of Baltimore, Md., presenting resolution urging substantial reduction in existing corporate Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. Also, petition of W. Herman Pearcy, St. George, S. C., favoring early action on bill for retirement of disabled emergency officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

118. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of William Hannon and 468 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., not to pass the Sunday bill (H. R. 10311), nor any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, or the Lord's Day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to adopt any resolution or bill that will in any way give preference to one religion above another, or that will sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the American principle of total separation between religion and the State may forever remain inviolable; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

119. By Mr. THOMPSON: Resolution of the Defiance Rotary Club, Defiance, Ohio, dated December 5, 1927, in support of House Joint Resolution 61, providing for a fitting memorial to Gen. Anthony Wayne on the site of Fort Defiance, and providing for the preservation of the site; to the Committee on the Library.

120. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of sundry citizens of Elliott County, Ky., opposed to compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, *December 12, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The eternal God is our refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms. Let us pray.

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit. Make us godly for man's sake and manly for God's sake, that we may live as the sons of God among men. Prosper Thou the consultations of these Thy servants, that whatsoever they do may be done to Thy honor and glory and for the safety and welfare of Thy people everywhere. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THOMAS J. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, December 6, 1927, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) providing for the printing, with illustrations, of 10,000 additional copies of House Document No. 90, being the message from the President of the United States transmitting a letter from the Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, transmitting with favorable recommendation the report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of

Engineers, containing the plan of the Army engineers for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	La Follette	Shortridge
Barkley	Fess	McKellar	Simmons
Bayard	Fletcher	McMaster	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Black	George	Mayfield	Steck
Blaine	Gerry	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Gillett	Moses	Stephens
Borah	Glass	Neely	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	Norbeck	Thomas
Brookhart	Gould	Nye	Trammell
Broussard	Greene	Oddie	Tydings
Bruce	Hale	Overman	Tyson
Capper	Harris	Phipps	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Warren
Couzens	Heflin	Ransdell	Waterman
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Sackett	Willis
Dill	Kendrick	Schall	
Edge	Keyes	Sheppard	
Edwards	King	Shipstead	

Mr. BRATTON. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] is absent on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HOWELL. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at home by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

HOUSE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed with illustrations 10,000 additional copies of House Document No. 90, being the message from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, transmitting with favorable recommendation the report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, containing the plan of the Army engineers for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, 3,000 for the use of the House document room, and 2,000 for the use of the Senate document room.

USELESS PAPERS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to papers in the files of the Department of State which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department, and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BORAH and Mr. SWANSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

USELESS PAPERS IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the War Department, and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. REED of Pennsylvania and Mr. FLETCHER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

A report showing in detail the travel of civilian officers and employees of the War Department on the regular roll on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; and

A report showing expenditures from the appropriation for the encouragement of breeding riding horses during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, as ex officio president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the said commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, as ex officio chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred as indicated:

A report showing permits and licenses issued under the authority of the Federal power act during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, together with certain information relating thereto; to the Committee on Commerce.

A report giving the aggregate number of the various publications issued by the commission during the said fiscal year with other details; to the Committee on Printing.

A detailed report of travel taken by officers of the commission on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the said fiscal year; and

A report showing typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for other machines during the said fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following annual reports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which were referred as indicated:

A report showing the proceeds from sales of waste paper and obsolete worthless documents amounting to $1,303.57;

A report showing in detail the travel on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia performed by certain officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture;

A report of revenues received at Center Market, Washington, D. C.; and

A report showing the exchanges of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices of the department in part payment of new machines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A report showing the publications issued and distributed, giving cost of paper, printing, and preparation; to the Committee on Printing.

A report on the agricultural experiment stations;

A report showing the names of all persons employed, together with their designations and rates of pay, in the Bureau of Animal Industry, other than those whose salaries were paid exclusively from the meat-inspection appropriation;

A report showing the number of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles purchased by the Department of Argiculture for use outside the District of Columbia;

A report showing the number of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles purchased by the Department of Agriculture from the appropriation of $40,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads for use outside the District of Columbia;

A report of refunds to depositors of excess deposits for the purchase price of timber or other use of national forest resources;

A report showing the payments to officers or other persons employed by State, county, or municipal governments from sums allotted to the Bureau of Chemistry; and

A report showing contributions received on account of cooperative work with the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered

by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 3, 1927, the amounts thereof, in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, which with the accompanying statement was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and order to be printed.

REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMISSION OF DUTY ON ADVERTISING MATTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General recommending a remission of the duty on advertising matter transported in the international postal service, in accordance with a resolution adopted at the Pan American Postal Conference, held at Mexico City on October 15, 1926, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the vice chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 31, agreed to June 3, 1926, a report of the said commission on "Prices, profits, and competition in the petroleum industry," which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

ANNUAL REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the text of his annual report for the year ended October 31, 1927, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation amounting to $25,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1928, to remain available until June 30, 1929, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet an emergency caused by the spread of the Parlatoria date scale in California and Arizona, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Joint Resolution 9, memorializing Congress to amend the river and harbor act so as to provide for maintenance of a uniform stage of water in the headwaters of the Mississippi River throughout the year

Whereas the river and harbor act passed by Congress in 1880 provided for the creation of storage reservoirs to impound the high waters of the Mississippi river during the spring and early summer and to release them during the late summer and fall so as to produce a greater flow in said river during the low-water season in the interests of navigation and disregarding the conservation and propagation of fish life in the headwaters of the Mississippi; and

Whereas the raising and lowering of the water in the storage reservoirs created by the War Department under said act has resulted in destroying much of the natural feeding, resting, and breeding grounds of migratory birds and has affected the value of the property of riparian owners and interfered with the natural propagation of game fish and has resulted in the freezing of many thousands of game fishes in shallow bays during the winter months: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That Congress be, and it hereby is, memorialized to so amend said river and harbor act that the wild life of the State of Minnesota may be protected and propagated, and that said act be amended so as to provide for the maintenance of a uniform stage of water or a definite, fixed, and permanent low-water level in said headwaters throughout the year: Be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States and to each Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN A. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. I. NOLAN,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 9th day of March, 1927.
JOHN I. LEVIN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 10th day of March, 1927.
GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved March 11, 1927.
THEODORE CHRISTIANSON,
Governor.

Filed March 11, 1927.
MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office March 11, 1927.
[SEAL.] MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of Senate Joint Resolution 9, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 23d day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Resolution 9

Whereas the Illinois River Valley has suffered ever increasing flood stages during shorter intervals of time to such an extent that the valuable properties within its borders are being jeopardized to an alarming extent; and

Whereas the necessities of drainage throughout the State of Illinois, also the State of Indiana, and the needs of sanitation and industry of the cities on the upper river have added huge volumes of excess waters to the natural precipitation of the Illinois River Basin; and

Whereas the Federal Government has maintained dams in the river for the purposes of navigation and will create a more comprehensive deep waterway in compliance with present Federal legislation; and

Whereas the problems of flood control are so great and far-reaching and complicated that it is impossible for local interests to solve them and inexpedient for the State of Illinois to interfere or participate with the War Department in the development of the Illinois River; and

Whereas the War Department of the United States now in charge of the river for navigation purposes is the only agent and governmental department capable of successfully working out the necessary methods for controlling the flood menace which is now a permanent factor in the Illinois River; and

Whereas a bill, H. R. 14838, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, proposes that the War Department be authorized to expend Federal money for flood-control purposes in the Illinois River Valley along the lines followed by the Mississippi Commission on the lower Mississippi River: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate of the fifty-fifth general assembly (the house concurring herein), That it is recognized that the War Department of the Federal Government is the only and capable governmental department that can successfully solve the problems involved and give the necessary flood control protection that will safeguard all the interests involved in the valley without conflicting with any other agency; and be it

Resolved, That the attention of the Congress of the United States be called to the seriousness of the situation and the wisdom and expediency of the measures proposed in the above-named bill; and be it

Resolved, That we most earnestly entreat both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States that such proposed flood control legislation be enacted into law at the earliest possible date consistent with the necessary preliminary surveys; and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States by the secretary of state.

Adopted by the senate March 2, 1927.

FRED E. STERLING,
President of the Senate.
JAMES H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives March 9, 1927.

ROBERT SCHOLES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Joint Resolution 25, memorializing Congress to grant Federal aid in the construction of interstate bridges

Whereas the boundaries dividing the several States in many instances consist of natural water courses and rivers; and

Whereas the cost of interstate bridges is very great since the rivers in many instances are wide and the engineering and construction problems difficult to solve; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States vests in Congress control over all interstate communication, and the Federal Government is vitally interested in developing national highways cutting across State lines: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin earnestly requests and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to give Federal aid for the construction of interstate bridges; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Fred E. Lukens, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial 4 with the original thereof adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the nineteenth legislative assembly of the State of Idaho and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Idaho February 25, 1927, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Idaho. Done at the capitol at Boise, Idaho, this 16th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

FRED E. LUKENS,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Memorial 4, to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent: That—

Whereas that Snake River between Lewiston and Homestead, Idaho, is the only means of transportation to serve an area approximately 100 miles long and 14 miles wide, which area is rich in mineral deposits and has great potential possibilities for the raising of agricultural crops and stock; and

Whereas the said river can now be safely navigated only during periods of high water by reason of obstructions therein consisting of large boulders at some eleven places and extensive and important developments both in the State of Idaho and the State of Oregon are for that reason being retarded and prevented; and

Whereas the opening of the channel in the Snake River for safe navigation at all times of the year can be done only by the Federal Government: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Idaho indorse and approve of the opening up of the Snake River for safe navigation, as aforesaid, and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to make an appropriation sufficient for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to send copies to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This memorial passed the house on the 14th day of February, 1927.

W. D. GILLIS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 18th day of February, 1927.

O. E. HAILEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within memorial 4 originated in the house of representatives during the nineteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

C. A. BOTTOLFSEN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Senate Memorial 3

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Whereas the State of Florida and the counties of Dade and Monroe have caused to be dug a sea-level canal across the Peninsula of Florida from the waters of the Atlantic Ocean at Miami to the waters of the Gulf of Mexico at Poinciana, saving all but 9 miles of the total distance; and

Whereas it is hoped and expected that this 9-mile gap will be completed and opened within the near future, thus establishing a sea-level water route across the State of Florida: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and hereby is, memorialized to pass the necessary legislation looking to the investigation and survey of this cross-State waterway, in order to disclose the feasibility and propriety of its being taken over by the Federal Government for improvement, operation, and maintenance, to the end—

(1) That the benefits and protection afforded by the Atlantic inside waterway route from Boston south and through the Florida East Coast Canal now terminating at Miami may be immediately extended across the peninsula of Florida to the Gulf of Mexico.

(2) That small shipping, in passing from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, may be relieved of the necessity of rounding Cape Sable with its attendant dangers and hazards.

(3) That the water-route distance for such shipping between points on the Atlantic Ocean and points on the Gulf of Mexico may be shortened.

(4) That this sea-level canal which traverses the heart of the Everglades may be developed to its maximum usefulness in serving as an artery of water transportation for this vast agricultural empire which is about to be opened; and

(5) That this canal developed to its full capacity, with its outlets to the east and to the west, may be utilized in the draining of thousands of acres of Everglades lands, and the ultimate reclamation of the Florida Peninsula south of the Tamiami Trail; be it

Resolved further, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL, and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, GREEN, and YON are hereby most earnestly requested to extend their efforts toward the accomplishment of the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of the State of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the Presildent of the United States, to the Congress of this Nation, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the governor May 7, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA, *Office Secretary of State, ss:*

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Memorial 3, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint Resolution 23, memorializing Congress to provide for earlier seating of Senators and Representatives elect

Whereas Members of Congress are elected in November of even-numbered years, but under the present Constitution of the United States do not meet in regular session until December of the year following; and

Whereas in the so-called "short" session of Congress, which convene in December following each general election, there are always many Members who were defeated for reelection and repudiated by their constituents; and

Whereas this provision of the Constitution operates to prevent the will of the people from being expressed in legislation within a reasonable time: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin hereby earnestly requests and petitions Congress to adopt and submit to the States the so-called "Norris amendment" to the Constitution of the United States for the earlier commencement of the terms of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, and for the convening of Congress in January of the year following its election.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution duly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of the senate and assembly be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Fred E. Lukens, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and complete transcript of Senate Joint Resolution 7 enacted by the nineteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho and filed in this office the 11th day of March, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Idaho. Done at Boise, Idaho, the capital of Idaho, this 27th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] FRED E. LUKENS,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Resolution 7

Whereas under the existing conditions newly elected Members of Congress do not take their seats in Congress, unless at a special session, until the elapse of more than a year after their election; and

Whereas Members of Congress who are not reelected continue to serve and vote for their constituents for the duration of the short session of Congress, although their successors have been elected; and

Whereas such conditions are not productive of the best interests of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, That the Legislature of the State of Idaho earnestly petition Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the several States which would provide that Members of Congress should take their seats within a short time after their election; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the governors of each of the several States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act

Whereas the voters of the State of Wisconsin at a recent referendum registered their disapproval of prohibition by a majority of approximately 176,000 votes; and

Whereas the people of Wisconsin have emphatically expressed themselves in favor of a modification of the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer; and

Whereas a nation-wide test on the question of modifying the Volstead Act would afford the means of accurately measuring the sentiment of the entire country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby goes on record as respectfully memorializing Congress to provide the necessary machinery for the holding of a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act to legalize the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested by the proper officers of the assembly and senate, be transmitted to the Presiding Officers of each House of Congress.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Fred E. Lukens, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the attached is a full, true, and complete transcript of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, enacted by the nineteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho and filed in this office the 7th day of March, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Idaho. Done at Boise, Idaho, the capital of Idaho, this 31st day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] FRED E. LUKENS,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, proposing an application to Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States to make subject to taxation all evidence of indebtedness of the United States, the several States, municipal corporations, counties, and all taxing subdivisions and taxing units thereof, together with the interest on and income from such evidence of indebtedness

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION A. That with the concurrence of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States of the United States application is hereby made to Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, said proposed amendment to read as follows:

"AMENDMENT NO. 20

"SECTION 1. All evidence of indebtedness of the United States, the several States, municipal corporations, counties, and all taxing subdivisions and taxing units thereof, together with interest on and income derived from such evidence of indebtedness, shall be subject to taxation by the United States, the several States, municipal corporations, counties, and all taxing subdivisions and taxing units thereof.

"SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

SEC. B. The secretary of state is hereby directed to send duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the Clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the presiding officers of each branch of the legislature of the several States of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, David C. Winebrenner, 3d, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland do hereby certify that James A. Young, who has made and signed the attached certificate, was, at date thereof, clerk of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, United States of America, duly elected and commissioned and sworn; that said certificate in in due form and by the proper officer, whose signature thereto and the seal authenticating the same I verily believe to be genuine.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state at Annapolis, Md., this 2d day of June, in the year of our Lord 1927.

[SEAL.] DAVID C. WINEBRENNER, 3d,
Secretary of State.

Joint Resolution 5, requesting Congress to submit an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that all amendments to said Constitution shall be submitted to a referendum vote

Whereas under the present method of amending the Constitution of the United States it is possible for amendments to be adopted when the majority of the people are opposed to them; and

Whereas under recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the

United States the people of every State have, in effect, been deprived of any opportunity to express their views, whether directly through a referendum or indirectly by the requirement that an election should intervene between the submission of an amendment by Congress and its ratification by the legislature of any State; and

Whereas it is contrary to the spirit of our institutions and of American liberty that any serious change should be made in our form of government without the consent of the governed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, earnestly requested to submit an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that thereafter all such amendments shall be submitted to a referendum vote and that no amendment shall become a part of the Constitution unless it receives a majority of the votes cast for and against it in three-fourths of the States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit under the great seal of this State a copy of the aforegoing resolution to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved, April 1, 1927.

E. BROOKE LEE,
Speaker of the House of Delegates.
DAVID G. MCINTOSH, Jr.,
President of the Senate.

Filed, April 2, 1927.

STATE OF MARYLAND, *ss:*

I, James A. Young, clerk of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full and true copy of the joint resolution of the General Assembly of Maryland, of which it purports to be a copy, as taken from the original joint resolution belonging to and deposited in the office of the clerk of the court of appeals aforesaid.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand as clerk and affixed the seal of the said court of appeals this 2d day of June, 1927.

[SEAL.] JAMES A. YOUNG,
Clerk, Court of Appeals of Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, David C. Winebrenner, 3d, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution 8 of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1927.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state, at Annapolis, Md., this 24th day of March, in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven.

DAVID C. WINEBRENNER, 3D,
Secretary of State.

Joint Resolution 8 and memorial of the General Assembly of Maryland to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, requesting that legislation be enacted making provision for loans to ex-soldiers on their bonus papers or certificates

Whereas by the adoption of the soldiers bonus act, provision has been made for a bonus for ex-soldiers; and

Whereas ex-soldiers have come into possession of a paper or certificate providing for future payment; and

Whereas loans may be made upon this paper or certificate; and

Whereas it has become difficult and complicated to obtain these loans through the ordinary channels: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, be, and they are hereby, requested and urged to enact legislation making provision for loans to ex-soldiers on said bonus papers or certificates; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives from the State of Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to urge and support the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit under the great seal of this State a copy of the aforegoing resolution and memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved March 18, 1927.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, David C. Winebrenner, 3d, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution 12 of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state, at Annapolis, Md., this 24th day of March, 1927.

[SEAL.] DAVID C. WINEBRENNER,
Secretary of State.

Joint Resolution 12, requesting Congress to make provision for the removal of explosives stored in the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, Curtis Bay, Md.

Whereas great quantities of explosives are now stored by the Ordnance Department of the United States Army in the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot, immediately adjacent to Baltimore city; and

Whereas the presence of such explosives at such place is a menace to the lives and property of the people of the city of Baltimore; and

Whereas the Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore city and the Association of Commerce of Baltimore city and other citizens have requested the Secretary of War to provide for the removal of said explosives, and the Senators and Representatives from Maryland have urged upon Congress the enactment of legislation providing for such removal, but no provision for such removal has been made, and such menace to the lives and property of the citizens of Baltimore city continues: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be requested to take appropriate action to bring about the speedy removal from the Curtis Bay ordnance reserve depot of the explosives there stored; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit under the great seal of this State a copy of the foregoing resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of War, and to each of the Representatives of Maryland in both Houses of Congress.

Approved March 18, 1927.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of House Joint Resolution 17, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 9th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution 17

Whereas the adjusted war veterans' compensation act, adopted by the United States Congress, which provided for the issuance of adjusted service certificates to the veterans of the World War contemplated that banks throughout the country would make loans on said certificates to the veterans; and

Whereas untold hardships and embarrassment are being suffered by the veterans because the great majority of the banks refuse to make loans on said certificates; and

Whereas the United States Veterans' Bureau now has on hand funds totaling over $300,000,000 which could be used in making loans to veterans on their adjusted service certificates; and

Whereas it would be beneficial alike to the war veterans and to the banks if the funds in the hands of the United States Veterans' Bureau could be used in making loans to the veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the efforts of the veterans of the World War to authorize, by appropriate legislation, the United States Veterans' Bureau to use the funds under the control of said bureau for the making of loans direct to said veterans upon their adjusted service certificates be, and the same are, hereby approved; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house February 8, 1927.

ROBERT SCHOLES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the Senate February 17, 1927.

FRED E. STERLING,
President of the Senate.
J. H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Filed March 8, 1927.

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, David C. Winebrenner, 3d, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution 3, of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state at Annapolis, Md., this 14th day of March, in the year 1927.

[SEAL.] DAVID C. WINEBRENNER, 3d,
Secretary of State.

Joint Resolution 3 and memorial of the General Assembly of Maryland to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled requesting the repeal of Title III of the revenue act of 1926, known as estate tax law

Whereas except in times of national stress the imposition of inheritance and estate taxes has been considered as being within the sole province of the several States; and

Whereas in the past the Federal Government has entered this field of taxation only because of war contingencies; and

Whereas the present Federal estate tax is the successor to a tax first imposed in 1916 because of the threat of war and was subsequently continued primarily as a war measure; and

Whereas the World War has long since ended and the proceeds at present derived by the Government from the Federal estate tax constitute a comparatively small factor in Federal revenue; and

Whereas the Federal Government has no occasion for remaining in any field of taxation essentially local by nature except for the purpose of revenue to meet the financial requirements of its Budget; and

Whereas there is no emergency or other pressing need which should militate against the prompt and immediate withdrawal of the Government from the exercise of a taxing power which is logically and primarily a matter for the determination of each individual State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled be, and they are hereby, requested and urged to repeal Title III of the revenue act of 1926 known as the estate tax law, to the end that the Federal Government surrender back to the State governments a sphere of taxation properly belonging to them and which should only be invaded, if at all, in times of great national necessity; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives from the State of Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to urge and support the repeal of the above-mentioned law; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit under the great seal of this State a copy of the foregoing resolution and memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved March 11, 1927.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That—

Whereas the people of Florida, by an overwhelming majority, adopted a constitutional amendment prohibiting the State from levying in the future any inheritance or income tax; and

Whereas the State's finances are in such an admirable condition that, although it has no severance tax, no corporation tax, no corporation stock-transfer tax, no franchise tax, no income tax, and no inheritance tax, it has no bonded indebtedness of any kind or character, does not owe a dollar, and has as of the 1st of April in its treasury in excess of $11,466,280.05 in cash, thus demonstrating beyond question that the levying of an inheritance or an income tax is absolutely unnecessary in this State; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in enacting the present revenue law, providing therein for a Federal inheritance tax, but allowing those States that have inheritance taxes a credit to the extent of 80 per cent of the taxes so paid, the avowed purpose of which was to force the States of Florida, Alabama, and others similarly situated to levy an inheritance tax; and

Whereas taxing the dead, either by Federal legislation or State legislation, is a capital levy and should not be resorted to except in time of war or other grave emergency; and

Whereas an inheritance tax, if it is to be written into law at all, is a prerogative of the State, a political question exclusively within the province of the State; and

Whereas Congress by giving to the respective States that have inheritance taxes credit for 80 per cent of the taxes so paid admits and concedes that the Federal Government does not need the revenue; and

Whereas the action of Congress, in endeavoring by Federal legislation to coerce a sovereign State into enacting legislation contrary to the wishes of the people of that State in a question of purely local concern, is unprecedented, arbitrary, indefensible, and contrary to the very fundamentals of our American form of government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we protest against the passage of a Federal inheritance tax, and especially one in the form of that which has been passed, and we regard such action upon the part of Congress as unnecessary, uncalled for, indefensible, without justification, and contrary to the fundamental principles upon which the Republic is founded; that we reaffirm our confidence in the wisdom of the people of Florida in adopting the constitutional amendment prohibiting the Legislature of Florida in the future from ever levying any State income or inheritance taxes; and that the State of Florida declines to be coerced into repealing the constitutional provision forbidding the levying of taxes upon the estates of dead men, but avows its intention of forever maintaining and continuing the constitutional amendment in question; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to demand the repeal of the Federal inheritance tax and that they continue to take such vigorous action as may in their judgment be deemed best to bring this about; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Members of Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, the press of this State and of the Nation.

Approved by the governor April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint Resolution 37

Whereas war between nations under existing international law is a lawful institution, and any nation, with or without cause, may declare war against any other nation; and

Whereas war is the greatest existing menace to society, and the next great war is almost certain to be more terrible than any previous war and is likely to engulf and destroy civilization: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That war between nations should be outlawed as an institution or means for the settlement of international controversies by making it a public crime in international law, and that every nation should be encouraged by solemn agreement or treaty to bind itself to indict and punish its own international war breeders or instigators and war profiteers under powers similar to those conferred upon our Congress under Article I, section 8, of our Federal Constitution, which clothes the Congress with the power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and Congress be and are hereby memoralized to take the necessary steps to make this country the leader in the movement for the outlawry of war through agreements with other nations and through legislation curbing all instigators of war and war profiteers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each House of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Joint Resolution 38, memorializing Congress to adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, relating to "dollar diplomacy"

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 has been introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session; and

Whereas such resolution provides as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to direct the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, the Federal Reserve Board, and all other agencies of the Government which are or may be concerned thereunder, to refrain henceforth, without specific prior authorization of the Congress, from—

"(1) Directly or indirectly engaging the responsibility of the Government of the United States, or otherwise on its behalf to supervise the fulfilment of financial arrangements between citizens of the United States and sovereign foreign governments or political subdivisions thereof whether or not recognized de jure or de facto by the United States Government; or

"(2) In any manner whatsoever giving official recognition to any arrangement which may commit the Government of the United States to any form of military intervention in order to compel the observance of alleged obligations of sovereign or subordinate authority, or of any corporations or individuals, or to deal with any such arrangement except to secure the settlement of claims of the United States or of United States citizens through the ordinary channels of law provided therefor in the respective foreign jurisdictions or through duly authorized and accepted arbitration agencies." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That Congress be, and is hereby, respectfully petitioned and urged to adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 15; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Joint Resolution 39, memorializing the National Government to submit to arbitration the Mexican and Nicaraguan controversies

Whereas difficulties have arisen between Mexico and the United States relative to the retroactive and confiscatory provisions of the land laws of Mexico as affecting the claims of certain private citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the attitude of the United States Government toward Mexico and Nicaragua has been in spirit, at least, a violation of the Monroe doctrine; and

Whereas the President of Mexico has signified his willingness to submit to arbitration the controversies arising out of the land laws of that country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Government of the United States discontinue its present policy of interference in these countries and make every effort to submit the matters in controversy between the United States and the Governments of Mexico and Nicaragua to arbitration; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress, and each Wisconsin Member thereof.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

House Memorial 1, directed to the President and Congress of the United States requesting the establishment of military schools or camps for the purpose of training aviators upon the present Government fields of Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla.

Whereas the people of the State of Florida are intensely interested in the public welfare and common defense of the Nation; and

Whereas the training of aviators is essential to insuring the public welfare and maintaining the common defense of the Nation; and

Whereas the people of the United States now own in the State of Florida two flying fields, to wit, Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla.; and

Whereas said fields are not being used now as aviation training camps; and

Whereas the facilities of said fields for flying are unsurpassed by any in the world, due to the region about the camps and the atmospheric conditions most conducive to the safety for flying; and

Whereas the Florida climate is equal and mild and the location of the camps naturally healthful; and

Whereas the said flying fields of Dorr and Carlstrom form an ideal location for the training of aviators: Be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the President of the United States and Congress be, and they are hereby, earnestly solicited to take such steps as may be necessary, either by the legislative or executive branches of the Federal Government, to establish at the fields of Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla., Government schools or training camps for the purpose of training and equipping aviators for the use of aerial service in the United States Army, or for other public service; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be furnished by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Approved by the governor April 23, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 1 as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

House Memorial 6

A joint resolution proposing a memorial to Congress indorsing the support by the Government of adequate appropriations for the support of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves

Whereas there is located in Florida two separate regiments of the Florida National Guard which is maintained to a large extent by Federal appropriation of money; and

Whereas there is also located in the State of Florida various units of the Organized Reserves constituted under the provisions of the national defense act of 1920; and

Whereas the National Guard forms an essential and necessary organization for use in peace time, as evidenced by its services during the recent hurricane disaster in Florida, as well as an adequate fighting organization in the event of war; and

Whereas the people of Florida desire to see the National Guard and the Organized Reserves of the United States supported by adequate appropriations reasonably sufficient to enable these organizations to accomplish the purpose of their organization, said appropriations to be as liberal as may be consistent with the welfare of the public and the general good: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Legislature of the State of Florida herein memorializes and requests its two Senators in the United States Senate and its four Representatives in the Congress of the United States to use all honorable means in their power to prevent the handicapping or crippling of the National Guard or Organized Reserves by the withdrawal of any existing appropriations therefrom, and that they use all honorable means in their power to secure for the use of the National Guard and Organized Reserves as liberal an appropriation for the training of such National Guard and reserves as may be consistent with the welfare of the Government, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the United States Senators from Florida and to each of the Congressmen from Florida, to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the Chief of the Militia Bureau of the War Department, all duly certified to and under the great seal of the State of Florida.

Approved by the governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial 6, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled memorial on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following senate concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Indiana, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF INDIANA,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, F. E. Schortemeier, secretary of state of the State of Indiana, hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a full, true, and complete copy of enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 of the seventy-fifth regular session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, begun on the 6th day of January, A. D. 1927, which said resolution was filed in my office on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1927, as the same appears on file, as the law directs, in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and affix the great seal of the State of Indiana. Done at my office in the city of Indianapolis this 30th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] F. E. SCHORTEMEIER,
Secretary of State.

Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 (ch. 265)

A concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920

Whereas the President of the United States in a recent message to the Congress of the United States has stated that the Army and Navy of the United States should be strengthened and that a people who neglect their national defense are putting in jeopardy their national honor; and

Whereas in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920, and amendments thereto, and in order to increase and promote the strength and effectiveness of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States has recommended substantially as follows:

(a) That the Regular Army be brought back to the strength of 150,000 enlisted men and 13,000 officers, and that it be suitably housed and enabled to conduct annual maneuvers on a moderate scale;

(b) That the National Guard be given the support necessary to permit its progressive development toward a strength of 250,000;

(c) That the skeleton organization of the Organized Reserves be adequately maintained;

(d) That all reserve officers receive an average of 15 days' training in each 3 years;

(e) That the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units be further developed; and

(f) That provision may be made for a gradual increase in the number accommodated annually in citizens' military training camps: Therefore

SECTION 1. *Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana,* That the General Assembly of the State of Indiana respectfully and earnestly urges upon the Congress the necessity of appropriating such funds and enacting such legislation as will adequately provide for the effective carrying out of the provisions of the national defense act of 1920 and also the recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States hereinbefore set forth.

SEC. 2. Suitable copies of this resolution shall be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the members of the congressional Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs.

F. HAROLD VAN ORMAN,
President of the Senate.
HARRY G. LESLIE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
_____,
Governor of the State of Indiana.

Filed February 28, 1927, 4.10 p. m.

F. E. SCHORTEMEIER,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following senate resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona, ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, complete, and correct copy of Senate Resolution 1 of the fourth special session of the Eighth Legislature, State of Arizona, all of which is shown by the original on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 12th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

ARIZONA STATE SENATE,
EIGHTH LEGISLATURE, FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION.

Senate Resolution 1

Whereas there were nine classes of officers who fought for the United States in the World War, to wit: Army, emergency, provisional, regular; Navy, emergency, provisional, regular; Marine, emergency, provisional, regular; and

Whereas of the nine named classes of officers, eight classes, to wit, the officer of the Army, * * *, provisional, regular; Navy, emergency, provisional, regular; Marine, emergency, provisional, regular; who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past seven years, under laws passed by Congress, retired on 75 per cent of their active-duty pay on account of such disability; and

Whereas the niuth class of such officers, to wit, the emergency Army officers, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past seven years denied by Congress the retirement privileges which long ago were accorded the other eight classes of disabled officers; and

Whereas the American Legion at each of its national conventions, including the recent A. E. F. Convention held in Paris, has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of the emergency Army officer permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War so as to place them on the same footing as the other eight classes of disabled officers who are now on the retired lists; and

Whereas practically all the veterans' organizations have voted in department and national conventions to have enacted into law legislation to accord the disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges long ago accorded by Congress to the other eight classes of officers; and

Whereas bills to grant this justice have been pending in the National Congress since the armistice; and

Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arizona State Senate, Eighth Arizona Legislature, in special session assembled, at Phoenix, Ariz., That we do favor and urge the passage of such legislation as will eliminate this injustice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Senators HENRY ASHURST and CARL HAYDEN and Hon. LEWIS B. DOUGLAS, our Representatives in Congress.

_____,
President of the Senate.
_____,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following house resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Eighth State Legislature.

House Resolution 4

Whereas there were nine classes of officers who fought for the United States in the World War, to wit, the officers of the Army, emergency, provisional, regular; Navy, emergency, provisional, regular; Marine, emergency, provisional, regular; and

Whereas of the nine named classed of officers eight classes, to wit, the officers of the Army, * * *, provisional, regular; Navy, emergency, provisional, regular; Marine, emergency, provisional, regular, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past seven years, under laws passed by Congress, retired on 75 per cent of their active-duty pay on account of such disability; and

Whereas the ninth class of such officers, to wit, the emergency Army officers, who became disabled in line of duty, to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past seven years denied by Congress the retirement privileges which long ago were accorded the other eight classes of disabled officers; and

Whereas the American Legion at each of its national conventions, including the recent American Expeditionary Forces convention held in Paris, has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of the emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War so as to place them on the same footing as the other eight classes of disabled officers who are now on the retired list; and

Whereas practically all other veterans' organizations have voted in department and national conventions to have enacted into law legislation to accord the disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges long ago accorded by Congress to the other eight classes of officers; and

Whereas bills to grant this justice have been pending in the National Congress since the Armistice.

Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, eighth State legislature, in special session assembled, at Phoenix, Ariz., That we do favor and urge the passage of such legislation as will eliminate this injustice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Senators HENRY ASHURST and CARL HAYDEN and Hon. LEWIS W. DOUGLAS, our Representatives in Congress.

Passed the house October 31, 1927.

Carried unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Office of Secretary for the Territory.

I, Karl Theile, secretary of Alaska and custodian of the great seal of said Territory, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of Senate Joint Memorial 9 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, 1927, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy of said original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the Territory of Alaska at Juneau, the capital, this 4th day of May, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] KARL THEILE,
Secretary of Alaska.

Senate Joint Memorial 9

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, do most respectfully and earnestly represent that—

Whereas large portions of the Territory of Alaska are well adapted as grazing lands for musk oxen; and

Whereas musk oxen formerly naturally inhabited Alaska, but were exterminated many years ago; and

Whereas in those portions of Alaska suited to musk oxen it has not yet been proven to be commercially successful to raise cattle or sheep; and

Whereas it appears that the raising of musk oxen can be successfully inaugurated in the Territory in regions in which cattle and sheep raising has not been proven successful; and

Whereas musk oxen are valuable for both their meat and hides, and are therefore promising substitutes for cattle and sheep: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, petitioned to pass a bill and appropriate money authorizing the introduction of musk oxen, similar to the provisions of Senate Bill 4936, introduced by Senator NORBECK in the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session.

The carrying out of the recommended work will be of great immediate and ultimate benefit to the Territory and prove to be a well-paying investment.

Therefore your memorialists respectfully urge the action recommended.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the senate April 22, 1927.

BARTLEY HOWARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house April 27, 1927.

SUMNER S. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CASH COLE,
Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the original of Senate Joint Memorial 9, passed by the senate and house of representatives.

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Office of the Secretary for the Territory.

I, Karl Theile, secretary of Alaska and custodian of the great seal of said Territory, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial 8 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, 1927, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy of said original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the Territory of Alaska, at Juneau, the capital, this 27th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] KARL THEILE,
Secretary of Alaska.

House Joint Memorial 8

To the President and Congress of the United States, and to the War Department, Washington, D. C.:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents:

That the completion of the Government highway from Skagway, Alaska, to the international boundary line at the summit of the White Pass, will become the American terminal portion of an international high road from that port to the highways and waterways at the headwaters of the Yukon River, and furnish an outlet of that rich mining region to that terminal; such a highway will give free access to automobiles and other vehicles to the mining regions around Atlin and White Horse, British Columbia, and thence down the Yukon River, via Dawson, to eastern Alaska; it will be of great benefit to Skagway and will tend to bring the trade of the upper Yukon interior out to that American port, and will tend to increase population, prospecting, and the development of mining along the upper Yukon and around Skagway and in eastern Alaska.

That the construction of said highway, of which the Government has now constructed about one-fourth part, will give American tourists quick and easy entry from Skagway over the magnificent White Pass scenic route into the Lake Bennett, Atlin, and White Horse regions, and connect the highways in those regions with the terminal at Skagway, and be of great advantage in trade to the said port of Skagway.

That the Alaska road commission has heretofore had control of work on said project, and ought to be allowed and authorized to complete the same; that the people of Alaska have confidence in the said Alaska road commission and its ability to do good and effective road work;

Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully petitions for the completion of the Skagway highway to the summit of White Pass, and that it be so completed by the Alaska road commission out of funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States for the construction of roads, trails, and bridges in Alaska.

And your memorialist will ever pray: Be it

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the honorable Secretary of War, and to the Hon. DAN SUTHERLAND, Delegate from Alaska, Washington, D. C.

Passed by the house April 20, 1927.

SUMNER S. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CASH COLE,
Clerk of the House.

Passed by the senate April 25, 1927.

BARTLEY HOWARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Office of the Secretary for the Territory.

I, Karl Theile, secretary of Alaska and custodian of the great seal of said Territory, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, 1927, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy of said original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the Territory of Alaska, at Juneau, the capital, this 25th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] KARL THEILE,
Secretary of Alaska.

Senate Joint Memorial 7

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, does most respectfully and earnestly represent that:

Whereas all of Alaska is well adapted to the raising of game and fur-bearing animals; and

Whereas certain valuable fur-bearing animals native to Alaska have been exterminated over considerable areas of Alaska, and on other areas well adapted to raising certain fur-bearing and game animals, such animals do not naturally occur; and

Whereas fur-bearing and game animals are one of the important resources of the Territory and can be made to be of much greater value to the Territory by the stocking of lands with animals adapted to such habitats, and the proper protection and upbuilding of the wild fur-bearing and game stock indigenous to the Territory; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has by specific act retained jurisdiction over the game and fur-bearing animals of the Territory and has thereby prevented the Territory from taking an active part in the upbuilding of the wild life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, petitioned to assist in these matters by—

1. Appropriating funds and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture or the Alaska Game Commission to adopt and carry out a program of stocking lands of Alaska with valuable fur and game animals, similar to the program adopted by the Territory (ch. 51, Session Laws of 1925), for the beginning of which the Territory appropriated $10,000.

2. Increasing the appropriation for the protection of fur and game in Alaska and providing a special appropriation for the obtaining of needed transportation equipment to enable the Alaska Game Commission to carry on adequate wild-life protective work in Alaska.

Such expenditures will be of great immediate and ultimate benefit to the Territory and prove to be a well-paying investment.

Therefore your memorialist respectfully urges that these proposals be adopted.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Passed the senate April 13, 1927.

BARTLEY HOWARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house April 19, 1927.

SUMNER S. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CASH COLE,
Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of the original Senate Joint Memorial 7 passed by the senate and house of representatives.

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Office of the Secretary for the Territory.

I, Karl Theile, secretary of Alaska and custodian of the great seal of said Territory, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial 6 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, 1927, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy of said original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the Territory of Alaska, at Juneau, the capital, this 15th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

KARL THEILE,
Secretary of Alaska.

House Joint Memorial 6

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent:

That the future growth and development of the greater portion of the Territory of Alaska is largely dependent upon the successful operation and maintenance of the Alaska Railroad; that during the comparatively few years since its completion this railroad has been the chief factor in bringing into interior Alaska large and important mining and other interests, some of which involve the expenditure of many millions of dollars, and which are, with good reason, expected to give permanent employment to a great many people and to result in the ultimate settlement, development, and prosperity of Alaska;

That freight and passenger traffic over the Alaska Railroad is showing a steady and gradual increase, but, in the opinion of your memorialists, it is greatly hampered because of the fact that no protection whatever is afforded either the traveling public or the employees of the railroad against the dangers and hazards incident to railroad travel, as the United States has elected, in the operation of the railroad, to avail itself of its sovereign right not to be sued in any matter or action arising out of the operation of the road;

That your memorialists believe that it is a matter of simple justice and right that the United States should in no wise differ in its status from any other common carrier and should be willing to make reparation and should compensate, so far as it is possible to do so, any person suffering injuries or any financial loss by reason of the operation of the said railroad, or by reason of any accident arising out of the operation thereof, on the same basis as if the United States were a common carrier.

Wherefore your memorialists pray that a law be enacted by the Congress by the provisions of which the United States shall consent to be sued in all actions founded upon any contract, express or implied, with the Government of the United States in connection with the operation of the Alaska Railroad, or for damages, liquidated or unliquidated, whether founded in tort or otherwise, arising out of the operation of the said Alaska Railroad, in respect to which the party would be entitled to redress against the United States either in a court of law or equity if the United States were suable; declaring the Alaska Railroad to be a common carrier and subject to all the laws of the United States pertaining to common carriers; that such actions may be prosecuted in the courts of Alaska, and that the judgments which may be rendered therein against the United States may be paid in the same manner as judgments rendered in the United States Court of Claims.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed by the house April 1, 1927.

SUMNER S. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CASH COLE,
Clerk of the House.

Passed by the senate April 12, 1927.

BARTLEY HOWARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Office of the Secretary for the Territory.

I, Karl Theile, secretary of Alaska and custodian of the great seal of said Territory, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of Senate Joint Memorial 5 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, 1927, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy of said original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the Territory of Alaska, at Juneau, the capital, this 4th day of May, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

KARL THEILE,
Secretary of Alaska.

Senate Joint Memorial 5

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the representatives of the people of the Territory of Alaska in session assembled, do respectfully petition:

That whereas there are certain areas of the public lands in Alaska that are adapted to the grazing of cattle and other livestock; and

Whereas the great agricultural western section of the United States was developed largely by the governmental policy of granting settlers title to the land; and

Whereas a governmental policy of leasing land is not an American policy because Americans have always obtained title to the land upon which they live; and

Whereas the grazing homestead act of Congress has aided in building up the old frontier of the United States and we believe will operate to stimulate the grazing industry in Alaska, we therefore petition the Congress to extend the provision of that act to this Territory as an inducement to agriculturists to preempt our public lands.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the senate April 19, 1927.

BARTLEY HOWARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house April 27, 1927.

SUMNER S. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CASH COLE,
Clerk of the House.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the original of Senate Joint Memorial 5, passed by the senate and house of representatives.

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Office of the Secretary for the Territory.

I, Karl Theile, Secretary of Alaska and custodian of the great seal of said Territory, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial 1 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, 1927, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy of said original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the Territory of Alaska at Juneau, the capital, this 13th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

KARL THEILE,
Secretary of Alaska.

House Joint Memorial 1

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighth regular session assembled, do most respectfully represent that—

Whereas the construction of roads is a necessary requirement for the proper development of Alaska; and

Whereas the Fifth Alaska Territorial Legislature realizing the advantages and necessity of such improvement on Seward Peninsula, authorized the purchase of the Seward Peninsula Railroad; and

Whereas this railroad, now designated as the Nome-Shelton tramway, has proven of inestimable benefit to the southern part of Seward Peninsula; and

Whereas under authority of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1921, the Alaska Road Commission submitted a report printed in House Document No. 514, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, recommending the extension of the Nome-Shelton tramway in connection with related road and trail development on the Seward Peninsula; and

Whereas House Joint Resolution 60, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, authorizing the adoption of the above-mentioned report, was approved by the House Committee on the Territories, passed the House by unanimous consent on January 28, 1925, but failed of passage in the Senate because it was not considered; and

Whereas House Joint Resolution 73, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, in identical terms, was approved by House Committee on the Territories, passed the House on February 2, 1927, but failed of passage in the Senate because it was again not considered in the closing days of a short session: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That your memorialists most respectfully urge that Congress give the proposed extension of this tramway their most earnest and favorable consideration; and therefore be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of Alaska be instructed to send copies of this memorial and supporting petition to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives, to the Secretary of War, and to the Hon. DAN A. SUTHERLAND, Delegate for Alaska.

Passed by the house March 31, 1927.

SUMNER S. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CASH COLE,
Clerk of the House.

Passed by the senate April 9, 1927.

BARTLEY HOWARD,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

RUTH REAT,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

Concurrent resolution

Whereas the lessees of tracts of Hawaiian home lands on the island of Molokai have made remarkable progress in the development of their tracts notwithstanding the inadequate water supply for irrigation purposes; and

Whereas with proper irrigation the lessees of said tracts would be enabled to cultivate their tracts more properly and increase their financial returns for their efforts; and

Whereas by providing an increased water supply for irrigation purposes the value of the tracts would increase and the taxes therefrom would be greater; and

Whereas it would be to the financial advantage of the Territory in the form of increased returns from taxation to provide a more adequate water supply: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to extend to the Territory of Hawaii the provisions of the reclamation act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of Hawaii, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 27, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 19, 1927.

C. H. COOKE,
Speaker House of Representatives.
JOSEPH ORDENSTEIN,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 27, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 26, 1927.

ROBERT U. SHINGLE,
President of the Senate.
ALBERT E. LLOYD,
Clerk of the Senate.

Concurrent resolution

Whereas the women of the Territory of Hawaii have shown an interest in civic affairs and in the administration of justice at least equal to that shown by the men; and

Whereas it has been proposed that women should be permitted to serve as jurors; and

Whereas it is but proper that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii should consider the advisability of enacting a law to permit women to serve on juries; and

Whereas such a law would be in direct conflict with the provisions of section 83 of the organic act: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That Congress be requested to so amend the provisions of section 83 of the organic act that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii may enact a law permitting women to serve on juries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 20, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 20, 1927.

C. H. COOKE,
Speaker House of Representatives.
JOSEPH ORDENSTEIN,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 20, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 19, 1927.

ROBERT W. SHINGLE,
President of the Senate.
ALBERT E. LLOYD,
Clerk of the Senate.

Concurrent resolution

Whereas the annual compensation paid to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is $10,000; and

Whereas the governor, on account of the peculiar geographical position of the Territory of Hawaii, has been compelled to expend large sums of money to entertain distinguished visitors from the mainland of the United States and from foreign countries visiting the Territory and passing through Honolulu; and

Whereas the present compensation provided for the governor of the Territory, under the peculiar circumstances existing in Hawaii, is inadequate: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1927 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to increase the annual compensation of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii from $10,000 per annum to $12,000: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 27, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 26, 1927.

C. H. COOKE,
Speaker House of Representatives.
JOSEPH ORDENSTEIN,
Clerk House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 27, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 27, 1927.

ROBERT W. SHINGLE,
President of the Senate.
ALBERT E. LLOYD,
Clerk of the Senate.

Concurrent resolution

Whereas under the laws of the United States of America, and particularly under section 320 of the penal laws of the United States, it is provided that no boxing exhibitions can be carried on in the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii are interested in and in favor of allowing boxing exhibitions to be carried on in the Territory of Hawaii, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be requested to amend section 320 of the penal laws of the United States (35 Stat. L. 1150) by changing the last paragraph of said law to read as follows:

"The provision of this section shall apply to all of the Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, but shall not include the Territory of Hawaii"; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Territories of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 31, 1927.

ROBERT W. SHINGLE,
President of the Senate.
ALBERT E. LLOYD,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 1, 1927.

G. E. COOKES,
Speaker House of Representatives.
JOSEPH ORDENSTEIN,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following communications from the Secretary of the Interior, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 5, 1927.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I transmit herewith a copy of a letter from Hon. W. R. Farrington, Governor of Hawaii, submitting for consideration a copy of Joint Resolution 4, passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii at its fourteenth biennial session and signed by the governor April 20, 1927, in relation to the claim of the Territory of Hawaii on behalf of the University of Hawaii for recognition by the Federal Government of its right to share in the benefits of certain acts of Congress.

Respectfully,

HUBERT WORK.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Honolulu, May 24, 1927.

The honorable SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.
(Through the honorable Secretary of the Interior).

DEAR SIR: I transmit for your consideration and presentation to the House of Representatives, United States Congress, where it may possibly be referred to the appropriate committee, Joint Resolution 4, passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii at its fourteenth biennial session and signed by the governor of the Territory. This joint resolution is entitled "Declaring the claim of the Territory of Hawaii on behalf of the University of Hawaii for recognition by the Federal Government of its right to share in the benefits of certain of the acts of Congress."

The people of the Territory of Hawaii feel that their Territorial university, beginning, as the State universities have done, with a college of agriculture and mechanic arts, is the proper center for the continuation of those activities contemplated by the United States Congress through the so-called Hatch and Adams fund provided for the study of agricultural problems and the promotion of scientific research in relation thereto.

Hawaii has, since it became part and parcel of the United States, contributed to the Federal Treasury over $100,000,000 in excess of the Federal expenditures within the Territory, except, of course, the expenditures of the establishments of the Army and Navy. The people of the Territory are pleased to bear their share of national burdens as required by the revenues derived through customs and the bureau of internal revenue. Having established their position as contributors to the Federal revenue in larger amounts than many of the States of the Union, they are of the opinion that they should derive benefits from national legislation in the same proportion that the various States are benefited by specific legislation, especially in relation to agricultural industry.

Yours respectfully,

W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of Hawaii.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

This is to certify that hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution 4 of the regular session of 1927 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, the original of which is on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the Territory of Hawaii to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in Honolulu, this 12th day of May, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] RAYMOND C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

Joint Resolution 4, declaring the claim of the Territory of Hawaii on behalf of the University of Hawaii for recognition by the Federal Government of its right to share in the benefits of certain of the acts of Congress

Whereas the Congress of the United States by an act approved March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. L. 440), made provision for agricultural experiment stations to be established under the direction of the college or colleges or the agricultural departments thereof in each State or Territory which had been established or which might thereafter be established in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 503), entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," or any of the supplements to said act; and

Whereas the said Congress has further endowed agricultural experiment stations so established and directed under the provisions of an act of Congress approved June 7, 1888 (25 Stat. L. 176), and an act approved March 16, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 63), and an act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. L. 970); and

Whereas the Congress has further made provision for and endowed agricultural extension work in the several States of the Union by the provisions of an act approved May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L. 372), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has established as a part of the University of Hawaii a college in accordance with the provisions of said act of the Congress approved July 2, 1862, and its supplements, and the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has given its assent to the provisions of all acts of the Congress providing for agricultural experiment stations in connection with colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, such assent being expressed in section 4 of Act 203 of the session laws of 1919 (sec. 403 of the revised laws of Hawaii, 1925); and

Whereas all of the States of the Union and some of the present States when they were Territories have received the benefits provided by the Congress for such agricultural experiment stations, and the Territory of Hawaii is clearly within the purport and intent of these acts and the best practice as applied to other Territories, but has thus far been denied said benefits: Therefore be it

Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, The Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby reaffirms the declarations and claims specifically set forth in the act of said legislature approved April 26, 1923, entitled "An act to define and declare the claims of the Territory of Hawaii concerning its status in the American Union and to provide for the appointment of a commission to secure more complete recognition of such claims by the Federal Government," referring

especially to the high standard of educational institutions and educational policies in which American ideals and American programs have prevailed for a hundred years, and does further reiterate and express its confidence in the intent of the Congress to do full justice to the Territory of Hawaii, and its belief that the failure of the Territory of Hawaii to receive for the use of the University of Hawaii the benefits provided by the aforesaid acts of Congress for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in connection with the University of Hawaii and the endowment of agricultural extension work will be speedily remedied when the Congress is fully informed of the facts.

The Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby makes formal request of the Congress that in future annual appropriations made to carry out the provisions of the above-cited acts to establish and endow agricultural experiment stations, the Congress of the United States include the sums necessary to provide for the participation of Hawaii in the benefits of said acts.

The Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to so amend said act approved May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L. 372), as to include the Territory of Hawaii within its scope on a parity with the several States, and does further request that in future annual appropriations made to carry out the provisions of said act the Congress include the sums necessary to make said amendment effective.

To the end that the conditions herein recited may be remedied, the Governor of Hawaii, in association with the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, is requested to present and urge the claims of the Territory of Hawaii as above set forth to the next session of the Congress of the United States and the executive departments of the Federal Government.

Approved this 20th day of April, A. D. 1927.

W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, May 24, 1927.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.
(Through the honorable the Secretary of the Interior).

DEAR SIR: I transmit for your information and presentation to the United States Senate in the usual manner certified copy of Joint Resolution 1, passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in regular session of 1927, entitled:

"Declaring the project of rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race, as provided by the Hawaiian homes commission act, 1920, and as administered by the Hawaiian homes commission a success, requesting the Secretary of the Interior to approve the extension of the activities of the commission under said act, urging the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions thereof to all of the islands of the Hawaiian Group, and recommending certain amendments thereto."

Very respectfully,

W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of Hawaii.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
December 5, 1927.

Respectfully forwarded to the President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

HUBERT WORK, *Secretary.*

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

This is to certify that hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution 1 of the regular session of 1927 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, the original of which is on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the Territory of Hawaii to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in Honolulu this 12th day of May, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] RAYMOND C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

Joint Resolution 1, declaring the project of rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race, as provided by the Hawaiian Homes Commission act, 1920, and as administered by the Hawaiian Homes Commission, a success, requesting the Secretary of the Interior to approve the extension of the activities of the commission under said act, urging the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions thereof to all of the islands of the Hawaiian group, and recommending certain amendments thereto

Whereas by act of Congress of July 9, 1921, known as the Hawaiian homes act, 1920, large areas of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii were set aside to be administered by the Hawaiian Homes Commission, created by said act for the benefit of native Hawaiians in order to rehabilitate the Hawaiian race and prevent the decrease and possible extinction thereof; and

Whereas the Hawaiian Homes Commission was organized and became operative on September 16, 1921; and

Whereas under said act the activities of the commission were limited to the island of Molokai and to the lands of Keaukaha and Panaewa in Waiakea, South Hilo, and the land of Waimanu on the island of Hawaii; and

Whereas nearly all of the available lands on the island of Molokai suitable for cultivation under present conditions and portions of the lands of Keaukaha have been allotted to and settled upon by native Hawaiians; and

Whereas the Hawaiians who have taken up tracts of Hawaiian home lands have been successful, as evidenced by the following:

(a) One of the outstanding features of the work is that to date not one person that has settled on the land has left it.

(b) The 116 families occupying homesteads on the island of Molokai are making comfortable homes, their lands in most instances being profitably cultivated, and while there is no excessive wealth or luxury they are steadily making payments on the loans granted under the agreement of the lease.

(c) The house lots near Kaunakakai on Molokai and at Keaukaha on Hawaii have proved one of the best features of the commission's activity; especially on Hawaii have these lots served the intended purpose of getting working people out of the tenements.

(d) Cooperative marketing for handling the vegetables, poultry, and work is beginning to take shape among the homesteaders; and

Whereas of a total population of 650 native Hawaiians in the homesteaded areas on Molokai there have been 38 births and 11 deaths; of the deaths, 3 were from pulmonary tuberculosis, one from accident, 1 from poisoning, 1 born defective, 1 unattended, and 4 from removable causes, thus making a mortality rate of less than 1 per cent; and

Whereas on the basis of such success the commission's activities should be extended; and

Whereas under section 204 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission act further authorization of the Congress of the United States and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior of the United States must be secured before the commission could further use, lease, or otherwise dispose of Hawaiian home lands to native Hawaiians under the provisions of the act: Therefore be it

Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the project of rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race, under the Hawaiian Homes Commission act, as administered by the Hawaiian Homes Commission, is hereby approved and declared a success;

That the Secretary of the Interior of the United States be respectfully requested to give his approval to the extension of the activities of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, under the Hawaiian Homes Commission act, 1920, to all of the islands of the group, and that the Congress of the United States authorize the extension of the said project of rehabilitation to the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands on all of the islands of the Hawaiian group, as set forth in the said act;

That the Congress of the United States amend section 204 so as to authorize, and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States approve, the immediate selection by the commission of all of the available lands named in section 203 for allotment and settlement by native Hawaiians, provided that the land so selected shall not be allotted for settlement until existing leases expire: *Provided,* That the commission may return such portion of the available lands to the commissioner of public lands as may not be immediately needed for the purposes of the act, to be leased by the commissioner of public lands as provided in subdivision D of section 73 of the organic act, such lease to contain a withdrawal clause and the lands so leased may be withdrawn for the purposes of the said act upon the giving of five years' notice of such withdrawal: *And provided further,* That the commission shall not lease, use, nor dispose of more than 20,000 acres of the area of Hawaiian home lands for settlement by native Hawaiians in any five calendar-year period.

Approved this 13th day of April, A. D. 1927.

(Signed) W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Honolulu, May 24, 1927.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.
(Through the honorable the Secretary of the Interior.)

DEAR SIR: I transmit for your information and presentation to the United States Senate in the usual manner certified copy of Joint Resolution 2, passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in regular session of 1927, entitled:

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to exempt all officials and employees of the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions from the payment of Federal income taxes."

Very respectfully,

W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of Hawaii.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

This is to certify that hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution 2 of the regular session of 1927 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, the original of which is on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the Territory of Hawaii to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in Honolulu this 12th day of May, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] RAYMOND C. BROWN,
Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

Joint Resolution 2, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to exempt all officials and employees of the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions from the payment of Federal income taxes

Whereas under the revenue act of 1921 of the Congress of the United States the officials and employees of the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions are compelled to pay taxes upon income derived from the Territory or its political subdivisions; and

Whereas the officials and employees receiving compensation from the various States of the Union are exempt from the payment of income taxes; and

Whereas, although the United States Government has the power to tax the income from salaries derived from the Territory of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, such taxation amounts to a discrimination in favor of the officials and employees of the various States of the Union as against the officials and employees of the Territory of Hawaii: Now therefore be it

Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States is hereby formally requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to amend section 213 of the revenue act of 1921, so as to exempt from taxation thereunder all income in the form of salaries derived by the officials and employees from any Territory or the political subdivisions thereof if the laws of the Territory require the payment of a tax on such salaries.

Approved this 15th day of April, A. D. 1927.

(Signed) W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following communication from the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, together with resolutions of the legislature of the Territory, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Honolulu, April 15, 1927.

The honorable PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS
OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I inclose for your consideration a copy of a concurrent resolution passed by the members of the Fourteenth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting an amendment to the act under which various States of the Union have been invited to display in Statuary Hall of the Capitol of the United States, two statues of distinguished sons.

The Territory of Hawaii now makes its appeal for recognition to the end that statues of Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, for 20 years Delegate to Congress from the Territory and a member of the former royal family of the Hawaiian monarchy, and Hon. Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii, first governor of the Territory of Hawaii, and judge of the United States District Court of Hawaii, may be placed in Statuary Hall.

Hawaii has since its annexation to the United States carried all the financial responsibilities of a State. It is to-day practically a State, except that its executive and judicial officers are appointed by the President of the United States; its laws may be changed by the Congress of the United States, and its representation in the Congress is through a Delegate who has no vote in Congress.

These leaders whom our citizens desire to especially honor gave a lifetime of service to their country. They were pioneers in a great outpost. They deserve recognition in the same way that honor is done to other famous sons of our Nation.

Yours very truly,

W. R. FARRINGTON,
Governor of Hawaii.

Concurrent resolution

Whereas by act of Congress of July 2, 1864, it is provided that the President of the United States shall invite the various States of the Union to display in Statuary Hall of the Capitol of the United States not more than two statues of distinguished sons; and

Whereas the act limits the privilege to the various States of the Union; and

Whereas it would be fitting and proper for the privilege to be extended to the Territory of Hawaii, and that the said Territory present the statues of Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, Prince of the Hawaiian Kingdom and former Delegate to the Congress of the United States for a period of nearly 20 years, and Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii and first Governor of the Territory of Hawaii: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to amend said act so as to include the territories, and that the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii use his good offices to request the President of the United States to invite the Territory of Hawaii, as provided by said act, to place in Statuary Hall of the Capitol of the United States the statues of Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole and Sanford Ballard Dole; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii be requested to forward a copy of this resolution, with his approval thereof, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 12, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 11, 1927.

ROBERT M. SHINGLE,
President of the Senate.
ALBERT E. LLOYD,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 12, 1927.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 12, 1927.

C. C. COOKE,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

_____,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona, ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, correct, and complete copy of Senate Memorial 4, of the eighth legislature, regular session, State of Arizona, 1927, "To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America in Congress assembled to make appropriations for roads over Indian reservations"; all of which is shown by the original bill on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

Senate Memorial 4, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America in Congress assembled, to make appropriations for roads over Indian reservations

Your memorialist, the Eighth Legislature of the State of Arizona, in regular session convened, respectfully represents:

That of the 73,000,000 acres of land comprising the State of Arizona, approximately three-fifths are reserved by the Government of the United States;

That over these reserved lands the State of Arizona exercises no supervision nor jurisdiction;

That 20,000,000 acres of these lands are reserved by the Government of the United States to the use and benefit of the Indians in the State of Arizona;

That the above condition exists in many States;

That these Indian reservations are so situate as to prevent a systematic development and extension of county, State, or national highways without the cooperation and assistance of the Government of the United States;

That the Congress of the United States in enacting a most beneficient national road law has wholly failed to make any provisions for the construction and maintenance of highways over and upon the lands reserved by the Federal Government to the use and benefit of its Indian wards;

Whereas adequate transportation facilities are a vital factor in the prosperity and civilization of any country, and are essential to the

development of its agriculture and manufacture, to the working of its forests and mines, and to the spread of education and enlightenment among its citizens; and

Whereas the public roads of Arizona are for a large percentage of her citizens, and especially for the 42,000 Indian wards of the Federal Government, the only avenues of transportation leading from the point of production to the point of consumption or rail shipment, and these avenues are only now in the process of their development; and

Whereas a very large portion of the State of Arizona is held in reserve by the Government of the United States to the use and benefit of its Indian wards, and these reservations are so situated as to prevent any economic or systematic road-building activities on the part of the State government as continuous highways are rendered impracticable; this is especially true on the Apache Indian Reservation, as practically the entire long and important stretch of road from Rice to Springerville is on the reservation; and

Whereas a further inequity results from the fact that traffic in its development takes no account of reservation and State boundaries, and the State government is powerless to provide for the extension of its highway system through the adjoining and intervening reservations; and

Whereas the improvement of highways should be commensurate with their importance, and a system of highways upon the Indian reservations in Arizona, would form the only avenue by which the Indian nations could transport their products to a market, or over which the many thousands of tourists from all parts of the United States could pass to view the marvelous beauties of our natural and historical wonders: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, That the development of the material resources of the Indians of Arizona can best be furthered, their material prosperity best enhanced, their education and civilization more readily achieved, and that close association with civilization which has proved to be the efficient means of equipping them to share in the responsibilities of life most certainly assured, by means of highways constructed and maintained over and upon the lands reserved by the Government of the United States to their use and benefit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, urged to enact any legislation which may be necessary to provide adequate and continual appropriation for the construction and maintenance of highways over and upon Indians reservations in Arizona joining to and in conjunction with the system of State highways;

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to Representatives of Arizona in Congress and Chambers of Commerce in the State of Arizona; and that our Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to accomplish the enactment of such legislation.

(Signed) MULFORD WINSOR,
President.
(Signed) DOROTHY BURTON,
Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Department of State.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, J. Grant Hinkle, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial 5 with the original copy of said House Joint Memorial 5, now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the capitol, at Olympia, this 2d day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] J. GRANT HINKLE,
Secretary of State.
By A. M. KITTS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

House Joint Memorial 5

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has an established school under the direct supervision of the Department of the Interior, known as the Tulalip Indian School, at Tulalip, Wash., for the education and training of the Indian children; and

Whereas the Tulalip Indian School only provides an eighth-grade course for all such pupils, and those who desire a high-school education must attend Indian schools in other States at an additional expense; and

Whereas it is necessary, in order to provide such higher education, to establish a high school at Tulalip, Wash.: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled do respectfully request the Congress of the United States to pass legislation making provision for the construction of permanent and adequate buildings at Tulalip, Wash., for an Indian high school; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state, under the seal of the State of Washington, transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States at Washington, D. C., to the Secretary of the Interior, and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Washington a full, true, and correct copy of this joint memorial.

Passed the house February 4, 1927.

RALPH R. KNAPP,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 23, 1927.

W. LON JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Joint Resolution 28, memorializing the Congress of the United States to make a general survey of the conditions of the Indians and to enact into law the La Follette-Cooper bill, relating to the administration of Indian affairs

Whereas Senate Resolution 341, now pending in the United States Senate, details the deplorable condition of the American Indian and the need for a general survey for the purpose of correcting any abuses in the administration of Indian affairs and of recommending such changes in the law as will promote the security, economic competence, and progress of the Indians; and

Whereas there has been introduced a bill in the Congress of the United States known as the La Follette-Cooper bill, providing for the administration of the education, health, and public welfare of the Indians by the several States; and

Whereas there are several thousand Indians within the State of Wisconsin and it is the opinion of this State that the American Indian is entitled to have his needs taken care of: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully memorializes the United States Senate to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs to make a general survey of the conditions of the Indians as provided by Senate Resolution 341 and also memorializes Congress to enact into law the La Follette-Cooper bill, providing for administration by the several States of all funds appropriated for the education, health, and public welfare of the Indians; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested by the proper officers of the assembly and senate, be transmitted to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from this State.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE, STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Robert Byrne, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the twentieth legislative assembly on the 28th day February, 1927.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this the 28th day of February, 1927.

[SEAL.] ROBERT BYRNE, *Secretary of State.*

Concurrent resolution

Be it resolved by the senate and house of representatives:

Whereas during a period of the World War the United States Government established an arbitrary price upon the value of wheat cereal; and

Further, the Government organized and maintained a corporation which purchased and took over, handled, and resold all of the wheat

grown in the United States, and prescribed certain rules and regulations concerning the sale, distribution, and consumption of the same; and

Further, that during the years 1919 and 1920 the United States Government made urgent requests of the farmers and wheat growers of the United States to put forth an effort to increase and swell the volume of wheat for consumption in the United States and for export, in order that a famine situation might be averted; and

Further, that contrary to the implied promise of the United States Government that it would continue to support the market for wheat, and would maintain the price of wheat in 1919 and 1920 upon relative price level with that which was guaranteed and maintained during the period of the actual continuance of the operations of the World war; and

Further, that the Federal Government neglected to redeem its implied promise to do so; and

Further, the market price for wheat for the said years dropped considerably below the minimum price guaranteed by the Federal Government through the Federal Grain Corporation, and that by reason thereof the wheat farmers of the United States sustained tremendous losses on account of the said reduction and price;

Further, that the cost of the production of the 1919 and 1920 wheat crop was vastly enhanced by reason of the scarcity of labor and the consequent high prices paid therefor, and the high prices prevailing for all implements, machinery, and supplies necessarily used by the wheat farmers of the United States in the production of the said 1919 and 1920 crops; and

Whereas the said United States or Federal Grain Corporation closed out and ceased its operations with a large surplus in the treasury, which said surplus represented profits realized by the said Federal Grain Corporation during the period of the war when it operated and enjoyed a complete monopoly of the wheat markets of the United States, and through said power and influence it exercised a dominant power over the markets of the world; and that in justice and equity the said surplus belongs to the wheat growers of the United States of America;

Whereas the Federal Government, after the close of the World War and the termination of its contract with the manufacturers of war materials and supplies, many such manufacturers were settled with and paid large sums as a remuneration for losses sustained on account of the contract relation existing between the Federal Government and the said manufacturers;

Whereas further, the Federal Government settled with paid claims of the railroads and transportation companies with which it had contracts either expressed or implied, for the transportation of war material, soldiers, sailors, etc., and that large sums were paid to said transportation companies in settlement of claims which they presented to the Federal Government, many of which claims were not covered by express contracts;

Whereas the Federal Government during the period of war, by its rules and regulations assumed to dictate and control the production acreage of wheat grown in the United States during the period of actual hostilities, and for the years 1919 and 1920, being the reconstruction period after the war; and in consequence thereof an implied contract arose between the wheat growers and the Federal Government, and the wheat growers relied upon the said implied contract and in justice and right should be remunerated for their losses in a sum not less than a price guaranteed by the Federal Government for wheat during the period of hostilities;

Whereas the Federal Government realized a profit at the expense of the wheat grower and that the wheat grower in good faith complied with all the rules, regulations, and requests of the Federal Government, it is the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota that in justice and equity Congress should take full cognizance of these millions of dollars now in the national Treasury, so retained and belonging to the wheat growers of the United States; that this money should be made available to use in any manner required in connection with legislation which should be enacted at the earliest possible date, establishing for the grower of wheat in the United States a price for his product based upon American standards of living and cost;

Further, that a copy of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota and forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

WALTER MADDOCK,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.
JNO. W. CARR,
Speaker of the House.
C. R. VERRY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Joint Resolution 33, protesting to Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States against the passage of the Frazier-Burtness bill (H. R. 16776 and S. 5696), depriving the Grain and Warehouse Commission of Wisconsin of authority to act as Federal inspectors of grains in transit

Whereas bill H. R. 16776 was introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States on January 28, 1927, by Hon. OLGER B. BURTNESS, and a similar bill (S. 5696) was introduced in the United States Senate on February 12, 1927, by Hon. LYNN J. FRAZIER, with the sanction and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, amending certain sections of the United States grain standards act of August 11, 1916, and adding thereto a new section;

Whereas the proposed addition to the statutes of the United States confers upon the Secretary of Agriculture authority to establish and maintain laboratories at such points as he may designate for the purpose of making determinations of protein in wheat and oil in flax, etc., and to issue certificates showing the results of such determinations and tests upon requests of any interested party, fees for such services to be assessed and collected, the amount to be fixed by the Secretary;

Whereas if such a measure should be enacted into law it would, in effect, make null and void the act of the Legislature of Wisconsin in creating and maintaining the Wisconsin Grain and Warehouse Commission, for the reason that it would deprive such commission of the authority as agents of the Federal Government to make such tests and determinations and issue such certificates;

Whereas the Wisconsin Grain and Warehouse Commission, located at Superior, Wis., has been in efficient and effective operation since 1905 and has rendered valuable aid and assistance to the wheat and grain growers of this and neighboring Northwestern States;

Whereas during the 20 years of its existence the tests, grades, and determinations of grains made by the Wisconsin Grain and Warehouse Commission have seldom been called into question and its work has been uniformly satisfactory to the shippers and to the grain interests of the Northwest, and has been sanctioned and approved by the Federal Government;

Whereas there has been no call from the people of this State or the grain growers of the adjoining States for the abolition of the present system of grain inspection, and the only claim made for abandoning the present system is that it might relieve the Federal Government of slight financial obligations for the general supervision of the work in this and other States of the Union: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the State of Wisconsin hereby respectfully protests to the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture against any action changing the present system of grain inspection in this and other States; be it further

Resolved, That the Grain and Warehouse Commission of Wisconsin be instructed and directed to use every and all lawful and proper means at its disposal to combat this proposed legislation, and to cooperate with similar commissions and public bodies in other States to the end that this bill, which is inimical to the best interests of the people of Wisconsin and of adjoining States, be defeated; be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of both houses, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of Congress from Wisconsin; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, so attested, be sent to the governor and presiding officers of both houses of the legislature of each of the States of the Union maintaining grain and warehouse activities for the testing of grains in transit, and inviting the cooperation of these States in like protests to the Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Joint Resolution 91, memorializing Congress to provide more adequate support for forest research

Whereas the future prosperity of Wisconsin is bound up in maintaining and restoring the productivity of forest lands and the effective utilization of their forest products as well as the related recreational game and fish and other resources; and

Whereas there is now maintained by the Federal Forest Service in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin the forest products laboratory which is the outstanding institution for research in forest products in the world, and at St. Paul, the Lakes States forest experiment station for forest research in Wisconsin and other Lake States; and

Whereas the efficient development and use of forests and the products therefrom is dependent upon a permanent enlarged program of forest research for these institutions not only for Wisconsin but also for the entire United States; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress of the United States a bill, H. R. 17406, which would provide definite authorized appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture in order to secure an adequate national program of forest research in cooperation with the States: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin urges the passage by Congress of the above-mentioned bill; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of the senate and assembly, be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBA,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Joint Memorial Resolution 3

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the Federal Government has built at Muscle Shoals, Ala., at an expense of more than $150,000,000, a vast plant designated for the manufacture of nitrates for munitions in time of war and for the production of fertilizer products in time of peace; and

Whereas this plant has lain idle for more than eight years, since the close of the World War, thus disregarding one of the specific provisions of the national defense act, under which the plant was authorized, which provision was intended to result in the production of nitrates at a cost that would materially reduce the price of fertilizer to the farmers of the United States; and

Whereas the nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, representing an investment of $100,000,000, instead of being operated for the manufacture of cheaper fertilizer for the farmers of the Nation, are and have been idle for many years, while the Wilson Dam development is temporarily leased to private interests; and

Whereas the farmers of the United States are using more than 7,000,000 tons of fertilizer per year, costing more than $200,000,000, and the farmers of Florida alone are spending more than $14,000,000 per year for their fertilizer; and

Whereas we have the assurance of competent authorities that the facilities of the Muscle Shoals plant are adequate for the production of ample nitrates for the needs of American agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and hereby is, memorialized to enact at its next session such legislation as will without further costly delay start the vast Muscle Shoals plant to its intended work, which was the manufacture of nitrates for the needs of our Nation's agriculture, the production of munitions for war, and other national-defense purposes, and that any power in excess of these requirements be distributed to those States within transmission distances; be it further

Resolved, That United States Senators FLETCHER and TRAMMELL and Representatives SEARS, DRANE, GREENE, and YON are hereby urgently requested to use their most vigorous effort to accomplish the purpose of this memorial, and that the secretary of the State of Florida be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States, to the Congress of this Nation, and to Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved by the Governor May 25, 1927.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Office Secretary of State, ss:

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Joint Memorial Resolution 3, as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, session 1927, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 15th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, R. N. Hawkins, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "A memorial to the Senate of the United States, protesting against the enactment of House Calendar No. 204, S. 481 (Rept. No. 911), commonly known as the corn sugar bill," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 8th day of March, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 11th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] R. N. HAWKINS,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate Joint Memorial 4

To the honorable Senate of the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a bill commonly known as the corn sugar bill, being House Calendar No. 204, S. 481 (Rept. No. 911); and

Whereas said bill if enacted would permit the adulteration of about 75 per cent of our food products with corn sugar without declaring the presence of such sugar on the package or other container of such foods; and

Whereas such adulteration is contrary to the existing provisions of the national pure food and drug law and would, if permitted, tend to weaken said law in a vital respect and to greatly reduce the efficiency thereof; and

Whereas we regard the passage of such pending legislation as detrimental to the maintenance of the purity of food products: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we do hereby memorialize the Senate of the United States to refuse to enact the legislation aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Montana.

W. S. MCCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 8, 1927,

J. E. ERICKSON,
Governor.

Filed March 8, 1927, at 4 o'clock p. m.

R. N. HAWKINS,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, R. N. Hawkins, of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Memorial to the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to require payment of all moneys received from each forest reserve, after deducting administrative and other expenses, to the State or Territory in which such forest reserve is located for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of such State or Territory," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 26th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 3d day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Memorial 3

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the members of the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, respectfully represent:

Whereas by an act of Congress of May 23, 1908, provision is made for payment of 25 per cent of all moneys received from each forest reserve to the treasurer of the State or Territory in which said reserve is located for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which said forest reserve is located; and

Whereas it is the belief of your memorialists that each State and Territory is justly entitled to and should receive all of the moneys from the forest reserve in such State or Territory after deducting administrative and other expenses: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana that the Congress of the United States should enact such legislation as may be necessary to require the payment to each State and Territory in which forest reserves are located of all moneys received from such forest reserves less administrative and other expenses; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives of Montana in Congress.

W. S. McCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 26, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed February 26, 1927, at 4 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE, STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Robert Byrne, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the twentieth legislative assembly on the 28th day of February, 1927.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this the 28th day of February, 1927.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT BYRNE,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish the Roosevelt national park in Billings County, N. Dak., and to provide for the substitution of public lands of the United States for the State school lands located within the proposed park area

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring)—

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill to establish the Roosevelt national park in Billings County, N. Dak., introduced by Congressman SINCLAIR, of North Dakota, December 7, 1925, being H. R. 3942; and

Whereas the tract of land in such proposed park consists of the petrified forest and the famous Bad Lands, lying on both sides of the Little Missouri River, in Billings County, N. Dak., where Theodore Roosevelt operated his historic cattle ranches and hunted wild game in the early history of Dakota Territory, and which tract is admirably fitted by nature for scenic purposes, and preserves in its natural state the mountainous character and the wild, unchanged condition which existed in the West 50 years ago; and which tract it is practicable and appropriate to preserve as a national park in the honor of Theodore Roosevelt, in the interest of American scenic beauty, and as a relic of the traditional pioneer conditions of the West, which have all but disappeared from the North American Continent; and

Whereas there is included in said proposed park area approximately 42,000 acres of public lands belonging to the State of North Dakota known as State school lands, which was granted to it by the United States under sections 10 and 11 of the enabling act of February 22, 1889, to be held in trust by the State of North Dakota for the common schools, which lands, on account of its rough and barren character, can not be sold for the minimum price of $10 per acre, as prescribed in section 11 of said enabling act, and from which the State of North Dakota gets only a nominal income; and it further appearing that it would be expedient to exchange the said State school lands located within such proposed park area for public lands of the United States of like quantity, character, and value located in the vicinity of such proposed park: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby indorses said Roosevelt national-park project and respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to establish a national park as provided for in said H. R. 3942; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress, in furtherance of said park project, make appropriate provision for exchanging with the State of North Dakota public lands of the United States of equal quantity, character, and value for the State school lands lying within said proposed park area heretofore granted to the State of North Dakota under the provisions of sections 10 and 11 of the enabling act of February 22, 1889; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen for the State of North Dakota.

JNO. W. CARR,
Speaker of the House.
C. R. VERRY,
Chief Clerk of the House.
WALTER MADDOCK,
President of the Senate.
W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Joint Resolution 29, memorializing Congress to protest against the surrender of land in Michigan and Wisconsin by the Department of the Interior to private interests

Whereas the public welfare demands that there should be no interference with the homestead preference rights of soldiers and sailors as conferred on them by act of Congress of February 14, 1920; and

Whereas there is at present pending in Congress a bill known as H. R. 16547, which will give the Secretary of the Interior the right to withdraw large tracts of land in Michigan and Wisconsin from homestead entry; and

Whereas the passage of such a bill would deprive all war veterans and their widows as well as private citizens of the homestead privilege in Michigan and Wisconsin and would permit the acquisition of lands by speculators: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin earnestly requests the Congress of the United States to indefinitely postpone action on H. R. 16547; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of the senate and assembly, be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Concurrent Resolution 8, memorializing Congress of the United States to amend the transportation act of 1920 sufficiently to restore to the State of Minnesota general jurisdiction over its intrastate railroad rates

Whereas there has prevailed in the State of Minnesota, since 1913, a policy of railroad rate making pursuant to legislative enactments, known as the distance scale of railroad freight rates; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota has deemed it of the best interest to all of its citizens and communities to prohibit discriminations and preferences by requiring railroads to publish rates on the basis of a like charge for a like distance for a like class of traffic; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, acting upon applications filed pursuant to the Federal transportation act of 1920, has issued orders in the so-called Watertown and Fargo cases authorizing the rail carriers to publish and charge rates for the carrying of freight between points within the State of Minnesota on the basis of different charges for equal distances on class traffic; and

Whereas such orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission have created unjust discriminations against and undue preference of persons and localities within the State of Minnesota to the detriment and disadvantage of such persons and localities; and

Whereas it has been held by the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota that the railroad and warehouse commission of this State is without authority to order the removal of such discriminations existing between persons and localities within the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas the railroad and warehouse commission is under injunction of the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, prohibiting said commission from interfering with the different scales of rates on class traffic published and charged by the railroads under authority of said orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas by reason of said orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, there has been created and now exists within the State of Minnesota three different scales of rates for movement of class traffic between points within the State of Minnesota over like distances; and

Whereas the scale of rates on class traffic maintained by the railroads for movement of freight between points within the State of Min-

nesota prior to the issuance of said orders by the Interstate Commerce Commission were rates which were found by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Minnesota rate cases to be not confiscatory, as increased and decreased by the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission pursuant to recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission in proceedings affecting the general level of rates throughout the western district, and also the order of the Director General of Railroads, No. 28; and

Whereas such scale of rates published by the railroads for the movement of class traffic, within the State of Minnesota as authorized by the railroad and warehouse commission, was never the subject of an application for increase by the railroads to either the railroad and warehouse commission of the State of Minnesota or the intrastate commerce commission prior to said orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America be and hereby is earnestly requested to immediately amend the transportation act of 1920 so as to restore to the State of Minnesota general jurisdiction over its intrastate railroad rates so as to prevent the creation by orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission of intrastate discriminations and preferences in cases affecting the level of intrastate rates.

JOHN A. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. I. NOLAN,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 25th day of February, 1927.

JOHN I. LEVIN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 1st day of March, 1927.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved: March 1, 1927.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON,
Governor.

Filed: March 1, 1927.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of the State of Minnesota, and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office March 1, 1927.

[SEAL.] MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Concurrent Resolution 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of a Federal law regulating the shipment of machine guns, revolvers, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons, and the ammunition adapted thereto, in interstate and foreign commerce

Whereas stricter supervision in the matter of the sale, shipment, and importation of revolvers, machine guns, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons will materially aid in the suppression of crime; and

Whereas the Federal Government, by reason of its exclusive control in interstate commerce, may regulate the shipment and importation of revolvers, machine guns, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey—

1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized for the passage of a Federal statute prohibiting the shipment of revolvers, machine guns, automatic rifles, and other deadly weapons in interstate and foreign commerce.

2. *Resolved*, That copies of this memorial, signed by the speaker of the house of assembly and attested by the clerk thereof, be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States; and, further, that copies so signed and attested be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ANTHONY J. SIRACUSA,
Speaker of the House of Assembly.

Attest:

FREDERICK A. BRODESSER,
Clerk of the House of Assembly.

Passed senate March 7.
Passed house January 31.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Assembly Joint Resolution 5 memorializing Congress to establish a Government hospital in the State of Nevada

Whereas the State of Nevada has always been among the foremost in furnishing men, money, and otherwise supporting the Federal Government in the defense and preservation of the Union; and

Whereas many ex-service men and women reside within the State of Nevada and vicinity; and

Whereas Nevada, due to its favorable climatic condition for the treatment of various diseases, should be considered: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to establish a Government hospital within the State of Nevada for the treatment of disabled ex-service men and women; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House, to each of our Senators, and to our Representative in Washington.

D. H. TANDY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN W. WRIGHT,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
MORLEY GRISWOLD,
President of the Senate.
V. R. MERIALDO,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved February 25, 1927.

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Greathouse, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original assembly joint resolution now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office in Carson City, Nev., this 28th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following house resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Patents:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of House Resolution 68, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 17th day of June, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

House Resolution 68

Whereas under the present copyright act a person who has copyrighted a musical composition has not only the exclusive right to print, reprint, publish, copy, and vend that composition, but the additional exclusive right to use that composition publicly for profit; and

Whereas the copyright act provides that the copyright proprietor may recover a sum in certain cases of as much as $100 from the offender for the infringement of this exclusive right to use the composition publicly for profit; and

Whereas protected by this act certain copyright proprietors, in addition to the purchase price, charge unreasonable and exhorbitant prices for permission to use the composition publicly for profit; and

Whereas the various copyright proprietors have formed an organization known as the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers for the enforcement of the said provisions of the copyright act and for the protection of their interests thereunder; and

Whereas the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers maintains a supergovernmental enforcement agency with investigators always ready to descend upon any offender and bring him to task; and

Whereas this additional fee for permission to use the composition publicly for profit, and the penalties for infringement of the same, are paid to the copyright proprietor, who ordinarily is not the author or composer of the composition; and

Whereas these provisions of the copyright act are inimicable to the best interests of a majority of the people and make it impossible to present this music to them at reasonable prices: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United

States be memoralized to amend the copyright act of 1909 to provide that a person who has copyrighted a dramatico-musical or a choral or orchestral composition or other musical composition, which composition is offered for sale to the public, shall not have the exclusive right to perform the copyrighted work publicly for profit nor be entitled to receive any fee or price in addition to the purchase price for permission to use the composition in a public performance for profit, nor be entitled to any penalty if the composition is so used without the permission of the copyright proprietor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be delivered to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States, and also to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Illinois.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the house of represenatives on the 2d day of June, 1927.

B. H. McCANN,
Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Assembly Joint Resolution 3

Adopted in assembly March 18, 1927.

ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Adopted in Senate April 4, 1927.

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution was received by the governor this 12th day of April, A. D. 1927, at 4 o'clock p. m.

HOMER R. SPENCE,
Private Secretary of the Governor.

Assembly Joint Resolution 3, relative to the congressional reapportionment of the United States

Whereas the provisions of the Federal Constitution providing for a reapportionment of the Representatives in Congress from the several States every 10 years, based upon the Federal census, has not been acted upon since 1910; and

Whereas the present representation in the House of Representatives is based upon the census of 1910, an injustice is imposed upon many States where population has materially increased; and

Whereas the population of the State of California, according to the census of 1920, was 3,426,536, an increase over the population of 1910 of 1,048,987, showing conclusively that the State of California is entitled to more representation in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is pointed out that a policy of depriving the State of its proper representation is exceedingly detrimental to the republican form of government; and

Whereas it is deplored that there are differences of opinion and selfishness manifested on the part of those sections which either lose or do not gain in representation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California earnestly petition Congress to enact legislation which will give to the several States of the United States their just representation in Congress based upon the last Federal census; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution under the great seal of the State of California to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Seventieth Congress of the United States and to the governors of each of the several States.

EDGAR C. LEVEY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
BURON FITTS,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
[SEAL.] By FRANK H. CORY, *Deputy.*

(Indorsed:) Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of California, April 12, 1927.

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
By FRANK H. CORY, *Deputy.*

I, Frank C. Jordan, secretary of state of the State of California, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the transcript to which this certificate is attached with the record on file in my office, of which it purports to be a copy, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy thereof. I further certify that this authentication is in due form and by the proper officer.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the great seal of the State of California to be affixed hereto this 18th day of April, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
By FRANK H. CORY, *Deputy.*

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Special Committee on Investigation of Campaign Expenditures:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of House Joint Resolution 45, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 23d day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution 45

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas the seventeenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States makes mandatory that "the Senate of the United Sates shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years," and by reason of this constitutional provision the State of Illinois is entitled to, and guaranteed two Senators in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas on or about the 7th day of December, A. D. 1926, the Hon. William B. McKinley, one of the United States Senators representing the State of Illinois in the United States Senate, departed this life and thereupon by reason of this vacancy the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH was, in accordance with the Constitution and statutes, appointed to fill the unexpired term of said William B. McKinley as United States Senator from Illinois, and the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH presented the credentials in proper form under the great seal of the State of Illinois, to the United States Senate, and the United States Senate, without questioning the legal form and force of said credentials, nor questioning the constitutional qualifications of the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH, nor the guaranteed right under the Constitution of the United States for full representation to membership in the United States Senate by the State of Illinois, refused to administer the oath of office to the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH and by that act denied to the State of Illinois equal representation in the said Senate of the United States; and

Whereas for a period of nearly 140 years since the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and the amendment recited above the rights of a sovereign State to equal representation in the Senate of the United States wherein the credentials and constitutional qualifications were unquestioned, has never before been denied by the Senate of the United States refusing to administer the constitutional oath of office; and

Whereas this same question on an objection to the right of a Senator elect to take the prescribed constitutional oath of office was once before raised against the State of Illinois, but upon the able representation of the constitutional rights of the State of Illinois by Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, senior Senator from Illinois, in the matter of the credentials of Gen. James Shields, a Senator elect from Illinois, the United States Senate finally declared that the guaranteed constitutional rights of a sovereign State should not be abridged by a denial of the right of a Senator elect to take the oath, and by this action established a historic precedent; and

Whereas one of the early proposed amendments to the Constitution making it possible for United States Senators to be elected by a direct vote of the people was advocated by Senator John M. Palmer, of Illinois, and subsequently became a part of the fundamental law of the land; and

Whereas the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH has been by majority of the people of the State of Illinois, after a full presentation, discussion, and consideration of all issues involved, elected as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois and no contest has issued against said election, and credentials have been accepted by the United States Senate as being in due form, and the qualifications of the said United States Senator elect are in full compliance with all constitutional and statute requirements; and

Whereas the only test provided in the Constitution of the United States as to the qualifications of a Member of the Senate of the United States is as follows:

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been nine years a citizen of the United States and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen"; and

Whereas amendment 17 of the Constitution of the United States provides that—

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures"; and

Whereas Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides—

"* * * That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate"; and

Whereas Article I, section 5, of the United States Constitution provides that—

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business.

"Each House may determine the rules of its procedure, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expell a Member"; and

Whereas reference to the above article and section of the Constitution provides: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," etc.; and

Whereas the uniform construction of this provision has been accepted that "qualifications of its own Members" can not be construed otherwise, that in order to be a "Member" it is obvious that the taking of the required oath constitutes membership, and that previous to the taking of the required oath the Senate has no jurisdiction on another than a "Member," and the Senate shall subsequent to the taking of the oath be the judge of the qualification of the Member; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States further provides by amendment 10 that—

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people"; and

Whereas the foregoing are all of the relevant provisions in the Constitution with respect to the power of the Senate over the selection of Senators; and

Whereas the credentials of the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH hereinbefore recited, constitute a mandate of the choice of a majority of the people of the State of Illinois, at a general election and which selection and choice by a majority of the people of the State of Illinois is uncontested, and that said election is for a period of six years, and that the continued refusal of the Senate of the United States to administer the oath of office to the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH as United States Senator from Illinois will result in depriving the State of Illinois of the full representation in the Senate of the United States for a period of six years; to which it is by the Constitution of the United States entitled and guaranteed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the people of the State of Illinois, represented by the general assembly, That in view of the foregoing it be respectfully presented to the Senate of the United States of the Seventieth Congress that the people of the State of Illinois are clearly within their rights in the expectation that the credentials of the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH now on file in the Senate of the United States entitle the said Hon. FRANK L. SMITH to take the oath of office to which he has been elected as a United States Senator from the State of Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be directed to the Vice President of the United States, the constitutional presiding officer of the United States Senate, and a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Hon. CHARLES S. DENEEN, senior United States Senator from Illinois, with the request and direction that these resolutions be presented to the Senate of the United States, to the end that the sovereign State of Illinois shall not be deprived of the rights of full representation in the Senate of the United States, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a delegation on the constitutional rights of the State of Illinois be, and the same is hereby, created, the said delegation to consist of the speaker of the house of representatives, the president of the senate, and two members of the house of representatives to be appointed by the speaker thereof, and two members of the senate, to be appointed by the president of the senate on the nomination of the executive committee; and it shall be the duty of said delegation on the constitutional rights of the State of Illinois to appear before the Senate of the United States, or any of its committees or subcommittees, upon the convening of said Senate and at any time thereafter, and to present to said Senate and its committees a consideration of the constitutional rights of this State; and on behalf of the people of this State respectfully to insist upon a recognition by the Senate of the United States of the constitutional right of this State to be represented in the Senate of the United States by two Senators, and that said consitutional right be recognized by the administration of the oath to the Hon. FRANK L. SMITH as United States Senator from this State.

Adopted by the house June 16, 1927.

ROBERT SCHOLEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate June 21, 1927.

FRED E. STERLING,
President of the Senate.
JAMES H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, proposing the rejection by the Legislature of the State of Florida of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States provided for by House Joint Resolution 184 of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States, conferring upon Congress power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age

Whereas the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States has adopted House Joint Resolution 184, by the constitutional vote of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, whereby an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is proposed to the several States for ratification or rejection, said proposed amendment reading as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article, except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to the legislation enacted by the Congress"; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida, while being in full sympathy and accord with the humanitarian spirit which led to the submission of said proposed amendment of the Congress of the United States, is opposed to further extension of the powers of the Federal Government to invade and take away the inherent powers reserved by the several States: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States contained in House Joint Resolution 184 of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment reads as follows, to wit,

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article, except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress,"

be, and the same is hereby, rejected by the Legislature of the State of Florida in regular session assembled; and that the action of this legislature thereon be forthwith certified to the Secretary of State of the United States by the secretary of state of Florida under the great seal of the State, and that certified copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state of the State of Florida to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

(Filed in office secretary of state May 14, 1925.)

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 as passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida, regular session 1925, as shown by the enrolled resolution on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 4th day of May, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Torrington, Wyo., praying for the abolition of the tax imposed on tickets to Chautauqua entertainments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Business and Professional Women's Club of Casper, Wyo., favoring an increase in the personal exemption of single persons in computing their income taxes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DENEEN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Murphysboro, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of legis-

lation providing for compulsory Sunday observance, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of women of Harper County, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Capper-Ketcham bill, providing for the further development of agricultural extension work and home economics, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Cherokee Lodge, No. 370, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Parsons, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the installation by railroads of a device to make for further safety in the use of running boards on freight and tank cars, steps on caboose and passenger cars, safe brakes and foot boards on locomotives, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. EDGE presented petitions numerously signed of the Monmouth County Bankers' Association and sundry other citizens, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the repeal of the Federal estate (inheritance) tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSPIRACIES TO DEFRAUD THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be read at length.

The bill (S. 1397) amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. 220), was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. p. 220), be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 1044. No person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense, not capital, except as provided in section 1046, unless the indictment is found, or the information is instituted, within three years next after such offense shall have been committed: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall apply to any offense for which an indictment has been heretofore found or an information instituted, or to any proceedings under any such indictment or information."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have asked that the bill be read because, being a matter of very decided urgency, I am going to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

It will be recalled that prior to the year 1921 the statute of limitations as to all offenses against the United States not capital in character was three years. At that time the Attorney General represented that he was desirous of having further time to investigate alleged war frauds, that the facts were intricate and involved, and that possibly the statute of limitations might run before it would be possible to obtain indictments. He asked that the period of the statute of limitations applicable to conspiracies to defraud the Government of the United States should be extended from three years to six years. The Congress promptly responded and extended to six years the period of the statute as to that particular class of offenses.

It is not purposed by the department, as announced some time ago, to attempt any further prosecutions of offenses of that character; that is to say, offenses giving rise to the statute. Moreover, the whole period of six years has now run against all offenses of that character and there is no longer any occasion for a six-year statute. But it may be remembered that it was availed of in a recent trial in the District of Columbia to protect a witness from testifying, he claiming his constitutional privilege. It is hoped that the legislation may be enacted by the Congress before the trial of that case is resumed.

I have taken the matter up with the Department of Justice and have a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, who approves the measure. I ask that the letter may be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the letter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, December 12, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Following our conference of to-day relative to the proposed bill amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes, I took up with the Attorney General the matter of his approval.

He desires me to say that, in view of the fact that such an amendment would not affect any case now pending, he therefore approves the form of the bill proposed.

For your information I refer you to a letter that I wrote December 3 to Senator Pomerene, in which I inclosed an amendment to the six-year limitation law which would simply change the word "six" to "four."

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. DONOVAN,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The whole effect of the proposed law is to restore the statute of limitations as it was prior to 1921, making the statute as to all offenses, except those capital in character, three years. The bill provides that the proposed statute shall not apply to any proceedings now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I would like to know a little more about it. Is it the purpose of the bill to extend the limitation to enable some particular person to be punished for a crime?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; it is just the other way. It is to reduce the statute of limitations from six years to three years.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think it has been the uniform rule of the Senate not to pass bills without having been first referred to a committee. I take it that the Judiciary Committee could act on this bill by to-morrow. I do not like to object to the bill which the Senator from Montana calls up in this way, but I really think it ought to go to a committee and let the committee consider it. I think that on the statement of the Senator the committee might be polled, at any rate, on it, so there will be no trouble about the matter, and the bill might be reported even this afternoon. After a report from the committee, I shall have no objection at all to the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the bill may be referred to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the bill, with the accompanying letter, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TIME WHEN PARDONS EFFECTIVE

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I now introduce another bill, which I simply ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 1398) relating to pardons, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a pardon shall be effective to all intents and purposes from the time of its delivery or presentation, by or under the authority of the President, to the individual named therein as the object of executive clemency whether the same shall have been accepted by such person or not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I move that the bill be referred with the accompanying paper, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1399) to establish the office of insular affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

A bill (S. 1400) granting an increase of pension to Jane Richards (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1401) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Higby (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1402) granting an increase of pension to Ruth J. Wilson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 1403) granting an increase of pension to Josephine W. Dade; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1404) to regulate the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases, and to improve the administration of justice in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1405) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a dairy experiment station at or near Mayfield, Ky.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1406) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River;

A bill (S. 1407) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River;

A bill (S. 1408) granting the consent of Congress to Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River;

A bill (S. 1409) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River; and

A bill (S. 1410) granting the consent of Congress to Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1411) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa E. McCormick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYFIELD:

A bill (S. 1412) for the relief of Maurice S. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1413) to prohibit predictions with respect to cotton prices in any report, bulletin, or other publication issued by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1414) for the prevention and removal of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in cottonseed oil by regulating transactions on future exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1415) to amend the Judicial Code, as amended, in respect of venue for conspiracy cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1416) to amend the transportation act approved February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 456), amending the act to regulate commerce, as amended June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 596), and to repeal paragraphs 3 and 4 of section 13 of said act as amended February 28, 1920, and to repeal section 15a of said act, and to amend paragraph 1 of section 15 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended February 28, 1920, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1417) to amend paragraphs (18), (19), and (20) of section 1 of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1418) to protect trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1419) to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1420) amending the act approved May 4, 1926, providing for the construction and maintenance of bathing pools or beaches in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1421) providing for acquisition by the United States of America, by purchase or condemnation, of land within the District of Columbia for erection of buildings or for parks, parkways, playgrounds, or other public use, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1422) authorizing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to acquire future estates and rights in land, and to lease land or existing buildings for limited periods in certain instances; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 1423) granting an increase of pension to John Rose; and

A bill (S. 1424) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Glenn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

A bill (S. 1425) to remove a cloud on title; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 1426) for the taking of testimony in actions at common law and in equity in the United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1427) for the relief of W. L. Sellers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1428) for the relief of R. Bluestein; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1429) granting a pension to Augusta Cornog; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1430) to prohibit predictions with respect to cotton prices in any governmental report, bulletin, or other publication; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1431) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Bolton; and

A bill (S. 1432) granting a pension to Thomas A. McEntire, alias Thomas Ingalls; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1433) for the relief of J. C. Peixotto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1434) for the relief of Mattie Holcomb; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1435) authorizing the transfer of sewer to the city of Atlanta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1436) to make certain foreign-language newspapers nonmailable; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1437) to subject certain immigrants, born in countries of the Western Hemisphere, to the quota under the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Co.;

A bill (S. 1439) for the relief of Henry J. Wright;

A bill (S. 1440) for the relief of H. F. Frick and others;

A bill (S. 1441) for the relief of Samuel W. Tyson;

A bill (S. 1442) for the relief of Brewster Agee;

A bill (S. 1443) for the relief of Seth J. Harris;

A bill (S. 1444) for the relief of Horton B. Herrin; and

A bill (S. 1445) for the relief of S. C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 1446) to create a commission to collect and publish the records of American women in war; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1447) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare a medal with appropriate emblems and inscriptions commemorative of the services, sacrifices, and patriotism of the American women of all wars in which the United States has participated; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Omer D. Lewis;

A bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Manuel A. Martinez;

A bill (S. 1450) for the relief of Nicholas Gallegos;

A bill (S. 1451) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Joseph K. Humphrey;

A bill (S. 1452) for the relief of Eugenia Ascarate Griggs;

A bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Sigmund Lindauer; and

A bill (S. 1454) for the relief of J. B. McGhee; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1455) to grant extensions of time under coal permits; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1456) to authorize an appropriation for a road on the Zuni Indian Reservation, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1457) granting a pension to Joseph J. Ivie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1458) providing for a survey of the natural oyster beds in the waters within the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1459) providing for a reduction in the rate of postage on grove and farm products; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1460) granting a pension to Charles W. Carlisle (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 1461) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Jonesboro, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DILL. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. JONES of Washington] and myself, I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. DILL and Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1462) for the adoption of the Columbia Basin reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 1463) granting a pension to Katharine H. Califf;

A bill (S. 1464) granting a pension to Annie Wilcox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1465) granting a pension to Nola B. Hinton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1466) granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Akin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Amanda F. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1468) granting an increase of pension to Sarah T. Wright (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1469) granting an increase of pension to Esther J. Ramey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1470) granting an increase of pension to Lorina Hammons (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1471) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda C. Muncey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1472) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fist (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1473) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Wells (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1474) to establish the Federal emergency relief fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1475) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of land at Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to acquire necessary additional land at said reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1476) for the relief of Porter Bros. & Biffle, and certain other citizens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1477) readjusting the cost of furnishing water to lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1478) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a road on the Lummi Indian Reservation, Washington;

A bill (S. 1479) to add certain lands to the Colville National Forest, Washington; and

A bill (S. 1480) authorizing certain Indian Tribes and bands, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington, to present their claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 1481) to amend sections 11 and 12 of an act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes, approved May 26, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 1482) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1483) for the relief of the heirs of John Booren, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1484) granting a pension to William J. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 1485) for the relief of T. G. Roberts; and

A bill (S. 1486) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Addison E. Bullard;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 1487) granting a pension to Alice Baker; and

A bill (S. 1488) granting a pension to Ada Rollins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE:

A bill (S. 1489) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Sears; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD:

A bill (S. 1490) for the relief of the heirs of Nathaniel Pendexter, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 1491) for the relief of Harry C. Hall; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 1492) granting a pension to Thomas S. Hanoum; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1493) for the relief of William D. Prideaux;

A bill (S. 1494) for the relief of Edward J. Murphy;

A bill (S. 1495) for the relief of Medical Inspector Royall Roller Richardson, United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 1496) for the relief of Joseph M. Berman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1497) to correct the military record of James William Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 1498) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay, and to fix the location of said bridge; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 1499) for the relief of Harry C. Saxton; and

A bill (S. 1500) for the relief of James J. Welsh, Edward C. F. Webb, Francis A. Meyer, Mary S. Bennett, William McMullin, jr., Margaret McMullin, R. B. Carpenter, McCoy Yearsley, Edward Yearsley, George H. Bennett, jr., Stewart L. Beck, William P. McConnell, Elizabeth J. Morrow, William B. Jester, Josephine A. Haggan, James H. S. Gam, Herbert Nicoll, Shallcross Bros., E. C. Buckson, Wilbert Rawley, R. Rickards, Jr., Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 1501) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or Valley County, in the State of Montana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Glasgow, Mont.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1502) to provide for the leasing of allotted lands of Indians held in trust by the United States;

A bill (S. 1503) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Flathead Tribe or Nation of Indians of Montana may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1504) regulating Indian allotments disposed of by will;

A bill (S. 1505) providing that funds appropriated for the care and relief of Indians of Montana under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of Montana; and

A bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Thomas Hancock, Fort Peck Indian allottee of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1507) for the relief of William Boyer; to the Committee on Claims;

A bill (S. 1508) granting a pension to Lida E. Freer; and

A bill (S. 1509) granting a pension to Ross A. Hetrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1510) to amend the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1511) for the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Montana; and

A bill (S. 1512) to provide for contests of certain oil and gas permits; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 1513) granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection who were discharged in the Philippines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1514) for the relief of Mary R. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1515) granting a pension to Ella Eshleman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1516) granting a pension to Seth Seaton Ward;

A bill (S. 1517) granting a pension to Frank Trout (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1518) granting a pension to Margaret Fondersmith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1519) granting a pension to Fred Erton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1520) granting an increase of pension to Nannie M. Hixson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1521) granting a pension to Mary E. Eubank (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1522) granting a pension to Margaret Shirkley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1523) granting a pension to Laura D. Wilson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1524) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Moorehouse (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1525) granting an increase of pension to Diantha E. Nihart (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 1526) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended, to eliminate the requirement of certificates of public convenience and necessity in respect of construction of new lines of railroad and extension of existing lines; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 1527) for the relief of Robert W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 1528) granting a pension to Joseph Baker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 1529) providing that funds appropriated for the care and relief of Indians of North Dakota under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:
A bill (S. 1530) for the relief of Gilpin Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1531) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Weather Bureau station known as Mount Weather, in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
By Mr. WALSH of Montana:
A bill (S. 1532) for the relief of James A. Hoey, alias Francis Fairfield;
A bill (S. 1533) to correct the military record of William McCormick;
A bill (S. 1534) for the relief of William O. Mallahan (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1535) for the relief of Edward T. Moran;
A bill (S. 1536) for the relief of James W. Nugent (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1537) for the relief of Charles Callender; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1538) granting a pension to William Lentz (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1539) granting an increase of pension to Elma W. Brett (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to Jirah I. Allen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1541) for the relief of George A. Robertson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1542) for the relief of Josephene M. Scott;
A bill (S. 1543) for the relief of Kate Canniff (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 1544) for the relief of William F. Brockschmidt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. DENEEN:
A bill (S. 1545) for the relief of Darlington & Co.;
A bill (S. 1546) for the relief of Maximilian J. St. George;
A bill (S. 1547) for the relief of Johns-Manville Corporation;
A bill (S. 1548) for the relief of John Brown;
A bill (S. 1549) for the relief of Mildred Lane;
A bill (S. 1550) for the relief of Ben D. Showalter;
A bill (S. 1551) for the relief of G. T. Hanson;
A bill (S. 1552) for the relief of Thomas J. Roff; and
A bill (S. 1553) for the relief of Mary Altieri; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1554) to correct the military record of Eli J. Bennett;
A bill (S. 1555) to correct the military record of Arch Boyles;
A bill (S. 1556) making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the Regular Army, A. Richard Hedstrom, chaplain, an officer of the United States Army during the World War, who incurred physical disability in line of duty; and
A bill (S. 1557) to authorize the presentation to Julian L. Douglas of a distinguished-service cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1558) granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Rock River; to the Committee on Commerce.
A bill (S. 1559) granting an increase of pension to Rose E. Grimes;
A bill (S. 1560) granting an increase of pension to George Slifer;
A bill (S. 1561) granting a pension to Ella M. Beckett;
A bill (S. 1562) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Vordermark;
A bill (S. 1563) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Sisson;
A bill (S. 1564) granting a pension to Mary F. Hall;
A bill (S. 1565) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Billig;
A bill (S. 1566) granting a pension to Annie Bell Bass;
A bill (S. 1567) granting a pension to James W. Clark;
A bill (S. 1568) granting an increase of pension to Ida F. Hixson;
A bill (S. 1569) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Johnson;
A bill (S. 1570) granting an increase of pension to Anton Muller;
A bill (S. 1571) granting a pension to Robert Zink; and
A bill (S. 1572) granting an increase of pension to Etta Mack; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. NORBECK:
A bill (S. 1573) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
By Mr. NYE:
A bill (S. 1574) to amend section 4 of the Federal reserve act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
A bill (S. 1575) to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of North Dakota," approved June 25, 1921; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 1576) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain forfeited vessels and vehicles to other executive departments; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. BORAH:
A bill (S. 1577) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, Idaho; and
A bill (S. 1578) to add certain lands to the Idaho National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.
By Mr. BROOKHART:
A bill (S. 1579) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. Wait (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1580) granting a pension to Stella Gray (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1581) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Gray (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1582) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Reed (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1583) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ellis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. MAYFIELD:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) to declare the 11th day of November, celebrated and known as Armistice Day, a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
By Mr. WHEELER:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to appropriate certain tribal funds of the Flathead and other Indian tribes in Montana to bring test suits in the United States District Court of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. STEPHENS:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) consenting that certain States may sue the United States, and providing for trial on the merits in any suit brought hereunder by a State to recover direct taxes alleged to have been illegally collected by the United States during the years 1866, 1867, and 1868, and vesting the right in each State to sue in its own name; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. GEORGE:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) to correct an error in the Senate and House records of the Sixty-third Congress in the matter of the bills H. R. 7140 and S. 2810 entitled "A bill for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Nicholls," and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $33,450 to Elizabeth R. Nicholls and Joanna L. Nicholls, sole heirs of Joshua Nicholls, deceased, appropriated for them under said bills; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. PHIPPS:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to provide for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Second Pan American Congress on Highways at Rio de Janeiro; and
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to provide that the United States extend to the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses an invitation to hold the sixth session of the association in the United States and for the expenses thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENTS TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $126,000, for construction and installation of officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans., including utilities and appurtenances thereto, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5800, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BINGHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5800, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed, as follows:

On page 80, line 2, change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any permanent construction on Governors Island so located as to interfere with the ultimate use of a part of Governors Island as a municipal airport or landing field."

Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $463,732.49, to pay to the Indians of the Shawnee Tribe and 13 Delaware Indians affiliated with that tribe, their heirs

or legal representatives, in accordance with the official findings, arbitration award, and report of the Secretary of the Interior to Congress made in pursuance of the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Shawnee Indians proclaimed October 14, 1868 (15 Stat. L. 513), etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5800, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia. That resolution was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has twice favorably acted upon a similar joint resolution. At the last session a question was raised as to the committee to which such a joint resolution should go, and we agreed that it should go to the Committee on the District of Columbia first, and then, when that committee had acted and submitted its report to the Senate, that the joint resolution as then reported should go to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, which is probably technically the committee to which the joint resolution should go. I think it would be proper to send the joint resolution to the Judiciary Committee, which technically, I think, has jurisdiction over matters of this kind. So I ask that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution and that it may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator expect after the Judiciary Committee shall have reported that the joint resolution shall then go back to the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I would expect it then to go to the calendar, because technically I think the Judiciary Committee is the committee which has jurisdiction over matters of this kind.

Mr. KING. I think so. I do not believe that such a measure belongs to the District of Columbia Committee at all. I have no objection to the request of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the District of Columbia will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 and the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. MAYFIELD. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it lie on the table subject to call.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose and intent of the Congress by enacting section 5 of the transportation act of 1920 to bring about adequate and efficient transportation service through the grouping of railroads into a limited number of strong systems which would include as members the short and weak railroads; and

Whereas large independent railroads have been and are being brought into unified systems under common ownership and/or control, either under lease or by the purchase of stock, without taking into consideration short and weak railroads that might be included in such systems: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in order that an adequate and efficient transportation service may be maintained in the United States and the weak and short-line railroads preserved, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that there should be no acquisition of control by stock ownership, merger, consolidation, or grouping by or of railroads into a unified system for ownership, control, and/or operation unless the application for such ownership and/or control and/or operation shall make reasonable provision in the plan for the possible incorporation of every short and weak line that may be in operation in the territory covered or to be covered by the proposed grouping or unification or unless by affirmative testimony it is shown to be impossible to include such line upon reasonable terms, or unless the abandonment or operation of such line or its omission from the proposed plan is approved by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

FLUCTUATIONS IN PRICE OF MAY WHEAT, 1927

Mr. MAYFIELD. I offer another resolution and ask that it lie on the table subject to call.

The resolution (S. Res. 40) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to investigate, first, the effect upon the producers of grain of the suspension by the Secretary of Agriculture of the requirement for the making of reports by members of grain-futures exchanges, and, second, the situation in respect of the 1927 May wheat future which existed on the grain-futures exchanges during the life of such future for the purpose of determining the cause of the wide fluctuations in the price of wheat during the early months of 1927, and especially after February 26, 1927, the date of the suspension of such requirement; and to make a full and complete report of such investigation, including (1) a statement of the reasons for, and a showing of the effect upon the producers of grain of, the suspension of such requirement; (2) a statement of the quantity of wheat purchased and the quantity of wheat sold on 1927 May future contracts, and the quantity of wheat actually delivered and the quantity of wheat actually received on such contracts; and (3) the names of the parties doing heavy trading in such future.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. WATSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventieth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PAGE

Mr. CURTIS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 42), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized and directed to employ an additional page from the 5th day of December, 1927, to the 30th day of June, 1928, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $3.30 per day.

LOUISE K. PICKETT

Mr. DENEEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 43), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Louise K. Pickett, widow of Charles J. Pickett, late an assistant in the office of Senator DENEEN, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RECOGNITION OF SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA

Mr. BORAH submitted a resolution (S. Res. 44), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States favors the recognition of the present Soviet Government of Russia.

CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. BORAH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas war is the greatest existing menace to society, and has become so expensive and destructive that it not only causes the stupendous burdens of taxation now afflicting our people but threatens to engulf and destroy civilization; and

Whereas civilization has been marked in its upward trend out of barbarism into its present condition by the development of law and courts to supplant methods of violence and force; and

Whereas the genius of civilization has discovered but two methods of compelling the settlement of human disputes, namely, law and war, and therefore, in any plan for the compulsory settlement of international controversies, we must choose between war on the one hand and the process of law on the other; and

Whereas war between nations has always been and still is a lawful institution, so that any nation may, with or without cause, declare war against any other nation and be strictly within its legal rights; and

Whereas revolutionary war or wars of liberation are illegal and criminal, to wit, high treason, whereas, under existing international law, wars between nations to settle disputes are perfectly lawful; and

Whereas the overwhelming moral sentiment of civilized people everywhere is against the cruel and destructive institution of war; and

Whereas all alliances, leagues, or plans which rely upon war as the ultimate power for the enforcement of peace carry the seeds either of their own destruction or of military dominancy, to the utter subversion of liberty and justice; and

Whereas we must recognize the fact that resolutions or treaties outlawing certain methods of killing will not be effective so long as war

itself remains lawful; and that in international relations we must have not rules and regulations of war but organic laws against war; and

Whereas in our Constitutional Convention of 1787 it was successfully contended by Madison, Hamilton, and Ellsworth that the use of force when applied to people collectively—that is, to states or nations—was unsound in principle and would be tantamount to a declaration of war; and

Whereas we have in our Federal Supreme Court a practical and effective model for a real international court, as it has specific jurisdiction to hear and decide controversies between our sovereign States; and

Whereas our Supreme Court has exercised this jurisdiction without resort to force for 137 years, during which time scores of controversies have been judicially and peaceably settled that might otherwise have led to war between the States, and thus furnishes a practical exemplar for the compulsory and pacific settlement of international controversies; and

Whereas an international arrangement of such judicial character would not shackle the independence or impair the sovereignty of any nation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the view of the Senate of the United States that war between nations should be outlawed as an institution or means for the settlement of international controversies by making it a public crime under the law of nations and that every nation should be encouraged by solemn agreement or treaty to bind itself to indict and punish its own international war breeders or instigators and war profiteers under powers similar to those conferred upon our Congress under Article I, section 8, of our Federal Constitution, which clothes the Congress with the power "to define and punish offenses against the law of nations"; and be it

Resolved further, That a code of international law of peace based upon the outlawing of war and on the principle of equality and justice between all nations, amplified and expanded and adapted and brought down to date, should be created and adopted.

Second, that, with war outlawed, a judicial substitute for war should be created (or, if existing in part, adapted and adjusted) in the form or nature of an international court, modeled on our Federal Supreme Court in its jurisdiction over controversies between our sovereign States; such court shall possess affirmative jurisdiction to hear and decide all purely international controversies, as defined by the code, or arising under treaties, and its judgments shall not be enforced by war under any name or in any form whatever, but shall have the same power for their enforcement as our Federal Supreme Court, namely, the respect of all enlightened nations for judgments resting upon open and fair investigations and impartial decisions, the agreement of the nations to abide and be bound by such judgments and the compelling power of enlightened public opinion.

INVESTIGATION OF ESPIONAGE IN INDUSTRY

Mr. WHEELER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas various court proceedings and published investigations have tended to show that a large number of private detective agencies are obtaining large sums of money from business concerns and organizations by falsely representing movements among their employees by joining labor organizations and advocating revolutionary methods for the purpose of discrediting said labor organizations and by manufacturing scares concerning radical propaganda and alleged plans for the use of violence in industrial conflict; and

Whereas these agencies, and other interests connected with them, are detrimental to peaceful relationship between employers and employees, setting up a system of espionage in industry, thriving on the unrest and fear they create, and spreading false rumors and scares, and often bringing about strikes in order to maintain their alleged services: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor be, and hereby is, empowered to conduct an inquiry into the extent of this system of industrial espionage in all its ramifications and to report to the Senate what legislation, in the committee's judgment, is desirable to correct such practices as they may find inimical to the public welfare.

CONCESSIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. WHEELER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 47), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas American investments abroad, already amounting to many billions of dollars, are increasing rapidly, especially since the World War, and are alleged in a number of instances to be conditioned upon unjustifiable concessions from foreign governments which lack capital but desire to develop their resources; and

Whereas such concessions if unjust in their terms endanger legitimate investments abroad; and

Whereas controversies regarding the rights and duties of holders of such concessions constitute an increasingly important part of the foreign relations of this Government and produce tension which has frequently led to armed intervention and may lead to war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to investigate the terms and conditions under which concessions have been procured in foreign countries by United States citizens and by corporations and other associations in which United States citizens are financially interested, and the nature and extent of such concessions, with particular reference to (1) the source and sanction of such concessions, (2) the record precedents, and traditions of the Government of the United States in its foreign relations since its establishment, in so far as the rights and duties incident to such concessions constitute the subject matter of international official correspondence, and (3) the principal aspects of public policy involved in the treatment, as property rights for purposes of diplomatic protection, of such concessions.

For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of such committee or subcommittee shall not exceed $30,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee. Such committee or subcommittee shall make a final report to the Senate as to its findings at the beginning of the second regular session of the Seventieth Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HALE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 48), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania submitted a resolution (S. Res. 49), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COURT-MARTIAL OF COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that Senate Resolution 28, requesting a transcript of the court-martial proceedings in the trial of Col. William Mitchell, Air Service, United States Army, which was submitted by me on the 9th instant and now lies on the table, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

NEW MEXICO'S MEMORIAL STONE IN WASHINGTON MONUMENT

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, on December 2 the memorial stone presented by the State of New Mexico and placed in the Washington Monument was dedicated. At that time certain exercises were had, including an address by the President of the United States, giving a great deal of interesting data concerning the State of New Mexico. I ask leave to have those proceedings printed as a Senate document with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ARGUMENT BY HON. MILTON EVERETT

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an argument by Hon. Milton Everett, of San Antonio, Tex., in which he explains the "auction plan" for the sale and marketing of food products.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Southwestern Resources, November, 1927]

THE "AUCTION PLAN" FOR SALE OF FOOD PRODUCTS

A great deal is said in Congress and legislatures about "marketing plans," to enable producers of food products to realize the value of their products and to enable consumers to obtain same at a fair price. At present "the spread" between the price the producer receives and what the consumer pays is enormous and outrageous. The low prices received by producers on the one hand has the effect of limiting production, and the high prices paid by consumers on the other, limit consumption to the disadvantage of everybody but the handful of middle men, commission men, storage men whose ranks are filled with robbers.

ALL FARMS PRODUCE FOOD PRODUCTS

A farmer to make a living farming must grow his own living. In doing so, he must of a necessity grow a surplus which he should be able to sell at a fair price. But the farmer or producer has no opportunity to sell at a profit, because his prices are made in the city markets by a few men only, who are interested in selling his products. The great mass of the consumers have nothing to say as to the prices they are willing to pay for food products. There is only one way the consumer could have a chance to say what he is willing to pay, and that is by creating an auction marketing system under the supervision of the Federal Government, whereby every citizen of the country would be put on notice of food products for sale and the prices paid at wholesale for same.

It is entirely probable that taking all of the perishable food products grown for market purposes and the surpluses of farm home supplies, that in the United States there is as much wasted as is consumed by others than the growers.

WHAT IS AN AUCTION PLAN?

The sale by auction of products that swiftly deteriorate in quality or value is world-wide. In this country all of our furs, wool, and other products are sold at auctions conducted by private persons. In recent years auctions of fruits and vegetables conducted by individuals for profit have been established in 12 of our large cities. These auctions, of course, are limited in their price making to the dealers in the cities where they are held, and the prices received therein for fruits or vegetables by no means represent the true prices that people are willing to pay for such products—do not represent a price based upon supply and demand.

The plan submitted herein for the distribution and sale of food products is not designed to cover the distribution and sale of corn, wheat, and oats. These food products are now distributed and sold under a system about as good as can be provided. If there are any changes relative to these three products, such changes will or should come in perfecting the present system of distribution and sale.

WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE AUCTION PLAN

Especially and particularly included are all food products of a perishable nature, whether such nature requires icing of cars in transit or not. Such a plan should also include such products as are grown in all parts of the country in small quantities, as peas, beans, pumpkins, peanuts, rice, etc., and the nuts produced on our soil.

THE PRESSING NEED OF TO-DAY

For the present, or in the beginning of the inauguration of a system of distribution and sale of the products enumerated in the foregoing paragraph, it is sufficient to provide for the distribution and sale of perishable products, whether such require icing in transportation or not.

It is not necessary in this paper to consider the vast volume of traffic in perishable food products, or the tremendous total value of such products. Neither is it necessary to call attention to the hundreds of millions of dollars lost annually by our producers of perishable food products, nor to the great spread between the prices received by producers and those paid by consumers. These facts are known to all students of the marketing problem, or can easily be obtained from Government sources. The thing that the Congress needs to be convinced of is, that through the organization of a nation-wide plan for the sale of perishable food products by auction in the various trade centers, we can obviate the vast losses now sustained by both producers and consumers.

THE PRESENT CONDITIONS

Generally speaking, the preponderant proportion of our perishable food products has a price set on it by a few men in a few markets, totally and absolutely regardless of supply and demand.

The virtue of the "auction plan" is in making a price that is based on supply and demand. He who tries to provide a plan not based on supply and demand, for the purpose of carrying favor with this or that class, will in the long run, do all classes much harm.

Not until a plan is provided to get a consensus of opinion of the whole country, or a large part of the whole country, as to the demand for any certain product and what people are willing to pay for it, will there be any fairness in the establishment of prices for all parties concerned—producers and consumers—and one class has as much right to a fair price as the other class, and no more.

OUR WIDESPREAD TRAFFIC

No other nation has ever in history bought its food products from such far-distant markets within its own confines as this Nation. With us, wherever products come from, whether from producing points 50 miles distant or 3,000 miles distant, we are under obligations to see fair play and fair prices. We are not dealing with foreigners, as an European nation would be, with no obligation to see that this or that long-distance shipper got a fair price or not. Neither can we penalize one section for losses or forced prices in another.

It has often been stated that each producing section of a like product, in the distribution of such product, should keep in touch with the distribution of such product from all other sections, so that some markets would not be gorged and others slighted. Under present selling conditions this is absolutely impossible under any circumstances.

Primarily this is true for two reasons: First, organization work to acquire accurate marketing information over a large area of production as we have in this country requires the expenditure of large sums of money and also necessitates the employment of expert men at large salaries; second (and chiefly), the areas of production of perishable products is constantly changing for many reasons.

All farmers produce for their own use perishable food products, and all have a surplus at one time or another which should come on the market; in hundreds of small sections of the country the farmers once selling their surplus products at a good price will the following season plant largely of such products and without organization to sell them, will get low prices or lose money, and the next season cut down their acreage again to supply their own demands.

In Texas, which State is a large producer of perishable food products, it frequently happens that a single county will go in for, say, sweet potatoes, and in a season or two be marketing a thousand carloads; then comes a setback in prices, and the production will be less than a hundred cars.

This has happened in Texas scores of times as regards sweet potatoes, white potatoes, watermelons, cantaloupes, tomatoes, cucumbers, etc. Then again the weather conditions cause a wide divergence in production. For example, in a recent year in two south Texas counties which previously shipped during two months more than 500 carloads of cucumbers, beans, tomatoes, and peppers, this year on account of a drought did not ship 50 cars.

There is absolutely no chance under the conditions that exist in the widespread territory of our country for the production of perishable food products for such products to be sold at fair prices to producers and consumers under present marketing arrangements, and no way to arrive at fair prices except under the auction plan supervised by the Federal Government.

The only guide possible for the widely spread producers in the distribution of their products is the price offered, when such price is established through a widespread offering of the articles for sale, and said sale is made and price established by or through some Government agency, so that it is known to be a real price and not a dealer's fictitious price made to induce shipments, create an oversupply, and beat down the prices in the interest of cold-storage houses.

HOW PRICES ARE NOW MADE

Generally speaking again, our perishable food products are consigned to various brokers and commission merchants in a comparatively few cities. These brokers and commission merchants establish prices based upon the demand during a brief period each day—a consensus of the offerings of a few buyers or consumers.

For example, a certain number of cars of a perishable product arrives in the city of St. Louis. How many people who are in the market as consumers of such product have a voice in saying what the price should be? And even if every citizen and consumer in the city had a voice in setting a price according to the demand, the vast population within, say, 50 miles of the city who are also consumers have no voice at all, and there are as many people within a radius of 50 miles possibly as are in the city itself.

A handful of men, and generally men who have a selfish interest to serve in fixing low prices, make all the prices for our perishable food products. Of course, there are a few exceptions in highly organized products, but their percentage of the vast whole is so small that it does not count.

The thing to do is to fix prices based on supply and demand where all the population, all the buyers, dealers, and consumers have a say whether they live in the cities of large population, to which the perishable products are directly shipped, or in 10,000 small cities and towns of the country whose inhabitants are also interested in the purchase and the consumption of perishable food products. This condition can only be brought about by the sale of our food products by auction, said auction to take place at a certain time each day at an established place of which all men will have previous knowledge and each can compete with all others in the purchase of carloads of food products.

HOW THE AUCTION PLAN WILL WORK

Let us say that the Federal Government establishes a marketing organization along the lines of the Federal reserve system. In this organization it would be provided that the system will make a charge for

each car of products auctioned, such charge to cover the costs of operation and add something to a fund for the future establishment of Government market places in the larger cities. This marketing system would establish certain markets for the receipt and sale of food products to be sold each day at auction. At a certain hour each day an auction would be held, and there would be sold all carloads of food products on hand or "to arrive" prior to the next sale. All sales to be subject to certain standards of quality and condition and reclamations would be made when such standards were not complied with.

It may be here stated that in the course of a short time all producers would have a knowledge of the Government standards and would be eager to comply therewith. Furthermore, the producers, having confidence in getting just prices and real prices for their products and in not being robbed as they now are in thousands of cases, would vie with each other in establishing in the markets a reputation for their goods and seek to have their especial products find favor with the buyers who would know of their excellent pack or product.

In this public way—auction plan—of establishing prices at a certain hour each day in all the markets, it would be found that dealers in many small cities and towns would have buyers in the market places who would compete when there was an overplus of products in the market, and the cold-storage houses would be compelled to pay an honest price for their purchases. Eventually we would come to the condition when our perishable-food products would be sold at a uniform price throughout the country plus the transportation charges.

The price setting would be open and above board, the price would be a real and dependable price, not a fictitious price set by a few thieving brokers to rob the producers of the value of their toil. Another thing, there are thieving and dishonest producers and shippers, as well as those at the other end of the line. Such would be put out of business or compelled to mend their ways, for the quality and value of their pack would soon be generally known to all buyers. For example: The Government auctioneer would say, "I am offering a car of tomatoes, about 25,000 pounds, loaded in M. K. T. car 41144, due to arrive at 4 p. m. in this market. This car was packed and shipped by John Smith, of Smithville, Tex. What am I offered?" No shipper could possibly defraud the public under such a condition of sale.

The fact that the shipments of a certain man or brand would bring an extra price in the market at public auction would force, or at least encourage, all shippers to compete with the best or go back to producing something else that was not judged, priced, and sold under the glare of national publicity.

BENEFITS IN TRANSPORTATION

Such a plan for national auctions at certain hours each day in all markets would enable the railroad companies to so adjust their schedules of trains bearing perishable food products to arrive at the various markets at a nearly uniform hour each day, just as milk trains now arrive at the markets at certain hours.

It would also give our railway managements an opportunity to consolidate their shipments into solid trains, which would accelerate the time in transportation and provide more economical handling. It would not be long after the auction plan was inaugurated that facilities would be provided for showing in all the markets each day all of the carload perishable food products moving throughout the country.

A consolidation of the shipments of such products into solid trains would enable the railroad companies to put into operation cold-storage trains, with all cars kept at a uniform temperature by a refrigerating machine in one car, thus saving time, cost in reicing, and deterioration from changes in temperature, and insure all products arriving at markets in a uniform condition.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Dark Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill, together with an accompanying article by "The Rambler."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution and article are as follows:

Whereas the plight of the farmers of America is even worse now than it was 12 months ago at the time that President Coolidge vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill and offered neither substitute nor even consolation to the agricultural classes; and

Whereas an American standard of living has been guaranteed to merchants and manufacturers through the tariff bill; to bankers through the Federal reserve act; to railroads through the Interstate Commerce Commission; to laborers through the Adamson bill and the immigration law, while farmers, by being compelled to buy on a protected market and sell on a world-wide market, are forced to a standard of living on a level with European peasants and Mexican peons; and

Whereas the law of supply and demand does not apply when the supply is in the hands of unorganized farmers and the demand is in the hands of organized dealers; and

Whereas cooperative marketing of farm products on a large scale has failed because it is financially impossible for members to carry all the burden of the surplus for the benefit of nonmembers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the directors of the Dark Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association, in regular monthly meeting assembled this the 15th day of November, 1927, and speaking for the 70,000 farm families that we represent in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Indiana, do reaffirm our faith in the McNary-Haugen bill and especially the equalization fee feature which requires all growers of a commodity to share alike in carrying the burden of the surplus, just as all national banks are required to be members of the Federal reserve system; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly request our Senators and Congressmen to show their sympathy for their farmer constituents by using their influence and votes to secure the immediate passage of the McNary-Haugen bill in the next session of Congress.

MCNARY-HAUGEN BILL

By the Rambler

Relief for the farmer through the effort of the Congress will not down. In past years the Republican Party has existed as the protector of manufacturing and moneyed interests. Farmers of the northern and eastern States have remained Republican as a matter of "principle," but just what that principle is they are not well advised. Possibly it is the remains of the Civil War and the question of slavery.

However, the great West has been settled. The settlers there in the main left bygones behind, and while remaining Republican in principle, yet kept out a weather eye. Following the sentiment of those they represented western Congressmen have been more or less an uncertain quantity in the Republican ranks. The West is new, and the West has sprung a number of new ideas in government. Some of them were good and some not so good. But at least it may be said the West is original.

The western farmers have demanded relief. Such a thing as Government aid was unheard of. Then the people discovered for the first time that the Government had for a century, except when Democrats were in power, been giving aid to the manufacturing and moneyed interests, through the manipulation of the Republican Party, by the tariff.

The Democratic Party has sought to give relief by the lowering of the tariff. But the western farmer has remained loyal to the "time-honored" high tariff of his Republican Party, but would ingeniously circumvent its effects on his business with the McNary-Haugen bill.

Thus the agricultural Republican saves his face on his prior advocacy by still contending for high tariff, but at the same time insisting on relief from its effects upon agricultural products by the McNary-Haugen bill.

The McNary-Haugen bill is not sound in principle under normal conditions. But conditions are not normal, and we had as well fight the devil with fire.

Just so long as Republican high tariff remains in force, just that long I am in favor of offsetting its effects on agricultural products with the McNary-Haugen bill.

ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

The directors of the Dark Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association at their last meeting in Hopkinsville adopted a resolution requesting the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill.

The resolution criticizes President Coolidge for vetoing the McNary-Haugen bill and not offering any other relief or even consolation. The resolution mentions the following who are protected to be merchants and manufacturers through the tariff bill; bankers through the Federal reserve act; railroads through the Interstate Commerce Commission; laborers through the Adamson bill and immigration law, while farmers, by being compelled to buy on a protected market and sell on a world-wide market, are forced to a standard of living on a level with European peasants and Mexican peons.

The resolution further points out that the law of supply and demand does not apply when the supply is in the hands of farmers and the demand is in the hands of organized dealers.

In requesting the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill the directors of the association would have the equalization fee remain in it. This equalization fee means that every grower of a given commodity pay his fee and thus all share equally in carrying the burden of the surplus.

The hue and cry was raised against the McNary-Haugen bill that it was putting the Government in business. But the advocates of the bill answered that the Government had been in business as a protectionist for a century at the behest of the Republican Party and that it comes now with the poor grace to cry "wolf."

THAT BRANN SUIT

It has been intimated for some weeks that the buyers would lay off of medium and low grade tobacco this year unless it could be bought

"right." It has been suggested that this was to force the association on the market with what it has on hand. But the association didn't get panicky and give what it had away. It was negotiating a big sale at a reasonable price. This didn't suit somebody—somebody nobody knows who. But about the time for the market to open somebody—certainly not the deluded farmers in west Tennessee in whose name the suit in Judge Dawson's court was brought—filed a petition in the same suit for a receiver.

Well, there's no need to comment further. Space is valuable.

It may be slow work, but some day the farming classes will come to their own. Others with more brains and less honor have manipulated the thing for a long time. The farmer is a lot smarter than he used to be; that is, better informed.

Some of these days if the farmer doesn't get action in Congress and in State legislatures he's going to know the reason why.

But the good year of 1927 is the wrong time to pull this receiver stuff. There's too little tobacco in the world to-day for the big ones to force the price down. Government statistics show it and no one knows it better than the big buying interests. The association tobacco might all be dumped on the market through a receiver and still not fill up the hole.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1) thereon.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this bill was considered in the House of Representatives immediately after the 5th of December, and also by the committee of the Senate. It has been thoroughly examined in the meetings of the Committee, and the measure has been approved. The bill was passed last week by the House of Representatives. It is very similar to the deficiency bill which failed in the filibuster at the end of the last session of Congress; the items are almost precisely identical, but the amount of the bill, of course, is larger because of some very important deficiencies which have been added to it, such as the shortage in the appropriations for the payment of pensions, and so forth. I am reporting the bill at this time, and at some later time in the day, perhaps, I shall, with the consent of the Senate, bring it up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I inquire what became of the report submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]? I understand he simply reported the deficiency bill from the Appropriations Committee. I did not hear what action was taken.

Mr. WARREN. I merely reported the bill from the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was ordered to the calendar.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from Wyoming does not intend to call the bill up for consideration to-day?

Mr. WARREN. It was my intention to do so, should the Senate desire to consider the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped that the Senator would wait until to-morrow to ask for the consideration of the bill, so that we might have an opportunity to read it. Some of us who are not on the committee would like to know what its provisions are.

Mr. WARREN. That will be perfectly agreeable.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, there was so much confusion in the Chamber when the Senator from Wyoming offered the first deficiency bill that I should like to have the matter cleared up. Did the Senator report the bill from the committee or did he merely introduce the bill?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I reported the bill from the committee with amendments which have received the approval of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I ask the Senator how the committee has had an opportunity of passing upon the bill if the committee is not as yet organized?

Mr. WARREN. The committee was organized so far as its old members are concerned, who naturally could act, and the membership was all there, barring the two vacancies on the Republican side.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Were there any minority members present?

Mr. WARREN. All were present, I think, who were in the city and able to attend, and the bill was unanimously authorized to be reported.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. WATSON. I offer the resolution in the nature of an order which I send to the clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The order submitted by Mr. WATSON is as follows:

Ordered, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Seventieth Congress:

On Agriculture and Forestry.—Messrs. McNary (chairman), Norris, Capper, Keyes, Gooding, Norbeck, Frazier, Gould, Smith, Ransdell, Kendrick, Heflin, Caraway, Mayfield, Wheeler, Thomas, and Shipstead.

On Appropriations.—Messrs. Warren (chairman), Smoot, Jones of Washington, Curtis, Hale, Phipps, Keyes, Bingham, Oddie, Nye, Overman, Harris, Glass, Jones of New Mexico, McKellar, Broussard, Kendrick, Copeland, and Hayden.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Messrs. Deneen (chairman), Fess, Greene, Caraway, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Norbeck (chairman), Edge, Phipps, Sackett, Frazier, Pine, Brookhart, Steiwer, Fletcher, Glass, Edwards, Mayfield, Wagner, Barkley, and Tydings.

On Civil Service.—Messrs. Dale (chairman), Couzens, du Pont, Pine, Brookhart, Blaine, McKellar, Ransdell, Heflin, George, and Bruce.

On Claims.—Messrs. Howell (chairman), Capper, Deneen, Nye, McMaster, Steiwer, Waterman, Trammell, Bayard, Caraway, Stephens, Mayfield, and Black.

On Commerce.—Messrs. Jones of Washington (chairman), McNary, Willis, Johnson, Dale, Gould, Edge, Sackett, La Follette, Nye, Fletcher, Ransdell, Sheppard, Simmons, Stephens, Harris, Copeland, Hawes, and Tydings.

On the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Capper (chairman), Jones of Washington, du Pont, Sackett, Gould, Blaine, Waterman, King, Glass, Copeland, Edwards, Neely, and Bruce.

On Education and Labor.—Messrs. Couzens (chairman), Borah, Phipps, Metcalf, Bingham, Gillett, Jones of New Mexico, Ferris, Copeland, Tyson, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

On Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Greene (chairman), Gillett, and Blease.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments.—Messrs. Sackett (chairman), Hale, Keyes, Goff, Swanson, Bayard, and Hawes.

On Finance.—Messrs. Smoot (chairman), McLean, Curtis, Watson, Reed of Pennsylvania, Shortridge, Edge, Couzens, Fess, Greene, Deneen, Simmons, Jones of New Mexico, Gerry, Harrison, King, Bayard, George, Walsh of Massachusetts, and Barkley.

On Foreign Relations.—Messrs. Borah (chairman), Johnson, Moses, Willis, McLean, Edge, Capper, Gillett, Reed of Pennsylvania, Swanson, Pittman, Robinson of Arkansas, Walsh of Montana, Reed of Missouri, Harrison, Ferris, Bayard, and Shipstead.

On Immigration.—Messrs. Johnson (chairman), Keyes, Willis, Reed of Pennsylvania, Nye, Gould, King, Harris, Copeland, Blease, and Stephens.

On Indian Affairs.—Messrs. Frazier (chairman), Schall, McMaster, La Follette, jr., Jones of Washington, Pine, Steiwer, Ashurst, Kendrick, Wheeler, Dill, Bratton, and Thomas.

On Interoceanic Canals.—Messrs. Edge (chairman), Greene, Schall, Pine, Brookhart, Blaine, Walsh of Montana, Trammell, Ransdell, Mayfield, and Blease.

On Interstate Commerce.—Messrs. Watson (chairman), Gooding, Couzens, Fess, Howell, Goff, Pine, Sackett, Metcalf, du Pont, Smith, Pittman, Bruce, Dill, Wheeler, Mayfield, Hawes, Black, and Wagner.

On Irrigation and Reclamation.—Messrs. Phipps (chairman), Jones of Washington, McNary, Gooding, Oddie, Shortridge, Johnson, Howell, Sheppard, Walsh of Montana, Kendrick, Pittman, Simmons, Dill, and Ashurst.

On the Judiciary.—Messrs. Norris (chairman), Borah, Deneen, Gillett, Goff, Robinson of Indiana, Blaine, Steiwer, Waterman, Overman, Reed of Missouri, Ashurst, Walsh of Montana, Caraway, King, Neely, and Stephens.

On the Library.—Messrs. Fess (chairman), Howell, Gillett, Bingham, McKellar, Ferris, and Barkley.

On Manufactures.—Messrs. McLean (chairman), McNary, Metcalf, La Follette, jr., Gould, Deneen, Smith, Reed of Missouri, Edwards, Wheeler, and Tyson.

On Military Affairs.—Messrs. Reed of Pennsylvania (chairman), Warren, Greene, Bingham, McMaster, Pine, Robinson of Indiana, Brookhart, Blaine, Fletcher, Sheppard, George, Tyson, Blease, Steck, Wagner, and Black.

On Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Oddie (chairman), du Pont, Goff, La Follette, jr., Robinson of Indiana, Frazier, Walsh of Montana, Ashurst, Pittman, and King.

On Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Hale (chairman), Oddie, Norbeck, Shortridge, Metcalf, Schall, Howell, Steiwer, Waterman, Swanson, Gerry, Trammell, Broussard, Edwards, Dill, Walsh of Massachusetts, and Tydings.

On Patents.—Messrs. Metcalf (chairman), Norris, Waterman, ———, Smith, Broussard, Dill, and Shipstead.

On Pensions.—Messrs. Robinson of Indiana (chairman), Norbeck, Dale, Schall, Frazier, Couzens, ———, Gerry, Wheeler, Neely, Bratton, Steck, and Shipstead.

On Post Offices and Post Roads.—Messrs. Moses (chairman), Phipps, Oddie, Dale, du Pont, Schall, McMaster, Frazier, La Follette, jr., Brookhart, McKellar, Heflin, Trammell, Ferris, Blease, Bratton, Steck, and Thomas.

On Printing.—Messrs. Bingham (chairman), Moses, Capper, Fletcher, Ransdell, Bruce, and Shipstead.

On Privileges and Elections.—Messrs. Shortridge (chairman), Watson, Greene, Deneen, Goff, Edge, Steiwer, Waterman, King, George, Neely, Smith, Caraway, Reed of Missouri, and Bratton.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Keyes (chairman), Warren, Fess, McMaster, Gould, Smoot, Shortridge, Reed of Missouri, Ashurst, Trammell, Swanson, Mayfield, Edwards, Tydings, and Shipstead.

On Public Lands and Surveys.—Messrs. Nye (chairman), Smoot, Norbeck, Oddie, Dale, McNary, Willis, Gooding, Pittman, Jones of New Mexico, Kendrick, Walsh of Montana, Dill, Ashurst, and Wagner.

On Rules.—Messrs. Curtis (chairman), Hale, Moses, Watson, Dale, Smoot, Reed of Pennsylvania, Overman, Harrison, Robinson of Arkansas, Neely, Swanson, and McKellar.

On Territories and Insular Possessions.—Messrs. Willis (chairman), Johnson, Bingham, Robinson of Indiana, Nye, Reed of Pennsylvania, Metcalf, Norbeck, Pittman, Robinson of Arkansas, Harris, Broussard, Bayard, Bratton, and Hayden.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, does the Senator ask to have the resolution considered immediately?

Mr. WATSON. Yes. My thought was that the list of committees should be reported this morning and that the committees should be appointed.

Mr. DILL. I have not seen the list of committees, and I do not believe we ought to do that.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has handed me a list of Democratic members of committees.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I will say that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who was obliged to leave the city, left with me the list of committees agreed on by the Democratic steering committee. I understood that it was agreed that we would not proceed any further with the organization to-day than the appointment of committees, but that we would agree to do that much.

Mr. WATSON. That is right. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] can state the agreement with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CURTIS. The understanding was that we would act upon the election of the committees when they were reported and then defer further action on the election of officers until some later day, which I understand will be about Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. WATSON. Thursday.

Mr. DILL. Why can not the list be printed in the RECORD and taken up to-morrow? We have waited all this time, and another day's delay will not be material.

Mr. WATSON. I have no objection to that, of course, but I did not think there would be any objection raised.

Mr. DILL. I do not see any reason for suspending a rule on a matter of this kind providing for the appointment of committees, particularly inasmuch as some of us do not know what the list is.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana a question?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. There is nothing in the suggestion that there are certain Senators on the other side who must see what committee assignments they receive before they vote on the organization of the Senate, is there?

Mr. WATSON. I will say to my suspicious friend from Mississippi——

Mr. HARRISON. I am not suspicious; I am merely asking a question.

Mr. WATSON. I will say that there is nothing of that kind involved, because every Member on this side is fully aware of the committee to which he has been assigned, and my understanding is that they are as nearly satisfied as it falls to the average man to be satisfied in a complex situation of this character.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has performed a great service.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the list as proposed may be printed in the RECORD, so that the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] may read it before he gives his consent.

Mr. WATSON. I make the request that the list may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The list will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH. I ask the Senator from Indiana if he contemplates submitting the committee list for both sides?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly; that is the custom. They both are submitted by one individual. It does not matter about that, however.

Mr. SMITH. I understood from what the Senator said that he had been handed a list of the committee assignments for this side.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; I have been.

Mr. SMITH. And I thought, perhaps, if the others were going to be read that we should have both read at this time.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that the lists are not to be read, but simply printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, the list for both sides will be printed. That has been the custom, I will say to my friend.

AMENDMENT TO RULES—RELEVANCY OF DEBATE

Mr. JONES of Washington. I send to the clerk's desk a notice, which I ask may be read according to the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that on the next legislative day he will propose an amendment to Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to debate, as follows:

Amend said rule by adding thereto a paragraph to be numbered 7, to read as follows:

"7. Debate shall be confined to the subject matter under consideration, and all points of order relating thereto shall be decided by the Chair without debate. Upon an appeal from a decision of the Chair upon any such point of order no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes."

AMENDMENT TO RULES—RELEVANCY OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. JONES of Washington. I send to the desk another notice in accordance with the rules and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that on the next legislative day he will propose an amendment to Rule XVIII of the Senate Standing Rules, relating to amendments, by adding thereto a new paragraph to read as follows:

"2. No amendment shall be in order to a bill, resolution, or other amendment unless it be germane to the subject matter under consideration. If a point of order is made against a proposed amendment, it shall be decided without debate, unless the Chair desires to hear discussion. Upon any appeal from the decision of the Chair relating to such point of order no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator does not contemplate asking the Senate to adopt those amendments to the rules without reference to the committee?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I expect, in accordance with the rule and the notice, to offer the amendments on the next legislative day; and if then there is a request that they be referred to the Committee on Rules, I shall make no objection to it, although under the rules they could be taken up at once.

Mr. HARRISON. When will the Senator offer his resolution to change the rules?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that I gave the same notice and offered the same amendments in the last Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. I know.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is merely a notice of my intention to offer these amendments.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has offered a similar resolution in several Congresses; but at this Congress he has just offered his resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes; I just gave a notice.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator does not contemplate appearing before the Rules Committee and presenting his arguments in the matter and letting it take the regular parliamentary course before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I take it that when I offer the amendments pursuant to these notices there will be a request that they go to the Committee on Rules, and I shall be perfectly satisfied to have that done; and at the proper time I shall be glad to appear before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the chairman of the Committee on Rules ask that they go to the Rules Committee?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator misunderstands the rule. The rule requires that this notice shall be given before an amendment is proposed. It is my intention, when the amendment is offered, to ask that it go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought the Senator from Washington was trying to bring the matter up on the floor of the Senate and was giving the notice in order to avoid the two-thirds proposition.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President; I am giving the notice pursuant to the rules themselves, which require a notice to be given one day before any amendment to the rules is presented. This is the notice which the rules require.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he intends to oppose the course contemplated by the leader on our side?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President. If a request is made that the matter go to the committee, I shall make no objection, as I said a moment ago.

INVESTIGATION OF ELECTION EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is resolutions coming over from a preceding day. The Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 10, submitted by Mr. REED of Missouri.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senior Senator from Missuori [Mr. REED] is detained in the Supreme Court of the United States. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this resolution may go over without prejudice until the Senator from Missouri is able to be in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DEBTS

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Chicago Daily News of Friday, December 2, 1927, on the settlement of international debts; and I ask to have printed in connection with it an editorial on the same subject appearing in the same issue of the paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

BOND GERMANY FOR $6,000,000,000, END WAR DEBTS, HIS PLAN—SALMON O. LEVINSON, CHICAGO ATTORNEY, PROPOSES SWEEPING ADJUSTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL FISCAL PROBLEM AND 62-YEAR PEACE

An attempt to suggest a comprehensive plan of readjustment for the vexing questions of German reparations, allied and interallied government debts, European appeasement and peace, was made to-day in the form of a statement by Salmon O. Levinson, well-known Chicago attorney and student of international peace problems.

Coupled with a comprehensive financial proposal which aims at healing the financial sores left as a result of the World War, and as a guaranty to the undisturbed execution of the proposal, is a plan to eliminate war and threats of war over a period of 62 years.

Mr. Levinson enjoys a world reputation as a legal physician who is able to restore anemic corporations and even private properties to vigorous health. The same principles might, he thinks, be valid in curing the financial ills of States. He has discussed the financial program with leading bankers and other authorities in several countries and they have pronounced it to be practical. So far as is known, Mr. Levinson's proposal is the first attempt to couple financial cure and mutually covenanted world peace, without which the necessary period of financial convalescence would be at the mercy of deliberate or light-minded wreckers.

It is to be expected that Mr. Levinson's scheme will be received with deep interest and given exhaustive consideration not only in the United States but throughout Europe.

Following is Mr. Levinson's statement in full:

"Many excellent suggestions of readjustment have been made, but so far as the writer knows they deal, respectively, with only one phase of the European situation. Sometimes it is with the settlement and disposition of German reparations; sometimes with the resettlement or cancellation of the allied debts owing the United States; sometimes the emphasis is put upon the necessity for revising the treaty of Versailles; and, of course, many plans deal purely with the question of world peace. The central idea of this proposal is to consider all of these acute questions and problems together; in other words, to handle them as is done, generally speaking, in the case of a reorganization of a distressed railroad or industrial corporation. In reorganizations all interests are considered in one complete scheme of rehabilitation and adjustment. The analogy may not be complete, but it is sufficiently so for the purpose.

"When every nation sees what all other nations are to receive, how it is to be treated and what the general result will be, criticism and distrust are disarmed and general confidence and harmony are attainable. This is the 'open diplomacy' of reorganizations.

"Settlements have been made by our Government with practically all our European debtors except France, which has not ratified the agreement. This article does not discuss the wisdom of these settlements, but takes them as facts in the economic problem. However, it may not be amiss to say that the writer has never been in sympathy with the view that the Great War was originally our war, that we were military partners with the Allies throughout, and that our loans to them during and after the war were mere contributions to a common cause. Nor has the writer ever considered the effort to fix the 'capacity to pay' of a nation over a period of 62 years anything short of a wild guess. But the settlements are closed incidents and we start from them as a base. Suffice it to say that the United States has been liberal in these adjustments, although we have apparently received little or no credit for generosity or even leniency.

"In 1917 we entered the World War not only in good faith but enthusiastically 'to end war'—that is, to establish durable world peace. While we materially aided in victory for the allied cause, the vision of world peace is still distant.

"The purposes of the proposed plan may be summarized as follows:

"1. To get a reasonable compromise in cash for the United States of the 'present worth' of the debt settlements, which will furnish immediate and substantial relief to our taxpayers, who are bearing the whole brunt of the American cost of the war.

"2. To have the German reparations fixed at a definite amount and paid, the amount to be financed by a world consortium of bankers in cooperation with the governments involved, so that Germany may pay adequate reparations and also be able to work out the economic salvation of her people.

"3. To use the proceeds of the financed fixation of German reparations to pay all the sums needed under the proposed plan to bring about the settlement and discharge of all the allied and interallied government debts; for stabilization currencies for equitable adjustments with those European nations having specific claims to German reparations and for the necessary cost of the loan.

"4. The nations involved to sign a treaty of peace, open to all other civilized nations, wherein there will be substituted for the 62 years of debt installment payments by our European debtors, a 62-year experiment in world peace by the renunciation for that period of the use of war for the settlement of international disputes. In other words, to get also from this adjustment the ideal for which we fought in the war—the ending of war by international agreement.

"5. To make such modifications of the treaty of Versailles as are compatible with the terms and purposes of this proposal.

"The position taken by President Wilson that the question of allied debts should not be considered in conjunction with German reparations was sound. This view was approved and adopted by the Harding and Coolidge administrations. At the time this subject was originally broached it meant two things—first, the making of all payments by the Allies to the United States conditional on the payment to them of reparations by Germany; and, secondly, and more important, the United States was asked to take, in payment of the allied debts, German 'C' bonds, third-mortgage bonds, all subordinated to the bonds to be given the Allies. This would have put the United States in the position of military collector of reparations from Germany, in order to protect our third-mortgage bonds, as we would have released the Allies. The proposal herein contained is free from these objections. In fact, the plan provides a complete settlement, wherein the United States would be paid a fair present-worth compromise of the debt settlements in cash, the reparations would be adjusted and discharged, and the whole network of allied and interallied indebtedness would be disentangled and ended.

"The principal of the allied debts owing the United States was about $10,000,000,000, which, with accumulated interest, amounted to about $12,000,000,000. By the lenient settlements made by your Debt Funding Commission and approved by Congress (including the unratified French settlement) between $6,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000 were in effect canceled through the omission and reduction of interest over the period of 62 years. The present worth of the debts owing the United States under the settlements (that is, the present cash value an expert accountant would give them, assuming that all the installments will be paid for the 62 years) is, roughly, $5,000,000,000. The cancellation of $6,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 plus the present worth of about $5,000,000,000 epitomizes the present allied debt situation so far as the United States is concerned. Of course, it requires considerable optimism to believe that all these countries will continue to pay their installments to us over the 62-year period.

"Even if the nations actually and punctually pay all their installments, the present generation of our taxpayers will get an almost negligible benefit. For, under these settlements the installment payments and most of the interest rates do not begin to be substantial until about 25 years from now. But it has been computed that at the present rate of progress our own $18,000,000,000 of Government debt will all be paid off within 25 years. Therefore the next generation that will get the benefit of the increased installment payments and interest rates will be a generation that nationally is practically free from debt. In other words, American taxpayers will get relief when they do not need relief. There is no good reason why the present generation should stand all the burden of our participation in the war. The proposed plan offers immediate and partial relief to present taxpayers and even so will accelerate by many years the day when our national war debt will be entirely paid off.

"In addition to the debt settlements, the United States has a claim of $250,000,000 arising out of our contribution to the army of occupation immediately following the armistice. We were to have a first lien for these advances, but for some reason or other we have not been paid, so far as the writer knows, anything either on principal or interest. As the other governments contributing to the army of occupation have been paid, it seems reasonable to propose that this expense of the United States, which was incurred for the benefit of the Allies and after the war, should be repaid.

"While, as above stated, the United States happily kept itself free from participation in or collection of German reparations, nevertheless in any 'reorganization' of Europe we must all agree that the center and crux are the German reparations. This is obviously true so far as any financial adjustment is concerned, and it is almost equally true with regard to European appeasement and peace. Accordingly, this plan proposes that the German reparations be fixed at the amount of $6,000,000,000 and that this amount be financed and paid in cash in a lump sum. This would supersede the present method of installment payments by Germany without knowledge or fixation of the total amount of reparations, and, as the annual payments under the Dawes plan are rapidly increasing, would obviate the danger of default and consequent serious complications. The effect of the cash settlement of the reparations would be to terminate the quasi receivership now afflicting Germany, and she would owe $6,000,000,000 under a well-secured loan, handled by a world banking consortium working in concert with the governments involved, on a sound and economic basis. As the loan would be a first mortgage on all the national assets and revenues of Germany, the interest rate should be, say, 5½ per cent per annum, with a sinking fund of an additional 1½ per cent per annum, or at a total annual cost of 7 per cent. This sinking fund of 1½ per cent, kept alive, would, as banking tables show, automatically pay off the entire principal of the loan in about 28 years.

"Such a loan would, as stated, have to be undertaken by an international banking group in cooperation with the governments involved. Our American bankers would doubtless be willing to underwrite and distribute a proper and proportionate share of the loan. The financial task would, of course, be colossal but far from impossible, with the momentum of public approval and consequent investment. It would indeed be a reassuring revelation if a loan of such magnitude, easily possible in war time when loans are necessarily precarious, could be negotiated in peace time for constructive purposes, when the safety of the loan is beyond question.

"Under the proposed plan the United States Government would receive in cash out of the proceeds of the new German loan $4,250,000,000. The $4,000,000,000 represents the 'present worth' cash compromise of the allied debt settlements. Otherwise stated, we would accept in compromise of the $5,000,000,000, which is the estimated 'present worth' of the debt settlements, 80 per cent thereof in immediate cash—a discount of 20 per cent. The $250,000,000 would be repayment of the principal of our contribution to the army of occupation. The $4,000,000,000 of cash could be used immediately in reduction of our own national debt and by the time of its consummation would probably mean a reduction of 25 per cent thereof. This large reduction in our national debt, quite independently of surpluses, would justify an immediate and substantial reduction in our Federal taxes. The $250,000,000 could be utilized, if so desired, by Congress, in whole or in part, as an appropriation for farm relief under satisfactory legislation.

"The plan also provides that there be a general cleaning up and discharge of the allied and interallied war debt all around. The United States is the only clear creditor, we having paid our way as we went along in the war. Great Britain is a creditor as to her other allies, but is a debtor to the United States in the sum of about $4,500,000,000. As a part of this proposal Great Britain would be called upon to cancel the debts owing to her by her allies—about $7,000,000,000; in turn she would receive a release from the United States as to her own debt. This, in effect, Great Britain has heretofore offered to do.

"Under this proposal there would be no need of continued friction or even conference about the French debt settlement. All the debts would be settled and discharged, including France's. Disregarding the effect of the settlements, France owes us over $4,000,000,000, including $400,000,000 for materials purchased after the war, and she owes nearly $3,000,000,000 to Great Britain; Italy owes us over $2,000,000,000 and a similar amount to Great Britain; Belgium owes us $420,000,000; Rumania, $45,000,000; Czechoslovakia, $115,000,000; Latvia, $6,000,000; Finland, $9,000,000; Poland, $178,000,000; Greece about $20,000,000; Esthonia, $14,000,000; and Lithuania, $6,000,000. And these latter countries also owe similarly large amounts to Great Britain. Thus most of the countries in Europe would have a direct financial stake in this general adjustment.

"For obvious reasons the writer has left out all consideration of the Russian debts. Personally, he would like to see them incorporated if it can be done without friction and therefore without endangering the proposal.

"The $200,000,000 borrowed by Germany to inaugurate the Dawes plan should be paid off out of the $6,000,000,000, so that the new loan would be an absolute first mortgage on all of Germany's national property. This would leave a balance of $5,800,000,000. The payment to the United States of $4,250,000,000 would leave a balance of $1,550,000,000. This balance would be available, as far as needed, for stabilization of currencies for equitable adjustments with those European nations having specific claims to German reparations and for the necessary cost of the loan. The unused portion, if any, of the $1,550,000,000 to be applied in reduction of the loan.

"As a part of the general appeasement, the European nations involved, as well as the United States, are to sign a general treaty, in which the use of war for the settlement of international disputes would be renounced for the next 62 years as an international experiment in world peace. The other civilized nations to be invited to join in this treaty, so that for the period of 62 years the institution of war as a method of settling the disputes of the nations may be outlawed and a judicial system set up in place of the destructive war system which has brought Europe to its present plight. Thus the European nations, instead of enduring 62 years of 'financial servitude,' would enjoy 62 years of voluntary peace, during which time their economic rehabilitation could be effected and made secure. If toward the end of the 62-year period the experiment in peace proves distasteful to the civilized nations and they hunger for military power, they could revive the war system by refusing to extend the term of the peace treaty beyond the 62 years.

"Such a treaty would make possible and desirable the provision of this plan which calls for a world conference on the reduction of armaments, both on land and sea, to signalize the general renunciation of war. For so long as the institution of war is retained by the nations as their lawful and paramount court of last resort, all hopes of disarmament are doomed to disappointment. But with war renounced for 62 years all obstacles to drastic disarmament would be removed, and the economic convalescence and rehabilitation of the countries of Europe would ensue by leaps and bounds.

"It is obvious that in order to carry out the foregoing plan changes would have to be made in the treaty of Versailles in accordance therewith, and such other changes as may be agreed upon, in harmony with the spirit and compact of the nations to live together in amity and peace and to devote themselves to the progress and welfare of their respective peoples.

"This proposal is not submitted as a finality nor as having the magic of an Aladdin's lamp. The writer will be both surprised and disappointed if many important and beneficent suggestions and amendments are not forthcoming; and he will be abundantly repaid if this proposal stimulates or aids in any way a better plan of European adjustment and peace."

LEVINSON WELL KNOWN AS "DOCTOR OF CORPORATION ILLS"

As the result of his unique professional achievements, Salmon O. Levinson, Chicago attorney, who proposes world-wide financial reorganization as a necessary preliminary to world peace, has won a reputation as a legal physician who can cure the ills of ailing corporations and point out the way to health to holders of unsound properties.

Admitted to the Illinois bar in 1891, Mr. Levinson's legal work for the last 20 years has been principally concerned with untangling the complexities and constructively analyzing the details of great companies. Included in this work was the refinancing of two railroads, a task looked upon by many capable men as among the greatest that can confront a financial expert.

In 1915 the late Stephen S. Gregory, then president of the American Bar Association, said of Mr. Levinson that he had "developed signal and conspicuous abilities in all large matters of corporate reorganization and financing." Mr. Gregory said further: "It is probably not too much to say that in this important and lucrative field he stands in the front rank of the American bar."

In 1908 Mr. Levinson won high commendation from lawyers and financiers throughout the country by his remarkable success in reorganizing the Westinghouse companies and the personal business affairs of the late George Westinghouse, the inventor. When the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway began to totter in 1915 Mr. Levinson was called in, and he put the finances of the road back on a sound basis. He repeated the performance in 1921 with the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad.

According to his associates in the law firm of Levinson, Becker, Frank, Glenn & Barnes, in the National Bank of the Republic Building, Mr. Levinson himself doesn't know how he happened to enter the particular branch of legal work that has brought him fame for his successful dealings with warring groups of stockholders and bondholders, each claiming special privileges when reorganization of great properties is begun. But, turning again to Mr. Gregory's estimate of Mr. Levinson, it becomes apparent that, once engaged in this particular work, the Chicago attorney displayed the proper qualifications for it. Mr. Gregory said:

"Mr. Levinson is a man of acute and vigorous mind and great mental and moral force. From the character of his practice and work it has not been his custom in later years to appear much in court, but he has a strong and comprehensive grasp of the general principles of the law and his keen and powerful mind enables him to make most effective

and practical application of these principles to the complicated and tangled affairs of modern commerce and finance.

"He is a man of tireless industry, for without that the success which he has achieved would have been impossible. No effort is too great for him in any cause which he has undertaken; nor does he omit the most painstaking examination of all the facts necessary to correct judgment. Unlike many men who are resolute and self-dependent, he does not underestimate the value of full conference with others and of giving the most careful attention to the views of those who differ with him, whether they are his associates or those opposed to him in interest. He is a liberal and generous-minded man, loyal to his friends and not vindictive toward his enemies. He fights hard and resolutely, but conflict leaves no malice in his heart."

That was written 12 years ago. Since that time Mr. Levinson has set aside hours and days from his business to devote to the cause of the "outlawry of war," a proposal of which he was the author and which has made a deep impression on the minds of leading men in the United States and Europe. Among its American champions may be mentioned the late Senator Knox, of Pennsylvania, and Senator BORAH, of Idaho.

Last spring Mr. Levinson traveled through Europe, sounding out the sentiment of leaders there, telling skeptics that war could be outlawed in the same way that piracy and duels have been outlawed. And while he was discussing this topic with 75 molders of public opinion in London, Paris, Berlin, and Geneva his natural interest in financial matters led him into a thorough investigation of commercial and monetary conditions wherever he went. He returned home from his European trip with a vast amount of first-hand knowledge of the problems of the nations he visited and of the state of public opinion in each.

Only recently the outlawry proposal, already placed before the United States Senate in a resolution by Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, was summarized in a volume written by Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the Christian Century, dedicated to Mr. Levinson, and with a foreword and afterword by Prof. John Dewey, the philosopher, of Columbia University.

But Mr. Levinson wishes to induce the nations to make a thorough job of world peace. He is confident that treaties outlawing war, together with an international court, would keep the nations out of hostilities. However, he also feels that a reorganization of international debts would be an exceedingly helpful guaranty of world peace and prosperity.

Mr. Levinson was born in Noblesville, Ind., December 29, 1865. From 1883 to 1886 he attended the old University of Chicago and finished his academic education at Yale University. He pursued his legal studies in the law department of Lake Forest University, was graduated in the class of 1891, and was admitted to the Illinois bar in that year.

PRINCIPAL AIMS OF THE LEVINSON PROPOSAL

As analyzed by persons who have studied the Levinson plan, it would be designed to—

1. Settle the question of international debts by removing debt and reparation payments from the political into the ordinary financial field.

2. Discharge the United States war debts quickly and in cash, thus lightening the taxpayer's burden and providing, if deemed desirable, funds for a large revolving credit to be placed at the disposal of farmers for financing the marketing of crops.

3. Pacify Germany by fixing the total period of reparation payments, reducing the annual sum, eliminating financial supervision under the Dawes plan, and restoring German sovereignty in fiscal matters, thus clearing the way for the evacuation of the Rhineland by the Allies as provided in the Versailles treaty.

4. Cancel all debts between European allies, while providing Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, and the other creditors with a substantial annual sum which they can use for their own economic restoration.

5. Dissipate the bad feeling toward the United States on the part of the European debtor states which the payment of their debts to us over a period of 62 years is sure to foster; prepare the way for intercontinental understanding by removing the chief incentive to quarrels; nullify all further criticism of the United States as an "international Shylock."

6. Found a complete financial settlement on a solemn international pledge to "outlaw war" for half a century or more, and provide impoverished and fearful states with security, thus allowing the necessary period for the codification of international law, for progressive disarmament, and for the peaceful discussion of outstanding political differences.

Summary of German loan plan offered by Attorney Salmon O. Levinson

World loan to Germany	$6,000,000,000
Interest rate 5½ per cent per annum. Sinking fund 1½ per cent per annum. (Sinking fund, kept alive, will pay off entire principal in 28 years.)	
Pay off lien of Dawes plan reparation loan	200,000,000
Total	5,800,000,000
Pay United States in compromise and discharge of all war debts owing to her	4,000,000,000
Pay United States in repayment of cost of American Army of Occupation, 1919 and 1920	250,000,000
Total	4,250,000,000
Balance	1,550,000,000

This balance of $1,550,000,000 to be used for stabilization of currencies, for equitable adjustments with European nations having specific claims to German reparations, and for the necessary cost of the loan. The unused balance, if any, to be applied in reduction of the loan.

Great Britain to cancel all debts owing to her by her allies, amounting to about $7,000,000,000, so that all allied and interallied government debts will be wiped out.

The nations to sign a general treaty renouncing war, as a method of settling their disputes, for the next 62 years, and agreeing to set up a judicial system to supplant the outworn and destructive war system, as an epoch-making experiment in world peace.

Drastic limitation of armaments, both land and sea, through a conference of all nations based on the 62-year treaty outlawing war.

Treaty of Versailles to be modified in accordance with the needs and spirit of the foregoing proposal.

FOR WORLD SOLVENCY AND PEACE

For the first time since the Great War the world is offered in to-day's issue of the Daily News a comprehensive plan for settling simultaneously all the major problems resiluent from that disastrous struggle. It merits earnest consideration by statesmen here and abroad and by the people of the leading nations.

Credit for its authorship goes to Salmon O. Levinson, of Chicago, widely known for his genius in reorganizing great corporations. Being convinced that the same principles apply to sound statesmanship as to successful business, Mr. Levinson came to the conclusion that the many devices imagined and applied for settling international differences had proved unsatisfactory because they were not parts of a single thoroughgoing remedy.

The Dawes plan has had brilliant results in obtaining from convalescent Germany "reparations by consent." But, however ingenious, that plan postponed the final reckoning and already signs of dissatisfaction are manifest.

The disputes between the United States and its late allies over the payment of the latter's war debts to this country have been quieted by separate agreements, except in the case of France. Yet the solution, consisting of payments extending over a period of 62 years, can hardly be said to have mollified the debtor nations. It is even doubtful whether any international arrangement covering so long a period can be considered secure.

The Locarno pacts were an unexpectedly satisfying step toward international pacification. At best, however, they eliminate but a few of the possible subjects of contention. They do not take into consideration the basic difficulties, which are economic. The angry disputes between Italy and Yugoslavia, between Italy and France, between Poland and Germany—to mention only a few of the more strident—show how uneasy are certain European states with the degrees of "security" attained.

As for disarmament, it is still a pious dream.

The truth is that reparation and debt problems, security, and peace are integral parts of a single complex. The unusual merit of Mr. Levinson's proposal is that it embraces all these problems and undertakes to solve them simultaneously. It provides for early payment in cash of a fair share of the European debts to the United States. It provides for the cancellation of debts between the European allies and releases them from indebtedness to the United States and at the same time furnishes them with a considerable sum of money. It fixes the total of German reparations at a reasonable figure, reduces the annual schedule of payments, and frees that country from the humiliating fiscal tutelage established by the Dawes plan. As the implicit price, it asks only that during the period of reparation payments the several interested states pledge themselves each to guarantee some portion of a German loan of $6,000,000,000, which is the "present worth" of the debts as they are now computed, and during the period of payment, and for some years afterwards, agree to "outlaw" war as a method of settling international disputes.

Such "outlawry" would not require disarmament, but would contribute powerfully toward allowing disarmament. It would not exclude war; it would show war's character as brigandage against which self-defense is both licit and laudable. By connecting the financial integrity of each several state with the maintenance of a scheme destined to restore international confidence and sound business the possibility of armed conflict would be compressed to relative insignificance.

Mr. Levinson's proposal apparently offers in principle to each nation that peculiar benefit it would seem most to cherish.

To the United States it offers an 80 per cent cash compromise of the present $5,000,000,000 of debts owing to it under the government

settlements. One can imagine the degree of fiscal relief that would accrue to this country from the early payment to it of $4,000,000,000 in money. Further, the plan would settle by cash payment in the sum of $250,000,000 the vexed question of the expenses of the American Army of Occupation on the Rhine.

To Great Britain the plan offers immediate relief from further payments to the United States, repayments constituting a burden under which the debtor nation, mighty as it is, is staggering. And from the balance of $1,550,000,000 remaining after the payment to the United States Great Britain would receive immediately an equitable percentage.

If the Levinson proposal were in operation French statesmen, for the first time in many years, might sleep soundly. For not only would France be relieved of the possibility of having to pay its enormous debts to the United States and Great Britain, but it would receive a cash payment of about $800,000,000 for currency stabilization and final reconstruction of its devastated areas. France would know also that for a long period of years a "truce of God" had been established between the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Germany, Poland, and itself.

In exchange for waiving the transfer clause protecting its currency under the Dawes plan, Germany again would be a free and sovereign nation, no longer grudgingly yielding tribute to its conquerors, but simply meeting the obligations on an unusually large bond issue, including the extinction of the principal, during a period of 28 years, having, with the proceeds, satisfied all the foreign claims arising out of the war.

More important would be the value of the plan to the world in general if it should be accepted and should prove workable. First, the great number of international holders of German bonds would be a strong guaranty of peace. Second, once freed from the specters of war and foreign debts, European credit throughout the world would rise to the heights merited by intelligent, hard-working, and powerful nations. Third, during the period of war's "outlawry" human society, through the codification of international law, the organization of peaceful cooperation in a hundred fields, and the possibility of such disarmament as each state, unhampered and unconstrained, might deliberately effect, would enter an era of unequaled prosperity.

Leading bankers have pronounced the plan financially sound.

The Daily News is deeply impressed by the marvelous possibilities of the plan. It holds no brief for the details presented by Mr. Levinson. The precise sums, the best ways of obtaining and distributing the needed guaranty for the great loan, the exact use to be made of the proceeds, are all matters for international argument and negotiation. But the Daily News does emphatically and unequivocally uphold the underlying principle of coupling with world peace and security the questions of debts and reparation payments. Therefore it trusts that Mr. Levinson's idea will receive the serious consideration it deserves and will become a topic for world-wide discussion among responsible statesmen.

STATE RIGHTS VERSUS FEDERAL USURPATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State rights versus Federal usurpation," which appeared in the Nashville Banner of Sunday, December 4, 1927.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

If there are those who doubt the existence of a very serious issue between the State and Federal Governments on the question of jurisdiction over the development of water-power resources, the annual report of the Federal Water Power Commission is sufficient to convince such persons that this issue does exist, and that it is of tremendous importance and far-reaching in its consequence.

During the last session of Congress a bill was introduced by Senator McKELLAR and Representative FINIS GARRETT seeking to define navigable waters and to limit the authority of the Federal Water Power Commission to supervision over the erection of dams and obstructions in such navigable streams, and thereby recognize and acknowledge through a Federal statute the exclusive jurisdiction of the several States over nonnavigable streams. This bill has undoubtedly given the Federal Water Power Commission serious concern. That body has been assuming jurisdiction not only over navigable streams, but also over nonnavigable streams, and endeavoring to exercise authority over water-power resources which, under the Federal Constitution and the various State constitutions, when properly interpreted, belong exclusively to the several States.

The McKellar-Garrett bill proposes to curb this usurpation of State rights by the Federal commission. It proposes to lay down a definite line of demarkation between the State and Federal authority on the questions of navigation and water-power development. It would wipe out the twilight zone of uncertainty and of conflicting jurisdiction which exists to-day between the States and the Federal Government by reason of the unconstitutional interpretation which the Federal Power Commission has been placing on the Federal water power act. The bill introduced in Congress by McKELLAR and GARRETT would say to the Federal Government, "Thus far shalt thou go, but no further." It would render unto the States the things that are the States', and unto the Federal Government the things which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal control.

The McKellar-Garrett bill would say to the Federal Government, "Under the delegated powers expressed in the Federal Constitution this is your territory," and it would say to the States, "Under the reserved powers of the several States this belongs to you." Which is a consummation devoutly to be wished. It is absolutely essential as a matter of practical administration. It must come sooner or later. It is better that this grave issue should be settled by an unequivocal statutory enactment by the Federal Government and by similar State legislation than have it ultimately settled as a result of harassing, delaying, and expensive litigation involving a multiplicity of lawsuits.

The annual report of the Washington Power Commission, which was released for publication a few days ago, reveals a determination to oppose the passage of the McKellar-Garrett bill and to resist any curtailment of the authority of the Federal commission as that body has heretofore interpreted its powers. A brief résumé of certain portions only of the report was sent out from Washington for publication throughout the country.

The extracts from the report which were broadcast to the various States and congressional districts were calculated to create the impression on the minds of the people that the Federal commission acknowledges the jurisdiction of the several States over their water-power resources and that no issue really exists between the Federal Government and the several States. However, the vital sections of the report which were published in Washington sharply challenge the principles embodied in the McKellar-Garrett bill and make an issue with the several States on the question of their exclusive jurisdiction over nonnavigable streams within their respective borders.

This is a serious issue. When applied to conditions existing in Tennessee it is of far-reaching importance. The great Cove Creek Basin in Tennessee is located on a nonnavigable stream. It is conceded to be one of the most valuable water-power sites in the United States, even rivaling in magnitude Muscle Shoals.

As a water-power project, it lies wholly within this State. It belongs to the State of Tennessee in trust for all the people. It is under the jurisdiction of and it should be developed on the terms and conditions prescribed by Tennessee, and the electric energy generated by the water power of this great project should be utilized in such manner as this State may direct. All revenues arising from it should go into the State treasury, and the Federal Government should not be permitted to interfere with the rights of the State over the development and utilization of the energy generated.

The position taken by the Federal Water Power Commission in its annual report would make it possible for that bureau to exercise the jurisdiction and authority with respect to Cove Creek which should be exercised exclusively by Tennessee. The Federal authorities predicate their claims of jurisdiction on the theory that, although the Cove Creek project is located on a nonnavigable stream, its development will affect the navigability of the Tennessee River. Such a claim appears to be a mere pretext to enable the Federal commission to control the use of the water-power resource of Cove Creek, and other projects in the United States having a similar status.

For the ostensible purpose of improving navigation, the Federal Government must not be allowed to assert unbridled authority over nonnavigable streams, with a real purpose to tie Cove Creek and Muscle Shoals together as parts of a great superpower system, and turn both over to the power combine. The hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee clearly indicate that the major object in the mind of the Federal Power Commission is to thus tie the two together for power purposes, and that the alleged purpose to improve the navigability of the Tennessee River is a thinly disguised pretext which that commission hopes to use as a legal justification for carrying out its major purpose of asserting jurisdiction over the water-power resources of Cove Creek. The tail should not be permitted to wag the dog.

If the several States should concede the authority of the Federal Government to the extent asserted by the Federal Power Commission the States would be reduced to a point of impotence in the control of their water-power resources. This issue affects vitally the material welfare of Tennessee, and in addition involves directly the question of State sovereignty. If the Federal Government is permitted to encroach upon the authority of the several States, here a little and there a little, ultimately the States will be reduced to the status of dependent provinces.

Cove Creek water power, when properly developed and utilized, should yield Tennessee millions of dollars annually in revenue. In addition it can be made to add hundreds of millions of dollars to the industrial wealth of the State if it is developed and used primarily as a hydroelectric project in a manner that will produce the maximum amount of power.

This can and should be done under the jurisdiction and direction of the State and without impairing in the least degree the navigability of the Tennessee River. So long as the State does not permit the development and use of the water power in Cove Creek to impair the naviga-

bility of the Tennessee River in its natural condition the Federal Government should be required to keep hands off. Of course, the State has no disposition to impair the navigability of any stream flowing through the State. It is interested in improving navigation, but the development and use of the water power in Cove Creek, so long as it does not impair navigation, is a question over which the Federal Government should have no jurisdiction.

The Banner sincerely trusts that the McKellar-Garrett bill will be introduced in the coming session of Congress; that it will fix definitely the line of demarcation between State and Federal authority on this important question, and that it will in no uncertain terms assert the complete jurisdiction of the several States over nonnavigable streams within their respective borders and likewise the authority of the States with respect to the water-power resources, even on navigable streams, subject alone to the limited authority of the Federal Government over questions of navigation.

The Federal water power act should be amended in whatever particular is necessary to assert the rights of the States over their water resources. The people of Tennessee should not be compelled to go to Washington and ask a Federal bureau or commission what use they may make of their own natural resources. That question should always be decided by the State of Tennessee, acting in its own sovereign capacity as trustee for all its people.

There is a grave issue existing between the State and the Federal Government on the question of water development, and those who doubt the existence of such an issue should read and study carefully the report of the Federal commission just published.

There are many able, distinguished jurists and lawyers who are thoroughly convinced that the Federal water power act as it now stands is unconstitutional. Certainly either the act or its present interpretation and administration is in violation of the Federal organic law. The best legal minds, those who are authorities on the subject, are convinced that if the Federal water power act does confer on the Federal Water Power Commission all of the authority and jurisdiction which that commission has been attempting to exercise, the act itself goes beyond the constitutional authority of the Federal Government. On the other hand, if the Federal water power act, when properly interpreted, does not transcend the constitutional power of the Federal Government, then its administration by the Federal Water Power Commission is in violation of the delegated powers of the Federal Government.

It would be well if the entire Federal water power act were completely revamped, so as to make it a navigation act and not a water power act, so as to only confer jurisdiction on the Federal Government over navigation, and recognize the exclusive authority of the States over their water-power resources. Sooner or later, the better.

The States of the American Union should never willingly submit to any invasion by the Federal Government of their political, property, or revenue rights. When such an issue arises, it should be submitted to and determined by the people. The States have already yielded too far and too often. Federal bureaucratic government from Washington must not be permitted to dominate and control local State matters. The separation of State and Federal authority by our fathers was wise and beneficent. That separation must be preserved.

The famous toast of that immortal Tennesseean, Andrew Jackson, President of the United States: "The Federal Union—it must be preserved," was timely and all-important. It was uttered by the great warrior and statesman at a critical time in the Nation's history. He meant what he said. If Old Hickory were living to-day, when the several States of the Union are confronted with a threatened usurpation of their authority and invasion of their sovereignty, he would declare with equal emphasis and determination:

State sovereignty—"by the eternal"—it must be preserved.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar is in order, but there is no calendar. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] would like to take up his resolution this morning. As he has a case in the Supreme Court, and Senators are conferring with him on that question now, I move that the Senate take a recess for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, before that is done, what is the reason that the recess is asked for?

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that Senators are consulting with the Senator from Missouri as to whether or not he wants to go on with his resolution to-day. He is now engaged in the Supreme Court, and they will be back in a few minutes to let the Senate know.

I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 1 o'clock p. m., at which time it reassembled.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, with the accompanying report, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the seventy-eighth annual report of the board of directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

STUDY OF UNITED STATES BATTLE FIELDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE PURPOSES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with section 2 of the act of Congress to provide for the study and investigation of battle fields in the United States for commemorative purposes, approved June 11, 1926, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of War of the progress made under the said act, together with his recommendations for further operations.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

REPORTS OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual reports of the Alaska Railroad for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	McKellar	Shortridge
Barkley	Fletcher	McMaster	Simmons
Bayard	Frazier	McNary	Smith
Bingham	George	Mayfield	Smoot
Black	Gerry	Metcalf	Steck
Blaine	Gillett	Moses	Steiwer
Blease	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Borah	Goff	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Gould	Nye	Thomas
Brookhart	Greene	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Overman	Tydings
Bruce	Harris	Phipps	Tyson
Capper	Harrison	Pine	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heflin	Ransdell	Warren
Couzens	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Waterman
Curtis	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kendrick	Sackett	Willis
Dill	Keyes	Schall	
Edge	King	Sheppard	
Edwards	La Follette	Shipstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOFF in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. REED of Missouri rose.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just received from the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope there will be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none and lays the bill before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, United States Army Air Corps Reserve, for displaying heroic courage and skill as a navigator, at the risk of his life, by his nonstop flight in his plane, the *Spirit of St. Louis*, from New York City to Paris, France, on May 20, 1927, by which he not only achieved the greatest individual triumph of any American citizen but demonstrated that travel across the ocean by aircraft was possible.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question for information. Is not the resolution in violation of the statute relating to those to whom the congressional medal of honor may be awarded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not informed that it is.

Mr. BLEASE. Then I object until that question is passed upon. If I get the information that it is not in violation of such a statute I shall not object, but until I am informed that it is not contrary to the statute I must object. I think it is not right to sit here and permit a resolution, which I believe to be contrary to the statutes of the United States, to be passed without objection.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understood unanimous consent had been granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is correct.

Mr. BLEASE. I was endeavoring to get recognition from the Chair at the time, but I am somewhat hoarse this morning and could not attract his attention. I do not see why my friend from Missouri would want to have the resolution passed if it is contrary to the statute. I want the man to have the honor, but I object if it is violative of the laws of the country.

Mr. REED of Missouri. This, Mr. President, is not a resolution. It is a proposed act of Congress, and, of course, Congress can at any time enact a law touching the same subject matter that is covered by previous enactments. My friend from South Carolina did not, I think, in the confusion, catch the form of the measure. It is a bill, and reads:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present—

And so forth.

Of course, Congress can at any time pass a bill of that kind notwithstanding any previous general law which may have existed, and I hope my friend will not oppose it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. May I say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have no doubt he has in mind the thought that the congressional medal of honor can only be conferred upon an officer or man in the service.

Mr. BLEASE. No; but I think it has to be conferred upon a man for bravery in action.

Mr. COPELAND. It is in response to that very thought that I want to speak for a moment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understood the whole point the Senator from South Carolina desired to make was that this was a resolution and that such a resolution would be violative of the statute. But it is not a resolution. It is a bill, and that being the case, of course it can be passed.

Mr. BLEASE. I accept the Senator's construction of the law, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I may say that it has been done many times in this body. A number of times since I have been here it has been done.

Mr. BLEASE. But that does not make it right.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but I do not think it is unlawful at all.

Mr. COPELAND. May I say further that I had occasion last year to look up the record of Congress relative to the conferring of this honor, and I found that it had been granted to laymen, in one case to a man who gave a ship to the United States during the Civil War. I can see no reason in the world why the honor may not be conferred upon this splendid young man.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there is a general statute providing for the conferring of the congressional medal of honor, and it would not be necessary to have a special act of Congress to confer it. However, this is a case involving unusual bravery, courage, and achievement, and it is desired to have a special act of Congress to confer it. If it were desired merely to comply with the general statute there would be no occasion to have this special enactment; but it is desired to have a special act of Congress in this case. It does not violate the statute in any way. Colonel Lindbergh is in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. BLEASE. I have already stated that if the Senator from Missouri said it can be done legally I would make no further objection.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I make that statement unqualifiedly.

Mr. BLEASE. I would take the Senator's word anywhere.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF JUAN SORIANO (S. DOC. 13)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOFF in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of a claim against the United States for the death on October 2, 1923, at Guerra, Dominican Republic, of Juan Soriano, a Dominican subject, who was killed by the landing of an airplane belonging to the United States Marine Corps, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to me in March, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated March 22, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 84, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

I renew my recommendation originally made, that in order to effect a settlement of this claim, the Congress, as an act of grace, and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $2,000, and I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

SECOND PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON HIGHWAYS (S. DOC. 11)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I renew the request I made of the Sixty-ninth Congress that legislation be enacted authorizing an appropriation of $15,000, to enable the United States to participate in the Second Pan American Conference on Highways, which had been fixed to be held at Rio de Janeiro in the calendar year 1927, but which was postponed to meet at the same city in June, 1928.

A joint resolution for this purpose passed the House of Representatives on January 17, 1927, and was favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but failed to be reached in the Senate before final adjournment of the Sixty-ninth Congress.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, and House Document No. 631, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, therewith inclosed, in which the facts regarding this conference are set forth.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

INVESTIGATION OF ELECTION EXPENDITURES

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call up Senate Resolution 10 and to ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) submitted by Mr. REED of Missouri on the 9th instant was read and considered, as follows:

Resolved, That a resolution of the United States Senate, agreed to on May 19, 1926, numbered Senate Resolution 195, of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, creating a special committee to investigate expenditures in senatorial primary and general elections, and all subsequent resolutions dealing with the said special committee and agreed to by the United States Senate during the Sixty-ninth Congress (to wit, S. Res. 227, S. Res. 258, and S. Res. 324), have continued in full force

and operation since the dates of their respective enactment by the Senate, and do now, as then, express the will of this body.

And that the said special committee appointed pursuant to said Senate Resolution 195 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, shall continue to execute the directions of the said several resolutions relating to the said committee until the Senate accepts or rejects the final report of the said special committee or otherwise orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am quite well aware that the votes are here to adopt this resolution and that scant attention will be paid to anything that I may say about it. I can not, however, permit the resolution to be adopted without calling attention to the error that it embodies. The resolution as drafted and submitted contains a declaration by the Senate that the resolutions creating this committee, and the committee itself, "have continued in full force and operation since the dates of their respective enactment by the Senate, and do now as then, express the will of this body." That is a statement of past facts, and if the votes are here, as they are, that statement of facts will be made. I wish to call attention before it is made, however, to the fact that it is not a correct statement of past facts. We have Rule XXV of the Senate, and in the second paragraph of that rule it is provided:

The said committees—

Which are the standing committees mentioned in paragraph 1—

shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

If it were not for the second paragraph of Rule XXV every committee of the Senate, except the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which is kept alive by law, would expire with the adjournment of Congress.

That used to be universally recognized, and it was the custom in the closing days of each Congress to pass a special resolution continuing the standing committees in effect throughout the period of adjournment until their successors were created. I turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1919, when, as Senators will remember, our brethren on the other side of the aisle were in control.

Mr. Martin, the then Senator from Virginia, presented a resolution reading:

That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of the session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected.

Mr. Lodge, at that time the majority leader, then rose and stated that he was in favor of the resolution, saying:

We have always passed a similar resolution. I only wanted to speak to the Senator from Virginia as to his understanding being the same as mine—that none of these committees, with the exception of the Committee on Contingent Expenses, exists by statute, and none of them, of course, would transact any business whatever between the expiration of this Congress and the assembling of the new Congress. The Senator from Virginia agrees with me entirely about that.

Mr. Martin, of Virginia, then rose and said:

I do. When this Congress expires all these committees expire, except the vitality given by this resolution.

Then the resolution was adopted.

A few years afterwards, in order to prevent the necessity for the adoption of such a resolution at each session of the dying Congress, paragraph 2 of the Standing Rules was put in to end it, and the standing committees of the Senate are kept alive throughout the period of adjournment. Paragraph 2, however, does not apply to special committees. There was no resolution continuing this special committee, and, under the law, as agreed upon by both sides of this Chamber, that special committee died with the adjournment of the Sixty-ninth Congress. The United States Senate can, if it pleases, assuming that it has the votes, declare that last month was July or that this place is Chicago; if it could muster the votes, nobody could stop it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KING. The resolutions in question required the committee of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is chairman to collect the ballots, to preserve them, and count them. Does the Senator interpret those resolutions as not giving to that committee the power to continue its activities until it shall have discharged the duties and the mandate therein required or until by special act of the Senate it shall have been released from its duties?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It may be that that part of the authority of the committee continued by implication; I do not know; but it was not that power that was in question. I also recall that the Committee on Privileges and Elections was given jurisdiction of the election contest in Pennsylvania. That was the committee that should have collected the ballots and preserved them under that record.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that the resolutions to which I have referred authorized the committee to sit at such times and places as it might determine upon and to collect and preserve all those ballots. Obviously, inasmuch as the last resolution which required the special committee to preserve the ballots was adopted within a few weeks of the adjournment, it would have been impossible for the committee to have collected those ballots and to have preserved them until the meeting of the Senate in December, if it ceased to exist just as soon as the Congress adjourned last March.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. On the contrary, after that authority was given to collect the ballots the Senate referred the matter to the Privileges and Elections Committee; so that the duty of the special committee, as I take it, was to turn the ballots over to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That is why, it seems to me, the pending resolution embodies an incorrect statement of a historical fact; but, as I said at the beginning, I am perfectly well aware that the votes are here to adopt the resolution in any form in which its sponsor sees fit to present it. I can do no more than protest. I have no desire to waste the time of the Senate on the consideration of the resolution. I have made my protest, and that is all I have to say.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the injured-innocent attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania is a little amusing. One would think as he stood here plaintively declaiming that he was the sole guardian of what little is left of the public conscience and that all he can do, in the face of a cruel and brutal opposition, is to voice his dissent and save his reputation so that future generations may come to his shrine and say, "Here lie the bones of the only honest man of his period."

Mr. President, unfortunately for his position, unfortunately for the stand he now takes, and which is based upon the filibuster that he conducted here for the purpose of stopping these investigations and aborting this effort to learn what was going on in various States—unfortunately for all that, the Supreme Court has decided this question. The committee, which I believe was called the Wheeler Committee, was a special committee. The Wheeler Committee summoned Mr. Daugherty before it. Daugherty failed to come. Proceedings occurred in a recess, and the Supreme Court said this about it:

Another question has arisen which should be noticed. It is whether the case has become moot. The investigation was ordered and the committee appointed during the Sixty-eighth Congress. That Congress expired March 4, 1925. The resolution ordering the investigation in terms limited the committee's authority to the period of the Sixty-eighth Congress; but this apparently was changed by a later and amendatory resolution authorizing the committee to sit at such times and places as it might deem advisable or necessary.

That is the exact language of the Robinson resolution, which gave the special committee additional power.

It is said in Jefferson's Manual: "Neither House can continue any portion of itself in any parliamentary function beyond the end of the session without the consent of the other two branches. When done, it is by a bill constituting them commissioners for the particular purpose." But the context shows that the reference is to the two Houses of Parliament when adjourned by prorogation or dissolution by the King. The rule may be the same with the House of Representatives whose Members are all elected for the period of a single Congress; but it can not well be the same with the Senate, which is a continuing body, whose Members are elected for a term of six years and so divided into classes that the seats of one-third only become vacant at the end of each Congress, two-thirds always continuing into the next Congress, save as vacancies may occur through death or resignation.

Mr. Hinds in his collection of precedents says: "The Senate, as a continuing body, may continue its committees through the recess following the expiration of a Congress"; and, after quoting the above statement from Jefferson's Manual, he says: "The Senate, however, being a continuing body, gives authority to its committees during the recess after the expiration of a Congress." So far as we are advised, the select committee having this investigation in charge has neither made a final report nor been discharged; nor has it been continued by an affirmative order. Apparently its activities have been suspended pending the decision of this case. But, be this as it may, it is certain that the committee may be continued or revived now by motion

to that effect, and, if continued or revived, will have all its original powers. This being so, and the Senate being a continuing body, the case can not be said to have become moot in the ordinary sense.

That settles this question; and I am ready to vote on the resolution.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri one question about the last paragraph in the resolution, particularly with reference to this language—

shall continue to execute the directions of the said several resolutions relating to the said committee until the Senate accepts or rejects the final report of the said special committee or otherwise orders.

I assume that has reference to the committee's final report on elections held last year. That has nothing to do with any elections which may be held during 1928, for instance?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no. The committee has no thought of going into those elections, as far as I know; but the language speaks for itself, and I think what it means is perfectly plain.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The point I am getting at is this: Next year 32 Members of the Senate are to be elected.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator mean are we going to investigate the 1928 elections?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is precisely it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I certainly am not, unless the Senate hereafter commands me to do so by another resolution; and I hope I shall never have to investigate any election anywhere again.

I call for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. Until I find whether or not he will vote I withhold my vote.

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). I have already announced that my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. SACKETT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES]. Not having been informed how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS. I transfer my regular pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIS. I note that my colleague [Mr. FESS] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. I am not definitely advised as to how he would vote if he were present, but it is my impression that if present he would vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts entered the Chamber and voted "yea."

Mr. REED of Missouri. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HAWES] is necessarily absent from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HOWELL. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at his home by illness. I presume that he would vote "yea" upon this resolution.

Mr. GLASS. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] having appeared in the Chamber since I made the transfer to him, I shall have to withdraw my vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is temporarily absent on official business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

I also desire to announce that the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES].

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—58

Ashurst	Broussard	Ferris	Hayden
Barkley	Bruce	Fletcher	Heflin
Bayard	Capper	Frazier	Howell
Black	Caraway	George	Johnson
Blaine	Copeland	Gerry	Jones, Wash.
Borah	Couzens	Goff	Kendrick
Bratton	Dill	Harris	King
Brookhart	Edwards	Harrison	La Follette
McKellar	Overman	Smith	Tyson
McMaster	Pittman	Steck	Wagner
McNary	Ransdell	Stephens	Walsh, Mass.
Mayfield	Reed, Mo.	Swanson	Wheeler
Neely	Sheppard	Thomas	Willis
Norbeck	Shipstead	Trammell	
Nye	Simmons	Tydings	

NAYS—21

Bingham	Hale	Pine	Steiwer
Blease	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Deneen	Metcalf	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Edge	Moses	Schall	
Gillett	Oddie	Shortridge	
Gould	Phipps	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—15

Curtis	Glass	Jones, N. Mex.	Sackett
Dale	Gooding	McLean	Walsh, Mont.
du Pont	Greene	Norris	Watson
Fess	Hawes	Robinson, Ark.	

So Senate Resolution 10 was agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not see the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] in the Chamber, and I understand the Senate will not be given an opportunity to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] said something about wanting the bill to go over, but I do not know whether he still has that idea or not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand the Senator from Mississippi desires that the bill go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. I wanted to read it. At the time it was presented this morning I had not read it. I have done so since then, and if the Senate wants to proceed with it now I shall not interpose an objection.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will object to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, unless there is serious objection to taking up that bill, I would be glad to have the Senate proceed with its consideration this afternoon, if all the Senators interested are prepared to go on with it, because there are included in that bill some matters of importance which ought to be discussed.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the junior Senator from Utah objects, and wants the bill to go over until to-morrow. If he objects, under the rule it must go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Objection being made, under the rule the bill will go over until to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 13, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1927

MEMBER OF UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

Albert H. Denton, of Kansas, to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for a term of six years from June 9, 1927.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF MEDIATION

G. Wallace W. Hanger, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Mediation created by section 4 of the railway labor act, approved May 20, 1926, for a term expiring five years after January 1, 1928.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, *December 12, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, our days are in Thine hands. Do Thou give us the blessing of a sweet resignation. Come to us and sweep aside the mists of error; fortify our weakness and strengthen in all of us the wholesome sense of personal worth and the joy of life. Help us to glory in the wonderful precepts of the Master, by whose invasion the world is to be conquered, by whose presence the world is to be awed, by whose

rapture the world is to be thrilled, and by whose knees the world is to bow. O may the knowledge of His truth wedge its way into all our lives and may our feet press His highway. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 10, 1927, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. LEATHERWOOD, of the second district of the State of Utah, and Mr. STEVENSON, of the fifth district of the State of South Carolina, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the House is again honored in having a distinguished visitor. In the Speaker's row of the Members' gallery is the Speaker of the House of Venezuela, Señor G. Manrique Pacanins. [Applause.]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolutions 53 and 54

Resolved, That the following Members of the House be elected chairmen and members of the several standing committees of the House, as follows:

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee (interposing). Does the gentleman regard it as important that they be read or would it do to insert them in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. TILSON. Of course, that can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It will save time.

Mr. TILSON. I have no objection. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the list of committees as presented by the Republican committee on committees for majority places be elected without reading.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same procedure be followed as to the minority members of committees named in the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent that the Members named in the respective resolutions be declared elected as members of the several standing committees of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Connecticut made the request that those Members be elected to committees who had been recommended by the Republican committee on committees?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has that action been approved by the Republican caucus?

Mr. TILSON. Without a protest or objection, this can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand, but I mean, has the action of the committee on committees been approved by the Republican caucus?

Mr. TILSON. No; and it was not done two years ago, the same action being then taken by unanimous consent.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Then the gentleman's committee does not consult the Members of the majority party about it?

Mr. TILSON. We surely do consult them, and we feel that the Members of the majority party have confidence in our committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the list of committees for the real minority party also be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; the entire third party in the House will be printed in the committee lists in capital letters, following the majority members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The list of the chairmen and members of the several standing committees of the House is as follows:

MAJORITY COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Accounts.—Clarence MacGregor (chairman), of New York; Charles L. Underhill, of Massachusetts; Randolph Perkins, of New Jersey; Benjamin M. Golder, of Pennsylvania; Carl G. Bachmann, of West Virginia; U. S. Guyer, of Kansas; and Charles A. Kading, of Wisconsin.

Agriculture.—Gilbert N. Haugen (chairman), of Iowa; Fred S. Purnell, of Indiana; Thomas S. Williams, of Illinois; Charles J. Thompson, of Ohio; John C. Ketcham, of Michigan; Thomas Hall, of North Dakota; Harcourt J. Pratt, of New York; Franklin W. Fort, of New Jersey; Franklin Menges, of Pennsylvania; August H. Andresen, of Minnesota; Charles Adkins, of Illinois; John D. Clarke, of New York; Clifford R. Hope, of Kansas; and Victor S. K. Houston, of Hawaii.

Banking and Currency.—Louis T. McFadden (chairman), of Pennsylvania; Edward J. King, of Illinois; James G. Strong, of Kansas; Robert Luce, of Massachusetts; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; E. Hart Fenn, of Connecticut; Guy E. Campbell, of Pennsylvania; Elmer O. Leatherwood, of Utah; Carroll L. Beedy, of Maine; Joseph L. Hooper, of Michigan; John C. Allen, of Illinois; and Godfrey G. Goodwin, of Minnesota.

The Census.—E. Hart Fenn (chairman), of Connecticut; Clarence J. McLeod; of Michigan; Hays B. White, of Kansas; Lloyd Thurston, of Iowa; Frederick W. Magrady, of Pennsylvania; Henry L. Bowles, of Massachusetts; Florence P. Kahn, of California; Albert Johnson, of Washington; Daniel A. Reed, of New York; Hubert H. Peavey, of Wisconsin; Robert H. Clancy, of Michigan; J. Howard Swick, of Pennsylvania; and C. G. Selvig, of Minnesota.

The Civil Service.—Frederick R. Lehlbach (chairman), of New Jersey; Addison T. Smith, of Idaho; Ernest W. Gibson, of Vermont; Joe J. Manlove, of Missouri; Lloyd Thurston, of Iowa; Carl G. Bachmann, of West Virginia; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota; George J. Schneider, of Wisconsin; Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; Robert H. Clancy, of Michigan; and Cyrus M. Palmer, of Pennsylvania.

Claims.—Charles L. Underhill (chairman), of Massachusetts; Willis G. Sears, of Nebraska; Joseph D. Beck, of Wisconsin; Roy G. Fitzgerald, of Ohio; Scott Leavitt, of Montana; Henry R. Rathbone, of Illinois; Ed. M. Irwin, of Illinois; Harry E. Rowbottom, of Indiana; U. S. Guyer, of Kansas; John C. Schafer, of Wisconsin; Robert G. Bushong, of Pennsylvania; Katherine Langley, of Kentucky; and Thomas C. Cochran, of Pennsylvania.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Randolph Perkins (chairman), of New Jersey; Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana; Lloyd Thurston, of Iowa; Florence P. Kahn, of California; W. T. Fitzgerald, of Ohio; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; George J. Schneider, of Wisconsin; W. H. Sproul, of Kansas; Louis Monast, of Rhode Island; and Dan A. Sutherland, of Alaska.

Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.—Edward H. Wason (chairman), of New Hampshire.

District of Columbia.—Frederick N. Zihlman (chairman), of Maryland; Charles L. Underhill, of Massachusetts; Clarence J. McLeod, of Michigan; Ernest W. Gibson, of Vermont; Edward M. Beers, of Pennsylvania; Henry R. Rathbone, of Illinois; Gale H. Stalker, of New York; Frank R. Reid, of Illinois; Henry L. Bowles, of Massachusetts; Frank L. Bowman, of West Virginia; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; Albert R. Hall, of Indiana; and Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio.

Education.—Daniel A. Reed (chairman), of New York; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; E. Hart Fenn, of Connecticut; Florence P. Kahn, of California; Edgar R. Kiess, of Pennsylvania; Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey; Wallace H. White, jr., of Maine; Elmer O. Leatherwood, of Utah; Willis G. Sears, of Nebraska; Benjamin M. Golder, of Pennsylvania; Henry L. Bowles, of Massachusetts; and Louis Monast, of Rhode Island.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.—Hays B. White (chairman), of Kansas; Charles L. Gifford, of Massachusetts; Randolph Perkins, of New Jersey; Arthur M. Free, of California; W. T. Fitzgerald, of Ohio; Frank L. Bowman, of West Virginia; Henry R. Rathbone, of Illinois; and Cyrus M. Palmer, of Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 1.—Don B. Colton (chairman), of Utah; Carroll L. Beedy, of Maine; F. D. Letts, of Iowa; Godfrey G. Goodwin, of Minnesota; Charles A. Kading, of Wisconsin; and Robert G. Bushong, of Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 2.—Bird J. Vincent (chairman), of Michigan; Randolph Perkins, of New Jersey; Henry R. Rathbone, of Illinois; Carl G. Bachmann, of West Virginia; U. S. Guyer, of Kansas; and Joe Crail, of California.

Elections No. 3.—Charles L. Gifford (chairman), of Massachusetts; Willis G. Sears, of Nebraska; Charles Brand, of Ohio; Albert R. Hall, of Indiana; Richard J. Welch, of California; and Thomas C. Cochran, of Pennsylvania.

Enrolled Bills.—Guy E. Campbell (chairman), of Pennsylvania; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Joe J. Manlove, of Missouri; and Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments.—William Williamson (chairman), of South Dakota; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; Carroll L. Beedy, of Maine; Don B. Colton, of Utah; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; Godfrey G. Goodwin, of Minnesota; F. D. Letts, of Iowa; John C. Schafer, of Wisconsin; J. Russell Leech, of Pennsylvania; and Thomas C. Cochran, of Pennsylvania.

Flood Control.—Frank R. Reid (chairman), of Illinois; Charles F. Curry, of California; Roy G. Fitzgerald, of Ohio; William F. Kopp, of Iowa; Philip D. Swing, of California; Willis G. Sears, of Nebraska; James A. Frear, of Wisconsin; James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota; Gale H. Stalker, of New York; Frederick M. Davenport, of New York; U. S. Guyer, of Kansas; C. G. Selvig, of Minnesota; and Thomas C. Cochran, of Pennsylvania.

Foreign Affairs.—Stephen G. Porter (chairman), Pennsylvania; Henry W. Temple, of Pennsylvania; James T. Begg, of Ohio; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Hamilton Fish, jr., of New York; Cyrenus Cole, of Iowa; Morton D. Hull, of Illinois; Joseph W. Martin, jr., of Massachusetts; Charles A. Eaton, of New Jersey; Henry Allen Cooper, of Wisconsin; Edward E. Browne, of Wisconsin; Franklin F. Korell, of Oregon; and Melvin J. Maas, of Minnesota.

Immigration and Naturalization.—Albert Johnson (chairman), of Washington; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee; Hays B. White, of Kansas; Arthur M. Free, of California; Bird J. Vincent, of Michigan; Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio; Benjamin M. Golder, of Pennsylvania; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; George J. Schneider, of Wisconsin; Elbert S. Brigham, of Vermont; Carl G. Bachmann, of West Virginia; Katherine Langley, of Kentucky; and J. Mitchell Chase, of Pennsylvania.

Indian Affairs.—Scott Leavitt (chairman), of Montana; W. H. Sproul, of Kansas; Gale H. Stalker, of New York; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; William Williamson, of South Dakota; F. D. Letts, of Iowa; Elbert S. Brigham, of Vermont; Hubert H. Peavey, of Wisconsin; Samuel S. Arentz, of Nevada; W. T. Fitzgerald, of Ohio; Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts; Harry L. Englebright, of California; Cyrus M. Palmer, of Pennsylvania; and Dan A. Sutherland, of Alaska.

Insular Affairs.—Edgar R. Kiess (chairman), of Pennsylvania; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; Carroll L. Beedy, of Maine; Charles L. Underhill, of Massachusetts; Elbert S. Brigham, of Vermont; Albert R. Hall, of Indiana; Lloyd Thurston, of Iowa; Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; Frederick W. Magrady, of Pennsylvania; Joseph L. Hooper, of Michigan; Richard J. Welch, of California; and Felix Cordova Davila, of Porto Rico.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—James S. Parker (chairman), of New York; John G. Cooper, of Ohio; Edward E. Denison, of Illinois; Schuyler Merritt, of Connecticut; Carl E. Mapes, of Michigan; Walter H. Newton, of Minnesota; Homer Hoch, of Kansas; Adam M. Wyant, of Pennsylvania; Olger B. Burtness, of North Dakota; John E. Nelson, of Maine; Thomas J. B. Robinson, of Iowa; Milton C. Garber, of Oklahoma; Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana; and James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania.

Invalid Pensions.—W. T. Fitzgerald (chairman), of Ohio; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; Edward M. Beers, of Pennsylvania; Elbert S. Brigham, of Vermont; John M. Nelson, of Wisconsin; Edgar R. Kiess, of Pennsylvania; Daniel A. Reed, of New York; Hays B. White, of Kansas; Frank L. Bowman, of West Virginia; Frederick W. Magrady, of Pennsylvania; Katherine Langley, of Kentucky; C. G. Selvig, of Minnesota; and Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin.

Irrigation and Reclamation.—Addison T. Smith (chairman), of Idaho; Nicholas J. Sinnott, of Oregon; Elmer O. Leatherwood, of Utah; Scott Leavitt, of Montana; Charles E. Winter, of Wyoming; Philip D. Swing, of California; Samuel S. Arentz, of Nevada; John C. Allen, of Illinois; and Frederick M. Davenport, of New York.

Judiciary.—George S. Graham (chairman), of Pennsylvania; Leonidas C. Dyer, of Missouri; William D. Boies, of Iowa; Charles A. Christopherson, of South Dakota; Richard Yates, of Illinois; Ira G. Hersey, of Maine; Earl C. Michener, of Michigan; Andrew J. Hickey, of Indiana; J. Banks Kurtz, of Pennsylvania; C. Ellis Moore, of Ohio; George R. Stobbs, of Massachusetts; James French Strother, of West Virginia; Fiorello H. LaGuardia, of New York; and Homer W. Hall, of Illinois.

Labor.—William F. Kopp (chairman), of Iowa; Frederick N. Zihlman, of Maryland; Joe J. Manlove, of Missouri; Harry E. Rowbottom, of Indiana; Richard J. Welch, of California; Joseph D. Beck, of Wisconsin; Addison T. Smith, of Idaho; Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana; Guy E. Campbell, of Pennsylvania; James G. Strong, of Kansas; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee; E. Hart Fenn, of Connecticut; and Cyrus M. Palmer, of Pennsylvania.

The Library.—Robert Luce (chairman), of Massachusetts; John C. Allen, of Illinois; and Frederick M. Davenport, of New York.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Wallace H. White, jr. (chairman), of Maine; Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey; Arthur M. Free, of California; Charles Brand, of Ohio; Frank R. Reid, of Illinois; Charles L. Gifford, of Massachusetts; Harry E. Rowbottom, of Indiana; Frederick M. Davenport, of New York; Frederick W. Magrady, of Pennsylvania; Frank L. Bowman, of West Virginia; Robert H. Clancy, of Michigan; Louis Monast, of Rhode Island; Charles A. Kading, of Wisconsin; and Dan A. Sutherland, of Alaska.

Military Affairs.—John M. Morin (chairman), of Pennsylvania; W. Frank James, of Michigan; Harry C. Ransley, of Pennsylvania; Harry M. Wurzbach, of Texas; Louis A. Frothingham, of Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee; John C. Speaks, of Ohio; J. Mayhew Wainwright, of New York; James P. Glynn, of Connecticut; Allen J. Furlow, of Minnesota; William R. Johnson, of Illinois; James A. Hughes, of West Virginia; Harold G. Hoffman, of New Jersey; and Victor S. K. Houston, of Hawaii.

Mines and Mining.—John M. Robsion (chairman), of Kentucky; William Williamson, of South Dakota; Don B. Colton, of Utah; Charles E. Winter, of Wyoming; W. H. Sproul, of Kansas; Joe J. Manlove, of Missouri; Samuel S. Arentz, of Nevada; Harry L. Englebright, of California; Charles L. Gifford, of Massachusetts; J. Russell Leech, of Pennsylvania; and Dan A. Sutherland, of Alaska.

Naval Affairs.—Thomas S. Butler (chairman), of Pennsylvania; Fred A. Britten, of Illinois; George P. Darrow, of Pennsylvania; Clark Burdick, of Rhode Island; A. Piatt Andrew, of Massachusetts; John F. Miller, of Washington; Roy O. Woodruff, of Michigan; Ralph E. Updike, sr., of Indiana; Fletcher Hale, of New Hampshire; W. E. Evans, of California; Charles Tatgenhorst, jr., Ohio; Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey; Clarence E. Hancock, of New York; and Victor S. K. Houston, of Hawaii.

Patents.—Albert H. Vestal (chairman), of Indiana; Randolph Perkins, of New Jersey; Clarence J. McLeod, of Michigan; Godfrey G. Goodwin, of Minnesota; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; F. D. Letts, of Iowa; Harry I. Englebright, of California; and Robert G. Bushong, of Pennsylvania.

Pensions.—Harold Knutson (chairman), of Minnesota; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; William F. Kopp, of Iowa; Elmer O. Leatherwood, of Utah; Gale H. Stalker, of New York; Joe J. Manlove, of Missouri; Nicholas J. Sinnott, of Oregon; Wallace H. White, jr., of Maine; Hubert H. Peavey, of Wisconsin; Albert R. Hall, of Indiana; Richard J. Welch, of California; J. Howard Swick, of Pennsylvania; and J. Mitchell Chase, of Pennsylvania.

Post Office and Post Roads.—W. W. Griest (chairman), of Pennsylvania; C. William Ramseyer, of Iowa; Archie D. Sanders; of New York; Samuel A. Kendall, of Pennsylvania; Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania; Elliott W. Sproul, of Illinois; Laurence H. Watres, of Pennsylvania; Frank H. Foss, of Massachusetts; David Hogg, of Indiana; John T. Buckbee, of Illinois; I. H. Doutrich, of Pennsylvania; Frank P. Bohn, of Michigan; E. T. England, of West Virginia; and Victor S. K. Houston, of Hawaii.

Printing.—Edward M. Beers (chairman), of Pennsylvania; and Edgar R. Kiess, of Pennsylvania.

Public Buildings and Grounds.—Richard N. Elliott (chairman), of Indiana; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee; Daniel A. Reed, of New York; William F. Kopp, of Iowa; Gale H. Stalker, of New York; Charles Brand, of Ohio; Clarence J. McLeod, of Michigan; Ed. M. Irwin, of Illinois; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; Henry L. Bowles, of Massachusetts; Frederick W. Magrady, of Pennsylvania; J. Howard Swick, of Pennsylvania; and Joe Crail, of California.

The Public Lands.—Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman), of Oregon; Addison T. Smith, of Idaho; Don B. Colton, of Utah; Charles E. Winter, of Wyoming; Scott Leavitt, of Montana; Phil D. Swing, of California; Samuel S. Arentz, of Nevada; F. D. Letts, of Iowa; Joseph L. Hopper, of Michigan; Charles L. Gifford, of Massachusetts; Harry L. Englebright, of California; Robert G. Bushong, of Pennsylvania; Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin; and Victor K. Houston, of Hawaii.

Revision of the Laws.—Roy G. Fitzgerald (chairman), of Ohio; Willis G. Sears, of Nebraska; Frank R. Reid, of Illinois; Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts; John M. Nelson, of Wisconsin; Charles A. Kading, of Wisconsin; J. Russell Leech, of Pennsylvania; and Robert G. Bushong, of Pennsylvania.

Rivers and Harbors.—S. Wallace Dempsey (chairman), of New York; Richard P. Freeman, of Connecticut; Nathan L. Strong, of Pennsylvania; James J. Connolly, of Pennsylvania; M. A. Michaelson, of Illinois; W. M. Morgan, of Ohio; William E. Hull, of Illinois; George N. Seger, of New Jersey; W. W. Chalmers, of Ohio; Albert E. Carter, of California; Grant M. Hudson, of Michigan; Robert G. Houston, of Delaware; and Henry F. Niedringhaus, of Missouri.

Roads.—Cassius C. Dowell (chairman), of Iowa; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; Clarence MacGregor, of New York; Charles Brand, of Ohio; Joe J. Manlove, of Missouri; Don B. Colton, of Utah; W. H. Sproul, of Kansas; Henry L. Bowles, of Massachusetts; John M. Nelson, of Wisconsin; Robert H. Clancy, of Michigan; C. G. Selvig, of Minnesota; Thomas C. Cochran, of Pennsylvania; and Joe Crail, of California.

Rules.—Bertrand H. Snell (chairman), of New York; Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Thomas S. Williams, of Illinois; Fred S. Purnell, of Indiana; Earl C. Michener, of Michigan; Harry C. Ransley, of Pennsylvania; C. William Ramseyer, of Iowa; and Louis A. Frothingham, of Massachusetts.

The Territories.—Charles F. Curry (chairman), of California; Albert Johnson, of Washington; Cassius C. Dowell, of Iowa; Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania; James G. Strong, of Kansas; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; Ernest W. Gibson, of Vermont; Ed. M. Irwin, of Illinois; Florian Lampert, of Wisconsin; Bird J. Vincent, of Michigan; Harry L. Englebright, of California; Louis Monast, of Rhode Island;

J. Russell Leech, of Pennsylvania; Dan A. Sutherland, of Alaska; and Victor S. K. Houston, of Hawaii.

War Claims.—James G. Strong (chairman), of Kansas; Charles E. Winter, of Wyoming; Joseph L. Hooper, of Michigan; James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota; Hubert H. Peavey, of Wisconsin; Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; Edward M. Beers, of Pennsylvania; Florence P. Kahn, of California; Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio; Louis Monast, of Rhode Island; J. Mitchell Chase, of Pennsylvania; and Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin.

World War Veterans' Legislation.—Royal C. Johnson (chairman), of South Dakota; Robert Luce, of Massachusetts; Randolph Perkins, of New Jersey; Roy G. Fitzgerald, of Ohio; Bird J. Vincent, of Michigan; Ernest W. Gibson, of Vermont; Ed. M. Irwin, of Illinois; Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts; Frederick R. Lehlback, of New Jersey; E. Hart Fenn, of Connecticut; J. Howard Swick, of Pennsylvania; Joe Crail, of California; and J. Mitchell Chase, of Pennsylvania.

MINORITY COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Accounts.—Ralph Gilbert, of Kentucky; Clarence Cannon, of Missouri; Emanuel Celler, of New York; and Lindsay C. Warren, of North Carolina.

Agriculture.—James B. Aswell, of Louisiana; David H. Kincheloe, of Kentucky; Marvin Jones, of Texas; Fletcher B. Swank, of Oklahoma; Hampton P. Fulmer, of South Carolina; Thomas L. Rubey, of Missouri; Thomas A. Doyle, of Illinois; and John McSweeney, of Ohio.

Appropriations.—William W. Hastings, of Oklahoma; Fred M. Vinson of Kentucky; and John J. Casey, of Pennsylvania.

Banking and Currency.—Otis Wingo, of Arkansas; Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama; Charles H. Brand, of Georgia; William F. Stevenson, of South Carolina; Eugene Black, of Texas; T. Alan Goldsborough, of Maryland; Anning S. Prall, of New York; and Harry C. Canfield, of Indiana.

Census.—John E. Rankin, of Mississippi; Arthur H. Greenwood, of Indiana; Ralph F. Lozier, of Missouri; Meyer Jacobstein, of New York; Samuel Rutherford, of Georgia; Henry D. Moorman, of Kentucky; James M. Fitzpatrick, of New York; and Rene L. De Rouen, of Lousiana.

Civil Service.—Lamar Jeffers, of Alabama; Emanuel Celler, of New York; Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia; Gordon Browning, of Tennessee; Brooks Fletcher, of Ohio; William I. Sirovich, of New York; Orie S. Ware, of Kentucky; and Leslie J. Steele, of Georgia.

Claims.—John C. Box, of Texas; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, of North Carolina; Loring M. Black, jr., of New York; Emanuel Celler, of New York; Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; C. B. Hudspeth, of Texas; Leslie J. Steele, of Georgia; and Orie S. Ware, of Kentucky.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—B. G. Lowrey, of Mississippi; Edgar Howard, of Nebraska; Andrew L. Somers, of New York; John J. Douglass, of Massachusetts; Bolivar E. Kemp, of Louisiana; R. A. Green, of Florida; Vincent L. Palmisano, of Maryland; and O. J. Kvale, of Minnesota.

Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.—R. A. Green, of Florida.

District of Columbia.—Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas; Ralph Gilbert, of Kentucky; William C. Hammer, of North Carolina; Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey; Joseph Whitehead, of Virginia; William P. Cole, jr., of Maryland; and George H. Combs, jr., of Missouri.

Education.—B. G. Lowrey, of Mississippi; Loring M. Black, jr., of New York; John J. Douglass, of Massachusetts; Brooks Fletcher, of Ohio; Vincent L. Palmisano, of Maryland; Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia; Rene L. De Rouen, of Louisiana; and O. J. Kvale, of Minnesota.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.—Lamar Jeffers, of Alabama; Ralph F. Lozier, of Missouri; Samuel Rutherford, of Georgia; John N. Norton, of Nebraska; and Patrick J. Carley, of New York.

Elections No. 1.—Edward E. Eslick, of Tennessee; William J. Sears, of Florida; and William S. O'Brien, of West Virginia.

Elections No. 2.—Gordon Browning, of Tennessee; T. Webber Wilson, of Mississippi; and John J. Douglass, of Massachusetts.

Elections No. 3.—Guinn Williams, of Texas; John H. Kerr, of North Carolina; and Heartsill Ragon, of Arkansas.

Enrolled Bills.—Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas; Mell G. Underwood, of Ohio; and Miles C. Allgood, of Alabama.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments.—Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas; William C. Hammer, of North Carolina; Allard H. Gasque, of South Carolina; Meyer Jacobstein, of New York; James B. Reed, of Arkansas; John J. Cochran, of Missouri; William S. O'Brien, of West Virginia; and James T. Igoe, of Illinois.

Flood Control.—Riley J. Wilson, of Louisiana; William J. Driver, of Arkansas; Luther A. Johnson, of Texas; William L. Nelson, of Missouri; W. M. Whittington, of Mississippi; E. E. Cox, of Georgia; J. Earl Major, of Illinois; and William V. Gregory, of Kentucky.

Foreign Affairs.—J. Charles Linthicum, of Maryland; Charles M. Stedman, of North Carolina; Tom Connally, of Texas; R. Walton Moore, of Virginia; Martin L. Davey, of Ohio; David J. O'Connell, of New York; Sam D. McReynolds, of Tennessee; and Sol Bloom, of New York.

Immigration and Naturalization.—Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; John C. Box, of Texas; Samuel Dickstein, of New York; Samuel Rutherford, of Georgia; John W. Moore, of Kentucky; Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina; John M. Evans, of Montana; and R. A. Green, of Florida.

Indian Affairs.—William J. Sears, of Florida; John M. Evans, of Montana; Edgar Howard, of Nebraska; Sam B. Hill, of Washington; John Morrow, of New Mexico; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas; Everette B. Howard, of Oklahoma; and Wilburn Cartwright, of Oklahoma.

Insular Affairs.—Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Guinn Williams, of Texas; Frank Gardner, of Indiana; Heartsill Ragon, of Arkansas; T. Webber Wilson, of Mississippi; Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; Butler B. Hare, of South Carolina; and Ralph Gilbert, of Kentucky.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Sam Rayburn, of Texas; George Huddleston, of Alabama; Clarence F. Lea, of California; Tilman B. Parks, of Arkansas; Robert Crosser, of Ohio; Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Nebraska; Parker Corning, of New York; Jacob L. Milligan, of Missouri; and George C. Peery, of Virginia.

Invalid Pensions.—Mell G. Underwood, of Ohio; Ralph F. Lozier, of Missouri; Arthur H. Greenwood, of Indiana; William L. Carss, of Minnesota; Andrew L. Somers, of New York; James F. Fulbright, of Missouri; John N. Norton, of Nebraska; and James M. Fitzpatrick, of New York.

Irrigation and Reclamation.—C. B. Hudspeth, of Texas; William C. Lankford, of Georgia; James B. Reed, of Arkansas; Miles C. Allgood, of Alabama; Sam B. Hill, of Washington; John Morrow, of New Mexico; Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona; and S. Harrison White, of Colorado.

Judiciary.—Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas; Andrew J. Montague, of Virginia; John N. Tillman, of Arkansas; Fred H. Dominick, of South Carolina; Samuel C. Major, of Missouri; Royal H. Weller, of New York; William B. Bowling, of Alabama; Zebulon Weaver, of North Carolina; and Henry St. George Tucker, of Virginia.

Labor.—William P. Connery, jr., of Massachusetts; Meyer Jacobstein, of New York; William L. Carrs, of Minnesota; Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey; Everett Kent, of Pennsylvania; George H. Combs, jr., of Missouri; James T. Igoe, of Illinois; and Leslie J. Steele, of Georgia.

Library.—Ralph Gilbert, of Kentucky; and Alfred L. Bulwinkle, of North Carolina.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee; Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia; Clay Stone Briggs, of Texas; William W. Larsen, of Georgia; Tom D. McKeown, of Oklahoma; George W. Lindsay, of New York; Charles L. Abernethy, of North Carolina; and Oscar L. Auf der Heide, of New Jersey.

Military Affairs.—Percy E. Quin, of Mississippi; Hubert F. Fisher, of Tennessee; William C. Wright, of Georgia; Daniel E. Garrett, of Texas; John J. McSwain, of South Carolina; John J. Boylan, of New York; Lister Hill, of Alabama; and Virgil Chapman, of Kentucky.

Mines and Mining.—Arthur H. Greenwood, of Indiana; Mell G. Underwood, of Ohio; Joseph Whitehead, of Virginia; Andrew L. Somers, of New York; Butler B. Hare, of South Carolina; and Everett Kent, of Pennsylvania.

Naval Affairs.—Carl Vinson, of Georgia; James V. McClintic, of Oklahoma; Herbert J. Drane, of Florida; Patrick Henry Drewry, of Virginia; Morgan G. Sanders, of Texas; John F. Quayle, of New York; Stephen W. Gambrill, of Maryland; and Clyde Williams, of Missouri.

Patents.—Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas; William C. Hammer, of North Carolina; James B. Reed, of Arkansas; Mell G. Underwood, of Ohio; William C. Lankford, of Georgia; Jeff Busby, of Mississippi; Allard H. Gasque, of South Carolina; and William I. Sirovich, of New York.

Pensions.—William C. Hammer, of North Carolina; Allard H. Gasque, of South Carolina; Clarence Cannon, of Missouri; John W. Moore, of Kentucky; Frank Gardner, of Indiana; Henry D. Moorman, of Kentucky; Patrick J. Carley, of New York; and Tom A. Yon, of Florida.

Post Office and Post Roads.—Thomas M. Bell, of Georgia; James M. Mead, of New York; Milton A. Romjue, of Missouri; William W. Arnold, of Illinois; John H. Morehead, of Nebraska; J. Zach Spearing, of Louisiana; Frank Oliver, of New York; and Thomas S. McMillan, of South Carolina.

Printing.—William F. Stevenson, of South Carolina.

Public Buildings and Grounds.—Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas; Edward B. Almon, of Alabama; John H. Kerr, of North Carolina; Jeff Busby, of Mississippi; Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia; Edward E. Eslick, of Tennessee; Charles G. Edwards, of Georgia; and William W. Cohen, of New York.

Public Lands.—John M. Evans, of Montana; Sam B. Hill, of Washington; John Morrow, of New Mexico; Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona; Tom A. Yon, of Florida; Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma; John N. Norton, of Nebraska; and S. Harrison White, of Colorado.

Revision of the Laws.—Alfred L. Bulwinkle, of North Carolina; Loring M. Black, jr., of New York; William P. Connery, jr., of Massachusetts; Samuel Dickstein, of New York; and Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia.

Rivers and Harbors.—Joseph J. Mansfield, of Texas; John McDuffie, of Alabama; John J. Kindred, of New York; Homer L. Lyon, of North Carolina; Joseph T. Deal, of Virginia; James O'Connor, of Louisiana; Stanley H. Kunz, of Illinois; and Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio.

Roads.—Edward B. Almon, of Alabama; William J. Sears, of Florida; C. B. Hudspeth, of Texas; Frank Gardner, of Indiana; Clarence Cannon, of Missouri; Bolivar E. Kemp, of Louisiana; Charles G. Edwards, of Georgia; and Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina.

Rules.—Edward W. Pou, of North Carolina; Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee; William B. Bankhead, of Alabama; and John J. O'Connor, of New York.

Territories.—William C. Lankford, of Georgia; John E. Rankin, of Mississippi; Guinn Williams, of Texas; Brooks Fletcher, of Ohio; Heartsill Ragon, of Arkansas; Bolivar E. Kemp, of Louisiana; Everett Kent, of Pennsylvania; and Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma.

War Claims.—B. G. Lowrey, of Mississippi; Miles C. Allgood, of Alabama; Edward E. Eslick, of Tennessee; Butler B. Hare, of South Carolina; Joseph Whitehead, of Virginia; Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia; Paul J. Moore, of New Jersey; and William W. Cohen, of New York.

World War Veterans' Legislation.—Alfred L. Bulwinkle, of North Carolina; John E. Rankin, of Mississippi; Lamar Jeffers, of Alabama; Gordon Browning, of Tennessee; William P. Connery, jr., of Massachusetts; Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey; Edgar Howard, of Nebraska; and James F. Fulbright, of Missouri.

ADDRESS OF HON. R. WALTON MOORE

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a very able and scholarly address delivered by Hon. R. WALTON MOORE, of Virginia, at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Continental Congress meeting in York, Pa. The speech was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] on that occasion as one of the representatives of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon R. WALTON MOORE at York, Pa., on October 24, 1927:

CELEBRATION OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SESSION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS AT YORK, PA.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Long before the Revolution, when there was no thought of independence, many Americans favored the Colonies setting up such a union as might enable them to act together in protecting their frontiers and fostering their development. As early as 1754, about the time the youthful George Washington in British uniform was fighting the French and Indians in the western Pennsylvania wilderness, there was a meeting at Albany of delegates from six of the Colonies to consider Indian troubles, and it was determined to apply to Parliament for authority to form a permanent council of colonial representatives, to be appointed by the Crown, for the purpose of enacting laws of general import, apportioning to the several Colonies their quotas of men and money for military defense; deciding what forts should be built and taking all measures essential for the common safety. But this attempt, which, if successful, might materially have changed the course of future events, proved a failure. Benjamin Franklin, who took part in the meeting, tersely commented that in America the thought was that there was "too much prerogative" in the plan, and in England it was thought to have "too much of the democratic." Later, John Marshall wrote that the plan was refused support in America because it was supposed to place undue power in the hands of the King, and in England because of the apprehension that the Colonial assemblies would be rendered still more formidable by being accustomed to cooperate with each other.

During the struggle for independence it was misgiving of another sort—fear of the sovereignty of the individual States being impaired—which prevented the creation of such a vigorous and effective union as would have saved untold delay and suffering.

The Continental Congress had its definite origin in Virginia action. Twenty years had passed since the gathering at Albany, and in the latter part of that period Parliament enacted statutes representing a new and unjust policy. Protest and repeal followed and then further offensive enactments. The Boston port bill was passed to go into force June 1, 1774. In the spring of that year, the house of burgesses was in session at Williamsburg, the Virginia capital, a town even less in size than York then was, but to be forever remembered as the scene of events which have profoundly affected the progress of the world. A few members of the House conferred upon the expediency of taking formal notice of the Boston situation and agreed to propose that the 1st of June be set aside as "a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer to implore Heaven to avert from us the evils of civil war, to inspire us with firmness in support of our rights and turn the hearts of the King and Parliament to moderation and justice." The resolution was offered May 24, and adopted, but when it was brought to the attention of the royal governor his condemnation was so severe that he at once dissolved the house. Those mainly responsible for what was proposed afterwards served in the Continental Congress. They were Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and the brothers, Richard Henry Lee and Francis Lightfoot Lee, both of whom served here at York. On May 27 they and their fellow members assembled in the public room of the Raleigh Tavern near the Capitol Building and agreed a statement more elaborate and emphatic than the resolution itself, advising that until the grievances of America should be redressed, the purchase and use of tea and other commodities subject to tax should be discontinued. But that was not all. The outstanding feature was the recommendation for "delegates from the several Colonies of British America to meet in general congress at such place annually as shall be thought most convenient, there to deliberate on those general measures which the united interests of America may from time to time require." This was the genesis of the Continental Congress.

Patrick Henry was not only an orator of unexampled power but a leader whose foresight and courage and ability to direct events put him in a class by himself. In a previous month of May, nine years before the assemblage at the Raleigh Tavern, he alone fully estimated the importance of contesting the stamp tax, the first step taken by Parliament in its adventure of taxing the Colonies. Here and there the tax met emphatic disapproval, but the voice of Henry sounded the clear call which met a quick response through all of the sparsely settled country stretching along the Atlantic from New Hampshire to South Carolina. Not yet 30 years old, he had been elected to fill a vacancy in the house of burgesses. When he reached Williamsburg he found opinion uncertain and no one willing to make an open issue. He found the house under the control of men of prominence and wealth who were averse to any act or word bearing any tinge of disloyalty. Not counting what might be the cost to himself, he drew and offered resolutions denouncing the tax as a violation of the principle which had been originally announced by Virginia at Jamestown in the very beginning, even in advance of its announcement in the English petition of right, the principle forbidding taxation without representation. You remember the dramatic story of the consternation of the older members at Henry's eloquence, who according to Jefferson, then a student at William and Mary College, who heard him, seemed "to speak as Homer wrote"; of how Peyton Randolph, the Attorney General, who was to be the first President of the Continental Congress, came out of the house after the resolutions had gone through by a majority of one, and as he passed Jefferson exclaimed, "By God! I would have given 500 guineas for a single vote." You remember how Henry in his speech warned the King of the fate of Cæsar and Charles I and of his defiant attitude when he was met with the cry of treason. Soon the Colonial governor, writing to England, said that "in the course of the debates I have heard that very indecent language was used by Mr. Henry, a young lawyer who had not been above a month a member of the house, and who carried all the young members with him." One of those young members was George Washington, who as President of the United States was to testify his abiding confidence in the man whose leadership he that day followed by offering him great offices, among them the office of Secretary of State and the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. It was the voice of Henry that rang out and was heard everywhere. The effect is thus recently summarized by a distinguished New England historian: "All contemporary observers agree as to the tremendous and almost instantaneous effect on the public of the resolutions published in the papers. * * * A very frenzy took possession of the colonists." After Henry's death a memorandum in his own handwriting was discovered on an envelope in which he had inclosed the original resolutions: "The alarm," he wrote, "spread throughout America with astonishing quickness and the ministerial party was overwhelmed. The great point of resistance to British America was universally established in the Colonies. This brought on the war which finally separated the two countries and gave independence to ours. Whether this will prove a blessing or a curse will depend upon the use our people make of the blessings which a gracious God has bestowed on us. If they are wise, they will be great and happy; if they are of a contrary character, they will be miserable. Righteousness alone can exalt them as a nation."

The recommendation of a permanent Continental Congress had the weight of the most populous and influential of the Colonies. The total population of the country was then some 3,000,000, of whom about half a million were in Virginia. Other Colonies fell into line, and thus an approach toward unity and concert of action was insured.

Each Colony determined for itself the number of its delegates, their length of service, and their compensation. There was not and under the conditions could hardly have been possible any definition of the powers of the Congress. The governmental organizations of the Colonies were different; they were different in their religious, social, and political beliefs, and they were troubled with controversies among themselves; the only means of communicating with each other were sailing vessels and horses and vehicles traveling wretched roads; their literature was mainly derived from the mother country. The newspapers were few and poor. They were of little consequence in comparison with the pamphleteers headed by Tom Paine, whose philippics had enormous effect, and never more so than when the Congress was sitting here. With

reference to the newspapers, that they sadly lacked in enterprise and eagerness is shown by a resolution of the Congress at York authorizing a committee "to take the most speedy and effectual methods for getting a printing press erected in this town for the purpose of conveying to the public the intelligence that Congress may from time to time receive," which I believe was not accomplished. Such is the barest outline of conditions which made impossible a common basis on which the Congress might not only speak for all the colonists but act for all in exerting real powers of government.

When the delegates met in Philadelphia in September, 1774, it was under instructions which were diverse in substance and form, but in general simply looking to measures being considered which the Colonies might adopt for the purpose of checking the aggression of the ministers and agents of the Crown, without denying the duty and obligation of loyalty to the Crown. Of greater unity, Henry was the chief advocate. Before going to Philadelphia, the freeholders of his own county addressed him a public letter containing the words, perhaps dictated by himself, "United we stand, divided we fall," an expression then, so far as I know, employed for the first time. On the second day of the session, he declared, "I am not a Virginian but an American." He believed union necessary because he was hopeless of receiving justice from Great Britain. He said, "She will drive us to extremities; no accommodation will take place; hostilities will soon commence and a desperate and bloody touch it will be." Of Henry's attitude John Adams, long a great figure in the Congress and not by any means an overgenerous critic, said: "In the Congress of 1774, there was not one member, except Patrick Henry, who appeared to me sensible of the precipice, or rather the pinnacle, on which he stood, and had candor and courage enough to acknowledge it." A year later, when the thought of independence was still by no means general, Henry, in his rôle of pioneer and prophet, addressing the Virginia convention of 1775, said "There is no longer any room for hope * * * An appeal to the God of Battles is all that is left us," and throwing aside any consideration of personal safety passionately exclaimed, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Looking back, it can be said of this marvelous man that he was never mistaken in his conception of American rights or in his predictions as to what the future held in store.

No historian has comprehensively dealt with the Continental Congress. The casual student who tries to give even a very general idea of what it was is disturbed by the very mass or data he is compelled to survey. There are the 25 large volumes in which the Journal is thus far printed; innumerable official documents pertaining to civil and military affairs, and official and private correspondence ranging in every direction. In the beginning it acted in subordination to the Crown and to the several Colonies. After independence was declared, it acted in subordination to the several States. It was not a factor in a dual system of government, for there was no such system. It was the servant of 13 governments, each claiming and excising the powers of sovereignty. It could cooperate with each of the States, but it could not control or compel all or any of them. What it did was subject to their individual objection and this was even practically true of its conduct of the relations between the imperfect union which it symbolized and the nations of Europe. The character of the Congress is well described in the oft-quoted statement of Adams. Adams described it as "Not a legislative body nor a representative body, but only a diplomatic body." It was in the literal meaning of the word a parliament, a talking body, and it was under the same disadvantage which tended to discredit the Senate of the United States in the first six years of the latter's existence. Its sessions were secret. Wise action taken behind closed doors and eloquent speeches which nobody heard were wasted on a suspicious public. Its own realization of the need of some degree of central authority being devised was evidenced by the diligence with which, in the midst of its other labors, it toiled on the work consigned to it by the States of framing the Articles of Confederation in order to provide a more perfect Union. But the result of this work did not receive the sanction of all of the States until March, 1781. Under the circumstances it was the best expedient within reach, and even though it was hardly more than a rope of sand, it proved strong enough, and this is to the everlasting honor of the Congress, to hold the States together after the close of the Revolution, pending the establishment of the Union as it now is.

Notwithstanding its infirmities, the Congress was a necessary agency, performing a service beyond measure in value. In answer to all the criticism for delinquencies largely inherent in conditions and unavoidable, there is certainly this which is beyond denial: No assemblage at any time has ever more strongly and clearly, and with such lasting impression, set forth the fundamental rights to which individuals and political communities are entitled. I am thinking of the declaration of grievances, the address to the people of Great Britain, and the address to the King, adopted by the First Congress, which won the admiration of the most enlightened statesmen of England, who were outspoken in applauding the sagacity and courage of their kinsmen on this side of the Atlantic. And, of course, I am thinking of that later declaration which will forever hold its rank among all the political utterances of our race.

Turn for a moment to the events which led up to the great transaction of July 4, 1776. Williamsburg is again the theater. It is again the month of May, of that year, and all about the little town is the beauty of the Virginia spring. The convention is in session, and the Virginia statesmen, with George Mason at the front and Henry exerting his powerful influence, frame a constitution, including what we have come to call the bill of rights, which gives Mason enduring fame, the first written constitution ever promulgated creating a complete system of government. And then there is passed a resolution instructing the Virginia Delegates in Congress to propose to that body to declare the United Colonies free and independent States, absolved from all allegiance to or dependence upon the Crown or Parliament of Great Britain. The flag immediately designated as "the Union flag of the American States" is unfurled from the capitol; there is a military parade; the resolutions are read to the soldiers; and that night the town is illuminated. And then soon came the Declaration of Independence, which is coupled with an announcement of the principles of human liberty, a restatement of American rights, and the principles of national liberty.

And this further of the memorable transactions of the Congress: Before independence was declared, but after open conflict had occurred and the sword had begun to write the record of the Revolution, there was one thing sufficient to overbalance all shortcomings and mistakes—the appointment of Washington as commander in chief of the American Army. The motion was made by Adams June 15, 1775, and when Washington stepped out of the room it was unanimously adopted, and the next day Washington came back and in a few simple words accepted the trust. We may wonder what would have been the end of the Revolution, and following the Revolution the destiny of the country, except for the Virginia planter, who will continue for all time the loftiest figure in the history of the Republic. It was Adams who also said the final word which intrusted to Thomas Jefferson the preparation of the Declaration of Independence. Richard Henry Lee had moved the resolution for the appointment of the committee and was then called away. Adams and Jefferson were members of the committee. Each suggested the other for the work of preparation, but Adams insisted that it should be done by a Virginian and that the fittest Virginian was Jefferson.

There was no more serious period than those months in which the Congress sat here. It had been forced away from Philadelphia. Ahead were years of difficulty and doubt. The fate of the Revolution was in a trembling and perilous balance. There could be no vision of the distant event at the other town of York where the British flag was to droop in despair. Behind was the gathering gloom which had become thick darkness, relieved only by the flashing of guns on the battle fields where the most extreme valor could not avoid defeat. No catalogue of the discouraging conditions can be attempted now. But there is one fact, the significance of which is not always completely had in mind. The menace was twofold. There were the armies of trained and seasoned troops sent from England, with such equipment as the patriots could not parallel. And, besides, there were numberless Americans loyal to the Crown and willing to oppose by every conceivable means the success of the patriotic cause. They organized regiments and companies; they refused assistance to their countrymen and they took every opportunity to furnish assistance to the invaders. After the Revolution Adams estimated that at least one-third of the entire population had been Tory. When he sent this estimate to Chief Justice McKean, of Pennsylvania, who had served in the Congress at York and elsewhere, McKean concurred, but expressed the opinion that the Tories included more than one-third of the wealthy and influential people.

Here at York the darkness began to lessen and the light appear. The notable victory at Saratoga was won, paving the way for the treaties which made France our ally. On the other hand, there were the bitter ordeal at Valley Forge and the effort to displace the Commander in Chief. The principals in the Conway cabal were selfish and unscrupulous wreckers, but it is easy to understand that far better men, who would cheerfully have given their lives for the success of the Revolution, blinded by the glamour with which by distorting the facts Gates was able to surround himself, were sincerely convinced that a change was demanded. They were not wholly familiar with how much Washington had done to insure the victory; the inestimable value of his campaign in New Jersey and Pennsylvania; his direction or supervision of the campaign against Burgoyne; and the importance of his action in sending to the North the force of practiced riflemen under the command of his fellow Virginian, Col. Daniel Morgan, except for whom, and Arnold, the inefficient Gates would never have brought about the surrender of the British Army. That the evil scheme miscarried was due, as we all know, to Washington's quiet exposure of the duplicity of Gates and to the steadfast loyalty of Lafayette to his chief. Perhaps the building is not preserved where the banquet was held here in January, 1778, with the aim of consolidating opinion in favor of Washington's overthrow. But who can ever

forget how at the moment when the tide seemed to be running all one way against Washington, the young Frenchman rose from his seat at the table and rebuked the plotters by proposing a toast to the health of the Commander in Chief? No event in the annals of historic York is more worthy of the art of some great painter.

Coincident with the session here, there was not only what occurred at Saratoga and in France, but the light was breaking elsewhere.

Washington's fellow Virginian, who may be regarded as the progenitor of the American Navy, was showing that the Americans must be reckoned with on the sea as well as on the land. The delegates who were considering here on April 27, 1778, the means of suppressing disaffection could not know that on that very day the English newspapers began to notice with alarm the daring exploits of John Paul Jones on their coast, and how throughout the year they were to stress the peril in which he was placing their ports and commerce. Another of Washington's fellow Virginians, a gifted and daring soldier, was at the same time holding and defeating the British forces in the West, beyond the Alleghenies. The delegates who were considering here on June 24, 1778, the proper observance of the second anniversary of the Declaration of Independence could not know that on that very day George Rogers Clark was marching against the fort at Kaskaskia, Ill., and arranging the capture of other British strongholds in that region.

Some contemporary observers, whose opinion has since been echoed by many, ascribe the growing weakness of the Continental Congress, its loss of support and prestige, to the fact that it came to be composed of men of less ability than those who had formerly served. Alexander Hamilton, dwelling on this circumstance, in a letter to Washington, said, "Each State, in order to promote its own internal government and prosperity, has selected its best members to fill the offices within itself, and conduct its own affairs * * *. This is a most pernicious mistake and must be corrected." But Hamilton himself, who was highly qualified for congressional service, thought he should remain with the Army. He obeyed what he regarded as the call of duty, like Washington, Henry, Jefferson, and many of their colleagues in the earlier sessions who could not escape entering other fields where their services were imperatively demanded. Hamilton's letter was dated February 13, 1778, and he might have moderated his expression could he have looked in on the delegates here engaged that very day from early morning into the late evening on matters of the utmost importance.

It is not true that the delegates who served here or subsequently were inadequate to the work. Consider the Virginia delegates at York. If they are not to be counted in the group to which Washington, Henry, and Jefferson belong, they at least belong to a second group, indicated in an address made by Mr. Hoar a long time ago when he was a Senator from Massachusetts. Speaking of Virginia, he said: "Notwithstanding the splendid constellation of burning and blazing names which she gave to the country during the period of the Revolution and in framing and inaugurating the Constitution, if by some miracle they had been gathered together in one room, we will say in the year 1777 or 1780, and had perished in one calamity, Virginia could have supplied their places and have maintained almost entirely the same preeminence." Before naming the Virginia delegates, let me suggest that you consult the journals to see the variety of the business dealt with at York, the regularity of the sessions, and the protracted hours employed in the work, however large or small the attendance. And little imagination is required to understand the inconveniences to which the members were subject. The accommodations must have been extremely meager. Even the food supply was anything but ample, as appears from a letter of Richard Henry Lee, who wrote that he lived mainly on a diet of wild pigeons and his health suffered. John Adams wrote: "When I asked leave of Congress to make a visit to my constituents it was my intention to decline the next election and return to my practice at the bar. * * * All my emoluments as a Member of Congress for four years had not been sufficient to pay a laboring man upon my farm."

Who, then, at York were the delegates from my own State? None of them were inferior men. Forgotten by the historians are John Bannister, Thomas Adams, and John Harvie, but they all had gained distinction in the service of their State. The qualities of another, Joseph Jones, the Government of the United States has acclaimed by publishing his correspondence, which was largely with Washington, Madison, and Monroe, showing the power of his mind and his valuable contribution to the Revolutionary struggle and the formation of our institutions. The memory of the other three is enduring, and not simply because they were signers of the Declaration of Independence, whose author was their close associate and friend. One of them was Benjamin Harrison, the ancestor of two of our Presidents. When the delegates to the first Continental Congress were chosen, he had the distinction of being put in the list which included Washington and Henry. He was for years a Member of Congress and the honor fell to him as chairman of the Committee of the Whole to report the resolution appointing the committee to draft the Declaration of Independence and the instrument itself when ready for consideration. You know the story of Franklin remarking that if the delegates who signed the Declaration did not hang together, they would hang separately. Harrison had something of Franklin's sense of humor. He was portly, and Mr. Gerry was slender and thin. Turning to the latter as they were signing, Harrison said, "When the hanging scene comes on, I shall have the advantage of you. It will be over with me in a minute, but you will be kicking in the air half an hour after I am gone." When a successor to Peyton Randolph, President of the Congress and Harrison's kinsman, was about to be chosen, and all eyes were turned on John Hancock, Harrison seized Hancock in his arms and placing him in the chair, said, "We will show Mother Britain how little we care for her by making a Massachusetts man our President whom she has excluded from amnesty by public proclamation." An evidence of how he was regarded by his own State is that three times he was elected its governor in what some one has called the Athenian days of Virginia.

The name of Lee is as inseparable from the history of Virginia as the name of Washington. Upon some of its most shining pages that name is written, and through the story of the Revolution it runs like a golden thread. So much has been written of Richard Henry Lee and so much of his correspondence remains that it is unnecessary to say more of him than that he was the finest orator of the Revolution, except Henry, and one of the greatest statesmen who sat in the Congress at York, of which at another time he was President. His brother, Francis Lightfoot Lee, who was with him here, was equal in intellectual force and unsparing diligence. Another brother, Henry Lee, with Franklin, was representing the country in Paris when John Adams was sent from here to cooperate with them in negotiating the treaties. In the years to come, when he was reviewing the events with which he had been connected, Adams wrote of the Lees. He lauded the merits of Richard Henry Lee as too well known to need recounting. "They need," he wrote, "no illustration by me." Francis Lightfoot Lee he described as "a man of great reading well understood, of sound judgment, and inflexible purpose in the cause of his country." Then in a more tender vein he refers to Arthur Lee as "a man of whom I can not think without emotion, a man too early in the service of his country to avoid a multiplicity of enemies; too honest, upright, faithful, and intrepid to be popular; too often obliged by his principles and interests to oppose Machiavellian intrigues to avoid the destiny he suffered. This man never had justice done him by his country in his lifetime, and I fear he never will have by posterity." Of the same family was the soldier and statesman, Light Horse Harry Lee. All of these Lees were born near Wakefield, at the Stratford house in Westmoreland, Washington's native county. In that Virginia home, I may be permitted to say, at a later time was born another, the son of Light Horse Harry Lee, the wonderful soldier and stainless gentleman who commanded the armies of the Southern Confederacy.

If I have seemed to stress unduly the importance of Virginia and Virginians in the Revolutionary era, such has not been my purpose. I have had no other thought than to recall some of the noble memories of the common devotion, sacrifices, and achievements of the people of the thirteen original States, who laid the foundation of our great Republic, which has the faith and hope of us all—a more perfect Union than was dreamed of by those gathered here in York 150 years ago, the most perfect Union which the genius of man has created.

HEROISM OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on the first day we assembled here the press of the country carried on their front pages accounts of two of the greatest feats of rescue from shipwreck in the annals of the Coast Guard. Within a short distance of each other about the same time in my district, off the stormy coast of North Carolina, the Norwegian steamship *Cibao* and the Greek steamship *Paraguay* were destroyed, and the saving of their crews by the unparalleled heroism of the Coast Guard is described as one of the most remarkable achievements in the history of the service.

At a later date during the present session it is my purpose to address the House on the United States Coast Guard, the noblest service in the world. I shall endeavor at that time to point out the needs and aspirations of the service, and to show how this great organization, founded for the sake of humanity, has been so shamefully neglected by Congress. I hope that to-morrow morning every Member of the House will read what I am now inserting in the RECORD, and it will give them a greater appreciation of a work that has no press agents and where duty is the only word they know. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD letters of commendation of the work of the Coast Guard from the masters of these two foreign ships and a newspaper account of the rescues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

HATTERAS, N. C., *December 5, 1927.*

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am herewith forwarding a copy of my letter of commendation to Coast Guard headquarters and hope that it will meet with your favorable approval in regards to the great heroic work performed by the officers in charge and crews of Cape Hatteras, Creeds Hill, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Coast Guard stations in rescuing the lives of 24 souls forming the crew of the stranded Norwegian steamship *Cibao*, wrecked on Hatteras Inlet Bar December 4, 1927, when we were in a very dangerous position.

I request further that anything that can be done for these men in way of comment from your Government can not be too strong for the great work they performed in this case.

Respectfully yours,

M. MYLANDER,
Master Norwegian Steamship Cibao.

HATTERAS, N. C., *December 5, 1927.*

COMMANDANT U. S. COAST GUARD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the officers of the Norwegian steamship *Cibao*, wrecked on Hatteras Inlet Bar December 4, 1927, during severe storm, wish to extend our most heartfelt appreciations of the noble and daring rescue performed by the officers in charge and crews of Ocracoke, Hatteras Inlet, Creeds Hill, and Cape Hatteras stations. This rescue was made under a very hazardous condition through one of the most dangerous surfs that any bunch of men could ever plan such a noble piece of work, and going through the ordeal without even a mishap to any man.

This is to be looked upon as a heroic deed that could be performed by none other except they be courageous, brave, and experienced members of such a noble service as the United States Coast Guard, of which these men boast of their membership.

We wish to state further that this rescue was not a mere matter of these men launching their boats and coming to our assistance and their work finished, then soon forgotten by all concerned. Not so! It is to be long remembered that we lay in a helpless condition in a bed of high-rolling breakers and strong current.

Knowing that our plight was a very sad one for a crew of a ship to be placed in, it never dawned on our minds that there was such a brave bunch of rescuers in our midst that could ever master such high breakers that enveloped our ship. But our sad hearts were soon made glad to see the brave men with their rescuing boats approaching. At once we knew that we were safe by the way they maneuvered, and the means established to make the rescue—which was performed by a life line from the ship to the rescuing boat. Being 24 men in our crew, each individual had to be dragged through the breakers by means of a line for the distance of about 100 yards. There being more than one trip to make to get the crew off, each trip was made with equal skill, until three hazardous trips were made, and every man safely on shore.

In our opinion these men are deserving the very highest recognition possible that can be afforded by your department, as they have well proven their ability in this case. It is our earnest desire that the Norwegian Government, of which we are subjects, give these men the recognition due them for saving the lives of 24 of our nationals.

Respectfully yours,

O. HANSEN.
M. MYLANDER, *Master.*

"S. S. PARAGUAY,"
Piraeus (Greece).

To the HEADQUARTERS U. S. COAST GUARD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Please convey through your office on behalf of me as master of the wrecked ship, also on behalf of myself, officers, and the surviving crew, our gratitude and many thanks to Capt. W. H. Lewark and the guardsmen under his command of the Kill Devil Hill, also Kitty Hawk for the heroic deeds performed by them to save me, my officers, and my crew, and also for all the assistance given to us during our stay there.

It is my duty when I am returning to Greece not to fail to report to my authorities whatever was done to us in the predicament we were in.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed) MASTER OF S. S. "PARAGUAY."

% ZIMMERMAN,
15 Moore St., New York.

[From the Independent, Elizabeth City, N. C., December 9, 1927]

COAST GUARDS LIVING UP TO OLD-TIME TRADITIONS—SURFMEN AT HATTERAS AND KILL DEVIL HILL ACQUIT THEMSELVES HEROICALLY, SAVING 48 LIVES FROM A RAGING SEA THIS WEEK

The day of the surfmen and the Coast Guard station is not done. We have heard it said that Coast Guard stations will soon be a thing of the past. The wireless telegraph, the radio compass stations along the coast that give ships their exact position, the better lighthouses, whistling buoys, and bells that scream and clang louder and louder with the rising seas to warn the shipmaster of danger, all these they said would some day make the maintenance of Coast Guard stations unnecessary. Some of the surfmen have believed it themselves.

Folks just say they know we don't have the wrecks we used to have, and at any rate they know there aren't as many lives lost. Visitors to the seashore in summer time, when the sun broils down on the sands, when the water is tepid and the breezes are balmy, observe the Coast Guards drowsing in the shade and wonder why the Government keeps them there. The summer-time visitors do not know the beaches in December, when folks who live in steam-heated houses and whose muscles are weak and flabby could not withstand the chilling blast, nor battle against the gale the surfman patrols against. They wouldn't accompany a Coast Guard on a patrol for $500.

The stories we have read of surfmen of other days are not tradition. The day of the lonely Coast Guard on his bitter patrol of a storm-swept beach assailed by biting blasts of sand, drenched with rain, and dragging his way over weary miles is not a thing of the past. Nor are thrilling rescues of human life from lurking death in angry seas events that belong entirely to the obscure chronicles of other days.

Forty-eight foreign seamen, whose lives were snatched from the wrecks of their vessels on the Dare County coast on Sunday of this week, bear grateful witness to these facts. Thousands of miles from home they were, their luckless vessels breaking to pieces under them on the cruel reefs of a foreign land, they clung to their ships, despairing of help, and awaiting a terrible death.

Angry seas swept across the decks, their cries were drowned by the roar of wind and waves as the elements sang their death songs, the cold rain drenched them to the bone; the intense darkness hid the picture of complete despair on their faces.

And then there glimmered through the darkness, faintly at first, but not to be mistaken, the glare of a Coston light in the hands of a lonely man who was trudging along the coast. A surfman making his way with difficulty against the wind, and over the weary miles between the stations where boats and men and food and clothing are kept by the American Government to succor those who may be in distress.

The despairing watchers on the ship saw the signal and knew the Coast Guard had discovered their plight. A hundred men were along the darkened Carolina coast that night, their eyes strained seaward, facing death themselves that they might help others. Sons and grandsons of Coast Guards and native seamen who knew naught else but the calling of the sea.

SAVED 48 LIVES

And 24 men were rescued from the Greek tanker *Paraguay* near Kill Devil Hill, and 24 were saved from the Norwegian fruiter *Cibao* on the dangerous shoals at Hatteras by Coast Guards of the seventh district, who wrote an epic in the annals of the service, by effecting rescues that are conceded to be among the most heroic and thrilling deeds ever performed in the seventh district.

Old surfmen declare it one of the wildest seas and strongest winds in all their experience. The Greek tanker *Paraguay* sprung a leak on Friday. The men had manned the pumps until all were nearly exhausted. Water poured into stern and bow from the big leaks caused by the blows of the heavy seas. The ship was within 60 miles of Cape Henry; she might have made it. But the storm struck her. The waves broke across the vessel, tons and tons of water went into the hold and put out the fires, the power that was driving her was lost, down went the wireless telegraph that might have called for aid; dead went the engine that operated the lights that might have signaled for help. The lifeboats were swept from their davits.

The helpless ship drifted like a stray cork, the ripping of her seams sounded above the roar of the storm, she trembled like a leaf from the pounding of the sea. The men were working at the pumps. Four were swept overboard in the darkness, unknown to their comrades. And then the vessel struck bottom some 300 yards from shore, her bow high out of the water. Every man ran to the bow, where they huddled together in the darkness.

She was 2 miles north of Kill Devil Hill Station. Opposite the spot where the Wright Aviation Memorial is to be built. A surfman saw her, he notified the station. W. H. Lewark, boatswain's mate and officer in charge, mustered his men. He sent word down the line and moved his equipment up the beach, but no boat could put to sea in the storm.

Keeper Lewark and his men signaled to the men on the ship to make ready to catch a line. The surfmen on the beach planted their cannon.

A number four shotline was bent on and fired toward the vessel. It went unerring in its course across the rigging, and fell into the hands of the sailors.

THE FIRST LINE BROKE

The surfmen ashore bent on the whip block hawser and hauling tackle, one end of which was made fast on the beach. The sailors began to pull it toward them. Surely here was the gear that would take them all to safety. But it did not reach them. The shotline parted and the gear fell back in the sea.

Meanwhile Keeper Walter Etheridge, of Nags Head Station, and Keeper S. D. Guard, of Kitty Hawk, and their men arrived to help. A second line was shot across the bow of the vessel which had long since broken in two. With this line the sailors hauled in the tackle, and made it fast to their rigging.

One at a time the sailors were brought ashore without mishap, until all the 24 remaining men of the crew were saved. As fast as one was clear of the breeches buoy, it went back for another. One sailor came ashore carrying a pet rooster. All were pounded and drenched by the seas but none severely injured.

"I never saw a more grateful set of shipwrecked men," declares Commander Littlefield, who visited the station shortly after the rescue. "The captain declares he will carry a piece of the shotline that saved him away with him and treasure it as something sacred. He also says he will bring the rescue to the attention of the Greek Government on his return to Alexandria, believing that the surfmen of Kill Devil Hill will be given suitable recognition.

"It was a remarkable rescue, for not a man was lost," adds Commander Littlefield. "And it was performed under terrible conditions, if we would judge from the sea, which was extremely rough even 24 hours later."

Down below Cape Hatteras, the "graveyard of the sea," a rescue more dramatic, more risky, and thrilling and dangerous in every respect took place. Two miles out on the treacherous shoals near the inlet the *Cibao*, a Norwegian fruit steamer, was driven ashore by the gale. Twenty-four men, out in the raging ocean, despaired of help and were becoming resigned to a tragic end. The *Cibao* presented a problem more difficult than that of the *Paraguay*. It was impossible to fire a line from shore. No man could have lived through that surf, even though a breeches buoy could have been used.

A DANGEROUS PASSAGE

Any surfmen who attempted to make their way from Hatteras Inlet to the *Cibao* took their lives in their hands. No man could row against the seas. Only a power surfboat could make the trip. The pausing of the motor for a few seconds might have meant sudden death, for without power to hold it up in the wind the boat might have easily drifted out of the deeper water and onto a shoal where it would have capsized and every man have been swept overboard.

It was an heroic rescue. Charles O. Peel, of Hatteras Inlet; James H. Garrish, or Ocracoke; W. H. Barnett, of Creeds Hill; B. R. Ballance, of Cape Hatteras stations, all keepers, with a picked crew led the rescue. Taking a lifeboat in tow of a motor surfboat, they made the perilous trip out to sea. The sea was too rough to permit them to go alongside the *Cibao*. A wave would have caught the small boat and dashed it to bits against the side of the ship.

And so a rope was sent across the intervening water to the *Cibao*. One by one the men went over the side and made their way along the rope, each with a smaller rope around his own body, and as he came beside the surfboat the Coast Guards pulled him aboard. Three trips were made from shore to ship before the crew were rescued. "It was one of the greatest rescues I ever heard of," declared Commander Littlefield. "I don't believe you would find worse conditions anywhere under which to effect a rescue."

One Elizabeth City woman was fortunate enough to see the heroic work of the Coast Guards at Kill Devil Hill when the Greek tanker *Paraguay* came ashore Sunday. Mrs. Alice K. Grice, who was down on the beach for the week end, says:

"You would have been proud of the splendid way the Coast Guard handled their work. Captain Lewark, at Kill Devil Hill station, was assisted in the rescue work by Capt. Walter Etheridge, of Nags Head station, and his crew, and Captain Guard and Surfman Perry, of the Kitty Hawk Station. They had to use the breeches buoy, and it took 15 to 20 minutes to bring each man in through the water. The *Paraquay* was sailing from New York to Seville under the command of Captain Katulas. The ship broke in two when she struck the beach. The waves were breaking over it. I wouldn't have missed seeing the rescue for anything. I wish everyone who doesn't know of the work the Coast Guard does could have seen it. The whole picture was wonderful—the surf pounding the beach, whitecaps as far as you could see, and the wind blowing a hurricane, and real men working hard to save the lives of others. It was the most thrilling thing to see, and I wish it could be thrown on the screen."

WARREN EXPRESSES PLEASURE

Congressman LINDSAY C. WARREN got a real thrill on his arrival in Washington Monday morning when the United States Coast Guard office called him up to congratulate him on the splendid work done by his home folks, the surfmen of the first congressional district. Mr. WARREN was so glad to hear the news of their splendid work that he sent a telegram of commendation to all three stations. All of the stations are in Mr. WARREN'S district, and all three crews are personal friends of the first district Congressman. Mr. WARREN considers the rescues two of the most conspicuous examples of heroism in the annals of the Coast Guard.

The fact that the unusual rescues were made at this time is of especial interest to Mr. WARREN by reason of the fact that he has been planning for several months to make a speech in Congress concerning the work of the Coast Guard. Mr. WARREN has been much displeased at the disregard shown an honorable and able service as a result of burdening it with the enforcement of the prohibition laws, and it is his idea to present the Coast Guard in a different light from that in which the service is held in some sections of the country.

Admiral F. C. Billard, commandant of the Coast Guard, on Monday dispatched the following wire to District Commander O. A. Littlefield at this city:

"I am much gratified to learn of the splendid work of Kill Devil Hill, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke stations in the rescue made yesterday. Communicate immediately to the stations my congratulations and commendations."

WHERE WRECKS ARE WRECKS MUTILATED BODIES WASH ASHORE

Two bodies, supposedly of the seamen who had washed overboard, were found this week, one badly mutilated while the other was in better condition and bore a ring with the letters "A. M." engraved on it. The bodies were found near Oregon Inlet, and were so badly beaten by the surf that there is no means of positively identifying them.

The crew of the *Cibao* are standing by at Hatteras Inlet, according to last report. They were hopeful that the vessel might be salvaged, but she has been driven so far across the shoals that it is now doubtful that this can be accomplished. However, they will remain at Hatteras several days more, it is stated.

The wreck at Kitty Hawk took place just a half century after the wreck of the U. S. S. *Huron*, which landed 8 miles farther southward November 31, 1877, 2 miles north of Nags Head Station. Ninety-eight officers and men lost their lives in the wreck of the *Huron*.

At that time the Coast Guard stations were not active except from December 1 to some time during the spring months, and when the *Huron* stranded at 1 o'clock in the morning during a severe storm, all the surfmen were at their homes. No help came until early in the forenoon, and at that little could be done except to pull on land the bodies as they washed ashore. Only 48 lives were saved.

There were no funds to provide suitable equipment, and what the stations had at that time was inadequate and there was no means to drag it up the beach.

The tragedy of the *Huron*, which aroused the country to sense the neglect its seamen were subject to, was increased by the fact that the first superintendent of the Coast Guard, Lieut. John J. Guthrie, lost his life while attending the wreck.

THOSE WHO AIDED

The men of several stations of the Coast Guard of the Seventh District played a gallant part in the rescues of the seamen, and their work brought praise from Commandant F. C. Billard, who wired district headquarters at Elizabeth City of his commendation, and asked that the men at each station be commended. In the rescue work at Hatteras Inlet, the Hatteras Inlet Station, in charge of Boatswain Charles O. Peel, the son of a veteran surfman, was assisted by Ocracoke, Creeds Hill Station, and Cape Hatteras Station. Kill Devil Hill Station, in charge of W. H. Lewark, boatswain's mate (L), was assisted by the men of Nags Head and Kitty Hawk Stations. Dennis Twiford and Aubrey Harris, surfmen of Caffeys Inlet Station, residing at Kitty Hawk, who were on leave at the time, volunteered their services and worked all day Sunday with the men at Kill Devil Hill Station, rescuing the seamen from the Greek tanker.

The stations and crews taking part in these rescues are as follows: Kitty Hawk: S. D. Guard, officer in charge, and Surfman W. C. Perry; Kill Devil Hill: W. H. Lewark, officer in charge, John Westcott, W. S. Dough, E. J. Baum, T. T. Tillett, M. L. Tillett, S. G. Austin, D. I. Dowdy; Nags Head Station: W. G. Etheridge, officer in charge, C. C. Jones, G. B. Midgett, S. G. Basnight, Ellis Midgett, Paul Midgett, Norman Etheridge, Robert Baum, John Farrow, C. H. Barnett, Ellsworth Midgett, Andrew Williams; Cape Hatteras: B. R. Ballance, officer in charge, T. Barnett, W. L. Barnett, Noah E. Price, Andrew Gray, L. D. Midgett, W. R. Midgett, G. H. Whedbee, Geo. Gaskins, John L. Barnett, B. M. Jennette, and C. F. Midgett; Creeds Hill: W. H. Barnett, officer in charge, F. W. Miller, J. T. Tolson, O. W. Austin, A. M. Austin, S. S. Fulcher, E. B. Ballance, C. W. Stowe, and S. A. Stowe; Hatteras Inlet: C. O. Peel, officer in charge, Willie Austin, Erskine Oden, Ernest Austin, John S. Austin, Charles Styron, Bennie S. Etheridge, and Roscoe Burrus; Ocracoke: J. H. Garrish, officer in charge, H. J. Williams, M. P. Guthrie, H. H. Howard, L. B. Williams, R. F. O'Neal, Homer Howard, S. Garrish, G. B. Gaskins, D. Willis, and T. B. Wahab.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BECK], on account of the serious illness of Mrs. Beck.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, after the reading of the Journal on Thursday morning next, to speak to the House for 15 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman amend his request by asking this permission in case consideration of the revenue bill is finished?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. All right; I will do that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the gentleman wants to talk about.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Oh, divers and sundry subjects, principally with reference to the bill I have introduced providing for a joint reunion of the survivors of the armies of the blue and the gray in Washington next year. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for one moment in order to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the legislative counsel of the House and Senate, together with the legislative counsel of the Treasury, has prepared a print of the new revenue bill and the present law which is available to all the Members, and which I think we will find very useful. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to submit another unanimous-consent request. The bill which we have presented is in different form, as Members have observed, with certain cross references and headings and subheadings, and in case there is any amendment it is quite possible these cross references or headings or subheadings may have to be changed, and to avoid the necessity of going back at the end of the bill, I ask unanimous consent, as stated in the request which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa submits a request, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

That when the House has completed its consideration of H. R. 1, the pending revenue bill, that the Clerk may be authorized—

(1) To make necessary changes in numbers and letters in all headings and subheadings and in any cross references thereto.

(2) To strike out cross references that have become erroneous or superfluous and insert cross references made necessary or convenient by reason of changes made by the House.

(3) Where amendments adopted to the bill do not conform in style, typography, and indentation to the style of the bill as printed, to make such corrections as may be necessary to produce such conformity.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman a question, and couple with this question the statement that there is one feature of the bill in which I am very much interested. I have had no time in general debate, and I want to ask the chairman if he proposes to be liberal in the matter of time on the reading of the bill. I would like about 15 minutes, and I would like to know what will be the policy of the chairman in that regard.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The policy has always been to be very liberal in such matters and the policy will not be changed, but I can not say positively at this time, not knowing what the gentleman wants to talk about or the situation we are going to be in at that time. Of course, I am not able to make the gentleman a promise of 15 minutes, but I will do what I can.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1, the revenue bill, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, all time in general debate has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill by sections.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object to reading the bill by sections. I am just as anxious to facilitate the passage of this bill as the gentleman from Iowa, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with the statement that I have cooperated with him. Except where there are differences and I want to offer amendments, I am going to contribute what I can toward expediting the passage of the bill. I do not know what the rule really would be, but I do want to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that when we reach provisions of the bill where there is a serious effort made at a constructive or fundamental amendment that the gentleman give ample opportunity for us to suggest amendments to any paragraph of any one of the sections. With that statement, of course, I have no objection to reading the bill by sections.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that in reading the bill the table of contents printed on pages 2 and the following may be omitted, as it is not necessary to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that in the reading of the bill the table of contents on pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and a portion of page 7 be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, the Chair has not put the other part of the request that the bill be read by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not necessary.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think it is usual to read it by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that neither the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] nor the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] have any objection to the bill being read by sections.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But there are 433 other Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it ought to be read by sections. The Chair understands that that is a matter largely within the discretion of the Chair, subject, of course, to the will of the committee on appeal.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it not necessary under the rule to read it by paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not so understand it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I may be in error, but my impression is that it is very unusual indeed to include an index as a part of the law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is unusual.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Why is it done in this case?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It was done when the Judicial Code was enacted.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There was probably some necessity for it in that case.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is very useful here in my judgment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Undoubtedly an index is useful; but the question is whether you want the index as a part of the law.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That was what they did when they enacted the Code, and if they did it in the Code we can do it here. If it is beneficial why should it not be done?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Ordinarily the index goes to the back and this is at the beginning where the reader can see what is included.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I asked the same question the other day, and I was informed that it was so done in the Judicial Code. I said if we can do it in the code we can do it here, and it is undoubtedly of value so that when a man picks up the law he can see what is in it without having to go to other law books that publish an index.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk reading the bill read as follows:

SEC. 12. SURTAX ON INDIVIDUALS

(a) RATES OF SURTAX.—There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every individual a surtax as follows:

Upon a net income of $10,000 there shall be no surtax; upon net incomes in excess of $10,000 and not in excess of $14,000, 1 per cent of such excess.

Forty dollars upon net incomes of $14,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $14,000 and not in excess of $16,000, 2 per cent in addition of such excess.

Eighty dollars upon net incomes of $16,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $16,000 and not in excess of $18,000, 3 per cent in addition of such excess.

One hundred and forty dollars upon net incomes of $18,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $18,000 and not in excess of $20,000, 4 per cent in addition of such excess.

Two hundred and twenty dollars upon net incomes of $20,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $20,000 and not in excess of $22,000, 5 per cent in addition of such excess.

Three hundred and twenty dollars upon net incomes of $22,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $22,000 and not in excess of $24,000, 6 per cent in addition of such excess.

Four hundred and forty dollars upon net incomes of $24,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $24,000 and not in excess of $28,000, 7 per cent in addition of such excess.

Seven hundred and twenty dollars upon net incomes of $28,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $28,000 and not in excess of $32,000, 8 per cent in addition of such excess.

One thousand and forty dollars upon net incomes of $32,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $32,000 and not in excess of $36,000, 9 per cent in addition of such excess.

One thousand four hundred dollars upon net incomes of $36,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $36,000 and not in excess of $40,000, 10 per cent in addition of such excess.

One thousand eight hundred dollars upon net incomes of $40,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $40,000 and not in excess of $44,000, 11 per cent in addition of such excess.

Two thousand two hundred and forty dollars upon net incomes of $44,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $44,000 and not in excess of $48,000, 12 per cent in addition of such excess.

Two thousand seven hundred and twenty dollars upon net incomes of $48,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $48,000 and not in excess of $52,000, 13 per cent in addition of such excess.

Three thousand two hundred and forty dollars upon net incomes of $52,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $52,000 and not in excess of $56,000, 14 per cent in addition of such excess.

Three thousand eight hundred dollars upon net incomes of $56,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $56,000 and not in excess of $60,000, 15 per cent in addition of such excess.

Four thousand four hundred dollars upon net incomes of $60,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $60,000 and not in excess of $64,000, 16 per cent in addition of such excess.

Five thousand and forty dollars upon net incomes of $64,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $64,000 and not in excess of $70,000, 17 per cent in addition of such excess.

Six thousand and sixty dollars upon net incomes of $70,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $70,000 and not in excess of $80,000, 18 per cent in addition of such excess.

Seven thousand eight hundred and sixty dollars upon net incomes of $80,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $80,000 and not in excess of $100,000, 19 per cent in addition of such excess.

Eleven thousand six hundred and sixty dollars upon net incomes of $100,000; and upon net incomes in excess of $100,000, in addition 20 per cent of such excess.

(b) Sale of mines and oil or gas wells: For limitation of surtax attributable to sale of mines and oil or gas wells, see section 102.

(c) Capital net gains and losses: For rate and computation of tax in lieu of normal and surtax in case of net incomes of not less than $30,000, approximately, or in case of net incomes, excluding items of capital gain, capital loss, and capital deductions, of not less than $30,000, approximately, see section 101.

(d) Evasion of surtaxes by incorporation: For tax on corporations which accumulate surplus to evade surtax on stockholders, see sections 104 and 105.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 12, after the word "excess," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"And upon net income in excess of $1,500,000, in addition to the tax hereinbefore provided, 30 per cent of said excess."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the original purpose of a progressive income tax as I understand it was not only to provide revenue, but to prevent the concentration of the wealth of the whole country in the hands of a few families. After the amendment to the act of 1924 reducing the surtax on the last bracket from 40 per cent to 20 per cent the real purpose of the income-tax feature of our law was destroyed by limiting the tax to 20 per cent and stopping at $100,000, net income tax.

It has been pointed out in the course of general debate on this bill that a small percentage of taxpayers pay under this provision. That is being constantly used preparatory to a determined effort to abolish entirely our income-tax feature of the law.

Now, I submit that considering the previous income-tax laws we have had which went as high as 60 per cent at the top bracket, and 40 per cent in the 1924 act, that my amendment of 30 per cent on net income in excess of $1,500,000 income is by no means far fetched, radical, or removed from the very purpose of an income-tax policy.

Why, gentlemen, it was said before the committee when we had the 1924 tax bill under consideration that the excess surtax prevented these very few men from investing. I say that if the future development of this country depends entirely on four or five men, we indeed have a sad future before us. The wealth of this country was built up before we had these multimillionaires, with million-dollar incomes, and unless the Congress does something to prevent the accumulation and centralization of wealth you will have all the wealth of the country in the hands of a few families within the next 75 years.

It is our duty to legislate not only for 1928 but for 1958 and 1978, and if we are lax in permitting the real purpose of a progressive income tax to be destroyed, the responsibility will be ours. If we put a tax of only 30 per cent on the amounts in excess of $1,500,000 income, I submit that that is not an unfair burden of taxation. You have to guard very jealously our income-tax feature of the law. Indeed, as I said before, I believe that very soon there will be a determined effort made to abolish the whole income-tax system. I do not believe that will be possible as long as the genial gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] heads the committee, but I bespeak his help in this instance. I hope he will support my amendment, though in that perhaps I am hoping against hope. If the income tax means anything, we should at least catch something on incomes above $1,500,000. I do not go as high as the 40 per cent feature of the 1924 law.

I do not go up to the 60 per cent, but only 30 per cent. That is only 10 per cent more on incomes in excess of $1,500,000. I do not see how any Member can refuse to support this amendment if he believes in the income tax law. Of course, if a Member does not believe in the income tax law, and he wants to bring about a sales tax or a per capita tax, that is a different thing, and to him I can not make any appeal, because we differ on fundamentals; but if you are sincere in your belief in an income tax law, not only for the purpose of raising revenue but for the purpose of accomplishing its real intent, viz, to prevent the centralization of wealth, then I submit my amendment for your serious consideration, and I hope that the committee will vote with me.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] and am compelled to ask that it be rejected by the committee. This amendment was not considered before the committee at all, or anything of its nature. We have not had any proposition of that kind up for consideration whatever. While at one time I voted for higher rates, the Congress through the other body, which I can not mention, refused to make any provision for doing away with tax-exempt securities, and produced an unfair situation by reason thereof. Under the circumstances I am compelled to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not plead surprise in a surtax of 30 per cent on incomes of $1,500,000? There is nothing new involved in my amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We have had that before. Of course it is a jump, it would not be properly graded in that way, and while the rates are not put in the provision in the bill, they are just the same as last year. The maximum surtax rate was 20 per cent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not want to say that my amendment involves anything so novel that the committee is taken by surprise.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The committee did not consider anything of that kind or any proposition like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. LAGUARDIA), there were—ayes 37, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13 TAX ON CORPORATIONS

(a) Rate of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every corporation, a tax of 11½ per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income provided in section 26.

(b) Exempt corporations: For corporations exempt from tax, see section 103.

(c) Improper accumulation of surplus: For tax on corporations which accumulate surplus to evade surtax on stockholders, see sections 104 and 105.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, after line 6, insert:

"(b) Taxable income not more than $15,000: If the amount of the net income in excess of the credits provided in section 26 is not more than $15,000, then, in lieu of the rate prescribed in subsection (a), the rate shall be—

"(1) Five per cent if such amount is not more than $7,000.

"(2) Seven per cent if such amount is more than $7,000 and not more than $12,000.

"(3) Nine per cent if such amount is not more than $12,000 and not more than $15,000."

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am offering an amendment which I believe will meet with the approval of 90 per cent of the membership of the House. I have talked with a great many Republicans and Democrats, and I have not been able to find a single one who does not think that the smaller corporations with earnings of from $15,000 or $20,000 a year down ought to get some relief in their tax for several reasons, and especially for the reason that in their business they are in competition with partnerships of similar capital and earnings. The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony before the committee recommended that we adopt the policy of giving such corporations the alternative, where there were 10 stockholders or less, of making a return as a partnership or as a corporation. The committee gave that suggestion very extensive consideration, and if you will let your mind run along for a moment you will see that that plan is not workable, that a graduated tax will accomplish the same purpose in a better way than by permitting them the alternative method of making returns.

This amendment provides that where a corporation has an income of $10,000 or less the rate of tax on it shall be 5 per cent instead of 11½ per cent; that where a corporation has $15,000 of income or less, but over $10,000, the tax shall be 7 per cent instead of 11½ per cent; and where a corporation has $18,000 or less, but more than $15,000, the rate shall be 9 per cent instead of 11½ per cent; and that where the income is over $18,000 the 11½ per cent shall apply just as it does in this bill. Therefore, the only change that this amendment makes is to give to the smaller corporations an advantage in a rate over larger corporations, that is to say, with larger incomes. There is no new principle involved at all. It is the same principle exactly as is applied to individual incomes. I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] say the other day, that one corporation with a capital of $100,000 might make only $10,000, while another corporation with a capital of $10,000 might make $10,000 income, and that we would be treating both of them the same. So are you in this bill. The 11½ per cent applies. He says we ought to fix it on the valuation. We tried that on the excess profits, and we made a failure of it.

I say to you frankly if you place it on the valuation, the capital investment, the excess-profits tax is the prettiest piece of taxation possible. But it was a failure, could not be administered because you could not ascertain the value of the corporations. We have had some experience with trying to value the railroads for the past 12 years, and we have not completed the valuation yet. I do not know whether you want to give the small corporations a larger amount of relief than the larger corporations, but the small corporations constitute 70 per cent. This amendment affects 70 per cent of the corporations in the United States, as I recall it. Is that correct, Mr. Beeman? I do not recall the exact percentage. It is around 70 per cent of the corporations of this country which have an income of $18,000 and less, so this amendment I propose will reduce the corporation tax lower than proposed by this bill on 70 per cent of the corporations of the country.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I ask for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman state what is the estimate of loss of revenue that would occur from the adoption of his amendment?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I have that. The additional loss of revenue, according to the Treasury Department, will be $24,000,000, so I am informed by Mr. McCoy.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Compared with this bill?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will.

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the gentleman figured the tax on a corporation of an income of $14,900 over an income of over $15,000?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That provision is taken care of in another provision of this bill. They have no trouble about that, because we have a provision in this bill now that a corporation with an income of $28,500 will not pay more than one with an income of $25,000. Mr. Beaman will show it to you.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know that I got the gentleman's amendment clear. Some other gentlemen seem to have the same idea I have. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to corporations with a capital stock of $18,000——

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It does not have anything to do with the capital stock. I can not help the gentleman's inference——

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I have tried to explain it, and I will do it again; that where you have an income—whether you have a billion dollars of capital stock invested, or one dollar—the amendment which I propose will tax a corporation which has an income of $18,000 and less, down to $15,000, 9 per cent, and from $15,000 to $10,000, between that bracket, 7 per cent. Anything less than $10,000 would pay 5 per cent. Now, I think that ought to be very plain. That is all it means.

I do not know whether you want to invoke the same rule of equity, the same rule of justice in reference to corporations you do in reference to individuals, give the little fellow a little the best of it. Take the man of $10,000 and less of income, we do not levy any surtax on him at all. The highest tax is 5 per cent. If it is a just system and equitable in regard to individuals, if it has worked well, why not apply it to small corporations? I am going to listen for that answer with some interest. The principle is the same, it is not faulty in principle. It is a mere question of method. Now, the Treasury does not want this done; it does not want the surtax principle applied to incomes of individuals. I can understand that. I can understand how Mr. Mellon does not like this tax for two reasons. He does not like this principle applied to individuals. He does not want this principle extended to small corporations. All of his corporations are large, and, naturally, he is not for this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will.

Mr. LUCE. Did not the Secretary come before the committee or send in a recommendation that small corporations should receive attention?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, yes.

Mr. LUCE. That is one of the five basic proposals in his statement.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Giving them a privilege of making a report as a corporation or as a partnership.

Mr. LUCE. On that point will the gentleman inform the House whether his proposal takes into account in any way a competition between partnership and a small corporation, and does it go toward putting them on an equal footing?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It has this advantage over the present law: Suppose a corporation is doing business across the street from a partnership. If both of them make $10,000, both of them would pay 5 per cent under my provision. Under the present law it is 13½ per cent and 11½ per cent in this bill on the corporation, and 5 per cent on the partnership. Under my amendment any corporation having income of $10,000 or less would pay 5 per cent. Any individual or partnership would pay about 4 per cent plus.

The partnership just across the street that has $15,000 income would pay about 5¼ per cent under my amendment, if adopted; a corporation that has $15,000 income or less but over $10,000 would be taxed 7 per cent, but in the original bill it would pay 11½ per cent.

Mr. LUCE. Why not equalize them, put them on the same basis?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. You can not absolutely equalize a partnership and a corporation.

Mr. LUCE. Did not the Treasury Department recommend that?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, not by any means.

Mr. LUCE. It was the proposal I called to the attention of the committee years ago.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If you try to work it out, you will find that it has no sense in it.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. If I have an investment of a thousand dollars in a corporation that makes $5,000, and also have an investment of a thousand dollars that makes $75,000, would it be fair to apply your amendment in that case?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Well, I will say there is no man in the world who can draw a perfectly just tax law. I am trying to reach something that is a little better than the present bill.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. But you are making a distinction between the two corporations. If I have $1,000 invested in each why should I pay 11½ per cent on one and 5 per cent on the other?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Well, 80 per cent of the stock of corporations is owned by men in the higher brackets.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. I just want to suggest that the gentleman's proposition is more equitable than that of the Secretary of the Treasury, inasmuch as the Secretary's proposition applies only to a corporation with less than $25,000 which has less than 10 stockholders.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to argue this matter further. I think it is perfectly clear. I do not know whether the committee wants to favor it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This is the most important amendment that could be offered. It is fundamental.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman says he is trying to equalize the tax on corporations and partnerships. Where an individual in business makes as much as $50,000 profit, while the corporation makes a million dollars profit, the corporation has only 11½ per cent to pay under this bill, but the individual conducting the same kind of business, perhaps, that the corporation is conducting begins to run up into the high brackets of the surtax and must pay a higher tax. If he happens to have a substantial income from other sources he is pushed much higher in the surtax brackets and must pay a very much higher rate of tax than does the corporation. What is fair about that?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. No. The gentleman is making a mistake. You have to run to $100,000 before you get to the 11½ per cent. Read the bill. A man paying a tax on $100,000 pays only 11½ per cent surtax.

Mr. TILSON. But even so the adding normal tax makes it 16½ per cent.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes. That is on $100,000. The gentleman said $50,000 was away up yonder higher, which is a mistake.

Mr. TILSON. Is not $68,000 the dividing figure?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I believe so.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. What was the objection to the gentleman's proposition in the committee?

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] points out to me that $48,000 is the dividing line.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That means 11½ per cent.

Mr. TILSON. The surtax on $48,000 is 12 per cent——

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If you add the normal and the surtax together. Look at the tax levies.

They attend to it. The bill says how much it will be. Pick up your bill and look at it. I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] can not read and can not understand it. [Laughter.] He is the man you are getting the information from.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If you will give me a chance, I will read it to you.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, I know; but I can not yield now.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. All you have to do is to read it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If anyone will turn to the bill, on page 12 he will see that there is $11,660 upon net incomes of $100,000. How much per cent is that? Eleven and sixty-six one-hundredths per cent, if I know how to calculate. He did not know that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is only the surtax.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I said the surtax. That is all I mentioned.

Now, Doctor JACOBSTEIN, you asked me why the committee did not adopt it. I submitted it to the conference on the Ways and Means Committee. They believed a good deal in the value of the suggestion, but the Secretary of the Treasury did not believe in it; and, yielding to his judgment, the committee naturally did not adopt it. But I say, if you desire to give any consideration to the small corporation as compared with the large corporation, if you want partially to equalize the partnership and the corporation, this is a step in that direction. No harm is done, and no principle is violated. There is no innovation except as the application is made to individuals. If the little fellow pays a tax that he is less able to pay, the great corporation should not alone be allowed the privilege. That is all I desire to do in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM and Mr. LUCE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LUCE. My justification for addressing myself to this amendment is that, at any rate in part, responsibility attaches to me for having started the controversy. I called attention to the subject three or four years ago when I offered an amendment that was thrown out on a point of order. The proposal of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will not best accomplish the purpose he has in mind and the purpose which the committee has in mind to achieve in any way.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is partly in error on that. It is true the gentleman tried to get the committee to adopt the amendment. Ever since I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee I have been trying to get something done for the small corporation, but I wanted something done that was right, and this is not right.

Mr. LUCE. I do not desire to monopolize credit, but simply to point out that the particular form of change which the Secretary of the Treasury recommended to the committee was substantially that which originally I offered as an amendment and which was thrown out on a point of order. I thank the committee for the concession it has made by increasing the exemption for corporations, and I speak simply to justify myself in objecting to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] by reason of the fact that it does not in any way meet what should be the prime purpose of legislation of this sort, namely, to equalize the competition between partnerships and small corporations. His proposal has no logic in it. There is no principle in the way that he would apply the remedy. It is the wrong remedy, in my judgment, and I should hope that rather than adopt a wrong remedy we would at least accept the partial remedy that the committee has recommended.

Up to the time of the present proposal the lines crossed in this matter of competition at about $25,000. Now, I understand it will be nearly $50,000. Below the crossing point corporations are at a disadvantage in comparison with partnerships. Remedy should be provided for the reason that while a tax bill may not with any logic attempt to meet particular hardships it may well take into account the effect upon the general conditions of business. It would, I think, be universally admitted that the development of the corporation system of doing business in the last generation has been of great benefit to the community and that anything which discourages the chartering of small business enterprises is to be deprecated.

The present situation makes it unwise and imprudent for a small enterprise to take out a charter, because it will be penalized so heavily by the tax law. Inasmuch as we ought to encourage rather than discourage the incorporating of small businesses, I had hoped the committee would see fit to accept the advice of the Secretary in this particular. Possibly in the next revenue bill they may come to that point, but at present it strikes me we would more wisely accept the partial remedy proposed by the committee than embark upon the quite illogical and unscientific program suggested by the gentleman from Texas. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

The committee resumed its session.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, this is the first gun fired upon the integrity of this bill. From now on my good friend, my genial friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER], will be making proposal after proposal by which eventually he hopes to reach the $400,000,000 tax reduction he announced to the people this fall that he was going to give them. This is the beginning of it. This only adds an item of $24,000,000 to our tax reduction. Instead of $232,000,000 of surplus he is going to spend, including this item, $256,000,000, and a little later on he is going to take up the tax on automobiles and add $33,000,000 more, and so on all the way down the line.

His specious argument in favor of this thing is that he is doing something in the interest of the small corporations. I think I may say without violating the ethics of the procedure before the committee that the committee considered this matter. We discussed it very thoroughly, and the committee, of course, did not make this recommendation. It was the desire of the committee to do something in the interest of the small corporation. But I do not know why Members so generally seem to forget that after all a corporation is nothing but individuals. They talk about corporations as if the corporation was some entity outside of the people who own the stock of the corporation. They speak about a corporation on the one hand and a partnership on the other. A corporation is nothing but stockholders, and it is the individuals who compose the corporation who are, of course, concerned in the amount of taxation. Theoretically the tax is collected from the corporation but it is the individual stockholder who pays it, and the individual stockholder pays it whether he is in business as an individual or as a stockholder in a corporation.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] tells you he applies his 9 per cent rate upon a corporation having an income of $12,000 and not more than $15,000. As a matter of fact that corporation has an income of $18,000, because he provides in the beginning of his amendment that—

If the amount of the net income is in excess of the credits provided in section 26—

is not more than so and so, and section 26 provides for the $3,000 exemption to be given to corporations which have incomes of $25,000 or less.

I did not like the proposal of the Treasury Department, because it involved an option. The provision was that a corporation might make its return as a partnership if it saw fit to do so. It left the privilege, the option, and the choice to the corporation to file as a partnership if that method happened to bring it a lesser tax, and I do not like that. I do not think that is good legislation. I do not think we ought to have options in the bill or in the law. I do not believe in the theory of granting options in the law to taxpayers to choose one method one year and then another method another year, as it happens to suit with reference to the amount of tax that might be collected for a particular year.

My attention has been called to partnerships which would like to file their returns as corporations. The members of stock exchanges are not permitted to operate as corporations; they must operate as partnerships, and they would like the privilege of filing their returns as corporations. If we permit the one thing, if we give the option or the choice to corporations on the one hand, of course, we should give it to partnerships on the other.

Now, my friend says that Mr. Mellon—and, of course, Mr. Mellon is always the target of his guns—does not like surtaxes, and still Mr. Mellon approved the present law which provides for the payment of surtaxes by individuals. The gentleman says Mr. Mellon does not care about small corporations, and still Mr. Mellon recommended that small corporations or the corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less be allowed to file as partnerships.

Mr. COLLIER. Provided they had only 10 stockholders.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. Which is the viciousness of the proposition.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The small corporation with either a small income or a small list of stockholders, or both, I presume; but Mr. Mellon recommended that corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less should have the privilege of filing as partnerships, and that would have created a loss in the Treasury of $35,000,000, $11,000,000 more than what the gentleman from Texas proposes.

The committee, after long consideration—and, I dare say, very thorough consideration—decided that the better way was to enlarge the exemption for these smaller corporations.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman does not mean to convey the impression to the House that it took the committee a long time to decide they were not going to give this exemption to the corporations only that had 10 stockholders or less?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not remember how long the consideration was on the particular question of the 10 stockholders.

Mr. COLLIER. That was the gist of the whole thing.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But in section 26 in this bill we have increased the exemption from $2,000 to $3,000 for corporations having an income of $25,000 or less, and this makes an actual saving in money of taxes for each year for such corporations of $115.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman whether there was any limit as to the amount the corporation made, or was it only a limit as to the number of stockholders?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There were two proposals in it. I thought we had made that clear. First, an income of $25,000 or less, and secondly, stockholders of 10 or less; but you are not basing your tax here upon anything but the income of the corporation.

This subject of a graduated tax was discussed very thoroughly here when we repealed the excess-profits tax, and the big argument made then—and I think the large argument now even against the present law—is that the tax is not based upon the capitalization. A corporation with a capital of $100,000 and an income of $25,000 will be treated upon exactly the same basis, will pay exactly the same taxes under the graduated system proposed by the gentleman, as would a corporation with a capitalization of $1,000,000 and an income of $25,000. Of course, I will concede that that is an extension of the present flat rate law, but when you try to graduate the tax, when you try to make steps of it so as to make it dependent upon the amount of income by gradations, you are simply making more vicious the system which now exists, under which we pay no attention to the capitalization of the corporation but tax it only upon its income.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman tell the committee whether the Committee on Ways and Means gave any consideration to the original proposal in that particular, which was to the effect that the election to be taxed as partnerships might be made on the unanimous consent of all the stockholders with no specification of number, the idea being that only a small corporation could secure unanimous consent.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think we considered that in this way. I do not believe that proposal means anything, because if the management of a corporation can induce its stockholders to believe it is to their interest, that they are going to pay less taxes by filing as a partnership, of course, they will get the consent of the stockholders. So I do not think that makes a proper basis at all. They will consent if it is to their interest; they will consent if there is less tax. Personally, I do not think that would be a proper basis for the differentiation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those of us who favor this legislation will have to determine right now whether we are going to begin to emasculate this bill.

This provision adds $24,000,000 to the amount of reduction upon a system and upon a theory which does not come here with the recommendation either of the Committee on Ways and Means or of any of the administrative officers of the Government. It comes here upon the motion of a very distinguished gentleman, but I do not think he has thought it out quite sufficiently to give us any guaranty as to whether it is going to work out equitably and fairly to the corporations which are involved; but it does mean $24,000,000 of reductions, and to that extent will emasculate the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. GIFFORD rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to know if there was any gentleman on the other side who wanted to be heard, because, of course, we are entitled to close the discussion.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman can move to close debate in five minutes and close it himself.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The trouble is I do not like to have both five minutes used on this side.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the gentleman from Iowa ought to presume on which side I am in this controversy, and I do not believe, as the last speaker suggested, that there are to be many amendments offered to the bill. This tax bill is too difficult for most of us to offer amendments, but there are a few simple sections we all understand, and this is one of them.

The Treasury made a recommendation relating to certain small corporations that might profitably be changed into partnership form, and those who have had personal experience well know that many corporations are forced to the partnership method of doing business on account of the high rate of tax.

Certainly, most of us who have had any personal experience or interest in small corporations must realize that this 5, 7, 9 per cent provision will be of great benefit and encouragement to continue under the corporation plan, which has many advantages, especially in the diffusion of ownership.

The argument put forth by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HULL] is that if he has a share in a large corporation it ought to be treated like a small corporation. There is not much equity in the whole bill, so far as that goes, and equity can not be secured under such complicated situations; this is a practical situation.

You say you will lose much revenue by this provision; you do not know. Many who are doing business as small corporations will certainly depart from that method, and we will lose a great deal of revenue. Therefore it is pretty hard to estimate the loss.

Now, the real objections is that it is not desired to begin a graduated tax for corporations. The committee is not unanimous, and we acknowledge the principle involved. It should be applied to small corporations having a very limited number of stockholders, because of the difficulty of securing the consent of all stockholders for a change.

From a practical standpoint we may lose revenue if we do not press this amendment. Farmers who raise crops, doing business as small corporations—and I have one in my mind—would convey the property to individuals if the harvest promised large profits. Therefore I am speaking from the practical standpoint, for the Government as well as the small corporations forced to the partnership method, to save the large assessment of 11½ per cent. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if there are no other speakers on the other side I will move to close debate in five minutes and occupy that five minutes myself.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Go ahead.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate in five minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That is on this one amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying for years to get something done for the small corporations, but I want something logical, something that will not plague us in the future in regard to what ought to be done in other respects.

The committee did do something for the small corporations by raising the exemption $1,000. I think I can say that my views on this subject have been known for a long time, having been expressed publicly on the floor and in the committee and elsewhere when I tried to have the exemption raised $2,000; but that was not done.

We are presented now with this illogical and unjust method of remedying the differences between small and large corporations. So far as the justice of it is concerned, as soon as the corporation gets two or three dollars over the limit mentioned in the proposal the rate of taxation would rise 50 per cent. I do not think the committee wants any such graduation as that.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is the same principle that you apply to individuals.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It does not make any such difference as that. In this case we can not apply the principle of graduated tax to corporations because it applies the principle of a graduated tax twice.

Corporations are, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has just said, made up of individuals. We can not grade the tax twice. We can not stop right here. If we are going to apply the principle of graduated tax, we have got to go on up with it. There is no reason for stopping at $15,000. I do not know upon what theory this proposition can be justified. It is not for the benefit of the small corporation alone, it is for the benefit as well of the large corporations; if the total amount of the net income for any particular year happens to go down to this sum it applies to the large corporation as well as to the small corporation. If you apply the system of graduated tax to corporations you have got to go on up with it. The proposition is illogical.

It is true, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, that small corporations have not got the relief that they ought to have. But it is not my fault; I have been working for it ever since I have been in Congress to give them more relief, both in the committee and on the floor.

What we want is a logical method which can be used and will not plague us in the future.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. HAWLEY. This defines the small corporation as one having a small income. A million-dollar corporation might have at the end of the year a very small net profit. The proposal is not one affecting the small corporations as such, but rather affects all corporations whether large or small whose income in any year is $25,000 or less.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Under this bill they will pay 11½ per cent on it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Oregon is correct. But as the gentleman from Illinois said, here is a proposition which increases the amount allowed by the bill by $24,000,000. Where will we stop if we go on in that way? Before we get through we will have a bill such as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] wants, of $400,000,000 reduction.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The provisions of this act increases the exemption of corporations having $25,000 income from $2,000 to $3,000, and it gives relief to corporations to the extent of $12,000,000. The committee thought that was pretty fair.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; and it amounts to a great deal more than it seems on the face of it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] observed, a moment ago, that if a corporation with a capital stock of $1,000,000 should have a bad year and have only $15,000 of income, it would have to pay 11½ per cent of this bill; that if we adopt this amendment it would get off with 7 per cent.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Oregon was correct about that, but I do not see the point of the gentleman from Texas. This is simply undertaking to apply a graded tax to corporations, which results in a double gradation of income, because the stockholders are subsequently taxed upon the dividends they receive from the corporation. Unfortunately this gradation has no logical basis, because it is not based upon the income of the stockholders.

Mr. HALE. Is the gentleman opposed to a greater tax on corporations under any circumstances?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In a general way I am, yes; because, as I have said, it results in a double gradation of tax and the double gradation is not worked out in accordance with the net income of each stockholder. It is worked out first on the corporation and then it is worked out on the net income of the individual. There is where it ought to be worked out, and it is the only proper place for gradation. I think the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. GARNER of Texas and Mr. GREEN of Iowa were appointed to act as tellers.

The committee again divided, and the tellers announced the result.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the yeas are 136 and the nays 132.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the count. I had 129 originally, and I think 6 or 8 more went through after that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that as he understood the gentleman he announced the count as it was given. There was some confusion, and there is a possibility of a misunderstanding.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Under the rules of the House this question was submitted to tellers, and the tellers have made the report, and the Chair has announced the result; and, therefore, the matter is concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The result has been announced.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announced the adoption of the amendment.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBSTEIN of New York:

AUTOMATIC REDUCTION ON ACCOUNT OF SURPLUS

Page 13, after line 6, insert:

"(b) Automatic reduction on account of surplus.

"(1) Proclamation of surplus. If at the beginning of any fiscal year of the Government the President finds that the ordinary receipts of the Government during the preceding fiscal year (plus back tax collections over refunds) exceed the expenditures during such year chargeable against such receipts, he shall determine the amount of such surplus, and if he finds that the entire amount of such surplus will not be needed for expenditure he shall so proclaim, and in such proclamation state the amount of such surplus which he finds will not be needed for expenditure, hereinafter called "excess surplus." In determining the amount needed for expenditure and the expenditures during the preceding fiscal year, the President shall take into account, in respect of reduction of the public debt, only such amounts as are by law required to be devoted to such purpose. No such proclamation shall be made unless the excess surplus is more than $75,000,000.

"(2) Reduction of rate. When such proclamation has been made, then for each $25,000,000 by which the excess surplus exceeds $50,000,000 the fraction ¼ shall be subtracted from the rate otherwise applicable, including the rate for the calendar year preceding the year in which the proclamation is made.

"(3) Limit of reduction. In no case shall this subsection be applied so as to make the corporation tax rate of tax less than the rate specified in subsection (a) minus the fraction 3/2.

"(4) Year preceding year of proclamation. The benefits of the rate reduction provided in this subsection, in the case of the calendar year preceding the year in which the proclamation is made, shall be allowed to the corporation in a similar manner to, and subject to the same restrictions and limitations as, the 25 per cent allowance provided in Title XII of the revenue act of 1924.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday I stated I would vote for the tax reduction but I elaborated upon an amendment which I promised to introduce to-day. The purpose of the amendment is simply this. It directs the Treasurer of the United States to apply a portion of the surplus to a further reduction of the tax, instead of using it all in the retirement of the public debt. That is all there is to the amendment. At the present time whenever there is a surplus beyond immediate financial needs of the Government the treasurer at his own discretion may and does use that fund to retire the public debt; and owing to the fact that there has been a variation in the amount of the surplus from year to year, to the extent of approximately $2,000,000 in the last five years, I contend that the Congress of the United States should direct the Treasurer of the United States as to how part of that surplus shall be used.

I call the attention of my Democratic friends to one phase of my amendment which might disturb their minds unless explained. It does not give the Treasurer of the United States more power. It rather restricts his power. It restricts his power in that he can not use the surplus except by direction of the Congress of the United States. It is a limitation, rather than an expansion of the power of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Heretofore he has been applying it to the debt without authority?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Not without authority but he has been using it in that way because we never have directed the Treasurer of the United States as to what he shall do with the surplus. If my amendment became part of the law, the Treasurer of the United States would then be compelled to use part of the surplus to a further reduction in the corporation tax rates.

Mr. BROWNING rose.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I shall yield to you in a moment. I want to address myself now to the Republicans who raised the objection to the amendment on Saturday that it would involve a refinancing operation. I admit that the passage of this amendment would involve a refinancing operation immediately after the first of the year, but that ought not to frighten any member of this House. Refinancing operations have become a well-established practice in the Treasury department. I maintain that the Congress of the United States ought to go on record now and establish the fiscal policy of telling the Treasurer of the United States what he shall do with at least part of the surplus when it rises beyond the needs of the Government to maintain the Government, after making allowance for the loss in revenues resulting from the tax reductions called for in this pending revenue bill.

As I said on Saturday, the reduction in the corporation income tax would benefit 3,000,000 stockholders in the United States, and more people would be affected, therefore, beneficially by this amendment than are now receiving benefits in this proposed bill under the individual income-tax provision of the bill. I want you to look upon the corporation tax proposed in this bill as affecting no less than 3,000,000 people who are shareholders in corporations, whether they be large or small corporations.

The bugaboo about the administrative difficulties of this amendment, it seems to me, has no foundation. We are so familiar with refinancing operations in the Treasury of the United States that there is no particular criticism that justifiably can be made against my amendment. It establishes a perfectly sound principle, namely, that the Congress reserves to itself the right to determine what shall be done with the taxes which are collected from the people of the United States.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. Does the gentleman think we could delegate authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to fix these schedules?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I do not delegate to the Secretary power to fix the rate. The rates are specifically set forth in my amendment. The Secretary has to carry out our orders. We direct the Treasury to reduce the corporation-tax rates, depending upon the size of the surplus. The Secretary will have less authority under my amendment than he has at the present moment. He has used $2,000,000,000 of the surplus to reduce the public debt. Do you want him to retain that authority?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I can understand the position of a man who wants the Treasury to use the surplus to reduce the debt.

Mr. BLANTON. But everything he does will be automatically done and not in a discretionary way. Is not that true?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes. [Applause.]

The membership of this House and my own constituency know my sympathies are with the man or woman of small means. I have always labored and voted for tax relief and for liberal exemptions for the people of small income.

I will not be misunderstood, therefore, in advocating this additional relief for holders of corporation stocks. As a matter of fact, as I pointed out in my speech of Saturday last, the wide distribution of stock ownership is one of the remarkable economic developments in our country in the last two decades. In my home city—Rochester, N. Y.—there live 20,000 people who earn one or more shares of stock in a few of our largest corporations, like the Eastman Kodak Co. and the Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is simply an amendment for providing that in prosperous years we shall not have any surplus in the Treasury. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas a short time ago—and declared carried by the Chair, although I do not think it was carried myself—was an amendment providing that if we should not have a very prosperous year there would not be a surplus but a deficit. This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is to make certain that in prosperous years we shall not have any surplus.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In prosperous years is the time we ought to pay off the debt.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Why have a tax reduction at all; why not apply it all to a reduction of the public debt?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think that needs any answer.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is it your answer that you believe the retirement of the public debt gets votes next November? [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I like to hear the gentleman applauded, but on this particular occasion, for some reason, there was only a little applause. We have allowed a certain sum in reduction of the debt. We have allowed what we thought would leave a working surplus in the Treasury if there is not too much appropriation for certain big items. That is the reason why we kept it this way. We do not propose to wipe the surplus off for the benefit of the corporations.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. FREAR. What has been the misfortune in the country in having $2,000,000,000 stricken from the public debt that accumulated interest otherwise?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It has been a great benefit instead of a misfortune in that we were able to reduce the interest, and, in fact, if we had not done it we would not be able to make the reduction we are endeavoring to make to-day, because we reduced the amount of interest by reason of its application. Now, the converse of the proposition which the gentleman has stated on Saturday we thought ridiculous; namely, that if there is a shortage the corporations could be assessed. I see for

some reason or other he has not put in his amendment; he has not offered it. There is no proposition to assess corporations in the future.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That is taken care of. We have provided for a working surplus of $75,000,000 before this amendment could be set in operation, so there could be no deficit.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am astounded that the gentleman is willing to use $75,000,000. The steel corporations and automobile corporations think they ought to have a far greater amount in cash to carry on their operations, and they are very much smaller than those of the Government. What we should do is, in prosperous times like we have now, when the corporations are making great sums, when we are having prosperous times, we should apply our surplus to a reduction of the public debt. [Applause.] I can hardly believe this amendment is going to receive enough support that I should proceed further.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from New York. I am very sorry my learned and scholarly colleague lent himself to offer such an amendment. Now, I for one, am against a reduction of taxes and would apply all the surplus to a reduction of the public debt. My stand on the 1924 and 1926 bills speaks for itself. There is not a man in the United States to whom I would grant so much power as is given in the amendment of the gentleman from New York to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. In what particular; what power?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will come to that. We have delegated power to a Tariff Commission to raise and lower tariffs. The gentleman would now give power to the Secretary of the Treasury to so fix a flexible tax on corporations and, as the gentleman himself says, which would affect 3,000,000 of stockholders, 3,000,000 of people. The only way to use surplus under existing law is to apply the money for the reduction of the public debt; it can not be used any other way. When we shall have no national debt, we will provide for its disposition; but I venture to say that Congress will never delegate that power to any head of an executive department. If the gentleman would give the power to the Secretary of the Treasury on his own power to say to the corporations, "Now, we are saving money this year, we are retrenching in all departments; I am going to let you cut a mellon, we will reduce your tax"; what a power he would be in the country.

Why, the Secretary of the Treasury would have more power than all of Congress. Imagine ticket jobbers, the manipulators in the stock market getting in on an intended reduction. I have never heard of anything so absurd. It shakes the very fundamentals of our form of government. As the gentleman knows, no doubt, Congress is the only power authorized to raise taxes, and it was purposely given to the legislative branch in order to have a check on the executive branch. The gentleman by his amendment would relinquish that and give it to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. When the Secretary of the Treasury makes his recommendation as to how much revenue we shall raise he makes an estimate of what the reduction should be, and on that he raises the taxes. We are doing it to-day. Does not the Treasury of the United States exercise this wide latitude to-day as to how these amounts of the surplus may be used, if it does exist at the end of the fiscal year, this year, or next?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But it is entirely within our power, within the power of Congress, to act on the recommendation as we see fit.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I explicitly tell him what he must do or not do with the surplus.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is nothing more dangerous to our form of government than to do just that.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Simply saying it is so does not make it so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can not understand the gentleman's attitude and that of colleagues on his side, who are generally against centralization of power. You might as well abolish Congress entirely and have a commission form of government—Mr. Mellon, Mr. Hoover, and the president of the New York Stock Exchange. I have never heard anything like it. It will not accomplish what the gentleman seeks at all, but it will simply give that enormous power to one man in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Has it not been asserted here that he now has that power?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and therefore the gentleman would seek to make it absolute, and say, "Go ahead."

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I would restrict him as to the use of the surplus. That is all.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The only way to reduce taxes is for Congress to do so, according to the Constitution.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. You would get more reduction if my amendment were passed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think so.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Why are you interested in tax reduction?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How does the gentleman know I am interested in tax reduction; I am interested in the reduction of the public debt first.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. You just said so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman had heard my remarks on Saturday, he would know that I said the taxes should not be reduced more than $100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, of course, every Member of the House must realize that this is a fundamental departure from anything we have ever had heretofore in our fiscal system. I just want to call attention to one phase of the proposed amendment.

The President is to determine a surplus. How is he to determine it? The gentleman has fixed the rule. He says that if the President "finds that the ordinary receipts of the Government during the preceding fiscal year exceed the expenditures during such year chargeable against such receipts," he shall proclaim the amount of such "excess surplus"; and he also says in "determining the amount needed for expenditures and for expenditures during the preceding fiscal year the President shall take into account, in respect to the public debt, only such amounts as are by law required to be devoted to such purposes." In other words, in order to determine whether there will be a surplus the President of the United States can do nothing but take the ordinary receipts and expenditures authorized against them and on that basis proclaim the existence of a surplus.

He is to have no discretion. If any emergency arises and he knows it is going to be necessary to have $100,000,000 for some great purpose for which there is not yet any authorization of law, and he knows when Congress convenes either in regular or special session that he will have to ask for an appropriation for that emergency, he must not take that into account. He must simply automatically perform his duty; he must merely take the items for which the expenditures are provided by law, and then if there is a surplus he must devote it to the reduction of taxes on corporations.

Now, I think I have as much interest in the business operations and business concerns of the country as any other Member of this House. I have lived all my life in a large city, and my sympathies are there. But to give the Secretary of the Treasury and the President the authority to take the people's money and use it without any action on the part of Congress itself for the reduction of corporation taxes is beyond anything that ever occurred to me to propose.

It simply shows what dangers may arise if we adopt such proposals as this right here in the committee. The gentleman has never proposed this plan to the Committee on Ways and Means, and has never submitted it to the administration itself, and has never obtained the views, so far as I know, of anybody who is responsible in this administration; but he comes here and proposes to introduce this revolutionary measure right here on the floor of the House and take from the Congress the determination of what shall be done with the money derived from the people by taxes. I hope the committee—even in the flush of the recent victory by which were taken $24,000,000 more out of the surplus—even in the face of that victory I hope the committee will not make a further mistake and delegate to some one else the power to use the surplus, if there is any. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there are two very vital objections to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN]. One is that it is, in a measure at least—I shall not stop to quarrel as to how much—a delegation of authority over revenue questions to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to that extent, however light it may be, or however great it may be, it is objectionable to my mind, because of the constitutional provision that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives.

That is one reason why I could not give my support to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. There

is another objection, not so fundamental, perchance, but it is of striking force, and that is, it is proposed to give the benefit of the entire surplus simply to one class of taxpayers. In other words, it is proposed to take the surplus, built up from all sources, from your tariff, from your individual income taxes, from your surtax, from your corporation tax, from all sources of revenue, and apply it for the benefit of one particular class of taxpayers, namely, the stockholders in the corporations.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Did not the Democratic Party, as well as the Republican Party, go on record as favoring the creation of the Tariff Commission, which helps carry out the flexible provisions of the tariff law?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Democratic Party go on record in favor of the flexible tariff provisions?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Did it not help in the establishment of the Tariff Commission which later was given that power?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Democratic Party has never gone on record as favoring the flexible provisions of the tariff act.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Did they not help to set in operation the Tariff Commission which finally resulted in operating the flexible provisions of the tariff law?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not remember what the record shows about the Tariff Commission, but so far as the flexible tariff provisions of the tariff act are concerned, I regard them as wholly unconstitutional, and I am not going to follow that bad example now.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Was not the Tariff Commission established long before the question arose as to the flexibility of the tariff law?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was.

Mr. CRISP. If the gentleman will yield, I am in perfect accord with him on this amendment, and the Democratic Members of the Ways and Means Committee voted against the flexible provisions of the tariff law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME

In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

(a) Expenses: All the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, including a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered; traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business; and rentals or other payments required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession, for purposes of the trade or business, or property to which the taxpayer has not taken or is not taking title or in which he has no equity.

(b) Interest: All interest paid or accrued within the taxable year on indebtedness, except on indebtedness incurred or continued to purchase or carry obligations or securities (other than obligations of the United States issued after September 24, 1917, and originally subscribed for by the taxpayer) the interest upon which is wholly exempt from taxation under this title.

(c) Taxes generally: Taxes paid or accrued within the taxable year, except—

(1) Income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes imposed by the authority of the United States;

(2) So much of the income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes imposed by the authority of any foreign country or possession of the United States as is allowed as a credit against the tax under section 131; and

(3) Taxes assessed against local benefits of a kind tending to increase the value of the property assessed. For the purpose of this subsection, estate, inheritance, legacy, and succession taxes accrue on the due date thereof, except as otherwise provided by the law of the jurisdiction imposing such taxes, and shall be allowed as a deduction only to the estate.

(d) Taxes of shareholder paid by corporation: The deduction for taxes allowed by subsection (c) shall be allowed to a corporation in the case of taxes imposed upon a shareholder of the corporation upon his interest as shareholder which are paid by the corporation without reimbursement from the shareholder, but in such cases no deduction shall be allowed the shareholder for the amount of such taxes.

(e) Losses by individuals: In the case of an individual, losses sustained during the taxable year and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise—

(1) If incurred in trade or business; or

(2) If incurred in any transaction entered into for profit, though not connected with the trade or business; or

(3) Of property not connected with the trade or business, if the loss arises from fires, storms, shipwreck, or other casualty, or from theft.

(f) Losses by corporations: In the case of a corporation, losses sustained during the taxable year and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise.

(g) Basis for determining loss: The basis for determining the amount of deduction for losses sustained, to be allowed under subsection (e) or (f), shall be the same as is provided in section 113 for determining the gain or loss from the sale or other disposition of property.

(h) Loss on sale of stock or securities: For disallowance of loss deduction in the case of sales of stock or securities where within 30 days before or after the date of the sale the taxpayer has acquired substantially identical property, see section 119.

(i) Net losses: The special deduction for net losses of prior years, to the extent provided in section 117.

(j) Bad debts: Debts ascertained to be worthless and charged off within the taxable year (or, in the discretion of the commissioner, a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts); and when satisfied that a debt is recoverable only in part, the commissioner may allow such debt to be charged off in part.

(k) Depreciation: A reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear, and tear of property used in the trade or business, including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence. In the case of improved real estate held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction provided for in this subsection shall be equitably apportioned between the life tenant and the remainderman under rules and regulations prescribed by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary.

(l) Depletion: In the case of mines, oil and gas wells, other natural deposits, and timber, a reasonable allowance for depletion and for depreciation of improvements, according to the peculiar conditions in each case; such reasonable allowance in all cases to be made under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. In the case of leases the deduction allowed by this subsection shall be equitably apportioned between the lessor and lessee. (For percentage depletion in case of oil and gas wells, see sec. 114(b) (3).)

(m) Basis for depreciation and depletion: The basis upon which depletion, exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence are to be allowed in respect of any property shall be as provided in section 114.

(n) Charitable and other contributions: In the case of an individual, contributions or gifts made within the taxable year to or for the use of:

(1) the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, for exclusively public purposes;

(2) any corporation, or trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual;

(3) the special fund for vocational rehabilitation authorized by section 7 of the vocational rehabilitation act;

(4) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, or societies are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

(5) a fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, but only if such contibutions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals; to an amount which in all the above cases combined does not exceed 15 per cent of the taxpayer's net income as computed without the benefit of the subsection. Such contributions or gifts shall be allowable as deductions only if verified under rules and regulations prescribed by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. (For unlimited deduction if contributions and gifts exceed 90 per cent of the net income, see sec. 121.)

(o) Future expenses in case of casual sales of real property: In the case of a casual sale or other casual disposition of real property by an individual a reasonable allowance for future expense liabilities, incurred under the provisions of the contract under which such sale or other disposition was made, under such regulations as the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe, including the giving of a bond, with such sureties and in such sum (not less than the estimated tax liability computed without the benefit of this subsection) as the commissioner may require, conditioned upon the payment (notwithstanding any statute of limitations) of the tax, computed

without the benefit of this subsection, in respect of any amounts allowed as a deduction under this subsection and not actually expended in carrying out the provisions of such contract.

(p) Dividends received by corporations: In the case of a corporation, the amount received as dividends—

(1) From a domestic corporation, or

(2) From any foreign corporation when it is shown to the satisfaction of the commissioner that more than 50 per cent of the gross income of such foreign corporation for the three-year period ending with the close of its taxable year preceding the declaration of such dividends (or for such part of such period as the foreign corporation has been in existence) was derived from sources within the United States as determined under section 120.

The deduction allowed by this subsection shall not be allowed in respect of dividends received from a corporation organized under the China trade act, 1922, or from a corporation which under section 251 is taxable only on its gross income from sources within the United States by reason of its receiving a large percentage of its gross income from sources within a possession of the United States.

(q) Cooperative apartments: Amounts paid by an individual taxpayer during the taxable year to a corporation which owns or leases an apartment building and operates it under the cooperative plan if—

(1) Such amounts are bona fide expended by the corporation in the same taxable year in payment of taxes allowable as deductions under subsection (c) of this section or in payment of interest on its bonds or on other indebtedness incurred by it in the acquisition, construction, of maintenance of such apartment building or in the acquisition of the land on which the building is located; and

(2) Such individual is the owner or lessee of an apartment in the building under a lease the term of which is 20 years or more, or under an agreement with the corporation, is entitled, by reason of stock ownership, to the use and occupancy of such apartment for a like period, and

(3) No part of the net earnings of the corporation inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual other than an owner or lessee of an apartment in such building or one entitled by reason of stock ownership to the use and occupancy of any such apartment.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McSWAIN: On page 26, after line 11, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(r) Medical, surgical, hospital, or funeral expenses: The actual and necessary expenses paid by the head of a family for himself, or for any dependent member of the family, including only spouse or children, for medical, surgical, hospital, or funeral services not exceeding $1,000 for any individual person in any separate tax year, all such payments to be allowed and deducted only at the usual and ordinary rates in such cases and the commissioner is empowered to judge as to the reasonableness of any such charges under the facts and circumstances of particular cases."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in order that I may explain this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a serious effort to do what I respectfully submit is an absolutely just thing. There have been added to the deductions by the present bill three additional groups of deductions; three additional grounds have been added over and above those that exist under the present law. This proposition is to add just one more, and that is as simple and as plain, it seems to me, as can be; to wit, where a taxpayer, being the head of a family, is sick, or if his wife is sick, or one of his children is sick, or if any one of these should die, then the actual expenses of the hospital, of the surgeon, the physician, and of the undertaker shall be paid, not to exceed $1,000 for any individual in any one tax year. This payment is to be made, not upon the basis of the capricious and excessive bill of a surgeon, or of a physician, or of an undertaker, but the proposal says, according to the ordinary and usual rates or charges prevailing for such services in the community where rendered, and the commissioner is given the absolute right and power to say whether or not the charges in any particular case are fair, reasonable, just, and according to the ordinary basis of value for such services.

The amendment which was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], which prevailed in this Committee of the Whole House, was assailed on the ground that it was illogical. Of course, what logic is is a very flexible and fluid term; but I shall submit to you that the amendment now proposed can not be assailed even on the ground of being illogical; it will not be assailed as being unjust; it will not be assailed as being unfair, because during the consideration of the two preceding revenue bills, when I offered this same amendment, it was attacked only on the ground that it was not practicable and not workable.

On the 7th day of December, which was last Wednesday, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. I was satisfied he was not in favor of this deduction, because he is not in favor of the household exemption; he is not in favor of any exemptions; he is in favor of making the private soldier, and the humble citizen, the man who bears the brunt of battle in time of war, also start to pay taxes to Uncle Sam just as soon as he gets a revenue of $1,000. So, Mr. Chairman, I did not ask the Secretary of the Treasury as to whether he thought this was a wise additional ground of deduction, a fourth one over and above the three new grounds already proposed by the committee, but I asked him this question: Is it workable? I asked him to please answer me on the very day the letter was written. The 8th came and no answer; the 9th came and no answer; the 10th came and no answer. Of course, there was none on the 11th, on Sunday, but to-day, December 12, about 30 minutes before this House convened, a letter, which is still moist from the press, but dated December 9, was placed in my hands by a special messenger.

The letter, which I ask permission to put in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, says and admits that this provision from a strictly administrative point of view will be reasonable and workable. Of course, he goes on and says that, in his opinion, it is unnecessary and undesirable to add one additional ground of deduction, but that it is no more impracticable, no more unworkable, and no more impossible or difficult of administration than the provisions which are already in the bill. In fact, gentlemen, I submit it is the most easily administered of any proposition in connection with the deductions. They talk about allowing deductions for depleted mineral resources, depleted oil, and depleted gas. How are you going to arrive at that except by the wildest sort of conjecture? Then, also, one of the additional grounds is damages by reason of the casual sales of real estate. What do we mean by that anyhow? Of course, it means, I assume, that when a man sells a piece of real estate and makes upon the basis of the transaction an apparent profit, he is to be allowed to deduct from that profit certain estimated damages as to bonds he may be required to take out to guarantee the title or a bond to indemnify himself against any damage he may sustain through the failure of the purchaser to comply with the contract or for damages he might sustain through the foreclosure of a purchase-money mortgage.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. How does the gentleman feel about amending this bill whereby if a taxpayer does not make a return the next year that then he will receive a refund of taxes which have been paid and which the investment has proven should not have been paid and on which he did not make a profit?

Mr. McSWAIN. I will ask the gentleman from Florida to excuse me from undertaking to answer that question, because I think it is a purely local question. That probably applies to Florida.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Oh, no; it applies on mortgages throughout the country.

Mr. McSWAIN. I am discussing this matter from the point of view of justice. Now, the objection will be made, gentlemen, I am quite sure, that we have already provided a $3,500 deduction for the head of a family, with $400 additional for each child, and that therefore that is sufficient to take care of an operation upon the head of a family or the wife or one of the children, or to take care of hospital expenses and undertaking expenses. But I submit, gentlemen, that that $3,500, plus $400 for each child, making, for instance, $4,300 in the case of two children, and so on, is what you might call "bread-and-butter" and "shoes-and-clothes" deductions, and it is little enough at that.

It will not take care of these emergency expenses. It will not take care of the surgeon's fee or the hospital fee or the undertaker's fee, and these are emergencies.

Now, the corporations engaged in business and those deriving their incomes from the business of corporations are taken care of by this bill, but the individual whose income is from $4,000 up to, perhaps, $25,000 or $30,000, as the result of his own efforts, such as a lawyer or doctor or dentist or editorial writer or civil engineer or anyone engaged in a similar business, the man whose capital consists of his ability to work, such a man is not taken care of by this bill, and we are asking you gentlemen to vote into this bill something that will give a little lightening of the burden and the load of carrying on, on the

part of the professional man, whose income stops when he stops work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as a rule I am not disposed to oppose the gentleman who last spoke, but the gentleman has said that nobody will contend that his amendment is not fair or just.

I contend it is neither fair nor just, and that it will not reach the people whom the gentleman wants to help. It will help more the multimillionaire than anyone else, because it will take off from the top of his income tax. The man who needs help in matters of this kind is the man who does not pay any tax at all, or pays very little tax. As it is now, no married man who has an income of $5,000 pays very much tax. My recollection is there are only about 2,500,000 people who pay any income tax whatever at present.

The gentleman proposes to further increase the exemptions. We put these exemptions in the bill to take care of just such things. It is true, of course, that a proposition like the gentleman proposes can be worked out, but it is true also it will take a large number of Treasury employees to do it.

If we follow out the logic of the gentleman's argument, then the married people who do not pay any income tax whatever ought to be given a bonus by the Government. We have put up the exemptions in order to take care of just these things.

What reason is there with reference to the poor man—a man even with an income of $5,000, who pays a little tax of, perhaps, $5 or $6—what reason is there to exempt his expenses for a doctor any more than we should exempt his expenses for clothing, for food, or anything of that kind?

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McSWAIN. For the reason that the expense of the doctor or of the hospital or of the funeral is an emergency, is unusual, whereas every day in the year and for every year in our lives we have to have something to eat and something to wear. One is an emergency and the other is the usual thing.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That does not answer the question at all. We have provided a large and a generous exemption, which the gentleman wants to enlarge by this privilege, which, I have said, will benefit the multimillionaire more than it will benefit anybody else. It will not at all reach the man the gentleman proposes to help, but will lessen the number of taxpayers and will materially affect the incomes of the extremely wealthy.

Of course, it is always a case of misfortune where a person is sick; but if we include such a misfortune, why not include all the other misfortunes that may cost him money? Why omit any of them? He may have something happen to him that would prevent his work which may not be in the nature of sickness but is equally a misfortune. We have these exemptions now higher than most people think they ought to be, so high that only a few of our people pay any tax whatever, so high that those who do pay the tax can afford in the years that come along to pay their surgeon's bills, whatever they may be; and this also takes care of the nurses as well as the surgeons or any expense of that nature.

Does the gentleman mean to contend that this will not require a great deal of administrative work? I say it can not be worked out fairly, because one surgeon will charge one amount and another surgeon will charge an entirely different amount, yet the gentleman thinks the Treasury will be able to work out some rate that will be uniform and equitable. I do not know how they will do it.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Is not the corporation or the business man, so far as his business is concerned, permitted under this law to deduct lawyer's fees in the expense of his business?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. When we are determining how much his profits are, of course.

Mr. McSWAIN. And lawyers charge variable fees.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But that is a tax on profits, a tax on something the man makes.

Mr. McSWAIN. And this is the same thing, it seems to me.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I say the amendment proposed by the gentleman ought to be voted down.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

The committee resumed its session.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I imagine there may be other proposals with reference to deductions and exemptions, and for that reason I am going to make a statement now so that gentleman making such motions may know what the effect will be upon the Treasury.

There are two and a half million taxpayers who pay individual income taxes. The average rate is 4 per cent. For each $500 deduction or exemption that might be given those two and a half million taxpayers there would be a loss to the Treasury of $50,000,000.

I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has said. You are not giving this deduction on the normal tax or on the lowest bracket. Every time you make a deduction, every time you give an exemption, you are reducing the tax at the very top, in the highest surtax bracket; and more than that, you are reducing the tax all the way down the line, because you are lowering the taxpayer from the highest brackets down.

You are not giving this benefit to the poor man. The man with an income of $3,500, who is the head of a family, pays no income tax at all. You are giving this to people who have incomes of $4,000 and more. They have an exemption of $3,500 if they have no children. If they have children, they get another exemption of $400 for each child. It is estimated that the head of a family may be figured together with at least two children, making a total of $4,300 now exempt, and the purpose of these exemptions is to take care of the expenses of running a household.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the $400 exemption only applies to children under 18 years of age and does not apply to children between 18 and 21 years of age?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is true, and I would be glad to discuss that. We discussed it in committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Does not the gentleman think it would be fair to increase the age from 18 to 21?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; and I will tell the gentleman why. It happens that we have two children that have just reached that age, and the exemption as to both has now been taken away. These children are attending a college or a university, and I do not think we ought to give special exemptions to people who are able to send their children to colleges or universities. It is a good thing to have an education, and I am glad to be able to give it to them, but I do not think that is any reason why I should have a special preference.

What about the man who sends his children to the high school and the grammar schools? We have taken care of him, and I think that is enough. Does the gentleman realize that there are only two and a half million people in the United States out of 114,000,000 who pay a single cent of income tax? Where are we coming to if we follow out this line of exemption? Is not anybody going to support the Government of the United States except the multimillionaires or men of tremendous income? Is not your responsibility and mine the same as Mr. Rockefeller's or Mr. Morgan's? Should not we contribute something to the expenses of the management of this Government of ours? How far are we going? The head of a family can now have an income of $3,500 without paying any tax.

Mr. McSWAIN. In this bill there are three deductions for exemption reported.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They apply to business operations and do not apply to the individuals; they apply to expenses and profits of people who are engaged in business.

Mr. McSWAIN. These deductions would apply to property.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. By your amendment you are not aiding the people with a $3,500 income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McSWAIN) there were 35 ayes and 84 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the extension of my remarks I desire to print the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 25. CREDITS OF INDIVIDUAL AGAINST NET INCOME

There shall be allowed for the purpose of the normal tax, but not for the surtax, the following credits against the net income:

(a) Dividends: The amount received as dividends—

(1) From a domestic corporation, or

(2) From a foreign corporation when it is shown to the satisfaction of the commissioner that more than 50 per cent of the gross income of such foreign corporation for the three-year period ending with the close of its taxable year preceding the declaration of such dividends (or for such part of such period as the corporation has been in existence) was derived from sources within the United States as determined under the provisions of section 120.

The credit allowed by this subsection shall not be allowed in respect of dividends received from a corporation organized under the China trade act, 1922, or from a corporation which, under section 251, is taxable only on its gross income from sources within the United States by reason of its receiving a large percentage of its gross income from sources within a possession of the United States.

(b) Interest on United States obligations: The amount received as interest upon obligations of the United States which is included in gross income under section 22.

(c) Personal exemption: In the case of a single person, a personal exemption of $1,500; or in the case of the head of a family or a married person living with husband or wife, a personal exemption of $3,500. A husband and wife living together shall receive but one personal exemption. The amount of such personal exemption shall be $3,500. If such husband and wife make separate returns, the personal exemption may be taken by either or divided between them.

(d) Credit for dependents—$400 for each person (other than husband or wife) dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the taxpayer if such dependent person is under 18 years of age or is incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

(e) Change of status—

(1) The credit for dependents shall be determined by the status of the taxpayer on the last day of his taxable year.

(2) The personal exemption allowed by subsection (c) of this section shall, in case the status of the taxpayer changes during his taxable year, be the sum of an amount which bears the same ratio to $1,500 as the number of months during which the taxpayer was single bears to 12 months, plus an amount which bears the same ratio to $3,500 as the number of months during which the taxpayer was a married person living with husband or wife or was the head of a family bears to 12 months. For the purposes of this paragraph a fractional part of a month shall be disregarded unless it amounts to more than half a month, in which case it shall be considered as a month.

(3) In the case of an individual who dies during the taxable year, the personal exemption and the credit for dependents shall be determined by his status at the time of his death, and in such case full credits shall be allowed to the surviving spouse, if any, according to his or her status at the close of the taxable year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 24, page 28, after the word "of," strike out the figures "1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "2,000."

Also, in line 1, page 29, after the word "of," strike out the figures "3,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the amendment raising the exemption of single people to $3000. When will that be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment will be in order now if he will prepare it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the lady from New Jersey has an amendment on the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only recognize one at a time. The gentleman from Texas is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment which I offer seeks to make the exemption for the head of a family $5,000 instead of $3,500, and for a single person $2,000 instead of $1,500. My distinguished friend from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] will offer an amendment increasing the exemption for a single person from $1,500, as carried in the bill and in the present law, to $3,000. It occurs to me that if we are going to hand back to corporations, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] stated here on Saturday, $178,000,000 out of $532,000,000, that certainly we can afford to make the exemption to the head of a family more than $3,500.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I did not say five hundred and thirty-two; I said two hundred and thirty-two.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman said that $178,000,000 of this total of $232,000,000 was going back to corporations.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; out of two hundred and thirty-two.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I thank the gentleman for the correction. I simply intended to state the total as $232,000,000. Just a slip of the tongue. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] stated here that he represented a great city, the city of Chicago, that he represented great business interests, and was proud of that fact; that he was born in the city of Chicago; that he represented a great business district in that windy city. I have read the gentleman's rather effusive and comprehensive biography in the Congressional Directory, and he represents ward 41, and several other wards of plutocratic coloring. I have been in the gentleman's district, and I have heard it called the aristocratic and "silk-stocking" district of Chicago; but doubtless there are many people of moderate means in that district. Whether its Representative knows they are there, I do not know. I know that once when I took a train of cattle there and I attempted to eat in one of the restaurants somewhere close to Devon Street in his district, without a coat on, the restaurant proprietor said I would have to put on a coat. Well, I did not possess that article of masculine wearing apparel, so I went back to my caboose and got my "slicker" or raincoat, entered, but was told I must have either a tuxedo or evening dress, so I went to a less aristocratic portion of the city and got my victuals. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Where was that?

Mr. HUDSPETH. That was in the gentleman's district, as I recall, now on or near or right north of Devon Street. Now, the gentleman said on Saturday he was unalterably opposed to the present exemption of $3,500 to heads of families—even if it was necessary to educate children. He gave strong evidence that he was inclined to favor reducing the present exemption to heads of families and single persons. Now, I observe from this same biographical sketch that the gentleman is a thorough college graduate and he should know the cost of educating children. Oh, there is no question but that the gentleman is educated. He admits it—attended public schools in Chicago—graduated from Augustana College in 1890 with a B. A. degree and got his LL. B. degree from Kent College of Law, Chicago. Oh, he is educated all right, and he truly represents the farmers and cattle raisers on Devon Street, where they would not let me eat without a regulation dress coat. Also, the gentleman went to school in the Sunflower State of Kansas. He attended Bethany College at Lindsborg, Kans. I believe the gentleman taught school there or somewhere else. He also says he practiced at law among those farmers and livestock producers on Devon Street, and I ask him now how can you properly educate a family of, say, two children to-day on an income of $3,500? The Department of Education says that it costs $8,000 to properly educate a child at the present high cost of living—which is four times greater than when the gentleman went to school—and yet the gentleman is saying to the Standard Oil Co. and the Texas Oil Co. and all of the other big oil corporations—and six of the biggest are in my district—"We will hand you back $178,000,000 in tax reduction," and yet the gentleman is very active on the Ways and Means Committee, that drafted this bill—says he is opposed to any greater exemption for single persons and heads of families, and if it had not been for JOHN GARNER'S amendment just forced over the gentleman and the Republicans on that side, the little corporations would not have gotten much reduction, as the majority drafted this bill. These big oil corporations are taking out of the ground down there, some of them, as much as 10,000 barrels a day from one well.

He hands this money back to them, but he says to the old farmer and the cattlemen, the men who went through the drought and the drop in prices in 1920, and who bore the brunt of the war, and who increased their herds as they had been requested to do—to them he says "No, no tax reduction for you"; and he says that he is proud of the fact that he was opposed to the exemption of heads of families up to $3,500—this distinguished scholar and graduate of all of these colleges, who has a string of A. B's, LL. D's and every other kind of B's after his name as long as a cowboy's lariat. He knows what it costs to educate two of his children. He has just stated he was doing so. I have educated a couple of them and I know what it costs. Yet he says to the farmers north of Devon Street in ward 41 of the great city of Chicago, and those stock raisers in that district of his, "We will not give you an exemption up to $5,000, those of you who have the responsibility of heads of families." I am not against corporations, I belong to a few, and this bill will probably help me a little, but can the gentleman

justify his position? The Department of Education says that it costs $16,000 to educate two children, and that is the average number in a family. The head of such a family is the one that I am pleading for. Then, also take the girl in the work shops, the stores, the school-teachers—splendid young women who educate our children and make better citizens out of them all over this country. I am trying to raise their exemption from $1,500 to $2,000. I presume when the gentleman from Illinois taught school and wielded the birch rod in the little red schoolhouse on the hill down in the sunflower State of Kansas, that they did not have many colleges there. There were not many colleges there when he was teaching the young idea how to shoot, but since then the State has developed and they have colleges all over the great State of Kansas. The gentleman says that if he had his way he would not raise the exemption to $3,500. I said to him Saturday, "Do you want to cut it down from what it is at present?" and the gentleman tip-toed and got florid in the face and all that, and I ask the gentleman now, Do you want to cut down the exemption of the head of a family and single persons as it stands at present? The gentleman does not make answer.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will answer the question as soon as the gentleman is through.

Mr. HUDSPETH. All right. The gentleman will have plenty of time to answer me. He has orated very vociferously three or four times already on this bill and, as I recall, almost every time the burden of his song was to reduce the taxes on the "oppressed" corporations. He seems to be the "director general" or, I might say, the "assistant director general" of this bill on the Republican side of the House. I say to my good friend from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I presume he will answer, but I want to know whether he can answer to the people of this country who do not make their millions and do not pay on incomes of thirty and forty and fifty million dollars a year. Can you answer to the head of a family when we are trying to raise his exemption so that he can educate his children? One great man in Texas—I believe it was Sam Houston—said that the educated citizen was a bulwark of our liberties and a protection of those liberties against socialism and anarchy throughout the Government.

And I am sorry, I want to say gentlemen of the House, that my State of Texas, the empire State of the Union, ranks a little low in the education of its splendid citizens. I wish it stood first. That is all I am seeking for to-day. I just simply want to secure justice for the man at the head of a family who has as many as two children, as the gentleman from Illinois says he has two children he is putting through college. All right. Perhaps he is more fortunate than many of the people of my district. Many own livestock and ranches and many of them do not, but they want to educate their children in our State university, the great universities of other States. You can not do it on an income, I will say to my friend, of less than $5,000 per year with the present high cost of living. I mean give them such a finished education as my people desire. Corporations as a rule have competent lawyers to prepare their income-tax reports—individuals have to go and hire them; this costs additional money; take that into consideration, also, gentlemen. I am also in sympathy with my friend from Oklahoma to raise the exemption of single persons as far as $2,000 or $2,500. However, I think everybody should marry who can, and I think almost everybody can. I trust my amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HUDSPETH: Strike out the figures "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,000."

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is agreeable to me.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment again, as I did on December 15, 1925, when the revenue bill was before the House.

I am so doing, because I sincerely believe that the Committee on Ways and Means this year should have increased the exemptions in personal incomes in the pending tax bill to $5,000 instead of $3,500 for married persons and $3,000 instead of $1,500 for single persons.

This committee is as well informed as I am on the true conditions of the country, especially with regard to the working classes.

I say this after carefully reading the address sent to us on the opening of Congress by the President, and I take exception to his statement therein that the country is prosperous. [Applause.]

Only the banker and men interested in high finance are prosperous.

I will take the President back to his own section of the country, for he may not be fully informed, having spent the summer in the Black Hills of the Dakotas, rather than the country he knew.

How about the people of New England in the textile industry? Are they prosperous? From their own evidence they have never suffered more than during the past few years.

In the closing days of the Sixty-ninth Congress we heard the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] tell of the idle spindles and the suffering of the people of her own district caused therefrom. These people have been working two and three days a week for the past few years.

I visited the city of Fall River myself and talked personally with many of the people employed in the mills there and they were bitter in their denunciation of this administration talking prosperity. It is poverty there, not prosperity.

I ask you, what are you going to do about it. If time permitted, I could cite many other instances of lack of prosperity among the working people of the country, but this, I think, is unnecessary, as every Member here has proof of the truth of this assertion.

Are you still going to add to their burdens? Are you indifferent to the plea of the farmer in the West; the cotton grower in the South; the industrialist in the East; and to that great unorganized army of men and women known as the "clerical staff" of the country? Are they not worthy of consideration? Is there a Member here who will say, with the high cost of living to-day, that an income of $5,000 for married people and $3,000 for single people provides anything more than the necessities of life?

How is this Republican administration going back to the people in 1928 without having fulfilled their promise that incomes of $5,000 or less should be free from taxation?

We have been told this revenue bill, if it is to pass at all, must be passed "as is" without any amendments, and we call this a free government.

I am in favor of reducing the corporation tax because it is good for business and the working man, but I also firmly believe in extending similar relief to the family man and woman.

We are the greatest Nation in the world, yet we help every other country before the people at home. Charity should begin at home. This year their Representatives in Congress should listen to the plea of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman and Members of Congress, I am in perfect accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] as to the matters of raising the exemption of heads of families to $5,000. However, the amendment I sought to offer raises the exemption to single persons to $3,000, and it is that amendment that I desire to discuss at this time.

I hope I may have your undivided attention for just a few moments, as this amendment is one of vast importance to a large number of our people. By it I seek to increase the exemption allowed to single people in the matter of income tax. I think the adoption of this amendment would only be extending justice to the large number of citizens interested. I fully understand that it has been the policy of revenue bills to make a distinction in exemption as between married and unmarried persons, under the plea that the married person is the head of a family, consequently has a heavier living expense, and for that reason is given a larger exemption.

Technically this is true, but I submit that there are in the United States literally thousands of working women and men who, while not legally the heads of families, are in fact assuming a part and in many cases all the responsibilities of this position. Every Member of Congress can call to his mind cases of which he has knowledge, of single persons who by reason of conditions are assisting in, or entirely supporting a family, and I submit that such person is just as much entitled to consideration as the other class whether these responsibilities come by reason of marriage or by circumstances which force upon them the same burdens.

It is my understanding also, Mr. Chairman, that it is not contended that this exemption would to any great extent disturb our revenues for the reason that the argument is made that this class of taxpayers as individuals pay at the maximum a very small tax. It is probably true that to many of them the amount in dollars and cents is small, but I suggest that in these days of high cost of living, in these days when the working woman

especially, must, if she is to continue in employment, spend a considerable amount of her income for clothing and to meet the requirements of to-day as to dress and fashions, which is expected of her if her employment is to continue, that even the small amount taken from her is to her very material. Not only this, but may I not suggest that this class of taxpayers, like most of the others, find it necessary in order to meet the requirements of the Government in making the technical and almost nonunderstandable reports required by the system, to make additional expenditures of from $2 to $5 in having their reports made. In addition to this, no taxpayer in these days can make a true report to the Government, as to income and expenditures if they want to be honest with themselves and their Government, without during the entire year keeping detailed book accounts.

This in itself makes additional cost and labor on the part of these people, and no doubt when we consider the expenses to the Government in handling, auditing, and passing upon these reports and add to that the cost of the taxpayers in preparing same, the probabilities are that these necessary expenses are as great, if not greater, than the revenues received by the Government.

But some one says they should pay a tax for the reason that every person receiving benefits of the Government should participate in paying its expenses. That is true, but I suggest that each of these taxpayers does contribute toward the cost of their Government. They contribute through taxes paid by the people from whom they purchase what they use and consume. They contribute by paying a tariff, in many cases an exorbitant tariff, on everything they use from the cradle to the grave.

In connection with an argument in favor of raising this exemption I read to you from an editorial printed in the Tulsa Tribune of Tulsa, Okla. This paper is owned and edited by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, a newspaper writer of national reputation and a man who is a recognized student of economics. In writing on this subject, this editor said:

"SINGLE" DISCRIMINATION

There's always a first for everything. Last week for the first time in Capitol records women testified before a committee of Congress on revenue matters. Taxes have to do with revenue. And women have always been the home economists, good, bad, or indifferent, to determine the outgo and, more and more, the income. But women who have always done this bit of practical economics had never before appeared to state their case before a congressional committee.

The women who appeared at this tax hearing in Washington were not the heads of homes, home being understood to mean a domicile whereof a man is head. They were single women asking for a removal of the discrimination in exemption against the unmarried person on the assumption that the unmarried person has not a family or other financial obligations which entitled her to the same consideration which the "head" of the family earns by virtue of his married state.

All of which discrimination against the single person comes as a result of the assumption, quite without fact basis, that single persons have none but themselves to support. As a matter of fact, most single persons contribute to the family support.

Insurance companies will flood you with proof that something like 90 per cent of all persons over 60 years of age are dependent upon others for their remaining years. But let several unmarried children be the sole support of their families, yet none may claim exemption as head of the family because she is not "sole" support of another.

This move for increased exemption for single persons is sponsored by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and is but one more plea for consideration to the small wage earner instead of additional concessions to the possessor of incomes over $110,000. This action of a national business women's organization is a move in line with their general purposes—to secure equal opportunity for women with men in the business world; not equal pay necessarily, but equal opportunity and equal pay for equal work.

In their plea to remove the income-tax discrimination against single persons these women argued from figures which showed:

That for the emergency of the war, exemptions of married men or heads of families were reduced 50 per cent while 62½ per cent was taken off the exemption allowed single persons, although single persons were then and always will be the first persons drafted for the trenches in times of war.

That the exemption for single persons remained stationary during 1917–1924, while the exemption for married men and heads of families was increased.

That the exemption for single persons is one-half of what it was before the war, $1,500 now as against $3,000 in 1913–1916.

That the unfair neglect of single persons is further emphasized by the benefits given corporations and persons having incomes near or above $1,000,000. In addition to which discrimination the 50 per cent surtax rate is largely a "paper" one, the actual rate being more nearly half of that, whereas the persons on the lower income levels rarely ever escape the full imposition of the normal rate. "If persons having incomes of a million or more dollars," the brief continues, "pay at the same rate as those having $110,000 income, then this favoritism is obviously absorbed through the rates paid by millions of smaller taxpayers."

The number of persons affected by this plea for removal of discrimination in exemption is considerable; witness the analysis of persons having incomes in the United States:

a. Number of persons having incomes or wages, 42,000,000.

b. Two per cent of these persons receive incomes of $5,000 or above.

c. Four per cent of these persons receive incomes of $3,000 to $5,000.

d. Eight per cent of these persons receive incomes of $2,000 to $3,000.

e. Eighty-six per cent of these persons have incomes of $2,000 and under.

Economic pressure has been blamed for a multitude of social, political, and moral changes, not least of which is the matter of marriage: "He couldn't afford to marry," or "She had to think of her mother and father." And in the economic struggle single persons, consciously or unconsciously, are in the lower income levels. Yet they, too, carry part of the burden of surtaxes which are passed on to the consumer.

There is this discrimination in the case of the single person. The tax rate is apparently the last place official Washington expected to have the discrimination attacked. Washington sat up and took notice when for the first time in the record of the Capitol women appeared before a committee of Congress on financial matters. A fair enough cause took them there.

In the name of thousands of single men and women in each congressional district in the United States, I plead with you for an adoption of this amendment, the raising of their exemptions to the $3,000 suggested in my amendment, and thus the extension to them of the justice and equity to which they are entitled. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy for Members to grow exuberant and generous on the floor of this House in giving exemptions and deductions and releases from taxation to their constituents. Of course, they do not bear the responsibility. The responsibility will be that of the House, and individual votes may not count much. But I want to suggest to Members of the House that it is of no use to make proposals here that are impracticable and impossible.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Who are to be the judges of that; the gentleman from Illinois or the whole House?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I did not yield to the gentleman. The proposal to increase the exemptions from $1,500 to $3,000 for single persons and from $3,500 to $5,000 to heads of families means a loss of revenue of $150,000,000. That is why I say it is impracticable and impossbile. There is no such money in the Treasury.

Now my good friend from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] saw fit to read the Congressional Directory for the purpose of advising the House as to the past history of my poor self. I hope he will enjoy that when he reads it in the RECORD. It of course went to the very fundamentals of this tax problem, and——

Mr. HUDSPETH. It goes to show the source of this "finished education."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman mean to say to me that a man with an income of $5,000, even if he needs it all for himself and his family, should pay nothing toward the maintenance of this Government?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Oh, he pays State and county taxes, and all that; taxes used for building schoolhouses and roads, and the like.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. We are here concerned with the income tax, and the gentleman does not meet the question, I will say to him, by any personal reference to my views on that subject. I said on Saturday, and I say now, that in my opinion the exemption of $3,500 for the head of a family is too high. I said I would prefer to make it $3,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Has the gentleman attempted to cut it down in this bill? He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No. We think that the exemption of $3,500 is not only ample, but generous. There are other things required by the people. I do not know whether the gentleman is in favor of increasing still further the allowance to corporations.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; I am not.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then I will say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] is opposed to it. He will have the opportunity to vote against it when the roll is called.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am in favor of the Garner amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Adding $24,000,000 to the corporation reductions?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; affording the small corporation the same chance as the large corporation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. When we get through with this bill, if these plans are successful, we will have a bill calling for a reduction of from $500,000,000 to $600,000,000 in the face of a surplus of about $225,000,000.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. How much would it cost to collect this tax?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will put that in the RECORD, if it is desired.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. Would it not cost more than the revenue obtained?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Certainly not.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. I understand it does.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Certainly not. There is a great deal of misapprehension as to the cost of collection even of the small amounts collected by the Government. They do not cost the amounts that are generally suggested.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We always have something at the bottom brackets.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But when you raise the exemption to $5,000 and $3,000, whom are you benefiting? The people who have an income of $3,500 and less get no benefit because they are not paying any tax. You are benefiting the men of the highest income, the men in the highest brackets.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Not now. The gentleman would not yield to anybody. A proposal was submitted to our committee by which a taxpayer of a lower bracket would have gotten a reduction of $40, whereas the man in the highest bracket would have got a reduction of $1,500. The benefit goes to the top of the list, not to the bottom. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a calculation has been made hurriedly as to the number of taxpayers who would be taken from the roll by this amendment. The clerk to the committee estimated that it would take a million and a half people off the roll. My friend from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] is as strong a friend of the income tax as I am myself, and I give him the credit for that. But these amendments offered now, if carried out, would inevitably destroy the tax and leave nobody to pay it except a few millionaires, a few people receiving high incomes.

Now, these amendments——

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If you raised the exemption to $5,000, how many people would it drop from the roll from among those who are now paying an income tax?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A gentleman in front of me says 970,000. But a hurried examination by the Clerk shows that a million and a half would be dropped off the roll. In other words, we would have only a small proportion of people paying taxes out of the whole general population.

Mr. BUTLER. How much would that cost?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. About $40,000,000. Those people have never paid hardly anything. The result I referred to would come from the fact that it is also carrying on into the upper brackets.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. McCoy, the Actuary in the Treasury Department, said that for every increased reduction or exemption of $500 to the individual taxpayer there will be a loss in revenue of $50,000,000. This proposal means a $1,500 increase in the exemptions for both heads of families and single persons, and that would mean a loss of revenue, according to Mr. McCoy, of $150,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Then we would have to withdraw the bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have only five minutes. I hope my friend from Texas will not insist on asking me further questions.

Mr. HUDSPETH. My colleague from Texas says you will have twice the surplus you estimate, so if he is correct you would not have to withdraw the bill, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas. I am no longer the head of a family, for unfortunate reasons, principally because I have advanced so far in years that my family is independent. I now only get this $1,500 exemption, but I do know this perfectly well, that my expenses are not one-quarter, not one-fifth—and I might put it larger than that—what they were when I was getting the full exemption of a married man, having my children educated, and taking care of a family.

I think the proportion we have fixed now is about right. I do not believe, in the interest of the income tax itself, we ought to increase the exemptions. I think they are high enough.

The people named by the lady from New Jersey are people who would pay no income tax whatever, the clerk in the store, the workingman, and the ordinary mechanic; all of those people pay nothing whatever, and they would not be helped by this. Only those whose incomes approach $10,000 or more would get any benefit out of it, and then it would run into the upper brackets. I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the lady from New Jersey to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, what became of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The CHAIRMAN. That was a pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 44. INSTALLMENT BASIS

(a) Dealers in personal property: Under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, a person who regularly sells or otherwise disposes of personal property on the installment plan may return as income therefrom in any taxable year that proportion of the installment payments actually received in that year which the gross profit realized or to be realized when payment is completed bears to the total contract price.

(b) Sales of realty and casual sales of personalty: In the case (1) of a casual sale or other casual disposition of personal property (other than property of a kind which would properly be included in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year) for a price exceeding $1,000, or (2) of a sale or other disposition of real property, if in either case the initial payments do not exceed 40 per cent of the selling price, the income may, under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, be returned on the basis and in the manner above prescribed in this section. As used in this section the term "initial payments" means the payments received in cash or property other than evidences of indebtedness of the purchaser during the taxable period in which the sale or other disposition is made.

(c) Change from accrual to installment basis: If a taxpayer elects for any taxable year to report his net income on the installment basis, then in computing his income for the year of change or any subsequent year, amount actually received during any such year on account of sales made in any prior year shall not be excluded.

(d) Gain or loss upon disposition of installment obligations: If an installment obligation is satisfied at other than its face value or distributed, transmitted, sold, or otherwise disposed of, gain or loss shall result to the extent of the difference between the basis of the obligation and (1) in the case of satisfaction at other than face value or a sale or exchange—the amount realized, or (2) in case of a distribution, transmission, or disposition otherwise than by sale or exchange—the fair market value of the obligation at the time of such distribution, transmission, or disposition. The basis of the obligation shall be the excess of the face value of the obligation over an amount equal to the income which would be returnable were the obligation satisfied in full.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 35, line 12, the word "amount" be changed to "amounts." That is a printer's error.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that on page 35, line 12, the word "amount" be changed to "amounts." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa if there is any change made in existing law by this section, and particularly I want to ask whether there is any change in subdivision (b) of section 44?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The only change in (a) and (b) is liberalizing the provisions for the benefit of the installment sale dealers. We have changed the requirement of 25 per cent, as in the former law, to 40 per cent.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman tell me what is meant by the language "casual sale or other disposition of personal property"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is a single sale that is not in the regular business.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is that in the existing law?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; that is the same as in the existing law. It has been that way for a long while and we have never had any trouble with the provision.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 48. DEFINITIONS

When used in this title—

(a) Taxable year. "Taxable year" means the calendar year, or the fiscal year ending during such calendar year, upon the basis of which the net income is computed under this part. "Taxable year" includes, in the case of a return made for a fractional part of a year under the provisions of this title or under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the period for which such return is made. The first taxable year, to be called the taxable year 1927, shall be the calender year 1927 or any fiscal year ending during the calendar year 1927.

(b) Fiscal year. "Fiscal year" means an accounting period of 12 months ending on the last day of any month other than December.

(c) Paid, incurred, accrued. The terms "paid or incurred" and "paid or accrued" shall be construed according to the method of accounting upon the basis of which the net income is computed under this part.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this bill can not become a law until some time in 1928. It proposes to rebate 1927 corporation taxes, amounting to more than $150,000,000. A similar retroactive rebate of excess-profits taxes, also urged by the Treasury Department, was rejected by Congress in the 1921 tax bill. Why not now? We should be both just and consistent. If any provision in this bill is not right in the judgment of an individual Member it is his duty to offer amendments and, irrespective of political affiliations, he has the right to vote his convictions. I did so on the graduated tax amendment offered a few moments ago to relieve small corporations. The audible criticism was then made that three Republicans went through the tellers with you Democrats on this side of the aisle, and I regret if you felt contaminated by the presence of three Republicans. I would have been glad, however, to have voted with you on that proposition even if I had been alone, believing as I do that greater relief should be afforded small corporations than is contained in this bill. I believe we ought to relieve them, if possible, because their proportionate tax is too heavy. The large corporations of this country have been making enormous profits within the last year or so. They have been accumulating great surpluses and declaring frequent stock dividends that escape taxation while the small corporations have been glad to get by with any surplus at all for a rainy day. We all know that. I looked for another amendment to come from some gentleman on the Democratic side of the aisle. Such an amendment substituting 1928 for 1927 would protect the Treasury by $160,000,000 if that date was fixed for the time the corporate tax reductions in this bill are to go into effect. If the tax cut goes into effect for the 1928 tax, instead of for 1927, that great saving to the Treasury will occur and a retroactive tax refund will not occur to corporations that have passed on the 1927 tax to consumers.

I recollect reading the other day a pronounced article by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]—a very distinguished gentleman now sitting on the right-hand side of the aisle—to the effect that by making this tax reduction law for corporations to apply in 1927 instead of 1928, as this bill proposes, we will give these corporations a present outright of $160,000,000 in 1927 taxes, which they have already passed on to consumers. Thus we will relieve them from payment of a just tax they ought to pay. I also saw the answer of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], to the effect that the tax had not been charged to consumers, because he contends it is impossible to pass on the tax when a corporation is dealing with consumers. That may be true, so far as the exact amount of tax is concerned, but we took the position that it did pass on in the tax bill of 1921. That occurred when the question came up of making the excess-profits-tax repeal retroactive to cover the taxes of that same year of 1921. It was then decided that the tax had been passed on to consumers, and this same proposition was then defeated. In the excess-profits case it would have meant a loss of $400,000,000, but by the action of the Republican side of the aisle, taken in conference by a majority of 6 or 8 out of about 180 Republican Members who were present, we decided at that time the proposal to repeal the 1921 excess-profits tax would be a retroactive proposition and we struck it from the bill. The tax repeal was then dated in 1922 and saved nearly a half billion dollars to the Treasury. We passed the bill so that the enforcement of the act would take effect in 1922 and not affect the taxes collected by corporations from consumers in 1921. I was much interested, as some Members may remember, in that change then made against the recommendation of the Treasury Department.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There were some other reasons, too. We just simply did not have the money to spare at that time.

Mr. FREAR. Now comes the answer that was given a little while ago. We have no justification in making this tax reduction retroactive as is proposed in the bill before us or to give to corporations $160,000,000 taxes that have been passed on to consumers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But the gentleman, of course, is aware that I have always taken the position, following the professors of economics and all those who have made a special study of the subject, that except in unusual cases corporations could not pass on the tax. I made a speech three or four years ago on that subject and I have not changed my position at all.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Iowa was with me in 1921 and objected to having the excess-profits-tax cut made retroactive. It was argued then, successfully, that the tax had been collected by the corporation as a part of its profits. We took the position then, that it was also a retroactive tax. Now, if you are going to make this tax reduction for corporations become effective for the year 1927, as you propose to do by this bill, then all of the enormous profits that have been made by these great corporations—and they have never made larger profits than those accumulated during the last two years—those net profits are going to be placed in their treasuries without repayment of the tax they have collected from consumers and which we will permit them to keep.

I feel grieved that my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who made such a splendid argument in the press against presenting this retroactive tax collection as a gift to corporations, and with which protest I was very largely in agreement, yet has offered nothing here to prevent that gross injustice to other taxpayers. Nothing has come from him by way of an offered amendment to prevent the injustice nor from his side of the Chamber. I would have been ready to have joined with him in such an amendment, and if the gentleman had made his usual forceful argument a majority might have been induced to support such an amendment and thus saved $100,000,000 for additional tax reduction.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the gentleman had been here last Saturday, he would have heard me reiterate that argument then.

Mr. FREAR. I know the gentleman must have made a very eloquent and forceful argument, but only an amendment will affect the bill.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I took the same position here last Saturday. I took the position that in my judgment it was economically unsound, was unjust, and was in the nature of a donation to the corporations.

Mr. FREAR. But only by an amendment to the bill could we make our impressions known or make them effective.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And I will say to our friend from Wisconsin that one of the reasons he could do something in 1921 that he can not do now is because the Treasury Department's influence is a little stronger now than in 1921.

Mr. FREAR. I do not feel the Treasury Department is controlling the provisions in the bill. If so, both sides of this Chamber are in agreement on many of its provisions and also with the department even on this great tax rebate.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The Treasury Department is insisting that this provision apply to 1927.

Mr. FREAR. But the Treasury Department, if the gentleman from Texas please, a few moments ago was in accord on small corporations with the gentleman's own amendment. I was in agreement with him and with the Treasury when the Republican side of the House was not, and we changed the bill by amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Wisconsin says the gentleman from Texas last Saturday made an argument——

Mr. FREAR. No; I regret I did not hear it. The gentleman from Texas said that he made such an argument.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Texas said he made an argument.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I admitted it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The fact of the matter is I had supposed the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] was conducting an entertainment for the benefit of the House, and the greater portion of what the gentleman had to say at that time referred to me personally rather than to any matter of argument on any of these taxes. Perhaps that is the reason the gentleman has not been ready to offer his amendment to-day.

Mr. FREAR. I will say, Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to support such an amendment when offered, as I understood it was to be offered by a member of the committee.

I was sure there would be an amendment offered from what I had seen in the press, an amendment that would have been consistent with the House action on the 1921 tax bill, and would not make this great gift to the corporations. If we could have passed such an amendment, it would not only have been just to the other taxpayers of the country who receive no rebate, but it would provide the Treasury with additional funds to the amount of $160,000,000, so that in the event we change the form of the bill later on by increasing reductions, we would then have funds available for that purpose and not exceed the tax cut recommended by the Treasury.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But that, of course, would only be for the next year.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It would not help any for the year following or the years after that.

Mr. FREAR. I understand the question of permanency raised in any tax reduction, but if it was later discovered we were not receiving sufficient revenue after saving this additional $160,000,000, then we could change the law next year or two years or three years from now. That would probably be unnecessary, but Congress can increase taxes when needed and if needed. I am seeking to save that necessity by preventing this gift to corporations through the 1927 tax they have collected and will now keep.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. I take it the gentleman is in thorough sympathy with the graduated income-tax principle.

Mr. FREAR. Absolutely.

Mr. HASTINGS. Can the gentleman give us any reason, in principle, why the brackets should stop at $100,000?

Mr. FREAR. No. I am in favor of going higher with them, but I will say that no matter what kind of graduated income rates you may draw for either individuals or corporations, you necessarily will have to make the brackets stop somewhere. It is a question of individual and collective judgment as to what we should do and where the brackets are to be placed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then does the gentleman believe in stopping the highest brackets at $100,000, or taking them up higher?

Mr. FREAR. I would make them higher; personally, that is my judgment. But that question is not before us now, and we had passed the place in the bill before my attention was called to it, where the tax year should have been inserted to prevent the retroactive feature. I regret I relied on others to offer the amendment.

GOOD AND BAD FEATURES OF THE BILL

This tax reduction bill, like all such bills, is a compromise, and I approve that part which refuses to follow Secretary Mellon's request for a repeal of the Federal estate tax. In fact, with a tempting surplus on hand, I am fearful that another assault on the Federal taxing system would come from another array of governors and lobbyists, recipients of banquets, and free excursions to Washington. The application of the surplus to debts by the Secretary occurs if this bill fails. If we can give substantial relief to small corporations and wipe out the remaining nuisance taxes, I believe the bill will be helpful to people generally, who have had a slight dose of the sales tax, to make them careful in the future. Improvement in the administrative features it is claimed will relieve uncertainty, but complaint that needed amendments will wreck the bill comes with poor grace from those who are handing over $160,000,000 in 1927 taxes to corporations that are swollen to the bursting point with surplus profits. This gift should be held up in the Senate, where opportunity for consideration permits discussion and a return to paragraphs as a matter of courtesy. The 1927 tax on corporations should not be rebated in whole or in part unless personal income taxes are also rebated.

THE ESTATE TAX

Mr. Chairman, I desire particularly to address myself to another proposal connected with the pending tax reduction bill, because if the Federal estate tax is repealed, as advocated by Secretary Mellon, I believe the State inheritance tax laws in turn will also be repealed. Such a serious loss to 45 of the 48 States will benefit no one excepting the owners of great wealth, who, like William Rockefeller, may own an estate of which two-thirds, as, in his case, $43,000,000, escaped taxation during his lifetime in the form of tax-free securities.

Secretary Mellon's estate, it is estimated, will have upwards of from fifty to one hundred million dollars Federal estate tax to pay under existing law on his own enormous wealth, subject to the 80 per cent State credit by payments made to Pennsylvania. He is chief proponent of the estate-tax repeal. He first argued that the Federal estate tax makes double taxation when a State inheritance law taxes the same property. To obviate double taxation Congress has extended a credit up to 80 per cent of the Federal tax where State inheritance-tax collections reach that amount.

By retaining the Federal estate tax Congress protects over 40 States from two or three States that appeal to residents of other States to come where no State tax exists, like Florida or Nevada for example, or where a nominal tax of only 2 per cent maximum rate exists, like in Pennsylvania and Wyoming.

Secretary Mellon further asserts that the Federal estate tax ought to be repealed because the Federal Government now retains only 20 per cent of the amount collected. That is the other horn of his former argument when he protested against double taxation. He now further discovers that the Federal tax interferes with State rights.

THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX AND STATE RIGHTS

This latter argument for a repeal of the Federal estate tax, to be consistent, would require also a repeal of the Federal income tax that produced in 1926 $1,974,104,000, or more than one-half of all Government receipts for that year. Both encroach on State rights and the income tax is also double taxation.

Federal income-tax collections affect 20 States that have State income-tax laws and it is double taxation without any State credit allowed to those States, whereas the State credit of 80 per cent removes the double tax on inheritances. No one at this time dares advocate a repeal of the Federal income tax law, although no State credit is given.

Not only a repeal of the Federal estate tax and the Federal income tax, however, are to be attempted eventually, but in view of his recommendation for a sales tax to float the soldiers' compensation bill, Secretary Mellon will, presumably, favor also a repeal of the State inheritance and income-tax laws and will be a strong and influential supporter of a sales tax. His argument then will be that to relieve capital from tax burdens will help business. The sales tax in 1923 was defeated by wide indignation evidenced by protests from all the great labor and farm organizations that believed wealth, largely created by the last war, desired to shift its tax burdens over to consumption taxes to be paid by the 4,000,000 doughboys and the millions of other wage earners and farmers who through higher prices would then pay taxes on everything they consume. The powerful Hearst press then and since during every session seeks the passage of a sales tax and is an able supporter of Secretary Mellon in that particular.

Mr. Chairman, a vigorous effort to repeal the Federal inheritance tax is threatened as a forerunner of a later effort to repeal the Federal income tax. This eventual purpose is the judgment of legislators who from the day the first income-tax bill was passed have been active in protecting these sources of income. State laws to the same end will then be assailed by the same powerful interests. In House committee hearings strong lobbies appeared in Washington well financed and engaged in flooding Congress with propaganda to this end.

MILLIONAIRES INCREASED 300 PER CENT UNDER HIGH TAXES

In 1914 this country, based on reported incomes, had 7,509 millionaires. In 1926 the number had increased to 30,513 millionaires, based on their reported incomes. In other words, in 12 years, during and since the war and a period of unprecedented high taxes, if paid by them, millionaires increased over 300 per cent in number in this country and their total concentrated wealth was in a much larger proportion.

Prosperity it is alleged in some quarters is more diffused than ever before and corporations are now alleged to be owned by "the people" who have come into their own. After skimming the cream off from manipulated corporations, including consolidations, stocks have been unloaded by professional operators. Often numerous split-ups previously occurred among these operators. To induce the lambs to buy these manipulated stocks past profits are cited, but in all history the average man from the humblest wage worker to the white-collared floor walker has never been so burdened with purchases on credit, on partial payments that mortgage his income and peace of mind for years to come, irrespective of his earning capacity or fixed employment. High war prices have continued.

Prosperity comes last to the small taxpayer. He is the first to feel its departure and he outnumbers the millionaires a thousand to one. The millions yet living on farms who rarely have been able to hold their taxes and farm mortgages down to war-time figures are not urging the Secretary's particular tax-cut program that the committee has refused to follow in the estate tax repeal.

FEW FARMERS PAY INCOME TAXES

Three million people, we are advised, have abandoned their farms within the past six years. Those remaining in many cases hold onto their places because of no other place to go. They are not interested in estate or income tax reduction, for they have little to do with either, but they will be rudely awakened if they have to pay a sales tax. A repeal of the Federal estate tax is a long step toward a sales tax.

To the 30,000 millionaires and several hundred thousand others in affluent circumstances out of our 120,000,000 people, the Federal income tax gained after many legislative struggles and the Federal inheritance tax are constant nightmares. Repeal of the Federal estate tax and repeal of the Federal income tax now based on the principle of ability to pay will both be demanded.

Mr. Chairman, a sales tax and indirect consumption tax must be substituted before wealth can force a repeal of both the Federal estate and income tax laws. Facts and evidence in support of these statements heretofore offered will not again be presented in detail, but students of taxation and the influences knocking at the doors of Congress all realize that arguments by powerful lobbies will be urged at this session and constantly hereafter for the early repeal of the inheritance and later for the repeal of the income taxes and for the substitution of a sales tax to provide revenues for the Government. The estate-tax-repeal lobby, well financed and eloquently represented by high-priced speakers, does not include in its numbers any laborers or farmers. The latter rely on Congress to represent them without any argument.

The Federal estate-tax-repeal lobby that reflects Secretary Mellon's views never sleeps, and its efforts are to be vigorously employed at the other end of the Capitol this session. The 30,000 millionaires can well afford to contribute unlimited funds to this lobby to "educate" Congress on the subject, because the Secretary alone, with holdings now rated by well-informed persons at from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000, could afford to give 10 per cent or more of his vast wealth toward that repeal "education."

OUR FEDERAL ESTATE TAX NOW IS ONLY ONE-HALF THAT OF ENGLAND

The maximum Federal inheritance tax rate is now 20 per cent of net estates exceeding $10,000,000. England and other countries have a maximum estate tax of 40 per cent, or double that of our own, with proportionate larger collections, but Secretary Mellon, in his presentation to the Ways and Means Committee, declared that no estate tax should be levied in this country excepting in times of war. Why not in the wake of war?

His cry was echoed by the press. Powerful influences immediately gathered in Washington to repeat his slogan and to sound his praises. Like other declarations of Secretary Mellon, who has been likened to Hamilton, his statement, I submit, will not stand analysis.

Our national war debt of $18,000,000,000, or eighteen times the pre-war figure, must be paid. It is a great war debt that will hang over our country for many years. It is as imperative for us to pay this $18,000,000,000 as though war was now with us. Every other country engaged in the last war recognizes its debt situation by maintaining its estate, income, and other war taxes.

For the Secretary to say that because the sound of guns has stopped the sources of great wealth and graduated taxation should be dried up is folly unknown elsewhere in the world and not worthy of a second Hamilton, whose personal tax contribution to-day is probably larger than that of a thousand combined other taxpayers on the average, and whose personal wealth probably exceeds the combined fluid wealth of the country when Alexander Hamilton was our first Secretary.

For what has this great wealth been collected by one individual, and to whom is it to be given? The present Secretary can not take this vast wealth, reaching hundreds of millions, with him nor can any of the other 30,000 millionaires carry theirs beyond the grave. According to statistics that wealth has increased over 300 per cent in 12 years, indicating the 30,000 were not heavily taxed in the past compared with many millions of people who have been struggling for a bare livelihood.

THE ESTATE TAX IS A JUST TAX

The estate tax is the most easily paid; it can not be shifted nor avoided, and it is the most just tax in principle that can be levied and paid. That is the judgment of economists of note. No estate tax or income tax has unjustly curtailed the accumulation of wealth by a handful of 30,000 millionaires, and whether the accumulation of the 30,000 have occurred through honest or dishonest means is not even the test, for they are able to pay the tax and should do so. If liquor bootleggers can be held by the Treasury to a payment of income taxes from their bootlegging activities, why should great wealth be permitted to avoid the Federal estate tax it now pays.

European countries like ourselves are paying their war debts in part by a 40 per cent maximum rate in their estate taxes. Unless all their financial experts and economists generally are at fault, Secretary Mellon's statement as to that tax and "war" debts is incorrect. His personal interest of upward of $100,000,000 in a Federal estate tax if to be paid at present rates may unconsciously influence his judgment as to taxes and also his recollection that our war debt is not paid. Until the $18,000,000,000 national debt is wiped out the 30,000 millionaires and those best able to pay should willingly pay their rightful share of taxes whether based on incomes or estates.

When urging that estate taxes properly belong to the State the Secretary failed to say that Pennsylvania has an inheritance tax law of only 2 per cent maximum or the smallest rate among all the States. Compared with the 20 per cent Federal maximum estate tax it is only one-tenth excepting as to the tax on collateral heirs. Secretary Mellon has persuaded Congress to reduce the English maximum estate tax rates we formerly had to just one-half of the English tax rates. Possibly the same reason accounts in Pennsylvania for its 2 per cent maximum State rate. Wyoming has that same rate.

STATES THAT HAVE NO ESTATE TAXES

Florida, now bidding for wealthy residents from Wisconsin, Illinois, New York, and other States, advertises it is a State without any estate tax for those who will come within its hospitable boundaries. Its taxes are collected from other sources. For years Florida circulated Northern States with attractive literature, but more inviting than any argument concerning its salubrious climate was its appeal to men of wealth who made their fortunes in other States to move to Florida for a temporary "residence" every year so as to avoid any estate-tax payments. Wisconsin furnished many such men, and the same is true of Minnesota, Illinois, and other northern States. These people "reside" in Florida briefly, but live in their northern homes eight months in the year.

In order to advertise to the world it is a haven of refuge from inheritance taxes Florida adopted a constitutional amendment providing its legislature shall not impose estate taxes. Nevada followed the same example of an estate-tax refuge as well as for would-be divorcees of the country, but of the 48 States, practically all, with two or three exceptions, have adopted and collect some kind of an estate tax, from the California rate of 12 per cent maximum down to the 2 per cent maximum in Pennsylvania and Wyoming. On indirect relations and with strangers to the deceased the fixed maximum rate is frequently higher.

Secretary Mellon complained of double taxation by both the State and Federal Government where such State taxes exist. The Pennsylvania and Wyoming maximum tax of 2 per cent is nominal, and if the Federal estate tax is repealed residents of Pennsylvania and Wyoming will carry their estates to the grave practically intact, yielding to the State only 2 per cent except to collateral relations.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has machinery for investigation and enforcement of both income and inheritance taxes. So, in justice to the States, Congress passed an amendment giving to all the States a credit based on their State laws up to 80 per cent of all Federal estate taxes collected where a State inheritance tax is paid. If the State has no estate taxes as in the State of Florida, then the northern resident may change his residence to the land of flowers, but the estate tax will not be escaped because the Government collects the tax from residents of all States with this difference that if Florida voluntarily absolved all its residents from estate taxes in the hopes of attracting wealthy people from 45 States then the tax not levied and collected by the State remains in the Federal Treasury.

New York has a maximum rate of 4 per cent for direct kindred: Tennessee and Vermont 5 per cent; Massachusetts, Texas, and North Carolina 6 per cent; Michigan 8 per cent; and Washington, Arkansas, and Wisconsin have a maximum rate of 10 per cent, while California is slightly higher.

On estates given to strangers or collateral kindred the maximum rates in each State are ordinarily higher, but, with the credit permitted to the State of 80 per cent of the Federal tax, the tax can not now be considered a double tax.

Until the two or three complaining States readjust their rates so they do not unscrupulously bid for residents from other States, any estate-tax loss is chargeable to the policy of the State that endeavors to rob other States of their residents by promised estate-tax exemptions.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL ESTATE TAXES MEANS REPEAL OF STATE TAXES

Only by retaining the Federal tax will the 48 States be induced to seek uniform State rates and only by retaining the Federal tax will States retain their own State inheritance taxes. The moment the powerful estate-tax lobby succeeds in a repeal of the Federal estate tax law, at that moment the same lobby will shift the scene of operations to repeal the estate tax laws of more than 40 States. I am speaking for the protection of every State, including my own, when I point out the danger of repealing the Federal estate tax as urged by Secretary Mellon in his argument before the Ways and Means Committee. It will involve a loss to Wisconsin of over $2,000,000 annually if the State tax is repealed and of $100,000,000 to the country at large.

An assault on the State inheritance laws in every State will be followed next by a demand for the repeal of the Federal income tax law that has been weakened by amendments and court decisions, which tax will fall in its turn. A sales tax that taxes every man "equally," not in proportion to his ability to pay, will then be substituted on the theory that any tax is a burden to business. Then the laboring man with six children and six pairs of shoes and six mouths to feed will pay six times the tax that need be paid by Mr. Mellon, subject to the different price paid by him for shoes and food. Not 2 per cent increase as represented by sales-tax proponents, but many times 2 per cent, depending on the number of turnovers. That is a "consumption or sales tax."

FEDERAL ESTATE TAXES, BY STATES, IN 1925

In 1925 the Federal estate tax amounted to $101,421,766, collected from the 48 States, including Florida and Nevada. New York, of course, contributed the major part, but this is explained by a tendency of people of wealth from the remaining 47 States to migrate to New York when spending their last days. In Florida the Federal estate tax collected in 1922 was $189,130 and that same year Wisconsin paid $1,291,782, or nearly ten times as much. California paid $4,241,140; Pennsylvania, $8,329,481; and New York, $47,023,286. In 1925, or three years thereafter, when northern residents rushed to Florida, the Federal estate taxes collected in Florida were $1,217,702; Wisconsin paid $1,125,099; California, $4,412,641; Pennsylvania, $10,123,406; and New York, $34,334,108. A jump in Federal estate taxes in Florida in four years from $189,130 to $1,217,702 indicates why the fountain of eternal youth has its variable moods, and why the Federal taxing machinery is of help to the States where they have like taxes to collect. State inheritance taxes collected in 1926 reaching $43,470,468 for New York and $2,034,989 for Wisconsin were credited to the extent of 80 per cent of the Federal estate tax, but Florida received nothing from estate taxes. Florida "residents" who had gone there from New York, Wisconsin, and other States to avoid their local State taxes paid tribute to the Federal Government, without any particular gain to the expatriated northern taxpayer and none to Florida. We do not love Florida less, but our own States more, when asking for square dealing.

A reduction in corporation tax in the pending bill from a present 13½ per cent rate to a lower rate is relatively not important. Nearly $100,000,000 is absorbed with every 1 per cent corporation tax, and a 2½ per cent reduction would dispose of the existing annual surplus according to estimates by the Treasury; but of infinite importance in our Federal taxing system is the proposal to wipe out the Federal estate tax, even as Secretary Mellon, supported by President Harding, unsuccessfully urged a Mellon tax bill and also a sales tax on Congress when the soldiers' compensation bill was passed over their opposition.

The Federal estate tax income of $100,000,000 annually in round numbers subject to State credits can not be wiped out this session if the surplus is absorbed by corporation-tax reductions or a repeal of remaining nuisance taxes, but the action of the House is only a first engagement. The real fight to repeal the Federal estate tax, when the time is propitious, will be made in the Senate. Possibly an amended Treasury tax reduction estimate may occur after this tax bill leaves the House, but in any event the powerful lobby and the gallery of State governors who urge that repeal were not brought here by accident. They are expected to overwhelm Congress even as the Mellon bill propaganda swept the country when Mr. Mellon gave the signal—but failed to sweep Congress. Congress refused to be stampeded in time of peace by war propaganda methods.

GOVERNORS WHO ORATE AGAINST THEIR OWN STATES

Mr. Chairman, governors of States are brought here by the estate-tax-repeal lobby to force repeal of a law that under its 80 per cent State credit provision protects and preserves their own State inheritance tax laws until we are forcibly reminded that the average man may easily be induced to sign a petition, without reading, to hang himself when executives of great States selected to guard the financial system of their States exercise no better caution.

They are captured by the lobby's glib argument of interference with State rights, when in fact the 80 per cent State credit protects the taxing State from faithless flapper invitations of any tax-free State. Only by retention of the Federal estate tax can State taxes be maintained through the 80 per cent State credit regulation, and it must be remembered that the Federal estate tax exempts the average estate left by 9 out of every 10 deceased persons.

State governors who favor a repeal of the Federal estate tax because of its interference with State rights in like manner seek to destroy our Federal income tax law that has been confirmed twice by the American people through constitutional amendments. Both the Federal income tax and the estate tax necessarily are invasions of State boundaries, and in most States to some extent result in double tax payments by the citizens affected. When these Federal taxes are repealed the estate taxes in the States will become a target for the lobby's fire and a vicious sales tax, the lobby's alternative will know no State boundaries when leechlike it fastens itself onto the necessities of life that every person consumes.

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AUTOMATIC VOTING MACHINE

Since the World War there has come to the American Congress among other powerful lobbies a substitute for all the study service and statesmanship that governed the deliberation of Congress in the earlier days of American history. Wisely or unwisely our forefathers placed the responsibility for legislation on the American Congress governed only by the Constitution and the presidential right of veto. That responsibility is construed by the United States Chamber of Commence to have been shifted. A superbody now exists that neither studies nor finds need of statesmanship but undertakes to decide momentous questions by simply voting from Dan to Beersheba its preference, unaffected by facts or arguments.

It waives the constitutional prohibitions and directions that govern Congress and by a gesture substitutes mechanical voting, nondeliberative methods. By directing its membership through suggestion how to vote on subjects that presumably have not enlisted the study of 5 per cent of its highly intelligent organization, Congress is now solemnly, frequently, and vigorously informed as to legislation by the United States Chamber of Commerce, that reiterates its 850,000 membership. By a pompously announced vote this "chamber" decides that all taxes affecting its 850,000 membership are objectionable to a large majority of that body. These include a substantial reduction in corporation taxes, a repeal of all remaining war excise taxes, repeal of the Federal estate tax, also protection of the Mississippi Valley against future floods, opposition to any proposal for a Government shipbuilding program, and so forth. Like the old-fashioned church pastor who in his prayers and sermons told the Lord just what to do and how and when to do it, this superbody by "voting" solves all the troublesome problems which 500 Senators and Members were elected by 120,000,000 people to settle.

Without argument pro or con, the American Congress is advised by the chamber of commerce 850,000 membership that the wise constitutional provision which permits each House to be the judge of its own membership is overruled by the chamber's vote of 36,122 to 2,221, or some similar figure. Only a fraction of the individual membership presumably attempts to vote.

A recent referendum asks these 850,000 members of the chamber of commerce to vote on the question of whether Congress can or should test the qualifications of its own Senators or Members when presenting themselves, however serious the charges pending.

Elihu Root, when United States Senator, offered this opinion over a decade ago:

> There exists no power in our Government short of our amendment of the Constitution of the United States to limit or control the evidence we (the Senate) shall reserve or the grounds on which we shall act in judging the qualification and election of a Member.

The constitutional provision, however, did not anticipate a referendum vote of the 850,000 membership of the chamber of commerce. Referendums that run wild permit bombastic utterances to issue from those who control its overworked referendum machinery. These referendums now cover every conceivable subject from farm relief and flood control and expert tax reduction to weather conditions and the heights of skirts, all to be settled by "votes" of its generally uninformed membership.

"ABSURD" VOTES BY AUTOMATIC MACHINERY

And so in its prodigious task of supervising all legislation in addition to running the "Chamber" units and innumerable golf courses, the individual members of the chamber from Androscoggin on the east and Tillamook on the west and Coffeeville or Biloxi on the Gulf and Kokomo and Oshkosh on the north are "voted" by the directors at Washington to show that the "Chamber," by 2,581 to 199, in its infinite wisdom on all legislative matters desires a tax reduction of $400,000,000 annually, although the Treasury advises we vote only $225,000,000 when flood control, farm relief, and other indefinite expenditures await legislation and appropriations.

President Coolidge declared the "vote" of the "Chamber" to be "absurd." It demands great appropriations and at the same time it "votes" a greater tax cut than either the Treasury or the Ways and Means Committee believes safe to make. The chamber officials who prepare these "votes" assert with positiveness its membership is intelligent. Does anything in the record of its "voting" methods support that belief?

Notwithstanding the Treasury estimate is $225,000,000 for possible safe reduction, the economists, tax experts, and financial authorities voting in Podunk, Tillamook, and Kokomo by their vote have given Congress and the press and the public the exact figures reached by the intelligent (?) voting of its members. Congress and the country may feel relieved that the tax cut voted by the thousands of "Chambers" did not reach eight hundred million dollars instead of four.

Skeptics and scoffers may say that a vote of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, or the Woodmen of the World would be of equal value, based on the lack of information possessed by those whose "votes" are thus solemnly reported to Congress from Pittsburgh to Podunk.

The measures on which this superchamber of commerce directs us how to act necessarily have all been studied in Congress, in committee and in the House and Senate, with the aid of expert information. True, also, in House and Senate the measures are debated by legislators who often burn midnight oil while grasping details that are made known to the chamber of commerce voters without study. When the several States by appropriate action delegate this chamber of commerce to tell Congress what to do then individual responsibility of Representatives will cease, but until that time comes every Member naturally inquires what interests and influences are responsible for some of the suggestions that are solemnly voted by the chamber's 850,000 membership.

Congress has not always accepted these commands, and numberless votes lie at the bottom of the average wastebasket, yet the chamber directors with a flourish of trumpets in the press always announce the result of the last vote, that to the lay mind assumes at times to regulate the solar and legislative system and votes that the law of gravity and the inheritance tax should both be repealed by the Seventieth Congress.

HOW THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AFFECTS CONGRESS

If I remember correctly, this superlegislative advisory body once advised Congress to pass a vicious sales tax, that would have added a billion or more dollars to the high cost of living for ninety-five-odd wage earners out of every 100 people in order to relieve the remaining 5 per cent of a portion of the income tax levied against large incomes, frequently accumulated through war speculations. The sales tax or consumption tax, backed by the American Chamber of Commerce, did not recommend itself to Congress to the extent of even getting a favorable recommendation from a single committee of Congress. A vote of 15,000,000 Literary Digest selected names decided overwhelmingly that Congress should defeat a soldiers' compensation bill. Congress vetoed the vote and also placed its veto over a presidential veto. The chamber of commerce also shrieked against "capitalizing loyalty"; at least those members of the chamber who had cost-plus war contracts so voted.

The Mellon tax reduction bill looked like a winner and was enthusiastically referendumed by the chamber of commerce because of its generous tax reductions to those best able to pay. Again Congress after much study and debate ignored the referendum vote that was collected for its guidance. The chamber's referendum vote against the soldiers' compensation bill, like the Literary Digest vote, did not reflect the judgment of the American Congress, that was selected by the Constitution to determine such questions. Publicity but not legislation seems to be the primary purpose of the chamber's "vote."

AN OVERWORKED LOBBY

The American Chamber of Commerce is an important organization in our business life and within its legitimate field has a well-defined service to perform. In a lesser degree it may be contended Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, and countless other organizations that thrive and prosper in America are of service, both in a large business sense and in the upbuilding of communities. Thus far none of these organizations has regularly given Congress the benefit of individual street opinions on legislative matters, nor can any objection be offered where the slightest intelligent understanding is evidenced by the vote returned.

We may soon look for group influences from the multitude of farm organizations that represent one-third of our population, and it is questionable whether the judgment of the tiller of the soil who has many moments of serious thought will not be of legislative value to the lawmaker equal to the votes on every conceivable subject now heralded through the press from the headquarters of the chamber of commerce.

This humble protest is not offered against the harmless referendums that regularly and often appear on Members' desks, but it is against a mechanical voting system, often without consideration, or at most, hazy street opinions gathered in hayrake style, then emblazoned on the front pages of reputable papers as the solemn deliberate conclusion of a highly reputable organization.

If its work is directed to enlightening members on legislative proposals every legislative agent has a useful duty to perform. The only criticism lodged against certain lobbies, including foremost the chamber of commerce, is the method used to try and influence legislative decisions. Those favoring the retention of the Federal estate tax, which it opposes, and Federal income tax without the emasculation of either, are our constituents back home, who have no paid lobby to send to Washington but who have elected their Representatives to protect their interests. That duty each Member of Congress must perform according to his best judgment, and the responsibility rests on votes in Congress and not on referendum votes cast by members of the chamber of commerce or by other organizations.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, earlier in the debate a question was asked of the gentleman who then had the floor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], and as yet the question has not been answered.

The question was how many people would be affected and how much revenue would be lost if we were to increase the present exemption of $1,500 for single persons to $3,000, and the exemption of married persons from $3,500 to $5,000.

According to the 1925 returns, this increase of the exemption for single persons would exempt 676,000 single persons who now pay a tax, with a resulting loss of revenue of $7,600,000. The increase of the present exemption of $3,500 to $5,000 for married people would exempt from the operation of the present income tax law 551,000 more people who now pay an income tax, with an additional loss of revenue of $6,706,000.

But the significant fact then remains that although this total of $14,306,000 represents the relief that would be given by this increase in exemption to the person of small income, an additional loss of revenue of $136,000,000 would result, or to put it the other way, such an increase in exemptions would affect all those in the higher brackets by saving them $136,000,000.

I think these facts ought to be clear to the House.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So that the total loss in revenue would be $150,000,000?

Mr. BEEDY. One hundred and fifty million dollars would be the total loss, of which only about $14,000,000 would benefit the man of small income, and only approximately 1,000,000 of our entire population would then come within the operation of our income tax law, which now applies to about two and one-half millions of our people.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 104. ACCUMULATION OF SURPLUS TO EVADE SURTAXES—1928 OR SUBSEQUENT TAXABLE YEARS

(a) Tax on personal holding company: If any personal holding company permits its undistributed profits for the taxable year 1928 or any succeeding taxable year to exceed 30 per cent of the sum of its net income for such year plus the amount of the dividend deduction and interest upon obligations of the United States, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for such taxable year, in addition to the tax on corporations imposed by section 13(a), a tax equal to 25 per cent of such undistributed profits.

(b) Definitions: As used in this section—

(1) The term "personal holding company" means any corporation if (A) at least 80 per cent of its gross income for the taxable year is derived from rents, royalties, dividends, interest (whether or not tax exempt), annuities, and (except in the case of regular dealers in securities) gains from the sale of securities, and (B) either—

Eighty per cent or more of its voting stock (exclusive of stock limited as to dividends and exclusive of stock redeemable upon less than 30 days' notice) is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, through affiliation, stock ownership, voting trust agreements, or otherwise, by or for not more than 10 individuals; or

The right to receive 80 per cent or more of the dividends distributed by the corporation is vested, directly or indirectly, through affiliation, stock ownership, voting trust agreements, or otherwise, in not more than 10 individuals;

But such term shall not include any banking or insurance corporation.

(2) The term "dividend deduction" means the deduction specified in section 23 (p).

(3) The term "interest upon obligations of the United States" means interest upon obligations of the United States issued after September 1, 1917, which would be subject to tax in whole or in part in the hands of an individual owner.

(4) The term "undistributed profits" means the net income for the taxable year increased by the amount of the dividend deduction and interest upon obligations of the United States, but diminished by—

(A) the amount of tax under section 13(a) for the taxable year;

(B) the amount of dividends declared out of earnings or profits for the taxable year, not later than the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year and payable prior to the 15th day of the sixth month following the close of such taxable year. If dividends so declared are not actually paid prior to such date, then the amount not so paid shall be included in the undistributed profits, and the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be redetermined in accordance therewith.

(c) Tax on corporation formed or availed of to evade surtax.—If any corporation, however created or organized, other than a personal holding company, is formed or availed of for the purpose of preventing the imposition of the surtax upon any of its shareholders through the medium of permitting its gains and profits to remain accumulated, instead of being divided or distributed among its shareholders, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for the taxable year 1928 and succeeding taxable years, in addition to the tax on corporations imposed by section 13(a), a tax of 25 per cent of the net income of the corporation increased by the amount of the dividend deduction and interest upon obligations of the United States. Such tax shall be computed, levied, collected, and paid upon the same basis and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions of law, including penalties, as that tax. The following shall be prima facie evidence that a corporation, other than a "personal holding company" as hereinbefore defined, is formed or availed of for the purpose of preventing the imposition of surtax upon any of its shareholders:

(1) That the corporation is a mere holding or investment company; or

(2) That the gains or profits are permitted to remain accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business. In determining whether gains or profits are permitted to remain accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business there shall not be included gains or profits remaining accumulated during a prior taxable year for which the corporation has paid a tax imposed by this section.

(d) Information statements.—A corporation which in the taxable year 1928 or any succeeding taxable year permits the accumulation of more than 60 per cent of its net income increased by the amount of the dividend deduction and interest upon obligations of the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, shall (1) file as a part of its return a statement giving in detail the reasons for the accumulation and the purposes to which the amounts accumulated are to be devoted, and (2) from time to time thereafter file reports under oath giving the disposition of the amounts so accumulated until all such amounts have been accounted for.

(e) Optional tax on shareholders.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply in respect of any taxable year if all the shareholders of the corporation include in their gross income, at the time of filing their returns, the amount of their entire distributive shares of the undistributed profits of the corporation for such taxable year. The tax imposed by subsection (c) shall not apply in respect of any taxable year if all the shareholders of the corporation include in their gross income at the time of filing their returns the amount of their entire distributive shares of the gains and profits remaining accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business as determined by the commissioner. Any amount so included in the gross income of the shareholder shall be treated as a dividend received by the shareholder. A shareholder who has so included in his gross income his distributive share shall be entitled to receive exempt from tax subsequent distributions made by the corporation out of earnings or profits until such taxpayer has received exempt distributions in the amount of such share.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of calling attention to this section 104. Unless you have the corresponding law of 1926 you probably do not know what the provisions of section 104 mean. I know I would not unless I had had some information about it.

Section 104 is entirely new. It is inserted in the bill in response to the advisory committee's criticism of the administration of section 220 in the present law. I am sure you will remember what section 220 in the present law is. It was intended to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to force corporations to distribute their profits and subject their shareholders to the tax levied by Congress. It has been in the statute for some years.

The advisory committee, in a very delicate way, intimated that the Treasury Department has not enforced the law. I say "delicate," because they call attention to the fact that it is very difficult to administer the law, and the result is that they suggest a remedy.

If you will take the report of the advisory committee that was placed in the box yesterday, you will find that the joint committee of the House and Senate recommended every provision in this advisory committee's report with the single exception of section 220. They did not recommend 220, but said they make no recommendation for 220. The reason was because the joint committee could not come to an agreement. The reason we could not come to an agreement is because some gentlemen, including the Treasury Department, is opposed to the recommendation of the advisory committee, which is in effect that you give an advantage of 20 per cent in taxes to those profits that are distributed against those retained in the treasury of the corporation.

I think that ought to be put in. I wish Congress would make a rate in this bill of 10 and 12 per cent instead of a flat rate of 11½ per cent. I wish it would make a rate of 10 per cent on distributed profits and 12 on profits retained in the treasury of the corporation. In this way you have an inducement to distribute the profits because you get an advantage of 2 per cent.

The individuals evading this tax do not want that done. No longer ago than the first part of last week you saw where the Federal Trade Commission, in response to a resolution of the United States Senate, made an investigation to ascertain the amount of stock dividends declared in 1920, and making a comparison for similar periods prior to 1920, when the Supreme Court held you could not tax stock dividends.

Now, that was an astounding report to me—an official report made by a bureau of our Government that six and one-half billion dollars of stock dividends were declared in seven years.

If the Government had been receiving a tax on that, we would have got something over $700,000,000. Suppose we distributed 50 per cent of it. The Government would have received in the surplus brackets from those gentlemen who did not pay the tax, in round numbers $300,000,000. In other words, the Treasury of the United States, by virtue of the nonenforcement of section 220 by the Treasury Department, has lost from three hundred to eight hundred million dollars in the last seven years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Now the committee—and Mr. GREEN is more responsible for it than anyone else—has in good faith undertaken to draw a provision that will be mandatory on the Treasury Department. When you find the Secretary of the Treasury is not enforcing the law as Congress intended, because he is not in sympathy with their paying in the higher brackets and compelling them to pay any more taxes than they can help, Congress now seeks to compel him to do it. When the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] asked one of the expert draftsmen if he thought this would do the job, the fellow being honest, had to say, no, he did not believe it would, that they could get around this tax.

But, gentlemen, you could not get around it; it would be impossible to avoid it if you carried out the report of the advisory committee and gave a preferential to the fellow who made an honest distribution of his profits as against one who makes a dishonest distribution and holds it in his treasury and then declares a stock dividend, and pays no tax. Six and a half billion dollars in six years—more than $1,000,000,000 a year of stock dividends declared in this country as compared with $300,000,000 six years prior to that time! You know and I know and everyone else must know that those profits were retained in the corporations and issued in the form of stock dividends to avoid the surtax of the individual who would have received those dividends from the corporations if they had been distributed.

You are not going to reach them with this. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has done about as good a job as he can do; but how can you reach it? I do not care

what laws you write upon the statute books, if you have not a man who is in sympathy with the law to enforce it, you will not get anywhere with it. I do not care what you put in that statute, if you turn it over to a man who is not in sympathy with the statute, he will find a way to avoid it, and that is what has been done with section 220 for the past six years. There is not a single instance, so far as I know, where the Secretary of the Treasury has collected what the statute said that he should collect, where a corporation fails to distribute the amount of money to its shareholders that it ought to distribute. You know there have been some instances in this country—and I think the chairman of the committee, if you will ask him when he gets on the floor, will tell you that he thinks that there have been instances where the Treasury ought to have enforced this statute. If there have been, and the Treasury did not enforce it, was it maladministration? No. It is just simply because the present Secretary of the Treasury is not in sympathy with these high brackets, is not in sympathy with this graduated surtax and the result is that wherever his discretion comes, he uses it in favor of the taxpayer. I thought the House ought to know what these provisions were intended for, and I took the floor for a moment for that purpose.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does not the gentleman know that we could not possibly invoke that section because the information necessary is absolutely unobtainable.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if he had been Secretary of the Treasury he would have made an effort at least to carry out that law, because he would have felt in honor bound to do it and no effort has been made to enforce it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is right. This is a very important section. The gentleman from Texas has made an argument, and I am glad he has, because he has the brains and ability to make an argument when he tries. When he tries to entertain the House, he is a great entertainer also, and that is what he was doing last Saturday.

Section 104 is supplementary to section 105. Section 105 is very nearly the old section 220 reenacted. There is a slight change in it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is also right in saying that I have not been satisfied with the way that section 220 has been administered, and the gentleman from Texas is practically right also in saying that there has been almost nothing collected under it. A small sum has been collected under it.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] in his interrogatory which he propounded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] referred to one part of 220. There is another part of 220 that is not discretionary at all because (b) of section 105 of this bill provides that—

> the fact that any corporation is a mere holding or investment company, or that the gains or profits are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business, shall be prima facie evidence of a purpose to escape the surtax.

Possibly the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may be right about the second alternative, but the first part of it is not alternative at all. It requires that when a corporation is a mere holding or investment company it shall be prima facie evidence of a purpose to escape the surtax.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was trying to express myself in this manner: The difficulty is that this section can not be administered. It is suggested that the officials could do it. This part of the law can not be administered, as sufficient information is unobtainable, and I am unwilling to have it blamed on this administration because it could never be administered under any administration.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman is in error in that. There has been no demonstration, at least, of any effort to enforce it. At all events, this subject has interested me greatly, and there was a special report made upon the administration of section 220 by the chief of the investigating division of the joint committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman tell us what the objections were to recommending a preferential tax for those who distributed the profits?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will come to that presently. As I said, there was a special report made, which report showed that the tax had never been assessed. They have not taken any cases to the Board of Tax Appeals. In a general way there has been little, if any, effort made to enforce this section 220 with reference to the evasion of the surtaxes by corporations, and when the surtaxes were so high there was an enormous amount of taxes evaded in this method. I do not think at present there is as much evasion as there was. I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that the method of putting a differential tax on those profits that are distributed from those not distributed is the proper way to remedy this situation. The trouble about any remedy of that kind is that it hits the honest man just as hard as it hits the dishonest man.

I repeat, the difficulty with the proposition recommended by the advisory committee, the one proposed by the gentleman from Texas, to put a differentiated tax on profits distributed from the rate on profits which are not distributed, hits the honest man who has a necessity for keeping a surplus in his corporation just as hard as the dishonest man who is trying to avoid taxes. If there is anything men do not like to be penalized for it is when they have not done anything wrong. Take the banks in my State. They are having a hard time to try to build up a surplus. The plan proposed by the gentleman from Texas would simply penalize those banks trying to build up a surplus. They lost their surplus in the hard times. Take the small corporations just starting. They have to build up a surplus in order to try to compete with the larger institutions. This provision proposed by the advisory committee, which was not approved by the joint committee, and approved by the gentleman from Texas, would penalize those gentlemen who are honestly endeavoring to build up a surplus which they needed in their business, and without which they could not make a success of their business, and they are hit as hard or harder than those trying to avoid the tax.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The recommendation provided for a blanket tax on all profits not declared whether kept legitimately for building up a surplus or not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; the provision recommended was that there should be a differential of 20 per cent between profits distributed and those which were not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They would tax all profits not distributed whether they were kept for the legitimate building up of a surplus or not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. No matter how legitimate the purpose might be for keeping them—and in a majority of instances the purpose would be entirely legitimate, because in only rather exceptional cases they are trying to avoid the tax—in a majority of cases it penalizes the honest man who is doing what he thought was for the benefit of his corporation in building up a safe and sound institution. For that reason I have been opposed to it. I have done the best I could to try to get something enforceable as against this practice of trying to avoid the surtax by corporations when I proposed this section 104. Now, the gentleman from Texas, probably unwittingly, somewhat misquoted the legislative counsel, Mr. Beaman. What Mr. Beaman said was, it would be possible to avoid section 104. It would be possible to avoid any tax. There is not any tax that could not be avoided. It will not be very easy to avoid it in my judgment or keep from enforcing it. We have got a large number of corporations in this country which are organized simply for the purpose of avoiding the surtax. They do not distribute any dividends, or, if they do, only a small part of them. We have a large number of companies, one-man companies, where one man owns practically all the stock with a few dummies, a secretary and stenographer and two or three others, or something of that kind. They are organized simply for the purpose of avoiding the surtax. We have motion-picture actors even who have incorporated themselves, who do not want to pay tax on their salaries, who hire themselves out to the corporation for a small sum. I do not say that is always done. I think it is rather exceptional, but it has been done, and in that way they have been able to avoid the surtax on large salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, you will observe that this is a tax on personal holding companies, and that personal holding company is defined to mean—

> any corporation if—(A) at least 80 per cent of its gross income for the taxable year is derived from rents, royalties, dividends, interest (whether or not tax exempt), annuities, and (except in the case of regular dealers in securities) gains from the sale of securities.

In other words, it is intended to reach corporations that have no regular business except cutting off coupons, collecting rents, and receiving dividends.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Has the word "personal" any special significance—"personal holding companies"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not think it may be said to have any special significance except the fact they are organized for the real benefit of one person—the person who was trying to get away from the surtax.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It means simply a tax on the holding company?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. The word "personal" was used to define the holding companies a little better. By that means we were able to make a better definition of the companies to which the tax applied.

As I said before, in nearly all of these cases there was one person who really got the benefit of all the profits of the company, but escaped the surtax by reason of the corporation.

Now, I wish to call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that these personal holding companies do not include any banking or insurance companies. We want the banks and the insurance companies to have a good surplus and to be perfectly safe, and all banks are justified in building up their business.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Do I understand that by the gentleman's definition of what a personal holding company means, it means a corporation limited to 10 stockholders? I call the gentleman's attention to that part of the provision contained in subdivision 3 on page 57, where it is provided that 80 per cent of the voting stock shall be held by not more than 10 individuals?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I understand the question of the gentleman, the gentleman is correct. It is confined to those cases.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Confined to cases where the total number of stockholders does not exceed 10?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; the gentleman will notice that it does not mean the number of stockholders, but where the right to receive 80 per cent or more of the dividends distributed by the corporation is vested, directly or indirectly, through affiliations, stock ownership, voting trust agreements, or otherwise, in 10 individuals.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It is where there are not more than 10 beneficiaries?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. "Beneficiaries" would be a more accurate term.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Has the gentleman any idea of what would be the practical operation of this if based upon past performances?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. You will not find much direct revenue raised by this provision but the effect will be to dissolve a number of these corporations that were formed to escape the surtax, and the persons who own them will pay their surtax in the regular way, the same as other people. That will be the effect.

There may be some of them that will see fit to fight this proposition. Others may try to work out some method of evasion which is not covered by the language here. The statement made by the committee's eminent counsel, Mr. Beaman, may be correct, that there may be still some of them who will work through some process of evasion.

But you will notice that they will take a big risk in attempting to do that. They are liable to a heavy tax. My opinion is that few of them will attempt it. If we can not reach them under this provision 104, we still have the old 220, which with a slight change of verbiage we have still preserved.

I am told by gentlemen familiar with the operations of these corporations and gentlemen connected with large accounting firms and others that section 220 of the present law, while it never brought in any revenue, operated in such a way as to cause a great many of these corporations to dissolve. It has been, in fact, a most excellent scarecrow, if it has been nothing else, and it has driven these people into taking such action as to avoid the penalties prescribed. The committee has been criticized in relation to this matter, and I admit that I myself am not entirely satisfied with the way section 220 has been enforced. At the same time we all must admit that there is some difficulty in administering it, and the old provision that we had before the last law had a joker that was slipped into it in some way—I do not know exactly how—so that we did not consider the Treasury at all to blame for not enforcing section 220 as it was before the law was enacted in 1926. But I want to say this, and it is one thing that I think justifies the creation of the advisory committee: There have been a number of cases commenced against these people. At the time the joint committee was organized, at the time when its staff went to work, my understanding is that there was not a solitary case pending against those people.

I understand that now, to-day, there are 50 cases pending against them. I think a considerable revenue will be got out of them, far more than the cost of the joint committee; I think it will come from this source alone. The attention of the Treasury has been particularly called to this kind of a provision, and I am free to say this to the Members of the House: That I propose to see that the provisions of these two sections are enforced, so far as the Treasury can enforce them. I am not content that they should sit back and say, "We do not think this can be enforced." Let them assess the tax and if the party assessed has any grievance let him go before the board and get a construction. Let the matter be tried out. Of course, we ought to have the statutes applied.

That is the situation, gentlemen, with reference to these two sections. They are, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] said, two very important sections. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I just wanted to say to the chairman of the committee that if he desires to accomplish the purpose entertained under section 204, there should be a change in the definition of a personal holding company; that between the time this bill passes the House and goes to the Senate some thought should be given to that definition. As it now stands, you limit that to 10, and if the person or number of persons are anxious to avoid the law, they certainly would not have any scruples against taking on one additional person.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Those are the persons that would get the dividends.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It should be applied to these beneficiaries rather than the group.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If we do not catch them under section 204, then we can go to section 205, as to the intent; and if they make the attempt to evade, you can get them under 205.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that this paragraph was one of the most difficult things that the committee had to deal with; and if, when this bill goes to the other branch, the gentleman can offer some suggestion that will improve the law and make it more effective in its administration, the committee will be only too glad if he will make the suggestion.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think that would be difficult.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit me to make a correction in my remarks?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have been speaking of section 105 when I should have been referring to (c) of this particular section. Section 105 applies to the taxable year 1927. That is what misled me for the moment and that is how I came to make that mistake. In my remarks when I referred to section 105 I should have said subdivision (c) on page 58.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUPPLEMENT B—COMPUTATION OF NET INCOME

[Supplementary to subtitle B, Part II]

SEC. 111. DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF GAIN OR LOSS

(a) Computation of gain or loss: Except as hereinafter provided in this section, the gain from the sale or other disposition of property shall be the excess of the amount realized therefrom over the basis provided in section 113, and the loss shall be the excess of such basis over the amount realized.

(b) Adjustment of basis: In computing the amount of gain or loss under subsection (a)—

(1) Proper adjustment shall be made for any expenditure, receipt, loss, or other item, properly chargeable to capital account, and

(2) The basis shall be diminished by the amount of deductions for exhaustion, wear and tear, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion which have since the acquisition of the property been allowable in respect of such property under this act or prior income tax laws; but in no case shall the amount of the diminution in respect of depletion exceed a depletion deduction computed without reference to discovery value under section 114 (b) (2) or to percentage depletion under

section 114 (b) (3). In addition, if the property was acquired before March 1, 1913, the basis (if other than the fair market value as of March 1, 1913) shall be diminished in the amount of exhaustion, wear and tear, obsolescence, and depletion actually sustained before such date, and

(3) In the case of stock the basis shall be diminished by the amount of distributions previously made in respect of such stock, to the extent provided under the law applicable to the year in which the distribution was made.

(c) Amount realized: The amount realized from the sale or other disposition of property shall be the sum of any money received plus the fair market value of the property (other than money) received.

(d) Recognition of gain or loss: In the case of a sale or exchange, the extent to which the gain or loss determined under this section shall be recognized for the purposes of this title, shall be determined under the provisions of section 112.

(e) Installment sales: Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent (in the case of property sold under contract providing for payment in installments) the taxation of that portion of any installment payment representing gain or profit in the year in which such payment is received.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In view of the volume of criticism of the gain or loss feature of the revenue law that comes from my constituents I should be personally grateful if the chairman would here insert a sentence or two explaining why it was impossible to get rid of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman means the tax on capital assets?

Mr. LUCE. No. I refer to the gain or loss provision. All I am after is a word of explanation, because the law is so burdensome and is complained of by so many citizens.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is all very fully explained, as the gentleman will see if he will read the report of the joint committee on page 10. The net revenue from this 12½ per cent tax in 1924 was $39,567,000, and in 1925 it was $109,912,000. We had the joint committee set one of its staff at work on it, and singularly enough we found that by far the greater portion of this tax was paid by those whose incomes were along toward the very highest brackets.

The reason we preserved this tax was, as it seemed to me, at least, that we could not justify ourselves before the people in saying that a man who earns something through the product of his hands or his brain should be taxed upon it, but that the man who held some property for a long time and did nothing with it, or the man who was successful simply in a long-time speculation should be exempted from a tax. We did not see how we could justify ourselves.

Now, it is true that this kind of a tax is not levied in England, but that country is in a different situation from ours. We are constantly developing here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We are constantly developing in this country; our values are expanding; our corporations are developing; the prices of their stocks are rising, and there is an enormous amount of what we sometimes call unearned increment that is not reached in any other way than by this tax. It seems very hard, indeed, that a man who exerts himself to the utmost, so far as his personal exertions are concerned, either, as I said before, by his hands or his brain, should be taxed to the utmost, while those who gather in enormous profits without doing anything should be left untaxed.

Mr. LUCE. The serious complaint that comes to me is because in so many cases the time taken in computing the gain is so far out of proportion to the tax resulting. Has any thought been given to an attempt to get rid of the trivialities in this particular matter?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is a fault of administration which we are trying to correct. It becomes purely administrative and we can not reach it directly. I think that in this country we are apt to be meticulous about our taxes, and that is why they get along better in England. They do not always try to collect the last cent, whereas here we think we have got to have the last cent if we spend 10 cents in collecting it. That is one trouble with our tax administration. I hope we will gradually get over it. That is about all I can say on that point, but, as I say, the total of this tax is enormous. As the gentleman will see, it amounted to over $109,000,000 in 1925.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 114. BASIS FOR DEPRECIATION AND DEPLETION.

(a) Basis for depreciation.—The basis upon which exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence are to be allowed in respect of any property shall be the same as is provided in section 113 for the purpose of determining the gain or loss upon the sale or other disposition of such property.

(b) Basis for depletion.—

(1) General rule: The basis upon which depletion is to be allowed in respect of any property shall be the same as is provided in section 113 for the purpose of determining the gain or loss upon the sale or other disposition of such property, except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) Discovery value in case of mines: In the case of mines discovered by the taxpayer after February 28, 1913, the basis for depletion shall be the fair market value of the property at the date of discovery or within 30 days thereafter, if such mines were not acquired as the result of purchase of a proven tract or lease, and if the fair market value of the property is materially disproportionate to the cost. The depletion allowance based on discovery value provided in this paragraph shall not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property upon which the discovery was made, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed without reference to discovery value. Discoveries shall include minerals in commercial quantities contained within a vein or deposit discovered in an existing mine or mining tract by the taxpayer after February 28, 1913, if the vein or deposit thus discovered was not merely the uninterrupted extension of a continuing commercial vein or deposit already known to exist, and if the discovered minerals are of sufficient value and quantity that they could be separately mined and marketed at a profit.

(3) Percentage depletion for oil and gas wells: In the case of oil and gas wells the allowance for depletion shall be 27½ per cent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed without reference to this paragraph.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENTZ: On page 79, after line 24, add the following words: "This paragraph shall not apply to metal mines discovered after approval of this act," and add a new paragraph, as follows:

"In the case of metal mines the allowance for depletion shall be 15 per cent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed without reference to this paragraph."

Mr. ARENTZ. Gentlemen, the matter of depletion of mineral resources has been the cause of a great deal of misunderstanding, the cause of litigation, and of expense to both the Government and the producer of mineral wealth.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ARENTZ. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is such an important matter and there are so few here, would the gentleman object to unanimous consent being given that we may return to this to-morrow?

Mr. ARENTZ. I will be pleased to do that; yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to pass over this amendment for the present, with leave to return to it the first thing to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the consideration of the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada and all amendments thereto be passed over for consideration the first thing to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any other amendment to this section that this request applies to?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It applies to any amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 116. EXCLUSIONS FROM GROSS INCOME

In addition to the items specified in section 22 (b) the following items shall not be included in gross income and shall be exempt from taxation under this title:

(a) Earned income from sources without United States: In the case of an individual citizen of the United States, a bona fide nonresident of the United States for more than six months during the taxable year, amounts received from sources without the United States if such amounts constitute earned income as defined in section 31; but such individual shall not be allowed as a deduction from his gross income any deductions properly allocable to or chargeable against amounts excluded from gross income under this subsection.

(b) Teachers in Alaska and Hawaii: In the case of an individual employed by Alaska or Hawaii or any political subdivision thereof as a teacher in any educational institution, the compensation received as such. This subsection shall not exempt compensation paid directly or indirectly by the Government of the United States.

(c) Income of foreign governments: The income of foreign governments received from investments in the United States in stocks, bonds, or other domestic securities owned by such foreign governments, or from interest on deposits in banks in the United States of moneys belonging to such foreign governments, or from any other source within the United States.

(d) Income of States, municipalities, etc.: Income derived from any public utility or the exercise of any essential governmental function and accruing to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision of a State or Territory, or income accruing to the Government of any possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof.

Whenever any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision of a State or Territory, prior to September 8, 1916, entered in good faith into a contract with any person the object and purpose of which is to acquire, construct, operate, or maintain a public utility—

(1) If by the terms of such contract the tax imposed by this title is to be paid out of the proceeds from the operation of such public utility, prior to any division of such proceeds between the person and the State, Territory, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia, and if, but for the imposition of the tax imposed by this title, a part of such proceeds for the taxable year would accrue directly to or for the use of such State, Territory, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia, then a tax upon the net income from the operation of such public utility shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the manner and at the rates prescribed in this title, but there shall be refunded to such State, Territory, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia (under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary) an amount which bears the same relation to the amount of the tax as the amount which (but for the imposition of the tax imposed by this title) would have accrued directly to or for the use of such State, Territory, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia bears to the amount of the net income from the operation of such public utility for such taxable year.

(2) If by the terms of such contract no part of the proceeds from the operation of the public utility for the taxable year would, irrespective of the tax imposed by this title, accrue directly to or for the use of such State, Territory, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia, then the tax upon the net income of such person from the operation of such public utility shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the manner and at the rates prescribed in this title.

(e) Dividends from "China trade act" corporation: In the case of a person amounts distributed as dividends to or for his benefit by a corporation organized under the China trade act, 1922, if at the time of such distribution he is a resident of China and the equitable right to the income of the shares of stock of the corporation is in good faith vested in him.

(f) Shipowners' protection and indemnity associations: The receipts of shipowners' mutual protection and indemnity associations, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder; but such corporations shall be subject as other persons to the tax upon their net income from interest, dividends, and rents.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, before we leave section 116, "exclusions from gross income," I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I presume this applies to the salary and compensation of the officials of the States and municipalities and, of course, their salaries are exempt.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They are exempt under the Constitution.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is what I knew.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. So far as my own inclinations are concerned, if I had any way about it, I think they ought to pay just the same as Federal employees, but we can not do it under the Constitution.

Mr. BRIGGS. Evidently, ever since the case of McCullough against Maryland was decided a great many years ago by the Supreme Court of the United States, that is not permissible; but I heard at one time that there was an effort being made to subject the officials of State and municipal governments, and of the subdivisions and agencies of the States and municipalities, to the tax, but I could not credit such information. I did not think this was in the mind of the committee and I just wanted this expression from the chairman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; and the committee did not deem it necessary they should be specially mentioned, being exempt under a constitutional provision.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill, and read down to and including line 10, on page 90.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1, the revenue bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

JUAN SORIANO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of a claim against the United States for the death on October 2, 1923, at Guerra, Dominican Republic, of Juan Soriano, a Dominican subject, who was killed by the landing of an airplane belonging to the United States Marine Corps, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to me in March, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated March 22, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 84, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

I renew my recommendation originally made, that in order to effect a settlement of this claim the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $2,000, and I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

SECOND PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON HIGHWAYS (S. DOC. NO. 11)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I renew the request I made of the Sixty-ninth Congress that legislation be enacted authorizing an appropriation of $15,000 to enable the United States to participate in the Second Pan American Conference on Highways, which had been fixed to be held at Rio de Janeiro in the calendar year 1927, but which was postponed to meet at the same city in June, 1928.

A joint resolution for this purpose passed the House of Representatives on January 17, 1927, and was favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but failed to be reached in the Senate before final adjournment of the Sixty-ninth Congress.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State and House Document No. 631, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, therewith inclosed, in which the facts regarding this conference are set forth.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the seventy-eighth annual report of the board of directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

BATTLE FIELDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with section 2 of the act of Congress to provide for the study and investigation of battle fields in the United States for commemorative purposes, approved June 11, 1926, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of War of the progress made under the said act, together with his recommendations for further operations.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ALASKAN RAILROAD

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual reports of the Alaska Railroad for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1927.*

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Speaker announced the appointment of Mr. NEWTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, and Mr. MOORE of Virginia as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADDRESS OF HON. R. WALTON MOORE

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] on the life and services of George Rogers Clark.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me therefor, I extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therewith a very able and interesting address recently delivered by our greatly esteemed colleague, R. WALTON MOORE of Virginia, touching the life and service of one of America's most illustrious Revolutionary heroes, George Rogers Clark. Though a native of old Virginia, General Clark lived the greater portion of his life in the Kentucky region and died there. To-day his sacred dust lies in beautiful Cave Hill Cemetery in the city of Louisville, within my congressional district:

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK DELEGATION FROM KENTUCKY AND THE OLD NORTHWEST TERRITORY STATES

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It is with something of maternal pride the people of this Commonwealth view the greatness of the States of Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, which afford such a marvelous example of American genius and enterprise. A welcome evidence of the growing intercourse and contact is that representative citizens of those States are now visiting the scenes of their social and political ancestry, to which attach the noble memories which are our common heritage. We hope they will find here that the structure built upon the old foundations is being expanded and strengthened, without forgetfulness of the past, but mindful of the requirements of the present and the future, and with the same steady vigor that is marking the progress of their own communities.

Those memories are, indeed, the heritage of us all, for it is clear that the States mentioned and also that portion of Minnesota lying east of the Mississippi River when the Revolution began were as much a part of Virginia as the locality where we are now assembled. The country west of the Mississippi previously a part of Virginia ceased to be so only when it was transferred by the British Government to Spain, which later transferred it to France, and it might have continued always under French rule except for the wisdom of the statesmen who effected the Louisiana Purchase.

When independence had been declared and the Revolution was being fought under the flag of the United States, the title of Virginia to Kentucky and the territory northwest of the Ohio River was legally unassailable. Consider the facts: By the charter of King James I, the boundary of the Virginia Colony covered all the region from sea to sea, 200 miles north and 200 miles south from a straight line running westward from Cape or Point Comfort, a region 400 miles wide, stretching from the Atlantic westward to the Pacific. While the colonial status existed the British Government, exercising its dominant authority, made deductions from this original area not only by the grant to Spain but by limited grants to Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas. But there was left to Virginia Kentucky and the Northwest Territory. And accordingly, the first Virginia constitution, the first written constitution in the entire world providing a complete system of government, after reference to the grants made by the Crown, it was declared "that the western and northwestern extent of Virginia shall in all other respects stand as fixed by the charter * * *." Virginia's ownership could not fairly be disputed. Kentucky and the northwest belonged to her as a colony and automatically continued hers when she became a State. Ownership and sovereignty were vested in her and could not be elsewhere. The principle upon which her claim rested was recognized by the Articles of Confederation, and the Continental Congress never denied that she was entitled to rely upon that principle. Without any elaboration it may be noted that subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States the soundness of the Virginia claim received judicial approval in a case decided by her own court and in two cases decided by the Supreme Court, in which Chief Justice Marshall delivered the opinion.

So long as the western country was an almost unsettled wilderness there could be no real governmental institutions or activities. There was even vagueness about the remote boundaries of the great Virginia counties, whose entire population lived in the East. Postponing for a moment any reference to Kentucky and turning to the Northwest Territory, the story is of deep and absorbing interest. That territory was the subject of anxious consideration at an acute stage of the Revolution. The Articles of Confederation had been adopted by the Continental Congress but not ratified by all the States. They reserved to the several States the unoccupied western lands. In December, 1778, the Legislature of Maryland insisted that such lands should be held by the United States for the use of all the States, and making that a condition of ratification. The resolutions were sent to Congress, with a statement that the proposed reservation would prove ruinous to Maryland and other States similarly circumstanced and destructive of any union that might be organized. It said by plain implication that should Virginia's ownership be maintained her power and wealth would endanger the well-being of her sister States. It would create, as was said, "essentially a subconfederacy, an imperium in imperio." That protest and the claims of certain land companies were referred by Congress to a committee, which in 1780 made a report not questioning Virginia's title, but advising that some liberal disposition be made of the matter and setting out how indispensably necessary that was in order "to establish the Federal Union on a fixed and permanent basis and on principles acceptable to all of its prospective members; how essential to public credit and confidence; to the support of our Army; to the vigor of our councils and the success of our commerce; to our tranquillity at home and our reputation abroad; to our present safety and our future prosperity; to our existence as a free, sovereign, and independent people." In view of the seriousness of the issue it can not be doubted that the success of the Revolution and the maintenance of the confederation were at stake. Had Virginia held off, there might have been immediate failure, and certainly the formation after a while of a more perfect Union under a better Constitution would not have been possible. But not more than four months following the appeal of Congress—in January, 1781—the Legislature of Virginia acted with unexampled generosity. It determined upon one of the most extensive gifts of which there is any record. It determined to give to the United States the lands northwest of the Ohio River, to be formed into States to be admitted to the Union on equal terms with the other States. Reasonable conditions were attached, among them being that the soldiers of the George Rogers Clark expedition should be properly compensated in land. When Jefferson, then governor, communicated to Congress what had been done he expressed the belief that should other States, having similar claims, assume a like attitude it might serve "to overweigh any success which the enemy might have hithereto obtained and render desperate the hopes to which these successes have given birth." There is no need to speak of the not material modifications made by Congress in accepting Virginia's proposal. It is enough to say that in 1783 the general assembly authorized the execution of a deed conveying the Northwest Territory to the United States. This deed, written on parchment, can be seen today in the manuscript division of the Library of Congress. It is dated March 1, 1784, and is signed, sealed, and acknowledged by four of Virginia's Delegates in Congress—Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, Arthur Lee, and Samuel Hardy, two of them afterwards Presidents of the United States. A copy of the deed was then forwarded to the then Governor of Virginia, Benjamin Harrison, the ancestor of an Ohio President and an Indiana President. The historically exact comment of a brilliant New England historian is that "Virginia gave up a magnificent territory of which she was actually in possession." In the manu-

script division may also be seen, written by Jefferson on two small sheets of paper, the report of a committee of Congress of which he was chairman suggesting a scheme of government for the new territory. That was the basis of the Ordinance of 1784 and expressed the fundamental ideas carried into the Ordinance of 1787. It is not to be forgotten that the Jefferson scheme included a prohibition of slavery which, though voted down in 1784, was finally adopted in 1787. That prohibition was in line with the long resistance of Virginia to the slave trade. It was in line with the provision contained in her constitution. A fact of the utmost significance, commonly lost sight of in studying his career, is that Jefferson urged the prohibition should be imposed not only on the Northwest Territory but on any subsequently acquired territory, which would have included the Louisiana Purchase and the Florida Territory. The opinion is expressed by Fiske and other historians that had this been done the fierce controversies which led to the Civil War and the war itself would have been avoided, and of this there can be no reasonable doubt. Here at Richmond, to which the Virginia capital at Williamsburg had been removed in 1779, the vital transactions took place. It was here that the cession of the Northwest Territory was authorized. It was here that the governor was informed of the execution of the deed which conveyed the enormous area of 266,000 square miles and 170,000,000 acres.

Jefferson was mainly responsible for the vast Louisiana territory becoming a part of the Union. It was his fellow Virginian, George Rogers Clark, who, in the service of the State, was primarily responsible for the vast Northwest Territory becoming a part of it. And it can not be doubted that the fate of Kentucky was involved in the fate of the Northwest. When the treaty of peace was made at the end of the Revolution, Great Britain could not reasonably contest the sovereign ownership of the States with respect to the regions which they had been able to take and hold by armed force, but she was unwilling to surrender other regions which she herself had been able to retain, as witness what occurred with reference to the boundary lines established between Canada on the one hand and New York and the New England States on the other hand. At the date of the peace negotiations, had the British been occupying the western domain of which we are speaking—Kentucky and the country north of the Ohio River—she would have applied to it the theory she urged with respect to Canada. This consideration measures the extraordinary value of what was accomplished by Clark.

It was at Williamsburg that the curtain was raised on the supremely important and picturesque drama in which Clark was to have the principal part. He and other adventurous spirits, nearly all from eastern Virginia, had located in Kentucky. When the sword began to write the record of the Revolution in the east, the pioneers were menaced by the British and their Indian allies. They were remote from the seat of government in Virginia, and there was an utter lack of definiteness and power in any local government. Clark, who had come quickly to the front as their leader, realizing the imperative need of closer relations with the Virginia authorities and of such assistance as they might be able to furnish, brought about a meeting which delegated him and another to represent the perilous condition of the frontier. In the summer of 1776 they traveled on foot toward Williamsburg, a distance of 600 miles. Before arriving they found the legislature had adjourned and it was agreed that Clark should proceed alone; and this he did, and remained for several months until the business in hand was settled. He saw the governor, Patrick Henry, who was ill at his home in Hanover County, and found him entirely sympathetic. At the suggestion of the governor, he waited on the council, which finally consented to furnish and transport a supply of ammunition. Then when the legislature met he took up the matter of having Kentucky created and organized as a separate county, which was effected after a long and stubborn contest in December, 1776. On the committee which drafted the bill dividing the county of Fincastle into three new counties, one of them Kentucky, were Jefferson and George Mason, who, from first to last, were Clark's unswerving friends and supporters, and they were instrumental in passing the bill in the house and breaking the deadlock caused by the senate's disapproval. Then Clark, not yet 25 years old, went back to Kentucky and exerted himself in repelling the Indians and in directing the various activities of the new county. But this was only the first step. With the vision of a statesman he conceived the wonderful plan which he was to execute as a soldier. For the purpose of securing indorsement of his plan to invade the Northwest, he returned to Williamsburg in the fall of 1777 and enlisted the interest of Henry, Jefferson, Mason, and Wythe. Legislation was enacted and letters of instruction furnished him by Governor Henry which authoritatively commissioned and fortified him for the undertaking which he had conceived. He took away with him the news of the American victory at Saratoga, and as he won his first success north of the Ohio he heard the news of the treaties with France, which gave him a conclusive argument with the people of the French settlements.

The British forts were Clark's objectives. Their capture would shift the substantial possession and control of the country from the British to the Americans, and nothing else could serve to put fear in the hearts of the Indians and restrain the cruel methods of warfare to which they had been instigated, notwithstanding the eloquent denunciations of Chatham and Burke. On the contrary, failure and defeat could mean but one thing, the complete extinction of the commander and his little army, which never numbered more than 200 men. All of the forts were captured except Detroit in a campaign lasting much less than a year. The fort at Kaskaskia, some 60 miles below St. Louis, fell into Clark's hands on July 4, 1778, while there was being celebrated in Philadelphia the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. A little later the fort at Cahokia, nearly opposite St. Louis, surrendered. Soon the fort at Vincennes surrendered, and having in the latter part of 1778 been recaptured by the British, was again taken by Clark in February of the next year, among the prisoners being the British lieutenant governor, Henry Hamilton, who had before made his headquarters at Detroit. Hamilton was sent to Williamsburg, where, in retaliation for his encouragement of Indian barbarities, he was confined as a prisoner in a house I believe still standing, which he called his dungeon. It is true that Clark's purpose to reduce the fort at Detroit miscarried, but his other triumphs rendered the British cause hopeless throughout the entire region, and this fact obtained practical recognition when the peace treaty was being negotiated. He wrote to Henry and Mason that he was mortified to see slip, because of the lack of a few men, so fair an opportunity to push a victory, but he continued to yearn for the means of capturing Detroit. In 1780 the matter was brought to the attention of General Washington, who wrote of Clark that the enterprise could not be committed to better hands. In 1781 an entry in Washington's recently published diary, under date of June 9, refers to the fact that Clark had asked that the Ninth Virginia regiment and Heth's company be assigned as a force to go against Detroit, but that the request had to be refused for fear of weakening the defense of Pittsburgh.

Of course, the means of communication in those days was slight, but those who knew anything of what had occurred knew that Clark had conquered the Northwest Territory. He received the thanks of the legislature of his State, and the conquest which he had made was quickly followed in December, 1778, by an act creating the new county of Illinois, to include "all citizens of this commonwealth who are already settled or shall hereafter settle on the western side of the Ohio." In 1779 the Continental Congress adopted a resolution expressing its "high sense of the enterprising spirit of Colonel Clark, of the State of Virginia, and under the particular appointment of that State," and "that the thanks of Congress be communicated to Colonel Clark and the brave officers and soldiers under his command for their ardor, bravery, and intrepidity."

There can be no attempt to detail the career of Clark in any of its stages. There can be no attempt to tell the story of the unparalleled obstacles which he and his followers encountered and overcame; of their experience in a wilderness where there were none of the ordinary belongings and processes of civilization, but only constant peril and inconceivable hardship; of his unflagging fortitude and cheerfulness when to nearly any other man the conditions would have seemed without hope; of his willingness to risk everything and suffer and die for the cause which he espoused; of his ready sacrifice of his own resources by pledging them for the purpose of securing the most meager equipment and subsistence. In the report which his antagonist, Hamilton, made of the affair at Vincennes, he pays the American this tribute: "The difficulties and dangers of Colonel Clark's march * * * were such as required great courage to encounter and great preseverence to overcome." He so impoverished himself that to him might be applied the words written over the tomb of Thomas Nelson at Yorktown: "He gave all for liberty." He held the abiding admiration and respect of his foremost contemporaries who knew him best and were in the best position to estimate the magnitude and value of his achievements—Washington, Henry, Jefferson, and Mason. Numberless voices now swelling into a great chorus echo their opinion. Long ago John Randolph of Roanoke spoke of him as the "Hannibal who by the reduction of those military posts in the wilderness obtained the Great Lakes for the northern boundary of our Union at the peace of 1783." A New England historian has written, "No story of the Arabian Nights is more romantic or improbable than Clark's conception of his plan of conquest and his success in carrying it out." That his career is coming to be all the time more fully understood, and the pinnacle of fame accorded him which he deserves, is largely owing to the patriotic diligence with which the historical societies of the States of which he may well be regarded as the founder have gathered up the original material, the documents, and correspondence, showing the originality and brilliancy of his plans and the skill and valor with which they were executed.

It is not to be asserted that Clark was always justly treated by those in control or by individuals. Even Washington himself did not escape the distrust and criticism which were inevitable in such a confused and difficult period as that of the Revolution. But, as has been stated, he quickly received the praise and thanks of Congress and the State legislature; and when he gave up his commission in 1783, Governor Harrison wrote: "Before I take leave of you I feel myself called upon in the most forceful manner to return you my thanks and those

of my council for the very great and singular services you have rendered your country in wresting so great and valuable a territory out of the hands of the British enemy, repelling the attacks of their savage allies, and carrying on successfully in the heart of their country." Years afterwards, in 1812, when he was old and poor and sick, the Virginia Legislature passed a resolution presenting him a sword with an expression of the gratitude and friendly condolences of that body and providing for the payment to him annually of the sum of $400. I like to recall that having received his earliest inspiration as a youth at Gunston Hall, in my own county, where he often visited George Mason, it was Charles Fenton Mercer, then a member of the General Assembly of Virginia and later a Representative of that county in Congress, who initiated the action taken by the legislature.

In the erection of the statues of heroes of the past, Clark has not been forgotten. It is surely fitting that he who fought the Revolution to a victorious conclusion in the West should now be exalted along with the man who fought the Revolution to a victorious conclusion in the East. There is a commission created by Congress, of which the President is chairman, charged with the duty of arranging an appropriate celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Washington, which occurs in 1932. It seems to me that the people of the mother Commonwealth of the statesman and soldier we are acclaiming and the Commonwealths formed out of the territory in whose history he is such a glorious figure might then unite to build in deathless commemoration of the conqueror of the Northwest a monument approaching in impressiveness and dignity the monument to Washington which towers above the Capital City of the Republic. No inscription could be devised that would adequately express what he was and what he did. No inscription would be needed except one name carved upon its face, the name of George Rogers Clark.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 13, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

198. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1929 in the sum of $5,000 (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

200. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report entitled "An act for relief in cases of contracts connected with the war, known as the war minerals relief act," covering the calendar year ending November 30, 1927; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3124) granting a pension to Emma Jane Boyd; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4947) granting a pension to Zorado B. Merrill; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 6957) in relation to the construction, maintenance, and regulation within and by the United States of America of a nation-wide system of durable, hard-surfaced post roads and their appurtenances and the provision of means for the payment of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6958) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Youngstown to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River at Division Street, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6959) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Caney Fork River in Tennessee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6960) for the purchase of additional ground and the enlargement of the Federal building at Savannah, Ga., or the purchase of a new site and the erection of a new Federal building at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6961) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Glennville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6962) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Claxton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6963) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Reidsville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6964) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Sylvania, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6965) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Millen, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6966) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the erection of a Federal building at Waynesboro, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6967) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Mitter, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 6968) granting pensions to the officers and soldiers who served in the State troops of the various States in the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 6969) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Russellville, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6970) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Carbon Hill, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Fayette, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6972) to create the American stabilizing commission and to provide for stabilizing the prices of certain farm products by purchasing the surplus thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 6973) granting the consent of Congress to E. H. Wagener, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6974) to permit the admission, as nonquota immigrants, of certain alien wives and children of United States citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6975) authorizing the appropriation of $25,000 for the erection of a monument or other form of memorial at or near Waynesboro, in Burke County, Ga., to mark the battle field where the Battle of Brier Creek was fought in the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6976) to foster and instill patriotism by furnishing United States flags to public schools and other educational institutions in America; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6977) for establishing a forestry experimental station and national park at the "Old Stockade," near Millen, in Jenkins County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6978) for investigation of brown wilt and other diseases of cotton plant in cotton-producing belt of United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6979) providing for drainage of low and swamp lands and for surveys and reports, and authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000 for this purpose; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6980) to establish a fish-cultural station in the first congressional district of Georgia for the propagation and hatching of shad, marine, fresh-water, and other species of food fish; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6981) to refund $100,000,000 of cotton-tax money now illegally held in the Treasury to the several States from which collected, in amounts as collected from each State, to be distributed to the persons from whom collected or paid to their legal heirs at law; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6982) for the development of the fishery resources of the South Atlantic States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6983) to determine proceedings in contested elections of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6984) authorizing an appropriation of $250,000 with which to acquire sea-island cottonseed and to reestablish the growing thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6985) authorizing the appropriation of $20,000 for the erection of a suitable monument or other form of memorial at or near Ebenezer Church, in Effingham County, Ga., to mark the spot where the Salzburgers settled their colony in 1734; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6986) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1919, as amended by act of March 6, 1920; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6987) to preserve Fort Pulaski, near Savannah, in Chatham County, Ga., as a national military memorial park on account of its historic interest in Revolutionary times and since; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6988) authorizing the appropriation of $100,000 for the erection of a monument or other form of memorial at Jasper Springs, Chatham County, Ga., to mark the spot where Sergt. William Jasper, a Revolutionary hero, fell; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. A bill (H. R. 6989) to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission act, 1920, approved July 9, 1921, as amended by act of February 3, 1923; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 6990) to authorize appropriations for construction at Pacific Branch, Soldiers Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6991) authorizing the erection of nonsectarian chapel at the Army medical center in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6992) to provide for flood control and the prevention of future flood devastations on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for improving navigation by lowering flood levels from the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo and beyond, and for making topographical surveys and maps and hydrographic investigations to expedite flood control, and for channel stabilization and bank protection and repairing levees and flood protective works and public highways and post roads in overflowed territory, and to create a waterways and water resources commission to prepare comprehensive plans for flood control on all watersheds in the United States of America; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 6993) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands in Louisiana and Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 6994) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River, in Jackson County, Ala., at or near Scottsboro, on the Scottsboro-Fort Payne Road; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6995) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Elk River on the Athens-Florence Road between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6996) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River near Whitesburg Ferry on the Huntsville-Laceys Spring Road between Madison and Morgan Counties, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 6997) to provide for the deportation of any alien who fails to maintain his wife or minor child living abroad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6998) to exempt from quota husbands, fathers, and mothers of United States citizens and their children under 21; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6999) to admit into the United States all persons having duly visaed passports prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7000) to exempt from quota wives and children under 18 of declarants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7001) to amend the naturalization laws relating to certificates of arrival; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 7002) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 7003) to amend paragraph 768 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7004) to encourage the development of the agricultural resources of the United States and the establishment of rural homes through Federal and State cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of such homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7005) to provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the health of the rural population of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 7006) to designate a building site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 7007) prescribing the Army ration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize appropriations for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7009) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 7010) to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7011) to detach Okfuskee County from the northern judicial district of the State of Oklahoma and attach the same to the eastern judicial district of the said State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7012) to reduce passport fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 7013) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend to the Governor of Arkansas 5,000 canvas cots, 10,000 blankets, 10,000 bed sheets, 5,000 pillows, 5,000 pillowcases, and 5,000 mattresses or bed sacks to be used at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Little Rock, Ark., in May, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 7014) giving civilian clerks, Signal Service at large, the same military status as Army field clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7015) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a universal system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, as last amended by the act of January 7, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 7016) to authorize and direct the construction and maintenance of a memorial highway connecting the city of Springfield, Ill., with the city of Beardstown, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 7017) to require manufacturers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce to give written notice to the Federal Trade Commission of the closing of their plants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7018) for the retirement of employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama who are American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7019) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads and for other pur-

poses," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, and authorizing appropriation of $150,000,000 per annum for two years; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7020) for an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of postmasters, officers, and employees of the customs and internal revenue services and other branches of the Government service"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7021) to provide a summer residence for the President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7022) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7023) to amend the tariff act of 1922 in order to provide for a tariff on hides of cattle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7024) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7025) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and Kansas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7026) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the North Platte River and other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7027) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and Nebraska with respect to the division and apportionment of the water of the North Platte River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7028) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and Utah with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Colorado, Green, Bear or Yampa, the White, San Juan, and Dolores Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7029) for the adoption of the Columbia Basin reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 7030) to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1895; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 7031) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States for the education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 7032) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7033) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7034) granting the consent of Congress to Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7035) granting the consent of Congress to Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7036) granting the consent of Congress to Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7037) to reduce visa fees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for the statue or memorial to Thomas Jefferson in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DEAL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the office of President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property located in Loudoun and Clarke Counties, Va., known as Mount Weather, no longer required for observatory and laboratory purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) granting the consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, and to the State of New York and State of Vermont to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across Lake Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIROVICH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 91) calling upon Calvin Coolidge to intercede in the name of humanity against the outrageous treatment of Rumanian minorities, and, failing in that, to bring about the abrogation of the treaties between the Kingdom of Rumania and the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 7038) granting an increase of pension to Millie Wynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 7039) granting an increase of pension to Fannie R. Parshley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7040) granting a pension to Mary Frederick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7041) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7042) granting an increase of pension to Alice T. Rawlings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 7043) for the relief of J. Georges Peter and Marc Peter, jr.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 7044) granting an increase of pension to Banner Chandley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7045) for the relief of Charles H. Edmiston; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7046) granting a pension to James W. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 7047) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 7048) granting a pension to Anthony Penson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7049) granting an increase of pension to Celia B. Se Cheverell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7050) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Hansmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7051) for the relief of George W. Gilmore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 7052) granting an increase of pension to Maryett C. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 7053) granting a pension to William Tanner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7054) granting a pension to Mary A. Kane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7055) granting a pension to Charles C. Lentile; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7056) granting an increase of pension to Mary Wilson Osterhaus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7057) granting an increase of pension to Lida B. Elkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7058) granting an increase of pension to Lucile Dodson Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7059) for the relief of estate of Sarah Harrison; to the Committee on Claims.

Alsa, a bill (H. R. 7060) for the relief of George W. Boyer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7061) for the relief of William V. Tynes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7062) for the relief of Hudson Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7063) for the relief of Bessie B. Hurd; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7064) for the relief of Lottie May Bolin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7065) for the relief of George T. Easton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7066) for the relief of Norfolk Dredging Co., of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7067) authorizing the appointment of Luther W. Dear as Infantry officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7068) authorizing appointment of Herbert L. Lee as Artillery officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7069) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to James Robert Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7070) making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the regular naval service Lieut. Commander William A. Hamilton, an officer of the United States Naval Reserve Force during the World War, who incurred physical disability in line of duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7071) granting an increase of pension to Fannie King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7072) granting a pension to Mattie Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7073) granting a pension to Cora E. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7074) granting a pension to Elizabeth N. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 7075) granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Baugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOYLE: A bill (H. R. 7076) for the relief of Contes Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7077) for the relief of Fuller-Morrison Co., of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7078) for the relief of William Knourek; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7079) for the relief of John Golombiewski; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7080) for the relief of Stella Murauski; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7081) for the relief of Pietro Lococo; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7082) for the relief of Thomas Hannon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7083) for the relief of Frank Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7084) for the relief of Lottie Naylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7085) granting an increase of pension to Louise Hendershott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7086) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Willey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7087) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7088) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Hamlet; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7089) granting an increase of pension to Ernest G. Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7090) for the relief of Horace M. Cleary; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7091) for the relief of George W. Turner; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7092) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah P. Nix; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7093) for the relief of W. H. Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7094) for the relief of E. M. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7095) for the relief of Otis Alexander Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7096) for the relief of the lawful heirs of Fanny Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7097) for the relief of the lawful heirs of Levy E. Byck; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7098) for the relief of and granting compensation to C. W. King, growing out of the death of his minor son, Carl Calder King; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7099) for increase of compensation and to fix rating of permanent total disability for Alfred B. Schachte; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7100) for increase of compensation and to fix rating of permanent total disability for Daniel J. Sheehan; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7101) for increase of compensation and to fix rating of permanent total disability for Richard M. Hull; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7102) granting retirement annuity or pension to John B. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 7103) granting a pension to John H. Sarrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 7104) for the relief of Charles Wellesley Berrington; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7105) granting a pension to Leonora H. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7106) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Burkhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORT: A bill (H. R. 7107) for the relief of James Golden; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7108) granting a pension to Myra C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7109) granting a pension to John F. Mann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 7110) for the relief of Frances L. Dickinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 7111) for the relief of Charley R. Saylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 7112) granting a pension to Mary S. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 7113) granting a pension to Rose B. Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7114) granting an increase of pension to Amy Hooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 7115) granting an increase of pension to Jennie A. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7116) for the relief of David Copp, alias George Copp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7117) granting a pension to Rosa Fosnight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7118) granting a pension to Harry E. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 7119) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Swan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7120) granting a pension to Stella A. Boldon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 7121) granting a pension to Virginia Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7122) granting a pension to Sallie Knightlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 7123) granting an increase of pension to George M. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7124) granting an increase of pension to Louis L. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7125) granting an increase of pension to Elbert C. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7126) granting a pension to Mrs. William R. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 7127) for the relief of Elizabeth Hazzard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7128) granting an increase of pension to Belle Stuart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 7129) for the relief of Michael Ferry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7130) granting an increase of pension to Rose Ehrenfelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 7131) to allow the distinguished-service medal for service in the World War to be awarded Capt. Kenneth C. Towe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 7132) granting an increase of pension to Sallie E. Masmar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 7133) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 7134) granting a pension to Pearl Trevaskis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 7135) granting an increase of pension to Leah J. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7136) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Kromer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7137) granting a pension to Elenora Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 7138) for the relief of W. Henry Robertson, former American consul general; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7139) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Orndorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7140) granting an increase of pension to Agnes May Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 7141) for the relief of Busch-Sulzer Bros. Diesel Engine Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7142) for the relief of Frank E. Ridgely, deceased; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7143) granting a pension to Margaret Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7144) granting an increase of pension to Emily L. Salkeld; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7145) granting an increase of pension to Hester Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7146) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Schoomaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7147) granting an increase of pension to Fidelin Brecette; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 7148) for the relief of G. R. Robertson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7149) for the relief of the legal representative of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 7150) for the relief of John Aloysius Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7151) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7152) granting an increase of pension to Margaret P. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEGER: A bill (H. R. 7153) granting an increase of pension to Pieternella Botbyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7154) granting an increase of pension to Hermine A. Sturm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7155) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Frederick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 7156) granting a pension to Sarah K. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 7157) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7158) granting an increase of pension to Margaretta Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 7159) granting a pension to Thomas C. Lacy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7160) granting a pension to James C. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7161) granting an increase of pension to Leo Pope Ott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7162) for the relief of Henry J. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7163) for the relief of H. F. Frick and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 7164) granting an increase of pension to Mariette A. Goodenough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7165) granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Brassfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7166) to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army of the United States on account of refunds made to purchasers of surplus war supplies; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 7167) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Tullis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7168) granting a pension to Maud E. Sparks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7169) granting a pension to Florence G. Melton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7170) granting an increase of pension to Rachel C. Stratton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7171) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Gatliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7172) granting an increase of pension to Bell Doll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7173) granting compensation to the daughters of James P. Gallivan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7174) granting compensation to William T. Ring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 7175) granting a pension to Seth Seaton Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7176) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7177) granting an increase of pension to Lula K. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7178) granting a pension to Rose Isabelle Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7179) granting an increase of pension to Walter W. Donahue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7180) granting an increase of pension to Charity Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7181) granting a pension to Mary E. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7182) for the relief of Charles Nick Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

121. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of certain residents of Delavan, Walworth County, Wis., urging the acceptance of the proposal of M. Briand, of France, regarding substitution of peaceful methods for those of force in the settlement of disputes between nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

122. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 17 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

123. By Mr. GARBER: Resolution of Irrigation Districts Association of California, Merced, Calif., upholding the Boulder Dam project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

124. Also, resolution of International Association of Fairs and Expositions, for the Government to assume control of and permanently keep in charge the waters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

125. Also, petition of certain residents of Tangier, Fargo, Woodward, Oakwood, and Supply, Okla., urging opposition to the Sunday observance bill and any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

126. Also, petition of certain citizens of Woodward, Okla., urging enactment of legislation in behalf of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

127. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Resolutions of Houston Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, of Houston, Tex., urging upon Congress adequate appropriations for housing comfortably the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army in the Army posts, and for adequate ammunition and equipment, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

128. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, reaffirming its resolution of May 5, 1927, and urging upon the Federal commission for the exchange of sites for a post office and courthouse building at New York, and upon the authorities of the city of New York, action upon this matter; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

129. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Association of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Colleges and Universities, Fourth Corps Area, recommending commutation of Reserve Officers' Training Corps uniforms be not reduced for fiscal year 1926–27; also recommends maintenance of efficiency of Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

130. Also, petition of officers of the Air Corps Reserve of the United States Army, airdrome, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., in training July 31 to August 13, 1927, advocating creation of department of national defense, with three coequal branches; that is, Army, Air, and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

131. Also, resolution protesting the enactment of section 3002, subsection B, of United States Veterans' Bureau Regulation No. 177, by Bucky O'Neill Post, No. 541, Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

132. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the New York Council for Protection of Foreign-Born Workers, protesting against legislation for the registration and deportation of noncitizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

133. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the International Association of Fairs and Expositions, favoring the passage of legislation looking to flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

134. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the repeal of the Federal inheritance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

135. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the construction of an adequate downtown post office and Federal court building in the city of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

136. Also, petition of the Slovak League of America, in behalf of readjustment of quota for immigrants from Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

137. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the location of a municipal airport in the Jamaica Bay district of the city of New York; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

138. By Mr. WATSON: Testimony expressed by the Bucks Quarterly Meeting, held at Middletown Meeting House, Langhorne, Pa., against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, *December 13, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be now and always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer.

Eternal God, who hast neither dawn nor evening, yet sendest us alternate mercies of the darkness and the day, there is no light but Thine, without, within. As Thou hast lifted the curtain of night from our abodes, take also the veil from all our hearts. Rise with Thy morning upon our souls; quicken every noble impulse and sanctify our best endeavors; and though all else decline, let the noontide of Thy grace and peace remain. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	La Follette	Shipstead
Barkley	Fess	McKellar	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	McLean	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Smoot
Black	George	McNary	Steck
Blaine	Gerry	Mayfield	Steiwer
Blease	Gillett	Metcalf	Stephens
Borah	Glass	Moses	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	Neely	Thomas
Brookhart	Gould	Norbeck	Trammell
Broussard	Greene	Nye	Tydings
Bruce	Hale	Oddie	Tyson
Capper	Harris	Overman	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hayden	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Warren
Curtis	Howell	Ransdell	Waterman
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Edge	Keyes	Schall	
Edwards	King	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1928, amounting to $10,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them," approved March 3, 1927, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment (House Office Building, 1928: To enable the Architect of the Capitol to remodel the room formerly occupied by the House restaurant, to provide rooms for the Committee on Agriculture and the joint committee on taxation, and to remodel the space formerly occupied for use as a gymnasium to provide room for the legislative counsel, etc.), for the fiscal year 1928, in the sum of $5,500, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. 15.)

DESIGNATION OF PERSONS TO ACT FOR DISBURSING OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, urging the passage of legislation to authorize the designation of persons to act for disbursing officers and others charged with the disbursement of public moneys of the United States, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up the order offered yesterday in regard to the assignment of Senators to committees, and I ask unanimous consent that so much of Rule XXIV as provides for the appointment of standing committees of the Senate by ballot may be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that that portion of Rule XXIV of the standing rules of the Senate relating to the appointment of members of committees by ballot be suspended. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator what method of election is to be substituted?

Mr. WATSON. Unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Are we to understand that now an election can take place only by unanimous consent?

Mr. WATSON. I have submitted a request for the present consideration of the order. It will be a viva voce vote.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand the rule of the Senate, we can proceed to the election by ballot or by roll call or by viva voce vote. The request is to suspend that portion of the rule appertaining to the election by ballot.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the list of committees appearing in yesterday's proceedings of the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 481.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I shall not interpose any objection to the consideration of the order, but listening to the list of committees as it has been read, it seems to me there ought to be some expression of felicitation to the distinguished Senator from Indiana and to his colleagues on the other side for their very great change of front in reference to certain gentlemen on the majority side of the aisle.

Mr. WATSON rose.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the Senator from Indiana will take his seat and bide his time.

Mr. WATSON. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. HARRISON. It was not so long ago, Mr. President, when we read in the newspapers in big headlines such news as "The radicals read out of G. O. P. ranks." It was so stated by the Republican official organ, the National Republican, or whatever the name of the publication may be. It was not very long ago when deliberate action was taken on the other side of the aisle with reference to party policies by Senators who adopted a resolution which had teeth in it and which meant

much. That resolution of the Republican conference, if the newspapers be correct, was presented by none other than the distinguished Senator from Indiana, the chairman of the committee on committees. Of course it had many champions when it was offered. Republican Senators who had held their tongues waxed eloquent on that day in behalf of that resolution. Indeed, the newspapers did not state that any Senator rose in opposition to it. I do not think that the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] was there, and some of the other so-called progressives were not there, but the resolution was passed by the Republican conference. Merely to recall to the public what it stated, I wish to read it:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the conference that Senators La Follette, Ladd, Brookhart, and Frazier be not invited to future Republican conferences and be not named to fill Republican vacancies in the Senate committees.

And they were not. One of the distinguished Senators who is not with us any more but who has retired to private life up in Pennsylvania, said that he would be unwilling to return to his people with such an organization as the gentlemen named in the resolution would make of the Republican majority of the Senate; that he believed in efficiency in party organization, and that that was what the people of Pennsylvania believed in.

Mr. CARAWAY. And they demonstrated that.

Mr. HARRISON. And they demonstrated that. I notice from a reading of this list of committee promotions that the colleague of the then Senator from Pennsylvania, who absented himself from the Senate for many days and many weeks and toured the more remote and sparsely settled as well as the populous centers of Pennsylvania in support of Mr. Pepper's reelection, and who the other day took such a prominent part in the defense of corrupt politics in America, and who during the closing hours of the last session filibustered into the wee hours of the morning and throughout the day so as to defeat the passage of the deficiency appropriation bill, which will be called up next—I notice that this distinguished Senator, through the work of the committee on committees, is promoted more than anyone else save these once maligned and so-called radicals. I notice from a reading of the committee promotions that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] not only retains his place upon the Finance Committee, but he is given Mr. Pepper's place on the Foreign Relations Committee. Not only that, but the committee on committees have promoted him to the Rules Committee. They name him upon the Immigration Committee; and, not satisfied with that, they do the exceptional thing, conferring a privilege that is accorded to no other Senator on the other side or on this side of having more than two major committee assignments and make this distinguished friend of Mr. VARE, this Senator who filibustered against the deficiency appropriation bill last year, chairman of the all-powerful Military Affairs Committee of this body. So the Senator from Indiana and his colleagues did certainly compensate him well for the service he has rendered in this body.

But the gentlemen whose names have been given, who were driven out of the party—and I must say to the credit of my distinguished friend from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] that he stood up and fought like a man; he did not cringe; he did not surrender; he stood his ground—have been given fine committee assignments.

Is it not strange that in this body, which met a week ago last Monday and the first duty of which was to organize and begin in an orderly way to elect a President pro tempore, to elect a Secretary of the Senate and a Sergeant at Arms and other officers, up until this good hour the majority have not dared to try to organize the Senate? If rumors may be believed, it is because they had an unruly group over there who, they feared, might not vote for the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] for President pro tempore of the Senate, who, they feared, might not vote for the Republican conference nominee, Mr. Barry, for Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or for the reelection of the present Secretary of the Senate.

The so-called progressives defied the regular Republicans. They even went to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the leader on the other side, and demanded of him that certain legislation be passed in this body. The newspapers did not say that they gave any promise that they would support the organization of the Senate if the regular Republicans would adopt that legislative program, but, so far as the country knows and we have been led to believe, the only legislative program which has been mapped out was by the so-called radical group that was driven from the Republican conference, and that program has been adopted by the leader of the Republican side.

When such actions as that are taking place it makes those of us who have great confidence in our fellow men grow a little bit suspicious. But we were willing to pass by this acquiescence upon the part of the distinguished candidate for President—and he would make a great President——

Mr. CARAWAY. To which one does the Senator from Mississippi refer? [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. We would have passed that by, I say, but when the action of the other side takes us by surprise over here and committee assignments are suggested before there is any effort made to organize the Senate, some people are likely to wonder if there is any trade in the air, if any agreement has been made by the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Indiana—and, of course, I know they do not like to make trades in behalf of their party's success—that for these promotions or committee assignments the so-called Progressives are to support the regular nominees of the Republican conference for the offices of this body.

Of course, it matters not what I may think and other people may think. I have such confidence in Senators over there who once defied the Republican majority and made them surrender that I do not believe they can be bought by such committee promotions and assignments. Of course, the future will tell. Tomorrow, I presume, it will be in order in carrying out the plans of the other side for a motion to be made to proceed to the organization of the Senate, and that the name of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] will be presented for President pro tempore and that for Sergeant at Arms of the Senate there will be presented the name of Mr. Barry, who passed through the troubled waters of the closing hours of the last Congress and who brought on his head criticism because he brought some Senators down here out of bed—a mighty poor thing to criticize him for—and the Senators who receive these promotions and who were once read out of the party will be called on to vote for him.

I do not know whether they are going to vote "present" or whether they are going to vote for the nominees presented, but if and when they do vote for them their action might be construed throughout the country as being due to some kind of a plum that they could not resist and so they accepted these committee assignments.

Mr. President, look how well these recalcitrant and progressive Senators on the Republican side have been taken care of. Mr. BROOKHART, whose name was listed in the resolution to which I have referred, who was driven from the Republican conference, has been given a fine place on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and on the Committee on Military Affairs, so that he will be in a position to keep the peace not only in the country but within the Republican Party. He is lifted high and placed on the all-powerful Committee on Banking and Currency. Those are fine committee assignments that the Senator from Indiana has chosen, as chairman of this committee, to give to him—this man whom the Senator once condemned as unworthy to wear the cloak of Republicanism.

Mr. FRAZIER is given a high place on Banking and Currency, so that he can work in unity with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART]; and then he is placed upon the very important Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and, not content with that, these gentlemen take this man who was driven from their councils and make him chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Mr. NYE, whose picture has been published in the Washington Post as one of the progressive group, and one of those who demanded of the Senator from Kansas that a vote be had on certain legislation here, is taken care of. They need the distinguished Senator from North Dakota; but if I know him correctly, Mr. President, they will not get him by handing out such sops as are embodied in these committee assignments. Why, they give to him Immigration; they give to him Claims. What finer committee could you have than Claims? They give to him Commerce—in this Congress to be a most powerful committee. Ah, they say to him, "You certainly will vote with us for organization when we give you an assignment on the Appropriations Committee," and so he is placed there; but they may have been a little fearful of some of those other assignments, and so they give him the chairmanship of the powerful Public Lands Committee.

Mr. CARAWAY. The one they made Senator Ladd get off.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the one from which they drove the deceased Member from North Dakota, Mr. Ladd, or of which they would not let him have the chairmanship.

I suspect that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] had his hand in this. He was in line for the chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee. They put him on Appropriations, and Finance, and these various committees, but the distinguished Senator from Utah would not swap his place on the Public Lands Committee for anything. He was in line for

the chairmanship of that committee; but he goes over to my friend NYE and he says, "You must be chairman of it. I will work with you."

They did not stop there. They gave to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] assignments on the Committees on Commerce and Post Offices and Post Roads, and Mines and Mining; and another distinguished Senator who has come into the body, whose picture has been placarded with the other so-called progressives, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], is given assignments on Judiciary and Military Affairs, as well as others.

Mr. President, it is to be hoped that the country will not believe that this kind of bartering and sale will go through. You, the old guard, may do it, because you have been guilty even of keeping men in the Senate when corruption showed in every fiber of their being; but I do not believe that these men, progressives from the West, who have voted against such measures as that and have tried to uphold the standards of this country, for this mere pittance will vote for your nominees for Secretary of the Senate and Sergeant at Arms and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I should like to obtain some information in reference to the demands that were made by the progressive Senators of the Northwest, and whether or not those demands have been fully complied with.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want an answer to that question?

Mr. McMASTER. I should like anyone who would be willing to convey the information to answer the question.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator had attended the conference he would have been satisfied about promises. There were no promises made except that a majority of the Republican conference took the position that there should be no unnecessary delay in securing a vote on the three measures at this session of Congress. There is not a man in the Senate but who knows that any Senator who wants a vote on a measure may secure it if he wants it, and that is what they were promised. They were not asked to commit themselves upon anything, and to-day I do not know how they will vote. I want them to vote their own judgment.

Mr. McMASTER. Well, I am simply asking: Did the Republican side of the Chamber agree that there would be a vote upon these three measures?

Mr. MOSES. The Senator is a Member of the Republican side. What agreement did he make?

Mr. McMASTER. I am perfectly willing that they shall have a vote. I simply want to know if there are any here who are opposed to a vote upon the propositions they have demanded shall receive consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. All that was said to them was printed.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me just one minute? I should simply like to suggest that the gentlemen take this matter back into conference, because now they are fixing to call out here and expose on the floor of the Senate what transpired in secrecy, and they ought not to do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there was no secrecy whatever. The letters were printed in the press. They were turned over to the press so that all the Senators and all who were interested might know what occurred.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why does the Senator get mad, then, when the Senator from South Dakota wants to find out what happened?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is not mad; but he thinks that when people read what happened it is unnecessary to ask questions about it.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is what I was coming to. I knew the Senator from South Dakota was asking questions about matters that ought not to have been exposed here on the floor, and I rose merely in the interest of peace; that is all.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the only assurance that the progressive Senators have received in regard to the matter of their bills receiving consideration is the assurance from the Republican leader that he will do all in his power to bring that about.

I want to say that I have the fullest confidence in the assurances made by the fine, genial leader on the Republican side; and I want to say also that he has spent many years here in smoothing the pathway for other Senators, and making their trials and their burdens easier; but every Senator in this Chamber knows that no floor leader can commit the membership of his side of the the Chamber to any particular proposition. That was demonstrated here last spring when the deficiency bill was up for consideration—a deficiency bill that involved millions of dollars, that involved many departments. The floor leader on the Republican side was in favor of the passage of that bill, and yet two Republican Senators filibustered the bill to death.

The point I want to make, however, is this: For the sake of argument let us take it for granted that particularly this proposition of farm relief will receive the favorable consideration of the Senators on this side—that is, that they will not use any obstructive tactics against that bill. That promise, however, does not mean anything so far as farm relief is concerned. Of course, they are going to permit the farm relief bill to come to a vote. Of course, it may be passed by the Senate, but every Member of this body knows that if the McNary-Haugen bill is passed, or any similar farm legislation that is of an adequate nature is passed, it will be vetoed by the President. Of course, they are perfectly generous in giving to the Members on this side the right to vote upon farm relief, but it is not the privilege of a vote upon farm relief that we are asking. We are asking that farm relief be made a substantial fact, that it be made a reality; and I want to say to the Republican Senators that in my judgment the American farmer has received a lemon here with just a little sugar in the way of committee appointments; and in my judgment the only way we can ever get farm relief is for this side and the other side of the Chamber to attack the tariff. If we ever obtain farm relief from this industrial group we must attack them at their vulnerable point; and I wish to say that I propose to introduce a resolution to the effect that it be the judgment of the Senate that the hour has come for tariff revision, for the lowering of tariff schedules, and in that resolution I shall propose also that a copy thereof be transmitted to the House of Representatives, as I understand that all revenue and tariff bills must originate there.

I want to say to this gallant band of Senators from the Northwest that they have made a splendid fight for farm relief; that I think they did win their objective here on the Republican side in receiving consent that their bills shall receive consideration; but I repeat that we want more than merely consideration of a farm bill. We want farm legislation; and if we proceed to attack the tariff we will place the industrial group on the defensive, just as they have been placing the farmer on the defensive here during the last four or five years.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I have always listened to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] with interest. There is much amusement in what he says, and sometimes there is a suggestion of solid fact. That is somewhat the situation this morning. In addition to that, there is a challenge to those known as the progressive Members of the Senate, and I want to accept that challenge.

I was kicked out of the Republican caucus. I am proud of it. I do not belong to the Wall Street party. I was kicked out of the Senate. I am proud of that. The Senator from Mississippi helped to do that. The reason I was kicked out was because I do not belong to the Wall Street party on either side of this Chamber. There are only two parties in the United States now. One is the Wall Street party and the other is that opposed to it.

In reference to the challenge to the progressives that they shall vote with the Republican organization or against it, I want to say publicly in the Senate, as I said to the Senator from Mississippi in the office of the Democratic leader, that I stand ready to vote for an organization that will unite the South and the West in this issue against the financial domination of this country in New York. No Democrat came back with any proposition to me to meet that. Plenty of them had criticisms of the Republican side and something to say against what the Republicans were doing, but there was no constructive program suggested from the Democratic side.

How about taxes? In 1924 we passed the best tax bill that ever passed the Congress of the United States. It contained an inheritance tax graduated up to 40 per cent on the $10,000,000 and more estate. Then a little later Duke, the great tobacco king, died, and the great Democratic leadership that assisted us in passing that bill then turned around and joined in putting over a Mellon bill that gave several million dollars of rebate to the Duke estate, and other propositions like that.

We progressives are not for tax reduction; we are for paying the debt. We are not for returning 80 per cent of these taxes to the States. Those millions that were returned to the State of North Carolina because of the Duke rebate were collected from Iowa and South Dakota and from these other States as truly as they were collected from North Carolina. That pernicious principle was injected into the bill, and you can not lay it onto the Republican majority, because the Democratic side, the Wall Street part of the Democracy, had more to do with it than did the Republicans on this side. Now, at this time the Democratic majority is trying to out-Mellon Mellon in this tax reduction for the big financial crowd of the United States,

which means higher taxes upon the common people of the country.

As to farm relief—there never has come such a calamity to agriculture in all its history as has come recently. The principal cause of it was a law passed during a Democratic administration, the Federal reserve banking law, with its power of deflation in the hands of a few men. Another part of it was brought about by a railroad law, a transportation act, with Republican names at the head of it, but with Democratic Wall Street votes making possible the passage of that law. At this moment the quotations on wheat in Winnipeg, Canada, and in Minneapolis, Minn., are from 20 to 25 cents a bushel apart, and the farmers of Canada are now receiving 20 or 25 cents a bushel more for their wheat than are the farmers of the United States, all due to freight rates under that Wall Street railroad law.

This Federal reserve banking proposition sent farm values down two and a half billion dollars in the State of Iowa, while it increased railroad stock values $3,000,000,000 on the stock exchange in New York.

The causes of this discrimination have been bipartisan, and I now challenge the Senator from Mississippi to put up a program for genuine farm relief from his Democratic side; to put up a program for correcting this unjust transportation act; to put up a program for correcting the inequalities in credit cost and control in the United States, and I will support it. Three or four hundred million dollars of the savings of my people in Iowa are now invested down in New York at 1¾ to about 4¼ per cent, while the farmers of my State are paying 7 to 8 per cent for their banking loans, due to the banking laws and the Federal reserve act.

This condition is due to somebody else fixing the price of everything the farmer must buy, under a tariff enacted by the Congress of the United States; somebody else fixing the rate of interest a farmer must pay upon his credits, under laws enacted by the Congress of the United States; somebody else fixing the value of the railroads and the rates the farmer must pay under laws enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Farmers are driven to extremity throughout this Union. I make no discrimination; East, North, West, South, their condition is about the same. When something is asked in the way of legislation for the relief of agriculture, the Senator from Mississippi rises in his place and, instead of answering these great questions, he says, "You vote for a Republican candidate for Secretary of the Senate whom you do not like, or for a Republican candidate for Sergeant at Arms whom you do not like." I say to him, bring in your program in the interest of the American people; I do not care whether you hail from Mississippi, or from what State you come, I am with you. I am ready to stand for this fight regardless of party lines, and I stand without compromise.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCMASTER] that he poll the Republican Senators in order to ascertain the exact position of each. I agree with him that the Senator from Kansas can not bind his side unless Senators over there consent and agree to that course. I suggest to my progressive friends that before they tie themselves up in this unholy alliance with the old stand-pat Republicans of this body they know exactly what they are going to get in the way of support of farm legislation. If they do not have such an understanding, they are going to get something else and get it in the neck. [Laughter.]

You will not be able to satisfy your constituents at home by telling them that you had an understanding on the side that you were going to have an opportunity at some time during the session, maybe just before we adjourn, to have a vote, just a vote, on somebody's bill suggesting some kind of relief for the farmers of the country. That kind of agreement will not be acceptable to the farmer.

I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota and to the Senator from Iowa that they have this kind of an understanding with the Senator from Kansas, and each of the stand-pat Senators that, "We will take up a farm relief measure of some sort, and we will keep it before the Senate and make it the continuing order until it is disposed of." If you will do that, my progressive friends, you will get somewhere, and you will have help from this side. But if you let this thing hang where it seems to hang, up in the air, you are not going to get any real consideration of a farm relief measure.

You must not be too easily satisfied. You would better follow some of the suggestions of the Senator from Iowa and know exactly what you are about. Of course, I know that these committee assignments are very soothing and very pleasant to the taste, and they probably will have the effect of satisfying and silencing certain progressives and lulling them to sleep.

I trust you are not going to forget the cause of the farmer, because the farmers of this country are in a dreadful condition. The Republican Party has been in power six years and more, and since they came into power 2,000,000 American farmers have been whipped in the fight with those who have robbed them of their substance; and they have been driven from the farm. They have lost their homes and farms and have gone into the crowded cities where they are living in tenement houses, and eking out a miserable existence. The farmers that are left behind will lose their fight in a little while and go the same way, unless they receive legislative enactments that will enable them to have a fair deal.

Senators, they are having a hard time. As I speak to-day, the cotton gamblers of the East are robbing the farmers of my State of $25 to $30 a bale on their cotton. A thing unheard of in the history of the cotton industry is taking place. When the Government makes a report that the crop is going to be smaller than they formerly thought it would be, it breaks the price of cotton. Heretofore, when a report came out estimating the amount to be produced at less than what the trade thought it would be, it boosted the price of cotton; but this year, at least, three times to my knowledge, when the Government has reported that the crop would be smaller the price has broken on the New York Exchange from $2 to $5 a bale.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYFIELD. In the cotton report of the Secretary of Agriculture, made on December 8, he estimated that we would make this year 12,789,000 bales of cotton. In the report for the year 1926, December 8, he estimated that we would make 17,977,000 bales. Therefore, according to these reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, we will make 5,180,000 bales less this year than we made during last year. In view of these facts should not the price of cotton have advanced $5 to $10 a bale on December 8 instead of declining $2 a bale?

Mr. HEFLIN. I agree with the Senator that it should have advanced at least $10 a bale.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Does not the Senator think that the reason why the price of cotton declined $2 a bale was that 60 days ago Secretary Jardine destroyed the cotton market, drove away all of its supporting influences when he predicted lower prices for cotton?

Mr. HEFLIN. That contributed tremendously to that unfortunate situation. I agree with what the Senator from Texas has said.

Mr. President, something has got to be done by Members of Congress who still have any conscience and courage left. There is an organized band of marauders who move upon the cotton exchanges and grain exchanges, and they are robbing the farmers of this country, and they are flourishing in evil doing. They are making money by the millions. Seats on the stock exchange and seats on the cotton exchange and grain exchange have gone up in leaps and bounds in price. They are bringing high prices. Men are seeking them now as never before. They have a place under Republican rule where they can go and sit around the table and speculate in farm products and beat down the price and control the spot market on cotton and grain in every State in the Union. That is what you have to-day under Republican rule. I want to warn my friends on the other side not to barter the birthright of the American farmer to the stand-pat Republicans of this body to-day in order to get some committee assignments that would be more agreeable than those they already have.

Now, a moment on the cotton situation. Here is a 12,000,000-bale crop selling for 18½ to 19 and 19½ cents, and up to 20 cents. There is no excuse under the sun for cotton bringing this year a cent under 25 cents a pound. It ought to bring that at least. But the speculators have combined, and they are taking the profits that should go to the farmer. They go upon the exchanges and sell millions of bales of fictitious stuff called cotton. They do not own a bale; they never deliver a bale; they settle the difference in money. The man who sells a contract has no cotton. The man who buys it does not intend to have any cotton delivered. It is a gambling deal. It is a dummy transaction. Yet the gambling gang on the exchange fix the price of cotton on the spot market in grain and cotton.

Mr. Jardine is not a friend of the farmer. I have studied this gentleman very closely for about three years. I lost confidence in him completely when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] during the last session of Congress found him hobnobbing with the grain and cotton gamblers of Chicago, when the Senator from Arkansas found the program of the

speculators up there, and Mr. Jardine was on the program to speak to the gamblers on the subject of how to speculate successfully. Now, think of that, Senators! There is a man who is supposed to look after and safeguard the interests of the farmers going to the enemies of the farmer, going into the stronghold of the gamblers and teaching them how they can rob the farmer more successfully than now. God knows they are making a wonderful success of it now.

They have driven from the farm 2,000,000 farmers in six years. They are holding up and robbing the farmers in cruel fashion now. They have been denying them the comforts of life and now they are robbing them of the necessities of life, and at last they are robbing them of their homes and farms; and still nothing is done to give the farmer relief and to give him a fair chance in his struggle for existence.

When the Senator from Arkansas found Mr. Jardine camping with the enemy of the farmer I lost confidence in him, I repeat. This year Mr. Tenny, in his department, gave out his view about what cotton prices would do in the near future, which was a most unheard-of and outrageous thing—a subordinate of the Department of Agriculture under the Secretary expressing for publication his view about cotton prices. His view was against the producer and on the side of the speculator, and as a direct result of his terrible act the market broke $7.50 a bale the next day.

Senators, are we going to sit here and permit this kind of thing to go on? They are doing the same thing to the grain growers in the West. They are robbing them every year of hundreds of millions of dollars. They have a well-worked-out arrangement for speculating in cotton and grain. They claim that the grain grower and the cotton grower could not get along without it. We are going to have a chance, I believe at this session, to get along without both of them. I am going to introduce a bill in this session of Congress—and I believe that nearly every southern Senator and Member of the House will support it, because it will do away with the cotton-gambling exchanges as they are conducted to-day. And I believe that western Members will join us. The cotton exchange as run to-day is an infamous machine and, unfortunately, the conduct of the Secretary of Agriculture is aiding it to rob the cotton farmer.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. DILL. Why does not the Senator include in his bill a provision to do away with the grain exchange?

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to do that. I shall be glad to join with the Senators of the grain-growing States and unite our forces and rout these gamblers who are feeding and fattening on the substance of the farmers of the United States, reducing their number every year, robbing them of their produce, and then making millions more out of it after they get it into their own hands.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. SMITH. In view of the marvelous situation which has developed in the last 90 days in reference to the cotton market—and I am not advised about the grain market, because I have not kept up with it—involving not millions but billions of dollars, not only the welfare of this country but of foreign countries, does he not think it is the duty of this body to have a thorough investigation of what to the ordinary man is inexplicable, that in view of a comparative failure in the crop, in view of the unprecedented demand for this product, the price has steadily declined ever since it was positively known that the crop would be from 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 bales less than it was last year?

I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that last year there was exported abroad from America the largest amount of cotton ever exported in the history of the cotton industry. There were 11,000,000 bales of the American crop exported abroad. There was an unprecedented consumption of cotton in America, evidencing the fact that what has been published in all the trade journals was correct, that the shelves of the textile merchants were bare, that the new uses of cotton in millions of pounds in automobile construction had increased the demand, and yet in the face of the fact that we will make this year 6,000,000 bales less than last year the price of cotton even yesterday went down $1.50 a bale. It seems to me that in acknowledgment of the responsibility of the Congress and in recognizing that responsibility it is our duty to investigate the whole situation as to the demand for cotton and cotton goods, and whether or not there is some artificial understanding by which consumption is being curtailed in order that there may not be a high price for the raw material.

I intend at a later time to take the floor to make a comparison between the prices of the manufactured goods and the raw material, to show the percentage of decline there was when cotton touched the ridiculous figure it did last year. I maintain that we ought to have a real investigation as to why this condition exists and whether or not it is justifiable. I do not know who is to blame—that is, I do not know the individual. I have my idea as to those who have helped to bring about this condition. But the American people, whose balance of trade is dependent upon this article, and the southern people, whose currency it is, are entitled to know whether or not this condition is justifiable, and we are the ones who should find it out and publish the facts. I have some data which I propose at the proper time to lay before the Senate. If the Senator will allow me just a moment, I will refer to it briefly now.

In September, when the estimate of the Department of Agriculture was that the crop would probably not exceed 14,000,000 bales but would be greater than 13,000,000 bales, cotton went to 24 and 25 cents a pound. When, in subsequent reports, they reduced their estimate as to the yield and brought it down to practically 13,000,000 bales, the prices began to break. The traders placed responsibility on the unfortunate bulletin issued by the Bureau of Economics, in which it outlined the fact that we were going to make an extremely short crop and that on account of the fact that the spinning world or the manufacturing world might curtail consumption, the prices for the next few months would decline. They also made the marvelous statement that we had 7,800,000 bales of the old crop to carry into the new crop. I investigated and found to my satisfaction, at least (because the bulletin had been considered by the world as official), that 7,800,000 bales was the exact estimate of a private concern. Side by side, in another column in a table said to contain the sources of their information to enable them to arrive at their estimate of 7,800,000 bales, was the estimate of the American stock by the Bureau of the Census. It evidently had been entirely ignored. In other words, one bureau of our Government quoted a private estimate as to the carry-over of cotton from the old crop into the new and ignored the Bureau of the Census whom we have charged with doing that work.

Mr. HEFLIN. Whose figures did they use?

Mr. SMITH. I wish I had them before me. They appeared in a New York commercial paper, whose name I will get, but I think it was the New York Commercial Chronicle. I believe their estimate was 7,818,000, and the estimate given by the Bureau of Economics was 7,800,000. In other words, they took this private estimate as to the carry-over, disregarding Mr. Hester, of New Orleans, who for 50 years had been accepted by the world as perhaps the greatest and fairest statistician in America. They ignored the Bureau of the Census and every other source, but accepted this private estimate almost down to the very last bale. That appeared on the opposite page in the bulletin that predicted that prices would go lower.

Mr. HEFLIN. In other words, they substituted a private estimate for the Government's figure?

Mr. SMITH. So far as the American crop was concerned. That is in strict accord with figures submitted to me. On one side was published the statement that the price would probably go down, and on the other side was the statement that we would have 7,800,000 bales of the old crop, while Mr. Hester was contending that it would be about 800,000 or 1,000,000 bales less. It does not make any difference who is right or wrong, I maintain that the Government had no right to state officially what the carry-over was until every consul in every foreign country had reported and every available means we have for information had been exhausted to know exactly how many bales of visible commercial American cotton were carried in stock in Europe and carried in stock in America. The addition or subtraction of a million bales would spell the difference between bankruptcy and prosperity in the great cotton-producing section of our country. And yet, seemingly without any care or regard for what they were doing, they stated the carry-over to be 7,800,000 bales. They did not give the source from which they got the information. The public was entitled to know where they got that information, because, had they printed along with that statement their source of information, it might have been discounted.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. MAYFIELD. They finally admitted that the figures were unofficial, did they not?

Mr. SMITH. After hard work on the part of some of us to get the department to acknowledge that it was not official and

should have been repudiated as an official document as soon as attention was called to it.

Mr. HEFLIN. They never did do it, did they?

Mr. SMITH. After a long time there was a statement by Mr. Jardine that it was not official.

Mr. HEFLIN. But the harm had been done and the market had been broken?

Mr. SMITH. The harm had been done. The thing that concerns me about our departments is that the heads of the departments should realize that they are responsible for whatever is done or said in any of the respective bureaus of their department. That is the reason a Cabinet officer is put into his position. I verily believe that Mr. Jardine never saw that bulletin until his attention was called to its disastrous effect on the market. What we ought to insist is that no estimate shall issue and no prediction shall be published as to prices from any governmental department, but that the department shall merely state the facts and leave the estimates alone.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with what the Senator from South Carolina has suggested; and there is no man in this body better equipped to introduce a resolution for a general investigation of that kind than is the Senator himself, and I trust that he will do it. I wish to assure him in advance of my hearty cooperation. I want the Agricultural Department investigated. I want Mr. Jardine interrogated and also those under him. It may be necessary to investigate the ginning bureau also. I have some inquiries I would like to make.

Along with what I was saying about Mr. Jardine when Mr. Tenny made his great mistake and colossal blunder in the early fall, which broke the price of cotton $7.50 per bale, amounting to millions of dollars loss to the cotton producers of the United States, I wired Mr. Jardine that this man Tenny's conduct was unwarranted and indefensible, and that it looked as though the speculators had reached him and were influencing him to give out such a statement, and that since he had given out that statement so dangerous and costly to the cotton farmers of the United States that he ought to be forthwith removed from office. Mr. Jardine wired me back that Tenny's performance would not occur any more. Think of that! Mr. Tenny's act constitutes a violation of every decent propriety surrounding his office and his act is a crime against every cotton farmer in the United States.

Mr. President, I hold that if a man at the head of a department has a crook in office under him, he should remove him, and the public generally believes that this man's conduct brands him as a crook and that he was influenced by pecuniary considerations to make the strange and unwarranted statement he did. As a Government official, this man under Mr. Jardine broke the price of cotton and helped to rob the cotton farmers of the United States of millions of dollars—but Mr. Jardine continues him in office. A man who has a crook in office under him and will not remove him is a crook himself.

I am sorry, Mr. President, to have to call this disagreeable and disgraceful thing to the attention of this body and to the attention of the country, but truth and justice demand it. Mr. Harding and Mr. Coolidge have been exceedingly unfortunate in some of their Cabinet officers. I recall that the Senate performed a solemn and righteous duty when it drove Denby out of the Cabinet. And it performed a great service when it drove Fall out of the Cabinet; and also later when it drove Daugherty out of the Cabinet. It seems to me as though there is something in the moral atmosphere of this administration that crookedness and corruption and graft hang to it as moss hangs to a tree. It seems as if Mr. Jardine has gone over to the crooked speculative interests, and I stand ready to impeach him, to remove him from the head of the Agricultural Department.

Think of keeping a man at the head of the great agricultural interests of the Nation who has hobnobbed with cotton and grain gamblers and is offering to speak to them in private and offering to teach them how to speculate successfully in grain and cotton. Mr. Jardine's action with regard to Mr. Tenny is greatly against him. We ought to summon him to the bar of the Senate or before one of its committees and interrogate him. I have had many men to tell me that they believed these officials got money from the cotton speculators for giving out and publishing a statement that helped the bear speculators to clean up millions of dollars on the cotton exchange.

Senators, I regret to say that the circumstantial evidence is overwhelming against these officials of the Agricultural Department. A Government official ought to be above suspicion of any kind. A man placed in charge of a great department of the Government ought to be so honest and straight and fair and just that when his conduct is brought into question he will come out in the open and explain the matter to the Senate and to the country. The burden of proof is on Mr. Jardine. His situation is far from being an enviable one.

He came out with a statement later in the fall that the cotton crop would not be so large as some thought it would be, and that statement helped the market a dollar a bale or more; but the very next day he undid the good effect of that statement by stating that he must not be taken too seriously when he was talking in private conversation. I wonder who suggested that he correct that statement. The department seems to be unwilling to let a statement which favors the farmer stand, but they knock it down immediately, because their influence and sympathies are on the side of those who rob the farmer.

Mr. President, it is high time that we were talking plainly and going directly to the issue here. Mr. Jardine has lost his standing and influence in the country. Men in the South who never complained heretofore have complained against him this year. I have had telegrams and letters saying "Get after Jardine about Tenny's report. It is unwarranted, hurtful, and is the most outrageous thing that ever occurred." Yet Tenny is still in the department, still holding his job, under Mr. Jardine. He did what somebody told him to do. He is responsible to Mr. Jardine and Mr. Jardine ought to compel him to do his duty honestly or he ought to get rid of him. He ought to require him to do right and be honest or drive him out of the Government service.

We have got to keep the fight up until the Agricultural Department is freed of crooked officials and there is a general house cleaning at this Capital. There is so much corruption around here, so much bribery in Government places, so much graft that some seem to think that it is all right. We have got to teach them to the contrary.

If this Republic is to live and the great masses of the people are to have a fair deal at the hands of their Government, the friends of the people have got to assert themselves in the Senate; and I want the progressives on the other side to cooperate with us to the end that we may accomplish something along this line this year.

Yesterday a very great American, a man with whom I served in the House of Representatives, Frank Lowden, of Illinois, afterwards a very distinguished governor of that State, a farmer on a large scale said—and I want Senators to pay particular attention to this—"I would have been better off if I had given my farms away seven years ago." Think of that, Senators! It is the worst indictment ever drawn against an administration when a big farmer, a man of wealth, says that he would have been better off if he had given his farms away rather than tried to conduct them under the present unfair conditions which he finds under the administration of his own party.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does not the Senator think that that statement is not only not an exaggeration, but that it would apply to the farmers of his State? I know it would apply to the farmers of my State and that it would apply to me. I myself would have been better off had I not had a farm at all, yet I think that my farm is rated as one of the best in Lee County, S. C.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank the Senator for that statement. Think of that, Senators! What are we coming to in this country if men who are able somehow to carry on and keep their farms say they would be better off if they should give them away. What must be the terrible struggle of those who farm on a smaller scale, and the one-horse farmers all over the country tugging away, trying to make a living for themselves and families, trying to gather up enough of the necessities of life to live decently. What must be their burden, and what must be the sad thoughts that occupy them when they are fighting under unfavorable conditions and fighting a losing battle every year. Let us resolve at the beginning of this session that we are not going to let the big highbrows of the Nation monopolize the time of this Congress. The big rich of the Nation somehow have legislation coming at their beck and call. We want to do justice by all classes and no injustice to any class; but let us resolve that we are going to see to it that the men who labor and earn their living by the sweat of their brows, the farmers who produce that which feeds and clothes the world, are going to have attention in this body at this session, and let us band together, stand together, and fight together until we accomplish something for them.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I inquire if the pending question has been put to a vote as yet?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). The question has not as yet been put to a vote.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the statements, and the inferences which might be drawn from them, which have been made by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I desire to print in the RECORD the correspond-

ence which took place between the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Republican leader of the United States Senate, and the five progressive Senators who signed the letters which were addressed to him.

In our first letter to the Senator from Kansas we made it perfectly plain that in so far as the Senators who joined in the signing of that letter were concerned their paramount interest in the matter of organizing the Senate was to secure assurance that votes would be had upon legislation which we considered of vital importance to the people of this country. We realized full well that we could not ask, and we did not ask, that Senators should be committed to vote for this legislation in advance. What we did ask was that there should be definite assurances that the legislation which we believed to be of vital concern should have an opportunity for a hearing and a final vote during the first session of the Seventieth Congress.

It would have been futile for the minority group of this body to demand or expect that Senators who were not in agreement with them as to legislative propositions should be requested to give assurance in advance that they would vote favorably upon those questions. Therefore, we addressed a letter to the Republican leader of the United States Senate requesting assurances with regard to a legislative program which we considered to be of importance. He replied assuring us that, in so far as he was able, as leader of this side of the Chamber, he would do everything in his power to bring about a final vote upon those three legislative proposals.

We again wrote the Senator in reply to his letter requesting an assurance from the Republican conference. He brought this correspondence to the attention of the Republican conference. Following that conference, at which this matter was fully discussed, he was authorized to confer with us further. In our conference with the Senator from Kansas he assured us that a majority of the Republican conference took the position that there should be a final vote upon these three propositions before the adjournment of the present session of Congress. With that assurance, and with the assurance given by the Senator from Kansas in his letter, we announced publicly that we would assist in organizing the United States Senate, reserving our right to pursue an independent course of action upon all questions which might arise during the session. That announcement was made before the committee on committees had had any meeting.

I desire to say upon my responsibility as a Senator that during our conferences with the Senator from Kansas we never either directly or indirectly brought up the question of committee assignments. We felt that the balance of power which passed into our hands as a result of the action of the electorate in the 1926 elections had placed upon us a responsibility not to feather our own nests, not to secure better committee assignments, but to advance a legislative program which we believed to be in the public interest.

I resent the imputation made by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that either I or any of my colleagues would engage in the business of trading a balance of power for better committee assignments. It is a fact well known to every legislator of any experience in this Chamber that a position upon a committee does not give a Senator an opportunity to bring about a vote upon legislation.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. Is it not a fact that all of the chairmanships that were assigned by the committee on committees in every case, without any exception, were simply the natural promotions through service, and that not one exception was made save in the case of a Senator preceding another Senator who did get a chairmanship refusing to take the chairmanship because of other chairmanships he already had? Is it not a fact that not a single chairmanship was assigned excepting those that Senators had earned in the ordinary way, through service?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee on committees.

Mr. EDGE. As a member of that committee, I will state that as a fact.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am very glad to have the Senator make that statement. I also desire to say that, so far as I am personally concerned, although solicited by the chairman of the Republican committee on committees to indicate my preference with regard to committee assignments, without intending any discourtesy to him, I did not respond to that request. Having obtained what I believed to be assurances that we would have an opportunity for a vote on the questions with which we were vitally concerned, I was satisfied to assist in organizing the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I therefore ask that there be printed in connection with my brief remarks copies of the correspondence which was conducted between the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and five progressive Senators upon this side of the Chamber and a public statement in which those five Senators joined, which was made on the 9th day of December, 1927.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 1, 1927.

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,

Republican Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: The undersigned progressive Senators desire to bring to your attention their attitude upon the question of organizing the Senate.

The importance of the control of the Senate committees is recognized by everyone. The legislative program of the entire session of Congress is involved.

The result of the 1926 elections has placed upon us a responsibility to our constituents which we must discharge. We are not so vitally concerned with individual preferment of Senators upon committees. The more important question with us is that certain legislation which we think is of paramount interest to the people shall not be pigeonholed in the various committees of the Senate which are about to be organized.

To that end we request definite assurance from the Republican majority that there shall be a final vote in the Senate before the adjournment of the first session of the Seventieth Congress upon the following measures:

(1) Adequate farm relief legislation on the basis of the McNary-Haugen bill to be reported from committee on or before February 1.

(2) A bill to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts in the issuance of injunctions.

(3) A resolution for a thorough investigation of the policy of the United States in Central and South America.

We do not ask that any Senator shall be committed to support any of these propositions. We are simply determined that the organization which we help to construct shall not function to prevent a vote in the open Senate upon these important questions.

Sincerely yours,

LYNN J. FRAZIER.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.
GERALD P. NYE.
JOHN J. BLAINE.

DECEMBER 3, 1927.

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of December 1 and note the attitude of the progressive Senators who signed the letter on the question of organizing the Senate.

While I can not speak for the Republican majority, I can assure you that, personally, without committing myself on the measures covered by your letter, I feel that you are entitled to a final vote during the first session of the Seventieth Congress on these questions. As leader of the Republican majority, I will gladly make every effort to secure consideration and final vote on them when they are reported from the committees to which they are referred.

Knowing the Senators who will be made chairmen of the various committees, if the Republicans organize the Senate, I do not see why you should fear that any one of the measures mentioned would be "pigeonholed in the committees," as Senator MCNARY will no doubt be continued as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Senator NORRIS as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and Senator BORAH as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. These are the committees to which the matters you submit to me for assurance of action will be referred in the regular course of the Senate's procedure.

I have not named the committee on order of business, but I assure you it will be made up of Senators who will favor the speedy disposition of the matters before the Senate and an early vote on all important measures reported to the Senate.

Assuring you that as leader of the Republican majority I shall do everything I can to secure early reports, consideration, and final vote on all important measures that may be presented to the Senate, I am, with kindest regards,

Very truly yours,

CHARLES CURTIS.

Hon. LYNN J. FRAZIER, Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., Hon. GERALD P. NYE, Hon. JOHN J. BLAINE.

DECEMBER 3, 1927.

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,

Republican Leader, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: Your letter of December 3, in reply to the letter which we addressed to you on December 1, has been received.

You disclaim any authority to speak for the Republican majority as to obtaining a final vote upon the propositions set forth in our letter

of December 1. In view of your statement we ask that you obtain from the Senators of the Republican majority the assurance that they will assist in obtaining a final vote on the following propositions before the adjournment of the first session of the Seventieth Congress:

(1) Adequate farm-relief legislation on the basis of the McNary-Haugen bill, to be reported from the committee on or before February 1.

(2) A bill to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts in the issuance of injunctions.

(3) A resolution for a thorough investigation of the policy of the United States in Central and South America.

No vote in the Senate will be possible upon these measures unless they are reported from committee. We have confidence in the chairmen of the three committees to which these propositions will be referred, but it has been demonstrated time and again that the chairman of a Senate committee can not report any measure or resolution unless authorized to do so by a majority of the committee.

In order that we may be assured that the committees to which these measures will be referred will report upon them to the Senate, we request that you obtain an assurance from the Republican members of the Foreign Relations, the Judiciary, and the Agriculture Committees that they will assist in reporting to the Senate the three measures mentioned above.

Sincerely yours,

LYNN J. FRAZIER.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.
GERALD P. NYE.
JOHN J. BLAINE.

DECEMBER 5, 1927.

Hon. LYNN J. FRAZIER, Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., Hon. GERALD P. NYE, Hon. JOHN J. BLAINE.

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of December 3, and assure you it, together with your letter of December 1, and my answer thereto, will be brought to the attention of the Republican conference at the first opportunity for such action as it deems proper.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

CHARLES CURTIS.

Senators FRAZIER, SHIPSTEAD, LA FOLLETTE, Jr., NYE, and BLAINE authorize the publication of the following statement:

"On December 1 we addressed a letter to Senator CURTIS requesting that he obtain definite assurance from the Senators of the Republican majority that there should be a final vote in the first session of the Seventieth Congress upon—

"(1) Adequate farm-relief legislation on the basis of the McNary-Haugen bill, to be reported from committee on or before February 1.

"(2) A bill to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts in the issuance of injunctions.

"(3) A resolution for a thorough investigation of the policy of the United States in Central and South America.

"Senator CURTIS replied, stating that while he could not speak for the Republican majority and did not desire to commit himself on legislation in advance, he would assist in obtaining a final vote upon these measures and would appoint a committee on order of business which would expedite consideration of all important legislation before the Senate.

"We requested Senator CURTIS, in our reply of December 3, to secure from the Senators of the majority a further assurance that they would assist in obtaining a vote upon these three measures before adjournment of the session. Senator CURTIS referred the correspondence to the Republican conference which met Tuesday. After a thorough discussion Senator CURTIS was authorized to confer with us further.

"In our meeting with Senator CURTIS he assured us that 'a majority of the Republican conference took the position that there should be no unnecessary delay in securing a vote upon the three measures during this session of Congress.'

"Having obtained definite assurance from Senator CURTIS and the Republican conference, we shall assist in organizing the Senate, reserving our right to pursue an independent course of action upon questions which may arise during the session."

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] seems to think that the little progressive group on this side of the Chamber have sold out or traded their birthright for a few assignments on committees. I want to assure the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and my other Democratic friends that the progressive group here have not sold out in any way. We did request of the leader on the Republican side, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], a statement as to securing votes on certain measures in which we were interested, putting the farm-relief measure first, as we believed that was the most important measure to come before the session. We received the assurance of the leader on the Republican side, and his statement that the majority of the Republican conference were willing to allow us to have votes on those measures. We did not ask anyone to pledge himself to vote for these measures.

I want to say to my friend from Mississippi that we are too democratic to ask anyone to pledge himself to vote for any measure for which he does not want to vote. We are willing that Senators shall vote according to the dictates of their consciences, and we grant that right to our friends on this side just as we do to our friends on the other side. We expect to be granted the same privilege; and I will say for the able and fair leader of the Republican side, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], that he did not ask any of us, so far as I know—I am speaking for myself, and I think I can speak for the rest of the progressives here—to pledge ourselves to vote for any particular bill or any particular candidates for office or anything of that kind; not even for the organization of the Senate itself.

I am in hearty accord with a great deal that was said over on the other side of the Chamber a few minutes ago in regard to the crop reports of the Agricultural Department of the United States; and I believe that the progressive group here are willing to back any investigation of that particular department or any bill that will rectify the mistakes that apparently are being made by them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. FRAZIER. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. Does not my friend believe that the tender solicitude of our friends, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], is somewhat belated, when we consider the fact that both of them voted against the only farm-relief measure that has been before the Senate and been voted on in recent years?

Mr. FRAZIER. In reply to the Senator from Indiana, I am very frank to say that I do think that some of our Democratic friends are not as consistent as they might be. I can remember only a very few months ago when bills were put forward here that seemed to me to be in the interest of the financial group of the Nation, and when there were not enough votes on this side of the Senate to pass them, enough individuals on the other side of the Chamber who apparently thought along the same lines united with those favoring the measures on this side to put across bills like the 1926 tax law, for instance, like the bank-relief bill known as the McFadden bill, and many others that I might mention.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a minute?

Mr. FRAZIER. Certainly.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Indiana suggests that I voted against that bill. I did in the form that it came in here because it included cotton, and was going to apply the tax to cotton immediately. I had voted for it before with the understanding that we would let our farmers have two years to study the question and decide for themselves whether or not they wanted to apply that principle to cotton. I voted for it with that understanding in order that the West might have it, because the West wanted it. The last time, when some smooth person got into conference with the friends of the measure and made them clamp cotton right into it—and I think some of them thought it would lose our support when they did it—I could not vote for it.

I have no apology to make for my vote under that condition. I would vote for the bill again now with cotton left out, to give us two years to work on it here, and let the West have it. I am friendly to anything that is substantial for the farmers of the country.

Mr. FRAZIER. I have no criticism to make of the vote on any measure of any Senator who votes according to his own conscience. I want to say that personally I am very much interested in farm legislation. I believe it is the most important piece of legislation that will come before this session of Congress or any other session of Congress until it is taken care of. I want to say further that the Democrats do not need to worry about the votes of the Progressives on this side. We have in the past shown by our record, I think, that we have voted according to the dictates of our conscience, regardless of whether it was with the Republicans or with the Democrats, and we will continue to do so in the future as we have in the past. Any measure that comes up that we believe is for the good of the people of our States and of the Nation we will be glad to support, whether it is a so-called Republican measure or a Democratic measure.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FRAZIER. Gladly.

Mr. COPELAND. I should like to ask the Senator if he heard the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] a little while ago, when he pointed out that there is a sure means of getting farm relief, and that is making an attack on the protective-tariff system? Would the Senator from North Dakota join the Senator from South Dakota in that suggestion?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am very frank to say that I think there should be some tariff revision. I am also frank to state that I believe that if a tariff revision bill were proposed here there would be enough of what my friend from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] calls Wall Street Democrats, together with the Wall Street Republicans, to prevent any worth-while change in the existing tariff legislation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I happen to come from the city where Wall Street is located. Does the Senator include me in that list?

Mr. FRAZIER. I did not mention the Senator's name.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I think in justice to the Senator from New York it should be stated that he is the only Senator from the East who voted for the McNary bill when it was on its passage.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator who is speaking has forgotten that, has he not? Has the Senator from North Dakota forgotten that the Senator from New York voted for the McNary-Haugen bill?

Mr. FRAZIER. Oh, no; not at all. I appreciate the progressiveness of the Senator from New York as shown in the vote that he cast.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say that in my judgment if the Senators representing the group to which the Senator from North Dakota belongs will get together in an attack upon the protective-tariff system, the industrial group—I suppose he means the Wall Street group over there—will then be ready to give farm relief; and that is the way to get it. If you will adopt the slogan "Protection for all or protection for none," you will win your fight, and I shall be glad, for myself, to join in that battle.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President——

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McMASTER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution with reference to the tariff, and ask its immediate consideration.

Mr. WATSON. That can not be done while the Senator from North Dakota is on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I will conclude in just a moment.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator can not take a Senator off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the resolution is withdrawn. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I want to call the attention of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] to the fact that there has been a slogan for a year or two or three years in the Northwest, "Protection for all or protection for none." The Senator has been too close to New York to know what was going on.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I did not get the full import of what was said by the Senator from Iowa. Will he repeat it, please?

Mr. BROOKHART. I say, the distinct slogan in the Northwest for two or three years has been "Protection for all or protection for none."

Mr. COPELAND. Did the Senator imply that the senior Senator from New York had not heard of that?

Mr. BROOKHART. His remarks led me to believe that he had not heard of it.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator from Iowa think the votes of the Senator from New York indicate that he has not heard of it?

Mr. BROOKHART. Sometimes.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to say, Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, that I believe the farmer must have relief, and the only way I can see for him to get it is to put that slogan into operation. I believe in the protective-tariff system, and I should hate to see it broken down; but the only way you can hope to have farm relief is to make it clear to the Senators from industrial centers that if farm relief is not given and the farmer given the benefit of protection, the protective-tariff system will be destroyed.

Mr. BROOKHART. If the Senator will present a bill embodying that principle, I will vote for it.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the progressives from the Northwest not only believe in protection for all but in a square deal for all. That applies to farmers, workers, and all others.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, when I made my few interesting remarks this morning I did not intend to stir up trouble on the other side of the aisle, and I would not now say anything if it were not for the charge of the Senator from North Dakota that I am inconsistent. It comes in poor grace, indeed, for the Senator from North Dakota to say that I am inconsistent when he stands among his brethren over there and realizes that just a few months ago they thought so little of him as to try to drive him from the councils of the party, and deliberately passed a resolution expelling him from conferences, refusing to give him committee assignments. He defied them here, and now he sees his brethren over there turn somersaults and come back into the fold, and he rises to their defense.

That is what I call inconsistency. I do not care whether the inconsistency is more upon the part of the Senator from North Dakota in his turning a somersault, or the Senators over there who control the destinies of the Republican Party.

Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. BLAINE, and Mr. NYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to all three of them, and we will have it out right now. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I want to say that I did not rise in defense of the Republican Party or the Republican organization or the Republican machine, or anything else you want to call it. I rose in defense of myself.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear that apology. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FRAZIER. I want to add just one word more. The genial Senator from Mississippi stated that he did not know how the progressive group would vote here on the organization, whether we would vote "present," or how we would vote.

Mr. HARRISON. I think I know now.

Mr. FRAZIER. I want to call to his mind a circumstance which took place here not so many years ago, when there was an attempt to elect a chairman of a committee.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator voted in the right way on that occasion.

Mr. FRAZIER. My colleague from North Dakota, the late Senator Ladd, had been chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and the Republican conference deposed him. An attempt was made on the floor of the Senate to continue Senator Ladd as chairman of the committee and enough of the Democrats voted "present" so that the majority group on this side elected their man.

Mr. HARRISON. Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, as a new Member of this body I would like to be informed what effect on legislation the election of a Sergeant at Arms, who is the policeman of this body, or of the clerk, and some other officials, who perform clerical work, and the President pro tempore, who presides in the absence of the Vice President, would have. I would like to know just what effect the election of any specific individual to any of those positions would have on the question of farm relief, the issuing of injunctions by the courts in labor disputes, international questions, revision of the tariff, banking and currency, or any other question of vital importance to our Republic and to our people? What has the election of a policeman or a clerk to do with any of those problems?

Mr. HARRISON. Has the Senator finished his question?

Mr. BLAINE. I have.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator propound the question to me?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator does not know, I am surprised at his constituency sending him here.

Mr. BLAINE. I am asking for information, so that the Senate may be advised what would be the effect of the election of these officers on legislation.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator does not know, I can not tell him.

Now, Mr. President, if I may proceed, I did think the Senator from Wisconsin knew what the duties of the Presiding Officer of the Senate are. If he does not know what the duties of the Secretary of the Senate or of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate are, he can read that little manual that is on his desk and find out.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. BLAINE. My question has not been answered. I put this specifically: Has the Secretary of the Senate any other power than that which may be authorized by the Senate, or any other duty to perform than that of a clerical nature which may be directed by the Senate?

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BLAINE. Wait a moment. Has the Sergeant at Arms any other duty than to see that decorum is preserved, under the direction of the Senate to appoint the necessary doorkeepers, and such other duties as devolve upon some one who holds an office of that character? Or has the President pro tempore any other duty than to preside under the rules of the Senate in the absence of the Vice President? Therefore, in what respect can the election of a single one of those officials have in bringing about farm relief, tariff legislation, banking and currency legislation, or in settling any other problem that may come before the Senate? I would like to have a specific answer.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator know that if a particular party in the Senate is able to organize by the election of the officers that party then controls the majority of the members on each committee, and that the committees initiate legislation, and that if we had the power to organize the Senate we would have the power then to name more members on the committees than we would have if we were in the minority? The Senator knew that, did he not?

Mr. BLAINE. That is not answering my question.

Mr. HARRISON. I can not answer the Senator's question.

Mr. BLAINE. I am very sorry the senior Senator from Mississippi fails to answer and will not detain him longer.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator a question? Would my answer to his question influence his vote to-morrow or the next day on the question as to who is to be selected Secretary or Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. BLAINE. I reserve the right on the floor of the Senate of freedom of action. I want the Senator to understand that I am not interested in this question of who may hold these offices. Little does it concern this Republic or the people of this country who may occupy those positions. But the people are interested in the action of this body upon legislation that relates to the interests of our Republic and the people thereof. If the Senator has a logical proposition that appeals to me, it will have its proper consideration by me.

Mr. HARRISON. I feel quite sure of that, and I want the Senator to understand that I do not want to get into any misunderstanding here with the Senator from Wisconsin, because I know that he and I are going to vote alike a great many times during his service here in the Senate. I regret that the Senator from Wisconsin sees fit to somewhat criticize my position here when I rise to defend the action of a distinguished Senator from his State and some other men who have collaborated and worked with him in the progressive ranks. I am merely pointing out the inconsistency of the Republican organization of the Senate in "firing out" from its councils, if I may use that term, men who saw fit to vote differently from them, but they now turn around and give them fine committee promotions.

I am glad those men received those committee assignments. That is fine. I believe that in most instances they will render greater service than some of the other men who could have been appointed to those majority places. I know now that all the banking and currency reforms of this country are to be put in force, that the great fiscal policies of this Nation are to be solved in the interest of the American people, because the distinguished Senator from Iowa will now be a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and his distinguished colleague, I believe, Mr. FRAZIER, goes on that committee.

Mr. President, the country will know of these inconsistent positions taken by the stand-pat old guard group of the Senate, throwing men out of the party one year, and then offering them every kind of inducement to bring them in the next year. I do not know what circumstance has arisen which causes the quick change upon the part of my friend from Indiana. I read the speech that he uttered in that conference and I read his speech in defense of his action upon the floor of the Senate. I know, as other men here and the people know, of his troubles out in the State of Indiana, but it does seem to me, as confused as might be the policical situation in Indiana, and as troubled as might be his heart, he has certainly taken the most radical departure from his former policies in bringing into the fold these men in this particular way.

I know not what has moved my distinguished friend from Kansas to have changed so completely with reference to the progressive group here. He gave succor and assistance to the distinguished Senator from Indiana a few months ago when they took formal party action in expelling these men from the conferences. I know that he has had some trouble in keeping harmony within the ranks of the party, and any leader of the Republican Party who tries to keep harmony within its ranks is going to have trouble. That is natural, because there are men here belonging to the majority who would put a tariff as high as possible on the things in their particular States, and would give no protection to the people in the West. There are others who want to give protection to everything in this country. However, they are a very small minority of the majority in this body.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I think that the Senator from New Jersey ought to rise in his defense——

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Because the Senator from New Jersey was one of the distinguished Senators who rushed to the defense of his party caucus when they expelled from their conference Senators BROOKHART and FRAZIER and LA FOLLETTE some years ago. He occupies a high and influential and powerful position upon the committee on committees, I think, and was one of the distinguished Senators who turned this political somersault and appointed these men to these high places, men he once assisted in throwing out of his party.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator for his compliments. He referred to harmony. I am wondering if the Senator from Mississippi thinks the Republican Party has a monopoly on endeavor to maintain harmony within its ranks?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, we have harmony. We always have harmony in the Democratic Party. [Laughter.] We do not have to use oil to smooth the machinery of the Democratic Party.

Mr. EDGE. It did not seem to worry the American people three years ago.

Mr. HARRISON. The people have waked up and have seen their mistake already. Even the Senator's own leader, the man in the White House, has refused in his good judgment to take another chance with the American people. [Laughter.] Not only that but another distinguished Republican, the Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, sees the handwriting on the wall and refuses to become a candidate. It looks to me like you will have to run either my friend FRANK WILLIS or my friend CHARLIE CURTIS after all. They are about the only ones who will accept the nomination of the Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I think there should be no word of criticism of the so-called regular stand-pat Republican organization for readmitting the progressive Senators and for giving them political advantage. I think it grew out of nothing but a somewhat tardy desire to raise the general average, and I am always in favor of that.

But I want to say seriously that I hope nothing said here will be taken as a charge that the so-called progressive element made a coalition with the other branch of the party for any improper reason or by any improper method. I have watched the course of the insurgent Republicans in the Senate for a good many years. I have differed from them many, many times. But I have always believed that they were patriotic, and I have frequently seen that patriotism manifested by their support of propositions in which we on this side of the Chamber believe. I see no wrong whatever in those Senators requesting some assurance that certain legislation in which they were interested should be given a chance to have consideration and be brought to a vote. Outside of that it is, of course, rather humorous to see men who were so recently expelled now called back and received with open arms, but I think we understand why. The majority is getting a little narrow and the votes of the insurgents are a little more necessary.

So far as the organization of the Senate is concerned, it is true, as stated or intimated by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], that who may be Sergeant at Arms or Secretary or President pro tempore is of little consequence. It is likewise true, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] stated, that membership of the committees is of great importance. But whether the insurgents or progressive Republicans sit by appointment of the Republican Party or should join with the Democrats in the organization of the Senate and the Democrats should then assign the insurgents to places, makes but little difference, because my opinion is that the insurgents or Progressive Republicans, whichever term they like best, generally vote as they think they ought to vote, and that they would do it regardless of which side assigns them to committees.

I think we can pass the incident by, at least I hope we can, without anybody's feelings being hurt, and that the humor and wit and satire in the speech of the Senator from Mississippi will be appreciated, as I know it was intended as merely a bit

of pleasantry indulged in on an occasion when it was perfectly apparent that the olive branch had been extended because it was necessary at this particular time to extend it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

The order was agreed to.

DATE OF APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE CLERKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have been requested by the financial clerk of the Senate to request the chairmen of committees not to make the appointment of clerks of committees effective until the 16th of December. They may send in their names now, but if the appointment should be made effective at once it would require some additional bookkeeping, which it is desired to avoid.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, 1927, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Wednesday, January 4, 1928, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOLIDAY RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the resolution just received from the House be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, 1927, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Wednesday, January 4, 1928.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so referred.

INVESTIGATION OF MEXICAN PROPAGANDA

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a resolution, and I ask that it may be read. Then I desire to have an opportunity to submit an explanatory word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 53), as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 7, of the Seventieth Congress, first session, agreed to on December 9, 1927, be authorized and directed to investigate the origin and authenticity of any documents published in the Washington Herald, a newspaper printed in the city of Washington, D. C., in its issues of November 14, 1927, to December 10, 1927, inclusive, which purport to be the records of a foreign government or governments or the officials or agents thereof, and which relate to the actions and policies of such governments, and which affect the interests of the Government and people of the United States.

And further to investigate whether any such government or governments have expended moneys to influence public opinion in the United States or to influence the decision of any international tribunal involving the interests of the United States or its citizens, and/or to support or maintain any revolutionary movement in any foreign state affecting the safety and interests of the United States or the people thereof.

The powers hereby granted are in addition to and not in derogation of the powers conferred by said Senate resolution, agreed to December 9, 1927, and said committee shall in the performance of the duties herein prescribed possess all the powers conferred by said Senate Resolution 7.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the object of the resolution is this: The Senate rather hastily passed a resolution which, at the time it was called up, I thought gave to the committee the power to investigate all of the documents which have been recently printed and all of which, in a certain sense, are interlocked. Part of the documents related to the alleged use of money with United States Senators. On examining the language of the resolution I find that it would seem to be confined to that one proposition. I would like to see the powers of the committee so enlarged that they can examine into the authenticity of all of the documents which have recently been published. They have come forward in a series of articles.

The claim is made that various documents have been printed, that facsimiles of them are before the public, and that the originals are in the possession of the proprietor of the newspaper. A few of those documents or of the series of documents deal directly with the question covered by the resolution which was passed. It seems to me a proper investigation would naturally lead into proof regarding the rest of the documents, where they all came from, and how they came to be in the possession of this paper. I would like to see the whole question thoroughly sifted. If the documents are genuine, then they are of vast interest and importance. If they are not genuine, then the paper publishing them has accepted a very grave responsibility.

I would have spoken to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] before introducing the resolution, but I did not see him in the Chamber at the time. He is here now. I hope that these additional powers will be quite satisfactory and agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator ask immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not demand it. I would like to have it, because I think the Senator's committee meets within a day or two.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The committee has set Thursday morning as the time for its first hearing. I should prefer to talk the matter over with my colleagues on the committee before stating our attitude toward so exhaustive an investigation.

It seems to me that the additional subjects of inquiry proposed by the resolution, as I have heard it read, are subjects that fall rather under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations than of a special committee appointed, as was ours, for the specific purpose of running down an allegation of bribery of one or more Senators. Those are matters I should like to consider before expressing an opinion.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania so desires, I am willing that the resolution shall lie over until the next session of the Senate, but I have this to say: Having followed to some extent these articles in the newspapers, and not in any manner vouching for them, but because they are here printed, it would seem to me, if the question arises as to whether certain documents relating to Senators are forgeries the investigation of that question naturally will lead into an investigation as to the genuineness of all the other papers presumptively secured at the same time, and that it would be almost impossible to confine the investigation of the special committee to the simple question of the two or three instruments that relate directly to the senatorial bribery proposition, which, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe ever occurred in the world. I make that suggestion; I am willing to have the matter lie over and let the Senator from Pennsylvania consider it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I feel very sure that the members of the special committee would not want to usurp the privileges of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I feel that if our inquiry shall be ordered to be broadened to such effect as the resolution purports we are apt to do all of our work badly, when, as a matter of immediate duty, we want to do our one job well, find out, if it is possible to find out, whether or not there is anything to the charge made by this newspaper that four Senators were paid money by the Mexican Government.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I recognize the wisdom contained in the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri that a committee which is investigating the one subject might be led into the other; but it seems to me that the matter referred to in the resolution could be more properly investigated by the Foreign Relations Committee. If the letters shall be ascertained to be genuine documents, then question will arise in connection with the policy which this Government should pursue, which would involve foreign affairs and would naturally appertain to the Foreign Relations Committee. I think an investigation ought to be made to ascertain whether or not these documents are genuine. After that shall have been done, an investigation should be made and a conclusion reached by the committee as to the policy to be pursued by the United States, in case the documents are genuine documents, as affecting our relations with a foreign government.

I could not consent that such a matter should go to a special committee in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who, I am sure, ought to be consulted in the matter. I could not consent that the special committee should supersede the duties appertaining to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not

know how the Senator from Idaho feels about it. If he desires the special committee to investigate the matter, and does not wish his committee to do so, that would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me a suggestion, I desire to say that I am now told that the Committee on Foreign Relations has been called to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock. Why not refer the resolution of the Senator from Missouri to that committee? If it agrees with him that the special committee ought to make this investigation, it can make its report to-morrow, and no time will be lost. If, on the other hand, the committee disagrees, it can express its conclusions to that effect to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, while the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is on his feet, I feel moved to say that in all probability the Senator from Pennsylvania spoke inadvertently when he stated that a certain newspaper had charged that certain Senators had been bribed. I did not understand from my reading of the newspaper in question that any such charge was made.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator was not present, I believe, on Friday when this incident occurred. The headlines of the newspaper article charged in bold type that $1,215,000 had been paid to four Senators. Following the story down to the small reading type one found no such charge; and on the following day the newspaper came out with a further statement that it had no evidence that any Senator had received any money; but the charge was made in the headlines. That is what attracted our attention on the first day of the publication of the story.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I merely rose thinking that the Senator from Pennsylvania had made inadvertently a statement which he did not intend to make. Apparently, however, the statement was deliberately made.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; because I think the headlines did make the charge.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the suggestion that the resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which will meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock, will afford a very wise disposition of the matter at this time.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The only desire I have is that this entire matter shall be thoroughly looked into. I repeat, it seemed to me that as the special committee was undertaking the investigation of one part of the matter, it naturally would run into all the other questions, and that it ought to have such authority as would enable it, if it desired to do so, to bring witnesses before it. I am quite content that the resolution shall go to the Committee on Foreign Relations for its judgment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ARTICLE BY HON. HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask the privilege of inserting in the RECORD—and I ask to have it printed in 8-point type—a very interesting and learned article, which is entirely nonpolitical, by HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives for many years, and formerly president of the American Bar Association, in which he discusses the construction of the constitutional phrase commonly known as the "general-welfare clause." I think it will be of great interest to the Senate, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri allow me an interruption?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment.

Mr. WARREN. Would it answer the same purpose if the Senator from Missouri could let the matter lie over until to-morrow morning or to a later hour? I have allowed the debate to run on on a resolution which the Senator had up, although desirous of proceeding with the appropriation bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think there will be no debate on this request, which is an ordinary request. I do not wish to read the article.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the only objection which I have to the request of the Senator from Missouri is that he has asked that the article be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type. The Joint Committee on Printing of the two Houses has objected to that, and there is a rule against having documents so printed. I shall not object to having the article printed in the kind of type in which such articles are usually printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Just one moment, with the indulgence of the Chair. What I have requested, however, can be done by the order of the Senate, can it not?

Mr. MOSES. No.

Mr. SMOOT. It can not be done by order of the Senate, but requires the action of the Joint Committee on Printing of the two Houses.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then I will let the request lie over until to-morrow morning and renew the request then, because I think it will do little good to print the article in the smaller type.

Mr. REED of Missouri subsequently said: I desire to renew the request I made a few moments ago with reference to the printing in the RECORD of an article by Mr. HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER.

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator, if it will not lead to debate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. I ask to have the article printed in the RECORD in the ordinary type and I also ask to have it made a public document. I will say to Senators who are interested in constitutional questions that it is well worth printing as a public document.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator, while he is on his feet, whether he asked to have this address printed in the RECORD?

Mr. REED of Missouri. In the RECORD, but in the ordinary type; and I also asked to have it printed as a public document.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a very unusual request, Mr. President. I should like to have it referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I thought we absolutely agreed on that about five minutes ago. I withdraw the request.

CONSPIRACIES TO DEFRAUD THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. WARREN obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WARREN. I will yield if the Senator desires to present a paper.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, we had not reached before the expiration of the morning hours this morning the order of reports of committees. I am very desirous of submitting a report which I think will give rise to no discussion and I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming to give me that opportunity.

Mr. WARREN. If it will lead to no debate I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If debate should ensue I will ask that the report be withdrawn.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 1397) amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. 220), and I submit a report (No. 2) thereon.

Mr. President, this is a bill which was introduced by me on yesterday morning, the nature of which I then explained to the Senate. The Committee on the Judiciary unanimously directed me to report the bill favorably. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator from Montana, as I recall, introduced two bills on yesterday. For which bill is he now asking immediate consideration?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I refer to the bill reducing the period of the statute of limitations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1397) amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. 220), which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. 220), be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 1044. No person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense, not capital, except as provided in section 1046, unless the indictment is found, or the information is instituted, within three years next after such offense shall have been committed: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall apply to any offense for which an indictment has been heretofore found or an information instituted, or to any proceedings under any such indictment or information."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN. I call up for consideration House bill 5800, being the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DILL. Under what order of business is the Senate now proceeding?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is now before the Senate the deficiency appropriation bill, and the Senator in charge of that bill has the floor. I move that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. DILL. We had no opportunity this morning to present morning business, and I should like to introduce a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The consideration of the order presented by the Senator from Indiana consumed the session until 2 o'clock, at which time the morning hour closed. Morning business may be presented at this time only by unanimous consent.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will take but a moment. On yesterday House Concurrent Resolution No. 7 providing for the printing of 10,000 additional copies of the President's message and the report of the engineers on flood control came over from the House, and was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The House committee says that its business is delayed because of the failure to get the documents printed. So I ask unanimous consent that the committee may be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and I wish to ask that it may be adopted at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed with illustrations 10,000 additional copies of House Document No. 90, being the message from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, transmitting with favorable recommendation the report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, containing the plan of the Army Engineers for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, 3,000 for the use of the House document room, and 2,000 for the use of the Senate document room.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wheatland, Wyo., praying for the exemption of Chautauqua entertainment tickets from admissions tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Big Horn County Farm Bureau at Basin, Wyo., remonstrating against the passage of legislation proposing further restrictions upon the immigration of Mexicans into the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the congregation of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of a resolution providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration or conciliation, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ODDIE (for Mr. DU PONT) presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, memorializing the Congress of the United States to abolish the Federal estate tax

Whereas the Federal estate (inheritance) tax law, as amended February 26, 1926, provides that the estate liable thereunder shall be credited with any inheritance tax paid by the beneficiaries to the State or States, the credit not to exceed 80 per cent of the Federal levy; and

Whereas this amendment menaces the rights of the States, because its object is to persuade them to abandon their State inheritance tax laws in favor of statutes based on the Federal law. The tax not being required for revenue at this time, its only object now must be coercion of the States; and

Whereas the joint levy is contrary to the theory of this Government, unprecedented, and offensive to the independence of the legislatures of the sovereign States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That we hereby request the present Congress to repeal immediately the Federal estate (inheritance) tax provisions of the revenue law effective February 26, 1926, and abandon this field of taxation in time of peace; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to Delaware's Senators and Representative in the Congress of the United States.

WM. F. ALLEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
WILLIAM WINTRUP,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 9, 1927.

ROBT. P. ROBINSON, *Governor.*

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Office of Secretary of State.

I, Charles H. Grantland, secretary of state of the State of Delaware, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to abolish the Federal estate tax, approved March 9, A. D. 1927, as the same appears on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and official seal at Dover this 11th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] CHARLES H. GRANTLAND,
Secretary of State.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1584) to create a department of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 1585) for the relief of Milton S. Merrill; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1586) granting a pension to Harry L. Dean; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1587) for the relief of Nelson K. Holderman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1588) granting a pension to Sidman S. Shaff;

A bill (S. 1589) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Williams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1590) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Bosley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1591) granting a pension to John Franklin Kyer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1592) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Gille (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Orndorff (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1594) for the relief of Capt. Joseph W. Loef; and

A bill (S. 1595) for the relief of William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1596) granting a pension to W. F. Johnston;

A bill (S. 1597) granting a pension to Melvina Green; and

A bill (S. 1598) granting a pension to Marie A. Stoner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1599) to establish the Grand Coulee National Park in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1600) to create and establish a national United States educational peace commission to promote peace by means of education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1601) relating to the deposit of funds available for maintenance of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 1602) to amend subdivision E of section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend the act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909, as amended; and

A bill (S. 1603) to increase the clothing and cash gratuity furnished to persons discharged from prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1604) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Deming Bronson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1605) to amend an act entitled "An act to further promote the efficiency of the Navy," approved December 21, 1861; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1606) authorizing additional employees for the Federal Water Power Commission, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1607) to provide for the conservation of fish, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1608) authorizing and directing the discontinuance of the transport service of the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1609) recognizing the heroic conduct, devotion to duty, and skill on the part of the officers and crews of the U. S. S. *Republic, American Trader, President Roosevelt, President Harding,* and the British steamship *Cameronia,* and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1610) for the erection of a Federal building at Blaine, Wash.;

A bill (S. 1611) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Centralia, Wash.;

A bill (S. 1612) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Chehalis, Wash.;

A bill (S. 1613) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Colfax, Wash.;

A bill (S. 1614) for the erection of a Federal building at Mount Vernon, Wash.;

A bill (S. 1615) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Pasco, Wash.; and

A bill (S. 1616) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Port Angeles, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1617) to provide compensation for individuals disabled and the dependents of individuals killed as a result of injuries arising out of the operation of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1618) for the relief of Margaret W. Pearson and John R. Pearson, her husband; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1619) for the relief of John E. Tucker; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1620) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia Caroline Ricketts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1621) to prevent deceit and unfair prices that result from the unrevealed presence of substitutes for virgin wool in woven or knitted fabrics purporting to contain wool and in garments or articles of apparel made therefrom, manufactured in any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1622) for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1623) for the relief of William Hensley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1624) to authorize the payment of additional compensation to the assistants to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1625) to fix the salaries of the members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1626) concerning liability for participation in breaches of fiduciary obligations and to make uniform the law with reference thereto;

A bill (S. 1627) relating to the payment or delivery by banks or other persons or institutions in the District of Columbia of deposits of money and property held in the names of two or more persons, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1628) relating to the office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital; and

A bill (S. 1629) to permit meetings of societies, benevolent, educational, etc., organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, to be held outside of said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Whitney (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1631) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Lambert (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 1632) authorizing the President to order Maj. E. P. Duval before a retiring board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1633) for the relief of Edward A. Blair; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1634) for the relief of Emma Gregory;

A bill (S. 1635) for the relief of Andrew C. Kinhart;

A bill (S. 1636) for the relief of Emily Patrick;

A bill (S. 1637) for the relief of Martha Henson;

A bill (S. 1638) for the relief of the Stewart Distilling Co.;

A bill (S. 1639) for the relief of Daisy Brown;

A bill (S. 1640) for the relief of certain persons formerly having interests in Baltimore and Harford Counties, Md.;

A bill (S. 1641) for the relief of John H. Gonderman;

A bill (S. 1642) for the relief of William Volkert; and

A bill (S. 1643) for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 1644) for the relief of J. P. Boland; and

A bill (S. 1645) for reimbursement of W. H. Talbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUCE:

A bill (S. 1646) for the relief of James M. E. Brown;

A bill (S. 1647) to extend the benefits of the employees' liability act of September 7, 1916, to Otis Gee, a former employee of the Chemical Warfare Service, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.;

A bill (S. 1648) for the relief of Oliver C. Macey and Marguerite Macey;

A bill (S. 1649) for the relief of Jennie Bruce Gallahan;

A bill (S. 1650) for the relief of Anna M. Filer; and

A bill (S. 1651) for the relief of the city of Baltimore; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1652) granting a pension to Effie I. Disney; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1653) relating to assuring compensation for accidental injuries or death of employees in certain occupations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1654) to amend the first sentence of paragraph (4) of section 20a of the interstate commerce act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1655) granting six months' pay to Maria J. McShane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1656) to authorize an additional appropriation for Fort McHenry, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1657) to authorize the acquisition of square No. 575 and reservation No. 12 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1658) for the relief of Dr. Stanley R. Teachout; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1659) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Fort Donelson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1660) authorizing the construction of a recreation hall at Hospital No. 88, Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1661) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 1662) to change the boundaries of the Tule River Indian Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1663) authorizing the award of campaign insignia to war correspondents and war artists;

A bill (S. 1664) for the relief of the estate of Alexander W. Reynolds, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1665) to authorize the board of park commissioners of the city and county of San Francisco to construct a recreation pier at the foot of Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1666) to grant authority to the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails by air to foreign countries and insular possessions of the United States for periods of not more than 10 years, and to pay for such service from the appropriation of foreign mails at fixed rates per pound or per mile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 1667) to prevent obstruction and burdens upon interstate trade and commerce in copyrighted motion-picture films, and to prevent the restraint upon the free competition in

the production, distribution, and exhibition of copyrighted motion-picture films, and to prevent the further monopolization of the business of producing, distributing, and exhibiting copyrighted motion pictures, by prohibiting blind booking and block booking of copyrighted motion-picture films, and by prohibiting the arbitrary allocation of such films by distributors to theaters in which they or other distributors have an interest, direct or indirect, and by prohibiting the arbitrary refusal to book or sell such films to exhibitors in which they have no such interest; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1668) granting an increase of pension to Paulina W. Beckman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 1669) to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1670) granting a pension to Adelaide H. Hadley;

A bill (S. 1671) granting a pension to Anna Mansfield Sherman;

A bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Louise M. Sutherland;

A bill (S. 1673) granting a pension to Albert Alexander Hill;

A bill (S. 1674) granting an increase of pension to Michael E. Breck; and

A bill (S. 1675) granting pensions to certain blind children over the age of 16 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1676) to authorize the appointment of First Lieut. Clarence E. Burt, retired, to the grade of major, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1677) to provide for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 1678) for the relief of the estate of George B. Spearin, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1679) amending the act of February 28, 1925, reclassifying the salaries of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 1680) to authorize Capt. Charles St. John Butler, M. C., United States Navy, to accept a decoration conferred upon him by the Republic of Haiti; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 1681) to regulate the height and exterior design and construction of public and private buildings in the National Capital fronting on or located within 200 feet of a public building or public park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

A bill (S. 1682) granting a pension to George M. Parker (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1683) granting a pension to Alice B. Gordon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 1684) for the relief of Paul D. Keller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 1685) making eligible to citizenship North American Indians born outside the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1686) to regulate the manufacture and sale of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1687) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to amend the regulations prescribing the rice standards used in the United States by defining imported broken rice; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 1688) for the relief of Gabriel Roth; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1689) for the relief of the Sachs Mercantile Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 1690) for the relief of Lewis W. Crain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1691) for the relief of William A. Light; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1692) granting a part of the Federal building site at Phoenix, Ariz., to the city of Phoenix for street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1693) granting a pension to Emma Hammond; and

A bill (S. 1694) granting a pension to Reuben Hadden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 1695) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Speed;

A bill (S. 1696) granting a pension to Sarah Gillespey;

A bill (S. 1697) granting a pension to Glenn Wisely;

A bill (S. 1698) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Morgan;

A bill (S. 1699) granting a pension to Laura A. Douglass;

A bill (S. 1700) granting an increase of pension to Ida B. Davis;

A bill (S. 1701) granting a pension to Emily Tillison; and

A bill (S. 1702) granting an increase of pension to Carrie G. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1703) for the relief of the legal heirs of Walter Blake Heyward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Blanche E. Little, individually and as assignee of Alice T. Johnson and Andrew W. Little; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1705) authorizing the Court of Claims to render judgment in favor of the administrator of or collector for the estate of Peter P. Pitchlynn, deceased, instead of the heirs of Peter P. Pitchlynn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) authorizing the Greene Memorial Association to erect and maintain a memorial to Gen. Henry A. Greene on the United States military reservation at Camp Lewis, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a memorial monument to the pioneers of the Pacific Northwest in Washington City, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) to provide for the printing of the Commerce Yearbook; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, etc.," approved February 8, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment of the eighteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution relating to intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to purchase a portrait of Chief Justice John Marshall; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) giving and granting consent to an amendment to the constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases and other contracts for the development and production of any and all minerals on lands granted or confirmed to said State by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910, and to the enactment of such laws and regulations as may be necessary to carry said amendment into effect, if it is adopted; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WATSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider, adjust, and settle the claim of the Indiana State Militia for military service on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Claims.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 744) to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

LEONA L. GALLAGER

Mr. McLEAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Leona L. Gallager, only daughter and dependent of William G. Gallager, late a messenger of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a

sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OF THE FARMER

Mr. BRUCE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to report to the Senate at the beginning of the second regular session of the Seventieth Congress his views as to whether the insurance of the farmer by the Federal Government against droughts, floods, and storms would be consistent with sound governmental and economic policy; and, if so, under what conditions such insurance should be issued.

THE TARIFF

Mr. McMASTER. I present a resolution and ask that it may be read and go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 52), as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Senate favors an immediate lowering of tariff schedules, and tariff legislation, embodying lowered schedules, should be considered and enacted during the present session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over one day under the rule.

CERTAIN FILES OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the following papers from the files of the Thirty-seventh Congress, third session, be transferred to the Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.:

Executive Document No. 7. Message from the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the Senate of the 5th instant in relation to Indian barbarities in Minnesota (dated December 11, 1862);

Testimony received by and reports of the military commission which investigated the Sioux outrages in Minnesota in 1862.

Rough draft of S. 416, "For the relief of persons for damages sustained by reason of depredations and injuries by certain bands of the Sioux Indians."

Copy of S. 565, "For removal of certain bands of Sioux or Dakota Indians and the disposition of their lands in Minnesota and Dakota."

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. PHIPPS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventieth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. METCALF submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRAZIER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS COMMITTEE

Mr. KEYES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. HOWELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BORAH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARING BEFORE THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Seventieth Congress at such times and places as they may deem advisable; to make investigations into internal revenue, customs, currency, and coinage matters, and other matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary; and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such expert stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all of the expenses of such committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee is authorized to order such printing and binding as may be necessary for its use.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that it may be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 2, after line 1, to insert:

SENATE

To pay to Kate F. McKinley, widow of William B. McKinley, late a Senator from the State of Illinois, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate, fiscal year 1927, to Kathleen W. Kivett, for services rendered as clerk to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys from October 15 to November 3, 1926, both dates inclusive, at the rate of $3,300 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate, fiscal year 1927, to Linn W. Nesmith for services rendered as assistant clerk to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, from October 15 to November 3, 1926, both dates inclusive, at the rate of $1,830 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 16, to insert:

For payment for services rendered the Senate or committees thereof, as follows: William A. Folger, fiscal year 1927, $1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

For payment to Dorothy E. Bent, assistant clerk to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, at the rate of $2,150 per annum in lieu of the salary she is now receiving, from December 16, 1926, to June 30, 1928, $323.75.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 23, to insert:

To pay additional sums to such persons engaged in the work of collecting, packing, and forwarding from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa., the ballot boxes and other election paraphernalia of the general election of November 2, 1926, and receiving and storing same in the Senate Office Building; said persons to be designated by the Sergeant at Arms and paid in such proportions as he may deem just, fiscal year 1927, $1,960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 6, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees, Senate, 1928, to Christopher Woodlen for services rendered in transferring, rearranging, re-marking, cleaning, and refiling papers of the Senate, $200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 11, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate for the fiscal year 1927 is made available for use during the fiscal year 1928.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 11, to insert:

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Public highways in the Virgin Islands of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing an appropriation for public highways in the Virgin Islands of the United States," approved February 25, 1927, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce, Office of the Secretary," on page 32, line 11, after the word "Congress," to strike out "$815" and insert "and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $869.80," so as to make the paragraph read:

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Department of Commerce under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 569 and 731, Sixty-ninth Congress, and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $869.80.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Lighthouses," on page 33, line 8, after the word "Congress," to strike out "$584.79" and insert "and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $609.52," so as to make the paragraph read:

Claims for damages: To pay the claims adjusted and determined by the Commissioner of Lighthouses and approved by the Secretary of Commerce under the provisions of section 4 of the act approved June 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 537), on account of damages occasioned to private property by collision with vessels of the Lighthouse Service and for which the vessels of the Lighthouse Service were responsible, as set forth in House Document No. 568 and Senate Document No. 222, Sixty-ninth Congress, and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $609.52.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Fisheries," on page 35, line 24, after the word "fiscal," to strike out "year 1928" and insert "years 1928 and 1929," so as to make the paragraph read:

Fish hatchery, Springville, Utah: For repairs to the cottage, ponds, and water supply, and for the construction of a garage and workshop at the Springville, Utah fisheries station, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 40, after line 10, to strike out:

To be expended in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress (H. R. 5218, 69th Cong.) entitled "An act to carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Shawnee Tribe of Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868," the sum of $463,732.49.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out it is proposed to insert the following:

To pay to the Indians of the Shawnee Tribe, and 13 Delaware Indians affiliated with the same tribe, their heirs or legal representatives, in accordance with the official findings, arbitration award, and report of the Secretary of the Interior to Congress, made in pursuance of the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Shawnee Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868 (15 Stat. L. 513), the sum of $463,732.49: *Provided*, That out of said sum there shall be paid to the attorneys for said Indians 10 per cent of the above amount in full satisfaction and in lieu of the contract dated May 26, 1909, and extensions thereof dated April 21, 1919, and January 31, 1924, calling for 20 per cent: *And provided further*, That before payment of the amount hereby appropriated the Indian beneficiaries or their legal representatives entitled to said awards shall execute in writing a receipt, release, and relinquishment of any and all claims arising under the twelfth article of said treaty which they may have against the United States, and which receipt, release, and relinquishment shall be approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and which shall be binding, when executed and approved, on all parties thereto. The Shawnee Indian superintendent and the council of the tribe at Shawnee, Okla., shall execute a release binding on all beneficiaries having no legal representatives.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is an old claim——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. If the Committee on Appropriations will accept my substitute, I will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. This is an old claim. It has been before the Congress for many years. It has been recommended for payment repeatedly by the Secretary of the Interior. It has been reported favorably repeatedly by committees of both Houses of the Congress. I respectfully call attention to House Report No. 1653 of the first session of the Sixtieth Congress; also, to House Report No. 827 of the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress; also, House Report No. 1293 of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. This item, in substantially the same form, has been reported favorably by numerous committees of the Senate; and I respectfully call attention to Senate Report No. 607 of the first session of the Sixty-first Congress; also, to Senate Report No. 401 of the second session of the Sixty-second Congress; also, to Senate Report No. 235 of the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress. In addition to having been introduced and having received favorable committee action, this claim has been approved by each of the two branches of the Congress on many former occasions. This item, identical in substance, has been considered and acted upon favorably at least three times by the Senate of the United States.

In the Sixty-second Congress Senate bill 459, being a bill "To adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians," was reported favorably by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, February 22, 1912 (p. 2319, vol. 48, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., 2d sess.). The bill as reported passed the Senate on May 10, 1912 (p. 6209, vol. 48, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., 2d sess.).

In the Sixty-fourth Congress Senate bill 1098, being a bill "To adjust and settle claims of the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians and to report the same to Congress," was reported favorably March 9, 1916, by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs (p. 3795, vol. 53, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 64th Cong., 1st sess.). The bill as reported passed the Senate on June 3, 1916 (p. 9233, vol. 53, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 64th Cong., 1st sess.).

In the Sixty-ninth Congress Senate bill 2113, being a bill "To carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribes of Indians proclaimed October 14, 1868," was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, May 11, 1926 (S. Rept. 807) (p. 9183, vol. 67, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 69th Cong., 1st. sess.).

On July 2, 1926, H. R. 5218, being an identical bill and which had already passed the House, was substituted for Senate bill 2113 and in that form passed the Senate (p. 12667, vol. 67, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 69th Cong., 1st sess.).

The fact that this item has been recommended for payment numerous times by the Secretary of the Interior, has been considered favorably by committees of each House of the Congress, and has been acted upon favorably numerous times by each branch of the Congress, and the fact that it has never been rejected when up for final consideration by either branch of the Congress, would appear to settle the merits of the item. However, in order to make the record complete, I will make a statement relative to the history and merits of the item.

The Shawnee Indians prior to the Civil War were located in southeastern Kansas and were in an advanced state of civilization, so much so that in the fifties it was reported by the Indian Office that the members of such tribe were so advanced as to justify their allotment in severalty of their lands.

These Indians had made frequent treaties with the Government, and were always a loyal and peace-abiding tribe of Indians. Over 200 of these Indians served in the Union Army during the War between the States. The Government had by previous treaties, including that of 1854, guaranteed to protect them, and Congress appropriated money to pay for claims for destroyed property in accordance with the treaty of 1854.

On January 28, 1867, the Secretary of the Interior reported to Congress as follows:

> The Shawnees as a friendly tribe, strictly regarding their treaty stipulations with the Government and abstaining from acts of private revenge and retaliation, but relying upon the good faith of the Government, are entitled to its protection and for remuneration for losses at the hands of its citizens. It is apparent from an examination of the evidence that the Government of the United States had the use for its troops of a larger amount of the property taken.

Following this report to Congress, a treaty was entered into between the Shawnee, Seneca, Mixed Senecas, and Quapaw Indians and the United States on February 23, 1867, ratified by Congress on June 18, 1868 (15 Stat. L. 513), and proclaimed on October 14, 1868.

Article 12 of this treaty provided for an ascertainment of the Indians' claims for losses during the Civil War and for a report to Congress. The provision reads as follows:

> ART. 12. Whereas the aforesaid Senecas, Mixed Senecas, Shawnees, and Quapaws were driven from their homes during the late war and their property destroyed, it is agreed that a commission of not to exceed two persons shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall proceed to their country and make a careful investigation of their claims and losses, and make full report of the same to the department; and the Secretary of the Interior shall report the same to Congress.

Following the ratification of this treaty, the United States appointed two Indian agents, John H. Pickering and Jonathan Richards, as the commissioners, as provided for in article 12 of such treaty. The said commissioners were instructed to proceed to examine each claim for damages filed; the claimants were to be investigated and examined, and all testimonies possible were to be secured in order to ascertain the exact amount of the property destroyed, the value of such property, and all facts relevant thereto; and the commissioners were instructed to make a complete report thereon.

The report of the commissioners, Pickering and Richards, sets forth each individual claim, the aggregate being $463,732.49. The commissioners included in the claims the claims of certain Delawares who were affiliated with the Shawnees, and who by treaty had been guaranteed protection by the United States, as in the case of the Shawnee Tribe.

On May 11, 1874, the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to article 12 of the treaty of 1868, reported the losses to Congress as found by the commissioners. The United States since then has paid the claims of the Senecas, Mixed Senecas, and Quapaws, which were filed, examined, and reported under the same twelfth article of the treaty of 1868, leaving unpaid only the claims of the Shawnees and affiliated Delawares, embraced in the pending bill. No impeachment of this report has been made, and no evidence has been offered that the allowances by the commissioners were excessive or not justified.

The report of the Department of the Interior, dated March 15, 1926, appended hereto, states:

> The twelfth article of this treaty of 1868 (15 Stat. L. 513) provides for the establishment of a commission of not to exceed two persons to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to make a careful investigation of the claims of the Senecas, of the Mixed Senecas and Shawnees, and Quapaws for losses sustained through United States and Confederate troops during the Civil War. The claims of all the abovementioned Indians except those referred to in the bill have been paid.

Inasmuch as the various items which make up the claim were investigated and reported by the agents of the Government and accepted by the Secretary of the Interior and reported to Congress at the time for payment, it appears that there is no question of fact in dispute.

The item embraced in the substitute amendment is to carry out a solemn treaty obligation between the United States and the Shawnee Tribe of Indians. This item is an admitted debt owing by our Government, as the guardian, to such tribe of Indians as our wards; and I submit the amendment to the Senate in the hope that this debt, now too long past due, may be paid and canceled.

I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator, if this amendment should be accepted, what will become of any funds that might properly belong to Indians who, if they were alive, would have received them but who are dead and who have no heirs?

Mr. THOMAS. Under the terms of this amendment the appropriation is made in a lump sum; but in its administration it will be divided in accordance with claims now on file in the Indian Office. Those claims are made by individual members. If they should be dead, the amount of money due the claimant would go to his heirs.

Mr. KING. Suppose there are no heirs.

Mr. THOMAS. It will go, then, to the remaining members of the tribe equally.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that would be just?

Mr. THOMAS. In this case there will be no remainder, because it will all be claimed.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean that all those whose property was damaged are alive, or have direct descendants?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. KING. I know that in a number of instances which have been brought to my attention, one in my own State, it was impossible to find the heirs of the deceased. As a matter of fact, many of the families become extinct, as the Senator knows, and I am inclined to think that an examination of the facts will disclose in this instance that many of these families are extinct, and if they owned their property in severalty, not in community form, I was wondering whether it would be just that the appropriation which might go to an Indian if he were alive or to his heirs if he had any, should be allocated to a community and distributed among those who had no interest in it. My understanding is that this property was owned in severalty, not in communal form.

Mr. THOMAS. The report is very exhaustive, and is itemized—I am advised that if any appropriation is made there will be no difficulty in ascertaining the proper apportionment of the sums among the heirs of those who have died since.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment offered. It is legislation, and an

entire change. In fact, we had nothing on which to base this, either from the Budget officer, or from any other source which we could recognize as giving us the authority. We have stricken out the appropriation, because it is well known—and no doubt to the Senator from Oklahoma who offered the amendment—that there is litigation now pending in the Court of Claims, case No. H–121, Okanogan and Other Indians against The United States, which must be settled before we could even consider the recognition of such a case as this. There is no law upon which to base such an appropriation, and there is no estimate for it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I submit that the point of order is not well taken, for the reason that this item is now in the bill, and I have a right to perfect an amendment which now appears in the bill before it is finally passed upon. Inasmuch as the item is now in the bill, I submit that a point of order will not lie against an amendment to such an item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will hold that the point of order is not well taken. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 16, to insert:

Payment to Charles J. Hunt: The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow the claim of Charles J. Hunt for compensation in the sum of $1,228.33 for services as financial clerk in the office of the superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes at Muskogee, Okla., from April 25, 1926, to September 8, 1926, inclusive; which services were at the rate of $3,300 per annum, and which claim was disallowed by the Comptroller General in his settlement dated January 27, 1927.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment at the top of page 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That being a separate amendment, the Chair will request the Senator to withhold it until the committee amendments shall be disposed of.

Mr. FRAZIER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 41, to insert lines 17 to 25, inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department," on page 58, line 12, after the word "Congress," strike out "$16,817.84" and insert "and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $36,782.02," so as to read:

OUT OF THE POSTAL REVENUES

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents No. 570 and 731, Sixty-ninth Congress and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $36,782.02.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 6, to insert:

Any moneys received from the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of securing information on which to base a treaty between the United States and Mexico relative to the use of the waters of the Rio Grande, Lower Colorado, and Tia Juana Rivers as authorized by the act of March 3, 1927, shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department," on page 67, line 11, after the word "Congress," to strike out "$4,838.80" and insert "and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $6,467.37," so as to make the paragraph read:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document Nos. 645 and 731 and Senate Documents Nos. 222 and 227, Sixty-ninth Congress, and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $6,467.37.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous Public Building Projects," on page 72, line 13, after the word "filling," to strike out "repairing gangway, boat landing," so as to read:

Marcus Hook, Pa., quarantine station: For new boiler and necessary remodeling of boiler house, rehabilitation of river bulkhead, back filling, repairs of isolation ward, fencing, and incidental work, $21,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. We are considering committee amendments now, as I understand, and I wanted to refer to an amendment on page 68, the Federal Farm Loan Bureau provision, whenever that is to be acted upon.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator refer to an amendment we have already made? If he wishes to amend the language as it came over from the House, I shall ask him to wait until the committee amendments shall have been considered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 20, after the word "thereto," to insert "removing, reconditioning, and using vault doors now in the Subtreasury Building," so as to make the paragraph read:

San Francisco, Calif., Mint Building: For an additional vault and work incidental thereto, removing, reconditioning, and using vault doors now in the Subtreasury Building, $90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 2, to insert:

Durango, Colo., post office, courthouse, etc.: Toward the construction of the building, $50,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to construct said building, except for the courts, at a limit of cost of $150,000 in lieu of $200,000 heretofore authorized: *Provided*, That the work be so done that the courts can be added later.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 4, to insert:

Juneau, Alaska, Federal and Territorial Building: Toward the construction of the building, $200,000, under an estimated total cost of $775,000 in lieu of $177,500 as authorized in act of June 25, 1910.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 10, after the word "amended," to strike out "$5,306,583.56" and insert "$5,556,583.56," so as to read:

Total appropriations for projects under section 3, act of May 25, 1926, as amended, $5,556,583.56.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—military activities, finance department," on page 82, line 1, after the word "Congress," to strike out "$322.13" and insert "and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $336.72," so as to make the paragraph read:

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document No. 567, Sixty-ninth Congress, and House Document No. 73, Seventieth Congress, $336.72.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 19, to insert:

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $2,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 5, after the figures "1927," to insert "without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, including also in connection with the erection of barracks at Fort Jay, Governors Island, not to exceed $30,000 for the employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of architects, or firms, or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be deemed necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States," so as to make the paragraph read:

Military posts: For construction and installation at military posts of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances thereto, as authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1927, without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, including also in connection with the erection of barracks at Fort Jay, Governors Island, not to exceed $30,000 for the employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of architects, or firms, or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be deemed necessary

without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States, $6,162,000, to remain available until expended; of this amount $3,680,000 shall be payable from the military post construction fund created by section 4 of the act approved March 12, 1926, and $2,482,000 shall be payable out of the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. BINGHAM. Let the amendment go over until after the other committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 18, to insert:

Fort Douglas, Utah, water and sewers at military post: For the construction of the necessary dam or dams, reservoir, and pipe lines, together with all necessary accessories and appliances, and for the repair and alteration of existing facilities, to improve and enlarge the water supply at the military post of Fort Douglas, Utah, including every expenditure requisite for and incidental thereto, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $370,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized, under such terms and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to sell such surplus water as may become available as a result of the installation herein provided for, the proceeds of such sales to be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department," on page 84, after line 20, to insert:

Ordnance service: For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $340,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 4, to insert:

Repairs of arsenals: For repairs and improvements of arsenals and depots, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $570,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The consideration of committee amendments as printed in the bill has been completed, except the one which was passed over on the request of the Senator from Connecticut, on page 83.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in connection with that amendment, I wanted to call attention to the fact that I presented an amendment yesterday with regard to a structure on Governors Island, and I would ask that the committee amendment, which I favor, should go over until there has been an opportunity to act on the amendment which I presented yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 83 will be passed over on the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. KING. I would like to inquire, Mr. President, whether that will mean that we pass over also the appropriation called for of $6,160,000, found on line 14, together with the subsequent enumeration found in the same paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hold that the entire paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment, which I ask to have acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 83, after line 18, to insert the following:

For construction and installation of officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans., including utilities and appurtenances thereto, as authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927, without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, $126,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator want to ask any question about this amendment?

Mr. KING. I want to make an inquiry with respect to a number of these items.

Mr. CURTIS. This item?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. This item is brought about by the fact that we have just had a very disastrous fire at Fort Riley, and there are 30 families of the officers of the fort without any quarters or places in which to live. The amendment makes available money already authorized in two previous acts, and also part of an estimate that will be acted upon in the next bill.

It is recommended by the department. The winter is coming on, and the department wants to begin to erect the buildings at once, so that those thirty-odd families now without quarters, and without any places in which to stay, may be taken care of. The amendment is recommended by the Budget, recommended by the War Department, and I will state that it was recommended by the committee of the House, but the amendment could not be prepared until yesterday, just before I offered it.

Mr. KING. The inquiry I was about to make was in connection with the appropriation of $6,120,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Will not the Senator let the amendment be acted upon first?

Mr. KING. I was just wondering why these various appropriations for military posts, and so on, are not provided for in the general military bill.

Mr. CURTIS. This was provided for and appropriated, as I understand it. All I ask in this bill is to add an additional amount, that has already been estimated to go into the next general bill.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I send the following committee amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

On page 6, after line 12, insert:

For maintenance, including miscellaneous items, and for all necessary services, fiscal year 1928, $5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I also offer the following amendment; and let me say that all these were sent up from the Budget, which had the recommendations and the legislation before them, but the amendment was received after the report was made yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

On page 29, after line 17, insert:

Administration of the produce agency act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commissioned merchants and others and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them," approved March 3, 1927, including the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, and the purchase of such perishable farm products as may be necessary for the detection of violations of the act, fiscal year 1928, $10,000: *Provided*, that all receipts from the sale of such products shall be credited to this appropriation and shall be reexpendable therefrom.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to make some inquiry in regard to the amendment just offered by the Senator from Wyoming. If I understand the amendment, as read it calls for the purchase of farm products by a commission, and the disposition of the same.

Mr. SMITH. No; this is pursuant to the deficiency bill passed last year. I think it is of importance to every man in the Senate. It is to correct the custom of commission men making false or erroneous statements in their reports to the effect that they found certain things in bad order. Perhaps they were in bad order, perhaps they were not. They justify that practice on the ground that such a thing occurred. Perhaps it did, and perhaps it did not. The bill was approved by the Budget, was passed and approved by the President, and everyone who saw it thought it was a necessary piece of legislation. There was proposed to be appropriated $25,000 for the purpose of carrying it into effect. That item came to the Senate in the deficiency appropriation bill just as the unfortunate filibuster arose, and, of course, it died with the other items in the bill.

It was not included in the present bill as submitted to the House because they were not apprised of the importance thereof. I went to see General Lord and those interested, and told them the spring crop would begin to move along in February and in March, beginning at Florida and moving north, and that until the $25,000 should be made available for the spring of 1929 we would need enough to protect the farmer at this time. General Lord readily agreed and sent the recommendation down that we use only $10,000. Out of that $10,000 they will, of course,

purchase some of the goods to bring here to prove whether or not they are in the condition claimed by the commission merchants. They are not going to purchase anything else except for that particular purpose.

Mr. KING. The appropriation is merely to see that the act, which was passed by Congress, is enforced?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. Let me explain to the Senator one further point. If a man ships a carload of vegetables to any one of our great markets, before they can make their report that it is in bad order or that they are getting a less price than the current quoted price, they have to get a certificate from some one designated by the Agricultural Department that the facts alleged are true.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered by the chairman of the committee will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 25, insert:

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the Parlatoria date scale in California, Arizona, or any other State, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act, fiscal year 1928, $25,000, to remain available until June 30, 1929.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I send to the desk another committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68 strike out the proviso in lines 5, 6, and 7 in the following words:

Provided, That the amount to be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1928 shall not exceed $242,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the purpose of the amendment. The appropriation bill which passed Congress on January 26, 1927, provided for the Federal Farm Loan Bureau as follows:

Salaries: For six members of the board at $10,000 each; for personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, $415,000; in all, $475,000, of which amount not to exceed $194,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Of course, there are seven members of the board, but the Secretary of the Treasury is ex officio chairman of the board, and I take it he does not get any additional salary by virtue of being a member of the board; so that there are really only six members of the board to be paid $10,000 each. The other item is:

For traveling expenses of members of the board and its officers and employees, per diem in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $6, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including books of reference and maps and for the examination of the national farm-loan associations and for the expenses of the registers' offices, including rent and miscellaneous items, $205,000; in all, Federal Farm Loan Bureau, $680,000, payable from assessments upon Federal joint-stock land banks and Federal intermediate credit banks.

We are now considering items which are taken care of by assessments imposed upon joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, and intermediate credit banks. In other words, all of the money that is being appropriated here for the benefit of the Federal Farm Loan Board must come back from those banks and be charged up against the operation of the system.

In the bill as it was proposed at the last session of the Congress on March 2, 1927, at page 68, under the head of Federal Farm Loan Bureau, we find two items, salaries amounting to $10,000 and miscellaneous expenses amounting to $5,000. In other words, the proposal of the last session in the deficiency bill was for $15,000. We have been told that the pending bill is practically the same as the deficiency bill which failed at the last session. The proposal at the last session was for an addition of $15,000 only to this total of $680,000. That bill, as we know, did not come to a vote on account of some proceedings which we need not go into now, but it was proposed at the last session, in the deficiency bill—and I say this because we have been informed that this is practically the same bill as the one that failed—to add to the overhead for the operation of the system $15,000.

Now, the pending bill provides at page 68, in the item which we are now considering, for an additional amount required for salaries of members of the board and for their personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field for the fiscal year 1928, $75,000. Then there is the proviso, which it is now proposed to strike out, that the amount to be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1928 shall not exceed $242,000.

In the general appropriation act there is this limitation:

Of which amount not to exceed $194,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

It is proposed to increase that amount to $242,000. Of course, if we add $75,000 to $194,000 we get $269,000, but it is suggested here that the amount be made only $242,000. I am not in favor of striking out the proviso. It is a safeguard, although it does not quite harmonize with the proposed addition of $75,000 to the $194,000.

Further provisions under this head are that an additional amount be appropriated as required for miscellaneous expenses of $10,000. In the concluding clause it is provided:

In all, Federal Farm Loan Bureau, $85,000, payable from assessments upon Federal and joint-stock land banks and Federal intermediate credit banks.

At the last session, when the bill was pending, it was estimated that we were to add $15,000 to be assessed against the joint-stock and Federal land banks and intermediate credit banks. Now we are to add $85,000 under the provisions of the pending bill. It is queer to me that these increases should be piling up in addition to the regular appropriation of $680,000. Here is $85,000 added, in addition to the regular appropriation of $680,000, within the last few months.

I wonder if the reorganization of the Farm Loan Board has anything to do with that? It should be borne in mind that last May three members of that board, who had been serving there for some years, who were acquainted with the provisions of the act and who were entirely reputable and competent men, were asked to resign, and in their places were installed, during the vacation of Congress, three members of the expiring and liquidating War Finance Corporation. The latter organization has been winding up its affairs for a year or two. It is supposed to be about concluded. Somehow or other it looks as if the members of that organization had to be taken care of in some way. That organization is identified with the Treasury Department, connected with it, related to it, under its control and protection to a large extent, and cooperating with the Treasury Department in the buying and selling of Government bonds and that sort of thing. It is about to be wound up.

These gentlemen, who are closely related to agriculture and have manifested a serious, intelligent, and faithful interest in the welfare of the farmers of the country, and particularly those who are taking advantage of the benefits of this great system—which, in my judgment, is the greatest thing ever done for agriculture since the establishment of the Department of Agriculture—had been asked to resign in the way I have stated. Over $2,000,000,000 has been made available for farmers and loaned to them at 5½ per cent, with the right to pay off any portion or all of the principal at any interest-paying period, and with the right to pay off the principal at 1 per cent per annum. Great benefits have resulted to agriculture from the operation of this system.

The law provides that the banks can not charge the borrower exceeding 1 per cent more than they pay as interest on the bonds. Consequently, when that interest is low the farmer must get the benefit of the low rate of interest. This 1 per cent is intended to take care of the cost of administering the system. It ought not to cost 1 per cent to administer the system. The less it costs to administer the system the greater the benefit to the borrowing farmer. He is to be given the benefit of the low rate of interest obtained on the bonds and the cost of administering is to be paid out of the assets of the Federal land banks, and so forth, so that all this expense is taxed or charged up against the system. The greater the expense the more the 1 per cent is eaten into. The farmer has to pay this cost.

It was claimed that we were going to get some advantage by this change of personnel on the Farm Loan Board.

This system was organized for the benefit of agriculture; it was intended from the beginning to serve the needs and necessities of those engaged in agriculture in this country. It is not a commercial system. These are not banks in the technical sense at all. There is not a dollar deposited in any one of these banks. There is no reason why they should be linked with the Treasury Department. It is a separate and distinct system entirely from the commercial system. Congress never intended, it was never expected, it was never planned or designed that the Treasury Department should operate this system. There were powers, rights, and duties vested in the Farm Loan Board, and the members of that board are charged with certain responsibilities and functions under the act of Congress.

It is proposed to destroy that independent functioning of the Farm Loan Board by appointing men who are connected with the Treasury, having to do with the Treasury, and never having

anything to do with agriculture in all their lives, so far as can be found. They are to administer the system, and therefore accomplish by administrative law what Congress has refused to grant in its statute.

It is proposed by the change of personnel of the Farm Loan Board to effect a policy and to bring about results which are a distinct departure from the original plans and purposes of Congress in creating this system. It is intended absolutely to destroy the independent functioning of this board and to place the entire system under the domination and control of the Treasury. It is to be done by demanding the resignation of honorable, intelligent, and capable members of that board, who understand the law, who have been administering the system faithfully, who are qualified to carry out the purposes and intentions of the act, and to discharge the duties which are vested in them under the law. It is proposed to take them off the board and to put on in their stead men identified solely with the Treasury and to give them the control of the operation of this entire system. The gentlemen who have been nominated to take the place of these three members, who have resigned on request, together with a member of the board who came originally from the War Finance Corporation, will give the War Finance Corporation a majority on the board, giving it four members, and control absolutely of the Federal land banks, the joint stock land banks, and the national farm loan associations, with power to adopt regulations in connection with the operation of the whole system.

That is the situation which confronts us, taking this system out of the hands of those who are in sympathy with agriculture and placing it absolutely in the hands of those who are serving the dictates of the Treasury—"big business," if you please. What is the first thing with which we are confronted by this change? Before these three men had to tender their resignations Congress was asked to give them $15,000, in addition to the regular appropriation of $680,000.

Mr. KING. For what?

Mr. FLETCHER. I can turn to the clause. That amount was:

> For an additional amount for salaries, including the same objects of expenditure specified in the act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, * * * approved January 26, 1927, * * * $10,000—

And—

> For an additional amount for miscellaneous expenses, including the same objects of expenditure as specified in the act, * * * $5,000.

Those were the two items in the deficiency bill which failed. Since then one effect evidently of the change of the personnel of the system has been to increase the overhead, to add to the charges taxed up against the joint-stock land banks and the intermediate credit banks. We are now asked instead of the $15,000, which a few months ago was regarded as sufficient, to add $75,000.

Where are we going to end? I think a great mistake has been made; I think a serious if not a deadly assault has been made upon this great beneficent system, and here is the beginning of it. Within a few months we are asked to add to this overhead $75,000, making the total amount to be charged up against these banks $680,000 plus $75,000. Of course, the more we add in the way of overhead cost the more we are taxing the borrowing farmers of the country.

I am opposed to the amendment as proposed. I do not think this whole proposition is properly conceived. If we are going to give them anything at all, it seems to me we ought to give them what was in the last bill. That may or may not have been advisable. However, there were hearings had on it and that amount was proposed at the time. Now, why should we go on to adopt this new policy, changing the personnel of boards and commissions, thereby changing constructions and interpretations of statutes, and thereby putting into effect in this country what is thoroughly well known in continental Europe as administrative law, giving to bureaus and to executives the power to depart from expressed statutes of Congress and to provide their own law by regulation and what not as they see fit? That is evidently the purpose.

At the last session of Congress a bill was introduced in the Senate to bring about Treasury domination of the Federal Farm Loan Board. That bill failed. A similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives, where hearings were held on it, but it was never reported out of the committee. Then came the Supreme Court decision holding that the President of the United States had the power to call for the resignation of any officer appointed by him by and with the advice of the Senate. So when Congress dispersed the President called for the resignation of three members of this board and put in their stead the remnant of the War Finance Corporation to administer an act intended for the benefit of agriculture and not a commercial banking system in any sense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it advanced as one of the reasons for the increase in amount that the three new commissioners are dirt farmers?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is not alleged here, and, so far as my information goes, not one of them ever had even a garden patch; they know nothing about agriculture. If any of the gentlemen who were on the board were not faithfully attending to their duties, there are plenty of people in this country who are in sympathy with agriculture, who believe it is the foundation upon which the Republic rests in an economic and industrial way, and who want to preserve it and serve those who are engaged in producing the Nation's food, and why not go to that group or class, if it may be called a class, to those identified with that great industry to fill this board? Why go to the Treasury Department and pick up the remains of a financial organization controlled and directed and linked up with the Treasury and put them in charge of this system which is supposed to be in the hands of those engaged in agriculture?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have recently seen in the newspapers criticisms of the administration of the affairs of the farm loan organization anterior to the change to which the Senator has just referred. The statements contained in the press were to the effect that a number of joint-stock banks were in the hands of receivers and a number of persons connected with such banks had been indicted for alleged violations of law. The charge was also made that several of the banking institutions organized under laws of Congress and related to the farm loan system were to be reorganized because of bad management.

May I further say, without desiring to precipitate discussion or project myself into the remarks of the able Senator from Florida, that one of the new members appointed by the President served the War Finance Corporation with great ability, and, so far as I am advised, exhibited marked sympathy for the agriculturalists and those engaged in the livestock business. I refer to Mr. Eugene Meyer. He interpreted the law under which he and the organization with which he was connected acted in a broad and liberal spirit and rendered great service to the livestock interests of the United States. He served, so far as I am advised, with so much ability in the position referred to that I believe, whether he is an agriculturalist or not, that he will discharge the duties of his new position with fidelity and with a proper regard to the needs of the farmer.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I had not intended to say even this much and I did not expect at this time to go into the questions which the Senator's inquiry opens up. I may say, however, that we will have occasion to consider all matters in connection with that appointment before we finish with the question of confirmation. Of course, some good came out of the War Finance Corporation and its operations. If you will give me a few hundred million dollars I can do something with it.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to answer briefly some of the suggestions made by the Senator from Utah. The trouble was in the joint-stock land banks and not in the Federal land banks; they are separate institutions. The joint-stock land banks are private institutions. The trouble was uncovered by the whole board before Mr. Meyer had anything to do with it, and the prosecutions started before Meyer ever came in. So far as the operations of the War Finance Corporation are concerned, I think there will be disclosures before this session is over that will change the opinion even of the Senator from Utah, because there are some things that can not be defended in the administration of the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, let me say in further answer to the Senator from Utah, who naturally is interested in the reports that have been circulated regarding the bad conditions in some of these banks, that the fact is that after all these years of the operation of this system there are just three joint-stock land banks that are in a bad way—three out of 55.

Is that any terrible record? Three out of 55 joint-stock land banks, after all these years, are found to be irregular in some of their practices; and even they have not yet been declared to be insolvent. There are receivers in them, but it is believed that the bondholders will get all their money, and will not lose a cent. In fact and in truth, however, just three out of 55 joint-stock land banks up to this time have been found to be engaged in irregular practices.

I should like to have you look over the face of this country and see how the commercial banking systems have been operating, and see whether you do not find scattered all over the land the remnants and remains of commercial banks that have toppled down day after day, and particularly since 1920. That is the record with reference to commercial banks. You do not think the whole system is bad and that we ought to have a revision of the whole system, because commercial banks have failed. Now, because three joint-stock land banks out of 55 have been found to be engaged in irregular practices, you want to denounce the whole system, and say that the people in charge of it and giving it supervision and direction were incompetent and incapable!

Not at all; not at all; and let me ask you this: Why was it that Mr. Dewey, the representative of the Secretary of the Treasury, sent to sit in with the Farm Loan Board last year, just before these bills were introduced, without any notice to the Farm Loan Board, without their knowledge or consent, caused special agents of the Treasury Department to go into five of these joint-stock land banks at the same hour of the same day and seize their records and close them up? There was no authority in the world for it. There was no law for it. If that sort of attack had been made upon commercial banks, they would have toppled over like pins in a bowling alley; and yet, notwithstanding all of that sort of thing, up to this date only three have been found to be in bad shape.

Mr. SMITH. By whose authority was this done?

Mr. FLETCHER. By nobody's authority except Mr. Dewey's own will, and perhaps the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, who was acting under his advice, I take it.

We will go into some of these other questions later. I did not expect to take this time on the matter. I do not want to delay the consideration of the bill. I will vote "nay" on the motion to strike out this language, and I will vote against the whole provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say just a word. I do not at this time wish to refer to the appointment of the new members of the board, as referred to by the able Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I do want to say, however, that the increased expense asked for here is for the very purpose of examining the banks more closely than they have been examined in the past.

The Senator referred to the fact that three of the joint-stock land banks have failed; and they are bad failures, too. The Secretary of the Treasury found that in these investigations that were made they had investigated or examined only a very few, and they could not possibly cover the field; it was impossible for them to do it. Most of this increase is for extra examiners to examine these banks more often and more in detail.

You all remember what my position was on joint-stock land banks. I think a mistake was made in the creation and organization of joint-stock land banks. The Federal farm loan banks themselves could have handled all that was handled or all that is necessary to be handled in the United States; but that is not involved here. The question here is as to the increase of some $70,000 for the fiscal year 1928 in order to pay the extra expense to which the Federal Farm Loan Board is put in making the proper examinations of these banks, and in the future, if possible, through those extra examinations and closer supervision, to see that the failures that have occurred in the past will not occur again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I quite agree with my colleague on the committee that for such purposes this money ought to be appropriated; but that is not what it is appropriated for, according to this statement. It says here—

> For an additional amount required for salaries of members of the board—

And so forth. Why should that language be used? We have appropriated for the salaries of the members of the board, and they are fixed by law at $10,000.

Mr. SMOOT. They will not get a cent more than that; but there is a deficiency.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wondered why this language is used.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is a general deficiency; and perhaps the Comptroller General, if an item had been paid for other purposes than the salaries of members of the board, covered everything for which the money was originally appropriated; and this is an amendment covering it all. The law fixes the salaries of the members of the board, and therefore not a cent of this amount will be paid for increased salaries; but the original act did provide not only for the employees but for the members of the board as well, and of course this is a repetition of it. I assure the Senator that not one cent will be paid to the members of the board out of this amount, because there is no deficiency there.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just at a loss to understand the language. I could not see how any additional amount would be required for salaries of members of the board.

Mr. SMOOT. It is just a repetition of the existing law. There is not a thing in it other than that.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I think I ought to say, without repetition, that it is a plain business proposition; that the increase involves no indorsement of policy, as has been stated by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. It does not involve the question of the management beyond a desire more effectually to examine these banks and avert any further failures.

As to the efficiency of the board as now constituted, I may say that the last bond sale of these banks was placed at the lowest rate of interest that has prevailed since the institution of the banks, and that one of these gentlemen criticized here—and I am not now going into the question of his confirmation—is responsible for saving this system $900,000 thereby. So that when it comes to the question of a trivial appropriation designed to avert a repetition of failures, we can put over against that trivial increased expense a saving of nearly $900,000 in the sale of the last bond issue of these banks.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from Virginia that while the interest rate was reduced in the last sale of bonds, still it has been more than $900,000 too high.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, well, I have no doubt in the world that the Senator from Iowa could take the place and save that much more; but not everybody is as expert as he is in these matters.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator from Iowa, if he will allow me to interrupt him, that it is not the function of the chairman of the Farm Loan Board or of the Farm Loan Commissioner to find a market and sell farm-loan bonds. The banks sell those bonds. They are issued by the banks, and there is a fiscal agent paid by the banks $25,000 a year to find a market for the bonds.

Mr. GLASS. And Mr. Meyer found one that saved the Government $900,000 in one bond sale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is another amendment offered by the chairman on behalf of the committee, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 121, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "1928," and to insert in lieu thereof "1926, 1927, 1928."

Mr. KING. What does this amendment relate to?

Mr. WILLIS. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. WARREN. It is a committee amendment, simply to add the three years instead of two.

Mr. KING. Just a transposition of figures, is that it? What is the object?

Mr. WARREN. It is an addition, not a transposition.

Mr. KING. What does it do?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator from Utah that the amendment is on page 121, line 11, and for the information of the Senator the Secretary will again state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 121, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "1928," and in lieu thereof insert "1926, 1927, 1928."

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that it is extending a deficiency appropriation for one year. Originally it was 1926 and 1927; now it is 1926, 1927, and 1928. In other words, instead of making an appropriation directly here, we can extend that deficiency appropriation for the next year, and this covers the point entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there is one other committee amendment which was passed over at the request of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BINGHAM, in order that his amendment which relates to the committee amendment might be offered. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 83, line 18, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any permanent construction on Governors Island so located as to interfere with the possible use of a part of Governors Island as a municipal airport or landing field.

Mr. WILLIS. Where does that come in?

Mr. PHIPPS. On page 83.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is legislation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it appears to me that this is a limitation on an appropriation, rather than new legislation, and that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. WARREN. It simply adds legislation, I think, as the Vice President will see if he will read it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wish to suggest that it goes further than mere legislation and changes the existing law.

Mr. WARREN. It can be put either way, that it changes existing law or makes new law, but it is certainly repugnant to the rules governing appropriation bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hold that the point of order is not well taken. He calls the attention of Senators to the holding in the Sixty-third Congress, in 1914, where the President pro tempore held:

The Chair is not disposed to take the view that this limitation or direction as to the manner in which a specific sum of money is to be expended is general legislation in the sense of our rule on the subject. The Senator from Wyoming [Clark], however, spoke to the contrary with such confidence that he has raised a doubt in the mind of the Chair.

The Chair will state that his ruling is in line with a precedent made when we had under consideration an item in an appropriation bill providing that certain officers should be exempt from the operation of the civil service law. The appropriation was designed to make a certain investigation in connection with this class of officers, and the Senator from North Carolina made the point, and the Vice President sustained it, that any legislation which sought to give direction for the expenditure of or place a limitation upon a particular item of appropriation was not subject to that point of order; that it was not general legislation. If Congress has power to appropriate the money, it has an incidental right to say how it shall be actually expended. The Chair holds that the point of order is not well taken.

The tenor of the holdings seems to be against sustaining the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. Is the point of order overruled?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask permission to perfect the amendment. The amendment is based on the committee print, and it should be page 83, line 18, instead of page 80, line 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be perfected in that regard.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WARREN. I can not consent to having that go in. It must be put in by a vote of the Senate, if at all.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if the purpose of his amendment is in any way to interfere with the use of the ground in question for military purposes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say to the Senator, not at all. On the contrary, the object of the amendment is to prevent anything being done at this time which would prevent the adoption ultimately of a part of Governors Island as a landing field. I will say to the Senator that the necessity for adequate airport facilities for New York has been acknowledged for a long time.

A few months ago a committee was appointed by the Secretary of Commerce to look into the question of finding the facts as to the possibility of securing adequate landing facilities for the metropolitan district. That committee consisted of representatives of the mayor of New York, the Governor of New Jersey, and the mayors of nearby New Jersey cities, and various State and municipal chambers of commerce, merchants associations, and other civic organizations.

At the first meeting of the committee, on August 4, an executive committee was appointed, with authority to study the situation from all angles. The results of these studies are to take the form of a report to the mayor of New York recommending a definite plan to be followed. The executive committee has given about four months' careful study to this problem, I am informed, and it is expected that the final report will be issued in the near future, probably not later than December 20.

The report of the committee will set forth an airport plan for the New York metropolitan district, not only with the idea of meeting the present needs of this area but to provide for the airport needs for the district for some time to come. It will outline an airport plan which can be developed in keeping with the increasing needs of commercial aeronautics in this area. The plan as set forth is wholly constructive, and is meeting with hearty approval and response on the part of the State and county officials interested in this project.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator suffer an interruption? I did not hear the personnel of the executive committee which made this investigation and which will make the report within a short time.

Mr. BINGHAM. The committee consists of representatives of the mayor of New York, the mayors of nearby cities, the Governor of New Jersey, the representatives of chambers of commerce, and so on. They are a fact-finding committee to try to determine what areas of the 70 which have been suggested are really needed or are likely to be needed for use as an airport or landing field for New York.

The object of this proviso is merely to see to it that none of the money appropriated here shall be used for permanent construction which in the future may be held to be the expenditure of millions of dollars for one thing which will thereby prevent us from doing another if we choose to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have yielded to the Senator from Utah. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee next.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator if he does not think that the War Department has made an examination with a view to determining the protective needs of the country, and that the plan which the Senator has in mind, and which might ultimately be reported favorably upon by the executive committee referred to, might interfere with the plan which has been devised and accepted by the War Department.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. May there not be a conflict between the determination of the War Department, contemplated by the appropriation, and the determination by this executive committee? Suppose the executive committee should report that a large portion of this field should be used for an air port, and the War Department has determined that it should not be used for an air port but should be used for purely military purposes. Would there not be a conflict, and whom should we follow, the recommendation of the mayor of New York and of surrounding cities or the recommendation of the War Department and the military authorities, who determine largely our military policy?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say to the Senator that it seems to me that the determination of this question ought to come after the committee has reported, when the whole matter would be before us. This amount of money, $6,000,000, is to be appropriated in such a way that the War Department might use it; I do not say they intend to use it—in fact, I have been assured by the Secretary of War that he believes such construction can be put up there as will not interfere with their program for the use of Governors Island as a landing field, but the object of this amendment is to make sure that no million-dollar construction is put on that island in such a place as to make it unlikely that, if it seems best, Congress could then set aside part of that island as a landing field.

Now I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut merely provides for delay until a thorough investigation can be made to see what should be done.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator. That is exactly the purpose of it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask that the amendment be reported first before I submit the remarks I want to make?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say to the Senator that the word "ultimate," to which he objected, has at his suggestion, been changed to "possible."

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for making the change. I want to say, for myself, that I am far from convinced that Governors Island is an appropriate place for an airport, and it was because of that feeling that I asked the Senator from Connecticut to change the word "ultimate," which seemed to me to give the intimation that we were closing the matter to further

discussion. But I do think it is proper for us to provide that the immediate construction on the island shall be so located that if ultimately we decide that that is the place for an airport, the matter will not be closed because of this construction.

So, for myself, I am glad to support the amendment of the Senator as amended by the change of the word "ultimate" to "possible."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 83, line 8, after the word "Treasury" and before the period, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any permanent construction on Governors Island so located as to interfere with the possible use of a part of Governors Island as a municipal airport or landing field.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I say that I have also consulted the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and that this meets with his entire approval.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator tell the Senate what it actually means? Under this provision can the Government economically spend this amount of money for the benefit of the Army, that is so greatly in need of a post there?

Mr. BINGHAM. The Secretary of War assured me at a conference yesterday that it could be done.

Mr. SMOOT. The Secretary of War knows more about it than I do, but I am a little doubtful.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator who offered this amendment will not deny that he has undertaken, not only before the Committee on Appropriations but heretofore in the Committee on Military Affairs, to estop entirely the use of Governors Island for a post or for any military purpose, except for a landing field. There is nobody connected with the Army, not a single individual, so far as I know, who is willing that that should be done. They are as willing that there should be landing places as can the Senator from Connecticut possibly be, but Governors Island, situated as it is, in the very teeth of the City of New York, and when those instant happenings that sometimes take place in cities occur they have, in addition to their own helpers, in case of fire or accident, these military men, almost all of them of the Infantry Arm.

Whether Governors Island is large enough for the location there of a landing field can be determined at a later date. The purpose now is to block the appropriation entirely. There has been a fire there. Those poor wretches there—and I call them "poor wretches" because of the condition in which they find themselves now—are living in tents and stables, and places of that kind. The Senator was able to put this estoppel over a year ago, when the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs was Senator Wadsworth, of New York. Senator Wadsworth was disappointed when he left this body because the effort had been successful for the time being in blocking the commencement of the building for a military post on Governors Island.

Since the point of order I have made has been overruled, I shall ask the Senate to vote on the question, and let us have a yea-and-nay vote and settle the matter.

In my opinion, we are putting it beyond our power ever to accomplish what the Army wants. It is all right to say what the Secretary of War may state, but I have talked to all those people, and without discounting or disputing anything the Senator says, I do not know of any such necessity as he sets forth. The authorities are willing, probably, if they find room there, to have an airport, but we should not undertake to determine that that post shall be dwarfed so much that it may be a little knob on the corner of the island, the balance of it to be used for airplanes, when New York can provide room enough for flying ships to land. But there is but one Governors Island in the world like that one there, there is but one city situated as New York is situated there, and which so needs the military right there. As I say, they are the teeth of the city.

Mr. President, it seems to me that to be enthusiastic is a great gift for a man. I used to think I was enthusiastic myself, but it ran away with me sometimes, and I have found that it would be better if we should move a little more slowly. There will be plenty of time to take this matter up after we have commenced to build, but this is no time for us to be won over to a proposition which really means no post at that point.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I rise with mingled feelings. I have never been convinced that Governors Island is an appropriate place for an air port, but I find there are many persons qualified to speak who feel that it is a proper place. In view of this difference of opinion, I think it would be a great mistake for the Senate to enact any sort of legislation which would prohibit the use of the island for this purpose if it is found ultimately to be a desirable place.

It must be recalled that New York geographically and topographically is a peculiar community. In order to find an open space where airships can land it is necessary to go a long distance, many miles, perhaps 25 or 30 miles from the center of the city. Now, here is a place near to the heart of the city, apparently capable of enlargement and possibly such enlargement as to make it a suitable place for an air port.

As I said, I am not fully convinced of the wisdom of the plan. It is for that reason that I asked the Senator from Connecticut to strike out the word "ultimate," as if it were a determined and settled thing, and to substitute the adjective "possible."

I may say to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], whom we all love, that I always feel guilty, as if there were something wrong with me, when I am in opposition to him.

However, we should not perform an act that may interfere with construction on that island. Certainly I do not want to do so. But we have the assurance of the Senator from Connecticut, and my own knowledge of the island would make me indorse what he has said, that the construction can go on elsewhere and be almost as favorably situated. Many times we see construction carried out in an inappropriate way, as happened in the case of the McKinley High School in this city. But if the warning is given to our friends in the Army that there must be some rearrangement of the buildings, there will be found a way. If it shall be determined ultimately that this is the place for the airport, it would be a shame for us to have spent millions of dollars upon construction which would have to be torn down to make available that land as an airport in the future.

I trust the Senate will see fit to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this question came up last year. The then Senator from New York, Mr. Wadsworth, stated the position of the War Department at that time. I do not know that the War Department has changed its mind on the subject since then. As a matter of fact, I find that General Cheatham, when asked by the House Appropriations Committee what the position of the Army was, stated that the War Department did not agree to the use of Governors Island as an air port. At page 518 of the House hearings the chairman said to him:

It has been stated that Governors Island ought to be used for an aviation base, a landing field?

General CHEATHAM. The War Department does not agree to that, as I understand it. The area is too restricted.

I do not like to disagree with anything that my friend from Connecticut says because I believe that his advice on aviation matters is of infinite value to the Senate and to the country. I disagree with him with diffidence. But it must be obvious, Mr. President, that if we are to place a regiment of infantry on Governors Island—and that is the intention—we can not coop that regiment up in a building on the island without a parade ground, without space devoted to the exercise and the training of those troops. It would be an impossible thing to restrict the troops to the buildings and leave the vacant ground for the use of the municipality as an airport. That situation could not exist.

As for the necessity for troops being there, I think we must all recognize that within a mile of Governors Island is probably the greatest amount of wealth ever assembled in any spot on the globe at any time in history. To have that additional safeguard there against riot or to preserve order in case of a great conflagration or earthquake or some such calamity seems to the War Department a matter of very necessary precaution.

As I said, much as I hesitate to disagree with my friend from Connecticut, I am going to vote against his amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] whom we all love and respect, has said, this is not the first time I have had something to do with the Governors Island project. In former sessions I tried my best to do what I could to carry out the recommendations of the select committee of the House of Representatives on the United States air services. They recommended that Governors Island be set apart as a great air port. At the present time I am not assuming that position, although it is only fair to say that all of our great authorities on aviation, particularly the Assistant Secretaries appointed to take care of Government aviation, except the one immediately connected with the War Department, agree that there is probably no bit of land in the world more important for the development of that commercial aviation which we hope will go forward, with the enthusiastic

backing that it has received since Colonel Lindbergh made his famous flight, which would do more to aid the progress of commercial aviation than Governors Island, which is only a few moments from the financial district of New York. There are other places which could easily be used for troops. Bedloes Island, for instance, is practically as near and, although a small island, a regiment could be housed there.

But I am not asking that that question be decided to-day. I am merely asking that the Senate provide some way of waiting until this committee of experts, this fact-finding committee, shall make its report and give us a chance to see what they think about it. If they say Governors Island is not needed, I will submit. But if we go ahead and appropriate the money in such a way that one or two million dollars may be spent to build a great building right in the middle of the area needed, as I believe, for a landing field, I believe we shall all live to regret it. When the day comes, as I believe it will, when we come to a really true appreciation of the importance of having a landing field as near to the heart of New York City as is Governors Island, and there is no other that I can see that compares with it for a moment, we shall then see that if we have spent one or two million dollars for beautiful buildings right in the middle of that field we will be told we can not destroy that amount of the people's money so quickly. I am merely asking that the matter of a permanent barracks on Governors Island, which has been hanging fire for a great many years, back to the days of Secretary of War Root and Secretary of War Taft, shall be postponed for a short time until we get the decision of the experts, and not at all that the matter be decided finally to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRATTON obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming yet been acted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not. The question is on the amendment offered on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Are all the committee amendments disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes they are.

Mr. BRATTON. I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, following line 29, add the following:

For personal services and traveling and other expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the Interior to determine the property loss by flood sustained by certain property owners residing at or in the vicinity of Hatch and Santa Teresa, N. Mex., in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 1792, private, No. 396, 69th Cong.), $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended from the reclamation fund.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding is that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] offered an amendment and it was accepted, but the understanding was that the amendment would be again considered after the other amendments were acted upon. If my understanding is correct, it would now be proper to consider the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was referring to a different amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma was agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I could not hear the Senator from Alabama. Let me say that as to the amendment to which the Senator from Alabama was referring, relating to four hundred thousand and odd dollars to be paid to Indian tribes, it was agreed to as in Committee of the Whole, but when the bill gets into the Senate I shall ask for a separate vote upon concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRATTON. I send to the clerk's desk another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, line 3, add the following:

Additional land for Jicarilla Reservation, N. Mex. (tribal funds): For purchase of certain lands and appurtenances thereto situated within the exterior boundaries of the Jicarilla Reservation, N. Mex., as authorized by the act of February 12, 1927, $10,000, payable from funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Jicarilla Indians (act Feb. 12, 1927, vol. 44, p. 1089), $10,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I desire to make an explanation of the item for the benefit of the Senator from Wyoming. The item was authorized by a statute enacted at the last session——

Mr. WARREN. We have no authority before us for it, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico, and I am rather astonished that he offers it. The Indian appropriation bill will be before the Senate very soon, and his amendment can be offered then. It is in no wise permissible in the particular bill now before us.

Mr. BRATTON. If the Senator from Wyoming will allow me to make an explanation of the item, I think he will withdraw the objection.

The item was proposed and is in the report of the Budget which was transmitted by the President and is now before the Senate. It comes out of the tribal funds of the Indians now on deposit in the Treasury and not the general fund. This transaction was agreed to more than two years ago, and this item was in the deficiency bill which failed in the closing days of the last session. It is purely a matter of tribal funds of the Indians. The item has been approved by the department; the expenditure is authorized; is in the Budget, and, I think, the point of order is not well taken under the rule.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I insist upon the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds the point of order to be not well taken.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say, if I may, that the amendment is obnoxious to the rule on the ground alone, if on no other, that it never was presented to the committee for consideration. I supposed I had brought to the attention of the Chair sufficient reasons to indicate why the amendment should not be allowed to go on this bill. The point of order can be made against it on several grounds. It was not printed; it was not presented one day in advance of being offered on the floor; it never has been to the committee, and the committee has no information that it has ever been estimated for or recommended by the Budget; and certainly there is no law authorizing it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico state that this item was estimated for in the Budget?

Mr. BRATTON. The language that is in the item was taken from the Budget at page 490.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say to the Senator that what he says about the necessity for the amendment may be all true, but the amendment has no place on this bill; it has not been recommended that it be placed on this bill; and if we are to open that door in connection with deficiency bills, which under the rules are to care for a shortage in previous appropriations, and to make appropriations that are necessary to complete the work of the year, I would have to stand here all night or probably the remainder of the week speaking in regard to amendments that might be offered. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico could properly be offered during the consideration of a later bill, such as the bill making appropriations for this Interior Department, which provides the funds for the Indian Bureau, but I ask the Senator, and I ask the Senate, to treat this bill as the rules require that a deficiency bill should be treated, and permit only such items to be placed in it as can properly be included within its pages.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that while the Budget does recommend the item covered by the amendment it really belongs to the Interior Department appropriation bill. I shall have that bill in charge, and I assure the Senator that if it is possible to put it on that bill I shall be glad to assist him and shall recommend that it be done with all the power I have. I think, however, that the item should be attached to the bill to which it properly belongs, namely, that providing appropriations for the Interior Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule upon which the Chair has acted in holding this amendment in order is Rule XVI, which provides:

* * * and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill—

And so forth—

unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

The Chair would hold that the item covered by the amendment presented by the Senator from New Mexico is in the Budget and the amendment is to carry out a project in pursuance of an estimate made according to law.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to call the Chair's attention to the provisions of the rule with regard to the treatment of appropriation bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair bases his ruling upon Rule XVI, which provides that if an amendment is moved by direction of a standing or select committee or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law, then it is in order. This is an amendment proposed pursuant to an estimate in the Budget.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, perhaps I have not made myself clear as to the rule to which I referred. It is one of the standing rules of the Senate, however, that in the treatment of appropriation bills amendments shall be first presented and printed and shall be before the committee at least one day before being considered. Hence, I say that under that provision of the rules alone the amendment is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct with reference to all amendments except, as the rule provides, those that are proposed in pursuance to an estimate submitted in accordance with law. This estimate was submitted in accordance with law and is in the Budget message. The rule makes an exception to amendments of that nature.

Mr. WARREN. If this were a bill making appropriations for the Navy, would the Senator wish to attach to it an amendment providing for some irrigation plan because it had been estimated for in the Budget? The reference which the Chair makes to the Budget, of course, is correct, but that does not make the amendment in order on the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the fact that the Budget has estimated for this item for the year 1929? The pending deficiency bill, however, has reference to appropriations for 1928. The item in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is not a deficiency, but it is in the Budget, which, as I have said, has estimated for it for the year 1929. I hope the Senator will withdraw the amendment, and when the Interior Department appropriation bill comes up this item may properly be presented to that bill making appropriations for 1929.

Mr. BRATTON. The pending bill is important, and in order to stop debate I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has sent an amendment to the desk, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

Provided further, For the reimbursement of local levee boards for funds contributed by them on emergency work on the lower Mississippi River on account of the flood of 1927, $1,323,073.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I sent this amendment to the desk a few moments ago, but I am not now going to press it, because the Committee on Appropriations did not have before it the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, and they have been very generous to us. I am quite sure, however, that when the Committee on Appropriations go into this matter they will find that this appropriation should be carried in the next appropriation bill. So I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I shall say to the Senator that there was no unkindly feeling in any way.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that.

Mr. WARREN. But it was a matter of order under the rule. It was not permissible to consider the amendment on this bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I will withdraw the amendment in the hope that we may get it on the next bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, but before I do that I wish to inquire of the Senator from Wyoming if he intends to continue the session until we dispose of the bill? I ask that because I have been waiting patiently here for about four hours to offer the amendment, but have yielded to the convenience of other Senators.

Mr. WARREN. My disposition, of course, is to give the Senator time to offer the amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Ohio appreciates that courtesy; he thinks he can offer the amendment inasmuch as he has the floor, but he wants to know whether the Senator intends to go on and finish the bill to-night. I desire to make some brief observations about my amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I hope that we may finish the bill to-night, because certainly the people who have been waiting nine months for their salaries, or for what may be due them on account of merchandise supplied, or for other reasons, ought not to be kept waiting longer. We ought to finish the bill and provide for the payment of all such necessary items.

Mr. WILLIS. I am perfectly willing to proceed, and I hope I may have the attention of Senators, as I think this a matter of some importance. On page 50 I move to strike out lines 3 to 13, inclusive. The matter proposed to be stricken out is as follows:

United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio: Not to exceed $100,000 of the appropriation "United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, 1927," shall remain available until June 30, 1929, to enable the Attorney General to furnish the necessary material, supplies, and equipment, and to defray such other expenses as may be necessary to provide adequate facilities for the employment of prisoners and the development of the institution in accordance with the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a United States Industrial Reformatory," approved January 7, 1925.

I shall explain as briefly as I can why I offer the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that I do not wish to cut him off from debating his amendment, but I shall be compelled to make the point of order against it because it is legislation and the amendment does not come to us in the regular way? Of course, I can state the reasons for my point of order later.

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, if the point of order is made, I shall discuss that, but the amendment which I shall propose is not subject to the point of order. I am willing to discuss that matter, however, for it certainly can not be out of order to move to strike out lines of the bill. I move to strike out from line 3 to line 13, inclusive, on page 50 of the bill. The first reason I am moving so to do is because of the important and far-reaching matter involved in those lines, contemplating as the language does indirectly a change in the attitude of this Government with reference to the conduct of its business. There has never been, either in the body at the other end of the Capitol or here, before a committee an opportunity for the people most directly interested in this matter to be heard. I have here requests from a large number of constituents, honorable men representing labor organizations, representing employers of labor, asking for an opportunity to be heard upon this proposition. They had no hearing at the other end of the Capitol; they had no hearing here.

I shall undertake to show that there is a very serious proposition involved, contemplating as it does the establishment of the policy that this Government shall engage further in business.

So far as I am concerned, I am not in favor of the Government of the United States invading the field of private enterprise. We are told on other important questions that the Government ought to get out of business; we are told, for example, that at Muscle Shoals we shall junk the plant there or do almost anything in order that the Government shall get out of business; we are told, touching the merchant marine, that there must not be any replacements and that the Government must get out of business; and yet here, carefully guarded and camouflaged in this language, is a proposition to commit the Government of the United States to the very idea of engaging in business.

In order to show how that has been developed, I wish to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This matter was very fully discussed in the other House, although, as I have stated, there was no hearing. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4941, under date of February 26, 1927. The amendment, when it was then before the body at the other end of the Capitol, read in this fashion, and I invite the attention of Senators to it:

United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio: Not to exceed $100,000 of the appropriation "United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, 1927," shall remain available until June 30, 1928, for the erection of dryers, kilns, and other buildings, purchase and installation of machinery, supplies, and equipment, and all other expenses necessary and incident to the construction of a plant to manufacture brick—

Note this:

to be used in constructing such reformatory and other Federal buildings.

I assert that when this idea was brought before the body at the other end of the Capitol it was openly asserted and claimed and admitted that the proposal was not merely to manufacture bricks to be used in the construction of buildings and other structures at the institution named, but that was to be a permanent plant and that they were to manufacture brick for the use of the Government of the United States. These brick were

to be shipped so far as freight rates would permit them to be shipped.

I beg of Senators to consider the situation by which they will be confronted and to be advised whether they are in favor of that; whether they are in favor of a situation that will thereby be created, whereby when a new Federal post office shall be erected in their State they can point with pride to the fact that it has been constructed out of brick that have been made by convict labor in some public institution.

Mr. WARREN rose.

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator properly refers to what was said in the other House, but he fails to refer to what was said by others along different lines.

Mr. WILLIS. I am going to read more, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I wish the Senator from Ohio to believe, as coming from me, that I do not propose to consent to any amendment to put the Government into business anywhere. I merely desire to suggest that those poor unfortunates who are in the penitentiary should have something to do sufficient to enable them properly to digest their food, so that they may be reformed if there can be any reformation in them, and so that they may be kept in the best condition that can be afforded them for life and health.

The Senator knows, because he is a hard-working man, that men must work hard if they are going to enjoy health or are going to be happy. Those men confined there, unless they have some work, are very unhappy, very miserable. I believe it is our duty to reform along proper lines, as I said before, all of those unfortunate prisoners so far as we can. On the other hand, I believe we should restrict this provision so that not a brick shall be sold, and so that the bricks can be used only in the penitentiary buildings in the different localities—the penitentiary itself or the connecting buildings.

Mr. WILLIS. Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment providing that the bricks to be manufactured at the reformatory should be used only in that institution?

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the Senator knows more about penitentiaries than I do.

Mr. WILLIS. I question that.

Mr. WARREN. As to using the bricks at one institution, there may be a good many little buildings that are connected in a way and yet are separate buildings; but, if I can do so in order, I should not object to an amendment that would carry out the very idea that the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee expressed in the House in his debate, near where the Senator is reading, where he was very vehement in his idea that this brick should be for the use of penitentiary buildings only, and nothing else.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, of course, I would believe any statement that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming, might make. I should want also to express the fullest sympathy with the humanitarian sentiments which he has expressed, and I fully absolve him from any purpose in the world to camouflage this proposition; but I still maintain that as the matter has come to us it is difficult to escape the conclusion I have stated. That was the way the amendment stood as it was offered. I repeat the language. It read:

> The construction of a plant to manufacture brick to be used in constructing such reformatory and other Federal buildings.

A point of order was made in the other body.

Mr. WARREN. Of course that is in the RECORD but not in the appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIS. I am coming to that, if the Senator will be patient with me.

A point of order was made in the body at the other end of the Capitol as to that form of language, and the point of order was sustained. Then able parliamentarians drafted another amendment to escape the objection that had been made when the point of order was raised, and that amendment is the amendment that appears in this bill exactly, word for word.

Yet it was said by these same gentlemen, who evidently knew what they were doing and what they had written, that this proposition would permit not only the making of brick to be used in the building of this institution but the sale of these bricks to other departments of the Government to be used in constructing other buildings.

Now we are told that we must consider the humane side of this matter. Very well. I know something about the situation. These persons who are at Chillicothe are not in any very difficult situation. If you will go into the city of Chillicothe at this hour you will find some of them riding about in automobiles. You will find some of them at mealtime in the restaurants down town eating their meals along with other people. They are not in as difficult a situation as are the families of the men who heretofore have had employment in the brick plants of our State.

The State of Ohio leads in clay products. I have stacks of telegrams and letters here calling attention to the fact that in many sections of the State 75 per cent of the brick plants are idle, the men without work, their families without provisions; and yet we hear much about the humanitarian sentiments that we must lavish upon these strong young men who happen to be in the reformatory. We hear nothing about the men who are out of jobs, nor about their hungry families.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to read a few words?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Then I am willing, if I may be permitted, to withdraw the point of order.

When this matter came up on the other side Mr. MADDEN said:

> I am citing this preliminary to my answer to the gentleman's question. We found we had to do something to house the people that were incarcerated at the place. There were nothing but temporary war buildings there and we had to construct new buildings. We had to find employment for the men who were incarcerated. There were about 120 men there a year or so ago and there are now 375 men there.

Apparently the morals of Ohio are deteriorating.

Mr. FESS. These delinquents come from all over the United States.

Mr. WILLIS. Most of those came from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. We are glad you took them.

Further, Mr. MADDEN said:

> They will go crazy if we do not give them something to do.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. Let me ask the gentleman if it is contemplated that the brick to be manufactured in this plant shall be used at this institution?
>
> Mr. MADDEN. Only.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. Only; and not put in competition with outside brick manufacturing?
>
> Mr. MADDEN. That is it. It is a humanitarian proposition.

As I said before, so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, I do not believe this item should be stricken out. I will oppose it on a vote; but, so far as I can, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, it perhaps would not be proper to go into an analysis of arguments that were made by Members of the other body, no matter how distinguished they might be. I may say, however, since the name of one distinguished leader of the House has been mentioned, that if you will read right on in the RECORD it will be found that two others perhaps equally distinguished took exactly the contrary view, and argued as I have been arguing, only they argued with very much more ability, that if the proposition were adopted which is now proposed by the committee the very thing could be done which I have pointed out. So there was at least a difference of opinion; but let us see what they said in the hearings. That is rather interesting. I quote, from page 823 of the hearings upon this bill, part of the statement of Mr. Conner. He said:

> I just figured far enough to get up to 7,500,000 brick, because when you get 7,500,000 brick then you have justified the building of this brick plant. It will pay for itself if you use that many brick.

That is the statement of Mr. Conner, who is in favor of this proposition.

Mr. WOOD, of Indiana, a distinguished leader, says:

> If it can be run as advantageously as that, why would it not be a good scheme to keep on making brick? We have demands for brick in the Government departments.
>
> Mr. CONNER.—

He is the superintendent—

> We intend to do that. After we get the brick that we need ourselves, of course we would be delighted to sell it to as many departments as we can.

Let us not deceive ourselves about this matter. If the Senate wants to do this thing, if it wants to put the Government further in business, let it do it; but let us not deceive ourselves. If there is any doubt about it, let us see what the committee report itself says.

I am reading from the House report, at page 10, just a sentence. This is the report of the committee which we are told wanted to construct a plant just so that they might make a

few brick to be used in building these buildings. The committee say:

After the completion of construction work at the reformatory, brick could then be sold to other branches of the Government.

Mr. President, I do not believe in putting the Government in business. I do not believe in invading the field of private enterprise.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. Does not the Senator believe enough in his Government to think it can transact business honestly once in a while?

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, yes; I believe in my Government pretty thoroughly.

Mr. BROOKHART. The remarks of the Senator indicate that he has no such confidence.

Mr. WILLIS. No; the Senator is not authorized to draw that conclusion. I have great confidence in my Government; but I do not desire that the Government of the United States shall invade the field of private enterprise and kill individual initiative, the thing that has made possible the development of the business of this country.

Take this very situation in the State of Ohio and in the other States.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WILLIS. Just a minute. These employees, the men that work in these plants, live there and pay taxes there. You are saying to them, "Very well; we will take of your substance and construct a plant to operate in opposition to you, where the overhead and the initial expenditure will not be counted at all"; and it was not counted by the committee. The committee said, "Why, we can make brick here for $5 a thousand"; but they admitted upon inquiry that in making that statement they did not take into consideration at all the capital investment, nor did they make any allowance for sinking fund. They just charged that all up to the taxpayer, of course. That is the way these socialistic schemes are generally planned out.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FESS. There is a movement in many of the States to employ convict labor to produce certain articles that are used in the institution. That has gotten to the point where some of those articles are being sold outside to such an extent that there has been an effort to pass Federal legislation against convict labor.

My only fear in this proposal is, while I have sympathy for the purpose that is in view here, that there is a door open that ultimately may put the Government in the production business, to sell its own products even in the open market. I think that would be quite serious; and while I have great sympathy with the humanitarian purpose that is involved here, and would, if I could limit it to that, vote for it, I am inclined to vote with my colleague on striking out the item.

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, I think the facts amply justify the position of my colleague.

I beg the pardon of my friend from Florida. I should have yielded to him before.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I just wanted to ask the Senator if he did not think the worst feature of this proposition was that of having convict labor utilized in manufacturing or other private business in competition with open, free labor, and private enterprise?

Mr. WILLIS. Why, absolutely.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is what this seems to contemplate, as I understand.

Mr. WILLIS. That is what it does contemplate. There is no question in the world that that is exactly what it will lead to; and then there is another objection.

We are talking about the men in this institution. There are 2,000 acres of land owned by the Government there, as good land as ever lay outdoors, Mr. President. If it is desired that these men should work more—and I can readily conceive that they could very well work more, as I have observed the institution—let them work at the best place for any man to work on this earth, and that is on the farm, instead of taking $100,000 of the taxpayers' money with which to buy machinery.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he thinks that everybody else ought to be protected from competition but not the farmer?

Mr. WILLIS. No; but I think there is quite a difference in this situation, because the Government of the United States already has there a 2,000-acre farm of the best land the Senator ever saw. He never saw any land like that in Nebraska. My judgment is that these citizens in Nebraska who have come temporarily to live with us in Ohio ought to have the privilege of tilling that 2,000-acre farm, and then they can go back to Nebraska and teach the Senator's constituents better about farming.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I think that diagnosticians who have investigated agriculture's plight have all concluded that fundamentally the trouble is that the farmer is the victim of unrestricted competition, whereas everybody else is eliminating competition for the insurance of profit. Here it is proposed to protect others from competition in industrial lines and put these convicts to work tilling the ground and competing with the farmers. Why will we not think somewhat of the farmer in the United States Senate?

Mr. WILLIS. The Government now owns the land. Would the Senator be in favor of selling that land? Is he opposed to these men working upon this farm which the Government already owns?

Mr. President, we can not at this late hour go into this general question of how we are to handle convict labor, but what I am trying to say to the Senate is that without hearing and in this form I do not believe we ought to commit the United States to another line of business activity, and particularly when it is not such a line of activity as is of benefit to these delinquents. Most of them are young men, and they are there for only a short period. That is only a stepping stone on the way out. They are there only six months. They can not be sent there until they are eligible to parole. The purpose is to teach them some useful trade, to educate them, to help them get hold of themselves. Let anybody explain, anywhere, how the establishment of expensive machinery to make brick is going to be of any help to these men.

Oh, no, Mr. President; it is simply a device to put the Government into business, and I am opposed to it.

I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD certain telegrams which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegrams referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *December 10, 1927.*

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
Senate Office Building:

Business interests of Ohio urgently request hearing on House bill 17291, known as second deficiency bill, under which the Government, through its penal institutions, would enter into the manufacture of brick.

FRANK D. MCMILLIN,
President Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *December 10, 1927.*

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
Senate Office Building:

Ohio manufacturers greatly concerned over inclusion of item in deficiency appropriation bill, House bill 17291, to build Government brick plant at Chillicothe. Wish hearing before Senate committee which will consider this bill. Please wire promptly name of committee and date of hearing, so that representatives of Ohio manufacturers can appear to oppose it.

L. B. WEBSTER,
Executive Secretary Ohio Manufacturers Association.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *December 10, 1927.*

Senator FRANK B. WILLIS,
Senate Office Building:

The Ohio Ceramic Industries Association, representing 150 Ohio plants manufacturing all kinds of ceramic products, is unqualifiedly opposed to the proposed Federal brick plant at Chillicothe, second deficiency bill, No. 17291. Measure is economically not sound from every angle. Letter follows.

J. L. MURPHY, *President.*

ROSEVILLE, OHIO, *November 23, 1927.*

Re: House bill 17291.
Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
Care of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIS:

* * * * * * *

If you are familiar with the clay industry in the State of Ohio you will readily recognize what it means to this State to have another brick plant in operation, and especially one operated by the Government with prison labor. Fully 75 per cent of the brick plants in this State

are at the present time either closed down because of surplus stocks or are about to close down on account of the fact that the industry is overcrowded.

* * * * * * *

The brick industry in this State has millions of dollars invested and gives employment, not only to a great number of men on their own plants, but practically all of the plants in this State use coal and other supplies furnished from factories in the State of Ohio. To further handicap the brick industry in this State would also work a detriment to as many people outside of the brick industry who are dependent on us for the purchasing of their material.

* * * * * * *

Yours sincerely,

HYDRAULIC-PRESS BRICK COMPANY,
GEORGE C. EARLE, *Manager.*

SUGARCREEK, OHIO, *November 29, 1927.*

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Senate will be asked to act on House bill 17291, known as the second deficiency appropriation bill, which passed the House at the last session of Congress. This bill no doubt will be introduced into the Senate some time next month. The bill, as you probably know, is calling for an appropriation of $100,000 to erect a brick plant at the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio. The appropriation occupies an inconspicuous place in the wording of the bill, and every Senator should pay close attention to its readings.

As brick manufacturers, we are opposed to the passage of this bill for the reason that it will throw upon the market an additional tonnage of brick by prison labor. There is already an overproduction of both face brick and common brick in the United States and particularly in the State of Ohio.

We are therefore protesting against the passage of this bill for the reason that we are employing at the present time approximately 200 men at our brick factory and are endeavoring to obtain sufficient business to keep these individuals and their families from going to the poorhouse. Hoping that we can count on you to use your influence as well as your vote to defeat this bill.

Very sincerely yours,

THE FINZER BROS. CLAY CO.,
Per R. C. BAHLER, *Sales Manager.*

The VICE PRESIDENT: The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I wish to offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 21, on page 90, strike out "$5,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,500,000."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall make a point of order against that amendment. It would increase the amount to almost double what the committee recommended and what was recommended by the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. HOWELL. Did I understand that the Vice President ruled upon the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair upheld the point of order.

Mr. HOWELL. I would like to make a statement which I believe will render it clear that my amendment is not subject to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be glad to hear any remarks on the point of order.

Mr. HOWELL. In the rivers and harbors bill adopted last year there was authorized the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal, for the sum of $11,500,000.

The canal company has bonds outstanding amounting to about $6,000,000, bearing 5 per cent interest, and under the contract if these bonds are not paid they become Government bonds, practically, and will be worth 125 in the market.

The purchase of this canal has been authorized. Now, the question arises as to the manner of payment, and it seems to me that a point of order does not properly lie against an amendment which provides for supplying all the money necessary, not merely to pay for the equity, but also to take up the bonds.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. We acted upon the suggestion the Senator has made as to the deficiency bill a year ago, and the matter has been looked up since. Of course, the Government should not be called upon to pay this additional money to anybody anywhere until it can get clear title, and the Senator is not able to say that if we appropriate that $5,500,000 we can immediately procure a clear title.

The Senator does speak of the contract under which one side asserts that it could obtain 95 per cent; but I am not one of those who is going to involve this Government in even 5 per cent of eleven or twelve million dollars. Therefore I say we should leave that until some later day, when money can be in hand and title clear.

Probably the State of Massachusetts might better have taken this responsibility—in fact, it did take it up first. Perhaps it would have been better if the Government had left it there, but when the Government officials believed that the mortgage that is on the property is one that can be in time extinguished, and they put their money in for the first half, as they are doing, it is little to ask that we wait until we have a clear title before the balance is paid.

The assertion that the bonds become United States bonds hardly holds true. It may be that they may have the value of United States bonds. The Government may lose something, but it will be dollars and cents, and not so much as it might lose in a percentage with all the costs, and so forth, that might follow under the reservation which the Senator must admit is in the contract.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As to the point of order, the Chair would like to say that if the amendment is for the purpose of carrying out the Cape Cod Canal purchase act, it would be in order.

Mr. PHIPPS. May I read from the hearings held by the House committee? They are very brief.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, have I not the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I read from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. We have had the item for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal with us for a long time. Last spring this item of $5,500,000 was estimated as the amount of the principal due, without the payment of the bonds and without any interest.

General DEAKYNE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And there is no interest submitted in the provision made here, or provision for the payment of bonds, or anything of that sort?

General DEAKYNE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senate put on an item of $6,000,000 for the payment of bonds and for rights of way. The item comes back to us as it went away from us last spring, without any additions.

Major ROBINS. I understand that the Treasury Department will submit an estimate to cover the cost of bonds and interest.

The CHAIRMAN. We will not pay any interest. There is no need to worry about this, because the transaction is not complete. We can not pay the money until the title is complete and there can not be any interest paid. This contract is only complete when the appropriation is made. That is the law. They tried to put on $1,500,000 interest last spring. They provided for that in the rivers and harbors bill, but we made them strike it out, and if anybody tries to do it now, we will not be very friendly to it. Does anybody here know whether the title has been examined?

Mr. WOOD. I know it has not been. There are 140 pieces of real estate involved in it.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, under the terms of the rivers and harbors bill, adopted at the last session of Congress, it was provided that a contract for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal and the payment of $11,500,000 therefor should be executed by the Secretary of War. Of course, upon the completion of that contract $11,500,000 becomes due. However, as stated, the canal company has outstanding $6,000,000 of bonds, bearing 5 per cent interest, that do not fall due until 1960. Subtracting the $6,000,000 from $11,500,000, there remains a payment due, on account of the equity, of $5,500,000, which is appropriated in this bill. Certainly we would not pay this $5,500,000 until we were afforded a clear title to the canal, subject, of course, to the mortgage, but the instant the equity is deeded and the title passes, then the Government becomes liable for the payment of 5 per cent interest upon the $6,000,000 of bonds until they are paid.

The Government is to-day borrowing money at 3¼ per cent. The difference is 1¾ per cent. In other words, the difference in interest that the Government will have to pay if it borrows the money at 3¼ per cent, or continues to pay 5 per cent upon these bonds, is about $100,000 a year, and for the remaining period of the mortgage would total some $3,200,000.

Under the circumstances, therefore, should we not provide for the payment of these bonds the instant we secure title to the

canal and pay that $5,500,000? The contract of sale provides for this, or for the retirement of at least 95 per cent of the bonds at the option of the Government. In other words, that they will deliver $5,700,000 of these bonds for payment upon demand.

Naturally, the owners of the canal, who hold 98 per cent of the bonds, would prefer to keep these 5 per cent securities, which, under the terms of the contract of sale are to become a liability of the United States Government, and therefore would be practically equal and equivalent to United States bonds worth about 125 in the market to-day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Suppose we passed the bill in the form in which it comes from the committee, appropriating $5,000,000. Would there be any inhibition against the Government next year, or before we adjourn this session, making a further appropriation to take up all of the bonds, and thus save the $100,000 a year in interest which the Senator says we would be compelled to pay if we do not take the bonds up?

Mr. HOWELL. The United States might later appropriate the $6,000,000, but under the provisions of the contract of sale, the Secretary of War must advertise a call for the bonds 10 days at least 6 months prior to date of retirement; that means a loss of $50,000 alone.

What I am fearful of is this, that prompt arrangement will not be made for the payment of this $6,000,000 in bonds, and therefore that the interest will accrue year after year, as these people want to keep these securities in their hands. There is indeed danger of this as they have been able, through their lobby, to compel the United States Government to pay $11,500,000 for a commercial enterprise that did not earn 6 per cent upon $1,800,000 last year.

Therefore I think we ought to dispose of this matter at once and make the $6,000,000 available, so that immediately when this bill becomes a law the Secretary of War can make publication, before the first of the year and end the interest upon at least $5,700,000 of the bonds by the 1st of July next. Is not that business?

I trust therefore, Mr. President, that we may adopt this amendment, a purely business proposition. I also would call attention to the fact that this $11,500,000 was in the appropriation bill that failed last year. Why should we reduce it by $6,000,000 now?

Mr. WARREN. Because we have information now that we did not have before. That is why it is cut out.

Mr. KING. What is the information?

Mr. WARREN. I have already stated it. If it is desired to have me state it again I will do so.

We find, in the first place, that we can not reach all of them, as I said, and we do not know that we can reach as many as the Senator thinks we can. But even in the Senator's enthusiasm he states that we can reach only 95 per cent of them. Then comes, for instance, the statement of the witnesses on the other side which, so far as I have investigated I believe, is true, that there are 300 or 400 matters still not settled relating to real estate abutting upon the canal and the right of way.

Mr. HOWELL. It must be evident that under the terms of the contract of sale, if they fail to furnish the bonds, the interest would stop.

Mr. WARREN. The men who own the bonds are under obligation to clean up the charges, not only the 5 per cent but otherwise, before the Government should be expected to pay and before they should receive payment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is there any infirmity in the title to the land upon which the canal has been constructed?

Mr. HOWELL. I do not know as to the title. It is said there are a number of pieces of property of which the titles must be examined.

Mr. KING. If there is any infirmity of title we ought not to pay the $5,500,000. If the infirmity of title referred to by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is merely the possibility of not getting all of the 100 per cent of outstanding bonds quickly, that is not an infirmity of title at all, because we could make the tender to the company for all of the bonds, and those holding bonds who fail to produce them and to take their money would at once cease to draw any interest.

Therefore the point made by the Senator, it seems to me, vanishes if the title merely relates to the fact that we could not get the 100 per cent bonds in at once. The position which they take is not tenable at all. We could make the tender and stop the interest; but, of course, if the real-estate title to the canal itself is defective or invalid, then I would not be in favor of appropriating a single dollar until the title has been made good, unless the contract would stop the interest and compel them to make a good title. Then we could make the tender of the whole $11,500,000 and stop the interest, and say, "When you perfect the title, then the entire amount of money will be paid over."

Mr. HOWELL. It must be evident that unless the Government conducts its business in a manner that would not be approved by any business man, the $5,500,000 will not be paid until we have a clear title, subject to the outstanding bonds; and when it is paid ought we not to be ready immediately to retire the $6,000,000 of the bonds and stop the 5 per cent interest? There is no question respecting the business features of this transaction and how we should proceed. Of course, the canal company may have to go into the market and buy some of these bonds at a premium in order to make delivery as agreed. This they do not want to do, and hence are here trying to stave off surrendering the bonds. There is no question as to what we should do. We should place this credit at the disposal of the Secretary of War so that he can stop this interest as soon as possible. I trust the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in order provided the amendment is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of existing law. The Chair is a little in doubt as to what are the provisions of the law, and must know in order to determine whether the amendment is proper.

Mr. WARREN. That amounts to nothing, because surely I would not ask it if that were the fact. I would like to have a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment on page 41, an item for an Indian reservation in North Dakota, which was in the second deficiency bill reported to the Senate on March 2 last and was left out of the pending bill. It is an item for money that is needed there by the Indian Bureau to pay the Indians. There is no appropriation to take care of them at the present time, and they are being taken care of by the county, which can not well afford to do it. I wish to ask unanimous consent, although this may be subject to a point of order, that the amendment may be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, after line 16, insert the following:

> Relief of distress among certain Indians: For the relief among the needy Indians of Turtle Mountain Band of North Dakota, fiscal years 1927 and 1928, $15,000.

Mr. WARREN. I should make the point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, and will make it unless there is unanimous consent. If the Senator can receive unanimous consent I will not make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what is the meaning of the language on page 80, line 13:

> Toward the construction of an extensible building, $1,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. It is in the bill and authorized.

Mr. COPELAND. But what is the meaning of it? Is it a building already begun?

Mr. WARREN. I understand that so far as this building is concerned this sum will not finish it. I do not believe it is anywhere near provided for in the money that is to be expended for the items under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, to the Senator from Wyoming a million dollars is not very much, but it struck me that a million dollars is a lot of money. I presumed this was a deficiency bill, but this appears to be a provision for a new building.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It comes under the title at the beginning of the paragraph, "Public building projects in the District of Columbia under section 5, public buildings act, approved May 25, 1926, as amended." These items are to carry out the provisions of that act.

Mr. COPELAND. I understand that, but a little while ago when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] wanted to

introduce an amendment providing for a new project it was stated that this bill is wholly to make up deficiencies. Is this item correctly placed here as a deficiency item?

Mr. WARREN. It is to complete a building already started that is very much needed in the service of the department.

Mr. COPELAND. Do not let the Senator misunderstand me. I have no objection to the completion of a building already started, but I had not been told until now that this is a building already started.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator has visited the Department of Agriculture, as I presume he has, he knows that the plan is to connect the two magnificent portions of the building which have already been constructed, and also to have some additions which will run as to length in the other direction. They have already commenced upon one section of their final construction which we hope some time during our lifetimes may be finished—that is to say, the Department of Agriculture headquarters.

Mr. COPELAND. May I say to the Senator that I am in fullest accord with him. I want to see it finished; but that is what we provide for in line 10:

Toward the construction of the central part of the administration building, $750,000.

Now, what is the "extensible building" provided for in line 13? Perhaps the building is lost. It may be the House that Jack Built, or something of that sort. Where is the building?

First may I ask the Senator a further question? I hold in my hand a report on the public buildings bill and find an estimate for new buildings in New York for $15,000,000. Where are those buildings?

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps the Senator knows and perhaps he does not know that there was an item for an appropriation of $19,000,000 which was before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate after having passed the House. It came up in the Senate during the celebrated filibuster which ended the consideration of the appropriation bill and in which I believe the Senator indulged.

Mr. COPELAND. I was present.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I think the Senator was present.

Mr. COPELAND. But not responsible, may I say? It was a Republican filibuster.

Mr. WARREN. That $19,000,000 was for buildings which were partly constructed, which were under way and were very much needed. I polled the committee, which is something I very much dislike to do and never do unless it is impossible to do otherwise. I did that while I occupied the floor in the Senate. I had the names of all the members of the committee, I think every one, and proposed, if we could do so, to have the amendment adopted. It was almost in the nature of a third deficiency bill. Many of those buildings, such as are quite far along in the matter of construction, were taken out from that bill and are included in the bill now before us in a sum amounting to something like $6,000,000. The balance of them must take the regular course. These are purely deficiencies, because here the buildings are partly done, and I know from experience that that is true, because a couple of them happen to be out in the West, with which I am personally acquainted. But the whole field of New York, Wyoming, and every other State is still open for the wish expressed through their representatives for more buildings and they will come in due time, possibly, but not in a deficiency bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will permit me, I was on the Public Buildings Committee last year, when the bill making appropriation for new construction and commencing new buildings was defeated on account of the filibuster.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator means a Republican filibuster.

Mr. SWANSON. The Republican filibuster, of course, conducted by two Senators rather than by the entire Republican side.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator alludes to the bill covering $160,000,000?

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, the pending bill is limited to appropriations for deficiencies for buildings that have heretofore been authorized. For instance, a building costing $5,000,000 may have been authorized, and this year we appropriate $1,000,000, next year a million and a half, and so on. Items of that character are included in this deficiency bill. This bill, I hope, will be followed soon by a bill to be passed by the House and to come over here making appropriations to start new construction.

Mr. WARREN. I think such a bill will follow.

Mr. SWANSON. Such a bill will follow, which will include buildings in New York, and I hope will also include buildings for some cities in the State of Virginia that very much need buildings along with cities in New York, but such appropriations have never been included in a deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia the meaning of the item on page 80, line 13, which reads:

Toward the construction of an extensible building, $1,000,000.

I have not as yet found out its meaning. Is that a new building?

Mr. SWANSON. I am not on the Appropriations Committee, but the committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, never did use any such expression in authorizing the construction of buildings. That committee is generally a little more definite than that.

Mr. COPELAND. If I can be assured by the chairman of the committee that the item is actually a deficiency item, I shall not have anything more to say; but I do want to ask him if we may hope that pretty soon there may be made an appropriation for these much-needed buildings in New York.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will allow me to ask the clerk to read from the page of the document which I send to the desk he will find that it relates to this very matter.

However, let me say to the Senator, first that I propose to do all I can not only for the $19,000,000 appropriation proposed last year, but for another bill carrying something like $160,000,000 that passed the other House but did not pass the Senate. I now send to the desk the statement made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the House side. I think we have a right to know his position in regard to the matter. The statement is in a public document and sets forth how the chairman of that committee stands in reference to the subject.

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be glad to hear it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS APPROPRIATIONS

The failure of the public buildings appropriation bill has postponed for practically a year the entrance upon the program designed to relieve the congestion and inadequacy which exist in facilities of the Government for the transaction of the public business throughout the country. The bill contained approximately $20,000,000 for carrying on work under this program. In the bill herewith presented there is included $8,131,583.56 for public buildings. This sum includes $5,306,583.56 for the continuance of work on buildings authorized in 1913 (now under contract or ready to be placed under contract), $725,000 for four projects authorized prior to the enactment of the act of May 25, 1926, and $2,100,000 for work on buildings in the District of Columbia now under contract or ready to be placed under contract. The amount of $12,600,000, contained in the bill which failed, for new buildings under section 5 of the act of May 25, 1926, the $100,000,000 authorization, has been transferred in the same or slightly modified form to the 1929 Budget and will receive consideration in connection with the Treasury Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1929. This transfer, means little, if any, delay as between this bill and that.

Public buildings appropriations are immediately available under the general law, and as the annual Treasury bill will be brought up for early consideration the difference in time between the two bills should be only a matter of several months. The transfer of these projects from the deficiency bill to the regular annual bill will not cause further material delay in their ultimate consummation. The public buildings program has already been delayed nearly a year by the failure of these appropriations last spring and other new projects which would in the normal course of events be taking their turn now are also further postponed by that occurrence. This interruption in the program can not be remedied by an increase in annual appropriations. Under the general law not more than $25,000,000 can be expended in any one year no matter what the appropriations may be. The only remedy, therefore, for expedition in the program would be a change in the basic law to provide an increase in the annual rate of expenditure. It can not under any circumstances be remedied by increasing appropriations over and above those recommended in this bill and those to be carried in the annual Treasury Department bill.

On page 728 of the hearings will be found a tabular statement giving a comparison of the estimates submitted for the public buildings appropriation bill, which failed, with the estimates submitted for public buildings for this bill and those submitted for the regular 1929 bill and also a brief indication of any suggested changes in each set of estimates as compared with the items in the failed bill.

Mr. WARREN. I think that covers what I desire to have read.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, bear in mind that the material which was read into the RECORD was read at the request of the Senator from Wyoming. Now, I wish to say, in all solemnity, that it is a very strange thing that a committee brings forward an appropriation for a million dollars and nobody knows what it is all about. If a Democratic committee or a group of Democrats had brought in an item so ill considered as this, every Senator on the other side of the Chamber would find fault with the Democratic Party.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. I wish to say to the Senator that it would be impossible for him or any group of Senators to read carefully every one of the details of the estimates which must come through the regular channel of the various departments of the Government, which are passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget, and considered by the House committee after voluminous hearings, a copy of which the Senator has before him, and be familiar with every particular item that goes into the bill.

We must proceed on the assurance that these public buildings have been put into three separate classes. We first consider those for which money from earlier appropriations still remains available. We eke these out, thus enabling the department to go ahead and contract so that the buildings may be gotten under way immediately. We put into the preferred class a very few others that are urgently needed.

Mr. COPELAND. In this bill?

Mr. PHIPPS. In this bill.

Mr. COPELAND. For new buildings that are urgently needed?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; the sum of $150,000, as I recall, is for buildings for the Government in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COPELAND. New buildings?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; new buildings.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that a deficiency?

Mr. PHIPPS. That is not entirely a deficiency, but it is stated clearly in the title of the bill that it is also to provide for supplemental estimates.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is a deficiency, because we passed a law providing for these very buildings.

Mr. PHIPPS. They were authorized months ago.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I say I think this is the first time that I ever knew the clerk of the committee not to know on the suggestion being made what was meant by a particular item. He has looked up the matter, and says it is intended for a building for the Agricultural Department with which they are ready to proceed and the word "extensible" here means that it is a building that may be hereafter extended if it is desired to extend it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I hope I will at some time become so rich that a matter of the expenditure of a million dollars will be so unimportant to me that I will not care to know what is going to be done with it, but I am assured now that this item is to provide for the extension of the Agricultural Department buildings and therefore may be properly considered. I wish, however, to serve notice now on my friends in the Senate that we in New York City are entitled to have some new buildings, and very soon. I took occasion to emphasize the fact by pointing out that construction is authorized which is just as much new construction as would be the building of a post office in New York City. I think the Senate should bear in mind the needs not alone of the Agricultural Department—and I am for adequate buildings for that department; I have no doubt that the Agricultural Department can use a million-dollar building and use it for the good of the country, but we need buildings in New York also, and I trust that at the earliest possible moment there may be brought to the attention of the Senate a bill which will provide buildings for the city of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a matter which has only just now been brought to my attention or brought to the attention of the commitee. On pages 69 and 70 of the bill, beginning in line 12, on page 69, there is a proviso regarding the refunding of taxes paid by manufacturers which makes it impossible for a manufacturer in the State of Connecticut—who makes bolts, nuts, and similar hardware and sells them to automobile manufacturers, who then put them into their automobiles and pass them on to the ultimate consumer—to distribute any refund which he may receive from the Treasury Department under decisions that his taxes have been paid improperly. Even if he has the benefit of a court decision he must return the refund to the Government unless he does what is practically an impossible thing to do.

My impression is that this provision was stricken out once before on the floor of the Senate, and I move that that portion of the bill beginning in line 12, on page 69, and going through to the end of the paragraph, on page 70, be stricken out.

Mr. SWANSON. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the provision.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to refund any amount paid by or collected from any manufacturer, producer, or importer in respect of the tax imposed by subdivision (3) of section 600 of the revenue act of 1924, or subdivision (3) of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921 or of the revenue act of 1918, unless the Commissioner of Internal Revenue certifies to the proper disbursing officer that such manufacturer, producer, or importer has filed with the commissioner, under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, a bond in such sum and with such sureties as the commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the immediate repayment to the United States of such portion of the amount refunded as is not distributed by such manufacturer, producer, or importer, within six months after the date of the payment of the refund, to the persons who purchased for purposes of consumption (whether from such manufacturer, producer, importer, or from any other person) the articles in respect of which the refund is made, as evidenced by the affidavits (in such form and containing such statements as the commissioner may prescribe) of such purchasers, and that such bond, in the case of a claim allowed after the passage of this act, was filed before the allowance of the claim by the commissioner.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand, the motion of the Senator is to strike out that language.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; that is what I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submit that that ought not to be done.

We will take a manufacturer, for instance, who has already collected the tax from the consumer and paid that tax over to the Government. The manufacturer is out nothing; and for the Government then to repay that tax to the manufacturer would be manifestly nothing more than making a gift to the manufacturer.

Why should that tax be repaid to the manufacturer? I am just using the manufacturer as an illustration. It ought to be paid to the person who actually paid the tax if it is going to be refunded at all. It would be manifestly nothing in the world but a gift to the manufacturer unless this language is retained, and of course this language should be retained.

We had a fight about this matter here some time ago, when the provision was first adopted; and it was then decided by the Senate that this language should go in. In other words, this language merely provides that the tax, if refunded, must be refunded to the person who actually paid the tax. I take it that no Senator, after he has gone into the matter and considered it, would be willing to refund the tax to a person who had not paid it; so I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, before the Senator sits down, will he answer a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Senator explain to me, in order that I may explain to my constituents, how a manufacturer may return the tax to the persons who purchased for purposes of consumption, when he does not know the ultimate consumers when he makes that kind of hardware, and it is used in machinery, and he does not know the names of the ultimate consumers?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is perfectly certain that the manufacturer in the Senator's State that he speaks of has already included this tax in the cost price of the article sold to the consumer. The manufacturer did not pay the tax. It has been passed on to the consumer, and therefore the manufacturer is not out the tax. If he is out the tax, he can make that bond and collect the money; but if he has not paid the tax, manifestly it ought not to be returned to a man who has not paid it.

Mr. BINGHAM. But the Senator has not answered the question. He has not told me how we can find out who the ultimate consumer is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then the tax ought not to be returned if the person who paid it can not be ascertained.

Mr. BINGHAM. Even if it had been illegally collected?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been illegally collected. That is not the question in this case at all.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. Would the Secretary of the Treasury pay the amount of the tax to a manufacturer who had never paid it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator who has the floor permit a word of explanation from me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In the first part of the paragraph it is made clear that this appropriation is payable only to persons from whom taxes were illegally collected. The whole appropriation is controlled by that.

Just to supplement what was said by the Senator from Connecticut, a good illustration occurs in my State.

We have there a manufacturer of storage batteries, which were thought subject to this tax, and from whom the tax was admittedly illegally collected. That company never raised its price one penny. It absorbed the entire tax itself; and the only changes in its prices during the operation of these acts were two reductions in price, which it made as it found its costs decreasing. It can not find out the people who bought those batteries, because they are sold, just like crackers in a grocery store, to anybody who comes along, no record being made of the purchase, except where it is on a charge account, and it is in the hands of the dealer that the charge account appears; but this company actually absorbed that whole tax itself. Then it brought suit in the Federal court for the recovery of these taxes, and it got a judgment against the collector for that tax, and no appeal has been taken by the collector or by the Government; but, on the contrary, a certificate of probable cause was filed, which makes it a judgment against the United States.

The wording of this proviso is such that the United States would not be permitted to pay that unappealed-from judgment for taxes illegally collected unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut were adopted; but I beg Senators to notice that the only persons who can get any benefit from the appropriation made in this proviso are those from whom taxes have been illegally collected.

Mr. McKELLAR. The case stated by the Senator may be an exceptional case, and if we had that case before us there would be a reason for acting upon it; but just to open the door here to any and every manufacturer or producer or importer who has paid out taxes illegally, though those taxes may have been paid by his customers, seems to me to be a proposition that the Senate ought not to stand for; and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is very evident to me that we are not going to be able to finish this measure to-night. It is nearly 6 o'clock. Some of us have been here all day. A great many of the Senators have gone home. I know that some of them did not think we were going to vote on the measure to-night and have gone to their residences. I understand that there are at least two matters upon which a record vote is desired.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I think probably this is the last matter except one, and that, I hope, will be voted upon without any remarks from anybody. I am certain there will be none from me.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I just wanted to suggest that a desire has been expressed by a great many Senators that we should get through with this bill to-night and then that the Senate should adjourn over until Thursday and give us all day to-morrow for other matters.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have heard that, too; and I should not object to having another day in which I could do some work in my office. Some of us have been here all day, however, and we are going to adjourn early for Christmas anyhow; and it strikes me, rather than keep some of us here for an hour or so longer and have a quorum brought here to vote on some of these matters, that it would be just as well to adjourn now until to-morrow.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator may have in his mind to bring up; but I wish to say that I do not propose to do anything regarding the amendment that has been offered except to let it go to conference, so far as I am concerned, for the committee, and to have a vote on the amendment that we adopted, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I think in his interest we ought to have a vote of the Senate. I am not saying that it will necessarily be a roll call. I do not know that I shall make a request for a roll call. I hope I shall not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Do I understand the Senator to say that he is willing to have this amendment go in, so that the matter may go to conference? If the Senator takes that position, that is contrary to what the committee has already passed on; and if he takes that position we must have a quorum here to do it, because I am going to insist upon a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WARREN. Wait a minute, please.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator ought to agree to that.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed I will.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator very often, in the committee room and here, has expressed the view that anything tending to decrease the amount of an appropriation was in order. In fact, rulings to that effect have been made in his favor by the Presiding Officer to-day. On what ground shall I urge that it is not in order to do something that lessens appropriations rather than increases them? There is no matter of money before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but the committee has passed on this amendment and reported it favorably; and I hope the Senator will not think the Appropriations Committee takes the same view as the chairman, that it is willing for this matter to go to conference. It ought not to go to conference. This is a matter that ought to be voted on, and this amendment ought to be voted down by the Senate; and I shall have to insist that a quorum be present when the matter is voted on unless the amendment is voted down.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill has been disposed of so far as all committee amendments are concerned, and most of the other amendments that have been offered by Senators, and there are three or four now pending. It is not yet 6 o'clock. I do not think anybody is worked to death by working from 12 to 6. We have an 8 hour law in the country, and I hope Senators will get inured to working from 6 to 8 hours. It does seem to me that if we can stay here and dispose of this bill it will take only a short while, and to-morrow we will all have a day of vacation, so that we can get up our mail and read it.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee insists that there must be a vote on this proposition. I think we can dispose of it and vote on it; and then, if it is carried and the proviso goes out, we can determine whether or not we will have a roll call. If we do, we might just as well adjourn.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I should like some information about this proposal. My understanding is that the language in the bill as now before us is the language sent over by the House——

Mr. WARREN. It is.

Mr. MOSES. And that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut was not considered in committee. Therefore, the committee has no record upon it; and the course proposed by the chairman of the committee is the usual course under such circumstances—to accept the amendment for the purpose of sending it to conference. If there is as much merit in the original language of the bill as the Senator from Tennessee apparently thinks there is, we may be sure that the House conferees will stand upon their rights in the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the law as it is now. It was passed last year. This is just a repetition of the present law. It is already the law; and if we strike this out, in accordance with the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, we will be changing the law as it is now, and not only changing the law as it is now but changing the bill as sent over to us by the House, and changing the bill as the committee has reported it out. It is just as much a part of the committee's report as any part of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator from Tennessee is correct in his recital, he can make a point of order that this amendment changes existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is subject to a point of order, I make the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut changes existing law, and is not in order.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator point out the existing law which is changed?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to send for the law. It is the law.

Mr. BINGHAM. If it is the law, why does it need to go into the present act?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. I am at a loss to understand why it should be done, except that the particular appropriation is affected by it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to take me off the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the pardon of the Senator; I did not know he had the floor. I will ask to have a copy of the law brought to me.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. My position is simply this: If Senators want to go ahead and pass this bill to-night, I have no objection; but here is what I have in mind:

We will probably go along here for an hour or so yet, and then some one will make the point of no quorum, and we will have to adjourn until to-morrow and have a session then, after keeping us here until a late hour in the hope that we can pass the bill. If we can have an understanding that we are going to get through with the bill in a little while, I have no objection to staying here and passing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask to have the law brought to me. I am quite sure this provision is in the law. I think everybody will agree that it is.

Mr. SWANSON. While we are waiting for it, I think possibly there is a limitation on the appropriation of last year, which does not make it a general statute.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us see whether that is the case or not.

Mr. SWANSON. A limitation on an appropriation act is not a limitation on a general law. It simply limits it to that appropriation. If it is on a revenue act it does change existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was in the revenue act of 1924.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that a motion to strike out part of the bill would be in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. It changes existing law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That makes no difference, if it is part of the bill and simply operates to strike out part of the text, that is certainly in order as to any bill.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I recall quite distinctly that this ground was gone over thoroughly about this time of the day a few months ago. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Connecticut led the debate on opposite sides, and this identical language was adopted through an amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee in the last revenue act.

It is a part of existing law because it controls the method through which the appropriation authorized by existing law should be made. It is a limitation and governs the procedure in making the payment under the act authorizing the appropriation.

A provision in an appropriation bill to strike out that limitation and change the procedure of carrying out the existing law would change law in an appropriation act, and would do the very thing that is forbidden under the rules of the Senate. In other words, existing law authorizes an appropriation to be made in a certain way. The appropriation bill, under the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, would authorize it to be made in another way. Under existing law it is authorized to be made with certain restrictions. Under the bill itself it is authorized to be made without restriction. Consequently the result would be to change existing law.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the existing law does a great injustice in that it prevents a man who has secured a decision from the courts which declared that he has paid a tax illegally from ever getting any justice.

Mr. BRATTON. That same argument was advanced before; but I am not discussing the merits of it. I am discussing the rule which forbids any change in existing law through an appropriation bill, and the merits of the controversy are aside from the question now pending. If existing law authorizes an appropriation to be made in a certain way and under certain conditions and an appropriation bill undertakes to change that, the necessary result is inevitably to change existing law.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator know that existing law contains this limitation?

Mr. BRATTON. Oh, yes. It was debated. The Senator from Pennsylvania was not in the Chamber a moment ago, but I reminded the Senate that this exact language was put into the revenue act authorizing this appropriation two months ago, but that the Senator from Tennessee proposed the amendment and the Senator from Connecticut led the opposition to it, and it was adopted and is existing law. This appropriation is made under existing law, carrying out that specific provision.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If that is the case, then this proviso is unnecessary and ineffective, because the removal of it here would not change the law there.

Mr. BRATTON. That may be true.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it would affect this particular appropriation. It would permit the paying out of money provided in this particular appropriation contrary to general law.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. On the contrary, this merely authorizes the appropriation to be made in accordance with the existing law. If that limitation is in the existing revenue law—and I am glad to accept the Senator's word that it is—then we do not need to put in the proviso a second time.

Mr. BRATTON. What would be the object of striking it out except to evidence a contrary view of the Senate? If language follows existing law verbatim, then to strike it out would indicate that the Congress desired a different method followed in making the payments under the appropriation act.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am told that when this appropriation bill was in the House of Representatives, Mr. MERRITT, of Connecticut, moved to strike out this proviso, and he was met by the statement from Mr. GARNER that he did not need to do that, because the revenue bill pending in the present Congress took care of the case. Therefore Mr. MERRITT withdrew his amendment. After the bill had passed the House it was discovered that Mr. GARNER had been in error, because the new revenue bill, as it stands in the House, does not take care of these cases. I think the thing ought to be done, and ought to go to conference, and if the Senator's view is right, undoubtedly the House conferees will insist, and the matter can then come to a vote in the full Senate.

Mr. BRATTON. It was debated at some length before.

Mr. McKELLAR. We find it in the appropriation act of last year, the exact wording. I will send it to the Vice President.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is that in the revenue law or appropriation act?

Mr. McKELLAR. The appropriation act of last year.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. This merely repeats a proviso in the appropriation act, then?

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is the law, we would be changing that law.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Putting a proviso in this appropriation just because there was a proviso on some other appropriation would not change that law in the least.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it would not change the law, then it would just leave it as it is.

Mr. BRATTON. Is it in the appropriation bill or in the revenue act?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was in the appropriation act.

Mr. BRATTON. Then I was in error in saying it was in the revenue act.

Mr. SWANSON. I was satisfied it was in the appropriation act.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have just been advised that it was in the deficiency appropriation bill of February 28, 1927. Nothing that is proposed to be done here would in any way change the statute of that date. The proviso in that bill related to that appropriation. We do not propose to change that in the slightest. This proviso relates to this appropriation and of course can be stricken out on amendment.

Mr. BRATTON. I quite agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the point of order is not well taken. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Add to line 11, on page 70, the following:

but this proviso shall not apply nor extend to, or prevent the payment out of the moneys hereby appropriated of judgments duly entered in any of the courts of the United States against collectors of internal revenue in suits for the recovery of taxes illegally collected and imposed by the said subdivision (3) of section 600 of the revenue act of 1924, or subdivision (3) of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921, or of the revenue act of 1918, and in which suits certificates of probable cause have been duly entered by such courts.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I can explain the amendment in a brief statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will explain it, and the extent of these judgments.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I ought to say, before we proceed further, that I shall make a point of order against the amendment, because it is entirely in the line of new legislation, and it does not refer directly to anything that is contained in the bill, so far as what we have heard from the proponents is concerned.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming has not caught the drift of the amendment I proposed. It would merely have the effect of taking out of this proviso which we have been discussing those cases in which suit has been brought, judgment has been rendered, and no appeal has been taken, but where a certificate of probable cause

has been filed, to relieve the collector and fix the judgment against the United States.

Mr. WARREN. Under the present law, is not that taken care of?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. There is no present law on the subject.

Mr. SWANSON. It is a doubtful question whether under existing law it is necessary to certify any judgment of the courts to the joint committee. I had occasion to look into that, where a judgment had been recovered for a refund. The custom of the Treasury Department is to certify the judgments to the joint committee before they will pay anything. That generally results in a delay of about 60 days.

I was talking to the senior Senator from Utah about the matter, and he thinks there is no necessity for certifying these judgments. This language does not cover judgments, but claims of the Internal Revenue Department. It seems to me that all that is necessary is to say that there shall be no necessity for certifying up to the joint committee the information in connection with the final judgments.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am afraid I have not made myself plain. All that this does is to permit the payment of final, unappealed-from judgments already rendered, which would otherwise be paid out of this appropriation act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Gladly.

Mr. McKELLAR. When those judgments are rendered, are they not sent up to the Committee on Appropriations, and does not the Committee on Appropriations always pay those judgments of the courts?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why intermingle it with this general fund? As I understand it, wherever a judgment of a court is rendered, that judgment is filed with the Appropriations Committee at once, and it is always included.

Mr. WARREN. It is always included, and it does seem to me that the amendment of the Senator is unnecessary.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, these are different judgments. A judgment of the Court of Claims is certified here and paid outside of these refunds.

Mr. McKELLAR. A judgment of any court is certified.

Mr. SWANSON. If a man wants to get a refund of taxes, as I understand the existing law, he goes to court and gets a final decree, and if no appeal is taken, the final decree of the court, to pay a man $10,000, we will say, for improperly collected taxes, is entered. The Treasury Department has said that this language requires that those judgments be certified to the joint committee of the House and the Senate for them to pass on them before they will pay them. I do not think the language requires that, but the Treasury Department by doing that has delayed the payment of the judgments. We do not wait to appropriate the money; it is already appropriated, but they wait until this joint committee has had the judgment certified to them. I think the present language is sufficient to cover the matter, and I think that if the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who is chairman of the Senate side of the joint committee, and Chairman GREEN, would write the Treasury Department that Congress never contemplated that there should be such certification, the matter could be taken care of.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It does not directly relate to that. We do not object to waiting while the joint committee acts. This is the only item in the bill out of which such judgments as that can be paid. They are not certified here. They are judgments of the Federal district courts, affirmed by the circuit court of appeals, but brought in the district court in the first instance, anyway, final judgments, from which no appeal is taken. Everybody admits their soundness and justness, and the only way to pay them is out of this appropriation. All I ask is that this proviso shall not extend so far as to prevent the payment of an admittedly just judgment which otherwise would be paid as a matter of course out of this item.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand it, then, the proposition is this: The Senator would change the entire law in reference to the payment of judgments obtained in courts. Under the existing law they are sent up here and certified to the Appropriations Committee, and the appropriations are made for them. This is a fund, as I understand, for the refund of taxes. It is a fund intended to provide for the payment of refunds of taxes, to pay the judgments rendered by all the courts.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. These are judgments on claims for refund of taxes. These are claims for refunds which have gone on and ripened into judgments and which, in the ordinary course of things, would be paid out of this appropriation as a matter of course. But the proviso is so sweeping that it is retroactive and impairs the judgments which have heretofore been rendered. I am not asking to have it applied to future judgments at all. These are established judgments.

No State could do this, because it would be impairing the judgment and therefore the contract. There is no question of the Federal power to do it. All I base my appeal on is the justice of the thing. Here are judgments of the court on claims for the refund of taxes which were illegally collected, which would otherwise be payable as a matter of course out of this appropriation.

The proviso as it stands in the printed bill is so sweeping that it would go back and prevent the payment of these admittedly just judgments. I think clearly the proposition is one which should appeal to any lawyer. The judgments were obtained under existing law, with full knowledge of everything in the law up to this minute, and were entirely sound and legal.

I feel sure that if the Senator will let it go to conference he will find that the House will acquiesce in the amendment.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment it will work a radical change in the existing law and policy in that it will authorize the department to proceed to settle these claims, where there is judgment, without their being brought to the attention of Congress or to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Not at all.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It certainly will authorize them to do it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; it does not change existing law by a syllable. Under existing law a judgment for a refund is paid out of this lump-sum appropriation and is not certified to Congress. There are thousands of them in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It is brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee, is it not, as a part of the estimate in making up the item of refunds?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Absolutely.

Mr. SMOOT. That is paid out of a lump sum.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That again emphasizes that the committee does not always know what appropriations are made for. It was emphasized this afternoon when it was disclosed that there was a $1,000,000 item in the bill which no one could explain or tell us what it was for except that it was for some kind of a building. Now it seems that the committee recommends a lump-sum appropriation to meet certain refunds, and they have no details as to what may constitute those refunds.

I suggest, as a matter of check on the department in the expenditure of this fund, that I would not like to see a change in the policy. I would not say it changes the law, but it does change the policy.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. All of these refunds of any amount are certified to the joint committee. We have a perfectly good way of keeping a check on the action of the bureau because they are certified every day in great number.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Under the present policy do they pay them and then certify them, or do they certify them and then pay them?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. They certify them and give the joint committee time to take exception to them, and they are carefully scrutinized by the experts of the joint committee. The amendment does not change that procedure at all.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I am glad to hear that. I do not want to stand for any change in the law which would bring about any laxity on the part of the department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have been serving on the Appropriations Committee for some time. I ask the chairman of the committee to bear me out in what I am about to say. He has been serving on the same committee for 30 years or more. I do not recall a single final judgment from any Federal court that has ever been filed with the Committee on Appropriations which was not promptly paid. Is not that true?

Mr. WARREN. All of them have been paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. The chairman says that is true. Under these circumstances why change the law? If final judgments have been obtained it is within the knowledge of the Senator that they have all been paid after approval by the committee. The Government does not intend, as I understand it, to turn down any judgment of a Federal court. I do not know why the change is proposed to be made, but it ought not to be made. We ought to vote it down.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WAR-

REN] on the ground that the amendment is in the nature of a change of existing law.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 97, line 5, after the word "judgments," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid in payment of judgment No. 34097 in favor of Sara E. Thompson and Marcella Thompson Berkley, administratrices of the estate of John W. Thompson, deceased.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I ask the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment and let the matter go to conference.

Mr. WARREN. I do not think I heard the amendment. What is its purpose?

Mr. MAYFIELD. It is proposed to amend the bill by adding after the word "judgments" on page 97, line 5, of the bill the following language:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid in payment of judgment No. 34097 in favor of Sara E. Thompson and Marcella Thompson Berkley, administratrices of the estate of John W. Thompson, deceased.

I ask that the amendment be adopted in order that the matter may go to conference. I have a constituent who is interested in the judgment who did not know the matter was in the bill and simply desires to present a statement to the conference committee.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask whether it was a final judgment rendered?

Mr. MAYFIELD. It was, as I understand it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then what could the Senator's constituent expect to gain by delay?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I do not know the extent to which he is interested.

Mr. SMOOT. No matter if he were interested in it, what good would it do to have the payment withheld? It is a final judgment.

Mr. SWANSON. The money is payable to the administratrices, and I presume the contest would be that if they got hold of it and distributed it, the claimant, whoever he may be, would not get his share of the fund.

Mr. SMOOT. He had his chance in court to do it.

Mr. MAYFIELD. There is something like that involved in the matter.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator's amendment proposes to prevent the actual payment until something further is done about it?

Mr. MAYFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I wish to reserve the right for a separate vote on the committee amendment to be found on page 41, beginning with line 17.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, with the exception of the committee amendment on page 40, lines 11 to 16, and the committee amendment on page 41, lines 17 to 25.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a point of order against the committee amendment on page 41, lines 17 to 25. I make the point of order upon the ground that it is a claim. I call the attention of the Chair to paragraph 4 of Rule XVI.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the paragraph which the Senator from Nebraska proposes to strike out because it is a private claim is one which I do not propose to contest, but I will say that it is one of those peculiar cases which we sometimes meet. It provides a payment to one of the trusted clerks in the Indian Bureau. This clerk had been for some years in charge of certain premises and conditions. Charges were preferred against him of a criminal nature. He was suspended for the time being. He believed he was honest and of course awaited the trial, when he was found not guilty. This item is for payment for the time during which he was under suspension. He believed it was necessary to remain on duty and to offer whatever information he could, and to clear his name.

I know the Senator does not want to impede anything that is in the line of sustaining the honor of an honest man. Of course, the Senator, who is to be chairman of the Committee on Claims, will have trouble enough without my making him any more. If the Senator insists upon his point of order, the item will have to go out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska press the point of order?

Mr. HOWELL. The reason why I press the point of order——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator presses it, the point of order is sustained and there need not be any debate upon it, though the Chair does not want to cut the Senator off.

Mr. HOWELL. I insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] reserved a separate vote on the amendment on page 40, beginning with line 11 and extending to line 16.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask a vote on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the matter was misstated. The committee amendment was pending before the Senate, and I offered a substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PARKS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital for 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 21 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 545), entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future

political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, including the reports of the heads of the departments of the Philippine government for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1926.

I concur in the recommendation of the Secretary of War that this report be printed as a congressional document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CHILD WELFARE (H. DOC. NO. 98)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I renew to the Seventieth Congress the recommendation I made to the Sixty-ninth Congress that legislation be enacted authorizing an appropriation of $2,000, to enable acceptance by the United States of membership in a Pan American Institute of Child Welfare to be established at Montevideo, Uruguay, in accordance with a resolution adopted at the Pan American Child Welfare Congress held at Santiago, Chile, in October, 1924.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, and its inclosed copy of Senate Documbent No. 184, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, containing my message of January 5, 1927, and related papers, on the subject.

It will be observed from the report of the Secretary of State that, in response to my recommendation, a joint resolution was introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress, authorizing the United States to become a member of the institute, and an appropriation of $2,000 per annum for the contribution by the United States toward the support of the institute; that the joint resolution passed the House of Representatives and was reported without amendment by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but, owing to the congestion toward the end of the session of Congress, the Senate was unable to act upon the resolution, and that the institute has received the adherence of the Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, and is now established and functioning at Montevideo.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COLE L. BLEASE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague at the county fair at Bishopville, S. C., November 24, 1927. I may not agree with all that he has to say in that address, but I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The address by Senator BLEASE is as follows:

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, to say that I appreciate the invitations from the president of your association as well as its secretary, several of the county officials and some of my personal friends to be with you on this occasion would be mildly expressing my feelings. I was in the city of Washington attending to my official duties and had little idea of returning to the State that we all love so well until at least the Christmas holidays. I am proud to be here in the county of Lee.

I propose this morning to give you some plain English talk, not in beautiful word painting, but in such language that all men can understand, for, after all, it makes but little difference in the use of the words or how we place them, but it is in putting the views that we hold, and the thoughts that we have, so that they can be understood. I expect severe criticism. I expect some to say that it would have been better had I not said some things, but after an experience of nearly three years as your public servant in the Senate of the United States I have reached the mature opinion that the truth is what the people of this country should know, and that they have not known, for it has often been concealed from them by men in high places whose duty it was, in my opinion, not to deceive but to act fairly and honorably with their people, let the consequences be what they may to them individually. And I wish it distinctly understood this morning that I am not making this speech to help my chances for being reelected or elected to any political office. Neither am I taking into consideration the fact that it may injure my political standing in the State or the Nation. I am disregarding absolutely all personal, present, or future considerations. I want this Nation of ours to quit being imitators.

It was once said that "God Almighty hates a quitter," but He loves an originator and one who imitates no man but stands alone in the advocation of those things which are original with himself. We imitate France; we imitate England; we imitate even Spain and Mexico and other nations of the world; in fact, we imitate every place but our own and heaven—hell not excepted. Women want to imitate France, the styles of Paris, in the cutting of the hair and the wearing of their dresses. Our men want to imitate England, and our public officials the acts of public officials of other countries. I want this stopped. Let America be for Americans, and let her be the original as leader of the world and thus set the pace and thus say to the world, "Here we are; follow us," and quit being a race that stands in waiting to see what some other country is going to do before we begin to move and get into action for that which is best for uplifting and upbuilding this great Nation of ours.

Now, as to some things on the political issues, I have, in speeches made in this State and in the past summer, which are reported in some of the papers, advocated making the enforcement of the prohibition law an issue in the national compaign, and said in those speeches that we should enforce the law or we should repeal the law because its nonenforcement is producing a race of people who not only disregard this law but uphold the nonenforcement of other laws. I said in those speeches that neither Smith nor McAdoo would ever be President of the United States of America, and I say to you, my fellow citizens, today, that if either of them is nominated the Democratic Party is sure of defeat. There is a most wonderful and most powerful influence being exerted in certain organizations of this country which inscribe upon their banners that they do not interfere with the religion or politics of any man, but they adopt principles which, if a member of them believes, they will prevent him from casting his vote for either of these men, and these great organizations are a great power in politics unknown to the men on the outside, and sometimes they are called secret societies, but they are not; they are fraternal societies working for the uplifting and the betterment of all mankind.

This influence will be felt as it has never been felt before in the elections of 1928. We have men in high political positions calling themselves Democrats who are the representatives of the large corporations, either by being paid in certain capacities or they themselves are large stockholders, and therefore they can not serve both God and mammon; they can not serve the corporate interests which they represent or in which they hold large interests and at the same time represent the people—the common people of this great Nation of ours; and the Democratic Party can not hold the respect nor the confidence of the people of this country so long as such men continue to be the leaders; and we will never write "Victory" upon our banners until we can prove to the people that the Democratic Party is not subservient to the corporate interests but to the great majority of this Nation.

We hear a great deal about the McNary-Haugen bill. I have not the time to discuss this bill or its principles, but every man knows that the equalization fee put in it was to force all business men, especially the farmers, into the cooperative organizations. Many voted for this bill who admitted it. Whom, then, are they serving? The money power and the cooperative organizations or the people? We hear a great deal about flood control. I am for all things that will relieve human suffering and distress and am for the protection of lives, but can we control rivers? Is it possible for human brain to compete with the hand of God? I remember when the Pacolet River went on a rampage just a few years back and washed away millions and millions of dollars' worth of property, livestock, and took the lives of many human beings; and Reedy River went an a rampage, changed her course, sometimes destroying power plants and thousands of dollars of property. I remember an animal called a boll weevil who has done a great deal of injury to us in the South. What could Congress do or what has she done to relieve us of our flood conditions or to relieve the South of her disastrous boll weevil? Ah, gentlemen, the God of the people of the Mississippi and of the Pacolet and the Reedy is the same God of the Connecticut, and not until he put his hands upon the people of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts were the eyes of a great many people opened to the fact that there were others who had likewise suffered. I only mention this in order to show you what it takes to call attention to giving relief to the suffering South.

We must remove the office of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee in Washington from next door to the office of Thomas F. Ryan. We must let our national Democratic chairman know that we are not subservient to the dictation of Ryan and his crowd. We must let the world know that when Ryan sends his agents to the West to investigate political conditions and to see if his candidate can be elected that he, Ryan, is not the dictator of the Democratic Party. We must let our leaders know that going duck hunting, and eating the food of galvanized and climatized Yankees, and being entertained in the homes in New York of the agents and employees of Wall Street, drinking their wine and liquor, is not sufficient guaranty to southerners that we will be treated right. These clandestine agents, calling them-

selves Democrats and leaders of Democracy, who are serving the money power, to wit: The Morgan-Rockefeller and like interests, the Steel Trust, the Oil Trust, the Powder Trust, the Gun Trust, the Armor-plate Trust (the very implements of war), the railroads, the hydroelectric power companies, and all other money power and corporate interests; yet say, that they belong to a party that is for peace and that stands for the relief of the farmer, the cotton-mill men, the railroad employees, the clerks, the merchants, and the other people of this country who make their living by the sweat of their face, should be told in no uncertain terms that southerners are no longer to be lead by such leaders and are no longer willing to submit to dictation through them from the great interests which they represent, and that we do not propose to sacrifice the Constitution of this country, the enforcement of the laws of this country, and the control of the people of this country to any such men or methods, and that the real Democratic Party does not indorse their methods.

In this connection, I want to warn you people of my own State to watch and be on guard as to the Water Power Trusts and the Hydroelectric Power Trusts that are to-day being insidiously formed in your own State for the purpose of controlling its politics; its hand can be easily seen, yet it is attempting to be disguised, and the same power here is attempting to control our people that is attempting to run the United States Government.

I was sworn in as a Member of the Senate on the 4th day of March, 1925. I was invited to a meeting of the Democratic Senators, which meeting took some little informal action in reference to certain routine matters.

I was not invited to any other conferences or to any consultation, in reference to any matters—political or otherwise. I was not consulted as to what committees I would like to be a member of, or as to what rooms I would like to have in the Senate Office Building; nor was I offered or given any advice in reference to my duties, or what was expected of me, or what I was entitled to from any department of the Government—the folding room, financial clerk's office, Sergeant at Arms' office, Secretary of the Senate's office, or any other place.

I asked no questions and made no complaints.

My predecessor, Senator Dial, was very kind to me and went out of his way to assist me in certain routine matters, and introduced me to several Senators on both sides of the Chamber.

I was perfectly satisfied with the committee assignments which I received; was satisfied with the rooms assigned me in the office building, and had no complaint to make as to any matter, or matters, or any treatment which I received—politically or personally.

I went back to the session of December, 1925, and remained during the entire long session, which lasted until July 3, 1926, during which time I was never invited to any political caucus, never consulted as to any matters coming before the Senate for discussion or to be voted upon. I was absolutely ignored by the so-called leaders of the Democratic side of the Senate, and went along independently without making any complaint, speaking when I saw fit, saying what I wished regardless of what anybody else thought about it, and voting as I pleased on all questions and for what I thought was for the best interests of the majority of the people of the United States and for the best interests of the people of my State, South Carolina.

In December, 1926, I went back again and saw newspaper statements as to what "Democrats" had agreed upon, what "leaders" had met and done. I was not invited nor consulted as to these conferences. On January 4, 1927, at 10 o'clock I was invited to attend a meeting at 11 o'clock that day. I can see no reason for me to attend the meeting of the Democratic Senators simply for the purpose of letting a majority tie my hands on matters which they have already met and decided upon in secret conclave.

If I were in the open caucus and there was a discussion of matters and, on a fair and square ballot, I was in the minority, I would cheerfully yield to the majority and go in and work and vote with them. But when the majority has a meeting without any notification to the minority and without their presence and decides upon the plan of action, then invites the minority in, and simply carries out the program which they have already agreed upon, the only purpose of inviting the minority is to bind them to the majority rule without giving them the opportunity to have anything to say in a general caucus.

For instance, seven men are on a committee. The committee is to meet December 3, 1927. Four of the members have a secret meeting the night of December 2, agreeing on what they are going to do the next day. Then the next morning, when one of them makes a motion, the other three vote to carry through the program as agreed upon December 2, and the three who were not in attendance at the meeting December 2 are simply bound by having been present at the meeting of the full committee on the 3d.

That is an old political trick and might be played on amateurs but is a little weak and hardly sufficient to entice a man who for 40 years has been playing upon the political chessboard.

I said on the floor of the Senate March 18, 1925, page 387, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"STATEMENT ON VOTES AT SPECIAL SESSION

"Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, in the organization of the United States Senate it is provided how the officers of the Senate shall be chosen and in what manner the committees of the Senate shall be appointed.

"Rule 24 of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides:

"'In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.'

"After carefully reading the rules, I conceived it to be my duty to vote upon the resolution offered by Senator WATSON, of Indiana, and the substitute offered by Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, as I did vote on March 9, as will be shown by reference to pages 68 and 72 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To have answered 'present' on the question to adopt or not adopt would not have been, in my opinion, a compliance with my duty as Senator; and I, therefore, voted for Senator JONES of New Mexico, in view of the fact that Senator PITTMAN, the ranking Democratic member of the committee, had requested that no Member of the Senate cast his ballot for him. On the adoption of the resolution of Senator WATSON, of Indiana, in my opinion an answer of 'present' would have been an acquiescence and a consent on my part to the selection of the chairman and members of the committees as chosen by the Republican caucus. I felt then and feel now, that the Democratic Party should have put up candidates for the chairmanship of each committee, and placed itself upon record, just as it did in the selection of a President pro tempore and Secretary of the Senate, and I voted 'no' because I do not believe that the committee chairman as selected, nor the committees, as selected, are subservient to the best interests of the American people.

"I made no declaration at the time on the floor of the Senate of my position in regard to this matter, because I knew that it was useless, and that being a new Member it might be construed in a manner foreign to the purposes which I had then and now have in view.

"I am, first of all, an American, and then a South Carolinian, and was elected to the Senate by the Democratic Party from a State which is rock-ribbed, the strongest of any in the American Union, and, in my opinion, it will continue to be so until the end of time.

"I do not agree with the doctrine that the Democrats should sit idly by and concur in the selection of committees simply because the Republicans have a majority of the Members of the Senate. I hold the interests of the American people above the interests of either party, and I am convinced that both parties, no matter which might be in the minority, should go on record as favoring those things which they conceive to be for the best interests of all the States and of every individual citizen of the Union. That was my guide when I voted, and when it comes time to cast my ballot on any occasion that shall continue to be my course in the future. I can not concur with the idea which has been advanced that a minority party should sit idly by and allow the majority to rule in a legislative body without a protest. I believe that the minority party should make its fight, and if there be any Members of the majority who see the issue as the minority see it they not only be permitted but requested to join with the minority in doing what they conceive to be for the best interests of all the people of our country; and, so far as I am concerned, as a Senator from South Carolina, I shall not sit quietly without a vote at least of protest and see the interests of this Government surrendered to what have come to be commonly known as the 'corporate interests.'

"The fight so ably managed and presented in such a way as to convince any but the most bitter partisan, and the vote on the confirmation of Mr. Warren assure me that my position in this matter of committees was and is correct. If I was right in voting against Mr. Warren and accepting the help of what is known as the insurgent group, composed of Members of this Senate, I was right when I voted with them as to committee assignments.

"In the vote on the Isle of Pines treaty I voted as I did because if the Isle of Pines did not belong to the United States it was not necessary to make a treaty. If the Isle of Pines did belong to the United States, then, in my opinion, the treaty-making power has absolutely no right to give over this piece of property or any other property of the United States without an act of Congress duly and legally passed by both Houses and signed by the President of the United States, or passed over his veto—in case there should be a veto—by two-thirds of the votes of each House. I voted against the treaty, further, because I believed then, and believe more strongly now, that the ratification of the treaty would mean that the island would be made a dumping ground for contraband liquors to be smuggled into the United States by rum runners and bootleggers, and that instead of adding to the happiness of the people of the island we would put a curse on them and their children and add another farce in the so-called enforcement of the so-called prohibition laws.

"It is said by some that the fight on Mr. Warren was a political fight or a slap at the President. Personally, I can say that that statement is absolutely false and unwise. I intended to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Warren, and so stated to both Republicans and Democrats, because I felt that the President should be allowed to name his own Cabinet; but after hearing the arguments of Senator WALSH and REED and the evidence presented by them I do not consider Mr. Warren fit for any public position, nor would I vote for him for one.

"I have repeatedly stated that I would not vote for any measure simply because it was introduced by a Democrat, nor would I vote against any measure simply because it was introduced by a Republican. I intend to vote as a Senator of the United States both for men and measures that I believe to be for the best interests of all the people of the American Nation, and I disclaim any intention on my part to embarrass Mr. Coolidge. I have not been led by any of my Democratic associates in the matter, nor did I caucus with them on this subject.

"My record in South Carolina in the past shows that I have always voted and acted as I, at the time, conceived to be for the best interests of the people of my State, and they, after 35 years of service by me, have given me the highest office within their gift, which I take as an indorsement of my record, and I shall pursue the same course in this body that I have pursued in my home State!"

I have no resentment toward anyone that I was not consulted as to certain matters, or that I was not invited to those conferences. I expected that, and it pleased me exactly and was along the lines of my independence of thought and action. I shall do as I have been doing; allow others to act just as they please and shall vote on all questions as I believe to be for the best interests of my people.

My friends thoroughly understand the situation and it would be useless for me to go into details. My opponents are equally informed, and my friends will approve my actions. My opponents will certainly not be surprised, for all of them know that I have always talked as I pleased, voted as I pleased, and at all times talked and voted for the best interests of the people of the State of South Carolina.

I am a Democrat. My democracy is based upon the rights of each State to control its own affairs without interference from the United States Government, and for each individual to do as he or she pleases, so long as they do not trample upon the rights of others, and of every person worshipping God in his own way.

Recently I said in a speech that this country was going to have a war with Mexico. I said that if some of the people of this country knew who the real General Polius is or was, and who his soldiers were, that that alone would almost cause a revolution in the United States. I was laughed at; some of the newspapers made fun of me; but just a few days ago the scheme of some of the leaders (even the President of Mexico) has been exposed, and it seems that my information was just a little further advanced than that of some of those who claim to be more familiar with the foreign affairs in this country.

There are other political questions which I would like to discuss, but it will take too much of your time, and you are here to mingle with each other and be jolly, and I would not attempt to detract one moment from your pleasures, but I must go just a little further, and here is where criticism will be brought upon myself.

The South is the Democratic Party.

It is seen and known by all men that those who to-day are endeavoring to control the Democratic Party have no genuine love for the South, and no good can come to the South from those sources which are endeavoring to obtain for themselves or their candidate the office of the Presidency of the United States by their present campaign of slander and abuse of that section of this Nation which has made it possible for it to be what it is. And what ill will of God's or man's could induce men to speak so contemptuously, as they do, of that section of our common country that waged the Revolutionary War and built here a Government which has raised the standards of human living and safety to heights hitherto unknown? That the South built the Republic and that men who built the Republic then organized the Democratic Party as an "association of patriots" to preserve the Republic the most illiterate among our people must see and appreciate.

Let only a recital of some of the events and outmarks in our history serve here to remind you of these facts, although to review all of the achievements of the southern patriots and statesmen would require more time than one could rehearse and might become tedious to those who are not in sympathy with them.

First of all, it was the feeble Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia that first wrote to the strong Virginia Colony Legislature, or House of Burgesses, suggesting the calling of the first Continental Congress to band the Colonies together for their mutual protection against the encroachment of the power of the tyrannical foreign monarchy that then held them subject to his crown; it was Patrick Henry, the burning torch of human liberty, a Virginian, who lighted the flames of the Revolutionary War, and he was the first commander of the American Army which he organized and mobilized on the James River near Williamsburg, until George Washington was placed in command in his stead by the combined Colonies; and what need is there in relating with what glory and valor the South participated in that frightful war and what portion of the victories they achieved. It will be interesting to relate that one event of that awful conflict might be sufficient rehearsal here to fix the greatness of her sons in your minds; I refer to the Battle of King's Mountain, of which Senator John W. Daniel, of Virginia, said in his one hundredth anniversary oration at the base of the monument in 1880: "It is indeed a mountain which kings may well remember." In that period of our struggle for independence Florida and Georgia had gone down under the merciless onslaughts of the conqueror; General Washington, his men exhausted from campaign and battle, and his southern troops laid beneath the sod from death due to affliction and the rigors of that awful winter at Valley Forge, were on the verge of general collapse and the British knew of his condition.

On December 26, 1779, Sir Henry Clinton, the British commander in chief, set out from London with 8,500 new troops for the strengthening of the forces already on this continent; on May 12 General Lincoln, who had been second to General Gates at Saratoga and new in command at Charleston, was beleaguered, and, after desperate resistance, surrendered the fort with 5,000 men, shipping, stores, artillery, and arms, and then it seemed that the heel of the conqueror had fastened a death grind on the necks of the colonists, for there was nowhere now for succor to come from, so it seemed. But they had failed to take note of the fact that the Presbyterians who had fled from the British Isles in search of religious liberty had taken up their homes in the valleys of southwestern Virginia and upper east Tennessee and northwestern North Carolina. To these liberty-yearning people the word went out from the British commander, Ferguson, who had taken up his quarters on Kings Mountain, from which he boasted that "All the rebels this side of hell can not dislodge me." Those patriots from beyond the mountains quickly met and marched through the mountains, living on parched corn, to North Carolina, where they were joined by the little company of 70 North Carolina troops who were standing guard of their homes, and under forced march arrived at Cowpens, S. C., where the remaining 200 South Carolina troops from the heroic Colony, already bled white from fighting, joined them on October 6, and on the morning of October 7 they set out, and in four columns advanced up the four sides of that mountain with the results that only the runner tale-bearer of the British escaped to warn his fellow soldiers farther to the north, while these southern heroes rolled the tide of the Revolution back to Yorktown. Of the result of this battle Senator Daniel, in his above-mentioned oration said:

"As the victory of Moultrie at the Palmetto fort was the early morning star, so Yorktown was the glorious and undimmed sunrise of American independence; and so King's Mountain came like a vivid flash from the storm clouds of expiring night, dazzling darkened eyes with lambent light that played around this hoary crest, the patriots' eyes caught in prophetic vision an inspiring glimpse of Morgan and his men emerging through the smoke of Cowpens upon the heels of the flying Tarleton; beheld Cornwallis retreating before Green after the dreadful carnage of Guilford, while at the close of the vista rose up in luminous splendor that grand historic picture which marks the dawn of a new era in the history of mankind, the sword of the conquered conqueror presented humbly to the Father of His Country, while the standard of France and the flag of the great Republic floated in mingled glory over the ramparts of Yorktown."

Who was it but the Southern Colonies that in the Constitutional Convention defeated the effort to make the new Government a limited monarchy, or a republican form of government in which the chief executive and the Senate would be elected for life; who but the Southern delegates led by Patrick Henry saved to the people that glorious heritage "State rights," and had incorporated into the Constitution the Virginia Bill of Rights which saved to the people the right of trial by jury among their own people, the writ of habeas corpus, the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's own conscience? It was also Patrick Henry, as first Governor of Virginia, who organized the counties of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio in the northwest territory of Virginia, and on the 3d day of May, 1784, the Virginia General Assembly ceded these three counties to the Federal Union with the stipulation that they should become three independent States.

These negotiations were handled between the State and the Federal Government by James Monroe, Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Hardy, and Arthur Lee; this same Virginia gave also its right to the Territory of Tennessee and Kentucky and West Virginia to the Federal Government that this Territory might become separate States in the Union; it was the South and southern statesmen that were with their means and brawn building the great seat of government at Washington when the British invaded our country in 1812, and, although we had a treaty of peace with the British, they destroyed our little Army and Navy at Baltimore and Bladensburg Road, drove President Madison and his wife from the seat of government, applied the torch first to the Library of Congress, then in the Capitol, then to the White House, after gorging themselves with what they found in it; sacked and burned the Treasury and the plant of the only newspaper of importance; sailed down the Potomac, bombarding Alexandria, and then into the open sea, which they had cleared of our ships, and on to New Orleans,

where they encountered Andrew Jackson, born on the soil of South Carolina, and his southern troops; and the historian, Parton, tells the story that of the British dead on the field 80 per cent were shot between the eyes; and their commander, Pakenham, taken dead from the field, was pickled in rum and shipped to his brother-in-law the Duke of Wellington, who received it on the eve of the Battle of Waterloo. And soon after this battle and as a sequel to it Florida came into the possession of the United States as a part of our national domain through the campaign of Jackson and the diplomacy of John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, the two outstanding figures in history of their day; and Jackson organized the first Territorial government over it and prepared it to be converted into a State. Of its acquisition and the part he played in it, John C. Calhoun, upon retiring from the portfolio of Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Monroe, in an address to the people of South Carolina replying to the attacks of Benton on him for the part he had had in this bit of statecraft, said:

"Although the youngest of Monroe's six Cabinet members, I have been attributed by Benton of being the author of the Florida treaty, the acquisition of which Territory he sees as a disaster to the Republic. I have said it is a good treaty, not without due reflection. We acquired much by it; it gave us Florida, an acquisition not only important in itself but also in reference to the whole southwestern frontier. There was at that time four powerful tribes of Indians, two of whom, the Creeks and Chocktaws, were contiguous to Florida and the two others, the Chickasaws and Cherokees, were adjoining. They were the most numerous and powerful tribes in the United States, and from their position were exposed to be acted on and excited against us from Florida. It was important that this state of things should terminate, which could only be done by the obtaining of Florida. But there were other and powerful considerations for the acquisition. We had a short time before extinguished the Indian title to large tracts of country in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia lying upon streams and rivers which passed through Florida to the Gulf—lands in a great measure valueless without the right to navigate those streams to their mouths. The acquisition of Florida gave us this right and enabled us to bring into successful cultivation a great extent of fertile lands which have added much to the increased production of the great staple, cotton. It also terminates a very troublesome dispute with Spain growing out of the capture of St. Marks and Pensacola by General Jackson in the Seminole War, and, finally, it perfected our title to Oregon by ceding to us whatever right Spain had to that Territory."

It was John C. Calhoun, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington in 1812, who forced on Congress the resolution declaring war on Great Britain because they were raiding and destroying our ships on the high seas and carrying our seamen away as prisoners into foreign dungeons or putting them to death when captured in their avocation beyond the protection of their own country, and Calhoun, also, wrote his philosophy of government into books which form bright jewels in our libraries and schools of political economy.

Was it not Thomas Jefferson, a southern man, and the original organizer of the Democratic Party, who negotiated the Louisiana Purchase and added to our domain that vast stretch of the finest valley and prairie land in the world now formed into mighty States with cities teeming with a mighty and independent population? Was it not James K. Polk, a southern man, born on the soil of North Carolina, who added all that vast domain of the Southwest and Pacific coast and the Rocky Mountains, and Oregon, Washington, and Idaho to our public domain to become great and immensely wealthy States of the Republic? Of this Territory the great Democratic orator from Indiana, Daniel Voorhees, once said in a speech in the Senate, "It embraces more gold and silver than is contained in all the world besides." Polk's enemies charged that he was turning the Republic into an empire by this act, and that the people would thereby lose their liberties; but the same flag floats over them to-day that floats from the Capitol at Washington, and their people enjoy the same liberty and protection of government as do the people of New York or Pennsylvania. And it was Sam Houston, the boy house carpenter from Virginia, whose journeys into the Southwest placed him in command of the army of patriots battling against marauders and alien enemies who were seeking to make our Government a failure and to turn us back to the tyrants of Europe, and after that glorious victory in war and the more glorious achievements in setting up and governing the Republic of Texas, brought it into our dominion to add the States of Texas, part of New Mexico, part of Oklahoma, and part of Colorado and Wyoming to our Republic. And Houston, after he had twice served as President of that short-lived but glorious Republic, and was in the United States Senate from Texas, refused to allow interests he thought not best for the future safety of the Republic of the United States to put his name forward for the Democratic nomination for President when he might have had the nomination by consenting to accept it. And after this vast domain was added to our Republic, extending its borders to the shores of the farthest ocean and lifting its greatness to the heights of glory never before known among men, and conducted without the breath of scandal ever being breathed against it, it was a Democrat in Congress, Andrew Johnson, born in North Carolina, and without a home of his own, who was the father of our homestead laws which gave all that vast domain acquired by southern statesmen as homes for the people, an administration of equal justice in government that was only attempted once before in history—that being in Rome during the administration of Julius Cæsar and Mark Antony and his brother, Lucius Antony, and for which the conspiracy against their lives was hatched.

With this glorious record of southern Democracy in building and conducting this Republic to such exalted heights, why should we allow it now to be dragged into the dirt to satisfy the vain desires of some candidate for office who has no sympathy for the people who made it, or for the party whose political faith he professes only to gain his ends and gratify the gall of his backers?

If you turn to the sentimental aspect which our gallant and glorious Southland has added to this Republic, you have only to stand at attention when a band plays our national anthem, The Star Spangled Banner, written by a southern man, on a greasy paper which had been wrapped around the coarse food that was brought him to eat, while he was imprisoned in the hold of a British warship that was bombarding Fort McHenry, in Chesapeake Bay.

When evil days came upon the Republic, and with them graft and scandal and outrages of justice and lowering of the standards of greatness and duties of government, was it not our Southland which gave to the world the martial air, Dixie, and the gallantry and bravery of the Confederate soldier? The escutcheon of the Southern Confederacy is adorned with more illustrious names in proportion to the duration of its existence than ever graced the pages of history of any government that ever existed. Of the Confederate Nation, Senator John W. Daniel, of Virginia, in an oration before the annual reunion of Confederate veterans at New Orleans in 1892, said:

"There was no Confederate before 1861, and there were none after 1865. The Confederacy marked its boundaries with the bayonet; it flashed into the family of nations like a sword from its scabbard; it vanished from the family of nations like a sword into its scabbard. Its birth was registered and its epitaph written in the blood of the brave. It was born, it lived, it died amid the roll of drum and the blast of the bugle, the rattle of musketry, and the thunder of cannon. Its constitution was dissolved in the flames of war; its flag fell to rise no more; its institutions perished."

The sons and grandsons of the Revolutionary War and the Mexican War, the Confederate soldiers, fought for the greatest principles ever advocated by man, the right of the States to govern themselves as they best saw fit. They whose forefathers had made America possible; and upon the foundation which they laid the present great United States of America is built. When they returned to their homes from what is called the Civil War (God only knows how anybody could call a war civil, yet it seems that that has been adopted and I have used it, not that I indorse it, but to express certain ideas) they were without money; their property gone; their servants all set free; no mules; no horses; no cows; no hogs; even the sheep and goats gone; their barren land, which had laid in waste for four long years; many of the loved ones which they had left at home sleeping in the silent graveyards. Any other race of people would have been heartbroken, discouraged, possibly have gone as emigrants to another country more prosperous to look for something to eat and for happiness; but no; they spurned it, and like the men they were, they went into their own homes, some of them pulled a plow while the good wife held it, to plant the seed for sustenance for the body; and in the late hours of the night the good housewife would sit and sew that she and he might have cloth in such shape as to hide their nakedness; they went to work; they went to their churches on Sunday and worshiped their God and asked for His assistance. I say to you my fellow citizens that they were the builders of this Nation and they should demand the right to say what this Nation stands for and what its principles should be. They met the deadliest foes ever known to man; the carpetbagger, the scalawag, the thief, the robber; yea, more than that, the black faces that had been their servants, which God had not made their equal and who will never be their equal or their associates. They proved that they could not be treated thus for they threw off that yoke of thraldom and oppression.

I repeat that no other people on earth would have done that or could have done it, and I repeat that we are the backbone of the American Nation; and if you take the South out of the American Nation to-day she would perish like Rome and Carthage and the other countries that are known now only in the dim pencilings of history. Then why should we not demand our rights? Why should we not stand in the Democratic Convention and say that "This is what we want, and by the eternal God we shall have it"?

And in the Spanish-American War the South sent her troops and stood ready with every man, woman, and child within her borders to defend the United States, and her people and did gallant service when called upon.

If you look to our aid to humanity you will notice that it is the cotton of Dixie that clothes the naked and furnishes beds for the tired workman to rest upon from his toil; it furnishes the swadling cloth which wraps the babe when it is born into the world, and it furnishes the winding sheet for old age when it quits the walks of life; it furnishes the sails for the ships which sail the seven seas and rope to hang traitors in all parts of the world; it makes life more comfortable for the rich and the poor, and it shelters the soldiers on the field and in the camp when war devastates the land; it is made into belts to drive your machinery in your factories. In fact, there is no other one article of production on which our civilization so much depends as it does on cotton.

And if you look still for bravery on the field of battle, I will remind you that it was the Thirtieth Division, composed of troops from South Carolina, North Carolina, and Tennessee, which broke the Hindenburg line and sent William II into his present retreat at Doorn, where he afterwards furnished some enlightening interviews, in one of which he expressed his view that Dixie was the greatest martial air that was ever written—and on that opinion I think he was qualified then to speak as an authority.

And yet there are Democrats to-day, so called, who are cursing the South. Adherents of some of the candidates for the Presidency have been condemning the South for doing things they do not approve of. Let me tell you that the South made this country and handled it for 40 years without a blot on its escutcheon. No charges of graft or corruption. I repeat, let the personal consequences be what they may, I favor the southern delegates to the next Democratic National Convention standing up in the convention and demanding to be represented and demanding that what they favor be written in the platform of the party, and if the two-thirds rule be abolished and their demands are not agreed to, that they withdraw from that convention and hold a Simon-pure Democratic convention and invite all of the citizens of the United States of America to join them in the election of their nominees and not allow mugwumps and camouflaged so-called Democrats to control the Democratic convention; men who do not want the Democrats to succeed but want both Democratic and Republican candidates from their own crowd, so it matters not which gets in, they win and the people lose. As I suggest, if anyone is to bolt, let it be them and not us. Why let delegates from States that never have and never will give the Democrats an electoral vote, name whom we shall vote for and what issues we shall advocate?

If I were writing the Democratic platform of 1928, I would put in it the Constitution of the United States and the bill of rights. Obedience to the Constitution and laws of the United States. Strict enforcement of all the laws to all men alike. Equal rights to all and special privileges to none; this to apply both to the individual and the corporations. Standing upon this platform, the two men as President and Vice President (such as I would nominate had I the power) would bring to the country peace, prosperity, and happiness. I would rather be defeated standing upon these principles and a supporter of the men who would be placed at the head of the ticket than to be elected, realizing that I was sacrificing all that was sacred to the people who made this country and bowing to the whip of the money power. I would rather be defeated than win if winning means the sacrifice of the principles of freedom, justice, and truth.

SIX-YEAR TERM FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD statements and arguments by notable characters of our country on the subject of six-year term for President. I insert this data as I have been able to collect it without expressing any opinion myself on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles are as follows:

Senator Benjamin F. Wade, February 20, 1866, speaking in support of a resolution to limit to one term said:

"The offering of this resolution is no new impulse of mine, for I have been an advocate of the principle contained in it for many years, and I have derived the strong impressions which I entertain on the subject from a very careful observation of the workings of our Government during the period that I have been an observer of them. I believe it has been very rare that we have been able to elect a President of the United States who has not been tempted to use the vast powers intrusted to him according to his own opinions to advance his reelection. And when I say this of the Presidents who have preceded us I say it with no desire to depreciate their merits, but because the Constitution places before them temptations which we can hardly expect human nature to resist, and in the long run it never will resist them. Early in the history of our Government Washington himself, who was exceedingly sagacious respecting its workings, informed the people that in his opinion here was a weakness that ought to be remedied. He saw it early. He saw that a man intrusted with these more than regal powers during the period that he was President might be tempted to use them for his own advancement afterwards. Almost all the Presidents who have come after him have in some way felt, and honestly felt, that some such check was needed upon the ambition of man. It is an injunction of more than human wisdom to pray to be relieved from temptation. If I had time I might trace it through all the preceding administrations and show that this consideration had weighed like gravitation upon the mind of almost every President we have had." (See p. 932, 39th vol., Congressional Globe.)

The case for the six year term amendment is well summed up by the New York Tribune (Republican) in these paragraphs:

"The campaign of 1912 certainly gave all the point needed to the argument that a President can serve the country more satisfactorily if custom does not require him to be a candidate for renomination.

"The lengthening of a President's term to six years would give him a better opportunity to develop his policies and would protect him from the importunities of those who now offer their aid toward renominating him. * * * He could be President in all that the term implies from the day he entered the White House to the day he left it.

"The second-term theory has been responsible for an undue narrowing of the field of choice in electing Presidents. It is not necessary to turn again and again to a few candidates and to ask men to run for President two, three, or four times. * * * There should be no 'trust' in presidential nominees."

On the other hand, Senator Lodge pointed out from the floor of the Senate that a President's ineligibility would not prevent him from using his influence to bring about the election of his own choice as successor. This, several newspaper writers go on to say, might bring about a state of affairs in which the President would be simply a figurehead and some ex-President the power behind the throne. "But the most serious objection to barring a President from reelection," declares the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle (Republican), "lies in the fact that the amendment might deprive the country of his services at a critical time and when it needed them most."

"The framers of the Constitution wisely left the question of deciding how long a President should serve to the discretion of the people, without any restrictions. The adoption of the proposed amendment, instead of being an indication of progress, would be a step backward."

There are plenty of good arguments in the abstract both for and against the plan, remarks the New York Evening Post, "but it is obvious that concrete and even personal motives entered into the Senate's discussion and final action." Senators "had their eyes fixed upon political motives" and "were thinking of individuals."

"No one can doubt this who followed the speeches or noted the alignment on the final roll call. All the Democratic Senators, save one, voted for the amendment. All the Progressive Republican Senators were for the amendment; only 8 or 10 opposed it. Such a division on party or personal grounds is plainly of great significance."—(Literary Digest, Feb. 15, 1913, p. 228.)

Aside from the political reasons thus involved, Senator Lodge saw other reasons for opposing the amendment. He, as well as Senator Bristow and others, referred to the fact that the party to which the President belongs frequently loses control of Congress in the middle of the presidential term. Grant, Hayes, Harrison, Cleveland, Taft, all had this experience. The result is, in such a case, a sort of deadlock for two years. To increase the presidential term to six years makes it probable that we shall frequently have a deadlock of that kind that will last for four years instead of two. Said Senator Lodge of such a situation:

"It is a false position and an unnatural situation, one which is not consonant with our system of Government. It arrests the work of carrying out the will of the people as expressed at the polls. Under the six-year term, I think that that defect of the system, if you choose to call it such—and it is a defect, as it seems to me—would be enhanced and not diminished."

Senator Root, on the other hand, favored the amendment because it makes, in his judgment, for efficiency of government. He put the case thus:

"I think the possibility of renomination and reelection of a President who is in office seriously interferes with the working of our governmental machinery during the last two years of his term; and just about the time he gets to the point of highest efficiency, people in the Senate and in the House begin to figure to try to beat him. You can not separate the attempt to beat an individual from the the attempt to make ineffective the operation of government which that individual is carrying on in accordance with his duty. Legislation in this Congress has been largely dominated for two years past by considerations of that sort; and I should like to see those considerations exiled from these halls." (Current Opinion, March, 1913, pp. 179–180.)

Both the great critics of our Government, De Tocqueville and Bryce, voiced the unfavorable opinion of our present presidential term that is held by a very large number of thoughtful Americans.

De Tocqueville, writing in 1834, with Jackson's reelection of 1832 before him, puts the situation very bluntly:

"When a simple candidate seeks to rise by intrigue, his maneuvers must be limited to a very narrow sphere; but when the Chief Magistrate enters the lists, he borrows the strength of the Government for

his own purposes. In the former case, the feeble resources of an individual are in action; in the latter, the state itself, with its immense influence, is busied in the work of corruption and cabal. The private citizen who employs culpable practices to acquire power can act in a manner only indirectly prejudicial to the public prosperity. But if the representative of the executive descends into the combat, the cares of government dwindle for him into second-rate importance, and the success of his election is his first concern. All public negotiations, as well as all laws, are to him nothing more than electioneering schemes; places become the reward of services rendered not to the Nation, but to its chief; and the influence of the Government, if not injurious to the country, is at least no longer beneficial to the community for which it was created.

"It is impossible to consider the ordinary course of affairs in the United States without perceiving that the desire of being reelected is the chief aim of the President; that the whole policy of his Administration, and even his most indifferent measures, tend to this object, and that, especially as the crisis approaches, his personal interest takes the place of his interest in the public good."

Mr. James Bryce, writing 50 years later, puts the same idea in somewhat softer words:

"The fact that he is reeligible once, but (practically) only once, operates unfavorably on the President. He is tempted to play for a renomination by so pandering to active sections of his own party, or so using his patronage to conciliate influential politicians, as to make them put him forward at the next election."

And again:

"The founders of the Southern Confederacy of 1861–1865 were so much impressed by the objections to the present system that they provided that their President should hold office for six years, but not to be reeligible."

"To make him ineligible for reelection would remove the temptation from a President to work for his own ends, and would leave him free to attend to the Presidency during the campaign for nomination. The six-year term would give the country a longer period undisturbed by national campaigns and would give each administration a better opportunity to do the tasks which it has pledged itself to perform.

"But on the other hand there are distinct disadvantages to the proposed amendment. Half way through Mr. Taft's administration he had ceased to represent the will of the electorate. To have continued his administration in office for four years after such a landslide as gave the House of Representatives to the Democratic Party would have been a travesty on popular government. Six years is too long for a President who is out of sympathy with the people who elected him. But for a man who is doing his great task well, six years is too short a term. Our history shows that we as a people believe this, for we have reelected nine Presidents and refused to reelect the same number." (World's Work, March, 1913, pp. 499–500.)

Senator A. B. Cummins, of Iowa, declared for the one term for President principle, in Chicago, August 6, 1923, as follows:

"I always have believed that one term is enough. The great responsibilities and the tremendous strain of the office are more than any man can stand. The President of the United States is required to exert himself almost beyond the bounds of human limitations. His cares and worries break him down. Human frailties are too great to stand the strain which the Presidency places on a man. We should limit the President to one term. It might be made a six-year term, but I am not so sure about that even.

"Our theory of government that the President should be the Chief Executive of the Nation has been extended to make him the political leader of his party. President Harding gave his life to his country and party. His death only proves the magnitude of the position. He was so conscientious and yet so human that it hurt him to hear criticism of his efforts and false presumption of his motives and the things he had in mind." (Journal of Commerce, Aug. 8, 1923, p. 14.)

Senator S. D. FESS, of Ohio, on August 24, 1923, declared for a single six-year term as follows:

"Steps must be taken to lessen the burdens of detail now carried on by the President. This can be partially remedied by the President himself without further legislation.

"The situation is greatly aggravated by the eligibility to reelection. Not infrequently much of the energy of the head of the administration during the first term is expended in getting ready for reelection. It is not his choice, but the case is made out for him by the exigencies of the office and party responsibility.

"Ineligibility for reelection would remove the grounds which to-day makes the President too much the head of the party rather than the head of the Government, no matter how much he might detest the discrimination. The six or seven years is long enough to develop a real policy, and would enable the administration to accomplish better results than two terms of four years each, because of the over emphasis of party success rather than of the general good."—Washington Post, August 25, 1923.

[From the Independent August 7, 1913]

THE SINGLE SIX-YEAR TERM FOR PRESIDENT

Resolved, That the President be elected for one, and only one, term of six years.

[This series of briefs is intended to serve two purposes—to provide debaters of colleges and lyceums with an outline of the best arguments and reading references on topics suitable for public discussion, and, second, to place before legislators and voters a compact synopsis of the chief points in favor and against a question likely to be brought before them for action. The first of the series on the question of the exemption of coastwise shipping from Panama tolls appeared May 29 last. The following has been prepared for us by Miss Edith M. Phelps, compiler of the Debater's Handbook Series.—Editor.]

When the Federal Constitution was adopted one of the last and most difficult problems to be solved was the length of time the President should hold office, and whether or not he should be permitted to stand for reelection. The present four-year term with eligibility for a second term, finally adopted, has been pronounced one of the most important compromises of the Constitution. Since its adoption at least 50 amendments have been proposed extending the length of term to six years, and many of them have stipulated that there should not be a second term. Until recently none of these amendments received serious consideration, although supported by the Whigs and Peoples' Parties, but in 1912 the Democratic Party made the single term a plank in its platform at the Baltimore convention, and in February, 1913, the Senate adopted a resolution providing for a single six-year term. This resolution was killed in the Judiciary Committee of the House, and as President Wilson has recently declared himself opposed to the single-term idea it is practically certain that there will be no further legislation on the subject during his administration.

ARGUMENT FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

I. There is need for a change in our present system of a four-year term for President with eligibility for reelection.

The four-year term is too short for a President to carry out his policies.

Eligibility for reelection is a prolific source of political corruption. (a) Privilege-seeking corporations support the public officer who will grant them privileges or protect them from deserved prosecution. Large campaign funds have often been supplied by corporations amenable to punishment under the antitrust law. (b) Owing to the immense power of the President, these funds are practically compulsory. The suits of the Government against the Central and Southern Pacific Railroad Companies were dismissed following Harriman's contribution of $250,000.

It has resulted in a use of patronage that has brought the President's office into contempt. (a) The President is regarded as head of his party and not of the Nation. (b) Members of his Cabinet become his political advisers. (c) His appointees must serve him rather than the people and work for his reelection whether or not he or they desire it.

It has forced the President onto the stump to work for reelection. (a) At least one year out of every four is spent in this way. (b) It has resulted in such spectacles as the Roosevelt-Taft contest of 1912.

II. These evils would be corrected by a single term of six years.

"Four years is rather a short time in which to work out great governmental policies. Six years is better."—William H. Taft.

The temptation to secure reelection by the use of patronage or by exerting undue pressure on large corporations would be removed.

It would aid the efficiency of the Executive and center his energy and attention * * * upon what is a purely disinterested public service if he were made ineligible after serving one term.

III. The proposed change would be beneficial both to the people and to the President.

It would preserve the dignity and prestige of the presidential office.

The President would serve the interests of the whole people rather than those of his party.

The people would suffer less frequently from the business instability that surrounds every presidential election.

Greater administrative efficiency would result from the less frequent changes in Cabinet officers and appointive department heads.

IV. The argument that this change would limit the right of the people to choose their Executive has no weight.

It will remove conditions that now permit the bosses and corrupt interests to thwart the wishes of the electorate.

V. The objection that the country would be deprived of the experience and superior fitness of the President often at a time when he is most needed is unsupported.

It is doubtful if a single case exists where a second term has proved superior to the first.

There has never been a time when a reliable and competent man could not be found to succeed the incumbent of a first term.

VI. Reelection as a reward of merit is unworthy.

A man weak enough to work for the sake of public approval is unfit to be President.

A reelection secured under the present methods costs too much in money and self-respect and is not a proof of public approval.

ARGUMENT FOR THE NEGATIVE

I. A single six-year term for President would be futile as a preventive of the evils of patronage.

A retiring President could and probably would use as much power to secure the nomination of his successor or to insure the carrying out of his policies as he would exercise in securing his own nomination. Roosevelt worked to secure Taft's nomination.

The evils of patronage can be nullified by means of an efficient civil service and the presidential primary.

II. Extension to a term of six years, with no opportunity for reelection, would be harmful.

It is taking from the people the right to elect to the Presidency anyone they see fit.

It will remove from the President the incentive to be responsive to the will of the people. He will be more obedient to those to whom he owes his election.

It might operate to deprive the Nation of the services of an Executive just when experience has made him most valuable.

"I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."—George Washington.

The continuity of policies would be destroyed by a change of Presidents every six years.

It would lengthen from two to four years the deadlock often resulting when the President is of one party and one or both Houses of Congress of another.

III. Six years would be too long for a President who does not represent the electorate after election, and too short for a good Executive.

IV. No harm results to the country from presidential elections every four years.

It is an advantage to have the people stirred up to an active consideration of public affairs.

V. There is no more reason why the President should be limited to a single term of six years than Members of Congress. They are as fully exposed to the evils of patronage.

REFERENCES

Bryce, James. American Commonwealth. Second edition, revised, pages 42, 48–49, 75–83. Commonwealth Publishing Co., New York, 1908.

Hamilton, Alexander. Presidential term of office and reeligibility of the President. Nos. 71 and 72 in the Federalist (pp. 475–488 in edition by Paul Ford).

The Madison Papers. Entries for June 1, 2; July 17, 19, 25, 26; September 4, 6 (records of the Constitutional Convention).

Stanwood, Edward. History of the Presidency. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1898. (See index.)

De Tocqueville. Democracy in America. Chapter 8, sections on the President, particularly "Reelection of the President."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: 48: 7072–7073. May 24, 1912. Extract from Farrand's Records of Federal Convention of 1787; 49: 2401–2408, February 1, 1913. Presidential term. Senator Cummins. (Consult the indexes to vols. 48 and 49 for debates on S. J. Res. 78.)

Current Opinion: 54: 179–180. March, 1913. Changing the presidential term to six years.

Literary Digest: 44: 1086–1087. May 25, 1912. One-term movement; 46: 327–329, February 15, 1913, six-year Presidents.

Outlook: 102: 880, December 28, 1912. How long shall the term last? 103: 331, February 15, 1913. Six-year term.

Review of Reviews: 47: 264–268, March, 1913. Only one term for President.

World's Work: 25: 499–500, March, 1913. Six-year term for Presidents.

Yale Review: 2: 511–520, April, 1913. Election and term of the President.

AFFIRMATIVE

Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Vol. 2: 448, 519, 555.

Chautauquan: 67: 103–5. Jl., '12. Single six-year presidential term.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: 48: 3132–4. Mr. 11, '12; 49: 294–9, 357–61. D. 9, 10, '12. Presidential Term. Senator Works; 48: 11255–62. Ag. 19, '12. Senator Cummins.

Forum: 31: 23–9. Mr., '01. Growing powers of the President. Henry L. West.

Harper's Weekly: 56: 8. My. 18; 56: 19. My. 25, '12. Clayton Resolution; 57: 4. F. 8, '13. Freeing the President.

Nation: 96: 280. Mr. 20, '13. Proposed constitutional amendment and ex-Presidents. Herbert L. Baker.

North American Review: 155: 426–9. O., '92. Business in presidential years. Charles S. Smith.

NEGATIVE

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: 48: 11441–3; 11458–66. Ag. 21, '12. Presidential term. Senators Crawford, Clapp, and Heyburn; 49: 2259, 2261–3, 2266–74. Ja. 30, '13. Senators Lodge, Dixon, Bristow, and Poindexter.

Independent: 74: 335–6. F. 13, '13. Presidential term.

Nation: 94: 484. My. 16, '12. Presidential term.

Outlook: 101: 152–3. My. 25, '12. Another effort to hamper the people; 102: 475–6. N. 2, '12. People and the Presidency.

World's Work: 24: 257–8. Jl., '12. Shall a third term be forbidden?

[From the Washington Star, August 26, 1923]

LONGER PRESIDENTIAL TERM CURB TO BURDEN—INDECISION IN EARLY DAYS OF UNITED STATES TO MAKE TENURE SEVEN YEARS WITH INELIGIBILITY TO REELECTION IS RECALLED

By Will P. Kennedy

The sudden passing of President Harding as a martyr to public service has called popular attention again to the burdens of that office, and leaders in Congress are studying measures to afford necessary relief. Senators Cummins, of Iowa, HARRIS, of Georgia, and others already have issued statements on this subject. The Institute for Government Research, which has been making a scientific study of the problems of public administration, also has advocated progressive improvement.

Now comes Senator SIMEON D. FESS, of Ohio, recognized as an authority on government, who says that the most natural proposal is to change the tenure of office to six or seven years and forbid immediate reelection, a change which would require an amendment to the Constitution. "Doubtless early action will be taken by Congress and the States will readily ratify the proposal when once made," Senator FESS says.

An additional proposal is to delegate much of the detail work to others, which could be done by legislation.

The first report in the Constitutional Convention on the tenure of the President was seven years and ineligibility for reelection, Senator FESS recalls. After discussion this was changed to four years with eligibility for reelection. The prevailing argument that led to the change was that the shorter term was protection against an avaricious, ambitious, and dangerous Executive. The discussion ranged from election for one year to life. Much was heard about the despotism of George III and the dangerous power of the King. Hamilton showed the proposed Executive had not a semblance of the power of the British King and was less than the Governor of New York or New Jersey.

ARGUMENT AGAINST REELECTION

Against ineligibility to reelection the argument set forth the following reasons: (1) A diminution of inducement to good behavior in office; (2) it would remove the temptation to sordid views to peculation and to usurpation; (3) the deprivation of the public of the valuable experience acquired in office; (4) the banishment from power of a leader at the time of an emergency that might unexpectedly arise when his leadership would be imperative; and (5) it would operate as a constitutional interdiction of stability on administration.

At the time this line of reasoning was decisive and the tenure was reduced to four years with the privilege of reelection so often as the electors chose. In the 136 years of national growth since that decision many changes have occurred. The relative powers of the Executive show the American President possessed of greater power than any ruler in any other constitutional government, Senator FESS emphasizes. This power has constantly increased until he is the most powerful officeholder of the world, while that of the British King has constantly decreased until he is merely a figurehead. Every year Congress adds by legislation to the President's duties in the enactment of laws authorizing the President thus and so.

Since the war numerous commissions, many permanent in character, have been created. Each looks for appointments and organization to the President, to whom it reports. While much of the detail is handled by heads of departments, bureau chiefs, etc., it all comes back to the President for final decision.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT CITED

As a good example Senator FESS cites the Post Office Department. Here is a Government agency, doing over a half billion dollars of business each year, employing more than 332,000 persons, touching the public at every point. The President has been unable to detach himself from final direction of this great service. As an example of added burdens by legislation witness the President's responsibility for the Federal Budget. The very genius of this legislation was to make the spending department, which is the executive, responsible for expenditures, to be audited by an independent auditor not subject to the Executive, but to Congress, which alone can remove him by impeachment. The operation of this law is most wearing upon the President. Since it went into operation President Harding felt it necessary to call into conference more than once the various bureau chiefs to instruct

it not to issue orders. Executive orders have been issued directing many items of detail. Only recently one was issued which required the return of unexpended balances back into the Treasury, instead of, as heretofore, permitting these heads to issue orders that no balance was to be unexpended.

It has been suggested that this burden should be shifted from the President to Cabinet heads. This can not be done safely, Senator FESS and other students of political economy protest, because each Cabinet head is too apt to fall in with the unnecessary demands of departments, especially such as the Army and Navy. As a pertinent example we now have the Navy Department demanding $350,000,000 for next year, which the Budget Director announces must be reduced to at least $90,000,000.

OBJECTIONS ARE OFFERED

A recent suggestion is to have this function given over to the Vice President. To this substantial objections are offered, not the least of which is that under our system at the present time we have no Vice President. Just now the Presiding Office of the Senate, until March 4, 1925, will not be Vice President, but a Senator, who as such votes on all questions, but does not have a deciding vote in case of a tie, as has the Vice President. A better plan, Senator FESS feels, would be to make the Budget Director the head of a bureau, of which the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee would be members, to administer this system.

Steps must be taken to lessen the burdens of detail now carried by the President. This can be partially remedied by the President himself without further legislation. It has not been done in the past because an Executive responsible for his office wishes to exercise the power that goes with the responsibility. He is reluctant to delegate to others even the details in which official influence resides. It serves as the connecting link between leaders of the party in power and the President. The situation is greatly aggravated by the eligibility to reelection.

Not infrequently much of the energy of the head of the administration during the first term is expended in getting ready for reelection. This is not necessarily the wish or judgment of the President. It is not his choice, but the case is made out for him by the exigencies of the office and party responsibility. In the case of our lamented Harding, who never was enamored with the Presidency, who had many times expressed his preference to remain in the Senate, where he was happy and satisfied, and who was so indifferent personally to reelection that a portion of the press persisted that he would not stand for renomination—much of his time had to be given over to leaders and issues, National and State, looking to party success. This involved the President, whether he willed it or not. His own wishes were not and could not be considered. To deny him a renomination or for him to decline it in either case would be tantamount in the public mind to a confession of failure and would render valueless the party nomination to anyone else.

PREVENTS SOUND JUDGMENT

This situation has the tendency, Senator FESS argues, to prevent the exercise of sound and independent judgment in the face of great clamor and enthusiastic advocacy of measures. In the case of Harding's bonus veto tremendous pressure was centered upon him to take that stand. It was placed by leaders on party necessity. A less courageous man would not have taken his position. It was urged that he should not act as a man of independent judgment, but rather as a leader acting in party interest. Herein lies the weakness and liability of reelection, Senator FESS feels.

Ineligibility would remove the grounds which to-day make the President too much the head of the party rather than the head of the Government, no matter how much he might detest the discrimination. The six or seven years' term is long enough to develop a real policy, advocates of this reform contend, and would enable an administration to accomplish better results than two terms of four years each, because of the overemphasis of party success rather than of the general good. This applies to too much legislation fully as much as to the character of legislation.

The objection to ineligibility previously enumerated will not hold. No man who reaches the high office of President needs the spur of reelection to insure good behavior or to guard against usurpation and sordid views. Neither would a longer term deprive the country of experience, but rather insure it.

It has been demonstrated that no man has been so indispensable that when he left office the country did not continue and without much of a jar to its machinery. Our strength is in our system of government, our institutions, our popular loyalty, rather than in the type of leadership. When a change in the latter takes place, the Government goes on.

* * * * * *

[From the Chautauquan, July, 1912]

THE SINGLE SIX-YEAR PRESIDENTIAL TERM

The personal and unpleasant phases of the Roosevelt-Taft rivalry have had one important effect. They have revived and greatly stimulated the demand for a constitutional amendment expressly limiting the President to a single term, while lengthening the term to six years. Several Presidents and other political leaders, as well as historians and teachers of political science, have from time to time advocated such an amendment, but the great public never before paid any attention to this question, treating it as academic and theoretical. The spectacle of the President and the former President touring many States, attacking each other, bandying epithets and insults, has served to arouse many to the practical importance of the change mentioned. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike, radicals and conservatives, have been urging it, and resolutions were offered in Congress proposing the amendment. Presidential advisory primaries are "coming" in every section, and they mean, among other things, campaigns of Presidents and ex-Presidents for second, third, or even fourth terms. For, with all its advantages, the direct primary brings the new element of intraparty and interfaction "stump" struggles for nominations. It means two long campaigns instead of one, and one of the campaigns must be fought out within the party fold. This often develops bitterness and passion, and forces governors and even the President to "take off their coats" and talk, plead, shout, and work for nominations.

Under these circumstances the dignity and prestige of the presidential office would seem to require legislation removing either the necessity or the occasion for unseemly wrangling and personal campaigning. An amendment limiting any man to one term of six years in the White House would have that effect. Perhaps similar amendments are desirable to cover the case of State executives.

But the argument for the reform in question is not based merely on considerations relating to dignity, prestige, propriety in high office. There are deeper and better reasons for making the change. Andrew Jackson thought that a single term without reelection for a President under any circumstances would add another safeguard to our liberties. Second terms are not now feared as threats to our liberties; whether third or fourth terms are a menace and danger is a matter upon which opinion differs. But what is undeniable and clear is that second and third terms are incompatible with efficient and single-minded public service. The best of men can not be exposed to constant temptation. The temptation of incumbents to use patronage, to build or strengthen machines, to "mend fences," to make sure of delegates, to control conventions, is too strong to be resisted in most cases.

Nor is this all. Men in office who are candidates for second or third terms may, and generally do, consider bills and policies from the political or personal point of view. Some do it unconsciously, but all do it more or less. The incumbent who is not and can not be a candidate again for the same office is free to deal with public matters on their merits, to use his independent and sincere judgment, to make the public good his sole test or concern. This would be an enormous gain to good government and to "the rule of the people."

The more the question is studied the more vital and progressive the single-term idea is seen to be. There is not the least danger that the supply of presidential "timber" will ever be so restricted that second or third terms will be necessary. No man or set of men is really indispensable to an age or generation or nation. Any vigorous, sound body politic contains many men and women who are fit to do the work of the day. To dip into the great mass of citizens and select administrators and servants with an eye to results, without overestimating any individual or underestimating the virtue and intelligence of his equals, is not always an easy task. But stable and prosperous democracies must endeavor to do this very thing. The single six-year presidential term idea is consonant with the warnings of history and with common sense.

* * * * * * *

[From the Washington Star, August 12, 1923]

By Joseph P. Tumulty

(Copyright, 1923, by the Washington Star. Reproduction prohibited)

The untimely death of President Harding has brought on a discussion of the duties and burdens of the presidential office. Distinguished public men are now engaged in debating legislation with a view of relieving the President.

The most definite proposal of relief thus far advanced is that an official be designated to act as assistant to the President, upon whom will devolve the ministerial duties in contradistinction to the administrative duties which are inseparable from the office of the Chief Executive.

From my own experience in the White House, covering a period of eight years, three of which encompassed the momentous events of the World War, my opinion is that if the plan of naming an assistant is carried out it will be a mere expedient—a quack remedy—and would not go to the heart of the thing we seek to correct. We can not really lift the burdens which beset the President at every turn until we find a way to free him from those things which worry and harass, those things which take is thoughts away from a proper consideration of the real questions of importance affecting the country's welfare and which daily press upon him for solution.

The trials of the presidency about which we complain are inherent in the tenure of the office itself.

It is only an unfortunate happening like the death of a President that brings us face to face with a stern fact, and that fact is that within a decade the duties of the presidential office have increased in alarming fashion. More and more our people have demanded presidential leadership of an individual and special nature so that with the tremendous growth of the country the varied needs of 48 prosperous and growing States, the administration of the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and our widely separated insular possessions, the trials and cares of the President have broadened until, with uncomplaining patience and fortitude, the pilot of this great ship of state must be at the helm both day and night, guiding the destinies of 110,000,000 people through dangerous waters. The war itself and its aftermath, which brought new and additional burdens in the way of grave world problems, have drawn greatly upon the energy—physical and mental—of the President. Only a robust and vigorous man can hope to withstand the resultant strain, worry, and anxiety.

SAW HEAVY BURDENS

While in the White House I was fortunately in a position to witness from the "inside" the constant demands upon a war President's time, patience, stamina, and energy. Time and again I saw a sorely burdened President, with the weight of perplexing cares and responsibilities upon him, indulgently listening to the partisan claims of "special pleaders" from Capitol Hill, even at a time when solemn decisions affecting the destiny of the Nation and the world had to be made.

In the face of all these hardships and cares it was a fine, noble, commendable thing, an act characteristic of the geniality and goodness of President Harding, to announce an "open-door policy" at the White House shortly after his inauguration, but I am expressing the opinion now that I then expressed to his friends and advisers that this benevolent, democratic policy could not be satisfactorily carried out without a severe charge upon the energy and time of the President. Such a policy can only result in physical and nervous exhaustion.

MUST BE ACCESSIBLE

Do we realize that while the President is thought to live in lonely isolation at the White House, he is compelled daily to be accessible to 435 Representatives and 96 Senators, not to mention the multitude of diplomats, bankers, business men of affairs, and delegates from all over the country? And added to these burdens the President must be ever ready to confer with the political chieftains of his party, who report to him the condition of his party in all States of the Union.

It is my opinion that if the President of the United States were permitted to handle the purely administrative side of his office, free from the blighting entanglements of politics, his energy and resources could be utilized in the handling of the greater problems, both international and domestic, which confront him. But the fact is—and when I say this it is without disparagement of the distinguished occupants of that high office—too much of the President's time is given to a consideration of problems that, in their last analysis, are purely political and have to do with that side of his administration which should be subordinated to that of weightier measures. In other words, the President is no sooner comfortably seated in the White House than the "urge" of friends is thick upon him to "sell himself and his administration to the country."

He is, of course, always averse to propagandizing and resorting to "swings around the circle." But his intimate friends and advisers impress upon him the wisdom of appealing to the people, explaining that the success of his administration depends upon his going before the country, and so the strategy of "campaigning" is urged upon him.

WOULD LIMIT TERM

The only solution of the problem is to make the term of a President one of four to six years' duration, with the proviso that he shall be ineligible for reelection. Were the President's terms limited in this way, how different from the present atmosphere, surcharged as it is with clamorous demands of oversolicitous friends, would be that in which he would work and labor for the big, exalted ideals of his country. Far removed from the exigencies of politics and the needs of constituencies, of Representatives and Senators, the President would be free to consider calmly and dispassionately the needs of the whole country. His selections to high office would be made regardless of the effect they might have upon the political future of statesmen and politicians.

I recall a story of President Lincoln. It appears that in the early days of the Civil War, when the northern armies were sorely pressed and bad news was reaching the White House, that the President, when seen by an intimate friend visiting him, was walking up and down his study, careworn and greatly disturbed. The friend said, "I wish I could relieve you of your burdens, Mr. President. The news we are getting from the northern armies is discouraging." The President turned and answered, "I am not now thinking of the northern armies. I am wondering whom I will appoint as postmaster at Shelbyville, Ky."

In this story there is illustrated the demands made upon a President of the United States at a time when personalities and the success of this or that individual in the political field should be subservient to the welfare of all.

During my term in the White House a striking incident occurred at one of the most critical stages of the World War, when a bitter controversy arose over the question of who should be appointed postmaster of a small city in northern Ohio. It was at a time when David Lloyd-George was crying out that the World War was a struggle between Von Hindenburg and Wilson. Various factions of the Democratic Party were interested in the selection of a particular man for the northern Ohio post. Many conferences were held. The Postmaster General had refused to recommend for the place the man chosen by the Representative from that district. The Senators from the State were at odds, and thus the controversy, in its finality, with all the soreness and bitterness that had been engendered, had to be passed on to the President for a decision. Feelings must not be hurt in this matter. And thus we found the President at a time when critical war matters pressed upon him compelled to give his time and energy and his vitality to this matter of secondary importance.

It is reported in the daily press that efforts will be made to relieve the Presidency through congressional action by making it unnecessary for him to sign various commissions, grants of public lands, etc. In my opinion, this attempt to relieve the President would be performing but a minor operation where a major one is necessary.

My plea, therefore, is to amend the Constitution so as to provide for a single term of either four or six years. This would leave the President free to carry out his responsibilities to the Nation as a whole and would relieve him of all worries and anxieties incident to a campaign for a second term.

Ex-President Taft, in his book The Presidency, page 4, said:

"I am strongly inclined to the view that it would have been a wiser provision, as it was at one time voted in the convention, to make the term of the President seven years and render him ineligible thereafter. Such a change would give to the Executive greater courage and independence in the discharge of his duties."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
DIVISION OF BIBLIOGRAPHY.

LIST OF REFERENCES ON PRESIDENTIAL TERM

Bibliographies

(1) Painter, Estella E., comp.: Selected articles on the six-year presidential term. Minneapolis, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1913. 47 p. (The abridged debaters' handbook series.) Bibliography: p. 5–8. JK550.P3.

(2) Phelps, E. M.: Single six-year term for President: Argument in brief. Independent, Aug. 7, 1913, v. 75: 323–325. AP2.I53, v. 75. References for and against.

(3) Texas: University. Department of extension. Public discussion and information division. Intercollegiate debates and bibliographies on a literacy test for immigrants and a six-year presidential term. [Austin, Tex.] The University [1914] 60 p. (Bulletin of the University of Texas. No. 351. Extension ser. No. 57. Aug. 5, 1914.) JV6508.E3T4.

Books

(4) Ames, Herman V.: The proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States during the first century of its history. Washington, Govt. print. off., 1897. 442 p. (American Historical Association. Annual report, 1896. Washington, 1897, v. 2.) "Term of President and Vice President": E172.A60, 1896, v. 2, p. 123–128. Z6456.A513.

(5) An argument for a third presidential term. By a Pennsylvanian. [n. p., 1874.] 8 p. JK550.T15. Advocating a third term for President Grant.

(6) Badeau, Adam: Grant in peace. From Appomattox to Mount McGregor. A personal memoir. Hartford, S. S. Scranton & Co., 1887. 591 p. "The third term": Chap. XXXVI. E672.B131.

April 10, 1920.

(7) Beard, Charles A.: American government and politics. New and rev. ed. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1914. 788 p. Third-term doctrine: p. 184. JK271.B5. 1914.

(8) Bishop, Joseph B.: Presidential nominations and elections; a history of American conventions, national campaigns, inaugurations, campaign caricature. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1916. 237 p. "A portion of the material in this volume appeared in a book published by me in 1904, entitled 'Our political drama.' * * * To it has been added sufficient new matter to present a complete review * * * down to the present time." "The third-term convention": p. 77–88. JK2261.B6.

(9) Black, Jeremiah S.: Essays and speeches. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1885. 621 p. E415.6.B62. "The third term: reasons against it": p. 366–389.

(10) Bryce, James: The American commonwealth. New ed. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1910. 2 v. JK246.B9. 1910. Reeligibility of the President: v. 1, p. 45–46.

(11) Chancellor, William E.: Our Presidents and their office: including parallel lives of the Presidents of the people of the United States and of several contemporaries, and a history of the presidency. New

York, The Neale Publishing Company, 1912. 603 p. Bibliography: p. 591–593. JK511.C4. See index under Presidential term; third term.

(12) Cleveland, Grover, Pres. U. S.: The writings and speeches of Grover Cleveland; selected and ed., with an introduction, by George F. Parker. New York, Cassell Publishing Company [1892] 571 p. E696.C61. E661.C63. "When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power * * * we recognize in the eligibility of the President for reelection a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate, and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people": p. 11.

(13) Donnan, William G.: Reeligibility of the President. Speech * * * in the House of Representatives, March 16, 1872. [Washington, printed at the Congressional Globe Office, 1872.] 8 p. On third term. E672.D68.

(14) Elliot, Jonathan, ed.: The debates in the several State conventions on the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Washington, printed by and for the editor, 1836–45. 5 v. Includes discussion on the presidential term. Consult the indexes of the several volumes. JK141. 1836.

(15) The Federalist: The Federalist, a commentary on the Constitution of the United States, being a collection of essays written in support of the Constitution agreed upon September 17, 1787, by the Federal convention, reprinted from the original text of Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison; ed. by Henry C. Lodge * * * New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1902. 586 p. JK154. 1902. The term of the President and eligibility for reelection: p. 448–455.

(16) Finley, John H. and John F. Sanderson: The American Executive and Executive methods. New York, The Century Co., 1908. 352 p. (The American State series.) Brief mention of term of office: p. 258. JK516.F5.

(17) Ford, Paul L., ed.: Pamphlets on the Constitution of the United States, published during its discussion by the people, 1787–1788. Brooklyn, 1888. 451 p. Brief remarks by Alexander Contee Hanson on the presidential term: p. 231. JK171.F71.

(18) Garner, James W.: Government in the United States, National, State, and local. New York, American Book Company [1919]. 416 p. "The presidential term": p. 275–276. JK274.G3. 1919.

(19) Guitteau, William B.: Government and politics in the United States; problems in American democracy. [Rev. ed.] Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company [1918]. 484 p. JK274.G85. 1918. "The original preference of the Constitutional Convention was for a single term of seven years, but this was finally changed to a term of four years, with no restriction as to reeligibility": p. 179.

(20) Hamilton, Alexander: [Duration of presidential term discussed.] (In his Works, edited by Henry C. Lodge [Federal ed.]. vol. 12. New York, 1904. p. 208–211.) E 302.H24, v. 12.

(21) Harrison, Benjamin, President, United States: This country of ours. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1897. 360 p. JK424.H3. Presidential term: p. 71–73. Mentions seven-year term.

(22) Hart, Albert B.: Actual government as applied under American conditions. 4th ed., rev. New York, Longmans, Green, & Co., 1919. 599 p. (American citizen series, ed. by A. B. Hart.) The term of the President: p. 265–266. JK421.H3. 1919.

(23) ———: Third term. (In Cyclopedia of American Government, v. 3. New York, 1914. p. 535–536.) JK9.C9, v. 3.

(24) Haynes, Frederick E.: Third-party movements since the Civil War, with special reference to Iowa; a study in social politics. Iowa City, Iowa, The State Historical Society of Iowa [1916], 254 p. "One term for President": p. 100, 110, and 349. JK2261.H35.

(25) Hillhouse, James: Propositions for amending the Constitution of the United States, submitted * * * to the Senate, on the twelfth day of April, 1808, with his explanatory remarks. [Washington, 1808] 52 p. JK170. 1808.

(26) ———: Propositions for amending the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of President and Vice President, and guarding against the undue exercise of executive influence, patronage, and power. Washington, printed by Gales & Seaton, 1830. 40 p.

A revision of his proposition for amending the Constitution * * * 1808.

The President to be appointed and to hold office for one year. JK170. 1830.

(27) Hunt, Gaillard: The President of the United States. [Madison, 1915] p. 75–98. (The State historical society of Wisconsin, separate no. 165.)

"From the proceedings of the society for 1915." Touches upon the term of the President. JK515. H85.

(28) Jefferson, Thomas, *President of the United States:* The writings of Thomas Jefferson; collected and ed. by Paul L. Ford * * * New York, G. P. Putnam's sons, 1892–99. 10 v. E302.J466, v. 5.

Remarks on reeligibility of the President, in letter to William Stevens Smith: v. 5, p. 3; in letter to George Washington: v. 5, p. 8; in letter to Edward Carrington: v. 5, p. 20.

(29) ———: The writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington, Taylor & Maury, 1853–54. 9 v. E302.J464, v. 2.

Remarks on reeligibility of the President in letter to A. Donald; v. 2, p. 355.

(30) Lockwood, Henry C.: The abolition of the Presidency. New York, R. Worthington, 1884. 331 p.

"Works of reference": p. 329–331.

"Term of office": p. 34–43. JK516.L8.

(31) McClure, Alexander K.: Our Presidents and how we make them. New York and London, Harper & brothers, 1900. 417 p.

Facts relating to the tenure of office of various Presidents: p. 397–400. JK524.M22.

(32) McKee, Thomas H.: The national conventions and platforms of all political parties, 1789 to 1905. 6th ed., rev. and enl. Baltimore, The Friedenwald Company, 1906. 418 p.

Democratic platform, election of 1896, "Third-term resolution: We declare it to be the unwritten law of this republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our Government, that no man should be eligible for a third term of the presidential office": p. 297. JK2255.M2. 1906.

(33) McMaster, John B.: With the fathers; studies in the history of the United States. New York, D. Appleton and company, 1896. 334 p. "The third term": p. 55–70. E73.M16.

(34) Madison, James, President of the United States. The papers of James Madison. Washington, Langtree & O'Sullivan, 1840. 3 v. JK111.M2.

Reeligibility discussed: p. 733, 742, 762, 766, 779, 860, 865, 887, 888, 891, 1124, 1128, 1141, 1145, 1189., 1198, 1205, 1209, 1210, 1223, 1236, 1417, 1420, 1486, 1498, 1507, 1552, 1614.

(35) Miller, Samuel F. Lectures on the Constitution of the United States. New York and Albany, Banks and brothers, 1893. 765 p. Presidential term: p. 151–152. JK241.M66.

(36) Montgomery, Henry. The life of Major General William H. Harrison. 2d ed. New York, C. M. Saxton, Barker & Co.; San Francisco, H. H. Bancroft & Co., 1860. 465 p. E392.M79.

Remarks on reeligibility of the same individual to a second term of the Presidency: p. 340–341.

(37) Munro, William B. The Government of the United States, National, State, and local. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1919. 648 p. "The principle that no President should hold office for more than two terms has become a strong tradition, although this was far from being the intention of those who framed the Constitution": p. 66. JK274.M9.

(38) Ogg, Frederic A. and Charles A. Beard. National governments and the World War. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1919. 603 p.

Brief comment on the presidential term: p. 95–96. JF51.06.

(39) Parsons, Geoffrey. The land of fair play; how America is governed. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1919. 189 p.

Brief comment on presidential term: p. 39. JK271.P3.

(40) Polen, George P. Shall our Presidents be elected for eight years? New York, F. Schmidt, jr., 1898. 32 p. JK550.P7

(41) Poley, Arthur P. The Federal systems of the United States and the British Empire; their origin, nature, and development. London. Sir I. Pitman & Sons, 1913. 453 p. JK295.P6.

"Washington was chosen for a second term, but refused a nomination for a third term; and this precedent having been established, since his time no President has held office for three terms": p. 67.

(42) Ray, Perley O.: An introduction to political parties and practical politics. New York, C. Scribner's sons, 1917, 628 p. JK2265.R2. 1917. Democratic platform, 1912. Presidential term: "We favor a single presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection, and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle": p. 27.

(43) Reed, Thomas H.: Form and functions of American government. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y., World book company, 1916. 549 p. JK274.R36. "The presidential term": p. 238–239.

(44) ———: Government for the people. New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1915. 265 p. See chapter 14, "What is the matter with the Presidency?" Touches upon presidential term. JK271.R35.

(45) Schouler, James: Constitutional studies, State and Federal. New York, Dodd, Mead and company, 1897. 332 p. JK34.S4. "The presidential term itself is limited to four years, and midway comes the opportunity to strengthen, weaken, or secure him in his policy. Hamilton in 1787 would have preferred the tenure of life or good behavior; Jefferson, a seven-years' term, once and for all; but the Constitution as framed fixed the moderate term of four years and put no restraint upon reeligibility": p. 157–158.

(46) Sparks, Edwin E. National development, 1877–1885. New York and London, Harper & brothers, 1907. 378 p. (The American nation: a history . . . ed. by A. B. Hart . . . v. 23.) No third-term principle; p. 165–170. E178.A54 vol. 23.

(47) Stanwood, Edward. A history of the Presidency. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin company [1916] 2 v. See index vol. 2 under President—term. JK511.S7. 1916.

(48) Stickles, Arndt M. Elements of government; political institutions, local and national, in the United States. New York, American book company [1914] 416 p. Presidential term: p. 168. JK274.S8.

(49) Story, Joseph. Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States; with a preliminary review of the constitutional history of the Colonies and States before the adoption of the Constitution. 5th ed., by Melville M. Bigelow . . . Boston, Little, Brown, and company, 1891. 2 v. Consult index vol. 2, under Executive. JK211.S7.

(50) Sumner, Charles: Speech in the Senate on one term for President, Dec. 21, 1871. Congressional Globe, 42d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 259–260. J11.G5, pt. 1.

(51) Taft, William H., *President United States:* Ethics in service * * * Addresses delivered in the Page lecture series, 1914, before the senior class of the Sheffield scientific school, Yale University. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915. 101 p. JK271.T3.

Brief mention of presidential term: p. 38.

(52) ———: The Presidency, its duties, its powers, its opportunities, and its limitations; three lectures. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1916. 145 p. (University of Virginia, Barbour-Page Foundation.)

"I am strongly inclined to the view that it would have been a wiser provision, as it was at one time voted in the convention, to make the term of the President seven years and render him ineligible thereafter": p. 4. JK516.T35.

(53) Thorpe, Francis N.: The constitutional history of the United States. Chicago, Callaghan & Company, 1901. 3 v.

See index v. 3 under presidential term.

Seven-year term: v. 1, p. 323. JK31T6.

(54) United States *Congress, House:* Debate on proposed amendment to the Constitution that "no person who shall have been elected President of the United States shall be again eligible to that office," Dec. 18, 1828, Feb. 6, 1829. (*In* U. S. Congress. Register of Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., 2d sess. Washington, 1830, v. 5, p. 119–125, 320–321.) J11.D5. 1828–29, v. 5.

(55) ——— ———: Debate on proposed amendment to the Constitution that "The President and Vice President shall hold their offices during the period of six years, and no person who shall have been elected and served as President shall be again elected to that office." Feb. 19, 1829. (*In* U. S. Congress. Register of Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., 2d sess. Washington, 1830, v. 5, p. 361–369.) J11.D5, 1828–29, v. 5.

(56) ——— ———, *Committee on the Judiciary:* Six-year presidential term * * * Report. (To accompany H. J. Res. 325) [Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1912.] 11 p. (62d Cong., 2d sess. House Rept. 885.) Appendix: North American Review. April, 1912. By George Harvey. The unwritten law and the "great emergency." p. 2–11. JK550.A5, 1912a.

(57) ——— ——— ———: Terms of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives * * * Report. (To accompany H. J. Res. 204.) [Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1912.] 25 p. (62d Cong., 2d sess., House Rept. 239.) JK550.A5, 1912.

(58) ——— ——— *Select Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:* Report from the minority of the committee appointed on the 21st of March, 1842, and to which was referred certain propositions of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Aug. 30, 1842. [Washington, 1842.] 24 p. (27th Cong., 2d sess., House Rept. 1104.) Serial No. 411. Favors a single presidential term.

(59) ——— ——— *Select Committee Relating to the Amendment of the Constitution:* Report in relation to the election of President and Vice President. Jan. 31, 1835. Washington, 1835. 1 p. (23d Cong., 2d sess. House Rept. 69.) Serial No. 276.

(60) ——— Constitutional convention: The records of the Federal convention of 1787, ed. by Max Farrand * * * New Haven, Yale University Press, 1911. 3 v. JK141 1911. For discussion of presidential term see Index by clauses, Article II: v. 3, p. 642. Seven-year term, v. 1, pp. 62–69.

(61) ——— President: A compilation of the messages and papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897. Published by authority of Congress, by James D. Richardson * * * Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1896–99. 10 v. J81.B96. Issued also as House misc. doc. No. 210, 53d Cong., 2d sess. Recommendations regarding limitation of term of President: v. 2, p. 448; v. 3, p. 117; v. 7, p. 445.

(62) ——— ——— (Jackson, 1829–1837) annual message: (In U. S. President. A compilation of the messages and papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897. v. 2 and 3.) J81.B96, v. 2, 3. Presidential term, and eligibility of President to reelection: v. 2, pp. 448, 519, 557, 605; v. 3, p. 34, 117, 176.

(63) ——— ——— (Hayes, 1877–1881) inaugural address: Mar. 5, 1877. (In U. S. President. A compilation of the messages and papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897. Washington, 1895. v. 7, pp. 442–447.) J81.B96, v. 7. Recommendation of a term of six years for the presidential office with ineligibility for reelection; p. 445.

(64) Wade, Benjamin F.: Speech in the Senate on the presidential term, Feb. 20, 1866. Congressional Globe, 39th Cong., 1st session., pt. 1, p. 732. J11.G5, pt. 1.

(65) Washington, George. Pres. U. S.: The writings of George Washington; collected and ed. by Worthington Chauncey Ford * * * New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889–[93]. 14 v. E312.7 1889. "Views on the tenure of office of the President." v. 11, pages 257–258.

(66) Wilson, James: The works of James Wilson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, being his public discourses upon jurisprudence and the political science, including lectures as professor of law, 1790–1792, ed. by James De Witt Andrews * * * Chicago, Callaghan and Co., 1896. 2 v. "The executive department"; v. 2, p. 60–74. JK171.W6 1896.

(67) Wilson, Woodrow, President United States. Congressional government; a study in American politics. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company [1907] 344 p. "The Executive": p. 242–293. JK1061.W765.

(68) ——— [Presidential term]: Letter to Mitchell Palmer, of Penn., May 5, 1913. Congressional Record, 64th Cong., 1st sess., v. 53, No. 203 (current file): 14757. J11.R5,v.53.

(69) Woodburn, James A.: American politics. The American Republic and its Government; an analysis of the Government of the United States, with a consideration of its fundamental principles and its relations to the States and Territories. 2d, rev. ed. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916. 398 p. President's term: p. 115–116. JK246.W88 1916.

(70) ——— and Thomas F. Moran. The citizens and the republic; a textbook in government. New York, Longmans, Green and Co. [1918]. "References" at end of each chapter. JK274.W8. "Term of the President": p. 236–237. "It was proposed in the convention of 1787 to make the President's term seven years and not allow him to be reelected, and for over a hundred years the proposal has been repeatedly made, in Congress and party conventions, that the President should be allowed only one term": p. 236.

Articles in periodicals

(71) 1871, Greeley, Horace: The one-term principle. Galaxy, Oct. 1871, v. 12: 488–493. AP2.G2,v.12.

(72) 1874, The American Rubicon: A crisis in our history. Views of statesmen respecting reelecting the President—Washington's repugnance to a second term—his refusal of a third—definite expressions of Jefferson on the subject—Jackson urges a constitutional limitation—consequences involved in the third term movement. New York Tribune, Monday, Sept. 14, 1874, p. 1, col. 6, p. 2, cols. 1–6, p. 5, col. 4.

(73) Howard, James Q.: Duration of the Executive term. Galaxy, Dec., 1874, v. 18: 816–821. AP2.G2,v.18.

(74) 1880, Howe, T. O.: Third term. North American Review, Feb., 1880, v. 130: 116–130. AP2.N7,v.130.

(75) 1880. Black, J. S.: The third term; reasons against it. North American Review, Mar., 1880, v. 130: 197–223. AP2.N7, v. 130.

(76) 1880. Stoughton, E. W.: The third term; reasons for it. North American Review, Mar., 1880, v. 130: 224–235. AP2.N7, v. 130.

(77) 1880. Hale, Matthew. The third-term question. National Quarterly Review, Apr., 1880, v. 40: 377–394. AP4.N35, v. 40.

(78) 1880. Boutwell, G. S.: General Grant and a third term. North American Review, Apr., 1880, v. 130: 370–388. AP2.N7, v. 130.

(79) 1880. Antithird term convention at St. Louis, May 6, 1880. Missouri Republican (St. Louis), May 7, 1880, p. 3, 6. Contains speech by J. B. Henderson.

(80) 1880. Godkin, E. L.: The specific argument against a third term. Nation, May 6, 1880, v. 30: 342–343. AP2.N2, v. 30.

(81) 1892. Eaton, Dorman B.: The perils of reelecting Presidents. North American Review, June, 1892, v. 154: 691–704. AP2.N7, v. 154.

(82) 1895. The American Presidency. Saturday Review, Aug. 24, 1895, v. 80: 230. AP4.S3, v. 80.

(83) 1895. McMaster, John B.: The third-term tradition. Forum, Nov., 1895, v. 20: 257–265. AP2.F8, v. 20. Condensed in Public Opinion, Nov. 28, 1895, v. 19: 694. Press comment on the third-term idea; p. 694–696. AP2.P9, v. 19.

(84) 1901. Rantoul, Robert S.: What Washington thought of a third term. Essex Institute. Historical collections, Oct., 1901, v. 37: 321–338. F72.E7E81, v. 37.

(85) 1903. Harvey, Charles M.: Some second-term precedents. Atlantic Monthly, Dec., 1903, v. 92: 736–742. AP2.A8, v. 92.

(86) 1904. Waters, D. R.: The third-term objection. Harper's Weekly, Apr. 2, 1904, v. 48: 522. AP2.H32, v. 48.

(87) 1904. The term of the President of the United States. Albany Law Journal, Nov., 1904, v. 66: 333–334.

(88) 1906. Has Roosevelt a right to accept renomination? Harper's Weekly, Sept. 15, 1906, v. 50: 1307. AP2.H32, v. 50.

(89) 1906. Mr. Roosevelt's moral right to become a candidate for reelection. North American Review, Sept. 7, 1906, v. 183: 331–337. AP2.N7, v. 183.

(90) 1907. Schouler, James: The third-term tradition. Independent, Nov. 7, 1907, v. 63: 1087–1089. AP2.I53, v. 63.

(91) 1907 [Anti-third term tradition]: North American Review, Dec., 1907, v. 186: 620–624. AP2.N7,v.186.

(92) 1908, the third-term movement: American Review of Reviews, Jan., 1908, v. 37: 3–5. AP2.R4,v.37.

(93) Watterson, Henry: Strange prophecy about Roosevelt. Cosmopolitan, Jan., 1908, v. 44: 302–308. AP2.C8,v.44.

(94) Parsons, F.: The President of the United States. Why he should succeed himself. Government, Mar., 1908, v. 2: 349–363. H1.G7,v.2.

(95) Creelman, James: Mr. Roosevelt's renunciation. Pearson's magazine, May, 1908, v. 19: 457–471. AP2.P35,v.19.

(96) Taft, William H.: My conception of the Presidency. Collier's Weekly, v. 41, June 27, 1908: 7. AP2.C65,v.41.

(97) Claudian on the third term: Nation, June 11, 1908, v. 86: 527. AP2.N2,v.86.

(98) Bryan, William J.: My conception of the Presidency. Collier's Weekly, v. 41, July 18, 1908: 7. AP2.C65,v.41.

(99) 1912, the presidential campaign: Third-term fears; third-term realities. Outlook, Feb. 17, 1912, v. 100: 337–338. AP2.O8,v.100.

(100) Schurman, Jacob Gould: The Republican presidential nomination. Independent, Mar. 21, 1912, v. 72: 600–603. AP2.I53,v.72.

(101) Judson, H. P.: Roosevelt and the third term. Independent, Mar. 28, 1912, v. 72: 653–655. AP2.I53,v.72.

(102) Third term; a poll of the press. Outlook, Mar. 23, 1912, v. 100: 615–617. AP2.O8,v.100.

(103) The tradition against a third term: Current literature, Apr., 1912, v. 52: 368–371. AP2. C95,v.52.

(104) Vale, Charles: Is the third-term issue negligible? Forum, Apr., 1912, v. 47: 441–444. AP2.F8,v.47.

(105) Watterson, Henry: Great unwritten law. Harper's Weekly, v. 56, Apr. 20, 1912: 7. AP2.H32,v.56.

(106) Schouler, J.: Third-term tradition. Independent, Apr. 25, 1912, v. 72: 877. AP2.I53,v.72.

(107) Harvey, George: Unwritten law and the great emergency. North American Review, Apr., 1912, v. 195: 433–450. AP2.N7,v.195.

(108) About the third term: World's work, Apr., 1912, v. 23: 610–611. AP2.W8,v.23.

(109) 1912: Great tradition, it must be kept inviolate. Harper's weekly, v. 56, May 4, 1912: 6. AP2.H32,v.56.

(110) Low, A. M.: Third term. Harper's weekly, May 11, 1912, v. 56: 10. AP2.H32,v.56.

(111) Clayton, resolution: Harper's weekly, v. 56, May 25, 1912: 19. AP2.H32,v.56.

(112) One-term movement: Literary digest, May 25, 1912, v. 44: 1086–1087. AP2.L58,v.44.

(113) Presidential term: Nation, May 16, 1912, v. 94: 484. AP2. N2,v.94.

(114) Another effort to hamper the people: Outlook, May 25, 1912, v. 101: 152–153. AP2.08,v.101.

(115) Hart, Albert B.: The third-term ghost. Saturday evening post, v. 184, May 18, 1912: 18–19. AP2.S2,v.184.

(116) Roosevelt and the third term: American review of reviews, June, 1912, v. 45: 699–704. AP2.R4,v.45.

(117) Baker, H. L.: Presidential term. Nation, June 27, 1912, v. 94: 636–637. AP2.N2,v.94.

(118) Single six-year presidential term: Chautauquan, July, 1912, v. 67: 103–105. AP2.C48,v.67.

(119) The presidential term: By B. B. W. Nation, July 4, 1912, v. 95: 9–10. AP2.N2,v.95.

Comments on a letter by Jefferson, Sept. 20, 1788, objecting to a presidential third term.

(120) Shall a third term be forbidden? World's work, July, 1912, v. 24: 257–258. AP2.W8,v.24.

(121) Shall the President serve one term? Americana, Aug., 1912, v. 7: 743–750. E171.A53,v.7.

(122) Hall, William: Grant and a third term. Americana, Sept., 1912, v. 7: 848–850. E171.A53,v.7.

The letter of Grant to Mr. Conkling refusing to accept a third term.

(123) Low, A. Maurice: The greatest of all issues. The third-term candidacy is the most momentous problem which the American people have to solve. Harper's weekly, v. 56; Sept. 14, 1912: 20. AP2.H32, v.56.

(124) 1912. Low, A. Maurice: The third-term peril. Further reasons why the election of Mr. Roosevelt this year would be destructive to republican institutions. Harper's weekly v. 56; Sept. 21, 1912; 19. AP2.H32, v. 56.

(125) Australian view of our third-term superstition: American review of reviews, Oct. 1912, v. 46: 485–486. AP2.R4, v. 46.

(126) The people and the Presidency. Outlook, Nov. 2, 1912, v. 102: 475–476. AP2.08, v. 102.

(127) The presidential term: a poll of the press. Outlook, Dec. 28, 1912, v. 102: 879–881. AP2.08 v. 102.

(128) 1913. Freeing the President: Harper's weekly, v. 57, Feb. 8, 1913: 4. AP2.H32, v. 57.

(129) Presidential term. Independent, Feb. 13, 1913, v. 74: 335–336. AP2I53, v. 74.

(130) Six-year Presidents. Literary digest, Feb. 15, 1913, v. 46: 327–329. AP2.L58, v. 46.

(131) Presidential term. Nation, Feb. 6, 1913, v. 96: 120. AP2.N2, v. 96.

(132) Six-year term. Outlook, Feb. 15, 1913, v. 103: 331. AP2.08, v. 103.

(133) Only one term for Presidents. American review of reviews, Mar., 1913, v. 47: 264–268. AP2.R4, v. 47.

(134) Changing the presidential term to six years. Current opinion, Mar., 1913, v. 54: 178–180. AP2.C95, v. 54.

(135) Baker, H. L. Proposed constitutional amendment and ex-Presidents. Nation, Mar. 20, 1913, v. 96: 280. AP2.N2, v. 96.

(136) Six-year term for Presidents. World's work, Mar., 1913, v. 25: 499–500. AP2.W8, v. 25.

(137) Ferrand, Max. The election and term of the President. Yale review, Apr., 1913, n. s. v. 2; 511–520. H1.Y2, n. s. v. 2. Includes material on seven-year term.

(138) 1915. Question of the single term. Nation, July 29, 1915, v. 101: 136–137. AP2.N2, v. 101.

(139) Lawrence, David. One term for Wilson? Collier's weekly, v. 56, Nov. 6, 1915: 7–8. AP2.C65, v. 56.

(140) 1916. Presidential terms and presidential nominations. Independent, Jan. 24, 1916, v. 85: 109–110. AP2.I53, v. 85.

(141) Mr. Wilson's hat in the ring. Literary digest, v. 52, Jan. 22, 1916: 159–160. AP2.L58, v. 52. .

(142) 1916, Wilson on the second term: Nation, Jan. 13, 1916, v. 102: 35. AP2.N2, v. 102.

(143) Palmer letter: New Republic, Jan. 15, 1916, v. 5: 268. AP2.N624, v. 5.

(144) Presidential term: Outlook, Jan. 19, 1916, v. 112: 118. AP2. 08, v. 112.

(145) Harvey, George. Wilson and a second term: North American Review, Feb., 1916, v. 203: 161–170. AP2.N7, v. 203.

(146) McPherson, John B. The one term pledge: Protectionist, Feb., 1918, v. 27: 659–662. HF1750.P6, v. 27.

(147) Wilson, Woodrow. Wilson on one term: Protectionist, Feb., 1916, v. 27: 687–689. HF1750.P8, v. 27.

Letter to Mr. Palmer.

(148) Second terms and treaties: North American Review, Mar., 1916, v. 203: 467–470. AP2.N7, v. 203.

SPEECHES, ETC., IN CONGRESS, AS PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, VOLUME 48

(149) Borah, William E. The presidential term. Senate, Aug. 20, 1912, pt. 11: 11355–11366.

(150) Clapp, Moses E. The presidential term. Senate, Aug. 21, 1912, pt. 11: 11461–11463.

(151) Driscoll, Michael E. The third-term menace. House, Aug. 24, 1912. Appendix: 909–912.

(152) "The first assault and repulse of third termism—a chapter of half-forgotten history." Editorial from Louisville Courier-Journel, April 23, 1912, pt. 6: 5304–5306.

(153) Floyd, John C. Terms of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives. House, June 1, 1912, pt. 8: 7521–7523.

(154) Henry, Robert L. Terms of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives. House, June 1, 1912, pt. 8: 7517–7519.

(155) McCall, Samuel W. Speech in House, Feb. 6, 1912, opposing a third term, pt. 2: 1790–1792.

(156) U. S. Congress. House. Debate . . . June 1, 1912, on (H. Res. 204) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to the terms of President, Vice President, etc., pt. 8: 7509–7516.

(157) ——— Senate. Debate . . . Aug. 21, 1912, on the (S. J. Res. 78) proposing amendment in the Constitution relating to presidential term, pt. 11: 11439–11443, 11458–11466.

(158) Williams, John S.: Speech in the Senate, Aug. 19, 1912, on the presidential term, pt. 11: 11439–11441.

Recommends term of four years and re-eligible for one additional term only.

(159) Works, John D.: Speech * * * Mar. 11, 1912, on S. J. Res. 78, proposing an amendment to the Constitution that will fix the term of office of the President at six years instead of four, etc., pt. 4: 3132–3133.

(160) Cummins, Albert B.: The presidential term. Senate, Aug. 19, 1912, pt. 11: 11255–11264.

Sixty-second Congress, third session, volume 49

(161) The beginning of the movement for a single six-year term for the President of the United States. Newspaper editorials, pt. 2: 1649–1650.

Introduced into the RECORD by Mr. Works, Jan. 17, 1913.

(162) Cummins, Albert B. The presidential term. Speech in the Senate, Jan. 31 and Feb. 1, 1913, on (S. J. Res. 78), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, pt. 3: 2363–2366; 2401–2407.

(163) Hamilton, Alexander. [Article relative to the reelection of the President.] pt. 3: 2412–2413.

(164) Lindbergh, C. A. Election of President and Vice President. * * * House, Feb. 6, 1913, on the bill (H. R. 28499) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia, etc. Appendix: 46–47. Opposed to the single six-year term.

(165) National business league of America. Memorial in support of a single six-year term for President, with newspaper editorials, pt. 2: 1649–1650.

(166) The presidential term. Newspaper editorials bearing upon the question of one term for the President of the United States, pt. 2: 1947–1948.

Introduced into the RECORD by Mr. Works, Jan. 24, 1913.

(167) U. S. Congress. Senate. The presidential term. Debate. * * * Jan. 30–Feb. 1, 1913, on S. J. Res. 78. pt. 3: 2258–2281; 2344–2366; 2401–2420.

(168) Works, John D.: The presidential term. Senate, Dec. 9 and 10, 1912, pt. 1: 294–299.

Speech occasioned by the consideration in the Senate of the joint res. (S. J. Res. 78) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the U. S. by changing the term from four to six years with no reelection.

Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, volume 5

(169) Coleman, Julius A. Amendment to elect President and Vice President by the people direct for one term of six years. Appendix: 295–298.

Introduced into the RECORD by Mr. Humphrey, Feb. 7, 1916.

(170) United States Congress. Senate. Term of office of President and Vice President. Debate in the Senate, Jan. 8, 1917, on S. J. Res. 177, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of President and Vice President without the intervention of the Electoral College * * * pt. 1: 989–992.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 5 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

JUDGE STORY'S POSITION ON THE SO-CALLED GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] I present an article entitled "Judge Story's position on the so-called general welfare clause," which I ask may be printed as a document and also inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed as a document and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal, July, 1927, p. 363]

PROPOSITIONS SUGGESTED IN CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ON SUBJECT OF POWERS OF CONGRESS—JUDGE STORY'S VIEW AS SET FORTH IN HIS COMMENTARIES—PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION EMPLOYED AND ONE-SIDED APPLICATION—CONCLUSION THAT THE WORDS "COMMON DEFENSE AND GENERAL WELFARE," ARE MERELY A LIMITATION UPON THE TAXING POWER RESULTS IN ANOMALOUS CONDITION [1]

By HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER, President American Bar Association, 1904–5; Member of Congress; Member of Virginia Bar

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Georgia Bar Association, I make no apology for presenting to you to-day as the subject of my address a technical and abstruse question, because it involves the foundation stone of our form of Government.

The subject to which I invite your attention may be put in this form, "Judge Story's position on the so-called general welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States."

The words "the general welfare" are to be found in two places in the Constitution—in the preamble thereto and in Article I, section 8, clause 1. All reputable writers concur in the statement that the words of the preamble to the Constitution constitute no grants of power, and, therefore, our investigation is confined to the words as found in Article I, section 8, clause 1, which reads,

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

[1] Address delivered before annual meeting of Georgia Bar Association held at Tybee Island on June 2, 1927.

It will be observed by reading the whole section carefully that the above clause is the first of 18 clauses, placed consecutively one after another, separated by a semicolon from each other, each beginning with the word "To" with a capital "T," and all 18 clauses constituting one sentence, the last clause of which is not a separate grant of power like the others, but is intended to perfect and enlarge the previous 17 grants of power to Congress. It is known as the coefficient clause, and reads:

The Congress shall have power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

To a proper understanding of the question it is proper to examine the propositions suggested in the Constitutional Convention on the subject of the powers of Congress.

Mr. Hamilton's plan on the powers of Congress provided that the Legislature of the United States should have "powers to pass all laws whatsoever, subject to the negative hereafter mentioned," which negative was the power of the Executive to have a negative on all laws about to be passed.

Mr. Randolph's plan proposed Congress should have all powers which it possessed under the Confederation, "and, moreover, to legislate in all cases to which the separate States are incompetent or in which the harmony of the United States may be interrupted by the exercise of individual legislation," etc.

Mr. Patterson's plan provided that Congress should have all powers which it possessed under the Confederation and power "to pass acts for raising a revenue, by levying a duty or duties on all goods, etc., imported into any part of the United States, etc., and by postage on all letters * * * to be applied to such Federal purposes as they shall deem proper and expedient, to pass acts for the regulation of trade and commerce, as well as with foreign nations as with each other," etc.

Mr. Pinckney's plan, offered on the 29th of May, 1787, three days after the convention met, provided: "The Legislature of the United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;

"To regulate commerce," etc.;

"To borrow money," etc.;

"To establish post offices";

containing in all 21 specific grants of power, the last of which reads, "and to make all laws for carrying the foregoing powers into execution."

Pinckney's plan, as introduced, on this subject came out of the convention on the 15th of September in form and substance pretty much as it was introduced on the 29th of May, with this change, that on the 4th of September there was added to clause 1, after the word "excises," the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

Hamilton's fight in the Convention was to give to Congress unlimited power. Pinckney's plan prescribed definite powers to Congress. This was the struggle of the Convention, and while Hamilton's plan, on this clause, was practically voted down six times in the Convention, either directly or by voting up a distinct opposing proposition, his followers have struggled to show that the words "the general welfare" put into clause 1, section 8, Article I, really mean what was specifically rejected by the Convention six times. (See speech of HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER—Maternity bill—delivered in House of Representatives March 3, 1926, p. 15 et seq.)

I

Judge Story's position on this subject can best be seen from quoting his own words on the subject, beginning at Sec. 906 of his Commentaries, page 628, volume 1:

"SEC. 906. The first clause of the eighth section is in the following words: 'The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense, and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises, shall be uniform throughout the United States.'

"SEC. 907. Before proceeding to consider the nature and extent of the power conferred by this clause, and the reasons, on which it is founded, it seems necessary to settle the grammatical construction of the clause, and to ascertain its true meaning. Do the words, 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises,' constitute a distinct, substantial power, and the words, 'to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States,' constitute another distinct and substantial power? Or are the latter words connected with the former, so as to constitute a qualification upon them? This has been a topic of political controversy and has furnished abundant materials for popular declamation and alarm. If the former be the true interpretation, then it is obvious, that under the color of the generality of the words to 'provide for the common defense and general welfare,' the Government of the United States is, in reality, a government of general and unlimited powers, notwithstanding the subsequent enumeration of specific powers; if the latter

be the true construction, then the power of taxation only is given by the clause, and it is limited to objects of a national character, 'to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and the general welfare.' But see e Contra, section 923.

"SEC. 908. The former opinion has been maintained by some of great ingenuity and liberality of views. The latter has been the generally received sense of the Nation, and seems supported by reasoning at once solid and impregnable. The reading, therefore, which will be maintained in these commentaries, is that which makes the latter words a qualification of the former; and this will be best illustrated by supplying the words which are necessarily to be understood in this interpretation. They will then stand thus: 'The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, in order to pay the debts and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States'; that is, for the purpose of paying the public debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. In this sense Congress has not an unlimited power of taxation; but it is limited to specific objects—the payment of the public debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare. A tax, therefore, laid by Congress for neither of these objects would be unconstitutional, as an excess of its legislative authority. In what manner this is to be ascertained, or decided, will be considered hereafter. At present the interpretation of the words only is before us; and the reasoning, by which that already suggested has been vindicated, will now be reviewed.

"SEC. 909. The Constitution was, from its very origin, contemplated to be a frame of a national government of special and enumerated powers, and not general and unlimited powers. This is apparent, as will be presently seen, from the history of the proceedings of the convention which framed it; and it has formed the admitted basis of all legislative and judicial reasoning upon it ever since it was put into operation by all who have been its open friends and advocates, as well as by all who have been its enemies and opponents. If the clause, 'to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States,' is construed to be an independent and substantive grant of power, it not only renders wholly unimportant and unnecessary the subsequent enumeration of specific powers, but it plainly extends far beyond them and creates a general authority in Congress to pass all laws which they may deem for the common defense or general welfare. Under such circumstances the Constitution would practically create an unlimited national government. The enumerated powers would tend to embarrassment and confusion, since they would only give rise to doubts as to the true extent of the general power or of the enumerated powers.

"SEC. 910. One of the most common maxims of interpretation is (as has been already stated), that, as an exception strengthens the force of a law in cases not excepted, so enumeration weakens it in cases not enumerated. But how could it be applied with success to the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States if the enumerated powers were neither exceptions from nor additions to the general power to provide for the common defense and general welfare? To give the enumeration of the specific powers any sensible place or operation in the Constitution, it is indispensable to construe them as not wholly and necessarily embraced in the general power. The common principles of interpretation would seem to instruct us that the different parts of the same instrument ought to be so expounded as to give meaning to every part which will bear it. Shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any signification? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power? Nothing is more natural or common than first to use a general phrase and then to qualify it by a recital of particulars. But the idea of an enumeration of particulars which neither explain nor qualify the general meaning, and can have no other effect than to confound and mislead, is an absurdity, which no one ought to charge on the enlightened authors of the Constitution. It would be to charge them either with premeditated folly or premeditated fraud.

"SEC. 911. On the other hand, construing this clause in connection with, and as a part of the preceding clause, giving the power to lay taxes, it becomes sensible and operative. It becomes a qualification of that clause, and limits the taxing powers to objects for the common defense or general welfare. It then contains no grant of any power whatsoever; but it is a mere expression of the ends and purposes to be effected by the preceding power of taxation."

II

The argument of Judge Story (contained in sections 909 and 910), which demolishes the theory of the Hamiltonians, shows conclusively that the words "the common defense and general welfare," as found in this section, constitute no substantive grant of power; and he further denies that these words contain any power whatsoever. His argument is irresistible in its conclusion to any unbiased mind, but it furnishes an equally powerful argument against his claim that the words "to provide for the common defense and general welfare" are merely words of limitation on the taxing power, for his argument for the latter claim is based upon the relationship of those words solely to the first clause of section 8, and excludes their relationship to the other 17 distinct clauses in that sentence. He would thus exclude these words "common defense and general welfare" from any participation in the construction of the whole sentence. How can that consist with his language in sections 909 and 910?

"SEC. 910. * * * The common principles of interpretation would seem to instruct us, that the different parts of the same instrument ought to be so expounded, as to give meaning to every part, which will bear it. Shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any significance?"

And yet, to maintain his argument, the doubtful and indefinite terms "common defense and general welfare" are allowed to stand unconnected, unchallenged, and unaffected by the clear and precise expressions which follow. Or how can his argument be maintained against the declaration in section 910?

"Nothing is more natural or common than first to use a general phrase, and then to qualify it by a recital of particulars."

If this expression controlled Judge Story in demolishing the Hamiltonian claim of a substantive power in the words "common defense and general welfare," why should not this same expression of his, on like principle, apply in the attempt to make them merely words of limitation on the taxing power? For this last quotation from Judge Story, section 910, shows that there is an indissoluble bond of dependence, that can not be broken, between the general expression "common defense and general welfare" and the subsequent explicit grants of power contained in the same sentence in section 8. The subsequent enumerated powers were sufficient to convince the learned judge that these general and indefinite terms could not be regarded as absorbing or nullifying the specifically enumerated grants. But by taking the two together, and giving to each that meaning which a just and reasonable construction justifies, he destroys the Hamiltonian argument; but alas, it is fatal to his argument holding these words to be merely words of limitation, for in it he rejects the basic foundation of his former argument. His argument showing that the Hamiltonian claim, that these words "common defense and general welfare" constituted a substantive grant of power, was based chiefly on the grammatical construction of the whole sentence, and he invoked two principles that must be admitted by all as sound, which have been quoted in sections 909 and 910; the first that the different parts of the same sentence ought to be so expounded as to give meaning to every part which will bear it, and, with striking emphasis, he asks a question which can be answered only in one way,

"Shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any signification?"

and, second, a principle recognized by all authors and writers.

"That nothing is more natural or common than first to use a general phrase, and then to qualify it by a recital of particulars."

These are two principles general in their application to all sentences and a fortiori when applied to one sentence, must be followed in the different construction of the same sentence; but this, Judge Story does not do, but rejects the principle that all parts of the same sentence must be considered for its proper construction, which he invoked so triumphantly in overthrowing the Hamiltonian claim of a substantive power in these words, and holds that these words "common defense and general welfare" have no relation to any part of the sentence, except the first clause of section 8. Is it consistent or logical that a principle adopted in solving the one construction of a sentence should be rejected in the other? And if a general expression, as he holds, may be qualified and explained by subsequent specific grants or qualifications in the subsequent parts of the same sentence, why should 17 specific and independent grants to Congress be denied any place in aiding in another construction of the same sentence. In his argument against the Hamiltonian theory, Judge Story has forged a weapon that must, in the minds of all intelligent people, prove fatal to that theory. It is beyond question sound, reasonable, conclusive, and irresistible; but that same weapon forged by his own hand, conceived and worked out in his own brain, will, to the same minds, prove fatal to his claim that the words "common defense and general welfare" are only limitations upon the taxing power, for in reaching this conclusion he has been forced to repudiate the basic principle that made his former argument irresistible. Byron has well interpreted Judge Story's position in the lines:

"So the struck eagle streached upon the plain,
No more through rolling clouds to soar again,
Viewed his own feather on the fatal dart,
That helped to wing the shaft that quivered in his heart."

III

The argument from section 913, et seq., to sustain the position that these words constitute only a limitation on the taxing power, is labored and unsatisfactory; it is a repudiation, distinct and complete, of the whole fabric of his former argument in which he unhorses the Hamiltonians who hold that these words constitute a substantive grant of power. In sections 909, 910, 911, he builds up what seems to be an impregnable wall of logic, and in sections 912 and 913, et seq., he seeks to batter down the wall he has builded. The two arguments must be read carefully together to see their inconsistency. In the second, he refuses to recognize the principles of his first argument and ruthlessly "bastardizes his own issue." See his language in section 913:

"It is no sufficient answer to say that the clause ought to be regarded, merely as containing 'general terms explained and limited by the subjoined specifications and therefore requiring no critical attention, or studied precaution' (President Madison's letter to Mr. Stevenson, November 27, 1830); because it is assuming the very point in controversy, to assert that the clause in connected with any subsequent specifications."

Here he asserts that there is no connection between the clause "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare" and the subsequent grants of power in the same sentence. Turn to section 910 and read what he says:

"Shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogther from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any signification? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power?"

Here he frankly states that every part of a sentence must be construed with other parts to secure a reasonable meaning, and that the words, "common defense and general welfare" are connected with every part of this sentence, with every specific grant of power; while in section 913 he claims that they are connected only with the first clause.

Again, he says in section 913:

"It is not said to 'provide for the common defense and general welfare in manner following, viz,' which would be the natural expression to indicate such an intention. But it stands entirely disconnected from every subsequent clause, both in sense and punctuation, and is no more a part of them than they are of the power to lay taxes."

In this he is asserting, again, that there is no connection between these specific grants of power in this whole sentence, involving the whole of section 8, though he has based his argument against the Hamiltonian claim upon the fact that the words "the common defense and general welfare" must be considered in relation to every part of the sentence for its proper construction. Section 8 of Article I constitutes one sentence. The 18 grants of power are distinct and separate, and the words in the first clause, "the common defense and general welfare," he says in his first argument, must be construed with reference to the whole sentence. The clauses are "distinct as the billows," but the sentence is "one as the sea." It is seen in this last quotation, also, that the learned judge claims that the omission of the words "in the manner following, viz," following these words in clause 1, is fatal to our pretenses. In section 910 he uses this language:

"Nothing is more natural or common than first to use a general phrase and then to qualify it by a recital of particulars."

He does not say here that it is usual to follow it by a videlicet, as follows, or in manner following, to wit.

A simple example will serve to clarify this question. Here is a contract which reads:

"This contract between William Johnston and Warren Grice, of the city of Macon, Ga., witnesseth:

"That said Johnston agrees to build for the said Grice a large, commodious, and convenient residence on a specific lot in said city of the best material in all respects; the house to contain 10 rooms, of which 6 are to be bedrooms, a dining room, parlor, kitchen, and pantry, and 4 bathrooms, three upstairs and one downstairs; the dining room to be 20 by 30 feet in dimensions, of oak floor; the parlor to be 25 by 35 feet, of maple floor; and on his part said Grice agrees to pay said Johnston, on the completion of the building, the sum of $25,000."

Under this contract Johnston has agreed to build for Grice "a large, commodious, and convenient house of the best material in all respects" in the first clause of the contract; but this clause has been modified by subsequent enumerations which explain what is meant by "a large, commodious, and convenient house." Can Johnston meet the demands of this contract by building Grice a house with a dining room 15 by 20 feet, a parlor 20 by 20 feet, with 8 instead of 6 bedrooms, and with 2 instead of 4 bathrooms, with dining-room floor of North Carolina pine and the parlor floor of oak? Is it not perfectly clear, under the proper construction of the contract, that the unlimited discretion conveyed in the words "a large, commodious, and convenient house, of the best materials in all respects," is explained and modified by the subsequent words giving the number and size of rooms, character of floors, and so forth? The real meaning of this contract is that Johnston has agreed to build Grice a house with a certain number of rooms; certain number of bathrooms, with the floors of the rooms specified of certain material, the size of each clearly indicated, and that when this is done the house will be regarded by Grice as "a large, commodious, and convenient house." In other words, the specific enumerations constitute the real contract, and the words in the first clause are merely words of general import. And so "the common defense and general welfare "are explained in their meaning by the enumerated clauses that follow in the same sentence.

IV

In discussing the argument made by his opponents that these words were merely general terms, that were explained by the subsequent specific enumerations of grants of power, each involving and being a part of the common defense or general welfare of the United States, Judge Story says in section 912:

"But there is a fundamental objection to the interpretation thus attempted to be maintained, which is, that it robs the clause of all efficacy and meaning. No person has a right to assume that any part of the Constitution is useless, or is without a meaning; and a fortiori no person has a right to rob any part of a meaning, natural and appropriate to the language in the connection in which it stands."

Now, it may be admitted that these words would have a natural and appropriate meaning as a qualification or limitation on the taxing power if this first clause was a complete sentence, but it is only one clause of a sentence of 18 clauses, and his argument heretofore, as I have shown, is that these words have a relation to every part of this sentence and must be considered in the construction of each clause of the sentence, and hence the error of his assumption.

But Judge Story also assumes that there must be a limitation on the taxing power in the Constitution in order to reach his conclusion; but why should there be? His assumption of such necessity is to "force the answer," as the children used to say at school when they lacked a link to make the solution of their problem complete. Suppose the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" had been omitted from this clause—and they were not put in the clause until September 4—would there have been no limitation on the taxing power? It is recognized by all authorities that the taxing power of a government, without special limitation or specification, extends only to the execution of the functions or powers of that government. Judge Miller, in Loan Association *v.* Topeka (20 Wall. 655), has laid down this principle as to our own Government, declaring that all taxation must be for public purposes—i. e., to carry out the powers granted to the Government—and the syllabus of the case (5) says:

"Among these is the limitation of the right of taxation, that it can only be used in aid of a public object, an object which is within the purpose for which governments are established."

Judge Cooley (Cooley on Taxation, 2d edition, p. 110) says on this subject:

"GENERAL EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT

"Every government must provide for its general expenses by taxation, and in these are to be included the cost of making provision for those public needs or conveniences for which by express law or general usage it devolves upon the particular government to supply. As regards the Federal Government, a general outline of these is to be found in the Federal Constitution. That Government is charged with the common defense of the Union, and for that defense it may raise and support armies, create and maintain a navy, build forts and arsenals, construct military roads, etc. It has a like power over the general subject of post offices, post roads, and over other subjects enumerated in the Federal Constitution and subjected to its authority. It may contract debts and must provide for their payment. For all national purposes it may levy taxes, and its power in so doing to select the subjects of taxation and to determine the rate and the methods is as full and complete as can exist in any sovereignty whatsoever, with the exceptions which are provided by the Constitution itself."

So that if these words had never been put into Article I, section 8, clause 1, the taxing power would have been limited to carrying out the powers granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government and no other. But the framers of the Constitution left this matter in no doubt, for the eighteenth clause of this section 8, after enumerating one by one 17 grants of power, reads:

"The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

This coefficient clause therefore constitutes the constitutional limitation on the taxing power of Congress; but any law passed by Congress to carry out an express grant must be necessary and bona fide appropriate to the end. So Congress, desiring to carry out some regulation of commerce that requires an appropriation, may by law appropriate money for it under this coefficient clause, for the end is legitimate and the appropriation is bona fide appropriate to the end.

So as to every other grant of power to Congress that may require money.

And so we find that Judge Story's interpretation that these words constitute a natural and appropriate limitation on the power to lay taxes is useless and unnecessary, as the true interpretation is supplied by the Constitution itself in the coefficient clause, which gives to Congress in the disposition of money raised by taxation the right to dispose of it wherever necessary and wherever bona fide appropriate to carry out a power granted by the Constitution to the Congress. Why, then, should Judge Story supply an interpretation which the Constitution itself clearly supplies? Why provide a limitation upon the taxing power when the Constitution itself has clearly provided it in this eighteenth clause, known as the coefficient clause?

V

But it is clear that these words do not constitute a limitation upon the taxing power of Congress as contended by Judge Story but an expansion of its taxing power, as will be shown. If these words had been omitted, the limitation upon the taxing power supplied to Congress in the coefficient clause limits Congress in its appropriations to "the foregoing powers," that is, the enumerated national powers; whereas, under Judge Story's construction, that slight limitation is brushed aside; and wherever sympathy, or emotion, or the political bias of Congress may conclude that an appropriation will be for the general welfare, whether it be to carry out a national power, a local power, or a power exclusively in the States, Congress may do it; a power as broad as the boundless seas and as infinite as the firmament, embracing the whole field of human desires and human cupidity, with no guide but its own will; with no restraint but its own discretions; with no Constitution but its own fiat, and no law but its own power.

The proposition of Mr. Hamilton would have given Congress unlimited power to create receptacles and then fill them up with appropriations from the Treasury. Judge Story stoutly denies such power as intended to be given in the Constitution, but claims the power in Congress to appropriate money to any persons, associations, or corporations if in their opinion it would conduce to the general welfare of the people. Under this view the courts are without power to obstruct any such measure, as it is to be left to Congress alone to determine and not the courts. Judge Story denies that the Hamiltonian claim could be sound because it would make of the Government one of unlimited powers, which he says, as we have seen, was never intended by the convention; but if Congress is without restraint in selecting objects of appropriation, and the tax power is likewise unlimited, is it not apparent that the union of these two unlimited powers in Congress creates a government of unlimited power? The roads may be different that lead to the same end, but if the end, a government of unlimited power, which Judge Story well says was never intended be the same, his construction must be rejected, as it leads inevitably to the same result, if not to a worse result.

But Judge Story's construction of these words as a limitation of the taxing power of Congress is subject to a fatal objection for another reason. The general welfare of the United States is made up of the welfare of the people in the several States, in relation to some particular object. Now, while this object may permeate the whole country in the welfare of the people it may be a subject which, under the Constitution, must be regulated by the States and therefore denied to the Federal Government, for it is well known that Congress can legislate only under the powers granted to it, while all else, under the tenth amendment, is left to the several States for their determination. So that the general welfare may be, and often is, claimed in a subject which is confessedly within the power of the States alone to control. If the special general welfare sought to be obtained is included in the power to regulate commerce, or establish post offices or post roads, or any of the granted powers, Congress clearly has the power to appropriate for it under the coefficient clause but not under the general welfare clause; but if the object should be education, or maternity, or vocational rehabilitation, or any other subject under the exclusive control of the States it must be denied, as Congress has no power to control those subjects.

If, therefore, the object selected by the Congress for legislation under the general welfare is under the Constitution subject to the control of the States, Congress has no power to legislate or to appropriate money for such object, for if the Constitution gives the power over this subject to the States, of course the act of Congress is void. Take, for instance, the proposed educational bill, the subject of which under the Constitution is reserved to the States for their determination; in a case of this character it may well be that the general welfare of the United States would be promoted by the education of every child in every State in the Union, but since the States alone have the power to control education, Congress, of course, can not assume that duty. The tenth amendment settles this question. Judge Marshall's statement in Gibbon *v.* Ogden can not be repeated too often. It stands as the irrefutable argument against the doctrine of appropriating money for the general welfare of the United States. In Gibbon *v.* Ogden, in discussing the powers of taxation, the power belonging to the States and the Federal Government alike, he uses this language:

"Congress is authorized to lay and collect taxes, to pay debts, etc. This does not interfere with the power of the States to tax for the support of their own governments, nor is the exercise of that power by the States the exercise of any portion that is granted to the United States.

"In imposing taxes for State purposes they are not doing what Congress is empowered to do.

"Congress is not empowered to tax for those purposes which are within the exclusive power of the States."

And what purposes or objects are within the exclusive power of the States? Everything except those granted to Congress in the Constitution. This simple statement of the great Chief Justice, who did more to expound the Constitution than any man who ever sat upon the Supreme bench, is the complete and final answer to the absurd claim of the existence of a general-welfare clause, under which, it is claimed, Congress can appropriate money for any cause that they may deem for the general welfare of the people of the United States.

This clear, succinct statement of the great Chief Justice was followed by Mr. Justice Wayne in delivering the unanimous opinion of the court (1842) in the case of Dobbins *v.* The Commissioners of Erie County (16 Peters, pp. 448, 449) where he says:

"The revenue of the United States is intended by the Constitution to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; to be expended, in particular, in carrying into effect the laws made to execute all the express powers, 'and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.'"

It is interesting to note that Judge Story was one of the judges who concurred in this unanimous opinion of the court rendered in 1842 by Justice Wayne, and it may properly be construed as the mature judgment of that great jurist, to which he had come in the later years of his life and which is in such contrast with the views expressed by him in his Commentaries, which were published to the country some nine years before, where he upholds the power of Congress to appropriate for any purpose which they themselves may deem for the good of the people of the country.

Chief Justice Chase delivering the opinion of the court in the case of Veazie Bank *v.* Fenno (8 Wall., 541, U. S. Rept.; 75 U. S. Rept. 541), after discussing the full and ample power of taxation given to Congress by the Constitution, follows Chief Justice Marshall by declaring:

"There are, indeed, certain virtual limitations arising from the principles of the Constitution itself. It would undoubtedly be an abuse of the power if so exercised as to impair the separate existence and independent self-government of the States, or if exercised for ends inconsistent with the limited grants of power in the Constitution."

Could language be clearer or stronger?

As applicable in a general way to this question the vigorous discussion of Chief Justice Taft of the power and objects of taxation by the Federal Government, as set forth in his opinion in the child-labor tax case (359 U. S., p. 38–39), may be consulted with interest.

The above cases show that Chief Justice Marshall's statement was indorsed by Chief Justice Taney and Chief Justice Chase. Three Chief Justices of the Supreme Court who, if not the greatest who ever sat on that bench, at least may rest secure in the fact that no greater can successfully be mentioned; three judges than whom no greater ever deserved the wreath of immortality; and to these must be added the names of those who concurred with Justice Wayne in the case of Dobbins *v.* The Commissioners of Erie County, supra. They were, in addition to Chief Justice Taney, Justices Story, Thompson, McLean, Baldwin, Catron, McKinley, and Peter V. Daniel, and those also who concurred with Chief Justice Chase in Veazie *v.* Fenno, supra, namely, Swayne, Miller, Field, Grier, and Clifford; a marvelous array of the brightest luminaries in the whole scope of our judicial history. Judge Story's concurrence in Chief Justice Chase's statement that "the revenue of the United States is intended by the Constitution * * * to be expended, in particulars, in carrying into effect the laws made to execute all the express powers" of the Government deserves a passing notice, for it reflects the high judicial character of that great judge who has enjoyed the reputation with the bar of the United States of being one of the most learned men who ever sat upon that bench. His commentaries on the Constitution, in course of preparation for years, were finally given to the public in 1833. His views on this subject I have given in this address and have sought to controvert his conclusions.

The Madison papers, the most complete compendium of the Constitution, were not printed until 1840. They were, therefore, not available to Story, the commentator, in 1833, but were open to Story, the judge, in 1842, when this opinion was delivered, and with a judicial instinct worthy of Chief Justice Chase, who, as statesman, created the legal-tender notes in order to save his country, but as judge was compelled to deny their validity to compel a creditor to take from his debtor less than he had received, Judge Story, with equal courage, was not afraid or ashamed to renounce his former opinions when he found them based on error.

Judge Story's conclusion that these words, "common defense and general welfare," are simply a limitation upon the taxing power of the Government while denying to them any constructive power, results in this anomalous condition, that the Federal Government, under these words, can construct or create no instrumentality unless the power be granted in the Constitution, but may yet appropriate the money raised by taxation to such organization constructed by the States or other power; that is, that while the Congress could not create a university in every State, it would have the power, if in its opinion it was for the "general welfare," to appropriate money to run them after being established by the States.

But an analysis of these words will show that this can not be admitted, for look again at these words critically—"to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Note the words in this phrase, "of the United States." Why were they inserted? Suppose this clause read:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, etc., * * * to pay the debts * * * of the United States."

What is the meaning of the words "United States" in that clause? Would it mean to pay the debts of the people of the United States or pay the debts of the Government of the United States? The words "the people" are omitted, and in this form clearly it would mean the debts of the United States Government. The words "United States" would therefore mean the Government of the United States, under the Constitution. Now, supply the omitted words in the above paragraph, "and provide for the common defense and general welfare"; must not the words "United States" mean the same as to both the payment of debts and common defense and general welfare? They are connected by the conjunction "and." So that this careful examination of the sentence shows beyond question that the common defense and general welfare contemplated was not that of the people of the United States but of the Government of the United States, and therefore, when under this construction, an appropriation of $100,000,000 is asked for out of the Treasury, to be applied to education in the States, there is no authority for it even under this supposed general-welfare clause, because it specifically declares that the debts to be paid and the welfare to be secured are not those of the people of the United States but of the Government of the United States. We find this view powerfully confirmed in an address of Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, a scholarly student of the Constitution, delivered before the Georgetown University Law School in February, 1886.

[From the American Bar Association Journal, August, 1927, page 465]

II

IS CONGRESS OR THE CONSTITUTION THE INTERPRETER OF THE WORDS "THE COMMON DEFENSE AND GENERAL WELFARE OF THE UNITED STATES"?—DANGEROUS UNION OF POWERS IN CONGRESS RESULTS FROM JUDGE STORY'S VIEW—EMINENT AUTHORITIES OPPOSED TO HIS POSITION—THE PROPER CONSTRUCTION—WHY THE WORDS WERE INCORPORATED

VI

If Judge Story's interpretation of this clause be admitted, namely, that these words are merely limitations on the taxing power of Congress, the real difficulty is still left unsolved, for he assumes, once it is granted that they are merely words of limitation on the taxing power, that Congress is clothed with the power of determining what is the common defense and general welfare. But this is mere assumption. If no definition or description of these words is found in the Constitution, and if the Constitution failed to give their meaning, there might be some reason to adopt his suggestion; but if there be a reasonable construction of the Constitution defining these words, why should that reasonable construction be set aside to give to Congress an unlimited control over the whole Government, which Judge Story has so eloquently decried? What is the common defense? What is the general welfare of the United States? Who is to determine this common defense and general welfare? What authority, under the Constitution, has the power to say what objects come within these two terms? If taxation can be had legitimately to meet the demands of these two extensive terms where shall taxation end? What are its limits? If the objects to which taxation can be applied are unlimited, then the union of the power of taxation with the power of determining the objects to which it may be applied constitute the most tremendous engine of oppression of a free people ever conceived of by the ingenuity of man. Yet, Judge Story assumes that Congress has the power to determine what is the common defense and what is the general welfare of the United States, and that when Congress has determined that a certain object is for the common defense or the general welfare, it may appropriate the tax money which it is authorized to levy, for that purpose. This unites in Congress two great powers, dangerous because unlimited, the one to select the objects of its favor, and the other the power to appropriate money from the Treasury for such objects.

The unlimited power to tax and the unlimited power to determine their benefactions, are, by Judge Story, united in the Congress, and yet Judge Story (sec. 909) affirms that this Government was intended to be a Government of limited powers only. The relief from this illogical impasse, into which the learned judge would drive us, is found in the simple examination of Article I, section 8, clause 1, and the 17 succeeding clauses, constituting the whole sentence. The manner in which this article was considered and adopted in the convention, the care with which each grant was discussed and adopted, constituting the limitations on the powers of Congress, show conclusively that no one power, which could submerge all other powers, was ever intended by the framers of the Constitution.

A close examination of this first clause and the relation of the words "to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" to the whole sentence will result in clarifying the situation. Clearness often follows confusion in construing a sentence by changing the location of its paragraphs, not the words, and will often bring out the real meaning of a sentence which seemed cloudy and uncertain. Judge Story says in order properly to understand this clause, the words "in order to" should be inserted before the words "to pay the debts" (sec. 969); and as we are considering merely the phrase "the common defense and general welfare," we will omit the words "to pay the debts" in the changes suggested below of clause 1 of this section. By a change of the collocation of the paragraphs, without the change of words or punctuation, clause 1 of section 8 above would read:

"The Congress (in order to) provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Under this arrangement, the first, second, third, fourth, and so on down through the 18 clauses would read as follows:

"The Congress * * * (in order to) provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States shall have power to borrow money on the credit of the United States."

The third clause:

"The Congress * * * (in order to) provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, etc."

The fourth clause:

"The Congress * * * (in order to) provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, etc."

And so on through all of the 18 clauses. This form of the sentence, which involves no change in the paragraphs or words or punctuation of these clauses as adopted by the convention on the 4th of September, and which is now in the Constitution of the United States, shows conclusively that the object of the framers of this clause was to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by giving Congress the powers granted in the 18 enumerated powers.

Four men of great eminence have shown that the 18 specific grants of power in this sentence constitutes the whole of section 8 constituted the general welfare which the Federal convention had determined to be necessary for the Government of the United States, and no more.

Judge Cooley in his Constitutional Limitations, page 11, says:

"The general purpose of the Constitution of the United States is declared by its founders (in the preamble of the Constitution) to be 'to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity.' To accomplish these purposes, the Congress is empowered by the 8th section of Article I:

"(1) To lay and collect taxes," etc.

"(2) To borrow money," etc.

"(3) To regulate commerce," etc., etc.

enumerating the 17 specific grants of power in this section. (See also the same author, Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, pp. 11 and 106.) Here Judge Cooley first quotes the preamble of the Constitution, which declares that one of the objects for the formation of the Government is to provide for the common defense and general welfare, and adds the significant words that the Constitution has provided a means for accomplishing that by the Federal Government, and that is by laying taxes, borrowing money, regulating commerce, and adopting the 17 specific grants as that "common defense" and that "general welfare" which the convention concluded was sufficient for the purpose.

James Wilson, a member of the Federal Convention, afterwards on the Supreme Court of the United States, has indorsed this view most strongly (Wilson's Works, Andrews, Vol. II, pp. 56–59):

"Once more, at this time: The National Government was intended to 'promote the general welfare.' For this reason Congress has power to regulate commerce with the Indians and with foreign nations and to promote the progress of science and of useful arts by securing for a time to authors and inventors an exclusive right to their compositions and discoveries.

"An exclusive property in places fit for forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings, and an exclusive legislation

over these places, and also for a convenient distance, over such district as may become the seats of the National Government—such exclusive property and such exclusive legislation will be of great public utility, perhaps of evident public necessity. They are therefore vested in Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

"For the exercise of the foregoing powers and for the accomplishment of the foregoing purpose, a revenue is unquestionably indispensable. That Congress may be enabled to exercise and accomplish them, it has power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

"The powers of Congress are, indeed, enumerated; but it was intended that those powers thus enumerated should be effectual and not nugatory. In conformity to this consistent mode of thinking and acting Congress has power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution every power vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any of its officers or departments."

The learned judge gives no hint in this statement that the "general welfare" was anything more than a description of those powers which were subsequently enumerated in the Constitution. There is not an intimation in his statement that Congress has any other power than those which are enumerated, and that the words "to provide for the general welfare" are merely a general description of that welfare, which is to be accomplished by carrying out certain enumerated powers.

Hon. Benjamin J. Sage, of New Orleans, some years ago published a remarkable book entitled "The Republic of Republics." It is a wonderful repository of most interesting criticism and commentaries on the Constitution. In discussing this question he affirms what has already been stated, that oftentimes the meaning of a sentence may be clarified by changing the collocation of the clause without the change of the words or punctuation, and adopting this method he arrives at the same result which Judge Cooley and Judge Wilson have arrived at, and he says that this section with those changes would read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Congress (in order to) pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, shall have power—

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;

"To borrow money;

"To regulate commerce"; etc.,

and so on, continuing through the 17 grants of power.

Mr. Otis, of Massachusetts, in the Fifth Congress (see Annals of Congress, 1797–1799, vol. 8, p. 1986) indorses the same view in the following language:

"Mr. O. agreed that the construction was just which the gentleman put upon the first article of the eighth section of the Constitution, and that to provide for the common defense and general welfare was the end of the powers recited in the first part of that section, and that the powers were merely the means. But this is equally the end of all the other powers given to Congress by all the articles of this section, so that these words might with propriety be understood as if they were added to every clause in it, and thus from the whole section it appears clear that Congress has a right to make war for the common defense and general welfare, and, of course, to do everything which is necessary to prepare for such a state."

IN CONCLUSION

The interested investigator into the meaning of this phrase, injected between the first specific grant of power to Congress and a limitation upon that grant (which of itself is conclusive against any grant of a substantive power, as claimed by the Hamiltonians), can not fail to inquire why these words were incorporated into this first clause on the 4th of September, 1787, only 11 days before the Constitution was adopted, after the convention on the 6th of August had adopted the Pinckney plan on this subject without these words. And especially is this inquiry most pertinent in reference to the words "to pay the debts," for without these words we have shown that the power of Congress to pay the future debts of the Government of the United States was already secured in the coefficient clause, and the old debts of the Government were secured in a subsequent clause of the Constitution. The answer is to be found in a fact which was thoroughly demonstrated in the discussions in the convention, showing an intense and determined feeling on the part of its members that there should be no doubt as to the integrity of the new Government, in its obligations to its creditors. Repudiation was rampant throughout the country; States were passing laws to repudiate their debts to foreign creditors, and this feeling and spirit pervaded the whole country; and a number of propositions had been offered and passed during the proceedings of the convention emphasizing the duty of the payment of the debts of the United States; and the founders of this great Republic were determined that the integrity of the new Government should never be questioned and that this should be made clear in the organic act. In response to this feeling these words "to pay the debts" were determined upon, and they were inserted, naturally and suitably, after the power "to lay and collect taxes." But when that was done, see the effect of it. The clause then would read:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Such a provision might have been construed as giving Congress the power to lay and collect taxes to pay the debts, and only for that purpose; what was to become of the other 17 grants of power that needed money to carry them out? What about commerce, post offices, post roads, if the expression "to pay the debts" had been left alone in the clause? Expressio unius exclusio est alterius. Such a form, to say the least, might have endangered the right of Congress to appropriate to the other specific grants of power. So some words had to be added to those "to pay the debts" that would make clear the power of Congress to appropriate for all Federal purposes, as set forth in the subsequent enumerated grants. What should those words be? Three times in two days, on the 22d and 23d of August, the convention indorsed a resolution of this nature: That the Congress should "fulfill the engagements and discharge the debts of the United States." What engagements had the United States? They are chiefly specified in the 18 specific grants in the Pinckney plan finally adopted August 16. Do not the words "fulfill the engagements" interpret the meaning of "common defense and general welfare"? Are not those the only engagements of the Government of the United States? Undoubtedly, having determined for the honor of their country that there should be an express provision to pay the debts some other words would have to be supplied to save to the Congress the right to carry out the grants of power to Congress thereinafter enumerated, and to show that its power to appropriate money was not confined alone to the payment of the debts. What should these additional words be? They selected these words: "To provide for the common defense and general welfare" as they embraced all the subsequent grants of power which the convention had already determined should constitute that amount of common defense and of general welfare which the Federal Government ought to control; and being merely words of general import and without power in the Articles of Confederation from which they came, brought with them to the Constitution of the United States the same innocuous character.

Now follow the steps in their adoption.

On the 31st of August, on motion of Mr. Sherman, a committee of 11 was appointed, 1 from each State, to whom was referred "such parts of the Constitution as have been postponed and such parts of reports as have been acted on." This committee consisted of Gilman of New Hampshire, Rufus King of Massachusetts, Roger Sherman of Connecticut, Brearly of New Jersey, Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania, Dickinson of Delaware, Carroll of Maryland, Madison of Virginia, Williamson of North Carolina, Pierce Butler of South Carolina, and Abraham Baldwin of Georgia. All except Morris and Brearly had served in the Continental Congress, and were familiar, therefore, with the Articles of Confederation, and the lack of power of the words in these articles.

On the 4th of September they reported that clause 1 of section 1, Article VII, of the Pinckney plan should read:

"The Legislature shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

And the claim is made by the followers of Mr. Hamilton that these words constitute a substantive grant of power to Congress to pass all and any laws affecting the general welfare of the people of the United States; and while Judge Story, in a luminous argument shows such a claim to be preposterous, he claims that, under these words, Congress may make appropriations for any object which in their judgment they may believe to be for the common defense or general welfare of the people of the United States, i. e., that Congress can appropriate money to an institution that it is denied the power to create. The question, therefore, is brought sharply to this issue: Did the men constituting this committee intend, by the insertion of these words, to destroy the Pinckney plan containing only specific grants of power to Congress, which had been passed unanimously by the convention without a single negative vote on the 6th of August previously? An examination of this committee will show that the majority of them could never have agreed to any such proposition. The known sentiments of at least seven of them, and probably nine, show conclusively that their insertion of these words was never considered by them as authorizing the construction put upon them by the Hamiltonians, or by the learned Judge Story. Among this number, Mr. Madison stands out preeminently as having shown and demonstrated beyond question that these words did not have, and could not have, such meaning. The evidence of their positions may be gathered from several sources.

Mr. Abraham Baldwin, a member of this committee, on June 17, 1798, as a Member of Congress, uses this language:

"That part of the first article of the eighth section, which declares 'Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States' had never been considered as a source of legislative power, as it is only a member introduced to limit the other parts of the sentence, and not of itself a substantive power,

as will be seen by recurring to the words of the first sentence of the eighth section."

On the 16th of July, in the convention, Mr. Pierce Butler, also a member of this committee, and Mr. Gorham, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, were participants in a debate in the convention which showed Mr. Butler was favorable to specific grants of power to Congress, and was objecting to general and indefinite grants that were suggested. But there was one gentleman on the committee, Mr. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, who knew that these words as reported by the committee were the death knell to the proposition of Mr. Hamilton, as may be seen from the following incident.

Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, was one of the most distinguished men of his day. On the 16th of June, 1798, as a Member of Congress, he made a speech on this clause, in which he said:

"He (Gallatin) was well informed that these words had originally been inserted in the Constitution as a limitation to the power of laying taxes. After the limitation had been agreed to, and the Constitution was completed, a member of the convention (he was one of the members who represented the State of Pennsylvania), being one of a committee of revisal and arrangement, attempted to throw these words into a distinct paragraph, so as to create not a limitation, but a distinct power. The trick, however, was discovered by a member from Connecticut, now deceased, and the words restored as they now stand. So that Mr. Gallatin said, whether he referred to the Constitution itself, to the most able defenders of it, or to the State conventions, the only rational construction which could be given to that clause was that it was a limitation and not an extension of powers." (U. S. Annals of Congress, 5th Cong., 1797–99, vol. 8, p. 1796.)

For confirmation of the above see the Framing of the Constitution, Max Farrand, page 182.

It is of interest to note that Abraham Baldwin, a member of this committee, was a member of the Federal Convention and a Member of the same Congress (the Fifth) that Gallatin was and engaged with him in this debate, and he doubtlessly heard Gallatin's statement, and there was no denial of it from him.

Who was the member from Pennsylvania in the convention who attempted this "trick"? It is easy to ascertain who he was. In being designated as one of a committee of revisal and arrangement in the convention we find that the member from Pennsylvania on that committee was Gouverneur Morris. And who was the member from Connecticut that discovered the "trick"? By the process of elimination this is easily discovered because Mr. Gallatin said "he is now dead." The Gallatin words were spoken in 1798. Johnson, Ellsworth, and Roger Sherman were the members of the convention from Connecticut. Johnson and Sherman died after 1800 and Roger Sherman died in 1793; and Roger Sherman, who detected this "trick," was a member of this committee of 11 that brought in this report, and, having prevented Morris from making the change by throwing these words into a distinct paragraph, it showed first that Sherman was opposed to the unlimited power attempted to be given to these words by Morris's "trick," and, second, that Morris was trying to make the change to carry out Hamilton's idea, because the clause as adopted September 4 was fatal to Hamilton's desire for unlimited powers.

This "trick," described by Mr. Gallatin as attempted by Gouverneur Morris, arose out of the fact that on the 8th of September the convention appointed a committee "of five to revise the style and arrange the articles agreed to by the House." The committee was composed of Samuel Johnson, Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, Madison, and King, and on the 12th of September that committee made its report, and article 1, section 8, appears as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Congress may, by joint ballot, appoint a treasurer. They shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;

"To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

"To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes," etc. (Journal of Federal Convention, Boston, 1819.)

Had the Constitution been ratified in that form there would be considerable ground for asserting that it contained the Hamiltonian idea of unlimited power, for here these words are taken from a dependent position in the first clause of section 8 as a part of it, and have no relation to the power of taxation as set forth in that clause, and are entirely divorced from this clause, and by their location are made an independent, separate clause, and becomes one of the substantive grants of power to Congress, just as the other 17 grants in this sentence.

This report, made by the committee on style, was made to the convention on September 12. The Constitution was voted on and adopted by the convention on the 15th of September, but between those two dates the Journal makes no further mention of it, and there is no other reference to it in the Journal; but when the Constitution appeared as finally signed by the members this clause was unchanged and was in the exact form adopted by the convention on the 4th of September. The attempt to change it had failed. This committee on style, in the dying hours of the convention that proposed this Hamiltonian power for Congress, which had been rejected five times before this by the convention, has an unknown genesis—unless it may be found in Roger Sherman's discovery—and its paternity is also unknown, for its proponent in the convention (September 8) is not given in the Journal, but only the featureless words "It was moved and seconded." Who was the mover of the resolution? And what was the necessity for the committee? Three of its members (Morris, Madison, and King) were all members of the committee of 11, 1 from each State, appointed August 31, that had large and complete powers to deal not only with what already had been acted upon but what might yet be considered by the convention. This much, at least, is known: That a majority of the five were Hamiltonians, and the failure of their report, presented on the 12th of September, on this section was the expiring gasp of centralized power at its failure to incorporate imperial power in the Constitution of the United States.

Another evidence of the views of this committee is to be gathered by the statement made by Luther Martin, one of the greatest figures in the convention, who, on his return home, addressed the Maryland Legislature, giving an account of the convention. In it he said there were three parties in the convention; first, the Hamiltonians, who desired to annihilate the States and establish a government of a monarchial nature; secondly, those who were opposed to the abolition of the States and the adoption of a monarchial government, but who wished for greater powers for the great States in the Union; and third, "was what I consider truly Federal and Republican; this party was nearly equal in number with the other two and was composed of the delegations from Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and in part from Maryland; also of some individuals from other representations."

On this committee of 11 were Mr. Sherman from Connecticut, Mr. Brearly from New Jersey, Mr. Dickinson from Delaware, and Mr. Carroll from Maryland.

Professor Beard, in his book Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy, page 35, says of Abraham Baldwin:

"Baldwin was in the opposition from the beginning and remained a consistent Republican until his death."

Mr. Jefferson said of John Dickinson, of Delaware, that he was "an orthodox advocate of the true principles of our new Government. (Jefferson's Works (Washington ed.), Vol. V, p. 249.)

In the Framing of the Constitution, by Max Farrand, page 81, he mentions a number of the members of the convention who advocated a strong National Government and those who were opposed to such, among the latter, he names Sherman, Brearly, Dickinson, and Butler.

The position of Hugh Williamson, of North Carolina, a member of the committee of 11 might well be determined alone by the position of North Carolina in refusing to ratify the Constitution for two years because of the need of amendments. As a member of the second North Carolina convention called to ratify the Constitution his position is more clearly seen by a motion made by him to ratify the Constitution as concluded at Philadelphia September 17, 1787. As the Constitution contained when passed the exact form of this section and clause recommended by the committee of 11 on the 4th of September, the conclusion is final that he favored that form. (See North Carolina State Records, vol. 22, p. 41, Raleigh, 1907.)

Thus we find in our conclusion that there is no general welfare clause in the Constitution; that the power of Congress to legislate for every object which, in their opinion, might be for the benefit of the people, pressed by Mr. Hamilton in the convention, was six times, directly or indirectly, rejected by that body; and in spite of that his followers have sought to construe these words as meaning what the authors of the Constitution had six times successively rejected; while Judge Story's construction lands us in the same morass, a government of unlimited power, though he reaches it by a different road.

These facts show that a large majority of the committee of 11 that reported these words to be incorporated into the first clause of section 8, Article I, were strongly opposed to the views of Mr. Hamilton and those of Judge Story that lead to the same end, though by different routes, a government of unlimited powers!

In support of our views we present a long catalogue of distinguished statesmen, judges, and authors, who sustain our position:

Primus inter pares, Chief Justice Marshall in McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316.

Gibbons *v.* Ogden, 9th Wheat. 1.

Virginia Constitutional Convention. 1829–30, on the militia.

Judge Brewer in Kansas *v.* Colorado, 206 U. S. 89, and Fairbanks *v.* United States, 181 U. S.

Judge Miller in Loan Association *v.* Topeka, 20 Wall., 655.

Judge Miller on the Constitution, page 229, note 2.

Mr. Madison, Resolutions of 1798.

Mr. Madison's message, May 4, 1822.

Federalist, No. 41.

Veto message, March 3, 1817.

Letter of Madison to Andrew Stevenson.

Supplement to letter to Andrew Stevenson. (Writings of James Madison, by Gaillard Hunt, Vol. IX, p. 424.)

Cooley on Taxation, second edition, page 110.

Cooley, Constitutional Limitations, pages 11 and 106.

Willoughby on the Constitution, volume 1, page 40.

James Wilson (Wilson's Works—Andrews—vol. 2, pp. 56–59).

John C. Calhoun, February 20, 1837, United States Senate (Works of Calhoun, Vol. III, p. 36).

Mr. Jefferson on power of Congress to establish Bank of the United States, February 15, 1791.

Letter to Judge Spencer Roane, October 12, 1815 (Works of Jefferson, by Paul Leicester Ford, 1905, Vol. XI, p. 489).

Von Holst, a strong Federalist, Constitutional Law of the United States, page 118.

Chief Justice Taney in Dobbins *v.* Commissioners of Erie County (16 Peters, 448–449).

Chief Justice Chase in Veagy *v.* Feano (8 Wall. 541).

Hare, American Constitutional Law, volume 1, pages 242–243.

William A. Duer, Constitutional Jurisprudence, second edition, page 211.

Grover Cleveland, veto message to the House of Representatives, making appropriations for drought-stricken counties in the Southwest.

B. J. Sage in Republic of Republics.

Calvin Coolidge, addresses of, Budget meeting January 21, 1924, and annual message, December 8, 1925.

Tucker on the Constitution, Volume I, pages 477, 478–480.

And who upholds the opposite view? Judge Story and Pomeroy? Where lies the weight of authority?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, December 15, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1927

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Henry L. Stimson, of New York, to be Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George T. McDermott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge, district of Kansas, vice John C. Pollock, retired.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Luther Cadwell to be postmaster at Holbrook, Ariz., in place of Luther Cadwell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Leonard D. Redfield to be postmaster at Benson, Ariz., in place of L. D. Redfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

ARKANSAS

Stella I. Winn to be postmaster at Winslow, Ark., in place of S. I. Winn. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nona E. Robertson to be postmaster at Thornton, Ark., in place of N. E. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edwin S. Thompson to be postmaster at Springdale, Ark., in place of E. S. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James H. Ward to be postmaster at Quitman, Ark., in place of J. H. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank Weldin to be postmaster at Piggott, Ark., in place of Frank Weldin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ned P. Atkin to be postmaster at Parkdale, Ark., in place of N. P. Atkin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Paul Smith to be postmaster at Nettleton, Ark., in place of Paul Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Thomas A. Hunt to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of T. A. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry L. Shambarger to be postmaster at Mulberry, Ark., in place of H. L. Shambarger. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George H. C. Palmer to be postmaster at McGehee, Ark., in place of G. H. C. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles L. Jones to be postmaster at Junction City, Ark., in place of C. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Oliver A. Hill to be postmaster at Hartford, Ark., in place of O. A. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William J. Rumsey to be postmaster at Hardy, Ark., in place of W. J. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Garland S. Russell to be postmaster at Green Forest, Ark., in place of G. S. Russell. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert M. Deason to be postmaster at El Dorado, Ark., in place of R. M. Deason. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edith M. Cook to be postmaster at De Valls Bluff, Ark., in place of E. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Redford G. Miles to be postmaster at Des Arc, Ark., in place of R. G. Miles. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Kay S. Rolley to be postmaster at Crawfordville, Ark., in place of K. S. Rolley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Milton R. Stimson to be postmaster at Brinkley, Ark., in place of M. R. Stimson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Thomas T. West to be postmaster at Beebe, Ark., in place of T. T. West. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Bing Moody to be postmaster at Bald Knob, Ark., in place of Bing Moody. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Roy W. Stevens to be postmaster at Ashdown, Ark., in place of R. W. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Mary Brown to be postmaster at Alpena Pass, Ark., in place of Mary Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

COLORADO

Anna Richards to be postmaster at Ouray, Colo., in place of Anna Richards. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ellsworth A. Weller to be postmaster at New Castle, Colo., in place of E. A. Weller. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William A. Sawyer to be postmaster at Mount Morrison, Colo., in place of W. A. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

James M. Brown to be postmaster at Mancos, Colo., in place of J. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Mary E. Kendall to be postmaster at Kiowa, Colo., in place of M. E. Kendall. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lula D. Trimble to be postmaster at Georgetown, Colo., in place of L. D. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lawrence H. Dewey to be postmaster at Fruita, Colo., in place of L. H. Dewey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alexander G. Johnson to be postmaster at Fort Lupton, Colo., in place of A. G. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Newell R. Usher to be postmaster at Florence, Colo., in place of N. R. Usher. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Paul P. Huston to be postmaster at Calhan, Colo., in place of P. P. Huston. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

CONNECTICUT

Adele P. Brush to be postmaster at West Cornwall, Conn., in place of A. P. Brush. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John V. Abbott to be postmaster at Watertown, Conn., in place of J. V. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William C. Saunders to be postmaster at Waterford, Conn., in place of W. C. Saunders. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry Muir to be postmaster at Thomaston, Conn., in place of Harry Muir. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John P. McGrath to be postmaster at Southington, Conn., in place of J. P. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Walter B. Palmer to be postmaster at Sound Beach, Conn., in place of W. B. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William P. Stone to be postmaster at Salisbury, Conn., in place of W. P. Stone. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nelson E. Welch to be postmaster at Somers Conn., in place of N. E. Welch. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William C. Bushnell to be postmaster at Plantsville, Conn., in place of W. C. Bushnell. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Fred R. Alford to be postmaster at Oakville, Conn., in place of F. R. Alford. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Casper K. Bailey to be postmaster at Norwich, Conn., in place of C. K. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Cyrus I. Byington to be postmaster at Norwalk, Conn., in place of C. I. Byington. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William P. Leete to be postmaster at North Haven, Conn., in place of W. P. Leete. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Walter E. Brown to be postmaster at Naugatuck, Conn., in place of W. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Courtland C. Potter to be postmaster at Mystic, Conn., in place of C. C. Potter. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ernest F. Brown to be postmaster at Manchester, Conn., in place of E. F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

W. Burton Allen to be postmaster at Litchfield, Conn., in place of W. B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Sarah L. Ruic to be postmaster at Farmington, Conn., in place of S. L. Ruic. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Leontine M. Root to be postmaster at East Berlin, Conn., in place of L. M. Root. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Carl W. Brage to be postmaster at Darien, Conn., in place of C. W. Brage. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Henry G. Linsley to be postmaster at Branford, Conn., in place of H. G. Linsley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John W. Cook to be postmaster at Beacon Falls, Conn., in place of J. W. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

GEORGIA

Clive A. Renfree to be postmaster at Lumber City, Ga., in place of Alice Calhoun, removed.

Bennie Leviton to be postmaster at Fargo, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Charles R. Jones to be postmaster at Rossville, Ga., in place of C. R. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1927.

INDIANA

Lucille MaCurdy to be postmaster at Monon, Ind., in place of W. D. Handley, deceased.

John A. Jones to be postmaster at Marion, Ind., in place of J. A. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

IOWA

Herbert E. Hadley to be postmaster at Nevada, Iowa, in place of C. P. McCord, deceased.

James A. Smiley to be postmaster at Winfield, Iowa, in place of J. A. Smiley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jessie E. D. Palmer to be postmaster at Walnut, Iowa, in place of J. E. D. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Layton E. Brown to be postmaster at Victor, Iowa, in place of L. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Clarence A. Knaack to be postmaster at Walcott, Iowa, in place of C. A. Knaack. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lennie L. Hoffman to be postmaster at Vail, Iowa, in place of L. L. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Tabitha Yelsma to be postmaster at Ute, Iowa, in place of Tabitha Yelsma. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Dwight C. Kessler to be postmaster at University Park, Iowa, in place of D. C. Kessler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John D. Herriott to be postmaster at Stuart, Iowa, in place of J. D. Herriott. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George W. Sisler to be postmaster at Stanwood, Iowa, in place of G. W. Sisler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edward R. Bender to be postmaster at Spencer, Iowa, in place of E. R. Bender. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Walter E. Witten to be postmaster at Sloan, Iowa, in place of W. E. Witten. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lucille Brouillette to be postmaster at Salix, Iowa, in place of Lucille Brouillette. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lloyd R. Hughes to be postmaster at Sac City, Iowa, in place of L. R. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John S. Baxter to be postmaster at Red Oak, Iowa, in place of J. S. Baxter. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jo G. Milligan to be postmaster at Pulaski, Iowa, in place of J. G. Milligan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edward Oldis to be postmaster at Preston, Iowa, in place of Edward Oldis. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Maude E. Barkley to be postmaster at Pierson, Iowa, in place of M. E. Barkley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Louis F. Bousquet to be postmaster at Pella, Iowa, in place of L. F. Bousquet. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Joseph E. Crissinger to be postmaster at Oxford, Iowa, in place of J. E. Crissinger. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John B. Balkema to be postmaster at Orange City, Iowa, in place of J. B. Balkema. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Christopher C. Morris to be postmaster at Oakland, Iowa, in place of C. C. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Carl A. Wissler to be postmaster at Oakdale, Iowa, in place of C. A. Wissler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Howard L. Nickerson to be postmaster at Grundy Center, Iowa, in place of H. L. Nickerson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John C. Foster to be postmaster at Hedrick, Iowa, in place of J. C. Foster. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alphonso T. Joder to be postmaster at Hudson, Iowa, in place of A. T. Joder. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles C. Shrader to be postmaster at Iowa City, Iowa, in place of C. C. Shrader. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles W. Woodward to be postmaster at Kellogg, Iowa, in place of C. W. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Dora M. Schenken to be postmaster at Keystone, Iowa, in place of D. M. Schenken. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Emma A. Gibbs to be postmaster at Klemme, Iowa, in place of E. A. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Maurice L. Curtis to be postmaster at Knoxville, Iowa, in place of M. L. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edwin E. Starr to be postmaster at Lake Park, Iowa, in place of E. E. Starr. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edward Thaves to be postmaster at Lakota, Iowa, in place of Edward Thaves. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James J. Pruitt to be postmaster at Larchwood, Iowa, in place of J. J. Pruitt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Andrew F. Bittle to be postmaster at Lisbon, Iowa, in place of A. F. Bittle. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lambert H. Meier to be postmaster at Lowden, Iowa, in place of L. H. Meier. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Irven L. Donner to be postmaster at Malvern, Iowa, in place of I. L. Donner. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Gus E. Holmberg to be postmaster at Manning, Iowa, in place of G. E. Holmberg. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Hope C. Niemann to be postmaster at Marcus, Iowa, in place of H. C. Niemann. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harland J. Maurer to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of H. J. Maurer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Claude I. Patterson to be postmaster at Mediapolis, Iowa, in place of C. I. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William E. Males to be postmaster at Milo, Iowa, in place of W. E. Males. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Anna A. Meek to be postmaster at Minburn, Iowa, in place of A. A. Meek. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George Guyan to be postmaster at Monticello, Iowa, in place of George Guyan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles S. Rogers to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in place of C. S. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William S. McKee to be postmaster at Muscatine, Iowa, in place of W. S. McKee. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Rose M. Ward to be postmaster at Neola, Iowa, in place of R. M. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James M. Crawford to be postmaster at New London, Iowa, in place of J. M. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Roy H. Bailey to be postmaster at Newton, Iowa, in place of R. H. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alexander J. Irwin to be postmaster at New Virginia, Iowa, in place of A. J. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lanah A. Lawler to be postmaster at North English, Iowa, in place of L. A. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Marion G. McCreight to be postmaster at Greenfield, Iowa, in place of M. G. McCreight. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William Molloy, to be postmaster at Galva, Iowa, in place of William Molloy. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William L. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Glidden, Iowa, in place of W. L. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Madge Fell to be postmaster at Fremont, Iowa, in place of Madge Fell. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arthur W. Moore to be postmaster at Eldon, Iowa, in place of A. W. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Howard C. Snyder to be postmaster at Earlville, Iowa, in place of H. C. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ralph R. Ray to be postmaster at Doon, Iowa, in place of R. R. Ray. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Adam F. Deadrick to be postmaster at Dike, Iowa, in place of A. F. Deadrick. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ressie E. Scheib to be postmaster at Delmar, Iowa, in place of R. E. Scheib. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank M. Williams to be postmaster at Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of F. M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Orlean P. Riordan to be postmaster at Correctionville, Iowa, in place of O. P. Riordan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William M. Crosier to be postmaster at Coggon, Iowa, in place of W. M. Crosier. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Omar H. Brooks to be postmaster at Cleghorn, Iowa, in place of O. H. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Sue G. Cross to be postmaster at Chelsea, Iowa, in place of S. G. Cross. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lloyd Lock to be postmaster at Castana, Iowa, in place of Lloyd Lock. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John C. Erton to be postmaster at Blairsburg, Iowa, in place of J. C. Erton. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Elda Bendigkeit to be postmaster at Bennett, Iowa, in place of Elda Bendigkeit. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George L. Beeler to be postmaster at Bellevue, Iowa, in place of G. L. Beeler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Walter H. Herzog to be postmaster at Baxter, Iowa, in place of W. H. Herzog. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Allen A. Mickelsen to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Iowa, in place of A. A. Mickelsen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Howard C. Walter to be postmaster at Arnolds Park, Iowa, in place of H. C. Walter. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Eddy L. Newton to be postmaster at Anita, Iowa, in place of E. L. Newton. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arthur L. Remley to be postmaster at Anamosa, Iowa, in place of A. L. Remley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lucian C. Tilden to be postmaster at Ames, Iowa, in place of L. C. Tilden. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edward J. Kooreman to be postmaster at Alton, Iowa, in place of E. J. Kooreman. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

KANSAS

Joseph C. Wolf to be postmaster at Macksville, Kans., in place of J. C. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John O. Rodgers to be postmaster at Mankato, Kans., in place of J. O. Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John B. Schwab to be postmaster at Morrowville, Kans., in place of J. B. Schwab. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Josiah Foltz to be postmaster at Newton, Kans., in place of Josiah Foltz. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Herman F. Kiesow to be postmaster at Osage City, Kans., in place of H. F. Kiesow. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William M. McDannald to be postmaster at Peru, Kans., in place of W. M. McDannald. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Leslie Fitts to be postmaster at Reading, Kans., in place of Leslie Fitts. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Albert E. Kerns to be postmaster at St. Marys, Kans., in place of A. E. Kerns. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ralph G. Johnson to be postmaster at Seneca, Kans., in place of R. G. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Guy E. Woodhouse, jr., to be postmaster at Sharon Springs, Kans., in place of G. E. Woodhouse, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Chester A. Freeman to be postmaster at Tonganoxie, Kans., in place of C. A. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Viola E. Stauffer to be postmaster at Valley Center, Kans., in place of V. E. Stauffer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Orliff F. Falls to be postmaster at Valley Falls, Kans., in place of O. F. Falls. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Carroll B. Kelley to be postmaster at Wakeeney, Kans., in place of C. B. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Mary O. Detwiler to be postmaster at Wamego, Kans., in place of M. O. Detwiler. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Charles E. Painter to be postmaster at Waverly, Kans., in place of C. E. Painter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Claude J. Wood to be postmaster at Wetmore, Kans., in place of C. J. Wood. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William L. Holmes to be postmaster at White City, Kans., in place of W. L. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Althea C. Curry to be postmaster at Winchester, Kans., in place of A. C. Curry. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John F. Allen to be postmaster at Yates Center, Kans., in place of J. F. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Zella M. Swope to be postmaster at Zenda, Kans., in place of Z. M. Swope. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Horace C. Lathrap to be postmaster at Blue Rapids, Kans., in place of H. C. Lathrop. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Arthur B. Fowler to be postmaster at Brookville, Kans., in place of A. B. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

James R. Galyon to be postmaster at Burden, Kans., in place of J. R. Galyon. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Linnihan M. Kelleher to be postmaster at Burlingame, Kans., in place of L. M. Kelleher. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Claude W. Simpson to be postmaster at Cawker City, Kans., in place of C. W. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Martin W. Sanderson to be postmaster at Cedar Vale, Kans., in place of M. W. Sanderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Charles S. Nation to be postmaster at Chanute, Kans., in place of C. S. Nation. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William C. Coates to be postmaster at Clyde, Kans., in place of W. C. Coates. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Orville G. Hannum to be postmaster at Corning, Kans., in place of O. G. Hannum. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Elwood M. Jones to be postmaster at Council Grove, Kans., in place of E. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Edward L. Kier to be postmaster at Courtland, Kans., in place of E. L. Kier. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Harvey E. Yenser to be postmaster at Delphos, Kans., in place of H. E. Yenser. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alfred N. Parrish to be postmaster at Dunlap, Kans., in place of A. N. Parrish. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Harry A. Osborn to be postmaster at Emporia, Kans., in place of H. A. Osborn. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Carl E. Meyer to be postmaster at Enterprise, Kans., in place of C. E. Meyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William L. Oliver to be postmaster at Erie, Kans., in place of W. L. Oliver. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Rebecca C. Minneman to be postmaster at Fairview, Kans., in place of R. C. Minneman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Hiram L. Hyde to be postmaster at Geneseo, Kans., in place of H. L. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Charles S. Goodrich to be postmaster at Goff, Kans., in place of C. S. Goodrich. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Edward M. Brown to be postmaster at Greensburg, Kans., in place of E. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Bessie M. Achenbach to be postmaster at Hardtner, Kans., in place of B. M. Achenbach. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Luella Meredith to be postmaster at Hill City, Kans., in place of Luella Meredith. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ferdinand Scharping to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Kans., in place of Ferdinand Scharping. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William T. Beck to be postmaster at Holton, Kans., in place of W. T. Beck. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alvey P. Spessard to be postmaster at Junction City, Kans., in place of A. P. Spessard. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Kirby L. Griffith to be postmaster at Kanopolis, Kans., in place of K. L. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Elmer E. Brewster to be postmaster at Leavenworth, Kans., in place of E. E. Brewster. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Eben Carlsson to be postmaster at McPherson, Kans., in place of Eben Carlsson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Jessie M. Arbogast to be postmaster at Belpre, Kans., in place of J. M. Arbogast. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John G. Hyde to be postmaster at Beloit, Kans., in place of J. G. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ernest E. Shannon to be postmaster at Barnes, Kans., in place of E. E. Shannon. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ella M. Greason to be postmaster at Atwood, Kans., in place of E. M. Greason. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William P. Ham to be postmaster at Atchison, Kans., in place of W. P. Ham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Frederick H. Dodd to be postmaster at Altoona, Kans., in place of F. H. Dodd. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

KENTUCKY

James W. Felkins to be postmaster at Albany, Ky., in place of J. P. Perkins, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Henry A. Forshag to be postmaster at Crowley, La., in place of H. A. Forshag. Incumbent's commission expires February 24, 1927.

MAINE

George H. Hopkins to be postmaster at Stockton Springs, Me., in place of G. H. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

George W. Tracy to be postmaster at Stockholm, Me., in place of G. W. Tracy. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ernest C. Butterfield to be postmaster at Springfield, Me., in place of E. C. Butterfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Earle R. Clifford to be postmaster at South Paris, Me., in place of E. R. Clifford. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alice C. Havener to be postmaster at Searsport, Me., in place of A. C. Havener. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Louise R. Harding to be postmaster at Orono, Me., in place of L. R. Harding. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Homer M. Orr to be postmaster at Old Town, Me., in place of H. M. Orr. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Edith B. Holden to be postmaster at Oakfield, Me., in place of E. B. Holden. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Bernice E. Morse to be postmaster at North Jay, Me., in place of B. E. Morse. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Albert C. Bradbury to be postmaster at Newport, Me., in place of A. C. Bradbury. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Mary G. Kennison to be postmaster at Madison, Me., in place of M. G. Kennison. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Walter B. Stone to be postmaster at Lovell, Me., in place of W. B. Stone. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Charles E. Perry to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of C. E. Perry. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

George D. Vose to be postmaster at Kingfield, Me., in place of G. D. Vose. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Stephen H. Ward to be postmaster at Kennebunk Port, Me., in place of S. H. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John E. Sargent to be postmaster at Fryeburg, Me., in place of J. E. Sargent. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Harry B. Brown to be postmaster at Farmington, Me., in place of H. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Eugene L. Jewell to be postmaster at Fairfield, Me., in place of E. L. Jewell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Everett M. Vannah to be postmaster at East Boothbay, Me., in place of E. M. Vannah. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Fred A. Pitts to be postmaster at Damariscotta, Me., in place of F. A. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Everett E. Brown to be postmaster at Brooks, Me., in place of E. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William F. Holden to be postmaster at Bangor, Me., in place of W. F. Holden. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Everett E. Sinnett to be postmaster at Bailey Island, Me., in place of E. E. Sinnett. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

MARYLAND

Mary W. Tise to be postmaster at Hyattsville, Md., in place of M. W. Tise. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1927.

Lloyd T. Hayden to be postmaster at Centerville, Md., in place of L. T. Hayden. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1926.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frederick C. Haigis to be postmaster at Turners Falls, Mass., in place of F. C. Haigis. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Otis J. A. Dionne to be postmaster at Walpole, Mass., in place of O. J. A. Dionne. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Blanche E. Robinson to be postmaster at Wareham, Mass., in place of B. E. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Thomas E. Hynes to be postmaster at Wayland, Mass., in place of T. E. Hynes. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alexander Wylie to be postmaster at Webster, Mass., in place of Alexander Wylie. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

George D. Roe to be postmaster at Westfield, Mass., in place of G. D. Roe. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Henry O. Bailey to be postmaster at West Newbury, Mass., in place of H. O. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Mary A. Fallon to be postmaster at West Stockbridge, Mass., in place of M. A. Fallon. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

W. C. Arthur Hebert to be postmaster at West Warren, Mass., in place of W. C. A. Hebert. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Susan F. Twiss to be postmaster at Three Rivers, Mass., in place of S. F. Twiss. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John H. Preston to be postmaster at South Hadley, Mass., in place of J. H. Preston. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Maurice Williams to be postmaster at South Easton, Mass., in place of Maurice Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Wesley G. Rose to be postmaster at South Deerfield, Mass., in place of W. G. Rose. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Edward L. Chapin to be postmaster at Southbridge, Mass., in place of E. L. Chapin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William E. Chaffin to be postmaster at Scituate, Mass., in place of W. E. Chaffin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Mark A. Putnam to be postmaster at Rutland, Mass., in place of M. A. Putnam. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Margaret E. Rourke to be postmaster at Prides Crossing, Mass., in place of M. E. Rourke. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Palmer J. Lord to be postmaster at Petersham, Mass., in place of P. J. Lord. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alonzo W. Jones to be postmaster at Orleans, Mass., in place of A. W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alice K. Briggs to be postmaster at North Easton, Mass., in place of A. K. Briggs. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

James T. Potter to be postmaster at North Adams, Mass., in place of J. T. Potter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

George W. Orcutt to be postmaster at North Abington, Mass., in place of G. W. Orcutt. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Harold Winslow to be postmaster at New Bedford, Mass., in place of Harold Winslow. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Charles D. Streeter to be postmaster at Mount Hermon, Mass., in place of C. D. Streeter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Bernard Campbell to be postmaster at Millville, Mass., in place of Bernard Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Turner R. Bailey to be postmaster at Medfield, Mass., in place of T. R. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Leon C. W. Foote to be postmaster at Lee, Mass., in place of L. C. W. Foote. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Ernest H. Wilcox to be postmaster at Manchester, Mass., in place of E. H. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

George A. Coolidge to be postmaster at Hudson, Mass., in place of G. A. Coolidge. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William F. Keller to be postmaster at Holliston, Mass., in place of W. F. Keller. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Albert F. Newell to be postmaster at Holden, Mass., in place of A. F. Newell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Leroy E. Johnson to be postmaster at Groton, Mass., in place of L. E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Fred A. Campbell to be postmaster at Dedham, Mass., in place of F. A. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Gilbert W. O'Neil to be postmaster at Gloucester, Mass., in place of G. W. O'Neil. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Charles H. Slocomb to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mass., in place of C. H. Slocomb. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William Davidson to be postmaster at Chicopee Falls, Mass., in place of William Davidson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William H. Lilley to be postmaster at Chicopee, Mass., in place of W. H. Lilley. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Maynard N. Wetherell to be postmaster at Chartley, Mass., in place of M. N. Wetherell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lawrence T. Briggs to be postmaster at Brockton, Mass., in place of L. T. Briggs. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lewis R. Holden, to be postmaster at Bondsville, Mass., in place of L. R. Holden. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John J. Downey to be postmaster at Blackstone, Mass., in place of J. J. Downey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Albert L. Porter to be postmaster at Avon, Mass., in place of A. L. Porter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John D. Quigley to be postmaster at Ashland, Mass., in place of J. D. Quigley. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Harry F. Bingham to be postmaster at Ashby, Mass., in place of H. F. Bingham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Frederick H. Green to be postmaster at Ashburnham, Mass., in place of F. H. Green. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Samuel L. Porter to be postmaster at Amesbury, Mass., in place of S. L. Porter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

MICHIGAN

Jennie McMinn to be postmaster at Bessemer, Mich., in place of Jennie McMinn. Incumbent's commission expired August 15, 1923.

MINNESOTA

Walter J. Westensee to be postmaster at Lewisville, Minn., in place of W. J. Westensee. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arnold E. Talle to be postmaster at McIntosh, Minn., in place of A. E. Talle. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Torstein M. Teigum to be postmaster at Madelia, Minn., in place of T. M. Teigum. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Isaac I. Bargen to be postmaster at Mountain Lake, Minn., in place of I. I. Bargen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edwin H. Vollmer to be postmaster at Northfield, Minn., in place of E. H. Vollmer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Henry Goulet to be postmaster at Onamia, Minn., in place of Henry Goulet. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frederick F. Arndt to be postmaster at Prior Lake, Minn., in place of F. F. Arndt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry F. Ward to be postmaster at Redwood Falls, Minn., in place of H. W. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Emily F. Peake to be postmaster at Remer, Minn., in place of E. F. Peake. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Clayton A. Larsen to be postmaster at St. James, Minn., in place of C. A. Larsen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank L. Henderson to be postmaster at South St. Paul, Minn., in place of F. L. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Theodora C. Radde to be postmaster at Truman, Minn., in place of T. C. Radde. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Henry W. Fingarson to be postmaster at Walnut Grove, Minn., in place of H. W. Fingarson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John N. Ross to be postmaster at Westbrook, Minn., in place of J. N. Ross. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Martin Leet to be postmaster at Blackduck, Minn., in place of Martin Leet. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Carl Adams to be postmaster at Brainerd, Minn., in place of Carl Adams. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Prudence M. Crosbie to be postmaster at Brewster, Minn., in place of P. M. Crosbie. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Norman W. Christensen to be postmaster at Cass Lake, Minn., in place of N. W. Christensen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Georgia C. Hompe to be postmaster at Deer Creek, Minn., in place of G. C. Hompe. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ralph C. Peterson to be postmaster at Dilworth, Minn., in place of R. C. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Theresa E. Thoreson to be postmaster at East Grand Forks, Minn., in place of T. E. Thoreson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Halsey C. Baldwin to be postmaster at Edgerton, Minn., in place of H. C. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Clarence W. Ivey to be postmaster at Elmore, Minn., in place of C. W. Ivey. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John A. Gregerson to be postmaster at Fertile, Minn., in place of J. A. Gregerson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George H. Baer to be postmaster at Frazee, Minn., in place of G. H. Baer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Albert W. Johnson to be postmaster at Fulda, Minn., in place of A. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nels O. Strommen to be postmaster at Halstead, Minn., in place of N. O. Strommen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Adolph C. Gilbertson to be postmaster at Ironton, Minn., in place of A. C. Gilbertson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Cline C. Parker to be postmaster at Kinney, Minn., in place of C. C. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Carl F. Peterson to be postmaster at Kennedy, Minn., in place of C. F. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William P. Marston, jr., to be postmaster at Lake Crystal, Minn., in place of W. P. Marston, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jacob Gish to be postmaster at Le Sueur, Minn., in place of Jacob Gish. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

MISSISSIPPI

Mary Norwood to be postmaster at Belzoni, Miss., in place of Mary Norwood. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Sherman W. Swalm to be postmaster at Brookhaven, Miss., in place of A. B. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired September 12, 1926.

Isaac J. Morris to be postmaster at Coahoma, Miss., in place of I. J. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Emma M. Therrell to be postmaster at Florence, Miss., in place of E. M. Therrell. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

David F. Fondren to be postmaster at Fondren, Miss., in place of D. F. Fondren. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

MISSOURI

James E. Roark to be postmaster at Anderson, Mo., in place of J. E. Roark. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

MONTANA

Frederick B. Gillette to be postmaster at Hinsdale, Mont., in place of F. B. Gillette. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Queenie B. Lyndes to be postmaster at Hysham, Mont., in place of Q. B. Lyndes. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry Kennedy to be postmaster at Rosebud, Mont., in place of Harry Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William L. Marsh to be postmaster at Roy, Mont., in place of W. L. Marsh. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jennie Bywaters to be postmaster at Sandcoulee, Mont., in place of Jennie Bywaters. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Amy B. Cowee to be postmaster at Wibaux, Mont., in place of A. B. Cowee. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James R. Minugh to be postmaster at Harlem, Mont., in place of J. R. Minugh. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John R. Lloyd to be postmaster at Great Falls, Mont., in place of J. R. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William S. Carlson to be postmaster at Ekalaka, Mont., in place of W. S. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Cass E. Parker to be postmaster at Fromberg, Mont., in place of C. E. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Otto M. Christinson to be postmaster at Glasgow, Mont., in place of O. M. Christinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Isaac L. Brooks to be postmaster at Culbertson, Mont., in place of I. L. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alfred Briscoe to be postmaster at Cascade, Mont., in place of Alfred Briscoe. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Asa E. Armstrong to be postmaster at Browning, Mont., in place of A. E. Armstrong. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

NEBRASKA

William Berridge to be postmaster at Wausa, Nebr., in place of William Berridge. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William H. Bogard to be postmaster at Avoca, Nebr., in place of W. H. Bogard. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert Pease to be postmaster at Beatrice, Nebr., in place of Robert Pease. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Hazel Babbitt to be postmaster at Belgrade, Nebr., in place of E. E. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

W. Ross Pedley to be postmaster at Bertrand, Nebr., in place of W. R. Pedley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Mary L. Simmons to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Nebr., in place of M. L. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arthur C. Smith to be postmaster at Carleton, Nebr., in place of A. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ethel Talcott to be postmaster at Crofton, Nebr., in place of Ethel Talcott. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Henry L. Balser to be postmaster at Dixon, Nebr., in place of H. L. Balser. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Sanford E. Ralsten to be postmaster at Geneva, Nebr., in place of S. E. Ralsten. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Earl D. Willard to be postmaster at Genoa, Nebr., in place of E. D. Willard. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Herschel L. Anderson to be postmaster at Havelock, Nebr., in place of H. L. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Herman L. Boyes to be postmaster at Hebron, Nebr., in place of H. L. Boyes. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank J. Prucha to be postmaster at Howell, Nebr., in place of F. J. Prucha. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Herman H. Schroer to be postmaster at Lawrence, Nebr., in place of H. H. Schroer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Emory S. Clements to be postmaster at Lyons, Nebr., in place of E. S. Clements. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Howard W. Botsford to be postmaster at Meadow Grove, Nebr., in place of H. W. Botsford. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ingebert J. Thomsen to be postmaster at Minden, Nebr., in place of I. J. Thomsen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edward L. Barker to be postmaster at Pender, Nebr., in place of E. L. Barker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edwin S. Garber to be postmaster at Red Cloud, Nebr., in place of E. S. Garber. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John C. Oaks to be postmaster at Seward, Nebr., in place of J. C. Oaks. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Clyde H. Hodges to be postmaster at Superior, Nebr., in place of C. H. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Claude A. MacDonald to be postmaster at Sutton, Nebr., in place of C. A. MacDonald. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

NEW JERSEY

Dorothy M. Cliver to be postmaster at Yardville, N. J., in place of T. L. Martin, removed.

John A. Smith to be postmaster at Wrightstown, N. J., in place of J. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William H. Albright to be postmaster at Woodbury, N. J., in place of W. H. Albright. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William A. Sweeney to be postmaster at Red Bank, N. J., in place of W. A. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Elvord G. Chamberlin to be postmaster at Montclair, N. J., in place of E. J. Chamberlin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Renview L. Hull to be postmaster at Lebanon, N. J., in place of R. L. Hull. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank Pierson to be postmaster at Lawrenceville, N. J., in place of Frank Pierson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James C. Norris to be postmaster at Hightstown, N. J., in place of J. C. Norris. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Howard N. Parker to be postmaster at Gibbsboro, N. J., in place of H. N. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry W. Bellis to be postmaster at Flemington, N. J., in place of H. W. Bellis. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank T. Buchanan to be postmaster at Bordentown, N. J., in place of F. T. Buchanan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Abram R. Bates to be postmaster at Allentown, N. J., in place of A. R. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

NEW MEXICO

Earl Douglass to be postmaster at Farmington, N. Mex., in place of N. P. Drolet, removed.

Frederic L. Sammis to be postmaster at Cimarron, N. Mex., in place of Lucy R. Haynie, resigned.

Nemesina Sandoval to be postmaster at Bernalillo, N. Mex., in place of Ralph Gutierrez, resigned.

Marie J. O'Bryan to be postmaster at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in pace of M. J. O'Bryan. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

James R. Roberts to be postmaster at Elida, N. Mex., in place of J. R. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired September 22, 1926.

NEW YORK

Alfred A. Clairmonte to be postmaster at South Fallsburg, N. Y., in place of C. H. Corwin, removed.

Lois B. Gridley to be postmaster at Macedon, N. Y., in place of E. W. Gridley, deceased.

Richard B. Coriell to be postmaster at Glasco, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Bessie P. Slater to be postmaster at Attica, N. Y., in place of J. M. Slater, deceased.

Henry W. Koster to be postmaster at Narrowsburg, N. Y., in place of H. W. Koster. Incumbent's commission expired August 30, 1926.

NORTH CAROLINA

John M. Tyler to be postmaster at Marion, N. C., in place of L. R. Cowan, resigned.

John F. Barlow to be postmaster at Banners Elk, N. C., in place of J. F. Barlow. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Andrew J. DeHart to be postmaster at Bryson City, N. C., in place of A. J. DeHart. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George E. Sweet to be postmaster at Cornelius, N. C., in place of G. E. Sweet. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alice W. Starr to be postmaster at Creswell, N. C., in place of A. W. Starr. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James H. Darden to be postmaster at Faison, N. C., in place of J. H. Darden. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John S. Downing to be postmaster at Fayetteville, N. C., in place of J. S. Downing. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Andrew J. Runion to be postmaster at Hot Springs, N. C., in place of A. J. Runion. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Marvin E. Barrett to be postmaster at Jackson, N. C., in place of M. E. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Leah J. Franck to be postmaster at Jacksonville, N. C., in place of L. J. Franck. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert W. Taylor to be postmaster at Lucama, N. C., in place of R. W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Flora E. Schlabach to be postmaster at Moyock, N. C., in place of F. E. Schlabach. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Rosa J. Cooper to be postmaster at Nashville, N. C., in place of R. J. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John H. Williams to be postmaster at Pikeville, N. C., in place of J. H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George W. Cox to be postmaster at Raeford, N. C., in place of G. W. Cox. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James H. Ramsay to be postmaster at Salisbury, N. C., in place of J. H. Ramsay. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1927.

Calvin L. Hill to be postmaster at Saluda, N. C., in place of C. L. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jacob H. Quinn to be postmaster at Shelby, N. C., in place of J. H. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert H. Dixon to be postmaster at Siler City, N. C., in place of R. H. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Sudie M. Morgan to be postmaster at Spindale, N. C., in place of S. M. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Grace B. Fagg to be postmaster at Stoneville, N. C., in place of G. B. Fagg. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William P. King to be postmaster at Windsor, N. C., in place of W. P. King. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Fronie Perry to be postmaster at Wingate, N. C., in place of Fronie Perry. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arnold Lien to be postmaster at Wyndmere, N. Dak., in place of Arnold Lien. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Norbert J. Joyce to be postmaster at Zap, N. Dak., in place of N. J. Joyce. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Irwin E. Walton to be postmaster at Bantry, N. Dak., in place of I. E. Walton. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Evan S. Brown to be postmaster at Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of E. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James Taylor to be postmaster at Cando, N. Dak., in place of James Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Oscar J. Haner to be postmaster at Douglas, N. Dak., in place of O. J. Haner. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nellie Ribb to be postmaster at Donnybrook, N. Dak., in place of Nellie Ribb. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Earl M. Sanness to be postmaster at Enderlin, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Sanness. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Louis Hansen to be postmaster at Esmond, N. Dak., in place of Louis Hansen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Hugh H. Parsons to be postmaster at Fessenden, N. Dak., in place of H. H. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Otto Gackle to be postmaster at Fredonia, N. Dak., in place of Otto Gackle. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Vern A. Tallackson to be postmaster at Grafton, N. Dak., in place of V. A. Tallackson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William D. Sinclair to be postmaster at Hannaford, N. Dak., in place of W. D. Sinclair. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Duncan McLean to be postmaster at Hannah, N. Dak., in place of Duncan McLean. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Walter P. Osborne to be postmaster at Hunter, N. Dak., in place of W. P. Osborne. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ole H. Larson to be postmaster at Killdeer, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Larson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Elizabeth Graham to be postmaster at Knox, N. Dak., in place of Elizabeth Graham. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Simon M. Ronning to be postmaster at Kramer, N. Dak., in place of S. M. Ronning. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Catherine Lynch to be postmaster at Lakota, N. Dak., in place of Catherine Lynch. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ole S. Aaker to be postmaster at Minnewaukan, N. Dak., in place of O. S. Aaker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nelson M. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Page, N. Dak., in place of N. M. Chamberlain. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John C. Black to be postmaster at Plaza, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Black. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lottie A. Lund to be postmaster at Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of L. A. Lund. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Albert F. Harris to be postmaster at Reeder, N. Dak., in place of A. F. Harris. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Albert M. Marchand to be postmaster at Rolla, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Marchand. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ralph H. McKean to be postmaster at Sanborn, N. Dak., in place of R. H. McKean. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John P. Breslin to be postmaster at Sanish, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Breslin. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Carl L. George to be postmaster at Sarles, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Seth E. Garland to be postmaster at Tioga, N. Dak., in place of S. E. Garland. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Chase E. Mulinex to be postmaster at Tolley, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Mulinex. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles S. Laidlaw to be postmaster at Wales, N. Dak., in place of C. S. Laidlaw. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Albert J. Drake to be postmaster at Westhope, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Drake. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert M. Mares to be postmaster at Wheatland, N. Dak., in place of R. M. Mares. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank Heglund to be postmaster at White Earth, N. Dak., in place of Frank Heglund. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Axel G. C. Strom to be postmaster at Williston, N. Dak., in place of A. G. C. Strom. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

OHIO

Mark E. Miller to be postmaster at Ashtabula, Ohio, in place of A. J. Richardson, deceased.

Dewey H. Beck to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ohio, in place of D. H. Beck. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William G. Corne to be postmaster at Newark, Ohio, in place of W. G. Corne. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Calvin L. Hartline to be postmaster at Newcomerstown, Ohio, in place of C. L. Hartline. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry M. Day to be postmaster at New Richmond, Ohio, in place of H. M. Day. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Albert S. Nye to be postmaster at New Washington, Ohio, in place of A. S. Nye. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Cloyde M. Kieffer to be postmaster at Orrville, Ohio, in place of C. M. Kieffer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Marshall O. Brooke to be postmaster at Peebles, Ohio, in place of M. O. Brooke. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank B. McCullough to be postmaster at Plain City, Ohio, in place of F. B. McCullough. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George A. Fisher to be postmaster at Port Clinton, Ohio, in place of G. A. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Clarence R. Seymour to be postmaster at Ravenna, Ohio, in place of C. R. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Olive Toland to be postmaster at Rayland, Ohio, in place of Olive Toland. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Fred O. Foster to be postmaster at Seville, Ohio, in place of F. O. Foster. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alva H. Anderson to be postmaster at Shelby, Ohio, in place of A. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry Oldham to be postmaster at Sidney, Ohio, in place of Harry Oldham. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles M. Sauder to be postmaster at Smithville, Ohio, in place of C. M. Sauder. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Elmer E. Weaver to be postmaster at Sugarcreek, Ohio, in place of E. E. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Oral H. Hilborn to be postmaster at Tiro, Ohio, in place of O. H. Hilborn. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ralph L. Stamm to be postmaster at Versailles, Ohio, in place of R. L. Stamm. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George W. Hassenier to be postmaster at Wapakoneta, Ohio, in place of G. W. Hassenier. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William E. Reed to be postmaster at West Lafayette, Ohio, in place of W. E. Reed. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ambrose B. Wingate to be postmaster at Beach City, Ohio, in place of A. B. Wingate. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ralph P. Crane to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of R. P. Crane. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Effie W. Mansfield to be postmaster at Brilliant, Ohio, in place of E. W. Mansfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Carl A. Brown to be postmaster at Bucyrus, Ohio, in place of C. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alexander C. McDonald to be postmaster at Coshocton, Ohio, in place of A. C. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Starling F. Trimble to be postmaster at Crestline, Ohio, in place of S. F. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arthur M. Eidson to be postmaster at Cygnet, Ohio, in place of A. M. Eidson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles W. Shaffer to be postmaster at Doylestown, Ohio, in place of C. W. Shaffer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Guy W. Reuter to be postmaster at Fort Recovery, Ohio, in place of G. W. Reuter. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James Lewis to be postmaster at Girard, Ohio, in place of James Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Fred Brockmeyer to be postmaster at Glendale, Ohio, in place of Fred Brockmeyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank W. Howard to be postmaster at Grafton, Ohio, in place of F. W. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Edward L. Jones to be postmaster at Granville, Ohio, in place of E. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Fred B. Reed to be postmaster at Green Springs, Ohio, in place of F. B. Reed. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Warren H. Noble to be postmaster at Greenwich, Ohio, in place of W. H. Noble. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jennie Pfeiffer to be postmaster at Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of Jennie Pfeiffer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William H. Tracy to be postmaster at Harrison, Ohio, in place of W. H. Tracy. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Michael Effinger to be postmaster at Lancaster, Ohio, in place of Michael Effinger. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lincoln A. Slusser to be postmaster at Louisville, Ohio, in place of L. A. Slusser. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Francis M. Fletcher to be postmaster at McComb, Ohio, in place of F. M. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Louis K. Carroll to be postmaster at Manchester, Ohio, in place of L. K. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles E. Penquite to be postmaster at Mason, Ohio, in place of C. E. Penquite. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John McCleery to be postmaster at Masury, Ohio, in place of John McCleery. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Pearl C. Brown to be postmaster at Middlefield, Ohio, in place of P. C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

George L. Sayles to be postmaster at Milan, Ohio, in place of G. L. Sayles. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

French C. Stillings to be postmaster at Milford Center, Ohio, in place of F. C. Stillings. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

OKLAHOMA

Marion N. Brumley to be postmaster at Selman, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Royal F. Hall to be postmaster at Boise City, Okla., in place of R. F. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Roy M. Muse to be postmaster at Elmore City, Okla., in place of R. M. Muse. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Marshall G. Norvell to be postmaster at Marietta, Okla., in place of M. G. Norvell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Frank W. Fuller to be postmaster at Ringwood, Okla., in place of F. W. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Otto G. Bound to be postmaster at Ryan, Okla., in place of O. G. Bound. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

William A. Vassar to be postmaster at Tryon, Okla., in place of W. A. Vassar. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Severee L. Massie to be postmaster at Tyrone, Okla., in place of S. L. Massie. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

OREGON

Henry A. Barrett to be postmaster at Athena, Oreg., in place of H. A. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arthur C. Wahl to be postmaster at Banks, Oreg., in place of A. C. Wahl. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Willis L. Cady to be postmaster at Beaverton, Oreg., in place of W. L. Cady. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William H. Hays to be postmaster at Brownsville, Oreg., in place of W. H. Hays. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arley A. Sollinger to be postmaster at Canyon City, Oreg., in place of A. A. Sollinger. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William G. Hoover to be postmaster at Fossil, Oreg., in place of W. G. Hoover. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Andrew R. Siegmund to be postmaster at Gervais, Oreg., in place of A. R. Siegmund. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frank W. Castor to be postmaster at Haines, Oreg., in place of F. W. Castor. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nellie Elliott to be postmaster at John Day, Oreg., in place of Nellie Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Emma L. Hufstater to be postmaster at Knappa, Oreg., in place of E. L. Hufstater. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William R. Cook to be postmaster at Madras, Oreg., in place of W. R. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Duncan E. Douglas to be postmaster at Marshfield, Oreg., in place of D. E. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Otis A. Wolverton to be postmaster at Monmouth, Oreg., in place of O. A. Wolverton. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Gaphart D. Ebner to be postmaster at Mount Angel, Oreg., in place of G. D. Ebner. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Oliver P. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Newport, Oreg., in place of O. P. Shoemaker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Evelyn D. Davenport to be postmaster at Oak Grove, Oreg., in place of E. D. Davenport. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Pauline W. Platt to be postmaster at Ontario, Oreg., in place of P. W. Platt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Grace W. Gamwell to be postmaster at Powers, Oreg., in place of G. W. Gamwell. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Fred. D. Wagner to be postmaster at Ashland, Oreg., in place of F. D. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mary E. Tunney to be postmaster at West Brownsville, Pa., in place of B. S. Davies, resigned.

William H. D. Moyer to be postmaster at White Haven, Pa., in place of W. C. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired November 17, 1925.

PORTO RICO

Agustin Carbonell to be postmaster at Caguas, P. R., in place of F. H. Bunker, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Loka W. Rigby to be postmaster at Moncks Corner, S. C., in place of L. W. Rigby. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gust M. Eggen to be postmaster at Vienna, S. Dak., in place of G. M. Eggen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Victor M. Dalthorp to be postmaster at Volga, S. Dak., in place of V. M. Dalthorp. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Volney T. Warner to be postmaster at Woonsocket, S. Dak., in place of V. T. Warner. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John W. Woods to be postmaster at Worthing, S. Dak., in place of J. W. Woods. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John Larson to be postmaster at Pukwana, S. Dak., in place of John Larson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Henry Rohrer to be postmaster at Madison, S. Dak., in place of Henry Rohrer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lee E. Buck to be postmaster at Flandreau, S. Dak., in place of L. E. Buck. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Leonard J. Walker to be postmaster at Carthage, S. Dak., in place of L. J. Walker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Winfred E. Whittemore to be postmaster at Estelline, S. Dak., in place of W. E. Whittemore. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Leroy A. Gage to be postmaster at Bryant, S. Dak., in place of L. A. Gage. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John V. Drips to be postmaster at Belvidere, S. Dak., in place of J. V. Drips. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John D. Evans to be postmaster at Alpena, S. Dak., in place of J. D. Evans. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

TENNESSEE

John P. Gallaher to be postmaster at Ashland City, Tenn., in place of J. P. Gallaher. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Clara M. Cain to be postmaster at Bradford, Tenn., in place of C. M. Cain. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lucile Brown to be postmaster at Cornersville, Tenn., in place of Lucile Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charley M. Mount to be postmaster at Franklin, Tenn., in place of C. M. Mount. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Stephen H. Bedwell to be postmaster at Friendship, Tenn., in place of S. H. Bedwell. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Herod H. Jenkins to be postmaster at Hartsville, Tenn., in place of H. H. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John J. Graham to be postmaster at Knoxville, Tenn., in place of J. J. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ernest C. Lowery to be postmaster at Leoma, Tenn., in place of E. C. Lowery. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Eva Shelton to be postmaster at Linden, Tenn., in place of Eva Shelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1927.

Bassil G. Taylor to be postmaster at Mason, Tenn., in place of B. G. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

A. Henderson Johnson to be postmaster at Newbern, Tenn., in place of A. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William S. Weatherly to be postmaster at Puryear, Tenn., in place of W. S. Weatherly. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Cyrus L. Fairless to be postmaster at Trenton, Tenn., in place of C. L. Fairless. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

TEXAS

Vina Johnson to be postmaster at Bertram, Tex., in place of E. P. Johnson, deceased.

Henry A. Williamson to be postmaster at Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of H. H. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Hattie M. Culpepper to be postmaster at Palmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Culpepper. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Jasper W. Blount to be postmaster at Quinlan, Tex., in place of J. W. Blount. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Arthur N. Brown, jr., to be postmaster at Richland, Tex., in place of A. N. Brown, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Elmer I. Wade to be postmaster at Rockdale, Tex., in place of E. I. Wade. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Gayle T. Snedecor to be postmaster at Rosenberg, Tex., in place of G. T. Snedecor. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Kelsey R. Dort to be postmaster at St. Jo, Tex., in place of K. R. Dort. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Riley M. Foster to be postmaster at Saratoga, Tex., in place of R. M. Foster. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nelson L. Yates to be postmaster at Stratford, Tex., in place of N. L. Yates. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James I. Dunn to be postmaster at Tioga, Tex., in place of J. I. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ralph D. Gilbert to be postmaster at Trinity, Tex., in place of R. D. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Vera Butler to be postmaster at Troup, Tex., in place of Vera Butler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Roscoe K. Garver to be postmaster at Van Alstyne, Tex., in place of R. K. Garver. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William G. McClain to be postmaster at Waxahachie, Tex., in place of W. G. McClain. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alphonso S. Butler to be postmaster at Winona, Tex., in place of A. S. Butler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

John W. Triplitt to be postmaster at Cisco, Tex., in place of J. W. Triplitt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Etta Varley to be postmaster at Collinsville, Tex., in place of Etta Varley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Wellington T. Cutler to be postmaster at Crockett, Tex., in place of W. T. Cutler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Chess W. Barr to be postmaster at Cross Plains, Tex., in place of C. W. Barr. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert H. Fenton to be postmaster at Denton, Tex., in place of R. H. Fenton. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Wilson I. Lawler to be postmaster at Deport, Tex., in place of W. I. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles H. Cmajdalka to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Tex., in place of C. H. Cmajdalka. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles W. Silliman to be postmaster at Ganado, Tex., in place of C. W. Silliman. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James P. Hewitt to be postmaster at Giddings, Tex., in place of J. P. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Virgil G. Pritchett to be postmaster at Gladewater, Tex., in place of V. G. Pritchett. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Emma J. Cleveland to be postmaster at Grand Prairie, Tex., in place of E. J. Cleveland. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

William I. Rodgers to be postmaster at Gunter, Tex., in place of W. I. Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Eva Currie to be postmaster at Happy, Tex., in place of Eva Currie. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James M. Everett to be postmaster at Hedley, Tex., in place of J. M. Everett. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Mamie B. Mustaine to be postmaster at Honey Grove, Tex., in place of M. B. Mustaine. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Maude L. Tucker to be postmaster at Idalou, Tex., in place of M. L. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles F. Adams to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Tex., in place of C. F. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Helen M. Peel to be postmaster at Jourdanton, Tex., in place of H. M. Peel. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

David W. Thompson to be postmaster at Keltys, Tex., in place of D. W. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Charles E. Smith to be postmaster at Kerens, Tex., in place of C. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Annie D. Barker to be postmaster at Kilgore, Tex., in place of A. D. Barker. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Nicholas C. Nail to be postmaster at Krum, Tex., in place of N. C. Nail. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Helen C. Wallace to be postmaster at Kyle, Tex., in place of H. C. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James D. Dyer to be postmaster at Lamesa, Tex., in place of J. D. Dyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

James E. Cooke to be postmaster at Mart, Tex., in place of J. E. Cooke. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

August C. Koepsel to be postmaster at Mathis, Tex., in place of A. C. Koepsel. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harvey J. McKinzie to be postmaster at Midlothian, Tex., in place of H. J. McKinzie. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Wenzel K. Richter to be postmaster at Moulton, Tex., in place of W. K. Richter. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Lindsey C. Payton to be postmaster at Abilene, Tex., in place of L. C. Payton. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Roberta G. Sterrett to be postmaster at Albany, Tex., in place of R. G. Sterrett. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Mack M. Pittman to be postmaster at Annona, Tex., in place of M. M. Pittman. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Ernest E. Cornelius to be postmaster at Athens, Tex., in place of E. E. Cornelius. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Joel A. Reese to be postmaster at Ballinger, Tex., in place of J. A. Reese. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Frederick W. Guffy to be postmaster at Belton, Tex., in place of F. W. Guffy. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harvey L. Pettit to be postmaster at Bloomburg, Tex., in place of H. L. Pettit. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

Harry N. Cook to be postmaster at Brady, Tex., in place of H. N. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Claude F. Riley to be postmaster at Canton, Tex., in place of C. F. Riley. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Josie D. Jackson to be postmaster at Center Point, Tex., in place of J. D. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alfred A. Thomas to be postmaster at Chandler, Tex., in place of A. A. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

UTAH

Peter Allan to be postmaster at Blanding, Utah, in place of Peter Allan. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Henry H. Lunt to be postmaster at Cedar City, Utah, in place of H. H. Lunt. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

James C. Hill to be postmaster at Elsinore, Utah, in place of J. C. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Will C. Barton to be postmaster at Garfield, Utah, in place of W. C. Barton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Alta A. Dayton to be postmaster at Magna, Utah, in place of A. A. Dayton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Henry C. Jacobs to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Utah, in place of H. C. Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

George G. Rosevear to be postmaster at Park City, Utah, in place of G. G. Rosevear. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Mary Cooper to be postmaster at Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of Mary Cooper. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

WASHINGTON

Gertrude Keys to be postmaster at Manson, Wash., in place of C. M. Jensen, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Wilbur Dolly to be postmaster at Franklin, W. Va., in place of Wilbur Dolly. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

John F. Lusk to be postmaster at Itmann, W. Va., in place of J. F. Lusk. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Millard F. Forgey to be postmaster at Kingston, W. Va., in place of M. F. Forgey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Elmer E. Radabaugh to be postmaster at Mason Town, W. Va., in place of E. E. Radabaugh. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Joe Van Zandt to be postmaster at Newburg, W. Va., in place of Joe Van Zandt. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lloyd V. McIntire to be postmaster at New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of L. V. McIntire. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lawrence Lipscomb to be postmaster at Parsons, W. Va., in place of Lawrence Lipscomb. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Waitmon T. W. Morgan to be postmaster at Rainelle, W. Va., in place of W. T. W. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Lawrence B. Kenniburg to be postmaster at Thomas, W. Va., in place of L. B. Kenniburg. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Thomas W. Stalnaker to be postmaster at Elkins, W. Va., in place of T. W. Stalnaker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Stark A. Willhide to be postmaster at Durbin, W. Va., in place of S. A. Willhide. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Henry A. Russell to be postmaster at Berkeley Springs, W. Va., in place of H. A. Russell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Rosa P. Oxley to be postmaster at Athens, W. Va., in place of R. P. Oxley. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

Cecil H. Martindale to be postmaster at Ansted, W. Va., in place of C. H. Martindale. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1927.

WYOMING

Fred W. Smith to be postmaster at Glenrock, Wyo., in place of F. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Alvah J. Macy to be postmaster at Moorcroft, Wyo., in place of A. J. Macy. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Harry R. Ellison to be postmaster at Parkerton, Wyo., in place of H. R. Ellison. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Conrad Johnson to be postmaster at Pine Bluffs, Wyo., in place of Conrad Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

L. Roy Ness to be postmaster at Powell, Wyo., in place of L. R. Ness. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

Robert E. Chittick, jr., to be postmaster at Shoshoni, Wyo., in place of R. E. Chittick, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1927.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, *December 13, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinitely Holy Spirit, Thou alone canst make our lives worthy. Bless us with that sweet, strange melody—namely, the whisper of Thy voice. Give us the morning face, the morning courage, the morning vision, and the blessing of the evening calm. Build up our hopes, our lives, and even our divine audacities. All these are the wings that carry us on amidst the push and the appeal of human interests. Forgive our sins, blessed Father, and help us to withstand the conflicts of life's old problem. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WARREN and Mr. OVERMAN members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the General Accounting Office.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MOSES and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SIMMONS members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the United States Veterans' Bureau.

THE COAST GUARD

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have asked for this time to call the attention of the House to the gallant rescue of human life which has been effected not only on the Carolina coast but, as referred to yesterday by my friend, Mr. WARREN, also on the Great Lakes by the Coast Guard within the last week. In addition to saving 48 lives on the Carolina coast the Coast Guard station at Marquette, Mich., on December 10 rescued 24 men and 1 woman from the stranded steamer *J. W. Oglesby*, which went ashore 12 miles east of that station. This rescue was effected under the most dangerous conditions.

The Eagle Harbor Coast Guard Station, in Michigan, after a two days' endeavor to break through the ice succeeded on Saturday, December 10 in rescuing 21 persons from the Canadian steamer *Altadoc*, ashore at Keweenaw Point, Mich. The rescued men were put aboard the Coast Guard cutter *Crawford* and landed.

I wish to say a word about this Coast Guard cutter *Crawford*. This boat left Two Harbors, Minn., in the teeth of a 50-mile an hour gale with the thermometer hovering around 30° below zero, crossed Lake Superior, the largest body of fresh water in the world, and appeared on the scene in time to assist in this rescue. I call attention to this fact because it has added greater laurels and glory to the Coast Guard.

These remarks refer to the activities of only four or five units of the Coast Guard that have reported up to date. Not until the full story of the great storm is told will we be able to properly appraise the service of the Coast Guard, but the saving of 96 lives in one week surely is a very creditable record.

Ah, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, while we are appropriating millions for our Army and Navy, let us not fail to provide adequate funds for this arm of the service—these men who are battling the storms day and night in the greatest of all causes, the cause of humanity. [Applause.]

HOLIDAY RECESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 8

Resolved by the House of Representations (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, 1927, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Wednesday, January 4, 1928.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 13, 1927.*

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I hereby resign from the Committee on Territories.

Very respectfully,

EVERETT KENT,

Thirtieth District, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means whether that committee, prior to adjournment for the holidays, will meet to extend the time for those who have not done so to apply for the bonus. The adjusted compensation law expires on January 1.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I can not answer the gentleman on that, because that matter has not been taken up before the committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am asking if the committee has given any consideration to that at all or is going to?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It has not been suggested by any member of the committee. These men were given a long enough time in which to file their claims for adjusted compensation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I know; but a great many men did not know about it, and a great many more have been in such a fix that they did not apply for it. There is no reason why 400,000 men, approximately, should not get this adjusted compensation, and that is what I want to call to your attention to find out whether you are going to do it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that some of these men do not want the adjusted compensation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. They need not take it in that event.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the revenue bill, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, under the order of the House the committee was permitted to return to page 79 for the purpose of considering the amendment offered by Mr. ARENTZ, and I believe he has the floor.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the Clerk report the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENTZ: On page 79, after line 24, add the following words: "This paragraph shall not apply to metal mines discovered after approval of this act," and add a new paragraph, as follows:

"In the case of metal mines the allowance for depletion shall be 15 per cent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed without reference to this paragraph."

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is introduced in the interest of simplification of the income tax.

One of the most technical and involved sections of the revenue bill is that one relating to depletion allowances.

No two men working independently of each other would reach, except by mere chance, the same conclusions regarding the rate of depletion to be applied to a particular ore or mineral deposit.

This is true in most cases where a technical physical examination is made of a natural resource developed but partially by underground workings or drill holes, irregular in shape, variable in mineral content, which in itself varies in price, to mention but a few of the factors entering into the determination of depletion allowance.

In the case of the United States against Ludey, Justice Brandeis had the following to say, as noted in Official Reports of the Supreme Court, under date of May 16, 1927:

The depletion charge permitted as a deduction from the gross income in determining the taxable income of mines for any year represents the reduction in the mineral contents of the reserves from which the product is taken. The reserves are recognized as wasting assets. The depletion effected by operation is likened to the using up of raw material in making the product of a manufacturing establishment. As the cost of the raw material must be deducted from the gross income before the net income can be determined, so the estimated cost of the part of the reserve used up is allowed. The fact that the reserve is hidden from sight presents difficulties in making an estimate of the amount of the deposits. The actual quantity can rarely be measured.

It must be approximated. And because the quantity originally in the reserve is not actually known, the percentage of the whole withdrawn in any year, and hence the appropriate depletion charge is necessarily a rough estimate. But Congress concluded, in the light of experience, that it was better to act upon a rough estimate than to ignore the fact of depletion.

The corporation tax law of 1909 had failed to provide for any deduction on account of the depletion of mineral reserves. The resulting hardship to operators of mines induced Congress to make provision in the revenue law of 1913 and all later acts for some deduction on account of depletion in determining the amount of taxable income from mines.

In section 23 of the present bill, under the heading of "Deductions from gross incomes," we find the following:

Depletion: In the case of mines, oil and gas wells, other natural deposits, and timber a reasonable allowance for depletion of improvements, according to the peculiar conditions in each case; such reasonable allowance in all cases to be made under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(m) The basis upon which depletion, exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence are to be allowed in respect of any property shall be as provided in section 114.

Turning to page 79 of the bill we have the following:

(2) Discovery value in case of mines: In the case of mines discovered by the taxpayer after February 28, 1913, the basis for depletion shall be the fair market value of the property at the date of discovery or within 30 days thereafter, if such mines were not acquired as the result of purchase of a proven tract or lease, and if the fair market value of the property is materially disproportionate to the cost. The depletion allowance based on discovery value provided in this paragraph shall not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property upon which the discovery was made, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed without reference to discovery value. Discoveries shall include minerals in commercial quantities contained within a vein or deposit discovered in an existing mine or mining tract by the taxpayer after February 28, 1913, if the vein or deposit thus discovered was not merely the uninterrupted extension of a continuing commercial vein or deposit already known to exist, and if the discovered minerals are of sufficient value and quantity that they could be separately mined and marketed at a profit.

(3) Percentage depletion for oil and gas wells: In the case of oil and gas wells the allowance for depletion shall be 27½ per cent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed without reference to this paragraph.

The amendment I have offered is in the interest of simplification.

It will be observed that the amendment proposed is a simple one which does not directly affect other provisions of the revenue act. Its adoption, therefore, will not make necessary any change in other portions of the act.

The outstanding advantages of the amendment are that without materially affecting the public revenue it provides a simple, equitable, and definite method of computing the depletion allowance that permits of the prompt and final determination of the tax liability. It eliminates for the future the analytical appraisal of metal mines with attendant technical complexities. It means a great saving of expense to the Government as well as the taxpayer.

Although mine operators have for years tried to bring about enactment of law simplifying the item of depletion allowance, the matter was brought most forcibly to the speaker's attention on reading that splendid article entitled "Simplifying the income tax," by our esteemed chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Hon. WILLIAM R. GREEN, in the Saturday Evening Post of November 26, 1927, page 125.

I quote the following from my friend's valuable article:

The tax on oil companies having producing wells has been greatly simplified.

The depletion allowance is now fixed on a per cent of the value of the oil produced, thus turning an uncertain amount concerning which the taxpayer and the Government could seldom agree into a mere arithmetical calculation.

It would seem as if the same plan might be applied to mining companies. Although it would not furnish an exact method for determining the amount of depletion when ore is taken from the mines and would not always work out equally as between different mines, it would greatly simplify an allowance that has been productive of much litigation, notwithstanding the fact that this matter of percentage depletion in the case of mines was initiated in Congress and in the Treasury Department, the proposed percentage basis for depletion of mines has not been provided for in the bill before us to-day.

I have been advised by Mr. GREEN and other members of the Ways and Means Committee that this item was not included, because at the time section 114 was being considered full information was not had from either the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation or the Treasury Department.

Such information, I am now informed, is now available.

During this year, 1927, a questionnaire was sent to metal-mining taxpayers throughout the country by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with a letter stating that the joint committee had requested certain information regarding depletion allowances. In order to expedite the preparation of the information desired by the joint committee, the industry cooperated almost 100 per cent and supplied all the information requested.

I have been informed by the Treasury Department that an investigation of the average depletion percentage allowed was found to be 16½ per cent on all returns allowed during the last four or five years.

Under the proposed amendment both the Government and the taxpayer may readily compute the amount of tax due at the time the return is filed. The taxpayer may proceed with his financial commitments and the further development of his mines without fear of large additional assessments. He would rather pay more tax, as he will in some cases under this system, and know that his obligation is fully and definitely discharged than to pay less tax after long delay.

The preparation and audit returns of income in the metal-mining industry have proven most expensive to both Government and taxpayer.

In the introduction of this amendment it is my desire to prevent this.

For the future discovery may be eliminated upon the adoption of an adequate percentage basis as proposed in this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENTZ. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. I will.

Mr. COLTON. Is it not intended by the gentleman's amendment to give to the metal mines, as far as possible, a definite per cent for depletion the same as is now extended to oil companies? This would result in being helpful to the Government as well as to the mining industry, would it not?

Mr. ARENTZ. The depletion of oil wells is 27½ per cent. This depletion would give the life of an oil well an indefinite period, but very much shorter under most circumstances than is enjoyed by that of the Tri-State Lead-Zinc Mines. The average life of a zinc mine in the Joplin district is eight years.

Mr. MANLOVE. Notwithstanding this, is it not true that because of the richness of the ore and the extent of the deposits this district produces one-third of the lead and zinc produced in the United States?

Mr. ARENTZ. I believe this is true. The depletion we are asking for is 15 per cent. Fifteen per cent deducted from gross income would give an average base metal mine a life of nearly 20 years. Mine owners generally are dissatisfied with the present method of determining depletion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENTZ. May I have five additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ARENTZ. I will say to the Chairman of the committee that it is not my intention to press this amendment at this time, but I would like to receive from the chairman of this great committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, a statement as to the extent of his desires to cooperate to the end that this elimination of difficulty of arriving at a return may be had by the introduction of amendments offered to it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman, I think the gentleman has acted very fairly about it. He says he does not intend to press the adoption of the amendment at this time. The circumstances are these, as indicated by the remarks which the gentleman read from an article I wrote for the Saturday Evening Post. I think something ought to be done along this line, and it would undoubtedly, as the gentleman says, greatly simplify a matter that has caused the department a great deal of difficulty and trouble; and unfortunately in our discussions in the committee we took so much time with other matters that we got to this the last thing, and we did not have time properly to consider it. Not only that, but the experts never had time to be sure they knew what kind of an amendment ought to be prepared. Now, in pursuance of what the gentleman says, let the matter go over to the Senate and I am sure the mining interests will be taken care of over there, and by the time we get there we can tell what kind of a provision ought to be inserted; and if the Senate puts it in, as far as I am personally concerned, I will be very sympathetic with it.

Mr. HADLEY. Will the gentleman yield? If the statement the gentleman makes is accurate, his information is that since it was considered in the committee the data to which he refers has been received and is at hand. Is that true?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not prepared to say; but I am prepared to say this, that it was received. We have not had time to examine it. I am inclined to think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HADLEY. I am satisfied that if it has been at hand and had shown a prima facie case made before the hearings had closed, the matter would have received the very serious consideration at the hands of the committee at the time. But it was not there, and I think it fair to say to the gentleman who has offered this amendment that the absence of that information before the committee precluded the committee from giving the matter more consideration.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The data had not been received yet from the gentleman from Washington when he addressed the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the experts should go over it first to see that it is right before it is adopted.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman believes, does he not, that some amendment of this kind should be adopted? It certainly would simplify the law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. I think something of this kind ought to be put in. Therefore I think if the matter is put in at the other end of the Capitol, it can be worked out; and, so far as I am personally concerned, I will give it very sympathetic consideration.

Mr. ARENTZ. The idea with me is that the committee should not stand against this amendment simply because the experts might stand for something defining gross income, or something of that kind. When you talk of copper mines, for example, the definition is different from that when you talk of gold and silver mines and of lead-zinc mines. I hope you will not hesitate in accepting this very important provision to clarify a subject which has been burdensome to taxpayer and Government alike for years and has resulted in much litigation, misunderstanding, and expense for the reasons I have stated. I thank the chairman for his courtesy and the sympathetic interest he has shown in this amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We simply want time to go into this matter. I think at present the amendment ought to be voted down.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 7, page 88, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not necessary to ask unanimous consent. An amendment is pending and subject to debate. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Florida: Page 88, line 7, after the word "Secretary," insert: "*Provided*, That if the taxpayer has no income for the years herein provided, then and in that event he shall be granted refund or deductions to which he is entitled out of net incomes to which he may be entitled to in the future."

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that amendment purports to reach the incomes which have been paid on mortgages which later have been found to be without value, and it will authorize the Treasury to expedite the refund of payments on these incomes. In other words, in some sections of our country millions of dollars' worth of mortgages, particularly on real estate, have been found later on not to possess the face value, and the owners of those mortgages have paid income tax on them. This amendment enables a refund to be made to those taxpayers.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, the gentleman's amendment does not on its face show that it relates to these mortgage transactions. It might relate to any situation where a taxpayer might be entitled to refunds and deductions. And in addition,

does not the gentleman think that his amendment is altogether too indefinite?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I do not think so.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will read it. It says:

Provided, That if the taxpayer has no income for the years herein provided, then and in that event he shall be granted refunds or deductions to which he is entitled out of net income to which he may be entitled in the future.

How long in the future? I suggest to the gentleman that this is a subject that the committee spent a great deal of time on. I think it is dangerous to inject it here.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. It ought to be taken care of in this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman's amendment provides that the Government shall give a bonus to these men who have worthless mortgages.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. No; it is to give a just refund to the owner of the mortgage, which is not worth face value.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 118. AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS

(a) Offset of losses: If any corporation which is a member of an affiliated group sustains for the taxable year 1929 or any succeeding taxable year a net loss, as defined in section 117, so much of the net loss as constitutes an ordinary net loss (as defined in subsection (c) of this section) may be allowed as a credit against the net income of one or more members of the affiliated group, if—

(1) In accordance with a written agreement filed with the return and entered into by the corporation sustaining the net loss and the corporation or corporations against the net income of which the credit is to be taken; and

(2) Such corporations are domestic corporations and have the same accounting period; and

(3) Such corporations have been members of the affiliated group during the entire taxable year, or so much thereof as each has been in existence.

(b) Affiliated group: As used in this section an "affiliated group" means one or more chains of corporations connected through stock ownership with a common parent corporation, if—

(1) At least 95 per cent of the stock of each of the corporations (except the common parent corporation) is owned directly by one or more of the other corporations; and

(2) The common parent corporation owns directly at least 95 per cent of the stock of at least one of the other corporations.

As used in this subsection, the term "stock" does not include non-voting stock which is limited and preferred as to dividends.

(c) Ordinary net loss: As used in this section, "ordinary net loss" means the net loss as defined in section 117 less the amount of the capital net loss computed in the same manner as provided in section 101 (relating to capital net gains and losses), except that gain or loss shall be computed without regard to the period for which the capital asset has been held.

(d) Remainder of net loss: Any part of the net loss, as defined in section 117, not so allowed as a credit, shall be allowed to the corporation which sustains the net loss as a deduction in computing net income in succeeding taxable years in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in section 117 (relating to net losses).

(e) China trade act corporation: For the purpose of this section, a corporation organized under the China trade act, 1922, shall be treated as a foreign corporation.

(f) Corporations deriving income from possessions of United States: For the purposes of this section, a corporation entitled to the benefits of section 251, by reason of receiving a large percentage of its income from possessions of the United States, shall be treated as a foreign corporation.

(g) Allocation of income and deductions: For allocation of income and deductions of related trades or businesses, see section 45.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARNER of Texas: Page 90, line 11, strike out all of section 118.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment seeks to do what the law did until the excess-profits tax was enacted. That is to say, it is proposed to treat all corporations alike in the taxation.

Now, remember that section 118 has for its sole and only purpose to give advantage to a large corporation owning more than one single corporation. That is to say, when a group of men own more than one corporation this is intended to give them an advantage in rendering their taxes. It permits them to choose whether they will render their tax as one corporation or as a group of corporations which they own.

I think you will see a great advantage in that. Yesterday you adopted an amendment and complained about it, as I understand, because you lost, according to the estimate, $24,000,000 of revenue to the Treasury on account of the corporation tax. This will let you recoup that money from 961 corporations, as I recall. You gave up yesterday $24,000,000 of revenue. We gave yesterday to 70 per cent of the corporations in the United States an additional relief of $24,000,000 in their duty to pay corporation taxes to the Government. Now, I offer an amendment to equalize corporations in the payment of tax. If you adopt that amendment you will recoup $24,000,000 to the department.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. As I understand section 118 as now written, permissive authority is to be given for one or more corporations to take advantage of the loss sustained by another corporation in the change?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, yes. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, doing business as a subsidiary company known as the Clarksville Petroleum Co., right across the street from you, in the same neighborhood in Texas, which is in competition with you, is instructed by its officers in New Jersey to "sell below BLACK."

If I sell below BLACK I am going to lose money, but it does not make any difference—lose the money—we will offset it against our profits made in New Jersey. Mr. BLACK can not do that. Mr. BLACK is compelled to go out of business, and after he has gone out of business this competitive corporation, which has some stockholders in New Jersey or Washington, D. C., Chicago, or Seattle, immediately puts up the price.

Now, I want you to ask yourselves about this, and I want some gentleman to say—I do not believe the Chairman is going to say—that it is unsound economically or that it is unfair to ask corporations to render their returns like every other corporation. You can not say it would be unfair to the United States Steel Corporation, having 147 affiliated corporations; you can not say it would be unfair to ask those companies to render separately when another steel corporation in competition with them has to render separately. That would not be unfair, would it? It would not be economically unsound. And remember this, that Mr. TREADWAY has brought about a great deal of simplification in this bill, and the Treasury Department says this would simplify very much the renditions of these nine hundred and some odd corporations that now render under the consolidated provision of the law.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have called your attention several times to what is known as the advisory committee. During the work they did this summer they ran across this and they decided it was unjust—that this consolidated provision was unjust. Knowing the policy of Congress to have a consolidated report they undertook to suggest a method by which you might have an affiliated return on class A corporations and abolish it entirely as to class B corporations, but when you ask them questions there has never been a single man anywhere, in the Treasury Department or elsewhere, who could justify affiliated corporation returns, either from the economical standpoint or from the standpoint of fair play and justice.

Let us assume that these men on the first seats here own a corporation located in New York, one located in Seattle, one located in Galveston, and another located in New Orleans. They are in competition with me in Galveston and I have only one corporation. Conditions are bad in Galveston and my corporation has to sell right down to the ground. I do not make anything but am making a loss. These gentlemen are also in a similar business and they make a loss. I have no way of recouping my loss, but they have by just transferring it to New Jersey or to Seattle. Now, that is all there is to it, and I know I can appeal to the consciences of the men here, because I know you do not want to give an advantage to one corporation having a multiplicity of corporations over another.

I have forgotten the number of corporations making returns, but we select nine hundred and odd corporations and say, "We are going to give you the privilege of returning either as an affiliated group or as individuals." That is wrong in principle. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] called your attention to it the other day. He said it was bad public policy to permit a corporation or any kind of a taxpayer to report according to a choice of two methods, and I agree with him. Nobody can justify it.

Now, if you will examine this amendment, you will find it can not be partisan and it is not a question of raising taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would the gentleman mind having the amendment reported again?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The amendment provides for the striking out of section 118, and if the gentleman will read that section he will know exactly what it means.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have read it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The amendment is, as I have tried to explain, that you will no longer permit corporations like the United States Steel Corporation, like the Henry Ford Corporation, or the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and others which have a multiplicity of corporations throughout the United States, to report as one corporation, but that you will require each one of them to do what every other corporation has to do, namely, make an individual return.

In Texas, for instance, the Standard Oil Co. will have a company named the Sun Oil Co. In Texas it drills a lot of wells. They will say it does not make any difference how much they lose, because they will charge it against the affiliated companies.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I do.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman seems to be trying to leave the impression that if each individual corporation had to make its tax return separately, it would eliminate what is apparently unfair competition, which the gentleman is trying to leave the impression is practiced. Suppose if we did that——

Mr. GARNER of Texas (interposing). You make your own interpretation of what I am trying to do.

Mr. BEGG. That is the only interpretation I can make.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. You have stated your whereases; now just ask your question.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman believe that if his amendment were adopted there would not be competition between the big corporations and the little ones?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But I do say that in this competition we ought not to encourage by law a multiplicity of corporations and we ought not to favor the big ones as against the little ones. [Applause.]

Mr. BEGG. Nobody is trying to do that.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. You are doing it in this law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I say, gentlemen, let us be honest. By this section you give the big corporations, nine hundred and odd corporations, an advantage over the little corporations, and I say you ought not to give them that advantage, and I say we ought to strike this language out of the bill, and that is my purpose in offering the amendment. If it is not beneficial to some one, why not strike it out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will tell the gentleman why not, in a moment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Why not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Go ahead now. I will wait until the gentleman is through.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I yield to the gentleman to tell why not. I am perfectly willing to be interrupted, but I imagine the spark did not connect and the gentleman could not tell me why not and therefore took his seat.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do any of these large companies, like the Standard Oil Co., the Steel Trust, or the American Tobacco Co., own 95 per cent of the stock in the other concerns as provided in section (b)?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes. This is the way they own it. The holding corporation owns the stock in all the balance of them and therefore they have the 95 per cent ownership. It is generally 100 per cent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And does that bring them within the definition of this provision?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes; holding the entire amount. That is exactly the way it is done.

Frankly, this could not be a partisan matter. It is impossible to say that the method of rendering taxes can be a partisan matter. I do not think any of you gentlemen could possibly come to the conclusion that the method of rendering the tax can be a partisan matter.

I am trying to point out to you that there is benefit being derived by nine hundred and some corporations that they ought not to have, and if you will strike out section 118 you will get twenty-odd million dollars additional into the Treasury from nine hundred and some corporations by having them render their taxes just like every other corporation is rendering such taxes, and it ought to be done, gentlemen.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. There is no one contending for this provision except the large corporations, is there?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Why, certainly not. It does not benefit anybody but the large corporations. It can not benefit anybody unless there are two or more corporations. I defy any gentleman to find where it would do any good or would be possible to file as an affiliated corporation if there was but one corporation. So it can only benefit in cases where there are two or more corporations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In the case of the Standard Oil Co., for instance, having these subsidiary companies, was not that the result of the dissolution of the Standard Oil Co.?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And this would give them the same status they would have had if they had not been dissolved, would it not?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

This will also simplify matters. Just think of it for a moment! They have cases pending in the Treasury Department going back to 1917, 1918, and 1919, and the reason is that it is almost impossible under the excess-profits tax provision to go back and value a corporation like General Motors, for instance.

I do hope you gentlemen will hear what the advocates of section 118 have to say. I say to you frankly, I wish you would examine it. I can not find a single reason for it, and I do not believe they can give you a good reason for it, viewed from the standpoint of equity and justice. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas may understand the effect of his amendment. I doubt it. If the gentleman will strike out 118, it would not abolish the consolidated return which is contained in section 141. There would be consolidated returns continued for a couple of years, and then after that time consolidated returns are abolished; but there is the privilege of taking the losses under section 141.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Without section 141 they would not have authority to file consolidated returns even for the next two years, would they?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, if you should strike both of them out, that is true; but let us see about that.

The gentleman says that the large corporations want this section 118. The large corporations do not want it. They are in sympathy with the gentleman from Texas. If the gentleman only knew it, they would like to have this section stricken out. The large corporations want to have the law stay as it is. What the committee did was to take a middle ground and put in this provision in section 118 and then provide in section 141 that after a certain date consolidated returns should no longer be permitted, although losses sustained by subsidiary companies of which the parent company owned 95 per cent of the stock might still be included.

What is there wrong about this? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] talks as if these big companies were the only ones permitted to get the benefit of this loss provision in some way. The fact of the matter is, it does not make much difference to the big companies if they own 95 per cent of the stock. When the subsidiary company has a loss, does not the parent company lose it? And what is the difference whether they make a consolidated return or whether they make a separate return for each company?

Mr. BUTLER. Then what is the benefit of the consolidated return? I will be indebted to my friend if he will tell me that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The consolidated return, it is contended by the companies, makes, on the whole, a fairer method of adjusting the matter; but there are certain complications about it, so that it has been recommended that the consolidated return be abolished after a certain period, because it does cause complications in assessing the tax. That is the chief difficulty about the consolidated return.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.
Mr. HUDSON. If it is to be abolished eventually, why is it not abolished now? What is the reason for the extension of two years?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. So they can get ready for it and adjust their accounts accordingly.
Mr. HUDSON. Then it is a mere matter of bookkeeping?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A matter of bookkeeping and getting themselves adjusted to it.
Mr. LAGUARDIA. And is the life of the consolidated return to be only two years?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. You will find in section 141 the provision for consolidated returns by corporations for the taxable years 1927 and 1928. After that time it is abolished, but the provision that they can get credit for the losses sustained by a company in which they hold 95 per cent of the stock is continued.
Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is continued. That is the feature some of us do not like.
Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to get through with my statement.
Mr. LINTHICUM. I simply want to ask the gentleman which method will give us the most taxes. The gentleman from Texas says this provision would give us $20,000,000 additional.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think it would give us a cent more, but would simply introduce confusion into the method of computing taxes, and the corporations could easily adapt themselves to it. They can abolish all these small corporations, make a new corporation, and take them all in under its original wings, if they want to do so, so far as that is concerned. It would cause some consolidations, some dissolutions, and the formation of new corporations, so that there would be fat pickings for the corporation lawyers.
Mr. LINTHICUM. Would it not simplify matters if each corporation made its own return?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think it would simplify the matters for the Treasury. That is the object of the provisions of section 141.
Now, let me answer the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Texas said there was no one who pretended to justify this position. Saturday you heard the gentleman from Texas talk, and while in the most of his talk he was merely entertaining the committee, he did say something upon which we are agreed. He said that when I appointed the advisory committee consisting of distinguished experts I did a good job. I would not compliment myself that way, but he said that there could not have been better or fairer men for that purpose. Now, that advisory committee that was created—he gave the names of them—recommended this provision of section 118. The report of the advisory committee was submitted to the joint committee, and a majority of the joint committee agreed to it. If the gentleman from Texas disagreed at that time I did not hear it. A majority of the joint committee agreed to it.
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask for five minutes more.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, I do not know anything unfair about this proposition. The loss is not allowed for two companies. The gentleman from Texas seems to speak as if the small company got it and then the other company got it. On the contrary, the law guards particularly against that. The loss is only allowed the consolidated group, and that is fully provided for.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How does the gentleman from Iowa answer the point made, or attempted to be made, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] when he said that the subsidiary corporations would practice cut-throat tactics competing with the business of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], driving him out of business, and then recoup with the New Jersey Corporation?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is an entirely fanciful objection. There is no big corporation would do it. It would be in violation of the antitrust law. Besides, if they wanted to do this, they could consolidate the corporations.
Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then the gentleman agrees with me, but thinks the big corporations would not do it on account of the good conscience of the corporation, that they would not permit it?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No.
Mr. GARNER of Texas. But they have the power to do it.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I say that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas will not better the situation a particle.
Mr. LAGUARDIA. It would make it more expensive.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Possibly; but it would not prevent it.
Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.
Mr. ALDRICH. It would be exactly against the antitrust law?
Mr. GARNER of Texas. But it would be in accord with the economic law passed by Congress giving them this advantage.
Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.
Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.
Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the gentleman from Iowa claims that the proposition of the gentleman from Texas is not tenable, why does he try to affect the situation by making section 118 operative for only a brief period?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The purpose of this is to moderate the law. The consolidated return is abolished in 1929, and after that affiliated corporations are required to file a separate return. It would be a difficult matter for the corporations to adjust themselves to this right away.
Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Then the gentleman is in substance admitting that there is force in the proposition of the gentleman from Texas. You are going to correct the existence of this abuse in the course of two years?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The provisions of the bill will simplify matters, and I think we ought to take that course.
The large corporations do not want it and the gentleman from Texas is in error. They would like to have section 118 stricken out.
Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman from Iowa give me an authority for that?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; I will give the gentleman one, Doctor Adams.
Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, Doctor Adams does not own any affiliated corporations.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I know he does not.
Mr. GARNER of Texas. There is not a corporation gets the benefit of it except those big enough to have a child. If the affiliated corporations have to make a return, how could it hurt them?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The repeal of this would enable them to go ahead with their consolidated returns.
Mr. GARNER of Texas. No; it would not. If you strike out section 141, following it up, then you have no law for consolidated returns.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And you will be in a fine situation with business generally if you do that. The fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] does not understand the effect of his own amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is simply raising a bugbear here that is not justified at all. This is an extremely complicated matter, which nobody can fully explain in a short time, but the very experts that the gentleman said were fair, were just, were economists, and whom he recommended in the highest way last Saturday, recommended this provision as an improvement on the present law, and it was adopted not only by the advisory committee but by the joint committee, and the joint committee recommended it to the Ways and Means Committee. Here it is; and we have not heard any opposing voices to it except those of large corporations. I have heard from them indirectly. They do not want this provision in here, and if it is taken out they will just continue to file their consolidated returns. That is all I desire to say.
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes in order to ask him a question.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In order to clear up the confusion that is in the minds of some of us, including myself, I ask the gentleman this question: In the case of these affiliated corporations, is it now permitted those that suffer losses to make returns, taking credit for those losses, and then permitted those who have made profits to take all of the exemptions they would be entitled to by making separate returns in each case?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no. Those that file consolidated returns, of course, have to file them all together; their returns include both losses and profits, and they are all put together; they are combined when all owned by practically the same party.

Mr. SABATH. And they take out the losses and are allowed the losses that they have sustained in any of their groups and deduct them from the profits of the parent or mother corporation?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman owned a farm and sustained a loss on it, why should he not be entitled to the credit for that loss? And if one corporation owned another corporation and sustained loss, why not be permitted to have credit for the loss that the other sustained upon filing a joint return?

Mr. SABATH. But these are different corporations.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Of course.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They are all owned by the same parties.

Mr. SABATH. And that is the evil, that is the trouble, and wherever they can take the loss they will, to the disadvantage of other smaller corporations, whom they destroy by unfair competition.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; if the gentleman will ask a question.

Mr. BLANTON. With regard to the case the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] put, where the Standard Oil owned subsidiary corporations in Texas, those subsidiary corporations can do business in Texas only because they are subsidiary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not yield to the gentleman to make an argument.

Mr. BLANTON. Why should they not make their separate returns when the State would not permit the parent corporation to do business there at all except through subsidiary corporations?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, the gentleman does not mean to intimate that the Standard Oil Co. can not do business in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. It has been prohibited from doing business there.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Supposing as an individual I operate a half dozen stores in a half dozen different cities. On one I make some money and on another I lose. When I am making my return as an individual I am entitled, am I not, to offset my loss in one store against my profit in the other?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALE. Is there any reason why a corporation should not be entitled to do the same?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. None that I know of, and where one corporation owns a number of stores it has the same right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. I think that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] must think that the House is very credulous if he expects us to believe that this section 118 of the proposed law is not desired by the large corporations. What is the situation? If it were not for section 141, to which the gentleman referred, the corporations would not be permitted to file any consolidated return after the passage of this act, and if we do strike out section 118, as proposed in the amendment of my colleague, and which I hope we will do, then we ought to end the evil of consolidated returns by following it up and striking out section 141 when we get to it.

The Ways and Means Committee has adopted what my friend from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] terms the middle course, and has prohibited the corporations from filing consolidated returns after the taxable year 1928, but to take the place of that unjust privilege the corporations have secured the enactment, or rather have secured the inclusion of section 118 in this bill, another unjust privilege, which will permit them for all time hereafter until Congress otherwise changes the law to take advantage of the loss of any affiliated corporation in offsetting the net income of the parent corporations. Thus these chain corporations would continue to get the substantial benefits of filing consolidated returns, although ostensibly the privilege of filing consolidated returns would be repealed by section 141 after the taxable year 1928.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, Mr. GARNER, is usually right, and even when he is wrong, his faults lean to virtue's side, but he was never more right upon any proposition that he has ever advocated in the House of Representatives than the amendment he offers here to-day. [Applause.] There is an old saying—and I think that it is a very true one, especially when applied to tax matters—that every tub ought to stand upon its own bottom. Now, a corporation—I do not care who the stockholders of it are—is a legal entity. It has a right to sue and be sued in its own name; it has the right of life until the expiration of its charter. It has many privileges because of its corporate charter, and I can not see any more reason and equity in allowing two or more corporations to pool their gains and losses and thereby reduce the amount of taxes that they are to pay. I can see no more reason in allowing two or more separate legal entities to do that than to allow two or more individuals to pool their gains and losses and thereby reduce their taxes. If either is right the other is right, but neither is just and neither should be permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I ask for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In the State of Texas, which I have the honor to represent in part, the Standard Oil Co. can not transact any business except that which may be in interstate commerce. Why? Because it has violated the law of the State of Texas, and in a suit has been permanently enjoined from doing business in Texas. Now, what is this method permitted in section 118? The method is to allow the parent corporation to organize a separate legal entity, a separate corporation. And under the vicious provision that permits consolidated returns, why, the parent corporation is permitted to pool all of its returns together. Now, after the taxable year 1928 they can not file consolidated returns, but under section 118, if it is permitted to remain in the bill, they can hunt up an affiliated corporation that has had losses and take advantage of those losses upon their own corporate return. Now, gentlemen, I do not think the Congress ever enacted a more unjustified law than that which originally permitted the filing of consolidated returns. It has caused a loss of millions of dollars that should have gone into the United States Treasury and would have been paid by corporations plenty able to pay the taxes. Already we have a good deal of complaint at the growth of chain stores and chain corporations. They are making it mighty hard for the independent dealer, and some of the States are endeavoring to enact laws by their own State legislatures to prohibit the spread of these chain stores and chain corporations. I am not saying we ought to venture out into that field at the present time. That is a matter not now before us for discussion, but I do say we ought not to confer an advantage upon these chain corporations by permitting consolidated returns, and under section 118 one corporation which has made a profit to take advantage of the losses of affiliated corporations. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, I will only take a minute; but I do want to answer the impression that might have been left in the minds of some Members when the inquiry was propounded by the gentleman on my left making a comparison of an individual owning three or four stores with affiliated corporations owned by the same stockholders. He cites the comparison as an illustration to show that the corporation owning two or three different businesses ought to be treated the same as an individual. The difference is this, that the corporations are organized into different entities for certain specific advantages. For instance, if the owner, an individual of a chain store, as illustrated by the gentleman, met in one of his stores with losses and he is sued and a judgment creditor obtains judgment in excess of the assets of store No. 1, there are stores Nos. 2 and 3 to answer and all of his assets are merged for payment of liabilities; but in the case of affiliated corporations and one of its corporations is sued, say, corporation A, and there is not sufficient to satisfy the judgment obtained, the judgment creditor can not look to corporations B and C to recoup his judgment because they are entirely different entities.

In many instances, as I understand, different corporations are organized for that sole purpose. They say, "Here we have got a good business; it may be risky in another State, but we will organize a separate corporation, but we will be liable only to the extent of the separate corporate assets." It is a distinct advantage. Therefore groups of stockholders incorporating

into separate corporations must balance the disadvantages with the advantages, and it is manifestly unfair to permit the loss of one corporation to be charged against the profits of another.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no doubt but that they ought to be considered as one corporation. But this is a question of profit, and the question of profit and loss is just the same in the case illustrated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] with reference to corporations as it is when the property is owned by one corporation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It gives a corporation under different entities an advantage in taxation of 11 per cent over its individual or single corporation competitors. I am talking about competition. If corporation A has corporations B, C, and D, and corporation D is operating in a poor market, it can afford to operate at a 10 per cent loss to the detriment of its competitors there, because it can make up its losses by applying them to the profits of corporations B and C and thereby reduce its taxes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. If I owned a corporation as an individual, why should I not have the same advantage?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All of your assets are liable if you are operating in your individual capacity. But if these four others are cooperating with you——

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. What would that have to do with it? I do not agree with you on that. It does not make any difference whether you are in a corporation or are acting as an individual. What does a corporation tax have to do with this? It makes no difference. I might be incorporated as an individual and have two dummies with me. That has nothing to do with the profits.

Mr. GIFFORD. Some of us are really trying to understand this proposition. I think we ought to express ourselves and see if we do. I understand section 141 continues the present law as in section 240 for two years and then section 118 takes effect.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is a fact.

Mr. GIFFORD. And this is a new law. What worries us is that any two of these corporations can get together and juggle transactions and take advantage of questionable sales to each other to get deductions. Should it be made possible or at least encourage one corporation to purposely sell to another to show a loss?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is stopped by the bill. It is simply a fraud.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we must necessarily have these chain methods of doing business. It does seem that there must be some advantage here, and I can not help having the suspicion that they can juggle their losses.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We have a special provision in the law, section 45, that permits the bureau to allocate the income where it belongs. It does so. He does not permit these corporations to place the expenses just where they want to put them.

Mr. GIFFORD. My objection is not particularly to do with the allocation of the income. This section has not been properly explained to us. The only persuasive explanation we have had is that the advisory committee says, "This is the better language." Under section 118 allowing any two of a group to make returns we might suspect that they can do some juggling under that construction.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why does the gentleman make such remarks as that when he has not made any effort to ascertain from the Treasury or from the experts that such a thing would be permitted? I assure the gentleman, after having given this matter a great deal of study, that it can not be permitted under the law.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have not been able to take it up with the Treasury. One does not need to. You understand that by operating one chain corporation with another they can purposely make losses by exchanging with each other. It is a new law that we are passing. If we just read the bill, we can not fail to understand that we at least encourage exchange of properties to effect deductions.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I turn to section 45, on page 36 of the bill. It provides:

> In any case of two or more trades or businesses (whether or not incorporated, whether or not organized in the United States, and whether or not affiliated) owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the same interests, the commissioner is authorized to distribute, apportion, or allocate gross income or deductions between or among such trades or businesses, if he determines that such distribution, apportionment, or allocation is necessary in order to prevent evasion of taxes or clearly to reflect the income of any of such trades or businesses.

It is necessary in order to really reflect the income. The commissioner has the authority to make that change. Of course, any of our income tax laws can be evaded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and the Chairman expressed himself as in doubt.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let us have tellers, Mr. Chairman. We might just as well have tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. TREADWAY and Mr. GARNER of Texas to act as tellers.

The question was taken, and the tellers reported ayes 158, noes 153.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 119. LOSS ON SALE OF STOCK OR SECURITIES

> In the case of any loss claimed to have been sustained in any sale or other disposition of shares of stock or securities where it appears that within 30 days before or after the date of such sale or other disposition the taxpayer has acquired (otherwise than by bequest or inheritance) or has entered into a contract or option to acquire substantially identical property, and the property so acquired is held by the taxpayer for any period after such sale or other disposition, no deduction for the loss shall be allowed under section 23 (e) (2) of this title; nor shall such deduction be allowed under section 23 (f) unless the claim is made by a corporation, a dealer in stocks or securities, and with respect to a transaction made in the ordinary course of its business. If such acquisition or the contract or option to acquire is to the extent of part only of substantially identical property, then only a proportionate part of the loss shall be disallowed.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have asked for this limited time for the purpose of addressing myself to a proposition which I consider the most vital in connection with this tax bill. I am concerned about the productiveness of this bill if enacted into law. Or, in other words, I fear that this bill will not produce the necessary revenues for a surplus in the Treasury to keep up the war-debt payments. Every generation should pay its own debts, and it is up to the generation that made the war debt to see to it that it is paid off. My attitude toward this bill, as I am about to express myself, is not going to surprise any Member of the Ways and Means Committee. I have appeared before that committee biennially every time the members of that committee were considering a tax reduction bill since the war, and besides discussing some of the tax schedules, I have tried to impress upon them each time the necessity of providing a surplus in the Treasury to make certain that the public debt be retired within at least 25 years after 1920.

My attitude as just expressed is one reason why I have always opposed all provisions in every revenue bill since the war which looked like a refund to income-tax payers. I am opposed to the provision in this bill which makes the reduction in the corporation income tax applicable to the 1927 income. [Applause.] I am not at all impressed with the reasoning of the Ways and Means Committee in its report accompanying this tax bill on this proposition. Evidently the committee as a whole is pretty well satisfied with the provision, as no minority report was filed. Among other things, the committee attempts to justify this provision for the reason "that a very considerable proportion of sales of corporations were made at a small profit or no profit or even at a loss." This is given as showing that the corporations were unable to pass this tax on to the purchasers of their products. Well, the corporations that operate without profit or at a loss—and I understand it is something like 41 per cent of them—will not be benefited by this provision. There is no use to shed any tears about them here, for having no income tax to pay, they will not get any of that $160,000,000 or $180,000,000—the amount the corporation income tax will be reduced for 1927. The committee in its report further states that "economists generally agree that the tax can not be passed on except by a monopoly."

If the committee is correct, then there is one thing certain, and that is that the corporations during the last few years have put out a lot of false propaganda in order to bring about

a reduction in the corporation income tax. The corporations have claimed that if the corporation income tax were reduced, it would enable them to sell their products cheaper to the public. There is no question but that the corporations have passed this tax on, if within their power to do so, just like any other of the costs of producing or handling their products. The committee in its report appears to admit that a monopoly could pass the tax on. One other thing is certain, and that is, in so far as the corporations are able to control the prices of their commodities, they add this tax on to the prices of their commodities. The corporations most able to control the prices of their products and to add the tax thereto are the large corporations, the powerful combinations of corporations, and those corporations which have a monopoly on the products they produce. There can be no question but what such corporations will derive directly some benefit from this refund provision.

Last fall a year ago I received a letter from one of the most intelligent and successful corporation men in the State of Iowa. He opposed the then proposed refund of the surplus in the Treasury to income-tax payers. Instead, he argued for a reduction in the corporation income tax. He stated that if the corporation got a rebate or a refund it would be impossible to pass that on to the consumer in the shape of lower prices, but, on the other hand, if there were a reduction of the corporation income tax, the corporation could reduce the prices on the articles it sold to the consumers. He inclosed with that letter a very interesting statement, which I shall have printed in the RECORD without comment, showing the effect of the corporation income tax on the cost of a keg of nails or a spool of barbed wire. I submit the statement for printing at this place:

The following taxes enter into the cost of a keg of nails or a spool of barbed wire when they are ready for delivery to the farmer in Iowa:

1. A mining corporation mines ore in Minnesota and into the cost of production of the ore is figured a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

2. A railroad carries the ore to Duluth and into the cost of its operation this railroad must figure a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

3. A steamer will carry the ore from Duluth to Gary, Ind., and into its cost the steamer company figures a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

4. A steel company reduces the ore to billets and the steel company pays a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

5. The billet is sold to the wire-producing company, who takes it and makes it into rods, then to wire, and manufactures nails and barbed wire. This wire company pays a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

6. A railroad company delivers the barbed wire and nails to a jobber in Iowa, and into the cost of operation this company is obliged to figure a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

7. The jobber is incorporated and must add to the cost of doing business a corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

8. A railroad company transports the nails and barbed wire from a jobbing house to the dealer, and again we find it necessary to recognize the corporate tax of 13½ per cent.

9. We need not take the process much further, as only about 25 per cent of the dealers are incorporated. Those who are must pay the corporate tax. Those who are operating as a partnership or individual have an advantage over those who are incorporated.

From the above it will be seen that the corporate tax of 13½ per cent has been figured into the cost of the keg of nails or spool of barbed wire at least eight times. It is impossible to believe that a reduction of 2½ or 3½ per cent would not materially affect the price of the article in question to the consumer, who is in this case the Iowa farmer.

Now, I have been led to believe, and especially from the literature I have received from corporations, that a reduction of the corporation income tax would benefit the consumers. If this reduction in the corporation income tax is not going to benefit the consumers, then the strongest argument that has heretofore appealed to me why the tax should be reduced fails.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman what reason he thinks there would be for reducing the corporation tax at all under his theory, because he certainly will admit that corporations do not sell for less than what they can get.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, I read the report with a great deal of care.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The report went into that matter at great length.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If they do not sell for less than they can get, then after this tax is reduced and they do not sell for less than before the tax was reduced, from the people's standpoint what is the reason for reducing the tax?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows the reason. The only reason which was given to the committee was that this tax is imposed on the stockholders, that it is an unfair tax and an unfair discrimination.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I wish I had the time to read the statement I referred to a moment ago. It is along the line that the corporations have been contending to bring about income-tax reduction for the last two or three years. That statement will be in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman puts that in, I will put in the RECORD a letter from a corporation in Iowa equally as large.

Mr. RAMSEYER. My colleague is privileged to place in the RECORD anything he desires. One reason I am placing this statement in the RECORD is to make my position clearer to the gentleman and others than I could myself. I think the statement is accurate and fair.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the gentleman will examine the hearings, he will find where two gentlemen owning very large corporate interests stated that they owned and controlled, with their affiliated corporations, $42,000,000,000 worth of property, and that it was undoubtedly carried on to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I suggest the gentleman examine the hearings and see if they did not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has that wrong.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not read the hearings to which the gentleman refers, so I do not know about the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will state that the trend of prices, according to statements made in the RECORD, does not correspond with a reduction or increase of taxes. This argument that has been made by some has simply been made to help get taxes reduced. That is all.

Mr. RAMSEYER. My attitude on this proposition is the same as when the income tax on individuals was up. I am not, as I stated at other times in this House and as every Member of this House should know, for high income taxes for the sake of imposing burdens on individuals and corporations. I am ready to reduce taxes on corporations and individuals as low as it is possible and yet have enough money in the Treasury to meet the expenses of the Government and have enough left to apply annually a considerable amount on the national debt. I have expressed my attitude not only here but before the Ways and Means Committee on the importance of having an adequate surplus for the payment of the national debt.

This proposal to refund or to make the corporation income tax apply to the 1927 earnings, as well as the proposal made yesterday to refund the surpluses annually to certain taxpayers, is economically unsound, lacking in good statesmanship, and in the long run will prove politically unwise. This $180,000,000 deducted from the 1927 corporation income tax should be applied on war debt payments.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS FAVOR DEBT REDUCTION AND OPPOSE INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

My chief purpose in asking for time this afternoon to discuss the tax bill is to get before you the attitude of the great farm organizations of the United States on the proposition of paying the war debt speedily. I have maintained ever since the war that the war debt should be paid speedily and that provision should be made by law for a sinking fund applicable to the entire national debt. Now the sinking fund applies to only about half of the national debt. In recent years the farm organizations have taken the same position that I have urged since the war. I, of course, do not claim they have taken this position because I have been contending for it, but I am presenting it to you to bring to your attention how the great mass of the people, through their organizations, are thinking and that they are demanding of Congress at this session that nothing be done to interfere with the orderly and speedy payment of the national debt.

The three great farm organizations, to wit, American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers' Union, and the National Grange, held their national conventions during the latter part of last fall, while the Ways and Means Committee was considering this bill and after the Treasury recommendations had been made. All three of these organizations are opposed to reduction in income taxes, are opposed to the repeal of the Federal estate tax, and favor the speedy payment of the national debt.

The Farm Bureau Federation last month reaffirmed its resolution along this line adopted a year ago. It reads as follows:

Our Federal debt was created in times of prosperity. It should be liquidated with all reasonable expedition while prosperous times continue. To delay into future generations the payment of this debt would be equivalent to doubling the burden not only in the interest

paid but in regard to times of depression into which our Nation may occasionally fall.

Any excess for years to come of income over expenses should be used in lessening the debt burden of our country rather than refunding it to persons and corporations who paid.

We reaffirm our position relative to Federal taxation, which is, substantially, that the basis of payment of such taxes should be net income. Present tendencies of granting exemptions, of lowering rate brackets in income, corporation, and estate taxes, so that reduced taxes may be enjoyed by those best able to pay, and of reducing the annual payments on our national debt, all are tendencies in opposition to the tax policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

I wish to call your especial attention to the second paragraph of this resolution. It is worth rereading:

Any excess for years to come of income over expenses should be used—

Listen—

in lessening the debt burden of our country rather than refunding it to persons and corporations who paid.

That position is absolutely sound, and Members of this House can do no better than to take a similar position.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The gentleman from Iowa has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's time is extended 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Farmers' Union, in its national convention, also held last month, has this to say in its resolutions unanimously adopted:

We are emphatically opposed to the proposed reduction of Federal income-tax rates, especially on the higher income brackets.

We believe an inheritance and gifts tax is the fairest tax that can be levied, for the reason that no part of it can be passed on to the consumer. We also believe that the great war debt should be reduced as rapidly as possible, and that an inheritance tax materially assists in this reduction without burdening anyone.

Next I want to give you the position of the National Grange in its national convention, also held last month, in its resolutions, under the head of principal grange declarations, I find this statement:

Opposes reduction in income taxes at the present time.

Further in the resolutions is this statement:

The National Grange opposes any income-tax reduction until existing war debts are materially reduced.

Here you have the great farm organizations of the United States speaking with unanimity. On the proposition of farm-relief legislation the farm organizations are not united, but on the question of applying the surpluses in the Treasury to reducing the national debt, every farm organization is absolutely of one mind.

I have not had time to investigate the attitude of labor organizations of the United States on this question, but I am advised from reliable sources that the labor organizations, and the laborers generally, of the United States are in accord with the farm organizations and the farmers on the issues that I have just submitted to you in the resolutions of the three great farm organizations. In other words, 80 or 90 per cent of the voters of the United States are in accord with the farm organizations in their attitude on war-debt payments.

I have made known to you now the attitude of the great farm organizations of the United States on what I regard the chief issues in connection with this tax bill. I insist that the attitude of these organizations is entitled to your most respectful consideration.

Next, I wish to present to you the attitude of the President of the United States, as expressed in annual messages and in speeches, on the rapid payment of the war debt. In his annual message to the Sixty-ninth Congress the President came out very strongly for the speedy payment of the war debt. Just preceding that message several prominent Members of Congress had given out interviews that they favored refunding of our war debt so as to extend the payment over a period of 62 years. The President, in that message, strongly opposed that proposal and suggested by way of illustration the payment in 20 years. The President again stated his position emphatically in his last message. I shall place in the RECORD excerpts from the President's message to the Sixty-ninth Congress.

The most forceful and thought-provoking statement made by the President on this subject was in his speech before the Union League of Philadelphia on November 17, 1927. I read:

The enormous debt has been partly refinanced at progressively lower rates and increasingly diminished in amount. At the end of this fiscal year almost one-third of the entire debt will have been paid. The saving in interest alone is about $1,000,000 for each day. But—

Now listen—

well over $18,000,000,000 of debt still remains. It is a menace to our credit. It is the greatest weakness in our line of national defense. It is the largest obstacle in the path of our economic development. It should be retired as fast as possible under a system of reasonable taxation.

When I read these meaningful sentences I was reminded of the exhortation of Solomon to those seeking wisdom and understanding:

To understand a proverb, and the interpretation; the words of the wise, and their dark sayings.

I fully realize that the propaganda for tax reduction has a stronger political appeal than the unanswerable arguments for debt reduction. To date we have made a very good record in debt reduction. The Treasury has applied every surplus dollar from every source derived to the retirement of the war debt. Now, we have come to the parting of the ways. According to the committee's estimate, if business continues prosperous, there will be a surplus not exceeding $41,000,000 in 1929. If business should be a little less prosperous, then there will be a deficit in the Treasury. So far as I can find in the report of the Ways and Means Committee, there is no recommendation to provide a surplus to apply on the war debt. That committee warns this House not to increase the tax reduction beyond that recommended in the bill for fear of a Treasury deficit. There is no concern expressed for a surplus to apply on the war debt. If the committee's estimates are correct, it is certain that there will be no considerable surplus to apply on the war debt, and there may be an actual Treasury deficit. As I stated when I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, I could not approve a bill that did not hold out the hope of a considerable surplus to apply on the war debt. I am for tax reduction whenever possible, but I can not approve tax reduction at the expense of debt reduction.

I have endeavored for a number of years to impress upon the Ways and Means Committee, and on the membership of this House, the importance of adopting a legislative policy that will insure the payment of the war debt by the generation that made it. I shall continue this fight. The sinking fund should apply to the entire war debt and not to only half thereof as is now the law. If the sinking fund did apply to the entire debt, then you could talk about balancing the Budget and nothing more. As long as this sinking fund law remains as it is, it should be the attitude of Congress in writing tax bills to see to it that there is a surplus of several hundred million dollars in the Treasury to apply on war-debt payments in addition to the present sinking fund and other existing provisions for debt retirement. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, having been granted leave to extend my remarks, I submit for printing in the RECORD, first, the following statement of Alexander Hamilton in "Cost of Government in the United States," by the National Industrial Conference, Inc., on page 125:

As the vicissitudes of nations beget a perpetual tendency to the accumulation of debt, there ought to be, in every government, a perpetual, anxious, and increasing effort to reduce that which at any time exists, as fast as shall be practicable, consistently with integrity and good faith.

Second. Two paragraphs from the President's annual message communicated to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress:

It has always been our policy to retire our debts. That of the Revolutionary War period, notwithstanding the additions made in 1812, was paid by 1835, and the Civil War debt within 23 years. Of the amount already paid, over $1,000,000,000 is a reduction in cash balances. That source is exhausted. Over one and two-thirds billions of dollars was derived from excess receipts. Tax reduction eliminates that. The sale of surplus war materials has been another element of our income. That is practically finished. With these eliminated, the reduction of the debt has been only about $500,000,000 each year, not an excessive sum on so large a debt.

Proposals have been made to extend the payment over a period of 62 years. If $1,000,000,000 is paid at the end of 20 years, the cost to the taxpayers is the principal and, if the interest is 4¼ per cent, a total of $1,850,000,000. If the same sum is paid at the end of 62 years, the cost is $3,635,000,000, or almost double. Here is another consideration: Compared with its purchasing power in 1913, the dollar we borrowed represented but 52 cents. As the value of our dollar increases, due to the falling prices of commodities, the burden of our

debt increases. It has now risen to 63½ cents. The taxpayer will be required to produce nearly twice the amount of commodities to pay his debt if the dollar returns to the 1913 value. The more we pay while prices are high, the easier it will be.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were presented to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

The committee resumed its session.

THE REVENUE BILL

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 120. INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

(a) Gross income from sources in United States: The following items of gross income shall be treated as income from sources within the United States:

(1) Interest: Interest on bonds, notes, or other interest-bearing obligations of residents, corporate or otherwise, not including—

(A) interest on deposits with persons carrying on the banking business paid to persons not engaged in business within the United States and not having an office or place of business therein, or

(B) interest received from a resident alien individual, a resident foreign corporation, or a domestic corporation, when it is shown to the satisfaction of the commissioner that less than 20 per cent of the gross income of such resident payor or domestic corporation has been derived from sources within the United States, as determined under the provisions of this section, for the three-year period ending with the close of the taxable year of such payor preceding the payment of such interest, or for such part of such period as may be applicable, or

(C) income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from bankers' acceptances;

(2) Dividends: The amount received as dividends—

(A) from a domestic corporation other than a corporation entitled to the benefits of section 251, and other than a corporation less than 20 per cent of whose gross income is shown to the satisfaction of the commissioner to have been derived from sources within the United States, as determined under the provisions of this section, for the three-year period ending with the close of the taxable year of such corporation preceding the declaration of such dividends (or for such part of such period as the corporation has been in existence), or

(B) from a foreign corporation unless less than 50 per cent of the gross income of such foreign corporation for the three-year period ending with the close of its taxable year preceding the declaration of such dividends (or for such part of such period as the corporation has been in existence) was derived from sources within the United States as determined under the provisions of this section;

(3) Personal services: Compensation for labor or personal services performed in the United States;

(4) Rentals and royalties: Rentals or royalties from property located in the United States or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of or for the privilege of using in the United States patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulas, good will, trade-marks, trade brands, franchises, and other like property; and

(5) Sale of real property: Gains, profits, and income from the sale of real property located in the United States.

(b) Net income from sources in United States: From the items of gross income specified in subsection (a) of this section there shall be deducted the expenses, losses, and other deductions properly apportioned or allocated thereto and a ratable part of any expenses, losses, or other deductions which can not definitely be allocated to some item or class of gross income. The remainder, if any, shall be included in full as net income from sources within the United States.

(c) Gross income from sources without United States: The following items of gross income shall be treated as income from sources without the United States:

(1) Interest other than that derived from sources within the United States as provided in subsection (a) (1) of this section;

(2) Dividends other than those derived from sources within the United States as provided in subsection (a) (2) of this section;

(3) Compensation for labor or personal services performed without the United States;

(4) Rentals or royalties from property located without the United States or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of or for the privilege of using without the United States, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulas, good will, trade-marks, trade brands, franchises, and other like properties; and

(5) Gains, profits, and income from the sale of real property located without the United States.

(d) Net income from sources without United States: From the items of gross income specified in subsection (c) of this section there shall be deducted the expenses, losses, and other deductions properly apportioned or allocated thereto, and a ratable part of any expenses, losses, or other deductions which can not definitely be allocated to some item or class of gross income. The remainder, if any, shall be treated in full as net income from sources without the United States.

(e) Income from sources partly within and partly without United States: Items of gross income, expenses, losses, and deductions, other than those specified in subsections (a) and (c) of this section, shall be allocated or apportioned to sources within or without the United States, under rules and regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Where items of gross income are separately allocated to sources within the United States there shall be deducted (for the purpose of computing the net income therefrom) the expenses, losses, and other deductions properly apportioned or allocated thereto and a ratable part of other expenses, losses, or other deductions which can not definitely be allocated to some item or class of gross income. The remainder, if any, shall be included in full as net income from sources within the United States. In the case of gross income derived from sources partly within and partly without the United States the net income may first be computed by deducting the expenses, losses, or other deductions apportioned or allocated thereto and a ratable part of any expenses, losses, or other deductions which can not definitely be allocated to some items or class of gross income; and the portion of such net income attributable to sources within the United States may be determined by processes or formulas of general apportionment prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Gains, profits, and income from—

(1) transportation or other services rendered partly within and partly without the United States, or

(2) from the sale of personal property produced (in whole or in part) by the taxpayer within and sold without the United States, or produced (in whole or in part) by the taxpayer without and sold within the United States,

shall be treated as derived partly from sources within and partly from sources without the United States. Gains, profits, and income derived from the purchase of personal property within and its sale without the United States or from the purchase of personal property without and its sale within the United States, shall be treated as derived entirely from sources within the country in which sold, except that gains, profits, and income derived from the purchase of personal property within the United States and its sale within a possession of the United States or from the purchase of personal property within a possession of the United States and its sale within the United States shall be treated as derived partly from sources within and partly from sources without the United States.

(f) Definitions: As used in this section the words "sale" or "sold" include "exchange" or "exchanged"; and the word "produced" includes "created," "fabricated," "manufactured," "extracted," "processed," "cured," or "aged."

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Wherever there is an entirely new principle of taxation, or a new exemption, I think the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ought to call attention to it. Here we have a new provision in section 120.

You turn to page 94, lines 10 and 11, you will find section C, which reads:

Income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from bankers' acceptances.

In order to know what that means you have got to turn back to page 93, lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, and you read:

(a) Gross income from sources in United States: The following items of gross income shall be treated as income from sources within the United States:

(1) Interest.—Interest on bonds, notes, or other interest-bearing obligations of residents, corporate or otherwise, not including—

Now, the things you do not include are down here. The things not included are (A) and (B), and then you come to (C), which says—

income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from bankers' acceptances.

Now, I am not going to make a motion to strike this out, but I do think the committee ought to understand the policy that is to be adopted by the Congress, and that is that we are favoring the foreign bank as against our own banks. If this exception did not go in, interest derived in this country by bank acceptances would be subject to tax. Interest on acceptances of your bank where they accept your paper have to pay interest.

Now, the query comes, Why did you make this exception? Well, you know when you make one exception it calls for another. When you make an exception it comes back to roost. The other fellow will say, "Well, you did it for MADDEN, why do you not do it for OLDFIELD?"

I remember the arguments made, as well as yesterday, before the Mexican conditions existed there. We exempted in the 1926 or the 1924 act—I forget which—the interest on money that the people of Mexico had in this country. That was to

induce them to put their money in our banks. It was a good thing, good public policy, but I suggest that it is a little difficult to satisfy your own mind that you are going to give a preference to foreign banks.

It does not appeal to me and I would like to strike it out because (A), (B), and (C) are based on the same principle.

I might add inferentially for the information of the Republican side as well as the Democratic side that this provision is the only provision that was recognized in the bill looking to the Secretary of the Treasury's recommendations. We thought he was entitled to some recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I think the Secretary's recommendations are worthy of the most serious consideration. He is a great financier and in many ways has made a great Secretary of the Treasury. So that his recommendations ought to be recognized and I did not make any kick about giving him this exception.

There was one other thing that the Secretary recommended that we adopted. He made an argument before the committee that was unanswerable to my mind, and I think his argument ought to be recognized. I refer to the argument that he made in favor of continuing the tax on prize fights. It is a very forcible argument. He pointed out where we had received two hundred and fifty thousand and odd dollars from the Tunney-Dempsey prize fight, and he said, "Who wants to repeal it?" Mr. Chairman, I could not find it in my soul to make an argument against it, so we just increased the rate from 10 to 25 per cent in response to the Secretary's argument in favor of that method of taxation.

Mr. MADDEN. And I wish that you had made it more.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. We said, if it is such a good tax, as the Secretary says, we might just as well make the rate as high as we can make it to receive the greatest amount of revenue, and you will find in this bill an estimate of $750,000 additional revenue on account of that splendid argument made by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to prize fights. He lost $35,000 by this other amendment to which I refer, but he recouped on account of his argument about prize fights some $750,000 for the benefit of the people.

Mr. MADDEN. So that there was a net profit of $725,000?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes; and this all because we carried out two of the suggestions made by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, I think my friend is altogether too modest. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is entitled to the credit for this provision with respect to prize fights, and I willingly give it to him.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Maybe so, but I just want to show that I am an impartial juror, and that I can give credit where credit is due, and whenever I can say a word for the Secretary of the Treasury I am anxious to do it. I took the floor on this occasion to point out these things, which we did because of the influence of the next greatest Secretary of the Treasury we have ever had—Alexander Hamilton being supposed to be the best.

Mr. MADDEN. And I suppose it is the gentleman's idea that a prize fight could be appreciated just as well with a 50 per cent tax as with a 20 per cent tax?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, no; 50 per cent would be too high. We would get no revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the rate?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Twenty-five per cent. If we had thought that 30 per cent would be better than 25 per cent, we would have put it at 30 per cent, but the committee decided that 25 per cent was the rate that would bring in the largest amount of revenue. Coming to the conclusion that the Secretary had made such an argument as could not be answered in respect to prize fights, we put the rate where we thought we would get the greatest amount of revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. And what did he say about the rate?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. He did not have anything to say about the rate, but we, as scientific tax providers, thought that the rate we provided was the proper rate to produce the greatest amount of revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman followed the Secretary of the Treasury by not paying any attention to him.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say just a word with regard to the provision in section 120 excepting and exempting from taxation the income derived by foreign central banks of issue from bankers' acceptances. This is done in order to keep foreign funds in the United States. In every other country in the world, particularly in the great countries of Europe, foreign banks of issue may keep funds on deposit without paying interest upon the income. There are three methods by which such foreign banks of issue can invest their money in the United States at the present time: First, by placing the money on deposit; second, by investing it in Government securities; and, third, by investing money in bankers' acceptances. Placing the money merely on deposit gives these banks of issue a very small return by way of interest. Some foreign banks of issue are not permitted to invest in Government securities which are not issued on a discount basis.

However, if those banks of issue invest their funds in these two methods, either by placing them on deposit in banking institutions or by purchasing Government securities, they are now exempt from tax upon the income. It is only in the case where they buy bankers' acceptances where they are now compelled to pay taxes on the income. These bankers' acceptances have the advantage that they are short-term paper and are very liquid assets and are just the kind of securities that foreign banks of issue want in order to keep their funds in the United States.

This statement is only by way of explanation for the insertion of this item in section 120, showing the reasons why the Treasury Department recommended this action be taken and why the Committee on Ways and Means approved it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 121. UNLIMITED DEDUCTION FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

In the case of an individual if in the taxable year and in each of the 10 preceding taxable years the amount of the contributions or gifts described in section 23 (n) plus the amount of income, war-profits, or excess-profits taxes paid during such year in respect of preceding taxable years, exceeds 90 per cent of the taxpayer's net income for each such year, as computed without the benefit of section 23 (n), then the 15 per cent limit imposed by such section shall not be applicable.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means a question. There is nothing in the report on this, and clearly it reads as though it was put in there to take care of some one individual.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is existing law. I have forgotten just when it was adopted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is nothing in the report about this.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is in the 1924 act.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is existing law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is it doing here?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. We are adopting the whole title relating to the income tax after the year 1927.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I took that up the other day and I found that there are several sections of the existing law that are not repeated in this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then they will not be in force after this date.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then we have a few amendments to put in.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman mean with reference to the income tax?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For instance, there is one on the theater tax.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is different. As to the income tax, we are repeating the whole law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And that is the law now?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If a man gives away 90 per cent of his income for 10 years, then he can deduct the whole amount?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are there many of these taxpayers?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; not a great many. It would be a good thing probably if there were more.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 208. MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES OTHER THAN LIFE

(a) Application of title: Mutual insurance companies, other than life insurance companies, shall be taxable in the same manner as other corporations, except as hereinafter provided in this section.

(b) Gross income: Mutual marine insurance companies shall include in gross income the gross premiums collected and received by them less amounts paid for reinsurance.

(c) Deductions: In addition to the deductions allowed to corporations by section 23, the following deductions to insurance companies shall also be allowed, unless otherwise allowed:

(1) Mutual insurance companies other than life insurance: In the case of mutual insurance companies other than life insurance companies—

(A) the net addition required by law to be made within the taxable year to reserve funds (including in the case of assessment insurance companies the actual deposit of sums with State or Territorial officers pursuant to law as additions to guarantee or reserve funds); and

(B) the sums other than dividends paid within the taxable year on policy and annuity contracts.

(2) Mutual marine insurance companies: In the case of mutual marine insurance companies, in addition to the deductions allowed in paragraph (1) of this subsection, unless otherwise allowed, amounts repaid to policyholders on account of premiums previously paid by them, and interest paid upon such amounts between the ascertainment and the payment thereof;

(3) Mutual insurance companies other than life and marine: In the case of mutual insurance companies (including interinsurers and reciprocal underwriters, but not including mutual life or mutual marine insurance companies) requiring their members to make premium deposits to provide for losses and expenses, the amount of premium deposits returned to their policyholders and the amount of premium deposits retained for the payment of losses, expenses, and reinsurance reserves.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, through the courtesy of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. GREEN of Iowa] I am permitted to make a brief statement. In 1924 the Income Tax Department made a ruling, or a ruling applies beginning then, that the heads and officials of county, municipal, and State hospitals are engaged in a proprietory business and therefore not exempt from taxation on their income. I have in my district the tuberculosis hospital in the State of New Jersey, built 20 years ago by State money, operated ever since by State taxation, and presided over by the same gentleman from the beginning, Doctor English. While we can not offer an amendment now with any success, I am going over to the higher body——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No, no; the lower body.

Mr. EATON. The lower body, and then if they can be induced to give relief to our long-suffering hospital officials we will come back here, and Mr. GREEN of Iowa and his copatriots assure me we will receive hospitable treatment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 214. CREDITS AGAINST NET INCOME

In the case of a nonresident alien individual the personal exemption allowed by section 25 (c) of this title shall be only $1,500. The credit for dependents allowed by section 25 (d) shall not be allowed in the case of a nonresident alien individual unless he is a resident of a contiguous country. These credits shall be determined by the status of the taxpayer on the last day of the taxable year, except that in case of death the rule provided in section 25 (e) (3) shall be applied.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the House, and especially Members from the cotton States, to a demonstration that will be made of some cotton bales next Friday morning in the House Office Building, in response to an expressed desire on the part of several Members of the House.

The Department of Agriculture has been making some tests in the use of cotton bagging as distinguished from jute bagging in the wrapping of cotton. In performing these tests it took some cotton baled at Henderson, N. C. and compressed to high density at Norfolk, Va., and shipped it to Bremen, Germany, and back. They have taken 9 bales from this shipment. Of these 9 bales, 4 were wrapped in cotton bagging of various weights, 4 in cotton colored the same shade as jute, and 1 bound in jute. They were subjected to the test of being sent to Bremen, Germany, and shipped back, thus being subjected to twice the ordinary handling. It is found the cotton bagging was in good shape, and in most instances better than the jute bagging. These bales will be on display next Friday morning in the caucus room of the House Office Building through the courtesy of the Speaker and the Superintendent of the Building, and those interested will have an opportunity to see them and see their condition after having been shipped abroad and back. The bales shipped bound in cotton bagging part weighed 12 ounces per yard, part 16 ounces, part 20, and part 24 ounces. New jute weighed 32 ounces per yard. The weight of covering a bale of cotton is 5 to 9 pounds and jute 14 pounds, exclusive of ties. There is a difference of only 36 cents in the cost of a bale of cotton wrapped in cotton bagging from that wrapped in jute, and the main difference that has always taken place in the price received has been owing principally to the fact that in the Liverpool market cotton has customarily been docked 30 pounds for the bagging and ties. That is one of the reasons for discouragement in the use of cotton bagging.

Cotton bagging is gradually coming into use, and this test of of the department is to encourage the use of cotton in covering cotton bales. It would take some two or three or four hundred thousand bales off the surplus market if the cotton could be used instead of the jute.

Mr. CRISP. I believe the gentleman answered the question I was going to ask—if it was true that if the entire crop was wrapped in cotton it would dispose of about 500,000 bales of cotton and take it off the market?

Mr. JONES. Yes; in a large crop it might run near that amount. Of course, the problem of a surplus is of great concern to our people, and it would be of great benefit to the cotton-growing States. Jute is produced in foreign countries, principally in India, and not in this country. Any new uses that are found for cotton will aid in disposing of the surplus and thus tend to the maintenance of a fair price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUPPLEMENT L—ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF DEFICIENCIES

SEC. 271. DEFINITION OF DEFICIENCY

As used in this title in respect of a tax imposed by this title "deficiency" means—

(a) The amount by which the tax imposed by this title exceeds the amount shown as the tax by the taxpayer upon his return; but the amount so shown on the return shall first be increased by the amounts previously assessed (or collected without assessment) as a deficiency, and decreased by the amounts previously abated, credited, refunded, or otherwise repaid in respect of such tax; or

(b) If no amount is shown as the tax by the taxpayer upon his return, or if no return is made by the taxpayer, then the amount by which the tax exceeds the amounts previously assessed (or collected without assessment) as a deficiency; but such amounts previously assessed, or collected without assessment, shall first be decreased by the amounts previously abated, credited, refunded, or otherwise repaid in respect of such tax.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, the section just read relates to the assessment and collection of deficiencies. Yesterday the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] raised a question with regard to the cost of collection of income taxes. I said I would try to secure some information upon that subject. I have here a statement sent me this morning by Mr. Charles R. Nash, the Assistant to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to insert a statement made by the Assistant to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

COST OF ADMINISTRATION—FISCAL YEAR 1927

The expenditures made for administering the internal-revenue tax laws for the fiscal year 1927 were $32,967,764.17, not including expenditures for refunding internal-revenue collections and taxes illegally collected, which in no sense are administrative expenses. The aggregate receipts of internal revenue for the fiscal year 1927 were $2,865,683,129.91, which makes the cost of operation for that fiscal year $1.15 for each $100 collected, as compared with $1.23 for each $100 collected for the fiscal year 1926, or a reduction of 6.5 per cent.

Approximately 40 per cent of the cost of administering internal-revenue tax laws during the fiscal year 1927 was expended in the auditing of back-year returns. It is not possible for the bureau to segregate the cost of auditing back-year returns from the cost of collecting the current year's revenue, as the work is interlocking to a vast extent, and the attempt to segregate such cost would require a very extensive as well as an expensive system of cost accounting.

The cost of collecting the internal revenue averaged very close to $1.80 for each $100 collected for 10 years prior to the World War. Following is a statement showing internal revenue receipts and expenditures, as well as the relative net cost of collecting each $100 for the fiscal years

1913 to 1927, inclusive. The cost of enforcing the narcotic and national prohibition acts is excluded in these figures for the years in which the enforcement of those acts was under the control of this bureau.

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures	Cost per $100
1913	$344,424,453.85	$5,484,654.61	$1.59
1914	380,008,893.96	5,779,329.72	1.52
1915	415,681,023.86	6,804,688.77	1.64
1916	512,723,287.77	7,199,163.32	1.40
1917	809,393,640.44	7,699,031.08	.95
1918	3,698,955,820.93	12,003,214.07	.33
1919	3,850,150,078.56	20,573,771.52	.53
1920	5,407,580,251.81	27,037,134.50	.50
1921	4,595,357,061.95	33,174,309.17	.72
1922	3,197,451,083.00	34,286,651.42	1.07
1923	2,621,745,227.57	36,501,062.94	1.39
1924	2,796,179,257.06	34,676,688.11	1.24
1925	2,584,140,268.24	37,266,573.16	1.44
1926	2,835,999,892.19	34,948,483.37	1.23
1927	2,865,683,129.91	32,967,764.17	1.15

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall comment upon this statement only to the extent of saying that for the fiscal year 1927 the total receipts of the Internal Revenue Bureau from all sources were $2,865,683,129.91, and the expenditures for all purposes were $32,967,764.17, making an average cost per hundred dollars of collection of $1.15. In other words, one and fifteen one-hundredths per cent has been the rate of the cost of collection in the bureau. I think that is a very remarkable showing. [Applause.] It shows that even in the very lowest brackets of the income tax—and no matter what we do in the matter of exemptions and deductions there will always be a lowest bracket—in the very lowest bracket, where the rate is 1½ per cent, the tax would be $1.50 per hundred of net income. The average cost of collection is even less than that returned from the lowest tax that possibly might be collected.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman's statement analyze and show the cost in the collection of taxes, starting with the low brackets and going up? Is not advantage taken of the fact that, using all the taxes collected and the total expense as a basis, they include in many instances cases where they collect $50,000 or $100,000, it costs no more to collect it than to collect $1 from the poor working girl?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from Illinois is not taking advantage of anybody. I stated what was the cost per $100 of collections in the bureau during the year 1927. Of course I have not segregated the cost in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma. The figures come from the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Any Member of the House can get exactly the same information as that I have procured, or any other information he may desire, by making application to the Treasury Department.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The point I want to make is this: When I was State auditor of the State of Oklahoma I could make a statement to show to the people of the State of Oklahoma how much it cost to collect $10,000,000, but the statement did not show how much it cost me to collect a dollar's tax from one individual.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not know how the gentleman conducted his office in Oklahoma.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. You could not well answer the question raised by the lady from New Jersey without covering that point.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I believe the statement I have inserted is informative, and I think the Members of the House will find that it gives them valuable facts.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 272. PROCEDURE IN GENERAL.

(a) Petition to Board of Tax Appeals.—If in the case of any taxpayer the commissioner determines that there is a deficiency in respect of the tax imposed by this title, the commissioner is authorized to send notice of such deficiency to the taxpayer by registered mail. Within 60 days after such notice is mailed (not counting Sunday as the sixtieth day) the taxpayer may file a petition with the Board of Tax Appeals for a redetermination of the deficiency. No assessment of a deficiency in respect of the tax imposed by this title and no distraint or proceeding in court for its collection shall be made, begun, or prosecuted until such notice has been mailed to the taxpayer, nor until the expiration of such 60-day period, nor, if a petition has been filed with the board, until the decision of the board has become final. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3224 of the Revised Statutes the making of such assessment or the beginning of such proceeding or distraint during the time such prohibition is in force may be enjoined by a proceeding in the proper court.

For exceptions to the restrictions imposed by this subsection see—

(1) Subsection (d) of this section, relating to waivers by the taxpayer;

(2) Subsection (f) of this section, relating to notifications of mathematical errors appearing upon the face of the return;

(3) Section 273, relating to jeopardy assessments;

(4) Section 274, relating to bankruptcy and receiverships; and

(5) Section 1001 of the revenue act of 1926, as amended, relating to assessment or collection of the amount of the deficiency determined by the board pending court review.

(b) Collection of deficiency found by board.—If the taxpayer files a petition with the board the entire amount redetermined as the deficiency by the decision of the board which has become final shall be assessed and shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector. No part of the amount determined as a deficiency by the commissioner, but disallowed as such by the decision of the board, which has become final, shall be assessed or be collected by distraint or by proceeding in court with or without assessment.

(c) Failure to file petition: If the taxpayer does not file a petition with the board within the time prescribed in subsection (a) of this section, the deficiency, notice of which has been mailed to the taxpayer, shall be assessed, and shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector.

(d) Waiver of restrictions: The taxpayer shall at any time have the right, by a signed notice in writing filed with the commissioner, to waive the restrictions provided in subsection (a) of this section on the assessment and collection of the whole or any part of the deficiency.

(e) Increase of deficiency after notice mailed: The board shall have jurisdiction to redetermine the correct amount of the deficiency even if the amount so redetermined is greater than the amount of the deficiency, notice of which has been mailed to the taxpayer, and to determine whether any penalty, additional amount or addition to the tax should be assessed—if claim therefor is asserted by the commissioner at or before the hearing or a rehearing.

(f) Further deficiency letters restricted: If the commissioner has mailed to the taxpayer notice of a deficiency as provided in subsection (a) of this section, and the taxpayer files a petition with the board within the time prescribed in such subsection, the commissioner shall have no right to determine any additional deficiency in respect of the same taxable year, except in the case of fraud, and except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, relating to assertion of greater deficiencies before the board, or in section 273 (c), relating to the making of jeopardy assessments. If the taxpayer is notified that, on account of a mathematical error appearing upon the face of the return, an amount of tax in excess of that shown upon the return is due, and that an assessment of the tax has been or will be made on the basis of what would have been the correct amount of tax but for the mathematical error, such notice shall not be considered (for the purposes of this subsection, or of subsection (a) of this section, prohibiting assessment and collection until notice of deficiency has been mailed, or of section 322 (c), prohibiting credits or refunds after petition to the Board of Tax Appeals) as a notice of a deficiency, and the taxpayer shall have no right to file a petition with the board based on such notice, nor shall such assessment or collection be prohibited by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(g) Jurisdiction over other taxable years: The board in redetermining a deficiency in respect of any taxable year shall consider such facts with relation to the taxes for other taxable years as may be necessary correctly to redetermine the amount of such deficiency, but in so doing shall have no jurisdiction to determine whether or not the tax for any other taxable year has been overpaid or underpaid.

(h) Final decisions of board: For the purposes of this title the date on which a decision of the board becomes final shall be determined according to the provisions of section 1005 of the revenue act of 1926.

(i) Prorating of deficiency to installments: If the taxpayer has elected to pay the tax in installments and a deficiency has been assessed, the deficiency shall be prorated to the four installments. Except as provided in section 273 (relating to jeopardy assessments), that part of the deficiency so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has not arrived, shall be collected at the same time as and as part of such installment. That part of the deficiency so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has arrived, shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector.

(j) Extension of time for payment of deficiencies: Where it is shown to the satisfaction of the commissioner that the payment of a deficiency upon the date prescribed for the payment thereof will result in undue hardship to the taxpayer the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary (except where the deficiency is due to negligence, to intentional disregard of rules and regulations, or to fraud with intent to evade tax), may grant an extension for the payment of such deficiency or any part thereof for a period not in excess of 18 months,

and, in exceptional cases, for a further period not in excess of 12 months. If an extension is granted, the commissioner may require the taxpayer to furnish a bond in such amount, not exceeding double the amount of the deficiency, and with such sureties, as the commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of the deficiency in accordance with the terms of the extension.

(k) Address for notice of deficiency: In the absence of notice to the commissioner under section 312 (a) of the existence of a fiduciary relationship, notice of a deficiency in respect of a tax imposed by this title, if mailed to the taxpayer at his last known address, shall be sufficient for the purposes of this title even if such taxpayer is deceased, or is under a legal disability, or, in the case of a corporation, has terminated its existence.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to offer an amendment that would change this whole section so that the tax returns would be much more simple to make than they are at present. I know that most of the Members of this House realize how difficult it is to make satisfactory returns at this time, and how intricate and expensive a proposition it is. We have in West Virginia a number of coal operators that have to come here as many as three different times to have their tax returns corrected on one case. In many instances they have to bring their books, their papers, their clerks and expert accountants, and the cost in getting these returns corrected is more than the amount they would get in return, and that in many instances is a very large amount. In fact, it costs some of the coal companies ten or twelve thousand dollars to get corrected back returns that have been assessed against them wrongfully. My amendment would simplify that in a general way.

They recently appointed a committee to go over that, but unfortunately I did not have an opportunity to go before that committee, and I want to ask at this time unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to print therein proposals which we think would be of much advantage in making returns under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGHES. I have read the report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which I received a few days ago. I have read the report with much interest, in view of the personal experience I have had with the bureau and those charged with the administration of the internal revenue laws.

The principal purpose for which a committee was appointed from both Houses of Congress was—

to investigate measures and methods for the simplification of internal revenue taxes, particularly the income tax.

The result of the committee's investigation is a condemnation of the present methods as insufficient, causing the inexcusable delays and enormous expense to both the taxpayer and the Government. This delay and expense to the taxpayer is so great as to amount to a complete denial of justice in most cases where the taxpayer and the unit do not agree as to the facts and the law.

The utter lack of competency of the bureau is shown by the following facts, among others, taken from the report:

(1) In the last five years there was collected from the taxpayers the sum of $690,862,327.71 illegally and unjustly. The yearly average of these illegal exactions was $138,172,465.54. The average number of employees was 15,332, at a total expense to the Government of $170,360,571.75.

(2) One-half of all the cases involving $10,000 or more decided by the Board of Tax Appeals were decided in favor of the taxpayer. The findings of the bureau were wrong and unjustifiable in one-half of all its conclusions. This record of inefficiency necessarily resulted in overrunning the Board of Tax Appeals with more work than it can possibly turn out.

(3) Quoting from volume 3, page 2, of the report:

More than 19,000 undecided cases are now pending before the Board of Tax Appeals, involving aggregate deficiencies of $550,000,000. The petitions being filed with the Board of Tax Appeals (new cases) exceed the number disposed of by more than 200 per month.

By the end of next year there will be 21,400 undecided cases pending before the Board of Tax Appeals.

CAUSE OF THIS CONGESTION

Of course, it necessarily follows that as long as the department is wrong in half the cases that come before it, and forcing the taxpayers to pay more than $125,000,000 a year unjustly and without warrant of law, controversy and litigation will continue to increase.

The actual results of the present system condemn it as utterly inefficient and unduly extravagant.

The injustice to and burden upon the taxpayer in defending himself against these unlawful exactions are really appalling when all the facts are known and given proper consideration.

Unfortunately there is no way by which an intelligent estimate can be made of the vast sum of money that it costs the taxpayers to resist and defend the illegal demands that the Internal Revenue Department is making upon them. This expense in loss of time and expenditure of money is so great that thousands of taxpayers are paying these illegal assessments rather than to make a successful defense thereto, because it is cheaper in the long run to pay than to defend.

THE TAXPAYER'S BURDEN UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS

(1) After filing his return he is visited by a field agent, to whom he must explain all of his business transactions, his books of account, depletions, and depreciations, including religious and charitable donations during the year. The field agent then makes his report to the local unit, which furnishes the taxpayer with a copy of the agent's report and finding.

(2) Taxpayer files his protest with the local unit and is given a hearing before this unit. This hearing means that the taxpayer brings a number of witnesses, including bookkeepers, accountants, engineers, experts of various sorts, including tax experts and attorneys. These witnesses are all high-priced specialists, who give their testimony after making a thorough examination of all the taxpayer's business transactions, plants, machinery, and physical conditions. From this evidence the local unit makes a recommendation to the department at Washington. The local unit has no power to settle anything, although it has heard all the evidence pro and con. It acts only as an advisory board. The local unit finally sends the case to Washington.

(3) Then the taxpayer, in order to receive simple justice at the hands of his Government, will be forced to take all his books and records and high-priced witnesses to Washington, and before some unit in the department have the second hearing and another trial. He must pay the railroad, Pullman fares, and hotel bills and other incidental expenses, which keep on mounting up. The chances are that the case will be shifted from one unit to another before a final determination is reached. I quote from page 5, volume 3, of joint committee's report:

(6) SHIFTING RESPONSIBILITY

It is admitted that there has been a failure on the part of the personnel of the bureau to assume responsibility in the disposition of cases. Final decisions have been shifted from place to place in the bureau and from the bureau to the Board of Tax Appeals. "Passing the buck" undoubtedly exists.

To such an extent has this "passing the buck" prevailed that several hearings, conferences, and trials have been required from the same taxpayer on the same case, attended with much cost and delay.

The reason for these various hearings and delays is stated as follows:

This is in most instances merely a consequence of the Treasury's inability to retain individuals competent and willing to assume responsibility and make final decisions.

After 10 years' experience, with the aid of many amendatory acts of Congress, the Treasury frankly admits that the present system is an utter failure, involving enormous and unnecessary time and expense upon the honest taxpayer.

(4) When a conclusion is finally reached by the bureau—one-half of which are erroneous—the taxpayer moves the case to the Board of Tax Appeals. This tribunal hears the whole case de novo. All the books, records, and witnesses that had given testimony (1) before the local unit and (2) before the unit in the bureau at Washington, often two or three times, must again (3) be brought all the way to Washington to testify and repeat before the Board of Tax Appeals precisely the same testimony and proofs that have been produced at least twice, and often three or four times before, at previous hearings, involving the same questions for the same year. It should be remembered that this complicated system of procedure is tremendously expensive to the taxpayer, which is a complete loss to him, to say nothing of the time taken away from his business.

The present system should be so simplified as to permit of but one hearing, involving the taking of testimony, and every step after that should be confined to the record made at the hearing.

In the interest of both the Government and taxpayer I make the following suggestions, which will speed the hearings and

final determination of the cases and come as near to securing justice to all concerned as it is possible to do in matters of taxation:

A. The field agent should make his report direct to the collector in each district, the taxpayer to be furnished a copy from the collector's office. Upon receipt of such report the taxpayer can file his protest with the collector, setting forth the grounds of his objections to the report.

B. Upon such protest coming in the collector will fix a day for a hearing and so notify the taxpayer. At the time fixed the taxpayer will bring before the collector all his evidence to sustain his contention. The Government will be represented by counsel, who may introduce rebuttal testimony. The evidence on both sides will be taken down and made a part of the record. After argument of counsel, if any should be desired, the collector shall decide the matter in controversy, and his findings and judgment shall become a part of the record. There will be a complete record of the whole proceeding, including all the evidence and the collector's judgment thereon.

APPEALS

C. All appeals shall be taken direct to the Board of Tax Appeals sitting at Washington. This appellate tribunal will review the collector's findings on the record made before the collector, and sustain or correct it as they may find just. But they will hear no evidence of any kind other than that contained in the record itself. The Board of Tax Appeals will act solely as an appellate tribunal to correct the errors of the collector as they appear on the record already made.

The original record or a certified copy shall be sent by the collector to the Board of Tax Appeals whenever an appeal is desired, and thus save much time and expense in the preparation of a new record or a copy.

D. In the method suggested there would be one hearing with witnesses, and this would be held in the district where the taxpayer lives. Instead of three or four trials there would be but one, involving the expense of both sides in producing their testimony. After this one trial all the additional expense would be for counsel to argue the case from the record before the Board of Tax Appeals.

This suggestion is based upon precisely the same principle that governs all our court proceedings. The collector would correspond to our district or trial courts, where all the evidence heard becomes a part of the record. On appeals from the trial court the record is transmitted to the appellate court, which hears no evidence, but acts only upon the record before it, and corresponds to the Board of Tax Appeals.

If the Congress should act upon this suggestion and make provision for its adoption, it would do away with the present method, which the Treasury frankly admits is cumbersome and most inefficient. It would reduce the internal-revenue employees more than one-half, and thus save an enormous expense to the Government.

SPEED OF APPELLATE HEARINGS

The increasing congestion of cases before the Board of Tax Appeals is due to two causes primarily, namely:

(1) The taxing units of the bureau are constantly changing their personnel. The more experienced and efficient men are leaving the bureau for better employment outside. The less efficient are "passing the buck" from one to another, and finally the taxpayer is driven to the Board of Tax Appeals to get justice.

(2) The Board of Tax Appeals have to go into a trial de novo, with all the delays incident to the production and hearing of original evidence in each case. If the Board of Tax Appeals would hear these cases on the record as made they could dispose of three or four times as many cases as they do now and with greater satisfaction to themselves and the litigants.

Under the suggestion made the collector could not shift his responsibility. The parties interested would get action immediately, and his findings would carry such weight that his judgment in most cases would be accepted by both parties and thus become final at once. Whatever expert and technical assistance necessary could be supplied him by the commissioner on regular or periodical assignment. He can and would decide cases in the first instance with more dispatch and reliable judgment than can possibly be had from the bureau at Washington.

That the present system of administering the internal revenue affairs of the Government is faulty and woefully inefficient is known by all who have had any experience with the bureau at Washington. In order to correct and simplify it so that it will function expeditiously with the least cost and expense to the taxpayer and delay to the Government, controversies should be heard and tried in the district where the taxpayer lives. This is the policy established by Congress for the administration of justice in our courts. A man may not be sued except in the judicial district where he resides.

To a considerable extent the foregoing suggestions have been approved by the report of the committee.

The report says, page 7, column 1:

In order to bring the audit work current, collectors of internal revenue have been assigned the task of auditing all the smaller individual returns, and during the past few years have also audited a majority of the larger individual returns.

With the aid of the field agent the collector can give an intelligent audit to all the returns filed with him, whether individual or corporate.

The committee says (p. 7):

It is recommended that serious consideration be given to the consolidation of the offices of collectors of internal revenue and the offices of internal revenue agents. A single organization will promote efficiency and convenience to taxpayers in the collection of taxes for the following reasons:

(a) Better service will be rendered to the taxpayer since there would be one directing head and one office in each collection district to which a taxpayer "may have convenient access."

(b) It would aid the central office at Washington.

(c) There would be a saving of $2,000,000 a year in expense. At present "there is a duplication of work in the mathematical verification of tax returns. There is a duplication in the numerous records that are required to be maintained. There is a duplication in the correspondence and files. Other important elements on which savings can be effected are rentals of office space, telephone, consolidation of mechanical equipment, and traveling expense."

If it is desirable, as the committee finds, to give the collectors more authority to determine in the first instance questions that arise between the Government and the taxpayer, such authority should be extended to include all returns and all taxpayers, individual and corporate.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 278. JEOPARDY ASSESSMENTS

(a) Authority for making: If the commissioner believes that the assessment or collection of a deficiency will be jeopardized by delay, he shall immediately assess such deficiency (together with all interest, additional amounts, or additions to the tax provided for by law) and notice and demand shall be made by the collector for the payment thereof.

(b) Deficiency letters: If the jeopardy assessment is made before any notice in respect of the tax to which the jeopardy assessment relates has been mailed under section 272(a), then the commissioner shall mail a notice under such subsection within 60 days after the making of the assessment.

(c) Amount assessable before decision of board: The jeopardy assessment may be made in respect of a deficiency greater or less than that notice of which has been mailed to the taxpayer, despite the provisions of section 272(f) prohibiting the determination of additional deficiencies, and whether or not the taxpayer has therefore filed a petition with the Board of Tax Appeals. The commissioner shall notify the board of the amount of such assessment, if the petition is filed with the board before the making of the assessment or is subsequently filed, and the board shall have jurisdiction to redetermine the entire amount of the deficiency and of all amounts assessed at the same time in connection therewith.

(d) Amount assessable after decision of board: If the jeopardy assessment is made after the decision of the board is rendered, such assessment may be made only in respect of the deficiency determined by the board in its decision.

(e) Expiration of right to assess: A jeopardy assessment may not be made after the decision of the board has become final or after the taxpayer has filed a petition for review of the decision of the board.

(f) Bond to stay collection: When a jeopardy assessment has been made the taxpayer, within 10 days after notice and demand from the collector for the payment of the amount of the assessment, may obtain a stay of collection of the whole or any part of the amount of the assessment by filing with the collector a bond in such amount, not exceeding double the amount as to which the stay is desired, and with such sureties as the collector deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of so much of the amount, the collection of which is stayed by the bond, as is not abated by a decision of the board which has become final, together with interest thereon as provided in section 297.

(g) Same—Further conditions: If the bond is given before the taxpayer has filed his petition with the board under section 272(a), the bond shall contain a further condition that if a petition is not filed within the period provided in such subsection, then the amount the collection of which is stayed by the bond will be paid on notice and demand at any time after the expiration of such period, together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of

the jeopardy notice and demand to the date of notice and demand under this subsection.

(h) Waiver of stay: Upon the filing of the bond the collection of so much of the amount assessed as is covered by the bond shall be stayed. The taxpayer shall have the right to waive such stay at any time in respect of the whole or any part of the amount covered by the bond, and if as a result of such waiver any part of the amount covered by the bond is paid, then the bond shall, at the request of the taxpayer, be proportionately reduced. If the board determines that the amount assessed is greater than the amount which should have been assessed, then when the decision of the board is rendered the bond shall, at the request of the taxpayer, be proportionately reduced.

(i) Collection of unpaid amounts: When the petition has been filed with the board and when the amount which should have been assessed has been determined by a decision of the board which has become final, then any unpaid portion, the collection of which has been stayed by the bond, shall be collected as part of the tax upon notice and demand from the collector, and any remaining portion of the assessment shall be abated. If the amount already collected exceeds the amount determined as the amount which should have been assessed, such excess shall be credited or refunded to the taxpayer as provided in section 322, without the filing of claim therefor. If the amount determined as the amount which should have been assessed is greater than the amount actually assessed, then the difference shall be assessed and shall be collected as part of the tax upon notice and demand from the collector.

(j) Claims in abatement: No claim in abatement shall be filed in respect of any assessment made after the enactment of this act in respect of any income, war-profits, or excess-profits tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 166, strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive, and insert:

"(j) Claims in abatement: No claim in abatement shall be filed in respect of any assessment in respect of any tax imposed by this title."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a clerical error. The language now in the bill applies to the 1926 act. What we should have is an amendment that will apply only to this act, and that is the purpose of the amendment I have sent to the Clerk's desk. The matter is fully covered so far as any taxes under the prior act are concerned by the prior law, and consequently the provision which is now in the bill is inappropriate. The amendment I have sent to the Clerk's desk should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 322. REFUNDS AND CREDITS

(a) Authorization: Where there has been an overpayment of any tax imposed by this title, the amount of such overpayment shall be credited against any income, war-profits, or excess-profits tax or installment thereof then due from the taxpayer, and any balance shall be refunded immediately to the taxpayer.

(b) Limitation on allowance.—

(1) Period of limitation: No such credit or refund shall be allowed or made after three years from the time the tax was paid, unless before the expiration of such period a claim therefor is filed by the taxpayer.

(2) Limit on amount of credit or refund: The amount of the credit or refund shall not exceed the portion of the tax paid during the three years immediately preceding the filing of the claim, or if no claim was filed, then during the three years immediately preceding the allowance of the credit or refund.

(c) Effect of petition to board: If the commissioner has mailed to the taxpayer a notice of deficiency under section 272(a) and if the taxpayer files a petition with the Board of Tax Appeals within the time prescribed in such subsection, no credit or refund in respect of the tax for the taxable year in respect of which the commissioner has determined the deficiency shall be allowed or made and no suit by the taxpayer for the recovery of any part of such tax shall be instituted in any court except—

(1) As to overpayments determined by a decision of the board which has become final; and

(2) As to any amount collected in excess of an amount computed in accordance with the decision of the board which has become final; and

(3) As to any amount collected after the period of limitation upon the beginning of distraint or a proceeding in court for collection has expired; but in any such claim for credit or refund or in any such suit for refund the decision of the board which has become final, as to whether such period has expired before the notice of deficiency was mailed, shall be conclusive.

(d) Overpayment found by board: If the board finds that there is no deficiency and further finds that the taxpayer has made an overpayment of tax in respect of the taxable year in respect of which the commissioner determined the deficiency, the board shall have jurisdiction to determine the amount of such overpayment, and such amount shall, when the decision of the board has become final, be credited or refunded to the taxpayer. No such credit or refund shall be made of any portion of the tax paid more than three years before the filing of the claim or the filing of the petition, whichever is earlier.

(e) Tax withheld at source: For refund or credit in case of excessive withholding at the source, see section 143 (f).

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. I understood from one of the gentlemen on this committee that this bill provided that where a corporation or individual transferred its or his business they could get a receipt from the department, if they did not owe anything, so they would not hold up funds for taxes. I want to know whether I am correct.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no special provision of that kind. But I had understood that where a receipt was obtained the department carried out that idea.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman that under the present administration we have corporations which are not making any money and, therefore, they pay no taxes. They sell out, but they are compelled to hold up a certain amount of their assets until the statute of limitations runs and there is nobody authorized to issue a statement that they have no claim for taxes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think I understand what the gentleman refers to. There is a provision in the bill for a settlement between the bureau and the taxpayer and where that is agreed to by both parties that is final absolutely and it can not be opened up again.

Mr. McKEOWN. If there are no taxes due they can so certify and turn him loose so that his funds will not be held up indefinitely? They do not do it now and I wanted to know whether under this bill that can be done.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman refers to the matter of a release of liens?

Mr. McKEOWN. No. I will illustrate. Corporation A has paid taxes, but in 1926 it makes no money and, therefore, has to pay no taxes and there are no taxes due; then corporation A sells out to corporation B and corporation B requires corporation A to hold certain funds from that sale until the statute of limitations runs. That ought not to be, and I want to know whether there is any provision in this bill by which corporation A can go to the Treasury Department, have an examination made, and get a clear receipt that there is no claim, and turn their property loose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There are two provisions which would apply to the case the gentleman mentions. The first is that provision with reference to settlements, which provides that when an agreement is made between the Treasury Department and a taxpayer a final settlement can be made and it can not be reopened. Then there is another provision that when a corporation wants to dissolve, they can have a final audit within a year.

Mr. McKEOWN. If that is construed to apply to a sale, it is a good provision, but the way it is at the present time if a corporation sells out, it is compelled to hold certain assets for an indefinite period of time until the statute of limitations runs and that ought to be cured in this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know how a corporation could sell out entirely without dissolving.

Mr. McKEOWN. One corporation can buy out another corporation or an individual can buy the property of a corporation and dissolve it. All I am trying to do is simply to have some provision in the bill providing that the department shall give them a clear receipt and say there is no tax due so they will not hold up any of their assets. I think it is a very necessary matter and I would like to have the committee's construction that it is the intention of the department to do that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think that can be done.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is all I wanted to know. The thing I am interested in is that it is provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS TAXES

PART I. ESTATE TAX

SEC. 401. DEDUCTIONS IN CASE OF NONRESIDENT DECEDENTS

(a) Section 303 (b) (1) of the revenue act of 1926 (relating to deductions from the gross estate of a nonresident decedent) is amended

by striking out: ", but in no case shall the amount so deducted exceed 10 per cent of the value of that part of his gross estate which at the time of his death is situated in the United States."

(d) Overpayment found by board: If the board finds that there is no deficiency and further finds that the taxpayer has made an overpayment of tax in respect——

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Page 183, after line 16, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 401, Title III, of the revenue act of 1926, shall not apply in the case of any decedent dying after the enactment of this act."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment very clearly is out of order, but I am not going to make a point of order against it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, I think the House or the committee ought to have an opportunity to debate this question, and I do not want to be charged with preparing the bill in such form that the amendment would not be in order. I have been charged, I may say, if the gentleman from Connecticut will permit——

Mr. MERRITT. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In some of the public prints I have been charged with not permitting a fair submission of this question to the Ways and Means Committee at the time of the hearing. This charge was utterly and absolutely false. Every indulgence was granted at the hearing to those who favored the repeal of the tax, nevertheless some of the papers misrepresented the matter. I saw a quotation from the Louisville Courier-Journal the other day in criticism of myself and the gentleman from Texas to the effect that the gentleman from Texas and myself said at the hearings that the people who were there asking the repeal of the inheritance tax had no business there because they were not invited and that nobody had any right to appear before the committee except those who had been specially invited by the committee. Now, there is not a word of truth in such a statement. The fact of the matter is the committee did not specially invite anybody at any of the hearings, out of all the numerous witnesses, except the Secretary of the Treasury and such officials as he wanted to present. They were the only ones to whom the committee sent any special invitations, and I do not want to have any repetition of such comments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment which the gentleman has offered, although I shall not insist upon it. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, however, this question. The gentleman has stated he is in favor of rather liberal debate upon the question now pending.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the gentleman's purpose to attempt to press for a vote on any actual amendments of the bill this afternoon?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; it is not. We ran very late last night, and I think we can well afford to adjourn a little early this afternoon.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. May I ask the gentleman a question in order that the gentlemen of the House who may have business elsewhere may be informed? Is it the purpose to try to pass the bill to-morrow or have it go over for a vote on Thursday?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think it would be best to have it go over for a vote on Thursday.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I think it would be well to have an agreement now that the bill will be voted on Thursday, so that the membership of the House may accommodate themselves accordingly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No earlier than Thursday, the gentleman means?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. No earlier than Thursday. We will then have ample opportunity to-morrow for debate on this amendment as well as other amendments that will be offered. It will be an accommodation to the House to know that we are going to vote on the bill Thursday.

The CHAIRMAN. We can not have an agreement to that effect now, of course, because that would have to be submitted to the House, but we can have an understanding.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether it would not be possible to approximate the length of the debate now so that we may have some idea as to when the vote will come in the committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. You can not do that in Committee of the Whole. You can have a gentleman's understanding that a vote will not be taken earlier than Thursday, but, of course, you can not in Committee of the Whole fix a definite time.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But there can be some understanding as to our purpose.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; of course.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman can ask unanimous consent that the debate close in one hour or two hours——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman means on this particular matter?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; on this particular item. We can make that one hour or two hours or whatever time may be agreeable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I thought the gentleman was referring to the vote on the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; only on this particular item.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] proceeds, will he permit a further interruption?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If I may, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Texas. Is it now understood that the final votes upon this bill will not be had earlier than Thursday?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is the understanding to which I have heard no objection from any one. It is agreeable to the gentleman from Texas and myself.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then there will be no roll calls earlier than Thursday?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No roll calls earlier than Thursday, but I hope gentlemen will attend, nevertheless, when there are votes here in the committee.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the time of the committee to go into a general argument with reference to the estate tax either on economic grounds or on constitutional grounds.

The economic ground is well understood—that the tendency of estate taxes is to use accumulated-capital estates for current expenses, which is an economic waste. The legal or constitutional ground is equally well understood that the right to hold property and to dispose of it by will depends on the law of the States and not on the United States, and therefore the tax should be left to the States. These grounds have been discussed so often that nothing can be added to them now.

If, under the necessities of war, the United States steps in and levies taxes on estates despite these economic and constitutional objections, there is certainly no excuse for the United States to lay these taxes in time of peace.

But at present, even beyond these reasons which are basic and which exist at all times, it appears to me that an objection even more important appears in the reasons given by the committee, and those favoring it, for continuing the tax at this time. The reasons given are that if the United States does not impose this tax then the State in many cases will not, and that there will be a race among the States for taking off the estate tax which will result in social injustice.

That has been stated many times in argument and in the hearings. Now, obviously, if those are the reasons it means that we are continuing this tax, not for the purpose of revenue but for certain social purposes, under the urge of those who fear the evils of large estates, and therefore think that a part at least of these estates should be taken away from the heirs and thus avoid danger to the social fabric. Therefore the United States through its Congress is undertaking to coerce the States and legislatures by Federal legislation in regard to State legislation on estate taxes.

It appears to me that if there is or ever has been any clear invasion by the United States of the sovereign rights of the States, this is a very glaring example. If the United States can legislate so as to force the States into a certain line of legislation on estates, of course they can do it in other directions.

For example, the State of Connecticut has no income tax. Perhaps some social reformer would say we ought to have an income tax, and therefore legislate in our Federal revenue bill so as to force the State of Connecticut to have an income tax. I do not believe gentlemen would seriously consider that, but I do not see any difference in the logic of it. Or they might insist that we should have a certain type of excise tax in the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. MERRITT. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The purpose of levying the tax is so that the estate tax shall be substantially equal, and if the State desires to levy a tax it can do so. The other purpose is that it is going to yield a considerable amount of revenue, which is very important in this bill, in the way we stand now.

Mr. MERRITT. If the reason of the tax was to raise revenue for the United States and have it equal throughout the Nation, and that was all there was of it, my contention, except as to the economical and constitutional grounds, would fail; but when the bill says that the United States will collect $100 and give the State back $80, it seems to me the reason given by the chairman is interfered with.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman has indicated that there are legal objections to the plan that is now in effect. I take it for granted the gentleman's attention has been called to the case decided by the Supreme Court in January, the case of the State of Florida against Mellon, in which it appears from the principal brief for the State of Florida that every conceivable constitutional objection was presented, and all of those objections seem to have been overruled, the court holding that the legislation is constitutional. Explicit reference was made to the 80 per cent credit and the motive of Congress in providing it. And so I think we must assume that the validity of the act is now beyond question.

Mr. MERRITT. I admit that the decision of the Supreme Court takes precedence of my view of the law, but I was arguing the matter on general theoretical principles.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I ask the gentleman to differentiate between an invasion of State rights when the Federal Government undertakes to tax the estate of an individual, and the action of the Federal Government when it undertakes to tax the income of an individual while alive. What violates State rights in the first case and does not in the second?

Mr. MERRITT. Of course there is a difference between the income of an estate and the estate itself.

Mr. BEGG. I would not concede that. The estate just becomes an income to some individual.

Mr. MERRITT. Oh, no.

Mr. BEGG. Why not?

Mr. MERRITT. It is a gift from a deceased person.

Mr. BEGG. If some of my ancestors die and leave me some money or some property, I do not know what you would call it if it is not exactly the same thing as getting an extra dividend, say, from some stock that I might hold.

Mr. MERRITT. But the gentleman's ancestor would have to die every year.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, I do not have to have that extra dividend every year.

Mr. MERRITT. No; the gentleman does not, but I think there is a very distinct economic difference between accumulated capital and the income from the employment of that capital.

Mr. BEGG. I would agree with the gentleman if he undertook to discuss the question from a certain angle, but I am trying to hold it to a discussion of State rights. If the Federal Government is violating State rights by taxing the estate of an individual, would it not also violate the same State right by taxing the income of that individual?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Of course, we have a constitutional amendment upon the matter of the income tax. I do not say that the Federal estate tax is unconstitutional, and I am in favor of the estate tax.

Mr. BEGG. That does not answer anything. I want to know what the difference is in the violation of State rights.

Mr. MERRITT. I admit it is legal. I am only talking about the theoretical sovereignty of the State. When you talk about something that you get by devise being the same as income, I think the gentleman is in error economically, because what he is talking about is the same as if I went into his State and said to his ancestors while living, "I am going to take 10 per cent of your capital."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I have practically finished what I had to say, because all of these questions have been considered by you gentlemen on the floor. I do think that we ought to all bear in mind the danger of legislating to bring results indirectly. The Supreme Court has animadverted on that in the child-labor case and some others, I think. If we will confine ourselves to Federal matters and to scrutinizing not only legislation of this sort, but so-called State-aid legislation, I think we shall much better preserve the integrity of the union and the sovereignty of the States and the independence of our citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print at the end of my remarks the resolution of the Connecticut Legislature on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no objection, but I think the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] had that printed the other day.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, it is a very short resolution and it seems to me that it would come very properly at the close of my colleague's remarks. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I have no objection to it, but I call attention to the fact that in the RECORD of this morning will be found resolutions of the various legislatures of the United States that have been passed on this subject, all inserted in the Senate proceedings and it includes the resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 36

Resolved by this assembly—

Whereas by the provisions of the Federal revenue act of 1926, which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, this State is being subjected to a form of coercion in order to compel the imposition of State death taxes at rates higher than its citizens desire to impose upon themselves for their own needs and benefit; and

Whereas any form of coercion, or financial inducement to States, by Federal authority is in distinct conflict with the spirit of our constitutional government, is offensive to sound policy, and is destructive of the responsibility of citizens and of States with respect to the power to levy taxes, the most vital of the powers which inhere in government; and

Whereas joint levies of taxes by the Federal Government on the one hand, and by the States of the Union on the other hand, are unprecedented in the history of this country, and are particularly offensive when the Federal enactment operates in any way to influence or control the exercise of sovereignty by the respective States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the judgment of the general assembly that the Congress of the United States should forthwith repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, leaving this field of taxation exclusively to the States of the Union in times of peace.

* * * * * * *

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the committee if we are going to adjourn at this time or when?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Unless the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] wants to be heard now, I would be glad to move that the committee rise. I think that we will adjourn very shortly.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I would like to have the floor at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], a member of the committee, is on his feet.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I will defer to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. TILSON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1, had come to no resolution thereon.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 92

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorizd and directed to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, the office of legislative counsel, and employees paid on vouchers under authority of resolutions, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

Mr. MADDEN. I move the adoption of the resolution. It is the usual resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time and passed.

ADDRESS OF LOUIS LUDLOW, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have an address made by Mr. Louis Ludlow, president of the National Press Club, at a luncheon held in Indianapolis, which bears upon constitutional questions. I think it is a valuable address, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Reserving the right to object, how long is this address?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is not very long, the length of an ordinary luncheon address.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Upon what subject?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Upon constitutional questions.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not believe I care to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Louis Ludlow, president of the National Press Club:

BACK TO THE CONSTITUTION

Jacob turned out to be a great patriarch, albeit in his younger days he was a pretty shifty specimen. There was something about the unregenerated Jacob, his imaginative faculties and, above all, his clever way of doing things which suggests a resemblance to that modern doer of great deeds, Doctor Cook.

But the parallelism between Jacob and the great explorer diverges at Bethel, the "House of God." From the time Jacob, in his dream, saw the ladder that arose to Heaven he was a zealous servant of the Lord. Time, grown dim with age, does not efface the record of service he made in the upbuilding of the Lord's kingdom. And, in foreign lands, after he had overcome rather heavy marital difficulties and had founded the Tribes of Israel, his heart always went back to Bethel and he yearned, and yearned, and yearned, for the place where God first made him see the light. Fortunate he was to realize his hope, and no tongue can tell and no pen can describe the joy that must have bathed his soul when he was permitted to go back again to Bethel.

The happiness I feel to-day must be somewhat akin to that which overflowed Jacob when he went back to the scene of his youth, for Indianapolis is, indeed, my "House of God." My newspaper associates at the Capital have been very kind to me and I can not measure my gratitude to them. They have given to me the highest and the best that is within their power to bestow. There is joy and magic in the touch of their friendly elbows, but, after all, there are no ties like the ties of home.

And when, some months ago, the ties of home began to press and strain against my heart, and I became homesick as I think I never had been before, I received a letter from your president inviting me to this presence, and I want to thank Mr. Sparks, and all of you, for affording me this incentive and this opportunity to come back again to Bethel.

Before I proceed to a discussion along other lines you will pardon me, I know, if I dwell a little longer upon the emotions that arise within me. That letter from Mr. Sparks set a thousand bells to tinkling in my recollection and made all of the chords of my heart to join in "Home, Sweet Home." I remember our city (I say "our city" because in all my wanderings and through all my vicarious adventures Indianapolis has remained my home and heaven) when it was truly a Main-Street town, practically all of its activities being centered on its arterial thoroughfare. I also remember—and this is the very ne plus ultra of unchallengeable evidence of my antiquity—the old transfer station, that queer structure with a cheese-box effect through which all street-car passengers in the early nineties were cleared for transfer. It was an institution that was outstanding and distinctive. In subsequent years while rambling over the country I have made inquiries to satisfy my curiosity, and I have never yet found any other city that ever had a transfer box like ours. In the days when it flourished, with plain-clothes men guarding its portals, every citizen of Indianapolis who lingered in the vicinity of Illinois and Washington Streets was under heavy suspicion of nourishing a wicked scheme to beat the street-car company, and the burden of proof was on him.

MISTS OF YEARS FADE AWAY

As I stand here to-day my mind is surfeited with moving pictures of the past, and I hardly know whether the entertainment which I visualize is a comedy or a tragedy. The mists of years fade away and I can see myself out there on Illinois Street, just as I came up from the country when I was a boy three and a half decades ago, looking for a job, a stranger in a strange land; my mother's lunch basket on my arm; wearing a pancake hat, trousers several inches too short, $1.96 in my purse, a whang watch chain dangling over my vest front and in my pocket a watch which, if it had been a sentient thing, would have felt complimented on being called a turnip. I can see an electric car whiz by me—one of the half dozen or so then being operated on the only electrified line in Indianapolis—and I can see myself jump 6 inches in the clear.

I can see myself the next day over yonder on East Ohio Street, wearing the same sartorial ensemble, as I enter the old Sun office, housed in an ancient weather-beaten residence, and receive from Fred Purdy—God bless him!—a little friendly advice and my first assignment as a writer. And I can see myself still, a few days later, as I enter the restaurant in the old union station to interview the restaurant's proprietor, Thomas Taggart, on a matter of news, and my heart still overflows with gratitude when I recall how fine and splendid he was to me, just as he always has been to everybody. He seemed to think, and rightly so, that I was the original "feller that needed a friend."

It was here in Indianapolis, as an ungainly, awkward, uncouth boy from the sticks, looking for a toe-hold in the world, I broke all of the conventionalities that society ever erected in all of the ages, as indicated by such faux pas as I committed when in blissful ignorance of clerical laws of celibacy I undertook to interview the imaginary wife of a beloved old priest concerning her putative husband's physical condition. It was across the street from here, in the office of the old Indianapolis Sentinel, adjacent to Dick Stegemeier's eating emporium, where I undertook to light an electric lamp with a match—a pioneering venture that was wholly unsuccessful.

SAILING WITH GOD, THE SEAS

It was here that during my youthful reportorial years of endless travail, of alternating hope and abysmal despair, I sailed, with God, the seas, not knowing whether or not I would ever be able to come into port. The experience, painful as it was when the operation was on, probably was good for me, because in this crucible of fate my sympathies were broadened and I resolved times without number that whatever might happen to me in after life I wanted to be always on the side of the under dog.

And it was here that on bended knees before that saintly old soul, Chancellor Charles N. Sims, pastor of Meridian Street Methodist Church, I made my first prayer to the Father of us all that He would permit all of the struggling millions of earth, then and forevermore, to see the light of His countenance and would save everybody—everywhere—at last in heaven, for the Redeemer's sake.

It was here that I married one of the Indianapolis girls, and I am happy to report to you to-day that she has tolerated me all these years and still abides with me. It was here that our four children were born. In the little Anderson graveyard, northeast of the city, lie my wife's parents, who were among the best beloved of Irvington's older citizens. The gates of heaven never opened to two better souls than Frank and Merilla Huber.

Is it any wonder that wherever I may roam my heart lingers here? When my eyes are feasting on the beauties of rural England or the matchless glories of the Alps I am thinking, in the back of my head, about this "no mean city," and when the currents of hot air surge and resurge in the Senate of the United States my mind draws the welcome antithetical analogy of the winds that whistle around the corner of Illinois and Washington Streets on a blizzardly day in January.

ROLL OF THE MIGHTY DEAD

As I call the roll it seems to me that there are more of my old friends on the other shore than there are this side of the eternal gates. Nearly all of those who, in those early years, by their kind acts taught me the meaning of the gracious doctrine of noblesse oblige, and helped a boy to wage a battle, are dead. Judge John H. Baker, William H. English, Benjamin Harrison, Claude Matthews, W. H. H. Miller, Gen. Lew Wallace, Nathan Morris, Edgar A. Brown, Hosea Hawkins, Col. Eli Lilly, James Whitcomb Riley, Otto Frenzel, Dr. William H. Wishard, Dr. P. H. Jameson, James L. Keach, Charles W. Fairbanks, Gen. George F. McGinnis, Felix McWhirter, William Watson Woollen, John W. Kern, Daniel Wait Howe, Frank B. Burke, David F. Allen, Addison C. Harris,

John H. Holliday, Smiley N. Chambers, David Turpie, Gen. John C. New, Dore Johnson, Hugh J. McGowan, Thomas R. Marshall, Samuel M. Ralston, Albert J. Beveridge—oh, the list is innumerable! And when I think of all of the mighty dead, and all of the dead who were not so mighty, but so good and true, my voice chokes and my heart is touched by the pain of recollection.

Emerson, the great interpreter of the heart, who has done more, in my opinion, to chart the realm of divinity than any other philosopher whoever lived, save only the Man of Galilee, has said that love is our highest word and it is the synonym for God. Springing from a pioneer ancestry, whose family history is interwoven with the simple life, the humble faith, the camaraderie of Indiana Territory long before Statehood was vouchsafed to our matchless Commonwealth, my love for Indiana is as enduring as her sand dunes, as the banks of her Wabash, and as her everlasting hills.

It is to me a source of utmost pride that my forebears were among the earliest pioneers, who bore on their faces the stamp of honesty and sincerity and whose patience and industry carved out of the wilderness this great empire we call Indiana. It has always seemed to me that I loved the whole State and that I am bound to her by myriad bonds of affection. It is a solemn thought that many of these mystic ties, after so long a lapse of years, reach out into the silent cities of the dead, but others go into living hearts of purest gold and find there a response that, next to my intimate family affections, is the greatest joy and satisfaction I have in the world.

I pledge you to-day that I shall so strive to live that when the end comes I shall be able to surrender into the hands of those who love me an escutcheon that is untarnished and unsullied—the escutcheon of a Hoosier—and I shall expect when "thirty" is written at the end of my newspaper career to be put to sleep beneath the beautiful green blanket out yonder at Crown Hill that already covers so many of those whom I loved and who loved me.

WILL REGISTER TREMENDOUS SCOOP

Now that you have patiently indulged this overflow of soul I shall proceed to the subject of my remarks, which is "Back to the Constitution." I like that subject because it is so expressive of the extra-constitutional meanderings of the times and of the necessity of returning to the faith and practice of the fathers if America is to endure as a self-governing Nation of free men and women.

Speaking in the parlance with which I am most familiar, the time is coming in my opinion when some political party will be able to register a tremendous scoop if it goes before the country on a platform composed of those four meaningful words, the shortest and at the same time the most impelling platform the mind of man can conceive:

"Back to the Constitution!"

Not yet, perhaps, nor even soon, but some day the thinking people of this country will awaken to the demoralizing and devitalizing influence which paternalism is exerting in our national institutions, and when they do they will be not only ready, but eager, for this four-word, seven-syllabic platform. And while I am juggling with the horoscope let me add the prediction that when that times comes party lines will break and crackle like reeds before an avalanche of army tanks as a resolute electorate rushes the bureaucratic bulwarks and restores this Government to its constitutional moorings. If not, then God save the Republic!

As an observer of more than a quarter of a century at the seat of Government, honestly seeking to get a true X-ray picture of what ails us as a Nation, I believe the most unwholesome, the most insidious, the most far-reaching, the most distressing tendency of government to-day is the drift toward paternalism. The founding fathers had the right idea of government. Their heads were as clear as a bell. All we need to-day is a recrudescence to the principles they laid down, but the ship of state has been so warped out of its course by paternalistic and bureaucratic evolution that thoughtful persons almost despair of the future.

The fathers erected a government on the principle of dual sovereignty, it is true, but it was to be a government in which the people were to manage their home affairs as local welfare might dictate—a society of self-governing States, in which the people were to be left to rule themselves to as great an extent as possible. Under this well-devised order of things the Federal Government would touch the citizens lightly and would hardly be felt except in situations and crises that require unified national action.

THE IDEALISTIC CONCEPT

From this idealistic concept which the wisdom of the ages has accepted as best adapted to promote the happiness and contentment of a free people we have departed as far as one pole is from the other. The once-treasured doctrine, "The least governed the best governed" has given way to its antithesis, "The most governed the best governed." We no longer have a Government with local autonomy as the major factor, but a Government by an overshadowing and compelling Federal bureaucracy. I think it is literally true that all variations—and they have been many—from the simple constitutional scheme of Government provided by the founding fathers have been mischievous and dangerous experiments, baneful in their effect upon this country and upon the world, and that most of the evils from which we suffer governmentally may be traced to departures from either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution.

We have in Washington the great departments of government through which all of the executive functions would be transacted under the scheme of the fathers, but while these are 10 in number we also have more than 40 commissions, boards, and independent establishments that have reached out in all directions and usurped governmental functions. The growth of paternalism in America is vividly indicated by the preponderance of commissions and boards. As the spirit of paternalism waxed strong these commissions and other extra-constitutional forms began to spring up like mushrooms, the difference being that while a mushroom dies, a commission, once created, goes on forever. The State governments patterned after the national example and they, too, created commissions and boards and bureaus and whatnot, and the people have found themselves oppressed by supervising and directing authorities and their taxes pyramided at a horrid rate. Federal commissions have literally wasted billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, which is bad enough; but when it is considered that they have been a potential medium in enforcing an enslaving paternalism upon the country, every patriot must rue their creation.

Alexander Hamilton, a political genius of the first magnitude, foresaw the danger, for he said:

"Lately Congress has gone into the measure of appointing boards but this, in my opinion, is a bad plan."

LINCOLN'S RULING PASSION

President Lincoln, with whom patriotism was a ruling passion, deplored the tendency toward extraconstitutional agencies of government, and out of the treasures of his mind he drew analogies and examples to warn his countrymen of the dangers which his statesmanship foresaw. Perhaps the last utterance by him on a public question was on this very subject. Its solemn notes have a peculiar force to-day. Just before he started for Ford's Theater on the fateful night of his assassination, a Mr. Ashmun, who had presided over the Republican National Convention of 1860, when Lincoln was first nominated for the Presidency, called at the White House and asked the President to appoint a commission to investigate certain cotton claims. Lincoln was under obligations to Ashmun, but he refused, and in doing so he spoke as a brave man and a patriot.

"Ashmun," he said, "I have done with commissions. I think they are contrivances to cheat the Government." (Vide Harry F. Atwood's Back to the Republic, p. 73.)

It undoubtedly was the purpose of the Constitution, although not specifically written into that instrument, that all governmental work, aside from legislative and judicial, should be performed by the heads of departments and their subordinates, and Federal Government has become wasteful, costly, inquisitorial, and domineering in proportion to the creation of commissions, boards, and other excrescences. The number of these commissions and establishments has grown and their tax-eating operations have developed until the appropriations for independent offices during the fiscal year 1928 amounts to over $500,000,000, or the equivalent of the entire cost of running the Government but a few decades ago. These sinister independent creations impose a thousand forms of paternalism upon the people and are continually grasping for more money and more power.

Those of us who spend our time watching the wheels of government go around see a hydra-headed and vicious paternalism grown up in this country which is touching every phase of life with its meddlesome activities and is sapping the very foundations of local self-government. The fact that this paternalism often hides behind the cloak of benevolence renders it less abhorrent only to those who are willing to take a dangerous dose of poison, provided only it is sugar coated. We who are behind the scenes do not lack concrete examples of this devitalizing influence at work in our Republic. They hit us in the face every time we turn around.

As I wrote this sentence I glimpsed on the desk before me a bulletin on frogs, issued by the Department of Commerce. I picked it up and waded through its textual and pictorial contents, and lo! I found in it a shining example of paternalism. It is a bulletin of 44 pages, superlatively illustrated, devoted to the propagation of frogs. It is hard for a simple-minded Hoosier to understand why Washington does not leave the task of propagating frogs to persons who are frogistically inclined. But Uncle Sam, standing away up there in his supernal majesty, says to the steady, easy-going frog:

"Multiply and replenish the earth!"

And to facilitate the frog in these worthy endeavors Uncle Sam, at the cost of untold thousands of the taxpayers' money, issues and circulates this bulletin.

I find upon examination that the bulletin was written by a Cornell professor who has a bug on frogs—pardon the metaphor—and here is some of the advice he hands out to the country boys who contemplate going into the frog business:

"Insects," he says, "are the main food reliance for frogs. Five orders, possibly a sixth (Diptera), enter largely into their dietary list. The five principal orders are Cleoptera, Lepidoptera, Hymenoptera, Hempitera, and Orthoptera."

FEEDING HIS FROG

The country boy whom Uncle Sam is encouraging to enter the frog business will know at once upon reading the above that when his frog gets hungry he must chase out after some Cleoptera, Lepidoptera, Hymenoptera, Hempitera, or Orthoptera. The Cornell professor in introducing his bulletin says:

"From time to time since Seth Green's day efforts have been made by our best fish culturists to raise frogs, but in all this period no definite successful mode of procedure has been evolved."

It remains for the Cornell savant to furnish clear and specific directions which any boy can grasp. For instance, quoting further from the bulletin:

"The aquatic salamanders, like the newt, frequently pull off eggs from a frog's egg mass for food. The large forms, like the mud puppy (Necturus) and hellbender (Cryptobranchus), may eat frogs' eggs or larvae if favorably situated. Among frogs there are several species whose adults do not stop at fratricide or cannibalism. In fact, it is one of the factors which has led some frog culturists to abandon bullfrogs, which will feed on anything from frogs to alligators, not even sparing their own progeny."

The freckled Indiana lad who wanders around barefooted in the marshes and herds his frogs will know hereafter—thanks to good old Uncle Sam—that he must be on the lookout for the Necturus and the hellbender, or the Cryptobranchus. However, he has some legitimate cause for satisfaction in the reflection that by the time one of his fractious bullfrogs has devoured an alligator it probably will be tired enough to hunt a corner somewhere and rest.

I have heard it said that some tight elections have been won by polling the frog vote, and I recommend this bulletin to our politicians who are interested in increasing the number of frogs.

Oh, the travesty of it all! To think that the Government that was founded by Jefferson and Hamilton—the Government that Lincoln died to save—has fallen so low that it has become an institution for the procreation of frogs!

MARK THISTLETHWAITE'S STORY

I note that while this bulletin is issued free through Members of Congress—Uncle Sam footing the bill, of course—extra copies may be obtained by any citizen from the Superintendent of Documents at 15 cents each, and I am reminded of Mark Thistlethwaite's story. All of us know Mark. He is the salt of the earth. Many years ago when Mark was a bachelor he and five other matrimonially unattached newspaper men decided they would live together, so they rented an apartment and fitted it out with half a dozen beds. In the course of time that pestiferous insect which the Cornell professor would call the Cimex Lectularius, but which Mark identified on the very first nibble as the old-fashioned bedbug, made its appearance, and the boys, after scratching a few days, decided to sell the furniture and close the establishment.

"What shall we ask for these beds?" inquired Mark.

One of his associates, a careful, thoughtful person, replied after a moment's reflection:

"Well, I'll tell you just what I think about that. No matter how little anybody pays for these beds he is going to get bit."

And that is exactly what I think about this bulletin. No matter how little any American citizen pays for it, he is going to get bit.

And so it goes. I have here an index of publications of the United States Department of Agriculture, and if anyone wants to get a bird's-eye view of paternalism all he needs to do is to run his eye over that book, with its names of thousands of publications paid for by the taxpayers, instructing the people how to do everything from roasting a peanut and putting the swaddling clothes on a baby to running a railroad. The distinguishing characteristic of most of these bulletins is that the bureaucrats tell the people how to do things concerning which the people are infinitely better informed than the bureaucrats.

Of course, paternalism costs frightfully, and the people pay the freight. And right here let me tell you a story about mosquitoes. I like this story because it shows that in at least one instance paternalism overreached itself and was hoist by its own petard. Under the head "Public Health Service," the appropriations for the fiscal year 1927 contained the following item:

"For a preliminary survey of the salt-marsh areas of the South Atlantic and Gulf States, to determine the exact character of the breeding places of the salt-marsh mosquitoes, in order that a definite idea may be formed as to the best methods of controlling the breeding of such mosquitoes, fiscal year 1927, $25,000, to be expended by the Public Health Service in cooperation with the Bureau of Entomology of the Department of Agriculture."

MOSQUITO MEETS MOSQUITO

Here the paternalistic camel stuck its nose into the mosquito tribe, and when the Senate Committee on Appropriations met again in solemn, secret conclave last spring to consider the 1928 appropriations the paternalistic camel was there trying to get its body in. Another appropriation of $25,000 to go after the salt-marsh mosquito was the objective. One of the greatest marvels of all times was that it was not granted offhand, and no doubt it would have been had not sectional rivalry developed among the mosquito champions on the committee.

One reverend Senator wanted to know why the comparatively inane and inoffensive salt-marsh mosquito of the Gulf of Mexico should be given a preferential status over the savage and muscular mosquitoes of New Jersey. This opened the ball. Nearly every Senator on the committee stood up valiantly for the prowess of the mosquitoes of his own State, and as the discussion proceeded State pride flared forth and State rights were defended in heated arguments. The proponents of the ferocious, man-eating mosquitoes of the North proved to be in the majority, and the upshot was that the committee adopted the item, but cut the amount to $10,000 and wrote the word "completion" into the item, so that the investigation of salt-marsh mosquitoes will end with the current fiscal year. The exact compromise that was worked out when mosquito met mosquito in the forum of debate is found on page 239 of the printed appropriations. Personally I have had many a chuckle over the outcome of this row, because it is the only instance in my recollection where paternalism, once intrenched and rampant, has had to take the count. Possibly the sad ending of the mosquito quiz is due to a realization by the committee that if all of the ferocious mosquitoes in America were "investigated," whatever that may mean, it would be necessary to float a billion-dollar loan. In this tiny paternalistic mosquito venture Uncle Sam gets off easily at a total cost of $35,000 and the salt-marsh mosquitoes are still doing business at the old stand.

INVASION OF RIGHTS

It is high time you business men should awaken, not necessarily to the wastage of untold millions of taxes, though that is bad enough, but to the ceaseless and ever-widening invasion of corporate and individual rights involved in the paternalistic activites of the Government. The political juggernaut not only is entering, but it already has entered, the realms where the individual should be unfettered and unmolested. Even you folks, well informed as you are, have no conception of the far-reaching activities of our central Government. These range all the way from the training of grocery clerks, which is actually provided for in a manual recently issued by the Federal Government, to the exercise of autocratic powers by the Interstate Commerce Commission and other commissions and boards. Among the Interstate Commerce Commission's excessive grants of authority it has been empowered by Congress to fix minimum rates. It can say to a railroad company that it shall not give to the people of a State, a section, or a community the benefit of lower freight rates, and the company is helpless in the matter. I am not saying that this authority is not justified as a means of preventing powerful carriers from occasionally undercutting weak competitors and driving them out of business, but I do point to it as an example showing how very far Government is going these days in regulating through bureaucracy the affairs of its citizens. Countless other instances could be cited, revealing the trend of centralization. The system requires more laws; officeholders are pyramided—always more expenses, more taxes. The Government conducts a school for bathhouse attendants. It issues a book on department leasing in retail stores, copy of which I have here.

A few years ago a number of business men from over the country were assembled at the Department of Commerce, when a young, fuzzy-mustached bureaucrat began to lecture them on how to route their sales agents. The business executives had acquired gray hairs working out that very problem, and when the amateurish bureaucrat began to spin theories they left the room in disgust.

In a bulletin entitled "Principles of Window Curtaining," the Government tells the good housewives how to select their curtains and chestily advises them that with the bulletin at hand "the homemaker need no longer rely on inspiration alone to obtain attractive curtains."

"Rely on inspiration alone!" No, indeed. Let Washington do it!

ABUSED OYSTER NEVER CHIRPS

Even the self-abnegating oyster, which never chirps when it is abused, is the subject of at least 20 Government books dealing with its habits, its ancestry and crustaceous kin and its ultimate gastronomic destination. Scores of bulletins have been issued instructing mothers how to take care of their children, how to perform the delicate attentions that are always suggested by a mother's love, and in every instance, as far as I know, the authors were spinsters who had reached an age where hope was no longer fortified by expectation.

The natural concomitant of the paternalism that grips our Nation is a multiplicity of laws. Bureaucracy, reaching for more and more power, never satiated but always looking for new fields to invade, goes to the fountainhead of authority and asks for laws which self-seeking and impotent legislators grant for the asking. Since 1789, when the first Congress assembled, 51,482 laws have been enacted and the American citizen is hedged about with a bewildering maze of "Thou shalts" and "Thou shalt nots." Not many well-informed persons will disagree with a recent statement of the brilliant

Missourian, Senator JAMES A. REED, that "enough laws have been passed to govern the world for the next 10,000 years." The evil of statute padding grows apace, the Sixty-ninth Congress which expired on March 4 last being the worst offender in that regard. It passed 878 public laws, more by far than any other Congress, not excepting those of the World War period.

The Parliament of Great Britain, whose legislative activities touch far-flung dominions on which the sun never sets, can not hold a candle to the United States Congress in fecundity of its product. The United States enacted 213 public laws in 1919 against Britain's 102; 181 in 1920 against Britain's 82; 231 in 1921 against Britain's 67; 256 in 1922 against Britain's 65. But, then, the people of Britain are not coddled, bulldozed, supervised, and regulated like their patient and long-suffering American cousins.

After working many years a committee of Congress has completed a codification of the United States statutes. The result is a volume of 50 titles and 2,465 pages. There are 5,212,416 words in the volume and 14,808,000 ems in the composition. To put it in another way there are written in statutes for the regulation of the American people by this single body of lawmakers 5,212,416 words, and the whole of the law and the gospel was put in the Ten Commandments of Moses, and those commandments could be printed on a single page!

I sincerely believe that if the usual order could be reversed and an entire Congress could be devoted, not to enacting laws but to repealing archaic, harmful, bureaucratic statutes, that Congress would go down in history with a halo that will never attach to any other Congress.

THE INQUISITORIAL ARMY

An inevitable accompaniment of bureaucracy is a lust for inquisitorial powers. The appetite for attending to other people's business grows by what it feeds on and the result is a swarm of agents, inspectors, and other nosey functionares who go about over the country worrying, bluffing, and exasperating individuals and corporations. Twenty years ago—in 1907—Senator Joseph B. Foraker, who was always on the firing line fighting Federal encroachment, bemoaned the multiplication of useless officers and offices in what he called his "degenerate day." In an outburst of indignation he made this statement:

"The little band of 167 special deputies, agents, and inspectors on the pay rolls of the Government 10 years ago has been swelled to an army of more than 3,000."

Shades of Jefferson and Lincoln! An army of 3,000! Why, the inquisitorial army to-day numbers more than ten times 3,000. I say this advisedly, basing my statement upon an investigation which I have just completed. In order that I might have some reliable data to present to you upon the subject of Government espionage I addressed letters to the heads of the departments asking them to advise me as to the number of inspectors and agents under their respective jurisdictions and I have here replies from all of the Cabinet members or their assistants setting forth detailed official figures which, by departmental admission, make an army of over five times 3,000 or, to be exact, 15,836. This does not include the secret service and other secret activities, the number and personnel of which are never disclosed. All together, I have not the slightest doubt that the total of those who might properly be included in the espionage class is well over 30,000. In the Department of Agriculture alone there are 9,000 inspectors and agents, or three times the estimated number for the whole Government that cast such a pall over the stout-hearted Senator from Ohio. This is not guesswork. It is the truth, officially certified to me by the acting head of that great department, Renick W. Dunlap, an able, honest, and conscientious official, who writes to me as follows:

"At present the field force of the Department of Agriculture consists of approximately 16,000 employees. Of this number about 9,000 fall in the class of agents and inspectors. The Bureau of Animal Industry has 1,331 veterinary inspectors and 1,729 lay inspectors employed in connection with the enforcement of the meat inspection and animal quarantine acts."

HARASSING THE FARMERS

Let every farmer who is being harassed by an inspector reflect that there are 8,999 other inspectors and agents at work on his rural brethren. This may be poor consolation, but the suffering farmer is entitled to whatever benefit flows from the old adage, "Misery loves company."

There are 535 inspectors in the Post Office Department. The Department of Justice advises me that its Bureau of Investigation has 362 men, of whom 287 are field agents. That department also has 22 examiners in the field all the time checking up United States marshals and district attorneys, and 4 inspection agents. J. E. Harper, chief of the division of appointments of the Treasury Department, writes that he is very sorry not to be able to give the desired information in full in respect to that department, but that the chief of the Secret Service has a very positive rule that no information shall be given out as to the number of Secret Service operatives. He says there are in the Internal Revenue Service 3,091 internal-revenue agents, while the Customs Service employs 30 special agents, 81 customs agents, and 1,093 inspectors. The Department of the Interior reports 136 inspectors, and the Acting Secretary of Labor advises that there are 1,476 inspectors under his department. It is perfectly apparent that if full information could be obtained from unsearchable sources it would be found that the inquisitorial force abroad in the land is far in excess of 30,000. The system is so far-reaching that in some instances inspectors are sent out to spy on inspectors, and all of this in a land that boasts of its civil liberty!

Having spent most of my life on and around the bright spot where greatness treads, I might properly hesitate to paint this rather sordid picture of malperformance in the public service, but I warn you that not all public men in Washington, or anywhere else, for that matter, are great. I would be the last person in the world to indict all men in official positions, because that would be unfair and untrue. Some have dynamic minds and are guided by high resolve. Others are the Spifflediinks of purpose and intellectuality, whose chief occupation is trimming sails to catch every passing breeze. Many are pure gold, giving the best that is in them and all that is in them to the service of their country; while others—well, they are just plain, ordinary brass.

SPIFFLEDINKS IN ACTION

In this insidious and deadly process of wrecking local self-government, the Spifflediinks have been the main ally of paternalism. Upon their seared consciences must rest this true bill of indictment. The touchstone of their peculiar brand of patriotism has not been "Is this good for the country?" but "Is this good for me?" They are the culprits who have eternally fanned among our citizens the desire to get something for nothing, as if government were some mysterious fountain of largess from which all blessings freely flow. They do not explain that every dollar, every cent, every mill of the cost of these questionable blessings is thrown back upon the citizens themselves with a terrific penalty added for misuse of Government functions. I knew a Tennessee Member of Congress who introduced a thousand bills in one day. By so doing he almost precipitated a riot among the employees of the journal clerk, who had to brief all of those impossible measures for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A New York Member had an individualistic style of Spifflediinking. He made it a point every day of his life when Congress was in session to take a petition of some kind to the House, and introduce it. That was his way of interlarding his name in the RECORD and inducing people to think he was a great man. When his well-stroked and contented constituents had no petitions for him to present he would turn the ingenuity of his mind loose on the things that ought to be regulated and work up petitions of his own. It is a common device of the Spifflediinks to encourage their constituents to get all sorts of impossible things from the Government, well knowing that by arousing interest along these lines their grip on the congressional job will be strengthened during the pursuit. Any sort of an issue or pretext will do, no matter how paternalistic or how harmful in its destruction of local self-government.

These are all untoward and distressing symptoms in our national life. Fortunately the people of America have the correctional remedy within their power. First of all, they should drive the Spifflediinks into the sea and should establish in their places men of intellectual honesty who will not promise to deliver the world with a fence around it, but who will really serve the people with all their love and all their strength and all their understanding.

"OLD FELLER, YOU'RE LOOKIN' WELL"

Many of you are employers. Suppose you should hire a traveling man to go out on the road and get orders for goods, and suppose after he has spent $1,000 of your money riding around in de luxe style and stopping at the best hotels you call him in to make a report.

"Have you got any orders?" you ask.

"No," he replies, as he slaps you on the back, "I haven't got any orders, but I want to tell you, old feller, how well you are looking. You are gettin' handsomer every day. How's your wife? That's good."

How long do you think it would be until you fired that man? Well, exactly that sort of thing is occurring all the time under the Government. The taxpayers pay high for service and what they get is that kind of baloney.

Recently some sight-seers were strolling through the grounds at St. Elizabeths Asylum for mental cases, just outside of Washington, when they came across a man who was chattering like one of our Darwinian ancestors and was trying vainly to shin up a telegraph pole.

"Who in the world is that man?" asked one of the party, addressing a guide who is noted for facetiousness.

"He is a Congressman who really tried to keep his pledges," was the reply.

In drawing this rather vivid portrayal of demagoguery I wish to have it understood that I am not attacking any particular individuals. I am speaking from a national viewpoint concerning a class that is too pestiferous in our national life. I am personally friendly with all of the boys, and sometimes I am almost inclined to sympathize with them in their extremities, but when I observe the wide latitude they take in their schemes to hocus-pocus the public I feel like tapping them on the sleeve and saying:

"Have a heart!"

Having got rid of the Spilledinks, the people should see to it that positions of trust are filled with men of purpose, with sincere men, with true men, with men who have the courage to fight to the last ounce of strength that the citizens of this Republic may enjoy forever the birthright prepared for them by Hamilton and Jefferson and saved for them by Lincoln. They should choose as their servants men of pellucid truthfulness; men whose rugged honesty sticks out all over them; men of the old Doc McGuffey type, who couldn't be insincere if they tried. Such men do not grow on bushes, nor thrust themselves into prominence in the political market places, but in their hearts abides the love of country, and if the call comes to them as an appeal to duty few there are who will resist it.

GREATEST THING IS SERVICE

The greatest thing in the whole world is service. It is the very apotheosis of human effort. The highest privilege that can come to any man is to be permitted to render honest, intelligent, unselfish, loving service to his fellows and one of the glaring inconsistencies in our country to-day is that so many of our public men spend more time trying to fool the people than they do in trying to serve them. Those apologists of the bureaucratic system who have fallen in with the specious notion that this is a "progressive age" and that progress somehow or other depends upon our departure from fundamentals, should remember that there are some things that never grow old. The Sermon on the Mount is the same flood of light to-day that it was when the Master, standing away up there next to God, delivered it. The constitution is the constitution now, just as it was when it sprang full-panoplied from the brains and hearts of the giants who created it, the greatest charter of liberty the world has ever known.

Ours is the responsibility to correct this alarming tendency toward the emasculation of the Constitution, the centralization of all power at Washington, and the destruction of local self-government. Upon us rests an obligation that is fearful in its magnitude. We are the guardians of posterity. We hold in our protecting arms the children of countless generations yet unborn. If we stand idly by and see their birthright surrendered inch by inch to an encroaching bureaucracy that knows no limits in its lust for power, we will be particeps in one of the greatest crimes of all the ages. Let us awaken to the insidious evil that ramifies our national life and, with hands aloft, solemnly resolve once more that this shall be a Government of limited powers, as Jefferson designed it—a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people, as envisaged by the mighty Lincoln. And when we have made this high and holy resolution let us move forward with a conscience that never sleeps and a determination that smiles defiance to time and fate, and even death, while we battle with all our strength to lead our country out of the devious by-paths where suspicion lurks into the white light and broad highways of true statesmanship. Nothing short of that goal will measure our sacred duty to posterity and not until that is done will we enjoy the advantages and the happiness that belong to us as our rightful heritage in this great American commonwealth.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 21 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 545), entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, including the reports of the heads of the departments of the Philippine government, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1926.

I concur in the recommendation of the Secretary of War that this report be printed as a congressional document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

ANNUAL REPORT NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House another message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Referred to the Committees on the District of Columbia and Public Buildings and Grounds.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CHILD WELFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House another message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I renew to the Seventieth Congress the recommendation I made to the Sixty-ninth Congress that legislation be enacted authorizing an appropriation of $2,000, to enable acceptance by the United States of membership in a Pan American Institute of Child Welfare to be established at Montevideo, Uruguay, in accordance with a resolution adopted at the Pan American Child Welfare Congress held at Santiago, Chile, in October, 1924.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State and its inclosed copy of Senate Document No. 184, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, containing my message of January 5, 1927, and related papers, on the subject.

It will be observed from the report of the Secretary of State that, in response to my recommendation, a joint resolution was introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress authorizing the United States to become a member of the institute and an appropriation of $2,000 per annum for the contribution by the United States toward the support of the institute; that the joint resolution passed the House of Representatives and was reported without amendment by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but owing to the congestion toward the end of the session of Congress the Senate was unable to act upon the resolution; and that the institute has received the adherence of the Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela and is now established and functioning at Montevideo.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House another message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital for 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1927.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BLANTON. Should it not also be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia? This embraces much business that is connected with the two jurisdictions in the District of Columbia. The Speaker pro tempore has just referred to both committees the Annual Report of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. It really ought to go to both of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the matters contained in this report refer almost entirely and exclusively to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, whereas the other message contains matters relating to both the District of Columbia and to Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BLANTON. But that subject embraces all the parks, the 1,200 parks, large and small, embraced in the District of Columbia. Counting the little and the big ones, there are 1,200 parks. It could do no harm to refer it to both committees, so that both would have jurisdiction to look into such matters as come within the purview of their work. It is immaterial to me, however, where it goes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker has examined this matter thoroughly, and has indicated that this is the only committee that should have jurisdiction, and accordingly he directed that it should be referred to that committee.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled an act (H. R. 3190) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, when the Speaker signed the same.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 14, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

201. A letter from the office of the Postmaster General, transmitting resolution from the Second Pan American Postal Congress and recommending that the remission of the duty on advertising matter be authorized from such countries as reciprocally provide for freedom of duty on advertising matter from the United States (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of letters dated January 21, 1927, and February 24, 1927, as to the necessity for the legislation contained in H. R. 16655, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of proposed legislation for the repeal of an act of Congress to "provide for the restoration of Fort McHenry, in the State of Maryland, and its permanent preservation as a national park and perpetual national memorial shrine as the birthplace of the immortal 'Star-Spangled Banner,' written by Francis Scott Key, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

204. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report recommending the repeal of an act of Congress which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a site and building for the accommodation of the United States Subtreasury and other Government offices at New Orleans, La., at a cost for said site and building not to exceed $250,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

205. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, covering activities of the Currency Bureau for the year ended October 31, 1927; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 7183) granting the consent of Congress to C. J. Abbott, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7184) granting the consent of Congress to J. L. Rowan, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 7185) to prevent gambling in cotton, wool, mohair, or grain futures and to make it unlawful for any person, corporation, or association of persons to sell or to buy any contract for future delivery of any cotton, wool, mohair, or grain within the United States, unless such seller is actually the legitimate owner of the cotton, wool, mohair, or grain, so contracted for future delivery at the time said sale or contract of sale is made, and such buyer is purchasing same for actual delivery; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7186) to provide for holiday service on rural mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7187) to amend sections 7 and 9 of the Federal reserve act, as amended, to provide for insuring depositors in member banks of the Federal reserve system against loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7188) to amend chapter 5 of title 16 of the Penal Code of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7189) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Macclenny, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7190) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Lake Butler, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7191) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain lands in Cook County, Ill., to the Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad Co., its successors or assigns, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 7192) to amend an act as amended entitled, "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa."; to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7193) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ambridge, Beaver County, Pa.; to the committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7194) to authorize the adjustment and settlement of claims for damages to and loss of private property; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7195) to provide for the purchase of horses and mules for the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD. A bill (H. R. 7196) to amend section 4 of an act entitled, "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes," approved May 26, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7197) to permit meeting of societies, benevolent, educational, etc., organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, to be held outside of said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 7198) granting the consent of Congress to Henry Thane, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 7199) granting the consent of Congress to the Oregon-Washington Bridge Co. to maintain a bridge already constructed across Columbia River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 7200) to amend section 321 of the Penal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 7202) to prohibit lobbying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7203) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7204) to authorize the creation of Indian trust estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 7205) authorizing and providing for the construction of a military highway paralleling the Rio Grande border of that portion of the United States between Texas and Mexico, and along the entire border, or certain sections thereof, of that portion of the United States between Mexico and the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 7206) to establish a national war memorial museum and veterans' headquarters in the building known as Ford's Theater; to the committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 7207) to appropriate treaty funds due the Wisconsin Pottawatomie Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7208) to regulate and control the manufacture, sale, and use of weights and measures and weighing and measuring devices for use or used in trade or commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 7209) to provide for the care and treatment of naval patients on the active or retired list, in other Government hospitals when naval hospital facilities are not available; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 7210) to remove the limitation on retirement of officers in the Naval Dental Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE: A bill (H. R. 7211) to prevent open conflict between State and Federal officers, and to allay the present unrest of labor in every State of the Union, and to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 7212) to increase the salaries of postmasters of the first, second, and third class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 7213) to grant authority to the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails by air to foreign countries and insular possessions of the United States for periods of not more than 10 years, and to pay for such service from the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails at fixed rates per pound or per mile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7214) authorizing the Secretary of War to dispose of obsolete aeronautical equipment to accredited schools, colleges, and universities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 7215) to prohibit the expression of opinions by certain persons or officials connected with the Government as to the future market prices of cotton, wheat, or other crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 7216) to repeal section 1445 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALLGOOD: A bill (H. R. 7217) prohibiting persons connected with Government departments from making statements pertaining to probable future market prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7218) to legalize a bridge across the Hillsborough Bay at Twenty-second Street, Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 7219) to amend section 1, act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 7220) to provide for the acquisition of certain land in the District of Columbia and the establishment and operation of a municipal airport thereon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 7221) to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7222) to add certain public lands to the Leadville National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7223) to add certain lands to the Gunnison National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

My Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 7224) to extend the time for the refunding of certain legacy taxes erroneously collected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 93) for the appointment of Paul E. Devine, of Tennessee, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 94) providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy and as a method of settling international disputes with France and like-minded nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) to print 15,000 additional copies of Senate Document 234, Fifty-eighth Congress, entitled "Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America"; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Resolution (H. Res. 55) directing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a select committee to investigate the activities of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 7225) for the relief of William J. Kenely; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7226) granting a pension to Laura E. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 7227) for the relief of William H. Dotson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7228) for the relief of Frederick Leininger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7229) for the relief of Henry Simons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7230) for the relief of Charles L. Dewey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7231) granting an increase of pension to William E. Lytle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOHN: A bill (H. R. 7232) providing for the examination and survey of Cheboygan River, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7233) granting a pension to Augusta Cornog; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7234) granting a pension to Henry Clay Berryman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7235) granting a pension to Clyde R. Ayers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7236) for the relief of James M. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 7237) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia B. Lackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 7238) granting a pension to Guss Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 7239) granting a pension to Corwin W. Holibaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 7240) for the relief of Marcus G. Goldstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By. Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 7241) granting an increase of pension to Pauline A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7242) granting a pension to Charles Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 7243) granting an increase of pension to Lena Kemmis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 7244) for the relief of Mary Martin Harrison; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 7245) granting a pension to Amy E. Spare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7246) granting a pension to Minnie S. Cadiz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7247) for the relief of Thomas H. McDowell; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7248) for the relief of Katie S. Goodrich; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7249) for the relief of Wilton L. Rushing; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 7250) granting an increase of pension to Alcinda Bradway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTEP: A bill (H. R. 7251) for the relief of K. S. Szymanski; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 7252) granting an increase of pension to Laura Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 7253) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7254) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Ayres; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7255) granting an increase of pension to Margaret F. Kane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7256) granting an increase of pension to Frances Evaline Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7257) for the relief of John G. Pavek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 7258) granting a pension to Eliza Z. Sweany; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7259) granting a pension to Harry H. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7260) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Lowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7261) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hambright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7262) granting an increase of pension to Louis K. Helle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 7263) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 7264) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Edick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7265) granting an increase of pension to Morton East; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 7266) granting a pension to Emma M. Oberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 7267) for the relief of Henry P. Kinney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7268) for the relief of John Hervey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 7269) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7270) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Satter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7271) granting a pension to Eva Rench Hudson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 7272) granting a pension to Etta M. Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7273) granting a pension to Lois Cramton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7274) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Heaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7275) granting an increase of pension to Flora A. Slenker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7276) for the relief of Charles C. Rehtz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 7277) granting a pension to Roxie Boster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7278) granting a pension to Mary Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 7279) for the relief of John L. Friel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 7280) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Ohio River at and in the vicinity of New Richmond, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7281) granting a pension to James Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 7282) for the relief of George O. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 7283) granting an increase of pension to Susan Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 7284) for the relief of Sarah Linard; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 7285) granting a pension to Mira Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7286) granting a pension to Sarah J. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7287) granting a pension to Sarah E. Arthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7288) granting a pension to Laura E. Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7289) granting a pension to Laura S. Herrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7290) granting a pension to Jane Grayson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7291) granting a pension to Annie Davey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7292) granting a pension to Mollie Orem; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7293) for the relief of Leroy S. Kiger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7294) granting an increase of pension to Minerva E. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7295) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Blakeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7296) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Browning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7297) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7298) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fountain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7299) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7300) granting an increase of pension to Helen D. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7301) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7302) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Joslin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7303) granting an increase of pension to Mariah J. Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7304) granting an increase of pension to Jennie McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7305) granting an increase of pension to Ella Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7306) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Quigley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7307) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7308) granting an increase of pension to Eliza O. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7309) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Whittington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7310) granting an increase of pension to Cora Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7311) granting an increase of pension to Delilah M. Zenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 7312) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Robb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7313) granting an increase of pension to Lydia I. Chrisman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7314) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Welshymer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7315) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Warthen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7316) granting an increase of pension to Selena Blyth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7317) granting an increase of pension to Anna J. Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 7318) granting a pension to Altha Denham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 7319) granting a pension to Lucy A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 7320) for the relief of Loyd L. Bolinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 7321) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 7322) granting an increase of pension to Jane Kirkman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 7323) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7324) to clarify the military record of Orla W. Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 7325) granting a pension to Ida B. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7326) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7327) for the relief of Richard A. Schwab; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITEHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7328) granting permission to Commander Jules James, United States Navy, to accept the decoration of the Legion of Honor tendered him by the Republic of France; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7329) granting a pension to Edith Faulkner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 7330) for the relief of E. M. Gillett and J. H. Swenarton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 7331) granting a pension to John S. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7332) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 7333) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Northup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7334) for the relief of Leandro Flores; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

139. Petition for the impeachment of Judge Evan A. Evans and criminal prosecution of said judge and others named in the petition and their associates in frauds and swindles, as stated in the petition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

140. Br. Mr. BOIES: Evidence in support of House bill 5851, granting a pension to Clara Daniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

141. By Mr. BURTON: Evidence in support of House bill 6132, granting an increase of pension to Emma D. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

142. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., relative to regulations of Steamboat Inspection Service and inclusion of motor-propelled vessels under the regulations; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

143. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Evidence in support of House bill 6346, granting an increase of pension to Liddie Leffert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

144. Also, evidence in support of House bill 6344, granting an increase of pension to Isabella Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

145. Also, evidence in support of House bill 6345, granting an increase of pension to Jennie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

146. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the New York Council for Protection of Foreign Born Workers, protesting against the Blanton and Johnson immigration bills, directed against foreign-born workers in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

147. Also, petition of the irrigation districts of California, favoring the Boulder Dam and all-American canal as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

148. Also, petition of the New York Employing Printers Association (Inc.), with reference to the present method of weighing mail matter of the third class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

149. Also, petition of the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 55, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., with reference to disabled war veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

150. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of A. A. N. W. St. Lawrence County Branch, encouraging the United States to be a signatory power to treaties of arbitration and conciliation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

151. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution passed at the conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, held April 28, 1927, in favor of settling international questions by arbitration and not by armies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

152. By Mr. WINTER: Petition of protest against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78), signed by residents of Wyoming; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

153. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition of residents of Schenevus, N. Y., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Commmittee on the District of Columbia.

154. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying that no bill be passed making Sunday observance compulsory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

155. By Mr. GARBER: Resolution of the National Camp of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, adopted at its national encampment, urging additional immigration restriction; the enactment of alien deportation law, similar to the Holaday bill, which passed the House during the last Congress; an alien registration law such as recommended by the President and urged by the Secretary of Labor; better naturalization laws; and the rigid enforcement of all such laws and adequate appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, *December 14, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! In wisdom hast Thou made them all.

Purge our vision, widen our horizons, and open our spiritual eyes that we may behold the light of Thy countenance. Refresh us, ennoble us, and purify us, that we may measure up to the highest ideals of manhood. God be with America's incomparable hero as he sails on in the open bowl of the skies, passes the shoulders of the mountains, and enters the gateway of the Republic on the south. May his chivalry, simplicity, and high moral standards be an example and inspiration to the youth of our land. We pray in the name of Jesus, the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had concurred in the resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) providing for the printing of 10,000 additional copies of House Document No. 90.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1397) amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. p. 220), in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BORAH and Mr. SWANSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the State Department.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. REED of Pennsylvania and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the War Department.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee on this day had presented to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3190. An act authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments to the first deficiency bill and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments to the first deficiency bill and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MADDEN, WOOD, and BYRNS.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the revenue bill, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to see whether we can not reach an agreement as to time for debate on this amendment, which is practically to the effect of repealing the estate tax. I want to see how many gentlemen wish to be heard.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment, and would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In case this amendment is dealt with within a stipulated time that will not exclude the offering of any other amendment, as I understand it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Gentlemen who want to get in and argue this matter had better get in during this time and present

their arguments on this amendment, because amendments which are simply offered for the purpose of manipulating things can not serve any useful purpose.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman there is no such purpose in my mind.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I know there is not as to the gentleman from Virginia, but that might be true of others. I understand there are some amendments which are likely to be offered to which I shall be compelled to object on a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I should like five minutes.

Mr. CELLER. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa whether he is referring to the estate-tax section or the entire bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am referring to this particular amendment, the effect of which is to repeal the estate-tax section.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I would like to have 10 minutes, although I doubt whether I will use all of that time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will try to accommodate the gentleman and also other gentlemen from Florida.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I understand that certain members of the committee want time. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] wants 15 minutes, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] 10 minutes. That would make 35 minutes requested by the members of the committee on this side. That is all the time requested on this side by members of the committee. I understand that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] wants 10 minutes and that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON] 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That makes all together how much on your side?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That would make 55 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think we might take an hour on each side.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That would perhaps take care of everybody.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the time be controlled equally by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and myself. It is true, of course, we are both against the amendment, but it is the understanding that he will take care of gentlemen on his side of the aisle.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let the RECORD show that I have requests on this side for 55 minutes, and I hope to use 5 minutes myself.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think, Mr. Chairman, I will simply submit the request that debate on this section be limited to two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this section, which is line 15, page 183, down to and including line 3 on page 184, be limited to two hours.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That is, the section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. And all amendments thereto. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman why he did not complete his request and ask that the time be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will make that as a supplemental request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that would be in order in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Chair is correct about that.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is a little unusual, I think, to have the time divided between two men both of whom are opposed to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not submitting that request.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I would like to say to the gentleman from Connecticut that the Chair has just ruled that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] can not control this time, and neither can I control it, and I do not propose to try unless I have such power vested in me. Under the rules of the committee, if the time is limited to two hours, which I understand can be done, then it will be a question of recognition by the Chair.

Mr. MERRITT. That will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and debate upon this section and all amendments thereto will close in two hours.

Mr. GREEN of Florida and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, a great deal has been said relative to the constitutionality of the estate-tax provision of the 1926 revenue act, which is now again up for discussion before our body. From the beginning I have contended that this bold and brazen act of the Congress was a violation of the States' rights and in absolute opposition to the Federal Constitution. If this law has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, I am sure that you would agree with me that, at least, the spirit if not the letter of the law is unconstitutional.

In my opinion no more iniquitous piece of legislation has ever been enacted, and I believe it is now time for this evil to be corrected. The stamp act and the tea tax in days of old may well be compared to this attempt at wholesale interference with and the complete destruction of the rights of the States. In no other instance has the Federal Government so boldly undertaken, under the guise of its power of taxation, to invade government functions in powers of the State's government. The framers of the Constitution of the United States and the State conventions which ratified it, never intended that the powers of the States should ever be trampled upon in this manner.

From the beginning of this Government to the year 1924 no attempt has ever been made by Congress to violate the rule of geographical uniformity in the levying of duties, imports, and excises. No attempt has ever been made to discriminate between States in the Federal act for the purpose of controlling State legislation. The two provisions in the Constitution for the protection of the States against discrimination were as to direct taxes proportionate in accordance with representation, as to indirect taxes, geographical uniformity throughout the country.

In section 2, Article I, of the Constitution it is plainly said:

> Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union.

And in my opinion the estate-tax provision of the 1927 revenue act is purely a violation of the Federal Constitution, in spirit at least; and I sincerely trust that you gentlemen will, in a fair-minded manner, enter upon this question with tolerance and eradicate from your minds that sectionalism which has prevailed from the beginning in this discussion, and now at this time remedy the great wrong which has been dealt to one, at least, of our sovereign States.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Yes; I always yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. If this is such an iniquitous law, does not the gentleman think it is very strange, indeed, that of our great Ways and Means Committee of 25 members only 4 members could be found to vote against it?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I would like to say to my friend from Texas that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is the most powerful aggregation in the United States, and they have sat here and deafly denied the people of the United States this provision in the revenue act for 1927, when a majority of the people say they want the Federal estate tax repealed.

Mr. BLANTON. I deny that they deafly denied anybody and also that a majority of the people want it repealed. I heard the committee give the gentleman's aggregation which he speaks of here two whole days of hearings.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Yes; quite a hearing, and when this bill was under general debate in the House it was so arranged that we had 15 minutes in which to discuss this very important provision. The gentleman from Texas gave us all the time he could. The gentleman was not to blame, but I maintain that when only 15 minutes is allotted to a State whose constitution has been abrogated, surely time is valuable with the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. On this question the gentleman can not find 2 per cent of the people who live in my big district who will agree with the gentleman. They agree with the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. That may be true, but the gentleman's State pays less in Federal inheritance tax, with all of its mighty domain and its millions of people, than does my little State with a million and a third population.

Mr. BLANTON. The last report of the Internal Revenue Bureau shows that during the last fiscal year Texas paid to the Government $42,000,000, while the State of Florida paid in income taxes that same year only $35,000,000.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Will my friend state by what authority he says a majority of the people of the United States are opposed to this inheritance tax?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. As you gentlemen are aware, the estate-tax provision of the 1926 revenue act was so fixed as to

vent havoc upon the State of Florida. This was the purpose of at least some of the framers of the 1926 revenue act, as will better appear by the written committee hearings and the House proceedings on this all-important and radical and prejudiced piece of legislation.

In this instance, at least, taxes are not apportioned among the several States inasmuch as by this iniquitous act it has obtained that the State of Florida is paying an unjust and unequal portion of the burden of taxation of our Nation. By reference to the report of the Internal Revenue Department of our Government I find that the State of Florida, with its one and one-third million population and with only a very small percentage of the wealth of the Nation, as of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, paid $5,495,662.41 Federal estate tax. I find also by reference to this same publication that only four other States pay a higher estate tax to our Government than does Florida. These States named in the order of payments are: New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and California. I find also in this same publication that the State of Idaho, which is a sovereign State the same as the State of Florida, pays only $454.56. I find that great States like Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Michigan (with all of its great automobile manufacturing establishments and great wealth), all paying less than the small State of Florida. Likewise is the great industrial State of Ohio, with her millions of population, paying less than the State of Florida. This unproportioned tax payment that is now paid by Florida is caused by the unequal apportionment of taxes as you have brought about by the 80 per cent credit provision of the 1926 revenue act. By this act you are compelling the State of Florida to pay an unjust proportion of the Federal taxation.

If Florida benefited by the 80 per cent provision she would to-day be paying about one and one-fourth million dollars estate tax to the Federal Treasurer, but by this iniquitous act with its unconstitutional spirit you are taking away approximately $4,000,000 in taxes from the Florida payers to the Federal Treasurer, which said moneys should be, according to the 1926 revenue act, left in the State of Florida.

Fellow Members of the House, I maintain that any act which discriminates as this estate-tax provision discriminates and which in actuality collects 80 per cent more taxes from one State than from another, and this said result was the avowed intention of the framers and perpetrators of this said law, that such a law is in violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

Let us go a little further in the matter of support of the Federal Government by taxation in the respective States. I find that the small State of Florida is paying from all sources a total of $44,483,095.42 to the Federal Government. Now, gentlemen of the House, do you believe that the laws of taxation are fair and are just which will compel a small and weak State to pay forty-four and a half million dollars toward the support of our Government annually when other States of similar population, or even greater, pay so much less amount? I would particularly call your attention to the fact that the large State of Iowa, according to this tabulation furnished by the Treasury Department, pays to our Government from all sources only $12,666,314.05. You should not be surprised, my fellow Members, that there are those on the floor of the House who are so zealous in their efforts to continue the iniquitous provision of the estate tax when a small State like Florida pays $44,500,000, approximately, toward the maintenance of our Government and when the powerful, populous, and rich State of Iowa pays approximately $12,500,000 annually toward the support of our Government. I find, gentlemen of the committee, that there are only 12 other States which pay a greater amount of taxation from all sources than does the State of Florida. And this high average in the payment of taxes obtained by the State of Florida is caused largely by the fact that the estate-tax provision of the 1926 revenue act was aimed at, directed at, and made for the handicapping and injury of the State of Florida.

The advocates of the estate tax, with its 80 per cent provision, would tell you that it is for the purpose of making taxation uniform; however, on scanning the figures in the case we find that since the 80 per cent credit provision has been enacted into law that the amount now received by the Federal Treasury from estate taxation is very small. In fact, in 1928 possibly $50,000,000 will be obtained; in 1929, possibly a lesser amount. In other words, the amount received will continue to decrease, because under the discriminatory and unfair 80 per cent feature the various States will continue to change their State laws to fit the national laws and thereby make mockery of the taxing powers of the respective States in order to receive the 80 per cent credit of such amount as is collected by the Federal Treasurer. We find the respective States now shaping their laws whereby they receive 80 per cent of the taxes collected on estates of decedents and the Federal Government receiving only 20 per cent. One of the most striking examples of this is the State of Georgia. I do not believe anyone would really contend that this and similar States in actuality has a State inheritance tax law.

It is not the duty of the Government to go around collecting estate taxes for the respective States. Neither was it ever intended by the framers of the Constitution of the United States that the Federal taxing power would go out so far as to crush the powers and prerogatives of the respective States.

It is encouraging to see such great States as Connecticut, Ohio, Virginia, and others now coming to and joining with Florida in this important fight for the rights of the respective States. I am glad that my distinguished friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] has this time offered the amendment for the repeal of the estate tax. I am proud to see the able gentlemen from Ohio, Virginia, and other States now coming in with Florida and fighting for the principle of the rights of the respective States; and, as a matter of observation, I would like to remind my colleagues that this subject is one which has obtained great proportions. I will give you here a list of the States whose legislatures have passed concurrent resolutions and memorials requesting the retirement of the Federal Government from this field of taxation, as follows: Connecticut, Texas, North Dakota, Washington, Rhode Island, Alabama, Maryland, Indiana, Arkansas, Florida, Michigan, Tennessee, Utah, Arizona, Delaware, Nevada, Oregon, Wyoming, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Colorado. States having passed same through one branch of their legislatures are Missouri, Illinois, Idaho, Maine, Iowa, and also many of the other States have been the scenes of activity in this behalf. However, our Committee on Ways and Means saw fit to again continue this iniquitous 80 per cent provision, as well as the estate-tax law in full. But I admonish my colleagues that when the legislatures of these respective States have spoken and have by petition requested an act upon your part to the end that the respective States be given their rights along the lines of taxation that you heed their mandates and vote with us in the support of the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, which will take from our statute books this discriminatory and unnecessary law. A majority of the legislatures of the respective States have spoken; likewise the representatives of the majority of the American people have spoken; therefore it is our duty to heed the mandates of the majority of the American people. Mr. Chairman, as time is so limited on this question and there are others who desire to talk, I will not take further time of the House to-day; however, I regret to see that it has been so arranged that those of us who are interested in this matter may have such limited time in which to discuss it, and I regret again that it has been so arranged that it is almost impossible to obtain a record yea-and-nay vote on this all-important question. I do not believe in lighting your candle and placing it under a bushel, but I do believe that all Members of the Congress should come out in the open and by their record vote let the people of America know whether they are for the rights of the States or for the continued encroachment of the great concentrating Federal power, which is forever growing with its bureaucracies. It is now time to obey the command, "Halt and about face" from the destruction of the rights of the States and carry back to our States and our people those rights and liberties which have forever meant so much in the preservation of our great Union.

My State has already by vote of 4 to 1 adopted a constitutional amendment prohibiting the State from levying in the future any inheritance or income tax, laboring under the belief that it is wrong to tax dead bodies; but if the other States desire to collect a death tax, we have nothing to say. But we do say that any effort of Congress to coerce and force the State of Florida into levying and collecting a State inheritance tax is emphatically resented.

Florida's constitution is her own and she has the right to say what her State must do in State tax matters. She also has the right, here in the Congress of the United States, to bring her plea for justice and fairness, and request the Congress to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to repeal the vicious provisions of the 1926 revenue act.

The State of Florida does not need a State inheritance tax, and may I advise you that the State government is debt free and has an enormous surplus of several million dollars in its treasury. Probably no other State in the Union has a debt-free government and large surplus in the treasury.

Florida is not asking any favor but only asking her rights as a sovereign State. She is asking that the constitution of her

State be saved and that the Constitution of the United States be upheld, and that she be permitted to tax and omit to tax her people for State purposes as she desires, and she refuses to be coerced by the Congress into the passage of a State inheritance tax law. The State chamber of commerce and scores of other civic organizations throughout the State are urging that Florida be given her rights in this matter. Florida feels and knows that she has been unjustly discriminated against and asks that this wrong be righted.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have just read a splendid argument against the 80 per cent provision. Said argument was made by the Hon. J. B. Johnson, of Florida. Among other things he shows the manner in which the country is accepting this iniquitous provision of the 1926 revenue act, and shows how the bill fails to carry out the intent of Congress. I take the liberty here to read a short statement from the argument.

As a concrete example of the practical workings of this rebate provision of the revenue act of 1926 the Legislature of Georgia has passed an estate tax law for that State, which was approved March 31, 1926. Section 1 of this law reads:

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That from and after the passage of this act it shall be the duty of the legal representative of the estate of any person who may hereafter die a resident of this State, and whose estate is subject to the payment of a Federal estate tax, to file a duplicate of the return which he is required to make to the Federal authorities for the purpose of having the estate taxes determined with the State tax commissioner. When such duplicate is filed with the said official he shall compute the amount that would be due upon said return as Federal estate taxes under the act of Congress relating to the levy and collection of Federal estate taxes upon the property of said estate taxable in Georgia, and assess against said estate as State inheritance taxes 80 per cent of the amount found to be due for Federal estate taxes.

The tax officials of the State of Georgia are advertising the advantages Georgia has in a leaflet, which says in part:

There you are. Analyze the act and see just what it means; then compare it with the laws of other States, particularly the so-called noninheritance-tax States. The analysis shows the Georgia law is far better than if the legislature of the State, as has been done in other States, merely has passed a law prohibiting the levy or collection of any inheritance tax. The why is clear. Take an estate in Florida, for instance, large enough to have levied against it by the Federal Government as an estate tax, say, $75,000. Florida has no inheritance tax law of any kind, but the Federal Government levies a $75,000 estate tax, collects it, and the whole amount goes into the Federal Treasury with not one penny of benefit, so far as that $75,000 goes, to either the estate or to the State of Florida.

Make the same calculation in Georgia. The same kind of an estate, of the same value, finds a Federal estate tax levied against it for $75,000. The Federal law provides that this estate is entitled to an exemption of 80 per cent of the levy made against it for Federal estate taxes, provided that 80 per cent has been paid the State in which the estate is located as an inheritance tax. Do you get it? In the Florida case the Federal Government can give no exemption, nor can the State claim it, because there is no State inheritance tax; therefore the Federal Government has to take the whole $75,000. In Georgia the Federal Government assesses $75,000 against the estate, credits the estate with an exemption of four-fifths of the amount levied, and takes one-fifth into the Federal Treasury, the four-fifths which is credited as an exemption going into the treasury—the four-fifths which is credited as an exemption going into the treasury of Georgia. In both cases the estate pays only $75,000; in our case, we get our share for applying to the expense of operating our State government. The noninheritance-tax States are, of necessity, compelled to supply the deficiency in the source of revenue by taxing other property on which there is no Federal exemption.

If the Congress had wanted to be fair and had wanted to meet the uniformity provision in the laying and collecting of taxes as required by section 8, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, they should have provided for the collection of the entire amount of the estate tax laid and then refunded to the treasury of each State for State purposes 80 per cent of the tax collected from each State. If Congress had no authority to do this, the Congress has no authority to do what it has done. Congress can not do indirectly what it is not allowed to do directly.

If it is so interpreted in the State of Georgia, which is one of the best and greatest States of the Union, then will it not be misinterpreted and misused in other States of the Union?

The rebate provision of this estate tax law is not only clearly outside the pale of the powers delegated to Congress but it is an expressed violation of the provisions of the Constitution, in that the tax is not "laid and collected to pay the debts and for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" and is not laid and collected "uniformly throughout the United States."

And I can never believe that this act of Congress ever represented the real feeling of the Members of Congress but was rather an avenue of escape for their respective States, enmities, and prejudicies, and since my colleagues and the Nation have cooled off and reflected I believe that it is now the ripe time to correct the wrong by adopting the amendment and retiring the Federal Government from the estate-tax field altogether and leaving the right to levy estate tax entirely with the respective States where it belongs.

Mr. Chairman, as I expect to speak on this subject from time to time, conveying my argument and the argument of the State of Florida—because it is not my fight; it is Florida's fight—before the House, I shall not speak at length to-day; but may I take time to inform my colleagues that the intent of the 80 per cent provision which was to stop the migration of people and the migration of wealth to the State of Florida has been entirely futile. The intent of this provision to stop the growth and progress of the State of Florida has been entirely without result, but in turn, Mr. Chairman, the great ship of growth, development, and progress upon which Florida embarked many years ago still sails on. To-day she is leading the South in building enterprises and general development. Small villages are growing rapidly into populous cities. Her vast reaches of more than 2,300 miles of seacoast are studded with splendid harbors and girded with among the best railroads in the world. Paved roads are rapidly extending themselves in every section of the State. Factories are springing up here and there and disbursing enormous pay rolls. Her mines are belching forth 80 per cent of the Nation's supply of phosphate, together with various and sundry building and manufacturing materials. Her tobacco fields are ever enlarging and growing more productive. Her common and staple crops, together with her livestock industries, are gradually improving. Her orange and grapefruit groves—the largest and best in the world—are becoming more lucrative. Her wild lands are rapidly transforming into gardens and fields and are to-day supplying the Nation with winter vegetables. Her more than 30,000 lakes are still clear, placid, and surrounded by gigantic forest trees, draped with gray Spanish mosses. Her thousands of springs still gush forth an overabundance of transparent and God-given fluid, sparkling with purity and virtue. Her rivers still meander "here and yon" and give vent to the sweet perfume of the magnolia in the moonlight. The flaming Poinsettia, the hibiscus, the bougainvillea, and the rose are still there, and the mocking birds sing at dawn.

My friends, Florida is carrying on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I will be satisfied with five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I can not agree to that. These other gentlemen are entitled to be heard.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. We have two hours.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I know that, but there are other gentlemen who want to be heard.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I want the gentlemen to be heard, but it does seem to me we could have five more minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I object.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition which we are now considering is not a political proposition. If it can be given any party label, it is a Republican proposition, and I am supporting it to the best of my ability.

The fight for an estate tax commenced way back in 1907, when President Roosevelt sent a message to the Congress advocating this kind of tax, and the fight has proceeded until finally we have engrafted it into the legislation of the United States, and I hope it is there to stay.

I might advise the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] who has just taken his seat that the total amount of the Federal estate tax collected in his State in 1926 amounted to $1,170,794, while the total amount collected in the State of Texas in 1926 amounted to $1,080,000. Therefore in 1926 Texas contributed about as much as Florida.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. If the gentleman will go to 1927, after this 80 per cent credit has been brought in, the gentleman will find that Florida paid five and a half million dollars and

Texas considerably less. Only four States in the Union paid more than Florida last year.

Mr. RAINEY. And Florida will continue to pay more of this tax than she has paid heretofore, because Florida is getting now to be an asylum for decrepit millionaires [laughter and applause], and the fact that Florida is paying more of this tax as the years go on is the strongest kind of argument in favor of retaining it. The estate of a millionaire in Florida pays the same tax exactly as if that millionaire had remained in some Northern State, where the environment is not so pleasant and where the Bimini Islands are not so near, and where airplanes can not bring in the refreshments which are attractive to a great many. Florida will continue paying this tax as long as it remains on the statute books, and Florida can get back her 80 per cent just as soon as she joins the Union [laughter] and amends her constitution and accepts her share of it.

This is the oldest tax in existence in the world. The ancient Egyptians developed an estate tax most carefully arranged.

It is older even than the Egyptian tax at the frontier. The ancient Egyptians developed the estate tax and all the nations of the world of any importance from that day to this have imposed it. We are getting into the band wagon last of all. We are getting in harmony with the theories of the tax experts and economists for 4,000 years and are now imposing it.

The tax is not imposed upon estates of under $100,000. Of an estate of $150,000, $100,000 will be entirely exempt, and a tax of 1 per cent will be imposed on $50,000. Therefore an estate of this size will pay a tax of $500, and $400 of that amount will be returned to the State where the decedent resided when he died, provided that State has consented to accept it by conforming to the provisions of the Federal law, and already 17 of them have done that, and all of them will do it within the next six or eight years. In England they impose this tax on all estates of over $500. Our tax does not assume any considerable amount until we reach estates of ten million and over. On estates of that size the tax is 20 per cent. On an estate of that size the tax in England is 40 per cent.

THE LAST CHARGE OF THE TAX DODGERS' BRIGADE

The fight to repeal this tax is the last charge of the tax dodgers' brigade, gallantly led by those governors of States and members of State legislatures who recently came to Washington in such numbers to overawe the Committee on Ways and Means and the Members of both Houses of the National Congress. Their expenses were all paid from their homes to Washington and back again, including their hotel bills here in Washington, and their entertainment while here, and they were lavishly entertained.

This tax is regulatory; retain it and tax-dodging millionaires—there are 30,000 of them now—will not be able to escape it, whether they live in Florida or any other State. Repeal it and the States will all be compelled to abandon this field in the near future. Repeal this tax and rich men can invest their money in tax-exempt securities and pay no local, State, or Federal tax while they live, and their estate will also escape taxation. This tax furnishes the only method that can be devised of reaching tax-exempt securities.

I regret that I do not have time to discuss the expensive lobby maintained here and throughout the country to bring about the repeal of this tax.

Vote down this amendment and retain this tax and you secure for the National Treasury between thirty and forty million dollars per year for all time to come, and this is about the amount we will lose if we repeal all taxes on automobiles. Retain this tax and you can remove the automobile tax. Choose now between the purchasers of automobiles and the rapidly increasing class of the very rich.

Retain this tax and you make it possible for the States, when they all conform to the Federal law, to collect from estates of over $100,000 five times as much as the Federal Government receives, and the States can still impose any taxes they may desire to impose on estates of under $100,000 in amount. This tax protects the States, and it is the only way in which the rights of the States to impose estate or inheritance taxes can be preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I withdraw my objection to the gentleman from Florida having five minutes more, and that will even up the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. YON. I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, it is with extreme regret that I am obliged on this amendment to take the opposite attitude from the majority of the great committee on which I have the honor to serve. I have, however, expressed my views against the Federal estate tax when previous bills were under consideration, and so I do not need to go into any argument as to my viewpoints and the merits of the amendment calling for the repeal of the estate tax.

The State of Massachusetts revised its laws to conform its laws with the Federal law whereby 80 per cent is returned to the State. However, our legislature was very particular to have that apply only for such length of time as the Federal estate tax might be in existence. In other words, it expressed no view as to the merits of the subject but rather wanted to conform to the requirements in order that the amount of money should be returned to the State that the Federal law provided for.

Our friends from Florida can carry out the same idea, perhaps, with a little more difficulty than we had in Massachusetts, because I understand they have adopted a constitutional amendment. But having adopted it they can repeal it. I think that is their way out of the trouble.

There has been no opinion expressed by our legislature for or against this measure on its merits. While men of influence in Massachusetts have expressed their views in favor of the continuance of the estate tax by the Federal Government, this opinion was based largely upon the fact that its application was bringing a million and a half of revenue into the State treasury. I gather from correspondence and the press of the State that a majority of the people of our State favor the repeal of this law. There is a feeling everywhere that Congress in adopting the present law—while our excuse was an equalization of the tax, nevertheless there was a desire for coercion against the States to bring them into line whether they desired to do so or not. That is true of the Legislature of Massachusetts, and I think of the Legislature of New York and some other large States. They do not approve of the Federal inheritance tax, but they do desire to conform to it to get their share of the returns.

There is a line of demarcation when we consider the right form for the Federal Government and the right form for the State. There is a line, and we maintain—and many other have the same view—that this tax is one that should be limited in its operations to the State as distinct from the Federal Government. To that extent I am a believer in State rights. I think this tax is one that should be levied by the States. There are plenty of sources for Federal income, plenty of ways that a tax can be levied for the benefit of the Federal Government. This is so distinctly a State proposition that it seems to us entirely wrong, now that the exigencies of war have gone by, that it should be continued to be used as a levy against the States for the benefit of the Federal Government.

I trust that this thought will be given due consideration by this committee to-day—where the line should be between the States and Federal Government in the exercise of the taxing power.

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. HOCH. Due to the fact that vast estates are generally accumulated from the patronage of the whole country, does not the gentleman think that there is something inequitable for the tax to go to one State?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I do not think so. I think that the tax should go with the residence of the individual.

If an argument of this kind has any merit, the present law is entirely out of line. Either the Federal Government should have all of the inheritance tax or the State should have it all. A division, as suggested by the question of the gentleman from Kansas, is entirely illogical.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have no great desire to talk on the motion to repeal the Federal inheritance tax, but I feel that it should not be repealed at this time. It has been repeatedly stated that it is a war measure and that this Federal estate tax should not remain in peace times, but we must not forget that our large national debt of many billions is a legacy of the World War, and the same reason for this tax during the World War remains until at least this heavy burden of debt is paid or largely reduced.

I know that certain States, and also owners of very large estates urge its repeal. The same great interests opposed the Federal income tax. Without the income tax the World War could not have been financed and it is now the principal source of income to meet the needs of the Government, whose annual budget is now four billions of dollars. Certain States do not levy income and inheritance taxes—notably Florida, Alabama, Nevada, and the District of Columbia. They have abandoned

this field of taxation to the Federal Government. Many are claiming that this estate tax should be left to the States. If the Federal estate tax is repealed, then the same large interests will exert their influence to have the States abandon taxation of estates on distribution after death, following the example of a few States like Florida, which has by constitutional enactment forbidden both income and inheritance taxes, either through pressure or by the desire to invite owners of large estates to locate in these States, fleeing from States where inheritance taxes are levied. Repeal the Federal inheritance taxes and great wealth can escape all inheritance taxes by change of their residence. Why should great wealth be thus allowed to be relieved of their full share of the burdens of taxation? This Federal tax is logical and just, because these great estates have gathered their wealth from all sections of the country. Take the automobile interests, the Standard Oil companies, the steel corporations, the copper magnates, the coal barons, the lumber interests, and great manufacturing interests, and the large individual owners of these great properties while living in a particular State and having their residence and domicile there, their wealth has been gathered from all the States. Repeal the Federal estate tax and they would pay estate tax in only their State of residence or can flee to States like Florida and escape both estate and income taxes. The distribution of estates on death go to the heirs or other distributees, who have not earned this wealth.

The General Government maintains a standing Army and great Navy and annually spends hundreds of millions of dollars to protect the life and property of its citizens. The Army protects the property from destruction and domestic trouble on land and our great Navy safeguards commerce on the seas and the property and investments in all parts of the world owned by large interests. Why should the Government expend annually hundreds of millions to protect the business and accumulation of great wealth and then relieve these large estates of a reasonable tax on distribution at death, no part of which has been earned by the distributees? Why not some return for this protection?

The tax is not heavy. There is exemption of $100,000 before any tax is levied on the net estate left on death and 1 per cent on $50,000 above such net exemption, so a net estate of $150,000 after all deductions would pay only $500 Federal tax—and 2 per cent on the next $50,000, so a net estate of $200,000 would only contribute on distribution the sum of $1,500. The tax is graduated above the exemption of $100,000—and there is a credit up to 80 per cent allowed for taxes paid to the States. Why cry aloud against this reasonable tax levied for the protection given during the years of its accumulation and going to distributees that have not earned it? The tax grows in per cent and becomes substantial in amount when the net estates left run into the millions. Great wealth favors strong governments with expensive armies and navies to protect them on land and sea, and yet great estates contend against this Federal tax and cry aloud that it is an invasion of the rights of the States to collect this tax alone; and when the Federal tax is repealed, the same great influence can press upon the States to repeal such tax or they can change their domicile to other States and avoid paying either income or estate tax.

Let us maintain a small, well-equipped standing Army for needed purposes and a strong Navy to protect our commerce and rights on the seas and wherever the rights of the citizens of the United States are, but let those most benefited not shirk their fair share of payment.

Thomas Jefferson in his day believed there should be a greater distribution of estates at death and was the author of the great statute of descents and distributions, so that estates should no longer go alone to the eldest son, and I believe there is a well-defined thought in the Nation that great estates on death should be reasonably distributed, so that wealth should not be unduly perpetuated in the hands of a few, so that a limited few shall not absorb the greater part of the wealth of the country. It has been often stated that 2 per cent of the 120,000,000 of the United States own over half of its wealth. Let the centralization of wealth and power increase and the day may not be remote when 1 per cent will own as much as the other 99 per cent of the wealth, as well as increased power and influence. I have no prejudice against wealth, which serves a great purpose, but I want it to bear its fair share of the burdens of government, whose strong arm reaches out for the protection of property wherever it may be.

Stocks and bonds largely exempt, hidden securities escaping taxation, stock dividends declared running into billions of dollars—untaxed—corporate dividends increasing enormously. Tax avoidance is so great that the Treasury Department urged the passage of a new revenue bill to help close the holes of escape of millions of dollars, and largely for this purpose to strengthen the administrative part of the revenue law the Ways and Means Committee of the House met in October to have hearings and to prepare the revenue bill now pending.

So enormous have been the profits of great wealth that the latest reports from New York indicate that the great corporations will declare extra dividends this year amounting to something like $400,000,000. This huge surplus represents the years profits over and above all fixed charges, including regular dividends. All of this sum is distributed by a few of the largest corporations. The smaller corporations and business concerns have not prospered to the same extent. Business failures have increased. Many banks in increasing numbers have failed. The toiling masses have not benefited. Agricultural sections have suffered while protected interests have been safeguarded by special legislation. The burdens of government should be equalized as far as possible—a fair and just distribution of taxes—our public debt reduced as fast as it can be reasonably paid without exacting too much contribution in any one year from business—war taxes entirely repealed as soon as reasonably can be done.

The present estimated wealth of the United States is $400,000,000,000—the estimated income $70,000,000,000. The total tax revenues for Federal, State, and local governments for 1926 as reported were $8,500,000,000. The total expenditures of Federal, State, and local Governments for the fiscal year of 1925 were $11,124,000,000. The total indebtedness of the Federal, State, and local Governments is about $32,000,000,000.

The report of the Federal Estate Tax Bureau shows that 65 per cent of the property comprising large estates consist of bonds and notes and similar intangibles, which manifestly escape taxation in whole or in part during the life of the decedent. There are two ways by which these billions can be reached for adequate taxation—through the agency of income and inheritance taxation.

The pending revenue bill as reported is in some respects at variance with the desires and advice of Secretary Mellon. The bill retains the estate tax which the Secretary of the Treasury urged Congress to repeal. The American Farm Bureau Federation urged that it be permanently retained. The Secretary of the Treasury urged that the Federal tax on automobiles be retained. The bill as reported cuts in half the automobile tax. The Farm Bureau says Federal taxes on automobiles should be eliminated, and this was done by the House when it voted for the repeal of all of the automobile tax by a large majority. The Treasury Department asked for a reduction of the corporation tax which is now 13½ per cent. The bill as reported cut it to 11½ per cent, which met the approval of the House.

The Farm Bureau Federation asked that the residue of the so-called nuisance taxes be repealed. This suggestion has been largely met.

The Treasury suggested a reduction in the surplus of $225,000,000—seeking to relieve business to that extent—the House favored a somewhat larger reduction, made so by repeal of the automobile tax and some further so-called nuisance taxes.

The budget presented to Congress by the President calls for expenditures in the next fiscal year of about $4,000,000,000.

The public debt is being reduced about one billion a year. A sinking fund is provided for reduction of the public debt, also an interest fund—so much set aside for that purpose each year—payments made annually by foreign creditors by law are applied to reduce the public debt. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized to apply surplus on hand for reduction of the debt over and above what is necessary to meet the demands of the Government.

The revenue bill has much of merit in it—not entirely satisfactory to some of us but meets the majority thought, as amended in the House. What will be done with it in the Senate or in conference or when it reaches the President is uncertain. I hope when finally passed it will be helpful.

Of the two Garner amendments adopted by the House, the first will be helpful to the smaller corporations, such as banks and incorporated commercial concerns, and reads as follows:

Page 13, after line 6, insert:

"(b) Taxable income not more than $15,000: If the amount of the net income in excess of the credits provided in section 26 is not more than $15,000, then, in lieu of the rate prescribed in subsection (a), the rate shall be—

"(1) Five per cent if such amount is not more than $7,000.

"(2) Seven per cent if such amount is more than $7,000 and not more than $12,000.

"(3) Nine per cent if such amount is more than $12,000 and not more than $15,000."

The second Garner amendment repeals all of section 118 of the bill as reported and makes it mandatory on all affiliated corporations to file individual returns alike, thereby saving millions of taxes to the Government, and seeking to treat all corporations alike in making their returns. Under the present law holding companies and large corporations with subsidiaries may file joint returns and get benefits by offsetting losses of one against the profits of another. It is estimated that under the lower rates for small corporations the taxes they will pay will be decreased $24,000,000 next year. Under the affiliated return amendment it is estimated the large corporations will pay about $25,000,000 more annually, thus more than offsetting the Treasury loss resulting from the reduced taxes of small concerns.

Favoritism should no longer be written in any law—Federal or State. Taxes paid by big business as a rule is passed on to the consumer. The masses who both produce and consume should bear the burdens of taxation only to the extent necessary to meet the needs of Government, and those who benefit so largely from government should not be relieved of their fair share of the Federal taxation, now so largely needed by reason of the World War and its legacy of debt. Big business has faired better than small business, that has suffered largely because of depressed agricultural conditions, which need more reasonable tariffs and lower freight rates, that would both lower the prices of their purchases and increase the profits from the sales of their own products.

Real and continued prosperity will not come until substantial justice is done to agriculture. Mere revision of the revenue laws to collect taxes is not sufficient. Prosperity in high places will not be reflected among the masses and toiling millions unless just laws are enacted and administered for the benefit of all. I fear real relief will not come until there is a change in administration and the party now in power be retired from control.

This revenue bill has been carefully considered in committee. It is not perfect. Amendment of the revenue law and especially those provisions relating to administration and collection of the income tax was badly needed. The bill seeks to remedy existing conditions in the Treasury by increasing the efficiency of the force dealing with its administration and expediting the collections and in closing many holes by which millions of income taxes have escaped collection.

The efficiency of the law is in its administration. The administration of the income tax law has been severely criticized and very recently attacked by an eminent expert of high authority, whose testimony as an expert on tax matters has always been welcomed by the Ways and Means Committee. This expert, Prof. Thomas S. Adams, of Yale, and president of the American Economic Association, is reported in the press as saying in a recent address in Washington that the administration of the income tax law as applied to the larger and more complicated cases—

has been characterized by vacillation, delay, and demoralizing uncertainty.

In making this attack he asserted—

that there are now more than 19,000 undecided cases before the Board of Tax Appeals and that these cases involve aggregate deficiencies of approximately $550,000,000. Powerful interests are vigorously endeavoring to rid themselves of present and proposed tax burdens.

Surely a vigorous administration of the law is needed. If collections are expedited and the pending cases closed by early action, a much larger surplus will shortly be available for all needed purposes. The conditions, however, in the Treasury are not ideal—the recent refund of over $103,000,000, mainly to large corporate interests, does not give much encouragement on old collections, long held up. Prosperity is not as widespread as claimed when nearly 50,000 bankruptcies in 1927, with liabilities of nearly a billion dollars are reported, an increase of $80,000,000 more than in 1926. Let us hope that conditions will be better in 1928.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was reported out of the committee I reserved the privilege of voting to strike out the estate inheritance tax law if I had the opportunity. Therefore I rise to speak in favor of eliminating this tax. I do not believe in taxing the dead. It is not a sound constructive policy. It may be in time of war, but not in time of peace. It is not a good policy. Again, there are many instances where a going corporation is obliged to dissolve because of the estate tax. It is not the policy of our Government to take the principal of an estate: although during the period of the war there was some talk of it in order to meet our expenses, but that is not the policy of America, although it may be that of Russia.

An objection is raised in opposition to the repeal of this tax because we want the revenue. Let me read part of the statement given by the United States Treasurer to our committee:

The Treasury Department renews its recommendation that the Federal estate tax be repealed.

If the Government wanted the money, it would not have asked the Ways and Means Committee to repeal the estate tax. We in America, the richest country in the world, who have paid nearly $1,000,000,000 a year on account of our national debt, who have reduced taxes yearly by millions of dollars, can well afford at this time to write off the estate tax. It is an unpopular tax. The people of this country do not want it. It is an abhorrent tax. Although Members of Congress may favor it, I do not think they represent the voice of the American people unless they repeal this tax. I am not going into the constitutionality of the question. I appeal to you upon economic grounds and bring to your attention at this time the folly of taxing estates, the folly of taxing the dead.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to the estate tax, stripped of all camouflage and pretenses, must be based entirely on opposition to the tax itself, as just stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Very clearly there can not be any sound argument based on State rights when we find the distinguished and conservative gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON] join hands with the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. GREEN and Mr. SEARS and Mr. YON, and other champions of State rights. I will say, though, that there are a good many State rights Democrats who are in favor of the Federal estate tax. There is nothing to arguments on this subject based on State rights.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This tax does not tax the dead, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON] suggests. That is the one thing it does not do. It taxes the living, who takes this money without doing anything for it. This tax does not apply at all to the dead. There is no way of enforcing a tax against a dead man. It is a tax on the right of transfer.

Mr. WATSON. If an individual had no estate there would be no taxation, and therefore when he leaves an estate it taxes the dead.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania a man can not take his gold and property with him. He can not use his money after he is dead. Fundamentally, the state has the inherent right to take all of a man's property after his death. Instead of doing that, it gives certain rights of inheritance, and an estate tax or a transfer tax is simply a tax on that right given by the sovereign or state to those who, under the laws, are given that privilege. As to these States which cry now because they are discriminated against, I want to say that there is no State discriminated against by this law except by reason of its own act and will, and——

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In a moment. At a time when the States had necessarily to look for new sources of revenue many of the larger States were compelled to impose an inheritance tax. Then the very States now complaining said, "Now we will go into competition with those States; we will attract their wealthy men to us; come down into our State and we will not tax your property after you die."

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Then why enact the 80 per cent?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Any State that tried to take advantage of another State and whose purpose was frustrated by our Federal estate law and now complains is not worth the shedding of a movie actress's glycerin tears. [Applause.] There is nothing in our whole taxing system that is more equitable and better worked out than the automatic division of this tax between the State and the Federal Government. Under our dual form of government we certainly must have in many instances duplication of taxes, but here the Federal estate tax is very skillfully and equitably worked out to apportion the tax to the State so as to equalize these taxes and make it uniform throughout the country. The Federal Government gives back 80 per cent of the tax on the estate if the State taxes up to the amount. This makes a uniform estate tax throughout the United States.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just a moment. Gentlemen, the opposition to this tax is to the tax itself. It is the easiest tax to collect. It brings in a revenue. It is a hard tax to dodge, because the money is in the bank, the securities are there, the property is all there, and it must all be transferred to the heirs or legatees and can be easily checked up. They can not go and get a certified public accountant, can not hire a lawyer,

some ex-employee of the Treasury Department, to dodge this tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Or pass it on.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Or pass it on. It is a good tax and fair tax.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit, let the logic of the gentleman's argument be decided by a question. Is not a recognition of the fact that it is a matter within the province of the States found in the 80 per cent rebate?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; just an act of generosity. [Applause.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I am in no sympathy with the argument that the tax upon inheritances or upon estates of decedents is inherently wrong, unconstitutional, uneconomic, or unfair either to decedents or to heirs and devisees. I believe in an estate or inheritance tax. I think it is a proper form of taxation. The right of inheritance has never been considered a natural or inherent right. It is purely a civil right granted by law. Conditions and charges may properly be imposed for its enjoyment. In the Federal scheme of taxation it is an excise tax permitted by the Constitution.

At this time, however—and this is the only subject upon which I expect to differ with the action of the committee—I shall vote for the repeal of the Federal estate tax in the Committee of the Whole, but I make this suggestion to those who believe as thoroughly as they say they do in the repeal of that tax, that if you materially increase the amount of tax reduction by this bill, if you add item after item to the reduction of taxes in this bill, you will defeat the very purpose that you have in mind.

I shall reserve the right of voting against the repeal of this tax if I find, when the bill comes into the House, that it has been loaded down with so many and such large reductions and exemptions that we are in danger of destroying the integrity of the bill.

I do not think there is any great question of policy or principle involved in this matter. I think it is purely a question of whether the Federal Government needs the money. I would like to leave this field of taxation to the States, and I want to say to those Members who come from States which have no estate taxes or inheritance taxes at all, that they have less ground for complaint than those of us who come from States that have estate or inheritance taxes. My own State of Illinois has a heavy inheritance tax, and I feel that the States should eventually have the exclusive use of this method of raising revenue. When I feel that our finances are balanced as to receipts and expenditures, I shall favor the repeal of the Federal estate tax. But when, as I say, you load down this bill with a lot of other reductions and a lot of privileges and exemptions and releases from taxation, you are sure to defeat the very purpose you have in mind.

Mr. Chairman, under the leave to extend my remarks, I want to add that I earnestly hope that the total reductions finally included in this bill, when it is enacted into law, will permit the repeal of the estate tax to take effect as to persons dying after this bill becomes effective. I have grave fear, however, that in its present mood the Committee of the Whole—and, perhaps, the House itself—will so far increase the tax reductions as to imperil the fate of the whole pending bill. We can not afford to pass any law which will create a deficit in the Federal Treasury. The committee in charge of this bill placed a dead line on tax reductions at $250,000,000. The Treasury Department fixed it at approximately $225,000,000. The committee's recommendations aggregate $236,000,000, with possible increases of revenue that may bring the total reduction down to $232,000,000. There is a widespread sentiment in the country for debt reduction as against tax reduction. It would be better to pass no bill than to pass one that will imperil the Treasury. Those actually desiring some tax reduction would do better accepting half a loaf than getting no loaf at all.

That, Mr. Chairman, is all I care to say now. [Applause.]

Mr. FORT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the tax on estates seems to me to be so clearly within the power of the Government, as has been stated by the gentleman from Illinois, that that feature needs no discussion. The question of the right policy on this matter is perhaps open to some debate. There is, however, one feature of the estate tax as a Federal tax which has not been, it seems to me, sufficiently considered on the floor and in the public discussion of this question.

We now have, as a part of our structure of revenue taxation, the system of levying a tax upon the profits realized by men who buy property and subsequently sell that property at a profit as though those profits were current income. By this bill we are further fixing as a part of the policy of the Nation that in the case of the sale of property of decedents, whether by their executors or their legatees, the cost of the property for the purpose of determining the profit is taken as the value at the death of deceased. If, then, we strip from the bill the estate tax the entire profit which has been gained by any individual on the purchase of any security or land which he owns at the date of his death escapes all Federal taxation. There is no other way in which the Nation can reach the profit that has accrued prior to the death of the decedent except by an estate tax.

It is in the national interest that men who make money should be induced to utilize it for the good of the Nation as a whole. It is in the national interest that capital should be profitably and gainfully used in projects which employ others. It is not to the national interest that it should be planted in sleeping investments in the hope of future profit, and then permit that whole profit to pass to heirs free of all taxation, thus discriminating in favor of the man who does not usefully employ his money and against the man who does usefully employ his money. [Applause.]

If you place the provisions of this bill on the books relating to the sale of property after the death of the original purchaser, then you must retain the estate tax or the entire unearned increment escapes Federal taxation. The Federal income tax would reach that profit if the property were sold before death. Only through an estate tax can we bring to the Federal Treasury its proper share of that profit, the share it would have gained if the profit had been cashed during the life of the owner.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORT. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman is discussing the estate tax as a profit tax. Does not the estate tax apply to all estates, whether profitable investments or not?

Mr. FORT. Certainly. But, as I said, it is the only way to reach the profit.

Mr. DENISON. There may be a loss as well as a profit.

Mr. FORT. I want to reach the situation where a man has put his money into undeveloped lands and holding companies for the purpose of avoiding the payment of income tax. [Applause.]

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Does it not also reach that part of his capital that is invested in tax-exempt securities?

Mr. FORT. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: On page 184, line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Paragraph (b) of section 301 of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"'Paragraph (b). The tax imposed by this section shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia in respect of any property included in the gross estate. The credit allowed by this subdivision shall not exceed 25 per cent of the tax imposed by this section, and shall include only such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within three years after the filing of the return required by section 304.'"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to make a point of order against that amendment. I think it is out of order for a number of reasons. In the first place, there is already an amendment pending and this is not germane to that, and certainly it is not germane to anything in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I simply submit to the Chair the proposition that when a motion is made to repeal a law it brings before the House that law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will direct himself to the first statement of the point of order.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I did not get that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that there is an amendment now pending.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I ask that it be made to read an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The effect of the amendment is to strike out the whole inheritance tax.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In addition to that, if the entire tax is repealed does the gentleman then want to provide that 25 per cent of the tax shall be given to the States? That is his amendment and that amendment is not in order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, why would not this be in the nature of a perfecting amendment? In order to strike it out why could not the gentleman from Florida offer his amendment and why would not the vote come on that first?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That would be so if there was a text before the committee which is being perfected, but there is no text before the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But the amendment puts the text before the committee because the amendment is to strike out all of the act as it stands, and that is before the committee now. Why is not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida germane to that? The present amendment strikes it all out and the gentleman's amendment only strikes out a part and inserts other language instead. Why is not that germane and why is it not a perfecting amendment that ought to be voted on first?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard a second, I thought the two hours were reserved upon this section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. Would not the gentleman from Florida have to offer his amendment within the two hours? Suppose the amendment which is now pending is voted down, then it seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida would be in order to the remaining part of the bill, and I had assumed that the gentleman's amendment would be offered and remain pending to be voted on if the other amendment is voted down, because it certainly then would be in order as an amendment to the remainder of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not called upon to pass upon that question.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, may the pending amendment be read for information—not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida but the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] on yesterday will be read for the information of the committee.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Page 183, after line 16, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Section 401, Title III, of the revenue act of 1926, shall not apply in the case of any decedent dying after the enactment of this act."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] will be read for the information of the committee.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: On page 184, line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Paragraph (b) of section 301 of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"'Paragraph (b). The tax imposed by this section shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia in respect of any property included in the gross estate. The credit allowed by this subdivision shall not exceed 25 per cent of the tax imposed by this section, and shall include only such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within three years after the filing of the return required by section 304.'"

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that where you have an amendment to repeal a law a perfecting amendment can be offered. Certainly I can offer this amendment to repeal paragraph (b) of section 301 because it is before the House, but dealing frankly with my colleagues, as I always try to do, I will state that this virtually repeals the law of 1926. It reduces the credit feature from 80 per cent to 25 per cent. So, as a matter of fact, it is a repeal of that law and goes back to the former law of 25 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman's amendment, in the way it has been submitted, has no relation whatever to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], and that it is not in order at this time. The gentleman from Florida will be recognized for five minutes on the amendment now pending.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I trust the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will be liberal with me, and I assure him I will be as brief as possible. I know your temper and that you want to reach a vote. I shall not go into the question of the inheritance tax, because that has been fully discussed. However, for the benefit of the new Members, I call their attention to my remarks of December 16, 1925, in which I quoted President Coolidge, Chief Justice Taft, and others along this line. You will find the remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 16, 1925. I will simply say that Judge Marshall held, in the case of Gibbons against Ogden, that—

Congress is authorized to lay and collect taxes, to pay debts, etc. This does not interfere with the power of the States to tax for the support of their own government.

Judge Marshall further held in the case of McCulloch against Maryland that—

The power to tax involves the power to destroy, that the power to destroy may defeat and render useless the power to create, that there is a plain repugnance in conferring on one Government—the Federal Government—a power to control the constitutional measures of another, which other, with respect to those very measures, is declared to be supreme over that which exerts the control, are propositions which are not to be denied.

Simply calling those decisions of Judge Marshall to the attention of my colleagues, I will pass over the question of the pending amendment, as I only have five minutes, and there are other points I desire to call to your attention.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard some wonderful ideas advanced here to-day, new to me, coming from the Southland and believing, as I do, in State rights. I have heard it stated that Florida, a State that wrote into her constitution a provision prohibiting the levy of an inheritance tax by a vote of more than 10 to 1 of her citizens, could only get the benefit of this law if she would kneel at the feet of Congress and submit to its will. In other words, you have told us that we no longer belong to the Union and that if we want to join the Union, according to my good friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], the way to do it is to repeal our constitution and write it according to the wishes of the gentleman from Illinois. Knowing the gentleman from Illinois as I do, I can not believe he was serious. Illinois might submit to that proposition, Mr. Chairman, but I do not believe they would submit to it, and if they would submit to it, speaking for my people I say, regardless of the penalty imposed on us and standing on our constitutional rights, I repeat that Congress and no other power can make the people of Florida change her constitution. [Applause.]

Oh, why do you not be fair. The gentleman said the State of Florida is being filled with old, decrepit, invalid men moving from, perhaps, the State of Illinois. Let me congratulate those wonderful people of Illinois in that they have finally seen the light and moved out of the cold, wintry blasts to go down and bask in the sunshine of Florida, where we believe in State rights. [Applause.] We are glad to have them.

I am not as familiar with the glycerin tears of the beautiful moving-picture actresses as my handsome and eloquent friend and colleague from New York. I trust, Mr. Chairman, his mental horizon does not begin at the Statue of Liberty and set on the western side of New York City, but why is he not fair with you in arguing this matter, and instead of jumping on Florida, tell you that last year approximately $36,000,000 of Federal inheritance taxes were collected in the State of New York. Of this amount, in round numbers, $28,000,000 of it went back to New York and the Government only received $8,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will yield, Florida has the same privilege.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes; Florida has the same privilege, if we would listen to you, but we do not care to listen to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes; we have the same privilege, Mr. Chairman, when we get ready to surrender all State rights. The Government now is centralized, as you know, where people hardly know how to turn for fear the Government will take hold of them for violating some law that fundamentally is no violation of any law.

Why not say to Connecticut, "You have no income tax. We will penalize you in Connecticut until you write an income tax law." Why not say to Georgia and South Carolina, "You have a tax on tobacco; Florida has none; and until you take the tax off tobacco the Federal Government will penalize you by giving money to Florida in proportion to the amount of taxes you take from the people of Georgia." There is no limit to it except the possibility of getting votes. Against all of these endeavoring to preserve to a State its constitutional right, I pledge my vote.

Let me now give you some figures that may astound you. If you are sincere on the inheritance-tax matter——

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I am sorry, but I have only five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. All right; I yield.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to know how the gentlemen differentiates the question of State rights that is involved in the Federal inheritance tax law and the Smith-Hughes law, the maternity act, or the Federal highway act, under which we take money out of our Treasury and give it to Florida to build highways.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. That is an appropriation and not a taxation matter.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes; they are appropriations.

Mr. BEGG. How does the gentleman differentiate the Federal income tax law?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Some of those laws I voted against. The income tax is provided for by the Constitution, and there has been no effort on the part of Congress to coerce the States.

Mr. BEGG. I do not recall the gentleman ever resisting the Federal highway appropriation or voting with me when I made a fight to cut down the contribution.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. No; I do not think the gentleman will find me resisting it because there are only a few things like that where the people get some real benefit out of their taxes, and besides the Constitution specifically authorizes the National Government to establish post offices and post roads, which makes that an entirely different question.

The citizens of Florida voted upon the amendment of their constitution in a perfectly legal manner, and even if we desired to do so it would take us four years to repeal the provision, and yet in the meantime you are penalizing us.

Let me call the attention of those who believe in a Federal inheritance tax to these facts.

It is estimated that in 1926 the Federal inheritance tax $156,000,000 dropped to $116,000,000, in round figures; in 1927 it will drop down to $100,000,000; in 1928 it will drop down to $80,000,000—this is the Treasury's estimate—I am informed in 1929 it will drop down to $65,000,000; and I am told that in about ten years the Government out of $156,000,000 will only get about $20,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is an estimate.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I am simply giving you the figures given by the department as an estimate. I do know that 17 States have now been whipped into line and have voted for an inheritance tax law in order to get the benefit of the 80 per cent refund, and this under the guise of taxation; but in the open you have bartered with them and said, "We will give you back 80 per cent of your taxes paid as inheritance taxes if you will write the law so you can benefit by it and as we dictate." What do we care about Florida paying her $5,000,000 and that $5,000,000 being distributed over the country for schools and roads?

I am not complaining. Let the States get the benefit of it; but I do say it is unfair to Florida to say to her, "You must change your constitution so that out of that $5,000,000 you can get 80 per cent of it back," while New York, as I have said, out of her $36,000,000, in round numbers, gets back $28,000,000 and only pays into the Government about $8,000,000.

It would be a wonderful thing for a demagogue to indulge in in the State in which he resides. I do not charge that any of my colleagues are demagogues, but I would like to have the question go before the people during a campaign, because they lose sight of these many intricate constitutional questions.

I simply ask you, my friends, not to forget the fundamental principles of our Government. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend remarks I call your attention to the following:

The President in his message stated to the House in 1925:

> Society is in much more danger from encumbering the National Government beyond its wisdom to comprehend or its ability to administer than from leaving the local communities to bear their own burdens and remedy their own evils. Our local habit and custom is so strong, our variety of race and creed is so great, the Federal authority is so tenuous, that the area within which it can function successfully is very limited. The wiser policy is to leave the localities, so far as we can, possessed of their own sources of revenue and charged with their own obligations.

Chief Justice Taft, in rendering his decision on page 37 (Fairbanks *v.* United States, 181 U. S. 283, 285), used the following language:

> The good sought in unconstitutional legislation is an insidious feature, because it leads citizens and legislators of good purpose to promote it without thought of the serious breach it will make in the ark of our covenant or the harm which will come from breaking down recognized standards.

On page 39:

> In the case at the bar, Congress in the name of a tax which on the face of the act is a penalty seeks to do the same thing, and the effort must be equally futile. So here the so-called tax is a penalty to coerce people of a State to act as Congress wishes them to act in respect of a matter completely the business of the State government under the Federal Constitution. This case requires, as did the Dagenhart case, the application of the principle announced by Chief Justice Marshall in McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheat. 316, 423) in a much-quoted passage.

On page 40:

> Should Congress in the execution of its powers adopt measures which are prohibited by the Constitution, or should Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not intrusted to the Government, it would become the painful duty of this tribunal, should a case requiring such a decision come before it, to say that such an act was not the law of the land.

On page 43:

> The court there made manifest its view that the provisions of the so-called taxing act must be naturally and reasonably adapted to the collection of the tax, and not solely to the achievement of some other purpose plainly within State power.

Mr. CROWTHER and Mr. STOBBS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from New York whether he is for or against the Merritt amendment?

Mr. CROWTHER. I am against the Merritt amendment.

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I heartily agree with all that has been said in reference to the fairness of an inheritance tax. I think the point that ought to be borne in mind, however, is that the States have preempted this field for 50 years, or perhaps not quite that length of time, and the Federal Government has only gone into the field recently.

The reason why I am opposed to the estate tax is because I disagree with the statement of the gentleman from New York that the present Federal estate tax is an equitable proposition.

I am going to demonstrate that if I can by an illustration. Suppose a person dies in Massachusetts leaving an estate to his wife and children. Suppose under our laws there the wife and children would pay an inheritance tax of $2,000. Suppose the Federal tax on the estate would be $5,000. I am using these figures arbitrarily to illustrate my point. Under the 80 per cent provision and the special law of Massachusetts passed to take up the slack there would be paid to the Federal Government out of the $5,000 Federal tax only $1,000, because, although under our State law originally the widow and children would only be obliged to pay to the State of Massachusetts $2,000; yet, on account of the special Massachusetts estate tax passed to take up the slack so as not to allow any part of that 80 per cent of the Federal tax to go back to the Federal Government, the estate which would go to the widow and children would be taxed $2,000 additional in the illustration I have used. Therefore, instead of the widow and children being taxed $2,000, they would be taxed $4,000, and only $1,000 would go to the Federal Government.

In other words, the tax on the widow and children in Massachusetts, taking my figures, would be double the amount that it would have been if there were no Federal tax, simply because the State of Massachusetts has taken up this slack so that no part of the 80 per cent would go to the Federal Government.

Suppose a man left an estate, not to his widow and children, but to a friend outside of the immediate family. Of course, in Massachusetts such friend would have to pay a higher rate. Suppose such person had to pay under our Massachusetts regular inheritance law $4,000. Then what would be paid by that individual would be $4,000. Eighty per cent of the $5,000 Federal tax would be $4,000, and that individual, who is not a member of the immediate family—and that is the point I want

to make clear—is not penalized one cent, because his tax is equal to the 80 per cent provision; but the widow and children, because they pay a less rate, are penalized double the amount of their original tax. So I say to you that the practical operation of your Federal inheritance tax is to penalize your wives and children and the people who ordinarily under the State law would pay a less amount of tax, and it inures to the benefit of the people who are not immediate members of the family and who under the State law would pay a larger amount of tax.

I say that is an unfair tax and it has the effect of reaching out and coercing our different States to pass that provision which they have all been passing to take up the 80 per cent slack—not because they want to, for we do not want to pass it in Massachusetts; we do not want to reach out in Massachusetts and take that $2,000 away from the widow and children, but we will not let that go to the Federal Government, and we do reach out and take it, and the reason why we do it and the reason why it is done in every other State is because we are practically forced into doing it because of this Federal inheritance tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOBBS. Let me finish my statement. That is the practical operation of the Federal inheritance tax in Massachusetts and in every State of the Union where we have low rates for the members of the immediate family. The answer to that statement, I suppose the chairman of the committee would say, is, to be sure, we may be forcing the State into that condition, but we want uniformity throughout the United States, and the Federal estate tax is going to make a uniform method of taxing inheritances throughout the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that that would not be the answer that I would make.

Mr. STOBBS. It is not uniformity that we want. Each State has a perfect right and ought to be left alone to work out its own inheritance-tax problems. We want to balance the budget as between inheritance taxes and direct property taxation, but the Federal Government comes in and says, "You have to increase your taxes by reason of this 80 per cent provision; you have to increase your estate taxes to reach up and take up the slack in that 80 per cent provision," and so, instead of being left alone to do what we want to do, we are obliged to meet that situation. I say that is unfair and that we ought to be left alone.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But Florida would not let you alone, because——

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I am glad to know that Florida has more power than the other 47 States.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman talks about an estate of over $700,000, with an exemption of $100,000, and he has not brought that into consideration at all.

Mr. STOBBS. Let me say to the chairman of the committee that the State of Massachusetts, under the special estate tax law that we passed to take up the 80 per cent slack, took in $1,500,000 that we would not have taxed the people otherwise, and if we had been let alone and not obliged to do that that $1,500,000 would not have been taken from the widows and children, who otherwise would not have been touched.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the Federal, State, and local governments annually collect from the American people $8,500,000,000 of taxes, of which about $3,250,000,000 are for the benefit of the Federal Government and the remaining $5,250,000,000 are for the benefit of the State and local governments. This huge amount constitutes one tax burden that rests in common upon our 118,000,000 people. The individual taxpayer is not so much concerned as to whom he pays taxes as he is about the question of equity and relative fairness of the total taxes imposed upon him, whether they be for Federal, State, or local purposes. The first question, therefore, that should be kept in mind in exercising the taxing power of both the Federal and the State and local governments should relate to the duty and the purpose to apportion and arrange such a combination of the most suitable tax methods as would secure the fullest possible measure of equity and fairness to each of the 118,000,000 population who are called upon to share the common burden of $8,500,000,000 of taxes. In no other way is it possible to avoid to a more or less extent gross inequalities and unfairness either to individuals or groups or businesses subject to tax. For illustration, I favor the repeal of the Federal automobile tax in order that the States may have the entire levy to apply to the construction and maintenance of public roads. In other words, we should at all times undertake to equalize the burdens of this total of $8,500,000,000 of tax levies.

With this purpose in view, is it wise and justifiable to enact as a part of this annual tax of $8,500,000,000 an estate or inheritance tax levy of, say, from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 a year? My individual view is that there should be annually collected by some governmental agency—by the States if they will—from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 of estate taxes to displace an equivalent amount of more inequitable and more vicious taxes now in existence. This is one of the oldest and most universally recognized tax methods in history. It is one of the least burdensome, most fair, and easily collected taxes thus far devised. The soundness of the principle has been universally recognized by economic authorities for thousands of years. It has never been seriously challenged except from that selfish motive which would challenge any tax method. One specious objection to the tax is that it is a tax on capital. This is in no sense a test. The true test of a tax is its equity and justice and productivity. If a tax is fair, just, and equitable, it is utterly immaterial as to how it is measured, whether by capital or income or other standard. All taxes deplete one's capital to the extent that they are paid, regardless, as just stated, of how they are measured. It is impossible to find in our present Federal, State, and local tax structure any other taxing method less burdensome or inequitable than the estate tax. Under the notorious general property tax the citizen pays as high as 40 to 50 per cent of his net income and as high as 4 to 5 per cent of his actual assessed capital. Why is not this challenged as "a tax on capital"? The estate tax, on the other hand, if imposed to the extent of three to four hundred million dollars would only take a small fraction of 1 per cent of our national capital, and this would come off of wealth and not poverty. There is no escape, therefore, from our duty to cooperate in a policy that would make this a part of the general tax levy of $8,500,000,000.

How, then, can such levy most effectively be brought about? Shall the Federal act be now repealed and leave such levy to our existing State inheritance tax system, in the light of their chaotic condition? When the Federal act was passed in 1916 the States, acting separately and independent of each other, had been wrestling with this tax method for a generation, with the result that only $30,000,000 was being derived from this method and eight States alone were securing five-sixths of its total revenues. The fact was generally recognized that these State inheritance-tax systems had virtually broken down. Duplicate, triplicate, and quadruple taxation of the most oppressive kind had become prevalent everywhere. There was the widest difference in rates and exemptions in the State laws, which also were subject to frequent and radical changes in various directions.

For many years the National Tax Association, comprising representatives of the States and of important groups of taxpayers, were proclaiming the fact that the one outstanding defect in the State inheritance tax laws was the lack of uniformity and stability of rates and exemptions, coupled with the taxation of intangibles belonging to the estates of nonresident decedents. State authorities and this National Tax Association during all these years had been struggling to bring about the one prerequisite for the suitable development of substantial State inheritance tax laws, namely, uniformity and stability. By no other course was it deemed possible successfully to impose and collect substantial State inheritance tax levies. My distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. STOBBS] has just announced the policy that each State should have carte blanche to do as it pleases about all phases, such as taxing intangibles, and the size of the rates imposed and the exemptions. As a matter of fact, this is precisely the policy practiced during the past 40 years, with result that we have every sort of multiple taxation among the State inheritance-tax systems, which has resulted in their general breakdown. Some States have a 5 per cent maximum, others 45 per cent, and still others none at all, while intangibles in some instances are taxed as high as six or more times. If there is any one point that has been agreed upon by the supporters of inheritance taxation, including that by the States, it is that uniformity must first be worked out and established among the States before they can possibly hope to maintain and collect a respectable tax levy. This brings us to the Federal estate-tax situation——

Mr. GILBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I would be glad to, but——

Mr. GILBERT. In the line of which the gentleman is speaking?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will pardon me, but I only have five minutes. In connection with the Federal estate-tax situation let me first remark on the matter of uniformity that many years ago, when New York raised her inheritance-tax rates slightly, the press of the country asserted that during the first eight months following $400,000,000 was transferred out of the State to other States with less rates. In other words, everyone knows that it is a distinguishing characteristic of many of those with large wealth that they have a roving disposition, migratory habits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes, or I will yield him my time, in order that he may be recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended five minutes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in further connection with the preliminary and indispensable problem of uniformity of State laws, there was a conference of tax representatives of the State and Federal Governments in 1925 here in Washington. It seemed to have been held under the auspices of the National Tax Association. They had a final meeting in New Orleans and recommended that the Federal estate tax be continued for six years, primarily from the standpoint of the success of the State inheritance tax systems, in order to give them time to do what they have been struggling to do, to do away with rivalry among themselves, and to promote uniformity, as it has been described.

I make the point that since the States themselves recognize that they must put their respective houses in order by establishing uniformity and abandoning multiple taxation, and since a majority of their own representatives at the New Orleans conference recognized that the continuance of the Federal estate tax for six years would, by maintaining tax uniformity in the meantime, offer indispensable aid to all the States seeking to promote uniformity and stability of their respective systems and thereby pave the way for a substantial tax levy. How, then, can any person favoring a substantial tax levy in this country oppose the present retention of the Federal tax which alone will make it possible for the States to bring about uniformity among themselves? What right has any one State or group to raise the question of coercion, when the overwhelming majority of the States insist that they desire a substantial inheritance tax levy in this country, and agree that it can only be made possible by first establishing among themselves uniformity and stability? Is this overwhelming majority of the States to be denied the right of temporary cooperation by the Federal Government on the objection of some minority State or States? Under this policy inheritance taxation save to a nominal or trifling extent would soon be abandoned in this country. We would also be required to abandon the practice and doctrine of majority rule in order to avoid the charge of "coercion" by even the smallest minority. When the majority is proceeding in an orderly and legal way to establish governmental policies in this country, it would be an unheard of procedure for the minority to raise the question of "coercion" as an effective block to such course. And yet this is the only question that is attempted to be raised in this controversy.

The sole question, as I see it, is whether we desire to levy from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 of taxes from estates, or whether in deference to the views of a small minority, many or most of whom are opposed to all inheritance taxation, we shall practically abandon this tax method by repealing now the Federal act, and thereby deprive the States, struggling to bring about uniformity among themselves, of Federal uniformity which would so greatly aid the States to secure this end. To base the opposition to this one available course of developing the inheritance tax upon the theory of State rights is an entire misnomer. I yield to no person in my loyalty to that time-honored doctrine. It is a gross violation of both its letter and spirit, however, to urge State rights in connection with this inheritance-tax situation when everyone understands that the inevitable effect of the course insisted upon would be the virtual destruction of inheritance taxation. I admire those who stand for State rights, but I would regret to see any true champion of this sacred doctrine invoke it as a shield for gross tax injustice by exempting the great wealthy estates in chief measure from inheritance or estate taxation. State rights does not mean the exemption of wealth from its fair share of taxes. If we should impose the English rates, our revenue yield would be from $800,000,000 to $900,000,000. But no one is proposing that. We simply propose a very moderate levy of a small fraction of 1 per cent, as stated, that would displace within a very short time an equivalent of general property tax or other harsh tax methods.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Federal estate tax is so small that within six years the revenue from the estates alone would pay it.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Unquestionably so. If a person is a friend of estate or inheritance taxation in this country, it is impossible to escape the view that the Federal tax should be maintained for a few years and until the States shall have opportunity to put their houses in order and to get out of the chaotic and collapsed condition into which their inheritance tax systems have fallen. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. YON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I made a few remarks the other day I did not expect to appear again before you on this subject. I am not now going to take up much of your time. I am only presenting a few facts setting forth the economic and financial condition of Florida and the reasons for our State legislature passing resolutions, and later, the people ratifying the resolutions, amending our constitution, making it impossible of assessing incomes and inheritance taxes in the State for the next 20 years from 1924.

Of course, the State was all in a state of excitement during the time of your consideration of the general revenue bill two years ago. It seemed that everybody was talking of the Florida boom. Everyone either was going to Florida or wanting to go, and consequently you had a disposition toward Florida then that ought not to exist at this time. The boom ought never have been. Florida will continue to grow as she had previously to the boom, and that was not of Florida people's making.

Now, getting down to the situation there now, I will say that in view of the fact that a little over a year ago a terrific hurricane struck the southeast and the northwest tips of the State, and the news went forth that Florida was destroyed with the storm, and the storm was used as a scare, greatly exaggerated, and kept hundreds of thousands of people from their usual winter vacations in the Nation's winter playground. But did this kill Florida? No; emphatically. And along just before the storm the boom had played out; and did that kill Florida? I say no again.

The people of the State—and that included lots of newcomers—have gone ahead tenaciously to keep up the great road-building program; and to give you an idea of what that is, our State road department has been working on the expenditure of more than a $15,000,000 budget this year, and on a cash-as-they-go basis, and the results of the work of the department to August 1, in that under their supervision, not taking into account the thousands of miles of splendid paved roads built by the sixty and odd counties, they have completed 227 miles of concrete, 17 miles of bitulithic concrete, 85 miles of slag asphalt, 89 miles of bitulithic macadamize, 23 miles of block asphalt, 737 miles of S. T. rock base, 418 miles of sand, clay, and gravel surface, and 28 miles of marl, or a total of 1,643 miles of as good road as is in the country; and, besides, they have graded over 2,000 miles with a grade surface of 30 feet and a 60-foot R. O. W. This work was not all done this year, but the great strides were reached last year and continued through this. Besides our road programs the financial statement of our State treasurer shows a good, healthy balance in all funds as of October 1, 1927, of $5,919,230.74, with no bonded indebtedness, and a 7½ mills State mileage, occupational, and other licenses and taxes, we raise something over $40,000,000 a year; and for these reasons we felt like we could forego the levying of incomes and inheritances. And now I am asking you gentlemen, in view of the foregoing facts, that you will please give us the advantages acceding to us under our law and constitution. And is it right, gentlemen, that you should endeavor to coerce a State by legislation that is not given you the right under the Constitution, for there is a sphere for national legislation to make assessments for National Government expenses; but when my State says that they don't want to assess a tax and collect it of a certain sort, as in the estate tax, I don't see how you could constitutionally take from us a share greater than from another State under the different schedules as are carried in the present revenue law.

It seems that the constitutional prerogatives of the State are all overlooked in the matters of expediency by this the greatest legislative body in the world. Now, as to the part the State of Florida pays of internal taxes, the latest report furnished by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, shows the total of $44,483,095.42 internal taxes, of which the larger items are individual incomes, $20,400,660.33; corporation incomes, $15,189,168.89; cigar and tobacco manufacturers' tax, $2,827,856.97; and estate and gift transfers of over a million dollars; and stamp taxes and miscellaneous making up the balance. The income taxes for the taxable year 1926, as per report of commissioner's office, shows an even greater amount—corporation, $17,679,748.17 and individual $28,998,920.30—or total incomes of $46,678,668.47, or the tenth State in the Union in payment from this source for calendar year. The fiscal year report for the year 1926 still further shows that Florida is paying a very high per capita tax. With a population of 1,317,000, she paid $32.81 per caipta, or the fifth in the Union per capita. Florida had that year 1.02 per cent of population and paid 1.52 per cent of taxes; also, Florida is thirty-second in population and, as stated, fifth per capita in payments. Great States like Arkansas, Georgia, Kansas, Nebraska, Kentucky, Iowa, and numbers of others that voted for this 80 per cent credit clause are paying from $3.05 to not over $10.64 per capita; and, of course, the States that pay the greater per capita are those States where the heads of and the general offices of great corporations, nation-wide in their scope of operations, are located; and, really, Florida helps pay their taxes, and Florida also is thirteenth among the States in percentage of payments of internal taxes, as shown by fiscal year report of 1927. In view of the part my State has played in the matter of paying Government taxes since you last arranged your revenue bill, do you not think we are doing our share? I can not help but express that the inclusion of your 80 per cent credit clause was an unnecessary step and does carry an injustice to a sovereign State. I believe you are fair and each of you have in your make-up enough of that spirit to not carry this injustice longer to my State or others, the few that have no law on their statute books assessing inheritance taxes. [Applause.]

You have punished Florida long enough now; please show your generosity and amend the revenue act so as to leave out this 80 per cent credit clause.

Of course in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress and the remarks made in support of the 80 per cent credit clause, anyone would know that this provision was intended to strike at my State, and the right for them to self-determine their strictly State affairs.

I am a Democrat not because I happened to be born "down South" and a native of my State. I am raising my voice in defense of its constitution; but if I had been born in Maine or the most solid rock-ribbed Republican State in the Union, and with the nature in me, I would be a Democrat. I am just naturally Democratic. I like associations with people and believe in that inherent right that the people, all of them, are entitled to equal rights under the law of the State and Nation, and I am placed in a rather embarrassing position, a new Member in this body, to have to take issue with such a large body of my Democratic friends on this very important question, for they, too, say along with the Republicans, that my State is not privileged to assert her individual rights to levy and collect taxes as she sees fit without being prevented from enjoying those rights by legislation of this body. [Applause.]

I thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I take the opportunity to say that I am in favor of sustaining the action of the Committee on Ways and Means in reporting to retain the inheritance tax.

Regardless of other considerations, it seems to me that to repeal it would be inconsistent with the needs of the Treasury and would make it more difficult at least to repeal or to reduce other taxes which are more burdensome, and the repeal or reduction of which is more urgent.

The inheritance tax is perhaps the least burdensome of all taxes. It is easy to collect, and, as has been stated here this afternoon, it can not be dodged, and it can not be passed on to the consumers. As it now stands, the Federal inheritance tax is practically no burden to anyone, exempting as it does altogether the first $100,000 of an estate, and taxing the next $50,000 1 per cent only, and so on progressively up to 20 per cent until the estate reaches the value of $10,000,000; all above that amount being taxed 20 per cent. The total amount that taxes may be reduced this year is very limited, and it seems as though Congress should concern itself first with the reduction or repeal of other taxes which are more burdensome than the inheritance tax. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been requested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] to recognize the gentleman from Florida to speak for five additional minutes, and there being no one else in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] seeking recognition, the Chair complies with that request. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindness of the Chairman of the committee in granting me additional time. There are only two or three further observations I would like to make on this matter. One of these observations is this: That when revenue is collected for defense, for the payment of debts, or for the general welfare, then it may well be said it is within the power of the Government to assess and collect, but when a tax is collected for coercion then it is a violation of the Constitution. We maintain that is the case here. I have no doubt in my mind, my friends, especially when these distinguished gentlemen from other States—the States of Iowa, New York, and other States—come before you and undertake to direct your vote by telling you that people are going to Florida for the purpose of evading taxation; that they are leaving your States for that purpose, and that the State of Florida is undertaking to coerce 47 other States into enacting laws similar to that in the State of Florida. I say, when they tell you this, their entire argument falls. Two years ago they did not say that Florida was coercing. They said "Florida, you must pay it," and now they say it has reached such great proportions where Florida is coercing the other 47 States. I wish Florida did have the power to coerce them in this matter and let the other 47 States have their just constitutional rights.

Then the State of New York says—at least one gentleman [Mr. LAGUARDIA] from that State said—that Florida was not worth, I believe, the moving-picture crocodile tears, or something like that. My friends, that should strengthen the argument to those of you who are on my right, when you see the manner in which we are looked upon by the great controlling power in the United States; when the financial center of our country, when the section of our country that directs the cancellation of debts owed us by foreign governments, when the section of our country which directs the elections of our Presidents and which directs the collection and the levying of tariffs in our country, comes to you and says the sovereign State of Florida is not worth the tears of a moving-picture actress. My friends, do you believe the time has come when you can support the issues that those on our left would sponsor and undertake to crowd upon us? It is worthy of your consideration, my friends, you should unite with us who would protect the rights of the States.

Twenty-two of the States of our Union, through their legislatures, have spoken and by both branches of their legislatures have requested the repeal of this tax. Other States have passed resolutions for repeal through one branch of their legislatures. I do not believe there is anyone here who comes from a State whose legislature has passed this resolution that believes the 80 per cent credit was put there for any other reason except to dodge and make a mockery of the Federal estate tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said in this debate about the coercion of the States and there has been a great deal said about the Federal Government invading this field of taxation and robbing the States of its benefits.

Since the sixteenth amendment of the Constitution was passed it changed the whole system and theory of Federal taxation. Federal taxes are no longer levied according to States or according to enumeration, but under the authority of the sixteenth amendment the Federal Government can now reach out to the individual.

So I think the argument which pits the amount paid by one State against the amount paid by another State is now irrelevant and not to the issue, as the Federal Government now levies the taxes upon individuals and is permitted to do so under the Constitution. The States are using the sovereignty that is given to them in levying any kind of inheritance tax they please, and the Federal Government has the same authority and is levying an inheritance tax or an estate tax. They are both exercising an authority which they have without any coercion.

If one State says it does not need this kind of revenue and believes in this theory to the extent of putting it in its constitution, they have a right to do so.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. We had inheritance taxes long before the sixteenth amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CELLER. And that is not the justification.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I understand that. I am not offering it as a justification but as an example of the fact that we are not now collecting Federal taxes by States, and therefore to compare what Florida pays with what the State of New York pays is not relevant to Federal taxation.

Mr. CELLER. Is not the justification for the inheritance tax the fact it is an indirect tax and need not be apportioned?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The justification for the inheritance tax is that it was levied over 100 years ago in the days of Alexander Hamilton on legacies, and in the time of the Civil War as a necessity, and the Federal Government was in that field of taxation long before the States and now has a right to be there. But why compare what one State pays with another when the levy is upon individuals and the exemptions that are allowed are not according to States but to individuals, because the 80 per cent is not allowed on the theory of a State law but on the theory that the individual has paid an inheritance tax and therefore rather than have double taxation upon that individual the Federal Government is willing to make this concession, although it has a right to retain it all.

Some one has said it ought to be repealed because it is not popular. Who ever heard tell of taxes being popular under any circumstances. The question is, Is it just? If it is just then the Federal Government ought to remain in this field, a field it has been in for over 100 years.

I say it is one of the most just laws that is levied by the sovereignty of either a State or a nation. Why? These gigantic estates are not accumulated within the precincts of any one State. These gigantic estates of above $100,000 are generally accumulated because such men have been in the banking business or in the merchandising business or in the transportation business, or have exploited natural resources and gathered such estates from the four corners of our Nation. Why, then, is it not just that at the end of life, when there is to be a distribution of these accumulations under the beneficent provisions of our Government, that the Federal Government, which has furnished stability and protection throughout all these years under the commerce clause, under the banking clause, and under the various provisions of the Federal Constitution, should say to this man's beneficiaries at the end of his life, "The Federal Government expects you to reimburse it by a certain portion of the estate for the benefits that have been conferred"?

There is a social phase to this as well. Over 100 years ago Thomas Jefferson made a fight against the laws of primogeniture in the State of Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GREENWOOD. May I have two more minutes, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana requests unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENWOOD. As the laws of primogeniture perpetuated——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman realize there is very little time left?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Well, there was not anyone asking for time on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there are quite a number of requests for time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If the gentleman from Iowa objects——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I shall not object.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I thought I had received the time before the gentleman from Iowa rose, and I do not know why the gentleman rose, unless he wanted to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. As the laws of primogeniture perpetuated these large estates and kept them in certain people's hands out of the avenues of trade and out of the distribution of wealth that ordinarily comes, so these large estates are perpetuated by wills and by trusts in the hands of certain families, and therefore there is a social phase in the dissipation of these estates by permitting the Federal Government to retain this power that shall say to a man, regardless of what States he lives in, "When the hour comes you shall die; we propose that rather than perpetuate and pass on this estate a portion of it at least shall go to the Federal Government, under which you have lived throughout these years to accumulate this estate and receive during your life the benefits of it."

So, my friends, I think it is a most just law. I think the Federal Government has been in this field of taxation long enough to say that it is not trying to rob the States, and I think any State has a similar right to exercise its sovereignty, and under the present situation I believe both the Federal Government and the States are exercising this sovereignty, and there should be at least no argument about coercion on the part of one as against the other. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to this side of the House that it seems perfectly regular to-day not to be with the committee, but I am glad to be with them on this matter. I differ from the other two speakers from the State of Massachusetts, speaking as individuals but not for the legislature of the State.

Inheritance taxes are so lacking in uniformity to-day that we must be sure to die within the confines of our own State, all our property owned within our own State, all our securities deposited within our own State; such securities must be in corporations incorporated in our own State, and all property owned by such corporations located in our own State to avoid serious expense and delay in settling the demands of many different States. If there is anything that can be done toward uniformity, we should welcome it.

I had the pleasure, like the gentleman from Tennessee, of attending the National Tax Association meetings, where able men were pleading for reciprocity among the States. We have not got very far. If a State passes a constitutional amendment guaranteeing 20 years' immunity from either an income tax or an inheritance tax, it appears to be done as a deliberate invitation rather than as a principle of State rights.

When our State had a general property tax wealthy men moved from town to town until we made it uniform. There was a case of a man coming from Illinois, where they guessed him too high on intangibles, and he brought $16,000,000 into one small community.

We who try to apply a principle think the income tax also belongs to the State.

In Massachusetts we have an income tax and have had it for a long time. Why not give us credit on the Federal income tax up to 80 per cent? The Federal Government having adopted this method, we have suffered thereby by double income taxation. We think both the income tax and the inheritance tax belong to the States.

I wish to put in the RECORD that the Massachusetts tax commissioner has written to the committee, and while he does not state his academic opinion, his practical opinion is that the act ought not to be repealed. [Applause.] One of the best-informed tax leaders in Massachusetts, the chairman of the ways and means committee, who has carefully considered this problem, has gone on record by letter against its repeal. However, other prominent tax experts of our State differ, and as yet none of us from Massachusetts know what our legislature may determine in the future. However, in the face of the State of Connecticut's flirtation with our citizens, and Florida with wide-open arms, we must try and restrain our wealthy citizens from leaving our Commonwealth.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, just a word in concluding this debate. The debate, I think, has been interesting. One of my objects in offering the amendment was to have the question discussed in a broad way. Before the discussion is closed I should like to point out that many of the arguments have, to my mind, missed what I think is the principal point of this amendment and in the legislation that I am trying to repeal.

Much of the debate has been with regard to inheritance tax as a tax. I think no one objects to that; but in its present form it is a Federal tax designed, as gentlemen say, to equalize taxation. If a man has got his money by doing business with the whole United States, then the whole United States should get the benefit from his estate; but, as a matter of fact, what happens is that the United States insists on taking a certain amount of money and then returning 80 per cent to the State. The whole objection I have to that is that it does result in coercion of State legislatures.

I think one of the great dangers we have had, and which continues in the Congress of the United States, is the increasing tendency, especially since the war, for the United States to take part in all the activities of the States and in all the activities of the citizens, and I for one am desirous that this Federal interference shall not be increased but rather curtailed. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1, the revenue bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

COLONEL LINDBERGH'S FLIGHT TO MEXICO CITY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have just received a report that Colonel Lindbergh arrived in Mexico City at 1 o'clock today. [Prolonged applause.] I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to send a telegram of congratulations to Colonel Lindbergh on behalf of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further considerartion of the bill H. R. 1, the revenue bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the revenue bill, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for two or three minutes. I do it for the purpose of directing the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] to one aspect of this matter which has not been referred to. I agree fully with the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] as to the inherent wisdom and justice of this tax and as to the reason why the tax is used by the Federal Government at this time instead of the subject being left to the States.

When the plan was devised originally 80 per cent was fixed as the figure of the credit to the States. That was an arbitrary figure, but gentlemen said, "We will reserve a substantial amount to the Federal Treasury, since we have doubts about the constitutionality of the law we are enacting." You know when we have no other ground for criticizing a proposal we are apt to suggest that it may be found unconstitutional. However, since the legislation was enacted all misgivings as to its constitutionality has been disposed of by the Supreme Court. If we really believe that ordinarily the States should be left unembarrassed and that under the present plan the States should be given all of the benefit possible, why not increase the credit from 80 per cent to 95 per cent? That is my question, and it is hardly necessary to say that 5 per cent would more than cover the cost of administration.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is giving a reason that I never gave. I was always confident that the provision was constitutional and I have always believed that by reason of the fact that these great fortunes were not made in the various States where these men have lived who accumulated them, but were made from the whole country at large, that they ought to contribute something to the Federal Government, and I think the amount of 20 per cent is not unreasonable. That was the reason, or one of the reasons, given by the Delano committee, whose report we followed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The commission mentioned by Mr. HULL said "we should maintain the normal tax for six years, with the hope that in that period the States will smooth out their conflict and discriminations." Most of us seem to agree that we should do what we can for the States in respect to this matter. Why do we not do what we can by raising the figure of 80 per cent up to 95 per cent?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A great many gentlemen think that it is too high now. It is fixed on a middle ground between varying opinions.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not think so. I would like to see the entire revenue raised by the tax less the cost of administration given over to the States, and I would do that for the reason that everyone knows—and I do not think that point has been stated more clearly than by the Undersecretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mills, who was on the floor a few minutes ago—that many of the States are so tremendously burdened at this time by local taxation as to be almost in a condition of revenue exhaustion.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Those States are greatly aided by the Federal law. Of course they would get more at 95 per cent, but the National Government ought, in my opinion, to receive at least 20 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa for nine and a half minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not understand that there was so much time left, and I do not think that I shall consume those nine minutes. I ask that the Clerk read the part of the President's message, which was delivered a few days ago, which I have marked.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any bill for tax reduction should be written by those who are responsible for raising, managing, and expending the finances of the Government. If special interests, too often selfish, always uninformed of the national needs as a whole, with hired agents using their proposed beneficiaries as engines of propaganda, are permitted to influence the withdrawal of their property from taxation, we shall have a law that is unbalanced and unjust, bad for business, bad for the country, probably resulting in a deficit, with disastrous financial consequences.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not know just exactly to whom the President refers, but I know that every word of that sentence from the message applies to this case. We have had the most extraordinary, highly financed propaganda for a selfish purpose—notice that I use the word "selfish" and not "moral" or "public"—that has ever been known in the whole history of this country. I wish I could tell you the story here, but I have only a few minutes, and it would take me several hours to tell you how they have been working with these various State legislatures in order to get these resolutions passed which have been presented here at this time, and of how witnesses who appeared before us were paid expenses, $2,500 from this State, $2,800 from the other State, and how $500 bills were flourished around in the hotels of this city. I have no accusation to make against the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], who has always taken the same position that he does now—that there ought not to be any kind of an inheritance tax. He was not influenced by any propaganda of that kind, and he has been actuated as he always is by high motives.

Mr. MERRITT rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MERRITT. Oh, just for a word. Was the President influenced by the propaganda when he advocated the repeal of this tax?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, the President does not advocate anything of the kind. That is where the gentleman is entirely mistaken. If the gentleman will read the corrected report of what the President's interview was, as published in the United States Daily, which is a recognized journal of authority, he will see that the President is not in favor of a repeal of this tax at all. What he said is simply that he was not going to go back on his secretary, but so far as he is personally concerned he is not in favor of the repeal of this tax.

A number of years ago President Roosevelt said there were a great many objections to a government by an aristocracy, but there was every objection to a government by a plutocracy. That is true at this time. If we permit this highly financed propaganda to control legislation in the Congress in the manner condemned by the President in his message, and contrary to an interview he gave out subsequently, we will have a government by a plutocracy. Let me say this: Some say this is a nonpartisan measure. In one sense it is. No Republican convention, no Democratic convention ever put a plank in its platform declaring for a repeal of the inheritance tax. The matter has been discussed for years. There has been abundant opportunity, and no one has dared even to suggest on the floor of those conventions that this tax should be repealed. Those who have been working this propaganda have preferred to work in the dark where there was no controversy made, working with members of the legislatures, numbers of whom have written me that if they understood the question they would not have voted as they did, and that they got caught not understanding what the real situation was.

Now, gentlemen, these great estates of this country are growing by leaps and bounds. This tax which we propose is so moderate that the income from the estate alone, within the time that may be obtained in which to pay, will pay the tax. Florida says we are coercing her. I say that Florida is undertaking to coerce the other States. Repeal this tax and no other State can maintain it, because if you do your wealthy men will go to Florida, as they have been going, and avoid the tax by saying they have a Florida residence, and large numbers will go there if that is done. The ultimate object of nearly all who favor the repeal of the Federal tax is to get the State taxes repealed also.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Does the gentleman favor the 80 per cent provision and believe in it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think it is about as fair as we can get it, as far as that is concerned. It was approved by the Delano committee——

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Would the gentleman favor a reduction in that amount?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not. The intention is to permit the States which desire to get the benefit of an inheritance tax to make use of it. If we abolish the 80 per cent provision, the law in this respect would become a farce. Partly for this purpose we fixed the exemption at $100,000, so that the States could use the lower brackets, and with the 80 per cent provision we do away with double taxation.

Florida, as I say, is undertaking to coerce these other States. That is what it amounts to. No other State can maintain this tax, when a rich man has only to move to Florida, with its delightful climate, salubrious air, and all the other attractions which naturally tend to make them choose it as a residence.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I am glad the gentleman admits it. I hope he may come there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to go down there. Most of these men of great wealth have houses there, and all they have to do if this tax is repealed is just simply to lean back and say, "My residence is in Florida, where they do not impose an inheritance tax." That is all there is to it. The other States can not maintain their tax in such event. Some gentlemen say the other States will not levy the tax. They can not. Some of the other States want to levy more inheritance taxes than they have, but they can not. Now, you will get $81,000,000 next year out of this tax. You get $63,000,000 in 1929. The very lowest amount you can get out of it is $33,000,000 if all the States took advantage of the 80 per cent provision; but they will not, and the receipts probably will be not less than $50,000,000 after the years named. I got these figures from the State division, from the gentlemen who audit the returns and who know just exactly what they are taking in. They are accurate in every kind of way.

We have already taken off $24,000,000 beyond the amount in the bill. Do you want to take $33,000,000 at the very lowest, and in all probability $50,000,000, off of this bill? I say it ought not to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. The debate is closed.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. That is the same amendment, except that it is an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: On page 184, line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Paragraph (b) of section 301 of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The tax imposed by this section shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, in respect of any property included in the gross estate. The credit allowed by this subdivision shall not exceed 25 per cent of the tax imposed by this section, and shall include only such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within three years after the filing of the return required by section 304.'"

Mr. LAGUARDIA. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have already made a point of order against the amendment. It is not germane to anything contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order. It is the same amendment as was offered a few moments ago.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 184, line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Paragraph (b) of section 301 of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The tax imposed by this section shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia in respect of any property included in the gross estate. The credit allowed by this subdivision shall not exceed 25 per cent of the tax imposed by this section, and shall include only such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within three years after the filing of the return required by section 304.'"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I make a point of order against that. I make the same point of order that I heretofore made against the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is to repeal the entire estate tax. Therefore the entire question is before the House. Certainly it is germane to offer an amendment to repeal a part of that. I would prefer, however, that the other amendment should stay in.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, for the present it seems to me it is clear that all of these amendments are out of order as amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT]. I think that is all that needs to be disposed of at this time.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, could not the amendment be offered when the other amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on that question when the question arises.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment for the present. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for. The question is on agreeing to the Merritt amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 55, noes 191.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the vote which was just taken indicate that the Merritt amendment was wholly without merit? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not called upon to pass upon that question.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: "Paragraph (b) of section 301 of the revenue act of 1926 is repealed, to take effect on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I must object to the introduction of these amendments. These are merely parliamentary maneuvers. I make the point of order that the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Florida is not germane to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is not germane to this section.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfair for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] to make that statement. This amendment is offered in good faith, as is shown by my remarks. The entire repeal of the inheritance tax is before the House.

I am going to confine myself to the point of order, because I do not want to take advantage of the House, even if the Chair would permit me to. The entire repeal of the inheritance tax is before the House for consideration. That opens up the entire subject. Certainly it is germane now to repeal a part of that tax. When the entire proposition is voted down, then the House has a right to vote on any section or subsection of section 301. You will find by consulting the precedents that these amendments are germane. I refer to volume 7 of Hinds' Precedents. You will find there that numerous Speakers and Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole have agreed that where you undertake to repeal a certain section of a law, an amendment to perfect it has been held to be germane.

It is certainly in order. If you can repeal the entire section—and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole let that question go in—then unquestionably it is germane to repeal a part of that section. I do not believe that this House or the Chairman will hold that the Members of this House can vote on the one proposition—that is, the repeal of the estate tax—and that

we shall not be permitted to strike out the part or all of section 301.

I move to strike out only paragraph (b) of section 301. The other amendment was to strike out paragraph (a). The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means should have made the point of order if the amendment was subject to the point of order, but the gentleman did not make the point of order then, and it is not in order to make it after the question has been debated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to suggest this to the gentleman: The provision of the bill pertaining to the estate tax as reported by the committee to the House and by the House to the Committee of the Whole only amended the estate tax in one very minute detail. That pertained to the question of deductions. Now, there was offered yesterday afternoon by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] an amendment about which there might have been some question as to its germaneness, but after a discussion the chairman of the committee reporting the bill decided not to make a point of order against it. That particular amendment has just been rejected by the committee, and it is not before the committee for consideration at this time. The Chair understands the gentleman's amendment to go to the measure as it was originally reported by the committee and as it is pending before the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair has the impression that the gentleman's amendment, wherein he seeks to amend this provision in one detail by another detail, has no relation whatever to the provision of the bill as originally reported and which has been read.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Then the Chair holds that because the chairman of the committee stated he would not make a point of order, and the Chair not having ruled upon it, that a point of order could not have been made and that does not leave it open for discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not passing upon the action of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I was simply quoting the Chair. I do not want to take up your time, but certainly that matter is before the House, even though it was voted down. We have discussed it, and it has been before the House. It is true that where a bill proposes to amend a law in one particular it is well established that amendments seeking to repeal the law or relating to the terms of the law rather than to the bill are not germane. But it has been held that the rule of germaneness applies to the relation between a proposed amendment and the pending bill to which offered and not to the relation between such amendment and an existing law of which the pending bill is amendatory. It is also held that where such amendments are so comprehensive as to practically repeal the law, unrelated amendments have been admitted. It has been held that such amendments as I have offered are germane. I contend that, notwithstanding the action taken by the Committee of the Whole, this amendment is germane. It would repeal a part of section 301, while all the committee has done is to decide it would not repeal the entire section.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if I correctly get the significance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, I believe this is likely to be a rather important ruling.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa (interposing). Rather than to have this extended debate I withdrew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa withdraws the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402. SUSPENSION OF RUNNING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

(a) Section 310(b) of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The running of the statute of limitations provided in this section or in section 311 on the making of assessments and the beginning of distraint or a proceeding in court for collection, in respect of any deficiency, shall (after the mailing of a notice under subdivision (a) of section 308) be suspended for the period during which the commissioner is prohibited from making the assessment or beginning distraint or a proceeding in court (and in any event, if a proceeding in respect of the deficiency is placed on the docket of the board, until the decision of the board becomes final), and for 60 days thereafter."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall apply in all cases where the period of limitation has not expired prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen, I am making this pro forma amendment so that gentlemen may be thinking about the substance of an amendment I propose to offer at the appropriate place. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to compel a complete separation of the ciriminal machinery of this internal revenue law from the civil liability to pay taxes under it, the purpose being this: To prohibit and make legally impossible the use of a threat of criminal prosecution in order to collect money.

Let me show just exactly what I am driving at. A gentleman of the highest character—I think with a character as high as any American—relying upon his accountant and upon the administrator of a large estate of which he was a beneficiary, made his tax return by merely signing a return prepared for him as to what his income was. He signed simply where his auditor told him to sign.

As a matter of fact, the administrator of the estate of which he was a beneficiary had made a mistake. The administrator unintentionally concealed a part of the assets. However, it put my friend in the attitude of concealing a portion of his income, a portion of the interest he derived as one of the heirs at law of this estate. The revenue officers went to him and said, "Did you sign this return?" He answered, "Yes." They replied, "Now, we have found out that you have collected more interest from your portion of that estate than this return shows. Now, then, you not only must pay the tax that is due this Government on this excess portion of this estate, but you must also pay a penalty of 50 per cent, and if you do not we will prosecute you and hold you up before your fellow countrymen as a criminal."

Now, there was no jury in the United States that would have convicted that man. His case was as clear as your case or my case so far as moral turpitude or criminal liability was concerned, but he knew this: That if an indictment were ever returned against him and a true bill found there would be a stigma and blot upon his name that no amount of knowledge of his high character on the part of the general public could ever eliminate and remove. Therefore, rather than see his family humiliated and embarrassed by reading in the morning papers the glaring headlines that he had been indicted, irrespective of his criminal liability or actual guilt or the possibility of convicting him, yet he paid into the Treasury of the Government, my recollection is, about $14,000 of penalty that the Government was not entitled to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, we do not need that sort of money, extorted by virtual blackmail, and I say we ought to write an amendment into this bill to the effect that whenever they say there is criminal liability they must go to the end of it, and that they can not compound a criminal liability by accepting penalties through private negotiation. We should provide that they must go to the legal end of it; that if they have charged a man with evading the payment of his income taxes they can not compound the offense, but must go to final judgment in open court. If they start it, they must carry it out. Civil and criminal liability must be kept separate and distinct. All taxes can be collected by assessment and levy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

If the gentleman's line of thought were to be followed out and the law were to be amended to take care of the cases such as his friends, we might as well repeal every income-tax penalty, because any tax dodger or evader who willfully or any person who inadvertently violated the law would only have to say that his stenographer made an error in his income-tax return and thus avoid any penalty.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. But the gentleman understands that merely saying so does not prove it. It is a fact that must be tried out in court, because we are all not guilty, according to our own statements.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman seems to be worrying about a true bill being returned and his friend being put in a bad light with his people. If legislation such as the gentleman advocates were in effect, a true bill would have been returned against this man whether he made the refund or not.

This is all I have to say on the question, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECTION 403. SAME—TRANSFEREE CASES

(a) Section 316 (c) of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The running of the statute of limitations upon the assessment of the liability of a transferee or fiduciary shall, after the mailing of the notice under subdivision (a) of section 308 to the transferee or fiduciary, be suspended for the period during which the commissioner is prohibited from making the assessment in respect of the liability of the transferee or fiduciary (and in any event, if a proceeding in respect of the liability is placed on the docket of the board, until the decision of the board becomes final), and for 60 days thereafter."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall apply in all cases where the period of limitation has not expired prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at the appropriate time I propose to offer an amendment to the section of the bill with reference to tax on admissions and dues. I shall, of course, refrain from such action if a member of the Ways and Means Committee shall suggest such amendment. In support thereof I desire to point out that the Committee on Ways and Means to my mind has been woefully lacking in its appreciation of the American drama, or rather drama in general, and by maintaining an admission tax of 10 per cent has sought to discriminate in favor of movies as against the spoken drama.

I am informed, as I read the statements made by those who are in a position to know who appeared before the committee, and particularly the representative of the International Theatrical Association, that whereas there were in this country some 500 theaters where there was spoken drama, since the enactment of this admission tax the number has been reduced to 400. There are large territories where the overhead costs to produce spoken drama have become so great that no traveling dramatic attractions will be booked. This is practically true of the States of Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and most of the South. It was testified to in the hearings that a booking agent cannot even book a theatrical traveling attraction, particularly in cities like Norfolk, Richmond, Omaha, Toledo, Wheeling, Muncie, Scranton, St. Joseph, Wilkes-Barre, Marion, Harrisburg, Binghamton, Grand Rapids, Battle Creek, Zanesville, Flint, and a great many others. While it is true that the movie is crowding the spoken drama to the wall, we, at least in this House, should not give an extra kick; on the contrary, we should help.

There has been a falling off in this tax collection of $6,000,000. This indicates that there has been an absolute loss of $60,000,000 due those who are interested in the production of American drama. The drama can not long endure with such losses.

Now, gentlemen, what does that lead to?

It strikes me that we have not treated the drama or, for that matter, the opera or music properly. We have no right to tax any medium that seeks to develop esthetic values, that seeks to develop the plastic arts. I am sure all right-thinking people feel that it is proper to encourage the drama and not to hurt or hamper it. But do we not hurt and hamper it by taxing it? We do not tax the novel or other forms of literature. Is it not true that many of the best gems in our own literature have been the result of dramatic writing?

I have just returned from a trip to Europe and had ample opportunity to see the generous treatment accorded drama, opera, and music by European countries. There they subsidize the drama and opera and here we seek to subvert it. In Paris there are five large national theaters supported by the Government—the National Opera, the Opera Comique, the Theatre Française, the Odeon, and the Athens. The director of the opera is an official under the French Government. It was a rare pleasure for me to attend productions in three of these houses. It is interesting to note that the cost of admission to the Paris opera, where the finest operatic productions are given, was trifling; in other words, the Government desires to instill in the hearts of its nationals a true appreciation of the arts of music and drama. Even in war-stricken Germany the theater is a national institution. Practically every large city subsidizes its theater. I attended a number of productions in Viennese theaters, all of which were subsidized by the Government. The Burg Theater there is one of the show places of the city, as is the opera house. Both are encouraged and subsidized by a government which has suffered much as a result of the war. That Government has always felt that despite insurmountable difficulties its peoples' thirst for music and drama must be satisfied—war or no war. The same conditions obtain in Prague, in Budapest, and in Berlin. Even our neighboring Republics in South America generously contribute to the support of national drama and music. In Brazil and Argentina there is absolute subsidization.

The mere mention of the names of dramatists, both ancient and modern, must needs awaken us to a sense of our responsibilities in this regard. The drama will fast disappear in this country and become as extinct as the dodo unless we lend some modicum of assistance. In the rural sections and small cities the rising generations will never be able to see productions of Shakespeare, Sheridan, Galsworthy, Shaw, Arnold Bennett, Clyde Fitch, or Eugene O'Neill. These young people will know nothing of the spoken drama. The door to the Hungarian Molnar; the Austrian Schnitzler; the German Schiller, Goethe, Lessing, and Hauptman; the French Rostrand and Voltaire; the Belgian Maeterlinck; the Italian d'Annunzio; the Norwegian Ibsen; and the Swedish Strindberg will be closed to them. The noble tragedies of Æschylus and Aristophanes will become meaningless, while the Elizabethan drama of Beaumont and Fletcher and Jonson and the comedies of Congreve and Prior will grow musty on the shelves.

Shakespeare is frequently quoted in this House; we frequently apply his old saws to modern instances; yet, this very night there is being produced in New York his A Midsummer Night's Dream. This is a very elaborate production. The players are under the supervision of the famous Max Rhinehart. In Germany the Government conceded that his players produced entertainment that did not come under the head of a taxable performance. Yet in New York those who wish to go must pay a 10 per cent extra tax on the admission charge. That burden comes out of the pockets of students and liberal-minded New Yorkers. Many of them can ill-afford this extra charge. We show very little reverence for Shakespeare when we tax him.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Will not the gentleman point out also that the producers who produce the drama are ordinarily not large corporations like the movie interests, and the men who put these shows out, like A Midsummer Night's Dream, and almost all dramatic productions, are men who put their all into their productions and who stand to lose everything if they fail.

Mr. CELLER. I quite agree with the gentleman.

We should give them encouragement and not do as we are doing in this bill—tax them to the extent of 10 per cent and discourage those who seek to go to these theaters.

Miss Jane Cowl, an eminent actress, is reported to have exclaimed recently:

> Our beloved theater is foundering—a broken ship on a stormy sea.

Its competitor, the movie, is fast attaining the ascendancy, and here we are helping in the "foundering" by taxing the theater out of existence.

The drama originally grew out of the church. The miracle plays were always given under the auspices of the church. It is interesting now to know that the Federal Council of Churches of the United States has come forward with a desire to help the drama. This council represents 20,000,000 adherents. This council realizes that the drama can serve a mighty purpose and through its medium can strengthen a feeling for greater religion amongst the people.

I have just received a telegram from the Actors' Equity Association which I desire to insert in the RECORD. It is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 14, 1927.*

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Actors and authors and better element of managers for two years have been developing constructive program to eliminate just causes of criticism of theatrical methods and to remedy pitiful situation whereby whole States and scores of important cities are without legitimate drama. A removal of tax would be very helpful to us. Hope for your sympathetic consideration.

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION.

We hear much about encouragement that should be given to American opera, yet here we tax to the extent of 10 per cent all admissions to opera. It costs a stupendous amount of money to maintain the Metropolitan Opera House in New York. Were it not for the generosity of a handful of philanthropists, who make up the yearly losses, the Metropolitan would close its doors and the light of opera in this country would go out. I attend the opera every Saturday evening, and although I can afford to pay the 10 per cent tax, there are many music lovers who can not and therefore remain away. We have very little opera in English. How can there be? No encouragement is given to it. The English opera company that is playing in

Washington this week has a difficult time making ends meet. I am of the opinion, though I am not certain, that Mr. Eastman is supporting it and is making up the deficit. Knowing that opera deficits always occur, why should we continue the burden of the 10 per cent tax?

There was produced at the Metropolitan last year the English opera called "The King's Henchman," written by Edna St. Vincent Mallay, with music by Deems Taylor. It was a very beautiful but costly production. It should never have been produced with a 10 per cent tax. It should rather have been produced with a 10 per cent Government subsidy.

With one breath we seek to encourage American singers and musicians, like Marion Talley, Albert Spaulding, and Percy Grainger, and with the other breath we frighten the audience away with a 10 per cent tax. Permit me at this point to insert the very interesting remarks of the producer Arthur Hopkins on the importance of the theater and the part it ought to play in our daily life:

We believe the theater to be an important part of social life. That belief is not novel. It has been held for centuries by wise governments, which saw the importance of mental and spiritual relaxation for great multitudes who are doomed to humdrum, mechanical lives. Certainly life in America is not getting less mechanical. The whole industrial tendency is toward regimentation. The great problem of the future is to make a man a machine for eight hours a day and a human being for the balance.

Since this is necessarily an industrial country, the tendency of legislation is to build up and fortify the working hours of the day and all who are connected with it in this period.

Wise legislation of the future, I believe, will take into account those hours in which a man should return to his individuality. In our short lives we have seen a distinct lessening of individuality. Perhaps that is the price we are to pay for the very rich ground upon which we live.

The theater is a part of man's dream life. There he may vicariously be a king, a Don Juan, a bandit, a burning apostle. There he has unlocked for him the repressed and clamoring part of his unconsciousness. There he soars far from machines and drudgeries, heartaches, and disillusionment. There he truly lives.

The theater tax is deplorable, not because it is unjust and discriminating, but because it expresses a Government policy.

We, the United States, say to you, our people, that we are not concerned about your relaxations. We not only will lift no finger to foster them but we will maintain to the last those barriers which have long since been raised in other fields.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II.—TAX ON ADMISSIONS AND DUES

SEC. 411. ADMISSIONS TAX

(a) The first two paragraphs of section 500 of the revenue act of 1926 are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 500. (a) There shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid—

"(1) A tax of 1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof of the amount paid for admission to any place, including admission by season ticket or subscription, to be paid by the person paying for such admission; except that in case the amount paid for admission is $1 or less, no tax shall be imposed, and except that in case of admission to a prize fight, or boxing, sparring, or other pugilistic match or exhibition, for which the amount paid for admission is $5 or more, the tax shall be 25 per cent of such amount."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 186, line 2, before the semicolon, insert a period and the following: "Amounts paid for admission by season tickets or subscription shall be exempt if the amounts which would be charged to holder or subscriber for a single admission is $1 or less."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is offered for the purpose of clarifying the provision of the law, as it is especially important to the Chautauqua, which is obliged to sell season tickets.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. CELLER. Why did the committee put it at $1 and not $1.50? What was the purpose of increasing the exemption only from 75 cents to $1?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We had to set the limit somewhere. The committee was of the opinion that this would take care of those who wanted to get into the shows.

Mr. CELLER. Those going to the spoken drama or the movies?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. To any of them.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman knows that in his State he can not go to a theater and hear a good production of the spoken drama for $1.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; but not in the orchestra seats.

Mr. CELLER. To such productions as Eugene O'Neill or Shakespeare?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The trouble with the spoken drama is that you have the speculators.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Would this interfere with the ownership of boxes in the opera?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This will not affect them at all.

Mr. KETCHAM. With reference to this particular amendment that the gentleman has offered, what does it do with reference to the Chautauqua season ticket?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It exempts these tickets unless the single admission is more than $1.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 185, strike out lines 20 to 26, inclusive.

Page 186, strike out lines 1 and 2, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "a tax of 25 per cent on the amount paid for admission to a prize fight or boxing, sparring, or other pugilistic match or exhibition for which the amount paid for admission is $5 or more."

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to eliminate from the bill all admission taxes except the taxes on the important prize fights like the one we had in Chicago last fall for which the admission is over $5.

We have had the admission tax proposition up for some considerable period of time. We have raised the exemptions, and every time we have raised them we have benefited the movies, but we have not done a thing for the spoken drama. This will have the effect of reducing the revenue probably $25,000,000 or $26,000,000. But it leaves a revenue of perhaps $800,000 which we expect to get from this Dempsey-Tunney prize fight we are preparing for next year. This continual raising of exemptions has proven of no benefit whatever to the spoken drama, and the spoken drama is rapidly disappearing. We have repealed all the war taxes on ice cream and similar articles, soft drinks, but we leave the tax on the spoken drama. We have repealed the tax on art, jewelry, bronzes, and paintings of every description. We have taken the tax off of Bowie knives, daggers, sword canes, brass knuckles, stilettos, and daggers, but we leave it on these cultural things.

We have taken the 10 per cent tax off of picture frames, valises, umbrellas, boots and shoes, smoking jackets, but we leave it on the spoken drama.

We have taken the tax off from films to help out the movies—5 per cent of the rental on the license value of the same—and we now exempt admissions to the movies from all tax, but we leave it on the spoken drama.

Mr. CELLER. And we leave it on music and opera.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; we leave it on music; in other words, the effect of the legislation has been to relieve such articles as Bowie knives, stilettos, brass knuckler—we relieve them from all taxes—but we leave it on music and the spoken drama.

Mr. SCHAFER. We leave it on near beer, too.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; some is left on near beer. It seems to me that we ought now to do something along cultural lines. For that reason I have offered the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not a fact that unless we do something for the spoken drama, the younger generation of our country growing up in the rural sections and in the far West will know nothing about our dramatic literature.

Mr. RAINEY. They do not know much about it now and they will know still less in the future.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] gave you a very clear description of the condition of the spoken drama of this country to-day. The last time we had a tax bill under consideration in

the House the committee voted to take off the tax on the spoken drama. The bill went to the other body and that body claimed that they could not interpret what the "spoken drama" was, and so they eliminated the exemption at that time. The situation is simply this. At no time has anything been done to help the theater in this country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] asked the Chairman of the committee where he goes in his own part of the country when he wants to attend the theater. Outside of the cities of New York and Chicago there are not 75 theaters in this country where the drama is performed. The gentleman from New York a few moments ago spoke about the theaters in this country. In 1918 there were 900 theaters in this country. To-day there are 200 where the spoken drama is performed. At no time has the committee done anything for the theater. The committee has taken off the tax on the movies up to 50 cents, up to 75 cents, and now up to a dollar. That would mean a reduction in revenue of about $8,000,000. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking for New York City alone. I am speaking for the drama throughout the country; I am speaking for the intellectual lecturer, such as Burton Holmes, who has still to pay this tax.

What you are giving to the people to-day in the way of relief from admissions is only to the moving-picture people when you raise the exemption from 75 cents to $1. You are exempting them from the payment of $8,000,000 of tax. In 1921 this country took in $89,730,000 in taxes from this source. That was $90,000,000 in amusements, and it was reduced last year to $17,900,000. The difference between 1926 and 1927 was $6,000,000. That means $60,000,000 in amusements taken off the theater in this country. According to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], we are only asking to take $8,000,000 off this tax and restore the spoken drama, the theater, to where it belongs in the field of education and art in this country.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman has spoken about the number of theaters throughout the country that have been closed in the last five years. Is not that largely the result of the talent being controlled by booking agencies, who send that talent into certain theaters and will not send it into others?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. The booking agents control no talent of the theater. The booking agents control talent of the vaudeville houses and such entertainment, but the theater itself is not controlled in that way. There are no booking agents, unless you refer to the booking agents that book shows throughout the country.

Mr. LOZIER. Do not booking agencies control these favorite theaters and keep all nights occupied, so that legitimate drama does not have a chance to get into those theaters?

Mr. BLOOM. No; the gentleman is wrong. That contention is entirely wrong.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I wish to call your attention to the fact that the theatrical industry deserves some relief at the hands of Congress. Of all the industries that have been taxed at one time or another as a result of the war, relief has been given every other industry. Peculiarly enough this business is least able to afford it. And that is the theater. To prove this, I would like to offer a brief comparison:

Under the revenue act of 1918 the tax on soft drinks, ice cream, and similar articles was 1 cent for every 10 cents or fraction.	This tax has been repealed.
Art, jewelry of every description, bronzes, paintings, were levied with a sales tax. In 1924, for example, the rate on jewelry was lowered to 5 per cent of the sales price.	In 1926 this tax was finally abolished.
A 10 per cent tax of the selling price was imposed on carpets, rugs, picture frames, trunks, valises, purses and hand bags, lamps and shades, umbrellas, fans, robes, kimonos, furs, neckwear, stockings, boots and shoes, hats, caps, waists, smoking coats, etc.	This tax has been repealed.
The tax on films was equivalent to 5 per cent of the rental or license value. There was also a tax of one-half cent a foot on raw film.	Both of these taxes have been removed.
There was a tax of 5 cents on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable messages up to 50 cents and 10 cents on charges in excess of that amount.	This tax was repealed in 1924.
Articles taxed by the revenue act of 1921 were: Bowie knives, stilettos, brass knuckles, daggers, sword canes, dirk knives, yachts, and motor boats not designed for trade or fishing.	Stilettos, brass knuckles, Bowie knives, daggers, sword canes, and these other articles mentioned to the left are no longer taxed.
On admissions and dues the tax of 10 per cent was imposed. Under the 1921 act a slight concession was made exempting 50-cent tickets from tax, and under the 1926 act the exemption was raised to 75 cents.	?

You will see that the proposed exemption of $1 does the theater no good. Later I will quote editorials from various parts of the country in proof of this contention; but let me tell you here that the purchasers of theater tickets from a dollar up constitute practically all of the patrons of the legitimate theater. They have had no relief from Congress. Such relief as has been given has been given chiefly to motion-picture theaters.

Figures supplied by the Treasury Department on the revenue from admission taxes bear me out. For example, the high-water mark of taxes collected on admission was in the fiscal year 1921, when a total of $89,730,832 was collected. In that year the exemption on tickets was raised to 50 cents, effective for 1922. This resulted in a drop of $16,500,000, in round figures in revenue from this source. Once again the movies were favored when the exemption was raised to 75 cents, effective for the fiscal year 1925. This resulted in a further drop of $47,000,000, showing very clearly to what extent the movies benefited by this reduction; but the legitimate theaters benefited not at all. As a matter of record, the collections on admission for the last fiscal year were only $17,940,636, a drop of $72,000,000 from the peak of 1921. And still the legitimate theater had received no relief. Now the committee proposal is to exempt all theaters charging up to $1, which will relieve substantially every movie house in the country from this tax. I heartily approve of this relief being given, and so do the representatives of the legitimate theaters and their allied associations, which include around 500,000 men and women who are actively employed in this business, and who are represented by the following organizations now petitioning Congress for relief: Theater Owners of America, Producing Managers' Association, Actors' Equity Association, Authors' League of America, Dramatists' Guild, Society of American Authors and Composers, Federation of Musicians, and International Association of Theatrical Stage Employees.

Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point a number of editorials from leading newspapers bearing on this subject. The public resents paying this unnecessary tax. Thousands stay away from the theater because of it. These editorials prove this. I am inserting only a few of the hundreds that have been published voluntarily.

THE TAX ON THE THEATER

Eight national organizations connected with the spoken drama have appealed to Congress to remove the admissions tax. They argue that of all the nuisance taxes imposed to pay for the war the theater ticket tax is the only important one that is left. The bill which the Ways and Means Committee has presented to the House raises the exemption from 75 cents to $1. But the defenders of the spoken drama make the point that while such a change would help the motion picture houses it would be of slight aid to the "legitimate" show business, the overhead expenses of which are immensely greater than those of the cinema, which has 48 audiences a week to the spoken drama's 8, and which, outside of the studios, has practically no expenses in the way of railroad fares. It is now hazardous, says the appeal, to send a company on tour; people stay away from the theater, resenting a ticket tax long after the war.

There is a good deal in the argument. The "show business" should not be thought of entirely in terms of $15 seats—white light luxuries which the customer will buy, whatever the tax. Notwithstanding the popularity of screen plays, there is still a very large public which refuses to accept a substitute for the spoken drama. It is not a public that buys $15 seats, or even $5 seats. For the sake of these lovers of the stage, as well as for the benefit of a business which honestly feels that it has been discriminated against in a rival's favor, Congress

might well raise the exemption to $2.50. That should aid alike the average theater goer and the average producer. (New York Sun, December 9, 1927.)

The bill for tax reduction of the Ways and Means Committee is, on the whole, politically and economically sensible, but in one respect it perpetuates an unfair discrimination against an important national industry and profession. It continues to tax theater tickets which cost over a dollar, and this is a gross discrimination in favor of moving pictures and against the spoken drama. There is no reason for such a discrimination. Moving pictures can be sold cheaper than spoken dramas, but that is only because the one photographed performance can be more widely distributed. A spoken drama which costs $3 to see and hear is being sold at a much smaller margin above its cost of production than is a moving picture which costs 25 cents to see. If amusements are to be taxed, they should be taxed at approximately the same rate. It may be sound public policy to impose a tax on tickets which cost $5 or more on the score of their being luxuries, but a $3 seat at a theater is not a luxury or an extravagance. It is a fair price to pay for an article which is one necessity of an interesting life for many people, and there is no reason to select it, as compared to cheaper forms of amusement, for peculiarly burdensome taxation. (The New Republic, December 14, 1927.)

SAVE THE PLAYHOUSE

An evidence that the situation regarding the Playhouse is serious is the calling of a meeting by the chamber of commerce for Monday evening to devise ways and means for stimulating interest in this legitimate theater.

No so long ago warning was given that the Playhouse would possibly be closed if more patronage were not forthcoming.

Robert W. Priest, the very capable manager, has informed the board of directors of the chamber of such a possible outcome. Our representative organization will, beyond doubt, do everything it can to avoid the calamity that the closing of the Playhouse would be.

Apart from other considerations, our civic pride should be sufficient to sustain this theater and the Messrs. Shubert, who control. When very much smaller in population Wilmington kept going a couple of legitimate theaters and a large vaudeville house. True, times have changed and the moving-picture places appeal to multitudes, but there should be room for at least one high-class theater of the spoken drama.

Our population is much larger than ever, and by all indications the desire for amusement is stronger than ever. The point is to get this desire into legitimate channels such as the handsome Playhouse, which should be the pride of the city, winning and holding the support of our people.

Lack of sufficient support is all the more odd when it is considered that the Playhouse is directed by such capable and high-class theatrical people as the Shuberts. It would indeed be a bad blow to the city, a black eye, if it should be scattered throughout the country that Wilmingtonians would not patronize, cared nothing about, the handsome Playhouse, which was constructed in the belief that it would be a permanent institution, commanding at least fair and paying support.

It would be a dismal end of such a vision if what is now the Playhouse should eventually be converted into office rooms, for which there is a demand. Let the chamber of commerce therefore do all it can to summon help and patronage for the Playhouse and appreciate what has been done for the city in a theatrical way. (Wilmington (Del.) News-Journal, December 1, 1927.)

THE THEATER

If the Nation's financial condition permits, an end should be made of the war-time taxes now imposed upon theaters. The present tax of 10 per cent is a heavy burden upon a business which needs prosperity as much as any other business does, and which should not be lightly disregarded merely because it supplies what is roughly called "pleasure."

And the 10 per cent tax is not only a burden upon the theater business but is also a burden on the theater goer. It tends to keep him away from the theater. And thereby it deprives him of something that he ought to have.

Secretary Mellon, in his recent presentation of his tax-reduction opinions to the House Ways and Means Committee, expressed the view that the theater tax should remain. He pointed to the sale of $40 seats in the Dempsey-Tunney fight as a fit object for the application of a 10 per cent tax. And in the same way, he said, a tax of 30 cents on a $3 theater ticket was commendable. He holds that the 10 per cent tax should be maintained on the luxury of theater going.

But theater going is not a luxury, can not be a luxury, in any civilized country. A Dempsey-Tunney fight is a luxury; but not so the theater. The theater is a necessity for the civilized mind.

The theater, in some of its forms, provides only enjoyment and laughter, and who shall say that enjoyment and laughter are not desirable? The theater, in some other forms, provides meat for the mind; it provides sauce for the intellectual taste; it satisfies a deep emotional instinct. The theater is thousands of years old. It is as old as all real civilization. It will last as long as civilization lasts. As long as human beings are human beings, nothing can ever be devised that will fitly substitute for the theater.

Mr. Mellon's belief that the theater is a luxury can be easily accounted for. Mr. Mellon during nearly seven years has lived in Washington. For 60 or more years before that, his home was in Pittsburgh. Neither Pittsburgh nor Washington knows what the theater is.

The theater does not exist in either of these cities. A man's mind could starve to death if it waited for sustenance during the long periods between the visits of two worth-while plays to Washington or to Pittsburgh. These cities are deserts, as far as the theater is concerned. Mr. Mellon is a denizen of the desert. He has a natural aptitude for cultivating civilized tastes; but as far as the theater is concerned, he has never had the opportunity to exercise that aptitude.

Government should encourage the theater, not stifle it. The 30-cent tax on a $3 ticket means a tax of 60 cents on a man going to the theater with his wife. This is heavy taxation. It is bringing a relatively small amount of revenue to the Government, and it is stifling the theater in America. (Chicago Journal of Commerce, November 29, 1927.)

THE DRAMA REACHES AN IMPASSÉ

The theater which puts forth spoken drama has reached its greatest crisis in many years. It is literally fighting with its back to the wall. Columbus happens to have a special interest in this situation, inasmuch as in one of its theaters is playing this week What Every Woman Knows, one of Barrie's best plays, and with a thoroughly adequate cast, and because next week The Silver Cord will be playing, one of the supreme attempts of Sidney Howard, a playwright of whom America has a right to be proud.

We happen to know that patronage on the Barrie play has been slim, and these words are not written because we are sorry for the managements of theater or company. But we are sorry for a part of the public which will soon be deprived entirely of these visiting dramatic companies unless they manifest their approval in the only speech that really counts—the tinkle of dollars over the box-office till.

The costs of production have been mounting for years. Salaries of players are high, and yet these financial troubles have occurred in "art for art's sake" companies, where salaries were little more than a living wage. And other costs are on the ascent, with employees asking still more money. If the public were increasingly loyal these demands might be met. With a diminishing patronage they can not. The result, therefore, is not far to see.

There is a disposition among cultivated people to lament the decadence of the drama. Columbus, however, usually gets the cream of Broadway, except for a few Pulitzer plays and others which could not weather the storms of the Provinces. Furthermore, these same cultured people sit passively at home and otherwise amuse themselves while they could help to keep worthy plays alive by their patronage.

The drama has reached a cul-de-sac from which there is no escape. Either the public must patronize good plays or the exposition of that type of entertainment will be limited very soon to performances by selected amateurs in the little theaters. (Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, October 27, 1927.)

TAXING THE THEATER

In all of life's activities there is nothing quite like the theater [says John J. Daly in the Washington Post]. It is everything or nothing, a necessity and a luxury, a hope and a disappointment, a business and an art, an inspiration and an illusion, an influence for good and a purveyor of evil, a sanctum for spirituality and a den of iniquity, or, as Phœnicians say, what have you? It is the paradox of paradoxes, is this theater that humanity has clutched to its heart since man first took to play acting and set up a land of make-believe.

With the newspaper, the theater is always with us and, like another old friend, the water is never missed until the well goes dry. If by some strange streak the theater were to close its doors to-morrow—here and everywhere—there would be weeping and gnashing of teeth. It has come to be a part of life. As such it must suffer a certain amount of neglect, as all component parts of life must, in season and out, merely to prove that human nature is what it is.

When the theater begins to die the death there is never a hand raised in its behalf. When the theater is alive and bustling all hands rush to its relief. This gesture betokens again the paradox that is the theater. It is dying when it's alive and alive when it's in the sepulcher; for there are always willing hearts to resuscitate it when it is perfectly able to get along by itself and a million friends to kick it into eternity when it is enjoying the fruits of a benevolent existence.

One of the best friends the Government has is the theater. One of the best friends the theater has is the Government; likewise, one of its worst enemies. In time of war, when there is need to put over propaganda, the theater finds itself called upon by the Government to lend a helping hand. It is so here and in other countries. In time of peace

a good government generally forgets—and so the war-time services of the theater are forgotten.

Up on the hill the other day, where a highly trained economic body got together to discuss ways and means of saving the taxpayers of this country a few dollars per capita, the theater came in for its usual consideration. It seems that during the war the theater was branded a luxury and so taxed. Ten per cent of the gross receipts on theater admissions were placed on the theaters. It is paid out, and has been paid out, for some nine years by those who go every now and then to see what the theater has to offer. Though the war has been over a goodly nine years, the theater tax persists, and probably will continue another nine years and another until some mighty man arises in his might and shows the inconsistency of such a tax.

Of all the institutions in the world the theater is man's friend when he needs a friend. It is the place he goes to forget his troubles; the place where he checks his mental worries with his hat and coat, at the door; the place where the imagination is permitted to hit the heights, to roam, to ride, or to fly away to fields afar. In peace or war the theater and those who are part and parcel of it contribute their time and talents to the general all-round good of their fellows. In turn they get the kicks and cuffs if kicks and cuffs are the order of the day; getting the handshakes and the plaudits when they are needed not.

In the course of the considerations the committee balloted, 15 to 3, to increase the exemption on admission tickets from 75 cents to $1. A move to raise the exemption to $1.50 was rejected 12 to 8, and another proposal to exempt admissions up to $3 was defeated 15 to 5. It is estimated that the loss from collecting the smaller fees under the dollar will amount to $8,000,000. Over and above that, the loss to the Government might have been doubled. So, not to cause the Government embarrassment, the theater tax stands; that is, all tickets sold for more than $1 must be taxed at the rate of 10 per cent.

One of the reasons there is no theater out where the West begins is that high costs of living have driven the theater out of business. The high rates of railroad transportation, the costs of production, and a host of relative interests, all recited numerous times by those interested in the welfare of the theater, have put it on a permanent footing on Broadway and taken it off the dusty roads. A tax added to the theater is just so many straws on the camel's back.

In Washington and Baltimore and Boston and Philadelphia and Chicago, Cleveland, and a few of the remaining strongholds of the theater there are those who want to see the old institution rock along with the ages; but then there is the tax—and so long as the tax remains, handed on to the man who appears at the box office in quest of tickets, just so long will half the joy of life be taken away from ardent lovers of the theater.

So far as the theater itself is concerned there is little or no complaint about the ever-present tax—though some manager may wonder why it is a tax levied nine years ago, when there was some reason for its collection, might not now be conveniently lifted—when the Government is looking for a way of relieving pressure on the taxpayers' pocketbook. The jolt thus handed out by the Treasury Department falls on the jaw of the honest young man who wants to take his best girl to the theater to give her a real treat. It hits, likewise, the man of family, who once in a while wants to take the good wife and the children to a really good work of the theater. In the case of the ardent swain, he might get away with a straight $5 bill if there were no tax; but with the tax he must needs break into the second five spot to take out the 50 cents coming to Uncle Sam for two straight $2.50 seats. The theater ticket has not changed in price since the war. It is merely the tax that makes the difference; and the tax, along with almost everything in creation, is passed right along to the consumer. (Washington Post.)

HOW NEW TAX BILL DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE USEFUL SPOKEN PLAY

The new tax bill exempts from the war-time 10 per cent "nuisance" toll all admissions to theaters costing $1 or less. That is eminently satisfactory to the millions of Americans who attend the movies. It is especially satisfactory to owners of film theaters who have themselves paid this tax rather than put patrons to the annoyance of making awkward change.

It is not satisfactory at all to either producers or patrons of the spoken drama. They are both at a tremendous disadvantage. In many cities they have given up the ghost. In all but a few large cities they are facing a decline in revenues which threatens at no distant time to remove them from the scene.

The spoken play is a cultural asset, distinct and unique. No other form of entertainment can fill its place. Its disappearance would be an irreparable loss to American civilization.

To some extent its plight is due to willful errors in judgment and taste among its producers. Correction of these is in process. It will be made difficult if the wholesome plays are confined by high costs, including taxes, to the larger cities. For the spoken play needs the financial, intellectual, and moral support of the mass of the people. It can not function as it should if only a few communities are permitted to see it.

National necessity laid this tax, and while that necessity was clear the tax was paid willingly. But does national necessity require its continuance? The Congress should be very sure that it does before it approves the recommendation before it. (New York American, December 10, 1927.)

ABOLISH NUISANCE TAXES

The Government is no longer in such need of revenue that it should be necessary to continue to plague the people with Federal nuisance taxes. There are other more substantial, popular, and remunerative ways of raising money to operate the Government than to continue the tax on theater tickets, which the House Ways and Means Committee has written into the national tax bill now before Congress for action.

The tax exemption now extends to those tickets priced at 75 cents, and the new bill would raise this to exclude tickets up to $1. It has refused, however, to go above that limit, which means that practically every ticket for admission to the so-called spoken drama is under tax, which the theater goer pays. Owners of theaters are acting properly in protesting this tax and demanding that the Congress do what the committee refused to do, eliminate it.

The theater is no longer a luxury. While not a necessity in the usual sense, it plays a day-to-day part in modern American life which should not be subject to annoyances. Upon prize fights where the admission runs to $10 or beyond there will be no objection to a tax, for those able to pay such prices can well afford the extra impost.

But upon the theater, the ball park, and other amusement and sporting entertainments where the admission price is comparatively small the present tax is adequately described as a nuisance. (Pittsburgh Press (Scripps-Howard newspaper), December 8, 1927.)

REMOVE THIS "NUISANCE TAX"

The Theater Managers' Association of Pittsburgh naturally has public sentiment with it in its protesting against the continuation of the admission tax in the proposed new Federal revenue bill. Theater patrons have become very tired of finding this extra still tacked on years after the passing of the war emergency that caused the laying of such "nuisance taxes." As this admission tax is the last of the "nuisance" type, the theaters are justified in feeling that it is discriminatory against them. The theater owners say that they can prove that this discrimination is becoming deadly to their business; that thousands upon thousands stay away from such amusements through sheer resentment of being called upon to pay a war tax long after the war is over.

Justice demands the repeal of a tax that is having such discriminatory effect. (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, December 8, 1927.)

These editorials, as I previously have said, are indicative of public sentiment generally. The war has been over nine years and relief from the burden of war taxes has been given every other industry but this. To continue to tax this business is an unjust and unnecessary discrimination. The loss of revenue to the Treasury will be negligible. To continue this tax will mean the wiping out of an art. I ask you not to tax the spoken drama out of existence, but to repeal the admissions tax entirely.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the Rainey amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as a former member of the theatrical profession and manager in that profession, I am deeply interested in the question which is before the House at this time. I felt like saying, humorously, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] that I had great pleasure in playing his State many years ago, and I am sure the gentleman is in error when he says that he can see a show to-day for $1 of the same quality that he could, say, about 20 years ago, before we had this tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, I did not mean that at all; but I do not think that is the main question in the matter, anyway.

Mr. CONNERY. We have taken off the tax up to a dollar on the movies. The movies have thousands of theaters in the United States to-day. The legitimate theaters are few and far between. We have taken care of the motion-picture theaters by taking off the tax up to a dollar, and yet we are penalizing the spoken drama. The people in the small towns will not pay to come in and see the spoken drama. We have actors and actresses like John

Barrymore and Ethel Barrymore, H. B. Warner, and Margaret Anglin, who are actors, and producers like George Tyler and George M. Cohan, who are interested in the spoken drama of the theater almost solely because of their interest in art. That may seem a strange statement—that a man should put on a show, and that his sole interest in it was in art, but it is true. We all know that George M. Cohan, in whose companies I had the pleasure of playing for six years, can write a musical comedy, produce it, and play in it personally, and make money on it almost any time he wants to.

Then Mr. Cohan can take the spoken drama out before the people and lose half the amount of money that he made on the musical comedy. To leave this tax on the drama penalizes the Barrymores, the George Cohans, the George Tylers, the Margaret Anglins, and all the people of the theatrical profession who are trying to foster art in the United States. In almost every other country in the world the government subsidizes the theaters. In ancient Greece and Rome the theater was one of the main things in public life for the benefit of the culture of the people in raising them to a higher standard. In England, Ireland, France, Germany, Brazil, Argentina—why, in these South American Republics their opera houses are built upon a grand scale; the people of these countries adore music and art. Their Governments foster every art, everything in connection with the theater, while we, the greatest Nation on earth, are following a policy of penalizing art. It is not the rich, particularly, who want to go to enjoy the spoken drama. Some imagine that because people are rich they are cultured, but that does not follow by any means. There are poor students in the United States who know more about art than all the rich in the whole country combined could possibly know. So we are not benefiting the rich exclusively by taking off the tax on the spoken drama, but the people—all people who are interested in the arts and sciences. The Actors' Equity Association, a body of highly intelligent and able actors and actresses, favor the repeal of this tax; and they are not the rich, but are members of the profession which does so much to bring cheer and happiness into the lives of all our people. The spoken drama is their bread and butter. Let us not fall behind the rest of the world by refusing to do justice to the wonderful profession to which all these people, actors, managers, producers, and all workers of the theater have dedicated their lives in the interest of true art. I think the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should pass and that we should do something in these great United States to help the spoken drama. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard from gentlemen interested in the culture side of this question, with which I agree heartily, but I want to speak to you about a matter that affects the every-day boy out on the farm as well as the boy in the city. I want to urge the adoption of this amendment in order to save to America her great wild-West shows that portray the hardships of the pioneers in the settling of this great Nation of ours. Oklahoma furnishes to this Nation one of the great Wild West shows. The 101 Ranch furnishes one of the most attractive shows of the Nation, portraying pioneer life in the United States, portraying the history of this country in the making, so the rising American generation may see and understand what it cost us to develop this great Nation. Now, gentlemen, you have all been boys, and some of you no doubt have gone out and carried water for the elephants when the show came to town. There is not an American boy who does not arise long before sunrise and go out to see the circus come to town. I have had some little experience—and I still am thrilled by the sawdust ring. Give the circus a chance, give the great Wild West show a chance. Our shows out in Oklahoma last year carried a heavy burden on account of this tax, because you can never ask the farmer to pay a tax when he comes to buy a ticket for a show. Do not deprive the boys of the opportunity of seeing Colonel Miller and his great show. I want you to cut it down so the farm boy and the city boy can go to the side shows as well as to the big top. So I ask your support. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. TILSON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. In order that the House might have the very earliest possible information in regard to Colonel Lindbergh the whip on the Republican side of the House, Mr. VESTAL, of Indiana, called up the Bureau of Information in the War Department and received the report I gave to the House more than an hour ago. In view of the fact that the report given to the gentleman from Indiana and reported to the House by me has not yet been confirmed and that some fear is now entertained as to the safety of Colonel Lindbergh, I should like to have the gentleman from Indiana make a statement as to the information he received, so that if there be blame in connection with inaccurate reports such blame may be placed where it belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] will be requested to make a statement.

There was no objection.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, in view of the fact that this report was made to the House of Colonel Lindbergh's safe landing in Mexico City, I desire to say that the information came to Colonel TILSON through myself, I having called up the Bureau of Information of the War Department, whereupon they told me that a report had just been received by them from the State Department that Colonel Lindbergh had arrived safely in Mexico. It appears now that the report has not been confirmed.

I wanted to make the statement because of the first report that came to the House. The report now is from the War Department, from the Secretary's office, that Colonel Lindbergh had not been seen even over Tampico. It was a wrong interpretation or an incorrect reception, and there is some concern about Colonel Lindbergh's safety.

THE REVENUE BILL

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I agree with the preceding speakers that the tax on the spoken drama should be repealed. I am in favor of the repeal of every one of the excise taxes levied as war measures except the tax on wine. I do not advocate the repeal of the excise tax on wine, as I believe the Volstead Act should be modified to permit light wine and beer, and one of the reasons which I have advanced in favor of said modification is that revenue which the Federal Government has lost since prohibition will be restored if the present prohibition law is liberalized.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. GREEN of Iowa] a few moments ago forcefully called the attention of the House to the pernicious and insidious lobby which has been active here in behalf of the repeal of the estate or inheritance tax. I therefore wish again to call the attention of the Members of the House to the bill which I introduced (H. R. 6098) having for its purpose the regulation of lobbyists and prohibiting former Members of Congress from having the privilege of the cloakrooms and floors of both Houses during the period of time in which they are acting as paid lobbyists.

I am glad to see that an overwhelming majority of the membership of this House voted against the repeal of the inheritance or estate tax.

The reduction of the Federal corporation income tax rates is also justified, as well as the provisions of this bill readjusting the rates on small corporations, the allegations of our Socialist colleague from Wisconsin to the contrary notwithstanding. Socialist leaders in Milwaukee, particularly around election time, vociferously condemn what they term "our capitalistic system," and berate and attack corporations as being inimical to the best interests of our country and her people. However, these Socialist leaders themselves have not suffered or been downtrodden under this so-called "capitalistic system," but, on the contrary, have greatly prospered.

The automobile excise tax should be repealed in its entirety, and I shall vote for the amendment which will be presented to accomplish that end. The automobile is not merely a pleasure vehicle, but is used in all lines of business.

If one of my constituents purchases a new automobile to-day, he subjects himself to many taxes. There is first the Federal excise tax, then a license tax, a personal-property tax, a gasoline tax, and a certificate-of-title tax. He also incurs additional expense in obtaining liability insurance, theft insurance, and fire insurance; and, if the automobile is used in producing income, it is thereby indirectly subject to the State income tax and the Federal income tax.

There are hundreds of thousands of people in this Nation who would be granted substantial relief by the repeal of the entire excise tax on automobiles. I reiterate that I shall be glad to vote for this repeal, and for the repeal of everyone of the excise taxes except the excise tax on wine. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BLACK of New York rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that one-half of the time allotted to the discussion of this question has already been occupied by those in favor of the amendment. Does anyone desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I desire to have five minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I want to say just a word or two about this increase of tax on prize-fight admissions. I think the committee has degraded the whole theory of revenue taxation by putting in the bill this a very obviously blue-law provision concerning prize fights. The Tunney-Dempsey prize fight netted the Government a quarter of a million dollars revenue last year. It is a strange spectacle that we have of people denouncing prize fighting as a wrong thing and then voting in favor of getting as much revenue out of it as possible. I am not in favor of using the national legislative body to enforce the peculiar ideas some people may have about morality or customs on the whole people. It is wholly going out of the way to use the great revenue power of the Government to bring down upon the people a peculiar and narrow theory.

It did occur to me, when the announcement was made concerning the uncertainty of Colonel Lindbergh's flight, that at New York on the night of his flight to Paris a very wonderful scene occurred. I was at a prize fight in one of the baseball grounds in New York on the night Lindbergh flew from New York to Europe. On that occasion Joe Humphrey, an announcer at the fight, got up and asked that the audience at the fight say a prayer in behalf of Lindbergh. Fully 20,000 men got up and bowed in silent prayer for the safety of that wonderful American.

Now, it should be understood that the folks who go to prize fights are not all plug-uglies and cutthroats. Some of the leading people in literary work and science and art and in business demand places at the leading prize fights in the country, and I am rather ashamed that the Committee on Ways and Means, for which I have always had the highest respect, should stoop so low as to write this blue-law provision in a great revenue act of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, supplementing the remarks of my colleague from New York, I have been assured that when the Tunney-Dempsey prize fight took place some 19 governors were present, 20 Senators, and a large number of Representatives in this House were also there. They made a mighty official audience.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman was talking about intellectuals?

Mr. CELLER. Even intellectuals attend prize fights. Does the gentleman deny that because Congressmen were there? I think it is inconsistent that the Government should on one hand enter into a partnership with the promoters of a fight by exacting such a vast amount of revenue and on the other hand have a law which prohibits the transportation of fight films in interstate commerce, so as to prevent the movie operators from showing these films to the vast hordes of people who desire to see them, the very same people who are allowed to hear about the fight over the radio and who are permitted to read about the fight, with all of its lurid descriptions, in the newspapers.

Now, it seems as though the committee might, but not necessarily in connection with this bill, consider the question of the inconsistency of having a prohibition against the transportation of fight films, the allowing of the vast majority of the rank and file of the people to hear about the fight over the radio, and read about it in the newspapers. These radio and press descriptions are vivid and dramatic. You can almost feel the blows land and see the bloody cauliflower ears—so powerful are the interpretations of the radio announcer. Yet the folks back home can not see the fight on the screen.

To add another word, we have a very anomalous situation. A judge of the Federal court in the southern district in New York has rendered a decision which stultifies all of us if we persist in keeping that law on the books. That judge has ruled that films may be shown in theaters everywhere, but you can not transport them. Now, if you can show the films it is necessary to procure them. But how procure them if you can not transport them? You thus encourage a new industry, and that is the "bootlegging of films" from the place where they were taken to the place where they are to be shown. I point that out to gentlemen for consideration, and particularly to the gentlemen of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has before it my bill to repeal the prohibition against transportation of fight films.

I am very glad my colleague from New York [Mr. BLACK] has adverted to the subject this afternoon. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we placed this limit at $1 because we wanted to fix it so that what is commonly denominated the poorer class would not pay a tax and so that those who could afford to pay a higher rate would pay it. So far as this figure is concerned, of course it is an arbitrary figure. The gentleman from New York wants to put it higher, but the committee put it at $1 as its best estimate.

Let me say, too, gentlemen, that it is not the tax which has put the spoken drama out of existence. The fact of the matter is that the movies have put the spoken drama out of existence, as well as the high prices which are charged for special tickets, so that nobody can get a good seat for less than $6 or $8 in New York.

I have stated all there is to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAINEY) there were—ayes 67, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINEY: After line 2, on page 186, insert a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"(b) Section 500 (b) of Title V of the revenue act of 1926 is amended by adding, after paragraph (2), a new paragraph, as follows:

"'(3) Admissions to any place of amusement, if during the time for which the charge for admission entitles the person admitted to remain in such place, there is produced in such place exclusively a legitimate spoken drama. As used in this subdivision the term "legitimate spoken drama" means a spoken play, whether or not set to music or with musical parts or accompaniments, which is a consecutive narrative interpreted by a single set of characters all necessary to the development of the plot, in two or more acts, the performance consuming more than 1 hour and 45 minutes of time; but such term does not include a revue, burlesque, or extravaganza.'"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will make it a little broader. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the section close in 20 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this section close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto and to the section close in 20 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, during that five minutes—and I shall endeavor not to occupy that much time—I want to explain this amendment. In the committee and in the House in 1926, when we adopted the last revenue bill, there was a general demand for a clause in the bill which would eliminate from this tax the spoken drama. I was appointed, together with two other members of the Ways and Means Committee, as a subcommittee to attempt to draft a clause which would define the spoken drama and present it to the committee. As a result we consulted the heads of the departments of English literature in Yale University, Harvard University, and other authorities, and consulted also leading producers in the country who were engaged principally in producing the spoken drama. The result of it all was this definition. The committee put it in the 1926 bill; it went through the House without any opposition after it was explained, and now I want to see, in spite of the determination to tighten up on that side against amendments, even against cultural amendments of the character I am offering, whether the committee and the House feel about this matter as they did in 1926, when, without a dissenting vote, we put in the law, so far as we could do it, this definition of the spoken drama, prepared after consultation with the leading

authorities in the country, or whether they want to leave it out of the bill. It went over to the Senate, and in the jumble of affairs in the Senate they left it out, and in the compromises in conference, in order to get what were conceived to be more important matters in the bill, this was sacrificed.

All I ask of Members of this House on both sides of the aisle and of members of the Ways and Means Committee is to be as consistent now and display as much culture and desire to aid the cultural propositions as they were two years ago, and if everybody feels now as he did two years ago this amendment will be adopted by unanimous vote.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] said that one of the purposes, as I understand it, in keeping this admission tax in the bill was to help the person who was unable to pay a larger price to see plays in theaters, but the gentleman did not mention the fact that the Actors' Equity Association, which is composed of the actors of the United States and which is the actors' union, is in favor of doing away with these admission taxes. The spoken drama is their bread and butter.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct about it. This does not relieve such plays from the payment of this tax as the Follies or this Show Boat performance a week or two ago, which drew such large audiences. That was an extravaganza, a burlesque, or a revue, and does not come in here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee, owing to the debate being limited, I would like to have the amendment read which I am going to offer at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, for the information of the committee and in the gentleman's time, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 186, line 2, after the word "amount," insert the following: "*Provided also*, That an equivalent tax shall be collected on all free or complimentary tickets or admissions to such prize fights or boxing, sparring, or other pugilistic match or exhibition, and the tax shall be on the amount for which a similar seat or box is sold at the said match or exhibition."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Gentlemen, I seriously urge this amendment. If we are going to tax tickets for prize fights and really want to carry out that provision of the law, we will have to tax these free tickets. The wholesale amount of passes and free tickets that are handed out for prize fights is pretty well known, and if the prize-fighting game has the enormous power that it has, sufficient to make their own rules and to put up fake fights, such as we have had in the past, it is because of the power which these free tickets wield. Here is an opportunity to stop the gap caused by wholesale distribution of free tickets to prize fights.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it not the law now that the holders of complimentary theater tickets pay such a tax?

Mr. BLOOM. No; that was taken off after the first year of the tax. There is no tax on any complimentary tickets throughout the country.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The thought which is running through my mind is that if there is such a tax on theater tickets, there certainly ought to be a similar provision of law with regard to these admissions.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. I looked that up. There is no tax now on free tickets. So my amendment would tax free tickets to prize fights. The bill places admission to fights in a separate class by raising the tax to 25 per cent. That being so, we should certainly tax the large number of free tickets that seem to be a part of these enterprises.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I am interested to know how that would solve the problem of faked fights.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, it would lessen——

Mr. CELLER. I am asking the gentleman for information because I do not know.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows as well as I do that it would lessen political influence, if the gentleman gets what I mean.

Mr. CELLER. I do not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman ought to.

Gentlemen, there are others who want to speak on their amendments. I trust you will bear in mind this amendment. Unless the amendment is passed, the provision in the bill raising the tax on admissions to prize fights will be absolutely futile.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the committee, as a practicing physician of 22 years I have uniformly found it to be a rule that it is not what men eat, but it is what they digest and assimilate that contributes toward their health and their strength. Every economist will teach you that it is not what workingmen earn but it is what they save that contributes toward their wealth. Every educator will advise you that it is not what men learn but it is what they remember that contributes toward their education; and every minister will teach you that it is not what men preach but it is what men practice that counts in this world.

It seems to me, fellow Members, that the message we should send out from this great forum, the House of Representatives, to the people of our country should be measured and judged not by our declarations of faith but by the fulfillment and realization of American ideals, which we should always battle to conserve and preserve as a heritage from our forefathers.

To me an ideal is the place to which God descends while man rises to meet Him. Ideals are the foundations upon which our Government was founded, and it is because I believe in maintaining the dignity of American ideals that I arise to speak in favor of these amendments. It seems to me that God reveals Himself to mankind in two ways—first, through the life of the universe that we term nature, and second, through the thoughts of man that we term art, and it is the cumulative collection of these contributions of nature and art that constitutes the culture and the civilization of our Nation, that should be given an opportunity for expression through the medium of the spoken drama in the life of our Nation.

I have had the privilege, my fellow Members, to write two plays that have been produced, and I have written a third one which I expect to come here to Washington, to which I intend to invite you all as my guests. [Applause.] Perhaps within a month or two it may be here.

I want to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that through the imposition of taxes upon all theatrical tickets you are demoralizing the opportunities we have of building up the great Nation of ours through art and through science by crippling the possibilities for artistic production and by denying to our humbler citizens the privilege of attending the masterpieces of the great authors of ours and foreign countries, by making it impossible for them to buy tickets that are beyond their financial ability to purchase.

Humanity, of which we are all members, has brought forward upon this world great men and glorious deeds. It has formed languages and reared and created civilizations, and what medium has it to express itself if it is not through the medium of the spoken drama.

The spoken drama, from my concept, is the symbolization of a conflict of basic emotions expressed through characters and reaching its conclusions through climax. The drama represents a cross section of life. It mirrors our daily conduct through our actions and through our emotions. How are we going to preserve these sublime products of the human mind? How are we going to educate our children? Are we going to educate them upon moving pictures, or are we going to open the archives and the treasuries of the great past in showing them the works of Sophocles and Æschylus and Euripides and the great writers of the past from medieval down to modern times?

I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, if you want to go back and build up the great drama that gives us a medium to express our thoughts and ideals through characterization, through dialogue, through action, and through scenery, the only way to do it is to open up the drama and remove all these shackles by which you are binding the hands and feet of the poorer elements of our community who would like to enjoy the artistic treasures that American authors can produce. [Applause.]

And so I appeal to you, ladies and gentlemen, not as Democrats and not as Republicans, but I appeal to you as Americans who are anxious to develop American drama and American art, to forget your partisanship and to go back to the home towns that you come from and open up the small, little theaters and give an opportunity for the expression of these cultural characteristics that have made America the greatest Nation in the world, the country of opportunity, the haven for culture, art, and education. [Applause.]

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order, not to be taken out of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order, not to be taken out of the time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to announce to my colleagues that I now have information, confirmed by two of the great newspaper services, to the effect that Colonel Lindbergh landed in Mexico City at 2.40 p. m. to-day. [Applause.]

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are five minutes remaining. I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] be recognized for three minutes of that time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have an amendment which I propose to offer read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 185, line 20, after the word "of," strike out "one" and insert "one-half."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, all this talk about being willing to do something for the drama, and after the address delivered by my colleague from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] I hope that you are going to have a little sympathy in your hearts. I am not going to ask for anything extra in the bill; I am only going to ask you to do the same thing for the theater that you have already done for club dues and for the automobile tax. You have cut that in half. Why not do the same thing with the theater tax; reduce it from 10 per cent to 5 per cent? Cut it in half. The sum total of the tax received by the Government will be practically the same as what you would receive after exempting tickets up to 75 cents. According to the amount it is said will be received by the Government if you tax the admissions over a dollar, it will amount to $8,000,000. You will receive $16,000,000 in taxes at 10 per cent, so if you cut it in half, making it 5 per cent instead of 10 per cent, you will be receiving just the same as you would be by reducing the tax on tickets at 75 cents to $1 a ticket. I do not believe that statement can be disputed by anyone, because they are the figures that have been given you.

It is argued that men who pay $5 to $7 for theater tickets ought to pay the tax. They did not say that about a man paying $20,000 for an automobile against the man who pays $300 or $400; neither did they say it to the man who pays $400 or $500 for club dues against the man who pays only $50. But they cut that all in half. I am not asking the Government for one penny in return, but I am asking that if they are honest in saying that they want to do something for the drama and the theater that they cut this tax in half, as they have done for the automobile and the club dues.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will devote just one minute to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. I would be in sympathy with that if it can be carried out. We did pass that same provision once and it went to the Senate, but the congressional experts and the Treasury experts examined it and came to the conclusion that it never could be enforced; that there was no way of drawing a line between the proper spoken drama and other exhibitions.

Now, with reference to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] cutting the tax in half, it would apply not only to the lower rates but to the $5 and $10 tickets where people can well afford to pay. That would cost about $5,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman mean to say that the cost of exempting tickets between 75 cents and a dollar would be $5,000,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I got the figures from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. I think he has it about right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. RAINEY)—81 ayes and 124 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, now I offer my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 186, line 2, after the word "amount," insert the following: "*Provided also*, That an equivalent tax shall be collected on all free or complimentary tickets or admission to such prize fights, or boxing, sparring, or other pugilistic matches or exhibitions. And the tax shall be on the amount for which a similar seat or box be sold at the said match or exhibition."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCKEOWN: Page 185, line 24, after the word "is," strike out "$1" and insert in lieu thereof "$1.50."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLOOM: Page 185, line 20, after the word "of," strike out "one" and insert in lieu thereof "one-half."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III.—EXCISE TAXES

SEC. 421. AUTOMOBILE TAX

Section 600 (1) of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows, to take effect on the enactment of this act:

"(1) Automobile chassis and bodies and motor cycles (including tires, inner tubes, parts, and accessories therefor sold on or in connection therewith or with the sale thereof), except automobile truck chassis and bodies, automobile wagon chassis and bodies and tractors, 1½ per cent. A sale or lease of an automobile shall, for the purpose of this subdivision, be considered a sale of the chassis and of the body. The tax imposed by this subdivision shall not apply to the sale or lease of an automobile body to a manufacturer or producer of automobiles, but in such case the tax shall apply to the sale or lease of the body by such manufacturer or producer."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCLAUGHLIN: Page 188, strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive, and insert:

"Section 600 (1) of the revenue act of 1926 is repealed."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if we can not fix on the time for debate upon this amendment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let us vote now.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am willing, as far as I am concerned. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, a number of gentlemen wish to speak on this, and I ask unanimous consent that all those who wish to may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD upon this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all Members have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD upon this section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. This is the automobile section to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is the automobile section, and my amendment would repeal the tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And would add $33,000,000 to the amount taken out by the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced himself in doubt.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 120, noes 120.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. McLAUGHLIN and Mr. TREADWAY to act as tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the committee divides, the Chair asks the attention of the committee, and especially of the tellers. The vote is going to be close, and there should be no confusion at the end to interfere in any way with an accurate count. Therefore the Chair requests that with those coming through late the vote be taken so that there will be no confusion in connection with the count.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 166, noes 142.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 422. REFUND OF AUTOMOBILE TAX TO MANUFACTURER, PRODUCER, OR IMPORTER

(a) Where prior to the date of the enactment of this act any article subject to the tax imposed by section 600(1) of the revenue act of 1926 has been sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer, and is on such date held by a dealer and intended for sale, there shall be refunded to the manufacturer, producer, or importer an amount equal to 1½ per cent of the price for which such article was sold by him, or, if the tax has not been paid, an amount equal to such 1½ per cent shall be credited against the tax in respect of such article.

(b) As used in this section the term "dealer" includes a wholesaler, jobber, or distributor. For the purposes of this section, an article shall be considered as "held by a dealer" if title thereto has passed to such dealer (whether or not delivery to him has been made), and if for purposes of consumption title to such articles or possession thereof has not at any time been transferred to any person other than a dealer.

(c) Under regulations prescribed by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, the refund provided by this section (1) may be applied as a credit against the tax shown by subsequent returns of the manufacturer, producer, or importer, and (2) may be made to the dealer instead of to the manufacturer, producer, or importer, if the manufacturer, producer, or importer waives any claim for the amount so to be refunded.

(d) When the refund or credit provided for in this section has been allowed to the manufacturer, producer, or importer, he shall remit to the dealer to whom was sold the article in respect of which the refund or credit was allowed, so much of that amount of the tax corresponding to the refund or credit as was paid or agreed to be paid by the dealer. Upon the failure of the manufacturer, producer, or importer to make such remission he shall be liable to the dealer for damages in the amount of three times the amount thereof, and the court shall include in any judgment in favor of the dealer in any suit for the recovery of such damages, costs of the suit and a reasonable attorney's fee to be fixed by the court.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offered having been adopted, some material changes should be made in section 422 and the following sections. They relate to the refund of the automobile and accessory taxes. I suggest that permission be given to return to them later when opportunity is had to look them over thoroughly.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. While these amendments that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] suggests are not absolutely essential as supplementary to the amendment just adopted, yet in the reduction of taxes heretofore we have applied these provisions and I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], if this amendment is to be agreed to and become a part of the law, that the amendments suggested by the gentleman from Michigan be adopted without controversy.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know what the amendments are.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It is the floor tax. I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that he let the amendment go for the moment, and before we complete the bill talk the matter over with the gentleman from Iowa and probably we can agree upon the amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is the suggestion that I make, that we have permission to return to these sections later after we have had an opportunity to consider the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that sections 422 and 423 be not read at this time, and that their consideration be postponed until after the rest of the bill has been read. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Let me ask, Has the gentleman from Michigan any objection to their being read at this time?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If it will do any good to read them, I have no objection, if we can have the privilege of returning to them later.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think we might as well have them read if the gentleman does not object. I shall not object.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have no objection to the reading of them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I shall not object to the request to return to them subsequent to the close of business.

The CHAIRMAN. Modified, the Chair understands the request to be to continue to read the bill and to make it in order to return to sections 422 and 423, if the gentleman from Iowa should deem it advisable to do so. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I think the Chair rather inaptly stated it, "If it is found desirable by the gentleman from Iowa to return." It might be found desirable by the gentleman from Michigan, who offers the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. That it shall be in order for the committee to return to the consideration of sections 422 and 423. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 424. REFUND OF AUTOMOBILE-ACCESSORIES TAX

No refund shall be made of any amount paid by or collected from any manufacturer, producer, or importer in respect of the tax imposed by subdivision (3) of section 600 of the revenue act of 1924, or subdivision (3) of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921, or of the revenue act of 1918—

(a) Except pursuant to a judgment of a court in an action duly begun prior to February 28, 1927; or

(b) Unless it is established to the satisfaction of the commissioner that such amount was in excess of the amount properly payable upon the sale or lease of an article subject to tax, or that such amount was not collected, directly or indirectly, from the purchaser or lessee, or that such amount, although collected from the purchaser or lessee, was returned to him prior to February 28, 1927; or

(c) Unless the commissioner certifies to the proper disbursing officer that such manufacturer, producer, or importer has filed with the commissioner, under regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, a bond in such sum and with such sureties as the commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the immediate repayment to the United States of such portion of the amount refunded as is not distributed by such manufacturer, producer, or importer, within six months after the date of the payment of the refund, to the persons who purchased for purposes of consumption (whether from such manufacturer, producer, importer, or from any other person) the articles in respect of which the refund is made, as evidenced by the affidavits (in such form and containing such statements as the commissioner may prescribe) of such purchasers, and that such bond, in the case of a claim allowed after February 28, 1927, was filed before the allowance of the claim by the commissioner.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DARROW: Page 192, line 5, after the word "to," strike out the words "February 28, 1927," and insert in lieu thereof the words "December 1, 1927," so that the same shall read: "(a) Except pursuant to a judgment of a court in an action duly begun prior to December 1, 1927; or."

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment, as it seems to me, and the fixing of February 28 is an arbitrary date which makes this bill retroactive. A suit commenced after the date of February 28 in many instances would have no validity even though a judgment was obtained in a United States court, and in order to make it fair to the people to whom the refund is due, it seems to me we ought to advance that date to December 1 at least. The reason for mentioning the date of December 1 is because it is in another section of the bill, section 431, in reference to contracts on motor boats.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But the gentleman ought to understand the reason for this date of February 28. I do not know whether the gentleman understands that February 28, 1927, was the date that the provision was included in the emergency deficiency bill saying no more refunds would be made. Now, that was the reason the date was put in here, because they were then refunding to people taxes collected on accessories that the man did not buy himself, and the country was notified at that time that it was not the intention of Congress to refund any more of these taxes except to the man who paid for them and who was the ultimate consumer of the article.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I realize that that was the reason for fixing the date of February 28, and yet it does not seem to help a situation that appeals to me as being one of justice.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes; in a moment.

Now, there are a good many cases, some of which I have in mind, where a suit was commenced prior to that date with the understanding with the Federal Department of Justice that if those suits were successful, they would apply to other suits of a like nature, following the judgment of the court as to the ones that were brought to trial, a gentleman's agreement; and it is true that in numerous cases where judgments have since been agreed upon and awarded in a court they are now debarred, whereas if it had not been for the agreement and gentleman's understanding between the Department of Justice and the litigants the suits would have been commenced prior to that act, and it applies to cases where it was not passed on to the ultimate consumer. It seems to me only a question of fair-

ness and justice that we should recognize the decree of the United States court, and not make it impossible for an award of that court to be paid by the Government.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is to limit the recovery under the act to suits begun prior to February 28, 1927. There was a decision in August, 1927, six months after this date, that was in favor of the taxpayer; and until that decision was rendered, he did not know he had a right to a refund. Therefore he did not begin his suit for a recovery or make his claim for the recovery of it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. He had no equities. He had a legal right to recover this tax, but not a moral right. The automobile manufacturer is the man who pays the tax. The Supreme Court held that that tax was illegal. Nevertheless, Congress ought not to give it back to the man when it was adjudicated by some one else. If you are going to give the commission the right to collect up to December 1 for an illegal tax it would be a strange proposition.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But it would be customary.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. You do not provide for that here, not where you have a suit.

Mr. DARROW. Take the case of a storage battery, for instance, where storage batteries are sold for all manner of purposes outside of the automobile. They were compelled to pay a tax, and under this provision they can not recover, even where it is acknowledged to be an illegal tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen understood at the time we passed the bill in February, 1927, that Congress did not intend that there should be a refund except under special circumstances.

Mr. LANHAM. The purpose of this, as I understand it, is to give relief to those concerns which do not pass on the tax to the consumer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. And some of them refrained from instituting suit practically at the request of the commissioner, with the understanding that a refund would be made.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the commissioner could not have done that in that manner after the passage of that act. This applies to cases prior to that time.

Mr. LANHAM. The claimants who have not passed the tax on to the consumer are left largely to the provision here under subsection (b), where it is provided that—

(b) Unless it is established to the satisfaction of the commissioner that such amount was in excess of the amount properly payable upon the sale or lease of an article subject to tax, or that such amount was not collected, directly or indirectly, from the purchaser or lessee, or that such amount, although collected from the purchaser or lessee, was returned to him prior to February 28, 1927.

Now, when you put the taxpayer under the obligation of proving that there was no indirect method by which the tax might not have been passed on, you probably exclude all opportunity for him to prove his case, because indirectly they may involve many things under the interpretation of the commissioner. But, as a matter of fact, the tax was not passed on. Where does that man get his relief if he has not passed on the tax and has instituted suit since February 27, and had the matter pending before the commissioner at that time and it was not determined?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is making a speech in my time.

Mr. LANHAM. I wanted information with reference to the matter.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman does not refer to the matter that is under consideration at all. He is referring to this whole provision, which, according to his argument, ought to be wiped out, but which, in my judgment, should not be wiped out.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let me explain the matter to my colleague. It was the intention of the committee to return the tax, as far as possible, to the man who paid it. Now, you have that premise.

Mr. LANHAM. To be sure.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Less than 2 per cent come within the exception; that is to say, 98 per cent of them had collected the tax from the ultimate consumer.

Mr. LANHAM. And my solicitude is for the 2 per cent

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I understand, and I am equally solicitous with my colleague. Here is the situation: Some gentlemen—not your constituents, maybe, but others—when this arrangement was made immediately did this: Instead of adding the tax as a part of the invoice with reference to an article they sold for $1, they just raised the price to $1.10. These concrete cases are in the Treasury Department, and there was no other reason for raising the price except the tax that was levied on them,. and that actually occurred. Now, if you are going to undertake to write into the law an exception for these 2 per cent, or one-half of 1 per cent of the 2 per cent, who are honest folks, I doubt whether you can reach it without opening the door for these other people to get away. I say to you, and I feel confident that you and any other Member of this House would say, that if this gentleman had manufactured an article, had sold it to me, and had added the tax, and the court held the tax was illegal, that the Treasury ought not to give it back to him.

Mr. LANHAM. To be sure; but that is not the man I am talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The whole question here is simply whether we shall refund the tax to a man who never paid it at all. As the gentleman from Texas just said, that is the rule except possibly in 2 per cent of the cases, and as to the 2 per cent of the cases the gentleman who has been interrogating me simply assumes that the commissioner is going to be unreasonable in this matter and unfair because he will require unusual proof.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that my question was intended to elicit information as to the legislative intent in order that the commissioner might be guided in his determination of these cases by the understanding that there was no intention here to preclude the 2 per cent that had not passed on that charge to the consumer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is quite correct about that.

Mr. LANHAM. Because a difference in price might arise from the cost of production and things of that kind.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit, I want to ask my colleague from Texas whether he does not know of this kind of a case, where a claim has been allowed by the commissioner and the man could not get a refund because he did not file suit before February 28, 1927?

Mr. LANHAM. That is true.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And the money should go back to him and not to some one else.

Mr. LANHAM. To be sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is very evident that tax reduction is popular. This can be seen very clearly from some of the votes that were taken Monday and yesterday and the one taken just a few moments ago cutting off quite a very large slice of revenue by the repeal of the entire tax on automobiles. The committee had decided that half of this revenue could possibly be spared, and had so indicated in the bill reported by repealing one-half of the present tax. The automobile people ought to have been content with half a loaf now and waited for the rest till the revenue could be spared. They have not done so, but upon their insistence the Committee of the Whole has now voted to repeal the entire tax. Yesterday, or the day before, it was voted to reduce the revenues some $25,000,000 by establishing a new system of graduated corporation income tax. I simply wish to sound this note of warning, that there may be such a thing as defeating the entire program of tax reduction. If anyone wishes to prevent any tax reduction whatsoever at this session of Congress, the simplest way to do it is to load this bill down with amendments of such a character as to destroy the revenue-producing qualities of the law to such an extent that in all human probability a deficit will be the result.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, if he desires to recoup, that section 442 of this bill could be stricken out and $8,500,000 recouped to the Treasury. I merely call this to the gentleman's attention in passing so that the gentleman can take it into consideration; and I might add for the information of the gentleman that 90 per cent of that tax is paid on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, whether it can be done, as my friend from Texas suggests, or whether the method he suggests is a good way to do it is neither here nor there.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. No one will deny the statement.

Mr. TILSON. I do not know whether the amendment proposed by the gentleman will be thought wise by the membership of the House, so we may not rely upon revenue from that source; but my statement is general that we are here threatened with too much reduction, and I am simply calling the attention of the membership of the House to that fact.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. It is not the contention of the gentleman that the amendment we adopted yesterday which strikes out section 118, preventing one or more corporations from taking advantage of the loss of an affiliated corporation, will reduce the revenues?

Mr. TILSON. I have been making a study of that amendment to-day and I am not at all clear as to just what will be the effect of it; but it is my present belief that as the bill now stands it will throw the law into such confusion that it will open the door wide to wash transactions between affiliated companies, or companies owned by the same individuals, in order to equalize gains and losses, so that ultimately there will be a serious loss of revenue rather than a gain.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Would the gentleman mind giving us some particulars to support that theory?

Mr. TILSON. I have not completed my study of this provision so as to be clear in my own mind as to just how it will work and shall therefore not attempt to illustrate by instances. It is my information, however, that its effect would be to introduce into the law wide possibilities for evasion of taxes; but not being thoroughly familiar with this somewhat technical and intricate portion of the bill, I did not rise to speak on this subject.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I think the gentleman ought to say that he has only had one lesson, because the teacher has only been here this afternoon.

Mr. TILSON. I am willing to get information from the teacher to whom the gentleman refers and from anybody else who may be able to give it. If I thought that by any chance the gentleman from Texas could give me reliable information on the subject, I should be pleased to have it.

In this connection while speaking of information, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend these remarks after making a little further study of the two amendments agreed to yesterday and the day before.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is one thing certain, the amendment to which the gentleman from Texas refers will not produce any change in the next two years, because they go on under the same old law for the next two years.

Mr. TILSON. Of course, it could not produce any revenue for the next two years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And during the two years the corporations will have an opportunity to do just what the gentleman from Connecticut has suggested.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. It is agreed by all of us that section 118 will not have any effect for the next two years.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; we are all agreed as to this, but after 1929, when consolidated returns are not permitted, without the provisions of section 118 it is not clear to me just what restrictions in the law, if any, will prevent corporations affiliated by a common ownership from so arranging matters among themselves as to protect their common owners from undue exaction.

The theory that corporations are separate entities is but a convenient legal fiction. The fact is that it is the individual stockholder who actually sustains the loss or receives the benefit of the gain. The corporation feels no pain or pleasure upon sustaining a loss or making a gain. It is the individual who happens to be a stockholder who is really concerned. Let us suppose that Mr. Jones and Mr. Smith own all the stock of corporation A, and that corporation A owns all of the stock of corporation B. Corporation A is engaged in selling a particular product and corporation B is engaged in manufacturing that product. For practical purposes it is quite immaterial whether corporation B sells the manufactured product to corporation A at a profit or at a loss, for Mr. Jones and Mr. Smith actually receive in dividends only the net result of the efforts of both corporations.

Let me illustrate further: Suppose that Mr. Brown runs a business in New York as an individual and runs a second business in Texas as an individual. His income is again based upon the net results of the two businesses. As an individual he is entitled for income-tax purposes to treat the two businesses as one. If the Texas business loses money, the loss may be offset against any gains resulting from the New York business, or vice versa. This is clear and simple as to an individual, but doing business as a corporation is exactly the same as doing business as an individual, at least so far as taxable net income is concerned. I am informed that the advisory committee of the Joint Committee on Internal-Revenue Taxation recommended that consolidated returns be abolished, not because the permission to file consolidated returns was economically unsound but because of administrative difficulties in determining the net income of an affiliated group, in which there were a large number of subsidiaries, and among the members of which there were a large number of intercompany transactions. The recommendations of the advisory committee, however, permit the offset of losses sustained by any member of the group, thus carrying out the sound economic theory upon which permission to file consolidated returns was based, and at the same time eliminating the administrative problems.

Let us remember that the provisions of the bill are applicable only where corporations are, in effect, but one corporation, 95 per cent ownership being required. In most cases there is an ownership of 100 per cent. The interests are the same.

The ability to pay must be governed by the net income of the entire group. Computing the income of each separate corporation is but the basing of an income tax upon paper profits. Our income tax law should be based as nearly as possible upon income actually realized.

Group organization of corporations, all owned ultimately by the same stockholders, has been developed by modern business for perfectly legitimate reasons, among them being separate accounting for the various parts of an enterprise and the desirability, and frequently the necessity, of creating an independent corporation for the purpose of carrying on a particular part of the business, both at home and abroad. The mere fact that by a legal fiction these are separate entities should not obscure the fact that they are in reality one and the same business, owned by the same individuals, and run as a unit. To refuse to recognize this fact and to compel for tax purposes the breaking up of the single business into its constituent parts is just as unreasonable as to require a single corporation to report for tax purposes the net result of its sales department the net profit or loss on its manufacturing activities, the net profit or loss on its investments, or the net profit or loss on each and every one of its agencies. Such a requirement would be so absurd as to appear on its face ridiculous, and it is only necessary to state the case of a single corporation to demonstrate its absurdity. It is no more absurd, however, when applied to the different departments of a single corporation than it is when applied to the subsidiary corporations of a single unit. For instance, if a single corporation has a manufacturing department and a sales department, and we regard it as absurd to separate them for tax-accounting purposes, it is equally absurd when dealing with two subsidiary corporations, one of which does the manufacturing and the other one of which does the selling, to claim that theoretically they are two separate entities, when, as a matter of fact, they are both engaged in a common, inseparable enterprise.

The contention that the elimination of the consolidated return will tend to prevent unfair competition and price cutting by subsidiaries is not tenable, for it is obvious that by the employment of the simplest devices the parent company, if it desires to use the subsidiary for price-cutting purposes, can so manage the transactions between the two companies as to see to it that the loss is borne by the parent company and so be made available for tax purposes.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] estimated the other day that the gain in revenue by striking out the provisions of the bill would be approximately $25,000,000. Upon inquiry, Mr. McCoy, the Government actuary, upon whose estimates the committee and this House have always relied, states that it is absolutely impossible to make an estimate. This much, however, seems to be certain, that whatever increase in revenue may result will be based on an injustice to the individuals who own the affiliated corporations.

The Committee of the Whole has also adopted an amendment imposing a graduated tax upon corporations having small incomes, the rates being 5, 7, and 9 per cent upon incomes of less than $7,000, between $7,000 and $12,000, and between $12,000 and $15,000, respectively.

The only justification for a graduated tax upon individuals or corporations is that the tax will be based upon ability to pay. It is quite proper that an individual having a net income of $1,000,000 should pay at a higher rate than an individual

having a net income of $10,000, because the former unquestionably has greater tax-paying ability than the latter.

In the case of corporations, however, the size of the net income has nothing to do with the corporation's ability to pay unless there be taken into consideration the controlling factor of the capital invested in the business. A corporation having an invested capital of $10,000 which has a net income of $15,000, will, under the amendment adopted, be given preferential treatment. It will pay the rate of 9 per cent upon the $15,000, notwithstanding the fact that it has in fact realized a profit of 150 per cent upon its investment. On the other hand, a corporation with an investment of $400,000, and with an income of $20,000, will be subjected to a tax at the rate of 11½ per cent, while its rate of profit is but 5 per cent. Is this a fair result?

The net income of a corporation is by itself not a correct basis for determining ability to pay. A corporation consisting of two stockholders with a small investment is in a much better position with an income of $25,000 than a corporation realizing the same income, but having 50 stockholders among whom its earnings must be distributed and having a large investment, upon which it is entitled to a fair return.

We all recall that the excess-profits tax was an attempt to grade the corporation tax in accordance with ability to pay, but of course took into consideration the capital factor. Theoretically it was sound, but in practice it could not be administered. With the capital factor eliminated, however, no one would contend for a moment that it is even theoretically sound. With invested capital eliminated, mere size of income indicates nothing. There is no reason why if I invest $1,000 in a $1,000,000 corporation, from which I receive only a 5 per cent dividend, the fruits of my investment should be reduced by 11½ per cent tax before I receive them, while if I invest the same $1,000 in a $50,000 corporation, from which I receive a 20 per cent dividend, my income is reduced by only 5, 7, or 9 per cent tax.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, an additional credit is given the small corporations, which favors them. The Committee on Ways and Means weighed carefully the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and decided against it. The provisions in the bill as reported are the conclusions of that great committee maturely reached. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas introduces into our corporation-tax system a new and, in my judgment, an unsound principle which in practice will produce absurd and unjust results.

Should this amendment finally become law, there will spring up, in all probability, a whole flock of little corporations created by men of wealth for tax-evasion purposes. Let me illustrate: Assume that a man with a net income of $200,000, spends $100,000 every year, but has $100,000 of income which he saves. His problem is to reduce his taxes on the second $100,000. He accordingly creates five corporations with net incomes of $15,000 each and one corporation with a net income of $25,000. The total taxes paid by these six corporations under the proposed scheme would be less than $8,000, whereas his tax as an individual on the second $100,000 would be $25,000. It is obvious that this device can be applied with even greater success by a man with an income of $400,000, $500,000, or $600,000. While, of course, it was not the intention of the gentleman from Texas to create new isles of safety, it almost looks as if some prospective tax dodger had handed him a well thought out device for tax evasion which the gentleman from Texas, with his usual good nature, has undertaken to put across.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by the majority leader is based upon the official estimates submitted by the Treasury Department for next year and the next year.

It comes in the nature of a threat to this House. In order to determine just how much weight should be given it, I want to call attention to the official estimates of surpluses that have been made in recent years.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, on June 30, 1923, according to the official estimates made public by the Treasury Department, there was going to be a deficit. In December, 1923, the Treasury Department admitted there would not be a deficit but there would be a surplus of $329,639,000. The actual surplus, however, for 1924 was $505,366,000, a mistake of over $500,000,000 in the estimates first given out, and over $200,000,000 in the estimates given out during the latter part of 1923.

On June 30, 1924, the Secretary of the Treasury told us there would be a surplus of $24,939,000. In December, 1924, he raised this estimate to $67,884,000, and the actual surplus turned out to be $250,505,000.

On June 30, 1925, he told us the surplus would be $290,970,000. In December, 1925, he reduced that amount to $262,041,000, and the actual surplus was $377,767,000.

On the 30th day of June, 1926, we were advised from the Treasury Department that the surplus would be $186,227,000. In December, 1926, he raised that estimate and told us the surplus would be $385,079,000. It was actually $625,000,000—a mistake of nearly $300,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman from Illinois aware that all of these figures have been put in the RECORD?

Mr. RAINEY. It will not hurt to put them in again; they have not been assembled for the RECORD as completely as I am now assembling them. Now the Secretary of the Treasury says the surplus for 1927 is going to be $207,703,000. Based on the precedents established by the Treasury Department in making the mistakes, and the mistakes they have made in the last two years will aggregate nearly $2,000,000,000; based on precedents that they have established, we are going to have a surplus that will carry a bill of $400,000,000 reduction, and there will be a surplus after that of at least $100,000,000.

That is enough for the business men of this country to carry. [Applause.]

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the time of the committee, but I want to say that I believe my amendment is in the interest of justice and fairness to the people, and I hope the committee will see fit to adopt it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was much interested in the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]. I want to call attention of the membership of the House to this fact, that such a speech as that was never possible either during or following a Democratic administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I am sorry, but I can not yield at this time. I have studied the political history of the United States, and there was never a Democratic administration in power without the national debt was increased, and they had to borrow money for the running expenses of the country.

My colleague from Illinois thinks it is a terrible thing for the Treasury Department, under a Republican administration, to estimate that there will be a surplus of $300,000,000, and discover that by the economy program and good business judgment used in national affairs we have a surplus of $535,000,000, which has made it possible in the past eight years to reduce the national debt by $1,760,000,000.

The one danger confronting us is that through the generosity of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle they want to reduce the national income to a point where the Republican administration will find itself in the same kind of a condition that they are always in, namely, a deficit.

I do not think that the prosperity of the country hinges directly on keeping the income of the United States, in its unusual prosperous condition, down to the last penny of margin, so that if there is anything hidden in the way of a slowing up of business, that we will wake up the morning after a little short in finances to meet our obligations. I admit that that would be the finest kind of a condition for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—if they could have it happen in the next year or two. I am sure, my colleagues, that although we may like the thought of tax reduction, they will think that over before they make the bill impossible of passing.

It is more pleasant to take off a tax than to put one on. I am wondering how many million dollars are going to be added to the charge on the Treasury by the same gentlemen that voted to take off about $57,000,000 in addition to the $235,000,000 already provided for.

That is the only comment I want to make. The gentleman from Illinois has paid to the Republican administration one of the greatest compliments that any man could pay to it, to wit, that we have succeeded in economies beyond the wildest dreams of the man who holds the purse strings, the Secretary of the Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard very briefly upon the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. The gentleman says that in the history of this country, which he says he has read—I do not believe it—he read a Republican campaign book—never has the Democratic Party reported a surplus. If the gentleman will read the history of this country he will find that never but once since this Government was established has this Government been out of debt and had a surplus which it could distribute amongst the States, and that is in the Democratic administration beginning on the 4th of March, 1829, when under Andrew Jackson. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I have not the floor, the House has it. O gentlemen, laugh because a great Democrat did what the

gentleman from Ohio says no Democrat ever has done. He paid the debt of the United States absolutely out, and distributed millions of dollars amongst the States which they have never been called upon to refund. That is one of the accomplishments of the Democratic Party, and that is but a small part of them; but when the gentleman undertakes to speak of the history of this country and the Democratic Party, I think he should at least read it before he perpetrates that kind of a canard upon this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Was not that at the time when the Democratic Party was called the Republican Party?

Mr. STEVENSON. But it was the Democratic Party. It was called the Republican or Anti-Federalist Party, and that was before the fellows took charge of the name "Republican" who stood upon the principle that the Republican Party stands upon to-day, to wit, the principle that a few rich people should rule the country and that the great mass should not. They called our party the Republican party because it stood for the inarticulate mass, which it has always stood for, and which it represents here today. [Applause on Democratic side.]

The Jackson administration finally fixed the name of Democratic Party upon it. We have always carried it proudly, and frequently successfully, since. There were many times subsequently when Democratic administrations reported surplus funds. Grover Cleveland on March 4, 1889, turned over to Benjamin Harrison a healthy surplus, and Harrison on March 4, 1893, turned back to Cleveland a Treasury so bare that the gold reserve was depleted to the extent that bonds had to be sold to secure gold to restore the reserve and save the credit of the country. March 4, 1897, Cleveland again turned over a solvent Treasury to McKinley and so did Wilson to Harding in 1921. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART IV.—SPECIAL TAXES

SEC. 431. TAX ON USE OF FOREIGN-BUILT BOATS

Section 702 of the revenue act of 1926 is amended by adding after the end of the first paragraph a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"On and after July 1, 1928, the rates shall be as follows: Yachts, pleasure boats, power boats, motor boats with fixed engines, and sailing boats, of over 5 net tons, length over 32 feet and not over 50 feet, $10 for each foot; length over 50 feet and not over 100 feet, $20 for each foot; length over 100 feet, $40 for each foot; except that the increase in rates shall not apply to a yacht or other boat built, or for the building of which a contract was entered into, before December 1, 1927."

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Iowa is about to move to rise, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] desires to offer an amendment and to reserve his privilege so that he can consider it in the morning.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no objection to that.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINEY: Page 193, strike out lines 8 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1, the revenue bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the Committee of the Whole I asked unanimous consent that Members have general leave to extend their remarks on section 421. I am informed that that request should be made in the House and not in the committee. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon section 421 of the revenue bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman make it general, so that every Member can extend his remarks once on the entire bill or on any portion of it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. With the understanding that they are his own remarks.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; and I think the time should be limited to five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the request. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that for five legislative days after the bill is passed by the House all Members may extend their own remarks on the subject of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, for nearly a week now we have been engaged in the consideration of the general revenue bill for this session of Congress. Through the general prosperity of the country we find ourselves in the happy position of having a large surplus in the Treasury. This has enabled the committee to report for our consideration the present bill with many items of the 1926 revenue law either eliminated or reduced.

I rise to address you this morning on the item contained in the bill known as the automobile excise tax, which the committee reports as an item carrying a tax of 1½ per cent upon the price of the car at the factory.

The tax upon the automotive industry of the country was placed there as a war measure for the purpose of raising revenue to prosecute the World War. There could be no argument at that time. Money must be obtained from such sources as possible. The motorists of the Nation in the years since have paid that tax, realizing the purpose for which it was collected; but now, gentlemen of the House, they come before this Congress and ask at your hands relief, believing that their plea is one of justice and equity.

The plea will be made that already all the reduction that it is possible to make from the 1926 tax schedule has been made. The great bulk of that reduction has been upon corporations and the first benefit from such reduction will accrue to the men of means and not to the poorer taxpayer. The reduction of the automobile tax will favor 4,000,000 taxpayers and a class of taxpayers represented in the lower brackets of tax collections. I want to address myself to the fact that the complete repeal of the excise tax on automobiles is only one of justice and equity. My district is vitally interested in this matter, for within four cities of that district there are 187,034 employees receiving a pay roll of $294,907,207. These figures are applicable only to those employed in the motor plants themselves and not in affiliated accessory corporations.

While the elimination of this item in the bill will increase the deductions from the receipts from the 1926 sum additional of $35,000,000, that money paid by the individual purchasers of motor cars will go back into general industry and reflect itself in increased revenue to the Government from other sources. Thus the loss is more visionary than real.

May I now give to you my reasons for asking you this morning to support the motion for the repeal of the tax or the elimination of this item from the present bill under consideration?

First. It is a discriminatory tax. It is a tax levied on a special product for the purpose of general revenue. It has singled out and to the extent of the tax imposed penalized one line of manufactured product while virtually to-day every other product that could be placed in a like category has been relieved from any excise tax. There was no thought of such a tax upon the manufacture of automobiles until the grave demands of war called for the levy of excise taxes upon products that would not be justified in time of peace. There is no tax upon the manufacture of pianos, though in a large extent they might be termed a luxury. That is likewise true of radios and other products of a like nature.

Congress has already repealed the war-excise tax upon every commodity formerly so burdened with one or two exceptions. I desire to insert here a table of the excise taxes imposed at one time and now removed. You will notice in that list the tax still remains upon automobiles and motor cycles and firearms, while every other item has been erased. This table clearly shows the discrimination. No fair government can afford to ignore the principles of just and equitable levies. A tax program should be general in its application and not discriminatory against any one industry or any group of individuals. We contend that the excise tax on automobiles is both. The seventy-odd million dollars raised the past year by this method of taxation has been a burden upon 4,000,000 of people, while the blessings of the automobile and the industry has been of general benefit to the entire Nation.

In the second place, I want to call your attention to the further fact that this tax is not only a discriminatory tax, therefore unjust, but it is also a tax on essential transportation.

Unless one has given a careful study to the recent developments of transportation they can not comprehend to what extent the automobile to-day has become the great means of transportation for both freight and passengers. The automobile in the United States travels one hundred and seventy-five times as many actual miles and seven times as many passenger-miles as does the steam passenger train. It has revolutionized local transportation, and is destined to become a still more important means for the quick and easy, as well as cheap, transportation of freight and persons. Other units of transportation were the first to be relieved of emergency war taxes because it was recognized they were of vital importance to the economic life of the Nation.

Secretary Mellon is quoted by the papers as saying:

> The automobile is one of the railroads' chief competitors. Our railroads are paying heavy taxes to the United States Government, a part of which is being used for highway purposes.

It is well known, gentlemen, that this tax which the railroad corporations pay to the United States Government is collected in one way or another through rates on merchandise or persons from the very John Smiths and Harry Jones who are compelled to pay the excise tax on automobiles, and which they can not pass on to anyone else to pay. The Secretary in this argument of comparing the tax on the automobile owner to the tax on railroad corporations is falling into the common error of reasoning by those who desire to see the tax continued, namely, that the corporations manufacturing automobiles pay this tax instead of the motorists.

Let us carry this reasoning a step further. The present excise tax of 3 per cent on automobiles is entirely on passenger cars, Congress having exempted "automobile truck chassis and bodies, automobile wagon chassis and bodies, and tractors." This leaves the present excise tax only upon passenger cars. It is the truck that is affecting railroad transportation, but that can not be adjusted by taxation. It is a matter of the transportation system of the Nation adjusting themselves to this new system of transporting merchandise and persons.

In this connection let me call the attention of the House to the fact that at the World War's termination $2,000,000,000 worth of road-building machinery was sold by the Federal Government to France for $450,000,000. Some of this machinery was sold back by France to some of our States for 100 cents on the dollar. I would suggest that when the money is paid to us the Government should place it in the Federal good-roads fund and be used to aid the various States in pushing through transcontinental highways, not only from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but also in closing up the many highway gaps now existing between the North and the South.

We urge that inasmuch as motor-vehicle owners of this Nation have given to the Government more than a billion dollars through the Federal war tax, that the Government show its appreciation now by applying the $450,000,000 toward the building of Federal highways. Such roads will save millions of dollars in wear and tear on automobiles and will bring prosperity to every section and industry.

I want to call your attention further that this tax is only one of the additional burdens by way of taxation that the motorist is compelled to pay. He buys his car and before he can possess it he pays this Federal war tax, then he must pay a State registration fee, then he must pay a tax upon the value of the car, and then he must pay a tax for the privilege of driving it, and in 45 States of the Union a tax from 2 to 4 cents per gallon on gasoline in order to run it. In other words, in 1926 there was levied upon this method of transportation and paid by the motor public a total tax, Federal, State, and municipal, of $712,272,350. These are the figures secured from the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue, Bureau of Public Roads, and municipal statistics. In other words, the motorist who has already paid all the general taxes required of the citizen of the Nation as income tax, indirect tax, and a corporation tax, if he is in business or a stockholder in a corporation, is still further taxed for this discriminatory, unjust Federal tax. The total of all motor-vehicle taxes in 1926 of $712,000,000 plus is equivalent to approximately 70 per cent of all the annual rural highway cost. The average tax per registered motor vehicle was $32.35 and in some States much higher.

Let me call attention again to what this industry, or rather this class, of our citizenship has paid in war taxes. At present I stated the tax was bringing to the Treasury of the United States between seventy and eighty millions of dollars. On December 31, 1926, the total revenue from the war excise tax on all automobiles and equipment had amounted to the vast sum of $1,039,071,746.53. No one can argue that this industry and this group of citizens has not paid its share of the war expense, and now we pray that they be relieved and not penalized further.

I want to turn now, gentlemen of the committee, and discuss very briefly the fallacies that have been brought forth as arguments for the retention of this discriminatory, unjust war excise tax.

It is contended that the automobile is a luxury and that those who are able to afford it should not complain of this Federal tax. Gentlemen, there might have been a day when the motor vehicle could have been classed as a luxury. That day has long since passed away. It is a necessity to-day to the extent of 90 per cent of its use. The motor is foremost in the movement of food from the truck farm to the city market, from the farm to the warehouse shipping point, and has thus become an absolute necessity both as a light truck and as a passenger car to the producer of the foodstuffs of the Nation. It is also foremost in the movement of raw materials and manufactured goods, and thus becomes to the smaller manufacturers his vehicle by which he receives the raw material for his plant and then in turn transports the manufactured article to the market.

It also is readily understood and conceived how the motor vehicle is in the front rank as a necessity for the transportation of persons both within cities and between cities. In fact, it is fast taking the place of the electric car and the street railway as a method of transportation.

May I call my colleague's attention in this connection to the further fact that the cheap automobile has made possible the doing away of the tenement district of our industrial cities and enabling the workmen because of his easy means of transportation to live in the outskirts of a city in God's sunshine and clean air where his family and children are growing into better citizens than was possible under the old régime.

Gentlemen, the automobile is not a luxury. It is the necessity to the farmer, the business man, the professional man, and to-day is the essential in the activities of our modern life, whether we are thinking of the farm or the city.

Another fallacy often heard and argued is that this tax should remain as long as the Federal Government gives financial aid to the States for Federal roads. Secretary Mellon calls attention in this connection to the Federal appropriation for good roads that in the fiscal year 1928 will run as high as $71,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1929 he estimates it will be $75,000,000. The Secretary then says:

> These expenditures by the Federal Government are for the direct and immediate benefit of automobile owners. They should make some contribution in return.

We desire to take issue with our most able Secretary of the Treasury when he states that the above expenditures by the Federal Government for good roads is for the direct and immediate benefit of automobile owners. There is no Federal expenditure for specific purposes that is so general in the application of its benefits as is that expended for Federal roads. May I call to your attention one illustration of that truth? It is entirely changing the isolated, small, illy furnished schoolhouse to the centralized, well-equipped school buildings in charge of trained, competent teachers. This is only one instance of a hundred ways whereby our highways are for the direct and immediate advantage of the entire communities and States affected. Surely Congress will not give any weight to such an argument, for I am sure that my colleagues readily recognize that it has never been the Federal policy to tax any one group of its citizens for a specific purpose of benefit. We do not tax the farmer to-day with a specific tax for the support of that great activity of our Government which we call the Department of Agriculture. While its benefits may seem on the face of it to be for one class of citizens and one industry, we all recognize that the work of the Department of Agriculture is for the general good.

May I cite a specific instance of the reason? The Sixty-ninth Congress, in view of the alarming devastations of the corn borer, appropriated $10,000,000, to be met by a like amount by the States affected, in an attempt to stop the ravages of this pest. We probably will appropriate a like amount, if not double, in this Congress for this purpose; but no one will advance the argument that the farmers directly concerned and receiving an immediate benefit should bear a specific tax to meet the expenditure.

The shipping industry of the Nation is not taxed with a specific tax or the money appropriated by this Government for the development of our river transportation, our harbor improvements, or our Lighthouse Service, while the benefits of the money thus appropriated seem to be for the benefits of our transportation and shipping interests, yet the Government recognizes that adequate and continuous transportation is a vital necessity of the Nation's life. There is no connection, gentle-

men, between the principle of the excise tax on automobiles and aid given by the Federal Government for the building of highways. While the man who possesses the automobile will travel with greater comfort and deliver the products of his industry with greater dispatch because we possess adequate and well-built highways, the benefits accruing from these highways are to all the people and not to any one class or industry. The Federal highway act was passed in 1916, a full year in advance of the war tax levied on motor vehicles. Further, there is no provision in the act, and none was contemplated in its passage, that the cost of Federal aid toward these Federal highways should be levied upon the motorists or upon the industry. Let me repeat that Federal aid represents Government participation in an enterprise for general good.

One more argument that is advanced by some as an excuse for not removing this unjust tax is that if the tax were removed the motorists would not profit by its repeal. This is an argument that is one and the same as the argument that the excise tax on automobiles is a tax on the industry and paid by the manufacturers. Of course, there is no reason or excuse for my answering such an argument before this intelligent group of men. You all understand very readily that this excise tax is attached to the price of a car and paid for by the purchaser when the car leaves the factory or sales station. The manufacturer is simply the tax gatherer for the Federal Government. The tax has always been added and billed separately.

Gentlemen, my district, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is perhaps the center of the automobile industry of the Nation, and I am here to say to you that the automotive industry has been a leader in the industries of the Nation in constantly seeking to reduce the price of its manufactured product to the consumer. Through mass production and efficient methods the automobile industry has constantly been increasing the value in efficiency of its output by reducing the cost to the purchaser. Practically every manufacturer in the industry, and especially is this true of the producers in quantity cars, has put himself on record that the prices will be reduced instantly to the consumer to the amount of the tax.

The average retail price per car is $825; eliminating the tax would mean a saving of approximately $18 on every purchase.

Gentlemen, the motoring public believes it has a right to the relief it is asking for at your hands to-day. The fact that 4,000,000 of these motorists would benefit from this item of tax reduction ought to be of great interest to you if the principle of unjust taxation does not seem an issue at this time. We are asking that this House stand upon the sound principle of Federal taxation—no class legislation, no discrimination, but justice and equity in general levies.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, the people who pay the automobile excise tax are long-suffering in their appeal for relief They are now almost alone in paying a war tax, when the war which made it necessary has been ended more than 10 years.

The automobile tax was originally created as an emergency tax. It was imposed upon 45 commodities which were grouped together as semiluxuries. Forty-three of these commodities, seemingly the least luxurious, have been relieved of this abnormal burden, leading logically to the conclusion that the automobile is the least necessary of all. Whether such is the case can best be answered by those millions of people who depend upon the automobile for daily transportation in every kind of business.

Successive revenue acts have removed this excise from all but 2 of the 45 kinds of goods originally included. In time of war no one of these 45 industries singled out to pay this tax was slacker enough to raise any protest. And in the uncertain days of reconstruction, when the Congress was striving to bring things back to normal, these industries and the country at large were willing to accept the mandate of Congress as to the order in which these taxes should be repealed.

But now that the Treasury Department comes out flat-footedly and asks Congress to retain the automobile excise as a permanent source of revenue, the automobile users of the country, of whom there are 22,000,000 or more, and the automobile distributors, manufacturers, laborers and people in allied industries, the farmers, and many other groups dependent upon automobile transportation have protested vigorously, and rightly so, against being thus discriminated against.

If it is proper to retain the automobile excise as a permanent revenue source, then it is equally as justifiable to restore the excise tax on the whole list of 45 products originally included. I should say it would be more justifiable. We might then even have a general sales tax. The fact that all but two of the commodities have already been exempted only serves to emphasize the discrimination.

Gentlemen who support the Treasury viewpoint, and I favor conservative reduction, will say it can not be abolished now because the surplus in the Treasury is not sufficient to justify it. Assuming these to be the facts, which I do not grant at this time, then I would say that some other reduction ought to be sacrificed and the automobile tax repealed now, because, in view of the expressed intention of the Treasury Department to make this remaining excise tax a permanent one, Congress can not leave even a vestige of it without seeming to approve that indefensible policy of the Treasury. Nothing Congress might do with respect to this tax bill, in my opinion, could be more unfortunate or more unjust.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the bill for tax reduction now under consideration is a good bill and will afford considerable relief to many who are now carrying the burden of excessive Federal taxation. However, it can be made a much better bill by the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, as well as other amendments which will doubtless be offered later.

In my opinion one of the greatest impediments to prosperity and happiness to-day is the excessive and most unbearable burden that the people throughout the entire country are carrying in the various forms of taxes; heavy Federal taxes, heavy State taxes, heavy county and local taxes, heavy municipal taxes, taxes galore of every form and fashion.

This tax of 3 per cent on automobiles is a relic of the war and was never intended as a peace-time measure. This tax should be promptly and completely wiped out, and by so doing we would afford relief that would be more generally and widely diffused and benefit more people who are heavily burdened than anything we can do at this time.

First. This tax should be removed, because it is unnecessary and an unfair and discriminating war-emergency tax on a special class. I say it is unnecessary, because I maintain there will be ample revenue for the proper and safe administration of the Government if this tax was all taken off. The 1½ per cent now left in the bill produces about $33,000,000 annually. If this amount is removed, the total reduction in the bill would amount to only about $263,000,000, provided the Garner amendment remains in the bill.

So long as we do not go over three hundred million in our reduction, I have no fear of a deficit. True, the Secretary of the Treasury cries, "Danger" and "Deficit," but when we recall that in every tax bill since the World War he has cried "Danger, danger," and "Deficit, deficit," and that none of his alarming predictions have been fulfilled we cease to be alarmed at his cries. Notwithstanding the fact that in each tax-reduction bill we have made a much heavier cut than he has said it was safe to make, still we have had a surplus, above necessary revenue, of from one hundred million to six hundred million dollars per annum. The people have at last become deaf to his cries of "Deficit."

The tax should be removed, in my opinion, because of the unparalleled burden the automobiles are carrying in the way of State and local taxes. It has been stated that the motor-vehicle taxes now amount to $712,277,350, or did amount to that for the year 1926, in Federal, State, and local taxes. In many of the States the cost of highway construction is being largely or entirely placed upon motor vehicles. They not only pay general property tax but gasoline tax, license tax, and many other special taxes, such as license fees, and so forth.

In the State of North Carolina, which I have the honor to partly represent, we are nearing the completion of a marvelous highway-building program. To this program the Federal Government has up to date contributed about $16,000,000, while the State has expended of its own money around $100,000,000 on our State highway system. We are levying and collecting for highway purposes around $14,000,000 per annum entirely by tax on gasoline, automobile and truck license, and title fees. Out of this huge sum we are able to pay the interest on our road bonds, set aside a sufficient sinking fund for the retirement of the bonds, bear the expense of maintaining the roads, and pay for the administration of the law.

It has been stated that the Federal excise tax paid by the motorist up to the present amounts to $1,060,000,000, this in addition to all State, county, and municipal taxes. This is about four hundred million in excess of the contribution thus far made by the Federal Government to the national highway building program. So it is certain that if the building of Federal highways or roads is in any way chargeable to the motor industry, that obligation has long since been more than discharged. By the removal of this unjust tax and gross discrimination all classes of our people will be benefited. We have reached the point in our national progress where the

automobile is no longer a luxury or semiluxury, but one of the indispensable necessities of everyday life. There are now more than 19,000,000 passenger cars in the United States, and are being sold at the rate of about 4,000,000 per annum. And 28 per cent of all the cars in the country are owned by farmers, and they are an essential instrument in their daily occupations.

This tax bears heavily on the small merchant, the clerk in the store, the wage earner, physician, preacher, lawyer, and, in fact, all classes of people in all conditions of life.

Here is an opportunity to bring farm relief which should not be overlooked. Something like one-third of all the cars in the country are owned by farmers. This tax is not paid by the manufacturer or the dealer but only advanced by them, and every dollar of it is paid by the user of the car. It is passed on from manufacturer to the dealer, and from the dealer to the consumer as a separate item on the bill or invoice. Sixty-eight per cent of the cars sold last year went to towns of less than 25,000. The average retail price of a car is $825, wholesale price about $600, and 3 per cent of this would mean a saving on each car of $18.

There is no more justification for a tax an automobiles than there would be for a tax on plows, threshing machines, or any other kind of farm implement. The automobile is used by the farmer in transporting his produce and crops to market. Every farmer uses them for this purpose. Millions of pounds of tobacco have been transported to market in my State this year in automobiles owned by the farmers. The farmer sadly needs this relief.

Practically all the cheap cars that are sold to-day are sold on time and often when the car is worn out and no longer suitable for use all the purchase price of the car has not yet been paid. So far as I know, no one has protested against the removal of this tax save and except Secretary Mellon, and I do not believe anyone would consider him qualified to speak for the great masses of the people. In many respects Secretary Mellon is a great man, as no one of ordinary ability could have built up the powerful organization he owns and controls; neither could they have amassed the great fortunes he has amassed; but one element of true greatness he lacks. He certainly knows nothing of the hard road traveled by the great body of the American people.

The taskmasters of Egypt had more sympathy and consideration for the children of Israel, who were the bondslaves of Pharaoh, than Andrew Mellon has for those who earn and eat their bread by the sweat of their faces. Secretary Mellon believes in a sales tax. He believes people should pay taxes in proportion to what they consume and not upon their ability to pay.

You all doubtless received a letter this morning from the National Grange. From that letter I quote the following:

> However, our convention declared if there be a tax reduction the National Grange favors the complete repeal of war-time Federal tax on automobiles. The grange is opposed to the permanent imposition of the automobile tax as a sales tax, on the ground that it is unjust and discriminatory.

Here is an organization qualified to speak for the farmer, in touch and in sympathy with the farmer, knowing the farmer's needs. I warn anyone who votes against this bill ever opening his mouth again in behalf of farm relief; such a course would be wholly inconsistent.

Gentlemen of the House, let us rise up to-day and emphatically reassert our conviction that this grossly unfair and unnecessary war-time tax upon an every-day necessity of life shall no longer continue. By this course—the removal of this tax—we will bring joy to the hearts of millions of our people who are to-day groaning under the load of heavy taxation and who have their eyes turned toward Washington with an earnest, fervent prayer that this relief will be granted. By the adoption of this amendment and the removal of this tax we will bring relief to the manufacturer, the merchant, the lawyer, the doctor, the preacher, the laborer, the school-teacher, the barber, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker, the undertaker, the hay raker, apple-tree shaker, and every other class and condition of life.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, E Pluribus Unum is the motto of the greatest Nation on earth; but, my colleagues, that motto assumes that the many out of whom the one is evolved shall equally bear all the responsibilities and burdens and shall equally share all of the privileges and advantages of the Union. The corner stone of our Union is equality of service and equality in responsibility. Class legislation and special privileges are contrary to the spirit of our Republic.

The Constitution of the United States was adopted to secure the blessings of liberty and equality to all the people. This basic principle of the Constitution will be violated if this bill without amendment is written into law. The 115,000,000 of people living under the protection of the Constitution will not be treated equitably and justly. It contains the most glaring example of class legislation. I refer to the automobile tax. There is not any doubt about this being class legislation. In its origin and in its nature this tax is discriminatory. It has been collected from a definite class for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

There is no longer any excuse for this class tax. Such procedure could find justification only on the ground of a great national emergency, as a special tax made necessary by stern dictates of war-time emergency. It may have had some temporary excuse, but the war is over. A 10-year period after the close of the war is long enough to retain an emergency tax.

During the war and during the postwar liquidation and adjustment we paid this class tax silently and without protest. Now, we are not only protesting, but we are going to howl until this unjust burden is taken from the shoulders of the basic industry whose success insures continued prosperity. The industry, very properly, strenuously objects to the continued imposition of this discriminatory class taxation on a special product for the purpose of general revenue. It is said that this tax is easily collected.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] says that the annual Federal appropriation for good roads is $75,000,000.

> If no Federal tax should be paid by the automobile owner there would at once arise a clamor for the repeal of the good roads appropriation.

Let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts why burden the automobile-tax payer with more than double his share of the appropriation for good roads? The automobile interests pay the highest tax in State and Nation of any class of taxpayer. The manufacturer pays his property tax, his insurance, his corporation tax, his income tax, and now in this bill you are forcing him to pay a sales tax. Your automobile purchaser pays his property tax on the automobile, his State license, his insurance, which is higher than any class of insurance in the business world. Sometimes this insurance runs more than 25 per cent of the value of the property involved. He also pays his driver's license and an unequal fuel-tax burden in the operation of his car.

When I left Toledo last month in my drive to Washington I filled my gas tank with gasoline at 15 cents a gallon—12 cents for the gas and 3 cents State gasoline tax. This tax was 25 per cent of the cost of the gasoline. When I reached West Virginia I paid 4 cents a gallon State tax. This was 33⅓ per cent of the cost of gasoline in Toledo. And now, gentlemen, you are insisting that the automobile owner shall, in addition to all of these burdensome taxes, pay a special sales tax. The claim that he should pay this tax for the purpose of maintaining good roads is only an alibi. He is paying more than his share of the road building without this sales tax. The trucks pound out the roads much faster than the automobile, and yet you relieved the trucking companies from their sales tax in the tax repeal of 1926.

You know how hard I have been working since I have been a Member of this House for cheaper transportation. Water last year carried 40 per cent of the freight load. Now, in this automobile tax you are forcing an unequal burden on the next cheapest mode of transportation.

In the Automobile Daily News, in its issue of December 5, the editor, Mr. Johnston, said:

> From the highest source of Government there was recently advanced the old theory that the automobile is still a sort of luxury or semiluxury, upon which people able to afford it should be willing to pay a tax. The whole life of modern America is based upon transportation. Whatever prosperity we enjoy, in the final analysis, comes from possession of a superior transportation system. In this transportation system the automobile plays exactly the same utilitarian rôle that the railway, the electric car, the steamship line perform.
>
> To cite a specific instance, farm life in America to-day would be impossible in its present form without motor vehicles. To the farmer his motor car is as much a part of his business equipment as his plow or his reaping machine. If the motor car is justifiably taxable, so is the passenger ticket for railway, steamship line, or any other method of transportation. The fact that the motor vehicle is a pleasanter, more comfortable, and more mobile method of travel than any of the others does not affect the essentially utilitarian character of its service. Pleasure is not wholly reprehensible or criminal. If the motor car gives pleasure in its use, not every trip taken by railway or steamship is completely commercial in purpose.

I knew this fight would be on if you left this class tax in the bill. On the 4th of last month I sent the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the following telegram:

I believe continued business prosperity requires the repeal of the automobile excise tax. I shall do my best to accomplish this in the Seventieth Congress. I believe this proposal should come from your committee rather than a floor amendment. I urge favorable action by our Ways and Means Committee.

I have the honor of representing the Toledo district. The Mather Spring Co., the Tillotson Carburetor Co., the Champion Spark Plug Co., the Bock Bearing Co., and the Electric Auto Lite Co. are all located in my home city. The Willys-Overland Co. is one of the largest manufacturers of automobiles in the world. Since the close of the last session of Congress I have had an opportunity to travel around the world in a journey of over 30,000 miles. Wherever I went I saw plenty of American-made automobiles. In a Japanese newspaper I saw a paid "ad" of apology to the Champion Spark Plug people of Toledo, Ohio, for infringement upon their patent, and a promise that if not prosecuted they would not repeat their offense. In India, northwest of Calcutta, as you reach Darjeeling, at the foothills of the Himalayas, you may see a Whippet, made in Toledo by the Willys-Overland Co., streaking up the mountain side toward the peak of Mount Everest, the highest point in the world, more than 29,000 feet above sea level. In the valley of the Dead Sea, nearly 1,200 feet below sea level, you will find Fords and Overland cars. From the north to the south in the islands of the seas in all continents and grand divisions you will find the American-made automobiles.

The President tells us in his annual message that our country is enjoying prosperity. The gentlemen on the minority side deny it. What cloud in the business horizon seemed to give color to the Democratic statement that the country was passing through a serious business depression? The one fact that the industrial establishments of Henry Ford have been closed for nearly a year. One week ago last Friday Henry Ford staged the most spectacular, the most successful sale the world has ever witnessed. One Member of this House told me he ordered a car the first day of the sale, down here on Pennsylvania Avenue, and they could not promise delivery before February, 1928. Do not worry, my friends, treat the automobile fairly and it will scatter the cloud of business depression as the sun will dissipate the mists on a spring morning. Even his competitors were hoping for the success of Henry Ford's great venture. They knew that its success meant business prosperity, free and easy money. As Henry Ford sold cars, we would sell cars.

Oh, my countrymen, what a brilliant success followed this gigantic world sale. Nothing so enormous was ever planned in the business world before. The success of this marvelous venture was even beyond the dreams of those who planned and executed it. At 7 o'clock Friday morning, December 2, the window shades shot up in the thousands of salesrooms all over the world, and there stood in public view the six Ford models. Fifty thousand people were storming for entrance to one showroom alone.

Do not worry about prosperity. Take your blistering tax hands off of the automobile industry and continued prosperity is assured in this country for years to come.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the splendid victory of the automobile interests in the House a few days ago is practically the culmination of a brilliant campaign waged for the past four years, for there is little doubt in my mind that the Senate has been prepared for some time to repeal the war excise sales tax on automobiles.

The first gun was fired before the Ways and Means Committee of the House at the opening of Congress in 1923, when I appeared and asked the members of that committee to begin the gradual repeal of the auto taxes. I was told peremptorily by some members of the committee that the taxes were on to stay, and one member said they might even be increased. The committee refused to touch the auto taxes in the bill it presented to the House, but I carried the fight to the floor of the House and won with practically a unanimous vote a cut of about $32,000,000 per year. The Senate ratified the action and even voted a further cut of about $5,000,000 per year, but this latter cut the House conferees refused to accept.

TWO MORE BIG CUTS

The Treasury Department felt the pressure of the highly organized auto forces and voluntarily granted a further cut of about $50,000,000 per year in 1926. This pressure has resulted in the Ways and Means Committee granting a cut of about $33,000,000 per year at the opening of this session, and a few days ago the House by a majority of nearly a hundred votes in an aye-and-nay roll call has voted for another cut of about $33,000,000 per year and to eliminate this unjust tax entirely.

I told the Ways and Means Committee emphatically in 1923 that the tax would have to come off, and now the deed is practically done. The four years of fighting have disclosed that the automobile interests have more political power than any other force in this country. They merely had to be awakened to their strength and to the ambition to defend themselves. The group of auto organizations were kind enough to accept me as their leader in the campaign of 1923–24, and they have won this supreme victory by following the plans I laid to carry the automotive propaganda back to the districts of Congressmen and Senators 12 months in the year.

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATION

The 22,000,000 auto owners were effectually mobilized and the various branches of manufacturing and repair were brought into the fray. A number of great national associations, including millions of voters and billions in capital, were highly organized. It was a political machine the like of which has never been seen before in American industry. Let him who dare encroach upon the auto industry from now on or try to subject it to persecution.

Much credit should be given to two Detroiters for the sensational victories in Washington. They are Thomas P. Henry, president of the American Automobile Association, speaking for the millions of car owners, and Roy D. Chapin, president of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, the organization of the auto manufacturers.

The auto industry has been recognized everywhere as the first industry of the land in capital and production. Now it is seen as the most powerful politically in the country.

I have been very happy in having the indorsement of every one of the great national auto organizations and with being credited in some of the leading automotive magazines with having initiated the battle for auto tax repeal and being its original leader.

PLANS FOLLOWED FOUR YEARS

The battle for auto tax elimination in this session of Congress has been very similar to the original campaign begun in 1923. The Treasury Department and the President of the United States have been strenuously opposed to any auto tax cut. Skirmishing began in the Ways and Means Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee in its report to the House cut the existing auto taxes in half, although in 1923 they refused to grant any cut. As a matter of fact, in December, 1923, the auto interests finally had a majority of 13 to 12 for a substantial auto tax reduction, but a vote was prevented by a summary adjournment of the committee. The victory was then won on the floor of the House and in the Senate and the President could not refuse to sign the bill.

THE AUTO BLOC

One of the authentic stories of the auto-tax fight is told in a leading auto magazine, namely, Automotive Industries, in its issue of March 6, 1924. This magazine was the official spokesman for the auto manufacturers. The author is one of their staff, Mr. James Dalton.

Excerpts from the article are as follows:

The automobile bloc in the House of Representatives has scored a great victory in its fight for reduction in automotive excise taxes. Success is more surprising because there was no such bloc until December 10, 1923, and when it was organized it contained only one member. * * * Representative ROBERT H. CLANCY, of Michigan, conceived the idea of organizing his one-man automobile bloc. What follows constitutes the most interesting chapter in the history of the motor vehicle.

The efforts of the friends of the auto industry before the Ways and Means Committee are recited in the story, which then continues:

The spokesmen were heard politely, but the only ripple of interest they evoked among Republican members was the reference to 15,000,000 citizen motorists, most of whom probably were voters. But it was felt the 15,000,000 never had made their voices heard politically and probably wouldn't.

Therefore when the bill came to a vote, the majority, being good Republicans and naturally anxious not to go counter to the wishes of the administration, followed the presumptive advice of Mr. Mellon and left the automotive sections exactly as they were.

Meanwhile, knowing what would happen in the committee, the one-man automobile bloc composed exclusively of Mr. CLANCY, had not been idle. As a Representative of Michigan he was familiar with the affairs of the industry. He was honestly convinced that retention of the automotive excise taxes when all others were being removed or reduced was distinctly unfair and discriminatory.

Mr. CLANCY is not unfamiliar with the intricacies of politics. He knows all about the voices which Congressmen must hear before they can be convinced. * * * Ten weeks ago he was able to visualize what would happen if any respectable fraction of the 15,000,000 motorists of the country would raise their voices so their Representatives could hear them.

THE APPEAL TO THE HOUSE

With his convictions, his vision, and his political astuteness Mr. CLANCY had no great difficulty in adding the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee to his bloc. Under his leadership they vigorously espoused the cause of automotive excise tax removal or reduction. He made a ringing speech on the floor denouncing the majority for deserting the Nation's greatest industry, and in support of the bills he had introduced for the removal of all the automotive excise levies.

The associations representing various branches of the industry and the Nation's motorists rallied around Mr. CLANCY and gave him their whole-hearted support. They had argued consistently for three years for tax relief and their arguments were irrefutable, but they made no progress for the simple reason that the voices which Congressmen dread were not raised in their support.

There was only one sure way to get action in Congress and that was to stir up constituents so they would raise their voices. Appeals were sent to all the members of all the organizations to write or wire their Representatives demanding excise tax relief. The National Automobile Dealers' Association went after the dealers and the dealers went after their customers. The Automobile Association of America went after the motorists. Every Member of Congress was bombarded daily with striking literature telling briefly and pointedly the ways in which motorists are overtaxed.

FARM BLOC BROUGHT IN

Then the Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange were given facts and figures demonstrating that automotive excise taxes cost the farmers of the country $45,000,000 a year. That swung the farmers into line and the farmers are thoroughly familiar with the best methods of making their voices heard on Capitol Hill.

The literature which was being fired at Members of the House was followed up by personal calls and direct arguments in as many cases as possible. In the beginning the results of these presentations appeared to be negligible.

Soon, however, Congressmen began to hear voices. The farmers, who never have acquired the habit of paying taxes silently and with resignation, were the first to act. They knew exactly what to do. They protested to the Representatives of their own districts and to the representatives of their organizations in Washington, who acted promptly.

Then the motorists raised their voices. Louder and louder rose the chorus. Congressional mail assumed alarming proportions. Messengers and pages were trotting around all the time with telegrams. They all told the same story—indignation at the retention of automotive excise taxes when they were being removed from nearly all other products.

REPRESENTATIVES GARNER, GREEN, AND M'LAUGHLIN HELP

For the first time in history the political consciousness of the motorists of the country had been aroused and they had become vocal. Mr. CLANCY'S automobile bloc grew larger by the day and almost by the hour. Representative GARNER of Texas, a potent factor in the Democratic ranks and the author of a plan of his own as a substitute for the Mellon plan of income-tax reduction, saw possibilities in an alliance with it. The same was true to a certain extent of Chairman GREEN of Iowa, of the Ways and Means Committee, who didn't like the Mellon bill any better than GARNER, but who voted for it chiefly to get it out on the floor, where it could be shot full of holes.

In the meantime Representative MCLAUGHLIN, Republican, dean of the Michigan delegation and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, had seen the light. He concluded that the minimum automotive-tax reduction program agreed upon was no more than fair. Mr. CLANCY, being a good politician and knowing he could count on Democratic support anyway, agreed that he would not press his bills for total abolition of the taxes if Mr. MCLAUGHLIN would offer an amendment to the automotive sections of the pending bill providing for the dropping of the levy from trucks costing $1,000 or less and for a cut of 50 per cent in the tax on repair parts and accessories. He found that it would gratify Mr. MCLAUGHLIN to do just that.

When the vote was taken not one Member of the House out of the 435 dared to vote against the measure for auto tax reduction. The Senate was similarly lined up and there was not a vote against the measure in the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senate was even more friendly and gave an additional $5,000,000 reduction, but when the Senate and House conferees got together this additional $5,000,000 was stricken out.

THE LAST CHAPTER

The auto-tax fight of 1923 and 1924 was probably the most sensational battle fought in the House during that Congress. The same tactics used to win that victory have been used in 1925, 1926, and 1927 to totally eliminate this tax.

It remains but for the Senate to agree to the House action and the final chapter will be written. The value of this victory to the automobile industry and to the 22,000,000 owners of cars can hardly be calculated. If the old taxes had remained, they would be a yearly burden of over $160,000,000. Thus each few years there would be placed upon the automobile industry and its customers the appalling handicap of over a billion dollars. This added to the numerous other taxes on the industry and its customers would be a burden which would seriously cripple the auto interests and in a larger sense the progress and prosperity of this country and of every country in which the American automobile is used, and which is a tremendous factor in the uplifting of mankind.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the tax bill under consideration shows careful and painstaking work on the part of the committee which prepared it. This is the fourth tax-reduction measure which has been presented to the Congress since the Republican Party came into power in 1921. Conditions growing out of the war which affected business abnormally have now largely been removed. This revenue bill of 1928, then, may very likely be the tax law for some years to come, and whatever changes are to be made for the next few years must be made now.

The President points out in his message that the reduction brought about by it "should be mainly for the purpose of removing inequalities." There is, in my opinion, an outstanding condition of inequality existing in the law as it is to-day and I, for one, regret that the committee did not see fit to devise an adequate remedy. I refer to the tax on small corporations which are not oftentimes much larger than the individually conducted business or the partnership and are in competition with them.

Secretary Mellon, in his statement to the committe, evidently recognized that such an inequality exists and suggested the following remedy in his recommendation to the committee:

Amending those provisions of the law that apply to the tax on corporate income so as to permit corporations with net income of $25,000 or less, and with not more than 10 stockholders, to file returns and pay the tax as partnerships at their option. It is estimated that such an amendment will result in a loss of from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000 in revenue.

In illustrating the inequality which exists throughout the country under the present law I can do no better than to quote a portion of a letter written me by Hon. Erwin M. Harvey, commissioner of taxes of the State of Vermont, when the revenue act of 1926 was under consideration:

At the present time the tax on corporations is very inequitable and unjust to small industrial corporations in Vermont. The present tax of 12½ per cent, which it is suggested be raised to 13½ per cent, is out of proportion to the tax on individuals. In my own private practice of the law I have fostered and encouraged the formation of private corporations for the operation of industrial enterprises. It is, however, becoming more and more difficult to convince men that the principle is right. In practice it works out something like this: Three men have a little corporation for the conduct of a granite business. Their corporation-tax returns show a net taxable income of $5,000. From this an exemption of $2,000 is deducted, leaving a tax to be computed at 12½ per cent upon $3,000, or $375. To this in the past a capital-stock tax of $1 per thousand is added. This, in the illustrative case, may be $25 more, making a gross payment of $400. The adjoining stone shed is being operated by three men who are working under a partnership organization. Their net income is the same, or $5,000. I need not call your attention to the fact that the partnership as a legal unit pays no tax. It files, however, an annual income-tax return, and from this return the net income is reflected over and divided among the partners. Each partner pays a tax of 2 per cent or less. In some instances the liberal deductions given to the individual are such that little or no tax is paid. Upon the assumption that all of this business income is reflected over and through the individual tax returns a tax of 2 per cent is paid. This group of men operating under a partnership organization are paying taxes aggregating $100, against $400 under the corporation formation. These men are very rapidly comparing notes. They are becoming dissatisfied, and unless some change is made many of these men will abandon the corporation form of doing business. This will be reflected not only in a mix-up in business conditions, but it will result in loss of revenue to the State of Vermont through the annual license tax which is paid through this office.

The illustrative case cited by Commissioner Harvey in 1926 would present, under the terms of the act now under consideration, still greater inequalities. Each partner in the partnership, if married, would have an exemption of $3,500 before the assessment of income tax, with further exemptions for dependents. The chances are that none of the partners would pay an income tax to the Federal Government. On the other hand, if the business is incorporated, the net income of $5,000

under the proposed act would have an exemption of $3,000, and the $2,000 left would be taxed at the rate of 11½ per cent, or $230. Suppose the net income should be $10,000. The partners, if the enterprise remained a partnership, would still probably pay no income tax, or at most would pay but a few dollars; but if their business were incorporated, the corporation would have to pay $805 tax to the Federal Government.

The small corporation may not be of such importance in the great industrial States where business is conducted on a gigantic scale; but in the rural States I submit that it is exceedingly important and should not be hampered and discouraged by unequal taxation. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that a reduction in the rate of taxation on the net income of the small corporations will encourage their organizations and will result in a greater revenue to the Government, while if the rate is left as it is their number will decrease; they will change from the corporate to the partnership or individual form of doing business, and the revenue derived from the corporate source will become correspondingly less.

THE DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the election of the President.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the election of the President. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the Electoral College system for the selection of the President was originally adopted as part of the Constitution on the theory that its members would be superior men who would use a wise, impartial, and judicial fairness in making the best possible selection of a President. Within a few decades the presidential electors were deprived of all discretion and pledged in advance to vote only for the candidates approved by the political group that selected them. Thus the reason for the Electoral College system ceased to exist. It has ever since been generally known to be unsatisfactory, but due to the inertia of public sentiment, the difficulty of changing the Constitution, and the lack of agreement on a better plan the system has remained as part of our election machinery.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 2, proposing to amend the provisions of the Constitution for the election of President. This amendment, in substance, if adopted would—

(1) Abolish the Electoral College.

(2) Provide for a direct vote for President and Vice President.

(3) Cause State returns to be certified to Congress.

(4) Provide that in computing the result in Congress, each State would retain its proportion of electoral votes as at present.

(5) Provide that each candidate be given such proportion of the electoral vote of the State as his popular vote therein bears to the total vote for all candidates. In other words, the proportionate State vote would be substituted for the present unit vote. In estimating the result, in the interest of simplicity, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth would be disregarded unless a more detailed computation would change the result of the election.

(6) Provide that the candidate receiving the highest number of electoral votes would be elected.

(7) Give Congress power to shorten the terms of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress not more than two months, to abolish the short session of Congress, and to provide that the new Congress shall assemble more promptly after election.

(8) Provide a method of filling the vacancy in case of the death of the President elect and Vice President elect before their induction into office. This contingency is not now provided for in the Constitution.

(9) Give assurance that the political group electing its candidate would have one of its group succeed to the Presidency in case of death of the President elect and Vice President elect. This would be accomplished by permitting the President elect to designate his Cabinet officers, who would in case of the disability of the President and Vice President succeed to office as in case of a vacancy occurring after the President is installed in office.

THE PRESENT METHOD OF ELECTING A PRESIDENT

Under the present system of electing the President each State elects a number of presidential electors equal to the number of Representatives and Senators to which it is entitled in Congress. The electors are elected by a plurality vote. The presidential electors so chosen from all the States vote for President. With unimportant exceptions the State vote is cast as a unit. Votes cast in the State for the minority candidates for electors are not counted in the final determination of the result. If a majority do not unite in supporting one candidate the election in the Electoral College fails and is thrown into the House of Representatives. There the States vote as a unit. In other words, a majority of the Representatives in the House from each State determines how the total vote of that State shall be counted. The States are all equals, each having but one vote. Pennsylvania with 36 Representatives and Wyoming with 1 are equal in determining who shall be President. It may easily occur that the party which has a majority of the State delegations in the House may not have a majority of the Members of the House. The minority candidate in the State receives no credit for votes cast for him in that State.

Members of the House of Representatives who vote on the selection of a President are elected two years prior to the presidential election then in controversy. They are expected to vote according to their political affiliations, even though the party controlling a majority of the State votes has been repudiated at the last election. The defeated Members may elect the candidate the voters repudiated at the election.

If no candidate receives a majority in the House, all presidential candidates are defeated. The election is thrown into the Senate, which must select a President from one of the two highest candidates for Vice President. The Senators vote according to their party affiliations without regard for popular desire as expressed at the election.

The present system of election misrepresents popular sentiment under a two-party system, and may utterly fail when three or more parties appear in the Electoral College.

The fundamental vice of the constitutional method of electing the President is the failure of that system to register popular opinion accurately. The unit system of selecting a President, both in the Electoral College and by election in the House of Representatives, permits the disregard of the will of the voters as expressed at the latest election.

The unit system of voting is inherently wrong. It permits the majority candidate to appropriate to himself the support of his minority opponent in the State. It permits the misappropriation of votes on a vast scale in defiance of popular will. It permits the defeat of majority candidates and the election of minority candidates. The unit system adds to the prestige of dominant political organizations in the State, but at the expense of misrepresented minorities.

Where the election is thrown into the House a small group controlling the balance of power can defeat the will of the voters, or exact compliance to their own demands in return for their votes in breaking the deadlock.

This system is crude, archaic, incapable of accurately reflecting the will of the voters, and unworthy of a place in a democratic government. The highest purpose of a popular election is to carry into effect the will of the people as expressed at the polls. The existing method of electing a President is poorly qualified for that purpose.

If tolerable consequences have been secured through the present system, the results are due more to good luck than the inherent reliability of the method.

Many illustrations could be given of the inaccuracy with which the electoral system reflects popular sentiment. In 1880 Garfield received about 48 per cent of the popular vote and 57 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1884 Cleveland received about 48 per cent of the popular vote and 54 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1888 Harrison received about 44 per cent of the popular vote and 58 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1892 Cleveland received about 46 per cent of the popular vote and 62 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1896 McKinley received about 50 per cent of the popular vote and 60 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1900 McKinley received over 50 per cent of the popular vote and over 65 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1904 Roosevelt received about 56 per cent of the popular vote and 70 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1908 Taft received about 50 per cent of the popular vote and 60 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1912 Wilson received about 42 per cent of the popular vote and 82 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1916 Wilson received about 49 per cent of the popular vote and 52 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1920 Harding received about 60 per cent of the popular vote and 76 per cent of the electoral vote. In 1924 Coolidge received about 54 per cent of the popular vote and 72 per cent of the electoral vote. LaFollette received about 16 per cent of the popular vote and 3 per cent of the electoral vote.

If one candidate should carry New York by 5,000 majority over an opponent who should carry Nevada by the same majority, the popular vote of these two candidates would be equal. The one who carried New York would have 45 electoral votes

and the one who carried Nevada 3. There is no common sense or just reason why a million votes for a minority candidate in New York should not be counted while 40,000 votes for the same candidate in Nevada would give him the 3 electoral votes of that State.

Eighty-nine is the total membership in the House of the 25 smallest States. Sixty-three of those Members constitute a majority in all these 25 States. Thus it is physically possible, though not probable, that less than 15 per cent of the membership of the House could select the President in case the election be thrown into the House. These facts illustrate the crudeness and unreliability of the constitutional method of electing a President in the House.

Suppose a majority of the State delegations in the House should be Republican and the Senate Democratic and a third-party candidate for President should receive a majority of the popular vote. He would not be elected unless he received a majority in the Electoral College. If he failed to receive that majority the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives where the Republican nominee would be elected. In case the election in the House failed and was thrown into the Senate, the Vice Presidential candidate in the Democratic Party would be elected. In each of these three possibilities the final determination would depend on something other than the popular vote for the candidate at the election. Either method of selecting is artificial and arbitrary.

Twice since 1875 the present system has resulted in the election of minority candidates for President. No election in recent years has strikingly manifested the untoward results of which this system is capable. Its evils may be surprisingly manifested at any election. Those evils will become distressingly apparent in case of the development of three or more parties.

Under the two-party system, for example, one candidate may carry a group of States sufficient to give him the election in the Electoral College at an average majority of 25,000 votes. His opponent may carry an equal or greater number of States by an average majority of two or three times that number. The minority candidate, by popular vote, would be elected and the other candidate, possibly with a majority of a million or more votes, defeated.

Whenever three important parties take part in a presidential election, deadlocks in the Electoral College and in the House are to be expected as natural and probable results of the present crude system of election. The final result to be expected would be a compromise, or trade, in the Senate by which it would make its choice of one of the two highest candidates for Vice President.

ENFRANCHISE MINORITIES

The system which denies State minorities representation in the election of a President is pernicious. Voting by the minority in States definitely committed to one party is a futile act. The minority voter is in effect disfranchised. His vote is not counted in the final result. This discourages the development of minority parties that are needed as a wholesome influence in the public life of the country. The tendency of the present system is to strengthen dominant political parties in the State and develop one-party control, with the indifference and arrogance that frequently attends that system.

Under the proposed amendment minority votes in each State would be counted in computing the final result. Minority voters would be enfranchised. The real contest of a presidential election, instead of being confined to a few doubtful States, would be extended to every precinct in the Nation. The voter, whether he belong to the minority or majority party, whether he be in Vermont, New York, Georgia, or California, would have the same interest in voting. Such a situation would inject new life and new interest, and tend toward a betterment of the political affairs of the country.

The present unit system of voting, which makes the result of the election depend on the electoral vote of a few States or even one State, promotes the corruption of the electorate. Unusual efforts are made and vast sums of money spent in a few doubtful States to swing the election. If such efforts are successful, it is because under the unit system large blocks of minority support are turned into majority votes in the Electoral College. Out of votes that rightfully belong to a disfranchised minority the successful candidate wins his election.

Turning a few thousand votes in our greatest State might win 8 per cent of the electoral votes of the Nation. It would take over 2,000,000 votes to equal that proportion of the popular vote of the country.

The temptation and the possibility of corrupting the few is much greater than that of corrupting hundreds of thousands or millions.

THE AGGREGATE POPULAR VOTE PLAN

The remedy commonly proposed as a substitute for the present system has been the direct election of the President by popular vote, with the office going to the candidate who receives the aggregate plurality vote of the Nation. There seems to be at least two reasons why this plan will never be adopted. One reason is that it would involve the surrender by the small States of a 10 per cent advantage they now have in the election of Presidents. Each State is represented in the Electoral College by the number of its Representatives and Senators in the Congress. Representatives are allotted to the States in proportion to the population. Each State is given two Senators regardless of population. Ten large States of the country have half its population, the other 38 have the other half. The 10 States are represented in the Electoral College by 20 votes as equivalent to their Senators. The other 38 States are represented by 76 votes as equivalent to their Senators. Under a system of aggregate popular voting, the small States would be deprived of this advantage. They can not be deprived of it without their consent. It is improbable they will ever surrender that advantage.

The second reason is the varied qualifications of voters in the different States. It would be to the advantage of the individual State, particularly if a sectional or local question were involved to cast the greatest possible popular vote. The States would be unwilling to enter into competition with each other in relaxing the qualifications of voters under a temptation to increase their voting population and thus increase their power in the election of a President. Neither would the States be willing to permit the Federal Government to set aside their election laws and prescribe uniform qualifications for voters.

The proportion who vote varies greatly as between States and within the same State, due to differences in the qualifications which limit the voting class, the extent to which the people are interested and aroused, the issues involved, the closeness of the contest, and the activities of interested groups.

The proportionate number of persons who vote in the various States has been a matter of frequent criticism and discussion. Suppose A and B States are of equal population, say, 3,000,000; 30 per cent of the population in A State votes and only 20 per cent in B State. Thus the total votes are 900,000 and 600,000, respectively, in the two States of equal population. Should the relative strength of these States in the selection of a President be determined by the number of their populations or by the number of their votes?

The present system is founded on the theory that the number of their populations should be the test of their relative strength in the election of a President. The proposed amendment retains that general theory, partly because it is unlikely any other plan can now be substituted and also because this theory, when practically applied, is probably more satisfactory.

Essentially, all our voting is representative. On the average, less than 25 per cent of the population of the country votes. In practical effect 25 per cent vote for themselves and also for the 75 per cent of the people who do not vote and who either have no right to vote or voluntarily refrain from voting. The result of the election affects 100 per cent of the population. The vast majority of the people have a part in the election only by representation through that small part of the population that in fact votes. Those who can not vote or refrain from voting share the result of the election, for weal or woe, as certainly and definitely as those who vote. Whether 15 per cent or 30 per cent of the population of the State vote, the effect is more accurately measured by the population than by the number of voters.

So far the experience of government has developed no system that more accurately registers the will of the whole population than a free and open election at which restricted classes of the population known as "the qualified voters" express the will of the people at the polls.

The State is an established political unit and is usually a more or less harmonious economic and geographical group. The State lines may therefore be accepted as the best lines of discrimination available for equalizing local or temporary variations in the proportions of voters to population.

Under the plan proposed this inequality of voting populations in the States is minimized greatly by establishing the proportionate voting system as a substitute for the present unit system. The rival candidates would more nearly share equally the effects of either a large or small vote in any State.

FILLING VACANCY ON DEATH OF ELECTED CANDIDATES

The Constitution provides no method by which the political group succeeding at the election in case of the death of its candidates before the term begins can be assured that one of its

group or one representing its political principles shall fill the vacancy.

The present law enacted under authority of the Constitution provides that certain members of the Cabinet in a specified order may succeed to the Presidency in case of the death of the President and Vice President. The proposed amendment would permit Congress to provide that the President elect could designate those he intends to appoint to his Cabinet. In case of the death of the President elect and the Vice President elect and the confirmation by the Senate of the appointment of the Cabinet members, they would be entitled to succeed to the Presidency as in case of a vacancy created after the newly elected President had gone into office. Thus assurance would be given that a representative of the political group succeeding at the election would fill the vacancy. The President in effect now chooses his successor in case of the death of himself and the Vice President. It would seem the President elect in advance of his installation should have the same power and thus provide a certain means of succession to the Presidency in case of the death of the elected candidates.

PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

The Norris amendment, favorably reported by the House Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress at the last session of Congress, proposes to shorten one term of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress and prescribe definite dates at which the new terms shall begin in January instead of March as at present.

The amendment here proposed necessarily deals with those provisions of the Constitution. The situation is covered by a provision giving Congress power to shorten the terms of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress not more than two months. This would simply give Congress power to shorten the terms, abolish the short session of Congress, and fix the date when a new Congress should meet.

Under the present plan the Members of a new Congress do not meet in regular session until 13 months after elected. They are then within 11 months of another election. The second election occurs after their first session in office, but before their last. If defeated at the election, they remain in office to exercise its powers contrary to the will of the voters so expressed.

The effect of this situation is not wholesome. It unreasonably delays the Members of Congress in carrying out the purposes for which they were elected. The second session under this plan ends in a jam, with legislation passing and failing very much in disregard of merit and without opportunity for proper consideration. The amendment proposed would give Congress power to shorten the terms of President and Members of Congress so the new Congress could assemble in the early part of the year. Then a newly elected administration could with reasonable promptness take up the duties intrusted to it by the people.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an amendment which I shall offer to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 226, after line 17, insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 707. SALES OF REAL ESTATE—RETROACTIVE

If in the return of a taxpayer for the taxable year 1924, 1925, or 1926 there was included income from the sale of real estate, and part of the consideration received upon such sale consisted of evidences of indebtedness, and it appears that the fair market value of such evidences of indebtedness, on the date of the enactment of this act, is less than 50 per cent of their face value, then, at the request of the taxpayer, the tax for such taxable year shall be redetermined, so far as relating to the income from such sale, substituting the fair market value of such evidences of indebtedness on the date of the enactment of this act for their fair market value on the date of their receipt by the taxpayer.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed with illustrations 9,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the Seventieth Congress, first session, on the control of the destructive flood waters of the United States, of which the Public Printer shall deliver 6,200 copies to the folding room of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies to the folding room of the Senate for equal apportionment to the Members of each House, respectively, and 1,800 copies shall be delivered to the House folding room and placed to the credit of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "nine thousand" and insert "three thousand."

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "six thousand two hundred" and insert "one thousand four hundred."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "one thousand" and insert "six hundred."

Page 1, line 13, strike out, at the end of the line, "eight hundred."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was adopted.

THE LATE BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH E. LEE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McMILLAN. Gentlemen of the House, there was buried at Arlington National Cemetery yesterday, with high military honors, Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Lee, a native of Summerville, S. C., and I have asked permission for a minute's time to bring to the attention of the House a few facts in connection with the life and character of this outstanding and distinguished South Carolinian.

General Lee received his early educational training in the city schools of Charleston and at the Porter Military Academy. He was admitted to the South Carolina bar at a very early age.

In 1888 he entered the State militia of South Carolina as a private, and by his loyalty to the service, coupled with his efficiency and ability, was advanced in rank until finally appointed brigadier general by the governor in command of the First Brigade of South Carolina. Although holding high military rank, General Lee at the same time actively interested himself in professional, political, and civic matters. In 1898, at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, he was recommended by President McKinley to serve as a brigadier general of United States Volunteers.

Soon after the Spanish-American War he moved to Spartanburg, S. C., where he resumed the practice of law and engaged in a successful newspaper enterprise, and later served as president of the South Carolina State Press Association.

In February, 1917, General Lee was appointed major, Quartermaster Reserve Corps, United States Army. He was called to active duty the following May and reported at Front Royal, Va. Shortly afterwards he was transferred to Newport News, and in July was appointed assistant to the commanding officer at the port of embarkation. He organized the supply division and served as its chief until September, 1917, later being appointed officer in charge. He served in this capacity until 1918, when he was transferred to the war prison barracks at Fort McPherson, Ga., as post quartermaster.

On October 31 General Lee was honorably discharged from service, due to disability incurred in line of duty, and which finally caused his death.

General Lee was an emergency officer of the World War. Although he had seen military service covering a period of years with the State militia of South Carolina, and a veteran of the Spanish-American War, he was ready for his country's call in its need for trained military leaders at the outbreak of the World War. It is, accordingly, to such men as General Lee and many other emergency officers of the World War that we can pause here for a moment at their passing into the great beyond and pay to them a word of tribute and respect for the patriotic services they have rendered to their country's cause. [Applause.]

COPY OF TELEGRAM TO COLONEL LINDBERGH

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House for printing in the RECORD a copy of the telegram he sent Colonel Lindbergh by direction of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1927.

Col. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH,

Care American Embassy, Mexico City, Mexico:

By direction of the House of Representatives and in its name I extend sincere felicitations upon the successful culmination of your great and significant exploit. We wish you a happy sojourn in the land of our esteemed and friendly neighbor.

NICHOLAS LONGWORTH.

WHITE v. CLARK

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Communication from the Clerk transmitting papers in the contest of Clark v. White.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed with accompanying papers, and referred to Committee on Elections No. 1.

WEFALD v. SELVIG

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmitting papers in the contest of Wefald v. Selvig.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed with accompanying papers, and referred to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

TAYLOR v. ENGLAND

The SPEAKER. The Speaker also lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

Communication from the Clerk transmitting papers, testimony, and documents relative to the contest of Taylor v. England.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed with accompanying papers, and referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

HUBBARD v. LA GUARDIA

The SPEAKER. The Speaker also lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

Communication from the Clerk transmitting papers in the contest of Hubbard v. LaGuardia.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed with accompanying papers, and referred to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There has been an abatement, and I do not think he wants to order that printed. There is an abatement of the contest.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it ought to be printed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred, as follows:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By request of Mr. COLTON, Mr. LEATHERWOOD was given leave of absence for one week, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request, that on Friday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of unfinished business, in the event the alien property bill is not taken up before the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a petition of the National Equal Rights League on behalf of the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw that. It has been the effort at this session of Congress to keep out petitions and resolutions. I should not at any time object to any Member extending his own remarks, but I shall have to object to the printing of matters outside of speeches. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request. If not, I shall object.

Mr. DALLINGER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 15, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 15, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

For the relief of flood-stricken farm areas in southern United States, with special reference to aid in the employment of county agents (H. J. Res. 4).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

Flood relief for the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

206. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Tampa and Millsboro Bays, Fla., and Tampa Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

207. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

208. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Knobbs Creek, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

209. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

210. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To remove the limitation on retirement of officers in the Naval Dental Corps"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

211. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the care and treatment of naval patients, on the active or retired list, in other Government hospitals when naval hospital facilities are not available"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

212. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of E. M. Gillett and J. H. Swenarton"; to the Committee on Claims.

213. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting suggested form of bill for the relief of Adriano Cruceta, a citizen of the Dominican Republic, authorizing an appropriation in the sum of $1,000 as indemnity for the death of his son, Rafeal Antonio, caused by a member of the United States Marine Corps at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, on August 22, 1923; to the Committee on Claims.

214. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the increase of the Naval Establishment"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

215. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Harlem River, N. Y., with a view to determining and reporting to Congress whether fixed bridges should be permitted across said river, and, if such bridges are deemed permissible, what clearance should be required in the interest of navigation (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

216. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Morehead City Harbor, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

217. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Port Alexander, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

218. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Cockrelle Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

219. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Illinois and Mississippi Canal in the vicinity of Mud Creek, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

220. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Resurrection Bay breakwater or harbor of refuge, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

221. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill entitled "To authorize payment of compensation to retired warrant officers and enlisted men employed by the Panama Canal"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Jose Francisco Rivas, of Leon, Nicaragua"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report extending the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to Juan Anorbs; to the Committee on Claims.

224. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report extending the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to Athanasios Metaxiotis; to the Committee on Claims.

225. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report extending the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to Charles C. J. Wirz; to the Committee on Claims.

226. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report extending the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to Steadman Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

227. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Coos Bay, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

228. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Delaware River, N. J., in the vicinity of Camden (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

229. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Anclote River, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

230. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Salem Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

231. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Ketchikan Creek and Sexman Harbor, Tongass Narrows, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

232. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting list of cases of relief granted since last report under date of December 17, 1926; to the Committee on Expenditures.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NEWTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 193. A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 444. A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.; with amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5582. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street in the city of El Paso crosses the Rio Grande, in the county of El Paso, State of Texas; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEERY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5628. A bill to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5642. A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Red River at Fulton, Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEERY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6053. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington Road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6479. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6657. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1697) granting a pension to Ida M. Cole; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5955) granting an increase of pension to Theresa McCleary; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4356) granting a pension to Eliza Gibbs; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5966) granting a pension to Anna N. Ford; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5972) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hayes; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5959) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Slawson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5960) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lake; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5961) granting a pension to Viola Scanlon; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5962) granting a pension to Sarah R. Garrison; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5964) granting a pension to Catherine Gollen; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5965) granting a pension to Delila A. Lilerbridge; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DE ROUEN: A bill (H. R. 7335) to provide a site and erect a public building at Oakdale, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7336) to provide a site and erect a public building at De Ridder, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7337) to provide a site and erect a public building at Eunice, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWLING: A bill (H. R. 7338) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 7339) providing for the purchase of a suitable site and the erection of a public building at Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7340) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Falls Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Inter-State and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 7341) to authorize the payment of additional compensation to the assistants to the engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7342) to fix the salaries of the members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 7343) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 7344) to authorize the President to detail engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture to assist the governments of the Latin-American Republics in highway matters; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 7345) to repeal part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes," approved January 12, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7346) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment thereon in claims which the Winnebago Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 7347) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Mahanoy City, Pa., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7348) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a Federal building at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7349) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a Federal building at Shenandoah, Pa., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7350) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a Federal building at Minersville, Pa., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 7351) to provide for the extension of Federal aid in highway construction to rural free-delivery routes and star mail routes which do not constitute portions of Federal or State highway systems designated under existing laws to receive Federal aid as primary (or interstate) or secondary (or intercounty) routes, and providing for the expenditure of such sums of money as may be appropriated hereunder; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 7352) to amend subsection B of section 302 of the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7353) making an appropriation of $1,000,000 available for the improvement and maintenance of Savannah Harbor from the bar to a point opposite the creosoting plant; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 7354) to allow the Postmaster General to promote mechanics' helpers to the first grade of special mechanics; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 7355) authorizing the payment of certain sums to Roosevelt County, Mont.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7356) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 7357) for the erection of a public building at the city of Glendale, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 7358) to amend section 4 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 7359) to provide for the increase of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 7360) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 7361) authorizing the establishment of a migratory-bird refuge in the Cheyenne Bottoms, Barton County, Kans.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7362) authorizing and directing the Inland Waterways Corporation to initiate water carriage upon the Hennepin Canal, Illinois River, and connecting canals with Lake Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 7363) giving retired officers credit for active service performed since retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7364) giving retired officers credit for active service performed since retirement; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 7365) to provide for public education upon political questions and for the dissemination of information upon political issues and matters of a political nature of public interest; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 7366) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 7367) to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Seward, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7368) to authorize the payment of compensation to retired warrant officers and enlisted men employed by the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 7369) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in the amendment thereof; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7370) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River, near Indian Cove Ferry, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7371) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River, near Heyburn, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 7372) conferring on the United States district courts jurisdiction to hear and determine the issues between operators of sailing vessels and the United States Government in all cases wherein loss or damages are claimed as a proximate result of the promulgation, adoption, or enforcement of certain orders by the United States Shipping Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7373) providing for the meeting of electors of President and Vice President, and for the issuance and transmission of the certificates of their selection and of the result of their determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7374) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River, near Swan Valley, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLGOOD: A bill (H. R. 7375) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Tennessee River near Guntersville on the Guntersville-Huntsville road in Marshall County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7376) to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 95) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. BELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) to correct an error in the Senate and House records of the Sixty-third Congress in the matter of the bills H. R. 7140 and S. 2810 entitled "A bill for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Nicholls," and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $33,450 to Elizabeth R. Nicholls and Joanna L. Nicholls, sole heirs of Joshua Nicholls, deceased, appropriated for them under said bills; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 97) to authorize the Alaska Game Commission to make refunds of license fees in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McLEOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 10) that there shall be reprinted and bound in the form of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 17,000 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Baron von Steuben in Washington, December 7, 1910, together with the proceedings relating to the unveiling of a replica of the statue of Baron von Steuben in Berlin September 2, 1911; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 7377) granting an increase of pension to Nannie J. Heinbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 7378) for the relief of Wade Allen and Ed Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 7379) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 7380) granting a pension to George S. Boutwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 7381) granting a pension to Martha F. Fry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLEY: A bill (H. R. 7382) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Leydet; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 7383) for the relief of Charlotte Robenalt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 7384) to authorize the appointment of Quartermaster Sergt. John Imhof, second grade, retired, United States Army, to quartermaster sergeant, first grade, retired, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7385) to authorize the appointment of Staff Sergt. Charles Mingus, retired, United States Army, to master sergeant, retired, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7386) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Robert H. White to the position and rank of major surgeon in the United States Army, and immediately retire him with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7387) granting a pension to Gertrude Delaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7388) granting a pension to Mary E. Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 7389) granting a pension to Carrie E. Viney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7390) granting a pension to R. D. S. Oakford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7391) granting an increase of pension to Permalia A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7392) for the relief of John I. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7393) for the relief of Pietro Bruno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7394) providing for the examination and survey of Richardson Creek, Ga.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 7395) granting a pension to Hannah B. Mead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7396) for the relief of Hans Roehl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 7397) authorizing the President to order Richard B. Barnitz before a retiring board for a hearing of his case and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 7398) for the relief of Catherine White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7399) granting a pension to Lee Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 7400) granting a pension to Susan E. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7401) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Fitzmaurice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7402) granting a pension to Annie A. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 7403) for the relief of William Lowell McBride; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7404) for the relief of Ellen Kline; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 7405) granting an increase of pension to Permelia Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7406) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. File; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7407) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Belles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 7408) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 7409) to authorize the appointment of Capt. John J. Campbell, resigned, to the grade of captain, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 7410) granting a pension to Mathilda H. Byrnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 7411) for the relief of Gilbert Faustina and John Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 7412) granting a pension to Hester M. Conklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7413) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 7414) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Corrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 7415) granting a pension to Charlie Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 7416) granting a pension to Jennie Ellen Powell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 7417) for the relief of Clara E. Wight; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 7418) granting a pension to Victor A. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7419) granting a pension to John F. Kopczynski; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7420) for the relief of James Colton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7421) for the relief of George W. McAnulty; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7422) granting an increase of pension to Alice Van Every; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 7423) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda J. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 7424) granting an increase of pension to Annie Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7425) granting an increase of pension to Delia M. Storie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7426) granting an increase of pension to Bridget M. Brashna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7427) granting an increase of pension to Emily Mapes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7428) granting an increase of pension to Lena Stuckey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7429) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Pettit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 7430) granting an increase of pension to Anna Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7431) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 7432) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Storms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7433) granting a pension to Grace P. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 7434) for the relief of Angustus P. Marrs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7435) granting an increase of pension to Evaline Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7436) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Bobo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7437) granting a pension to Frances Harmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7438) granting a pension to Frank A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7439) for the relief of Thomas Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 7440) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 7441) granting an increase of pension to Louisa H. Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 7442) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7443) granting an increase of pension to George Kellar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7444) granting an increase of pension to Frances Heath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7445) for the relief of Sheldon R. Purdy; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 7446) granting an increase of pension to Jane Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 7447) for the relief of Webster Flanagan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution (H. Res. 56) authorizing payment of one month's salary and funeral expenses to E. Kate Gilbert, on account of death of William R. Palmer, late employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

156. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

157. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War and the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the United States Veterans hospital, Castlepoint, N. Y.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

158. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition signed by 150 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

159. Also, petition from Local Union No. 679, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that certain conditions in the port of New York be eliminated; to the Committee on Labor.

160. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition to Congress against compulsory Sunday observance by 41 citizens of Johnson County, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

161. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Memorial of National Camp, Patriotic Sons of America, advocating the enactment of legislation looking toward the deportation of undesirable aliens and the registration of all foreign-born persons coming to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

162. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Barton Armantrout and 151 other citizens of Calhoun County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

163. Also, petition of John G. Smith and 392 other citizens of Kalamazoo County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

164. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Mr. A. B. Hall, of Oakdale, Nebr., and citizens of that vicinity protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill or any other bill enforcing observance of the Sabbath, or any such resolution proposing such legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

165. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the Michigan Legislature, adopted by both the senate and house of representatives, urging the construction of a shipway from the Great Lakes to the sea for the relief and development of vast areas in the interior of the continent, and the necessity of immediate steps to further the work already begun; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

166. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of William H. Spath and 138 other citizens of Chehalis, Wash., and vicinity favoring pension increases for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

167. Also, resolution adopted at Tacoma, Wash., by the Puget Sound Schoolmasters' Club, favoring negotiation of treaties for the settlement of international disputes without resort to war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

168. By Mr. KADING: Petition of 351 citizens of the city of Watertown, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

169. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 158 residents of Berrien Springs and vicinity, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

170. Also, petition of 66 residents of Benton Harbor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

171. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of the city of Fond du Lac and Fond du Lac County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

172. Also, petition of citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

173. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry citizens of Fall River, Mass., protesting against enactment of compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

174. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition opposing compulsory Sunday observance, by citizens of Ohio City, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

175. By Mr. WASON: Petition of 51 citizens of Washington and Windsor, N. H., protesting against any legislation relating to compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

176. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment of the compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, *December 15, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Whoso dwelleth under the defense of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

O God, inspirer and teacher of men, send out Thy light and illumine us; give us a deep and clear knowledge of ourselves and help us to a growing knowledge of our world. Confirm in us the holiness of true reason; strengthen in us the aspiration toward noble and spacious thinking; and in Thy good time bring us to Thy holy hill, where, lifted above the clouds of passion and the mists of prejudice, we shall think Thine own thoughts after Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 13, 1927, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making

appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. MADDEN, Mr. WOOD, and Mr. BYRNS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

House Concurrent Resolution 6

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed, with illustrations, 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the Seventieth Congress, first session, on the control of the destructive flood waters of the United States, of which the Public Printer shall deliver 1,400 copies to the folding room of the House of Representatives and 600 copies to the folding room of the Senate for equal apportionment to the Members of each House, respectively, and 1,000 copies shall be delivered to the House folding room and placed to the credit of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Bingham	George	McNary	Simmons
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	Metcalf	Steck
Blease	Glass	Moses	Steiwer
Borah	Goff	Neely	Stephens
Bratton	Greene	Norbeck	Swanson
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Thomas
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Bruce	Harrison	Overman	Tyson
Capper	Hawes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hayden	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Heflin	Pittman	Warren
Couzens	Howell	Ransdell	Waterman
Curtis	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Dill	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Edge	King	Sackett	
Ferris	La Follette	Schall	

Mr. BRATTON. My colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico] is absent from the Chamber on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HOWELL. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at his home by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am sure that the heart of every American will thrill this morning at the news which has come of the achievement, of the wonderful success, of Colonel Lindbergh. His flight will do more to cement friendly relations with Mexico than diplomacy can do. A little while ago we were proud at the news which came to us of his achievement in flying across the ocean.

The finest tribute that I have seen or heard to this king of the air comes from a newspaper man known to a good many in this Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, in the usual RECORD type, this tribute to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, being an address of Louis Ludlow, president of the National Press Club, the address having been delivered at a reception in this city on June 11, 1927.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Ludlow's address is as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Address of Louis Ludlow, president of the National Press Club, in presenting Colonel Lindbergh at the home-coming reception given at Washington, D. C., in the latter's honor by the club, June 11, 1927

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, not for ages has the imagination of man been stirred as it was three weeks ago when Charles A. Lindbergh, fired by the intrepid spirit of the Western World, launched forth in his airplane alone, provisioned with four sandwiches and a bottle of water, a pioneer of the trackless seas. As America's shores receded in the distance he faced a vast wilderness of treacherous ocean.

As if roiled by the very boldness of this Columbus of the air—this winged Mercury, speeding like a thunderbolt of Jove—nature sent her tempestuous elements athwart his path, and while he battled with the storm and sleet millions upon millions of his fellow beings sent up prayers for his safety to the throne of God. The 33 hours and 30 minutes from New York to Paris was a period of tragic suspense, when the whole world poured forth in a myriad of mystic ways its admiration for the incomparable aviator and its love for the mother who had brought forth such a boy.

To him mountains of peril were as nothing. His faith was buoyant and his hopes were high. Courage was his woof and fiber, and it is not difficult to imagine that stern fate, surprised by this peremptory challenge of her inexorable decrees, lifted her beetled brows and was touched by the very sublimity of his heroism, for she gave him a sporting chance.

And when he reached the other shores he arose to another test of character as greatly as when he battled with time and the elements. Amid all of the adulations of kings and parliaments he remained a modest, unassuming American, an honor to his home country, an ambassador of good will, doing more to foster amity between nations than could have been done by a thousand ministers of state.

"After all," he said in London, "two Britishers were the first to fly across the Atlantic." Again, when he learned that Chamberlin had started on the long flight, he remarked fervently, "I hope he makes it." Here he struck the major chord of his character in his desire to give to his comrades at home and across the seas a share of his imperishable glory. And when, in foreign lands, the ties of home began to press and strain against his heart and he confessed, in simple truth and sincerity, to being homesick, how America did yearn to take him to her bosom!

His name is now among the immortals. Around the firesides and in the vast, crowded halls of the future, wherever worth is recognized and genius is extolled, his achievement will be recalled with pride by countless generations yet unborn. Nothing finer could have been done; nothing grander could have been done; no greater epic could have been written into history, and to-night we thank Almighty God that in His infinite goodness and mercy He has permitted Charles A. Lindbergh to return to the arms of those who love him.

I now present Colonel Lindbergh.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and accede to the request of the House for conference, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Vice President.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LAWS OF HAWAII, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate copies of the journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, and a copy of the session laws of Hawaii, regular session of 1927, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Public Printer, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of miscellaneous papers and records in the Government Printing Office having no permanent value or historic interest and asking for action looking toward their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. FLETCHER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF INDIANA,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, F. E. Schortemeier, secretary of state of the State of Indiana, hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a full, true, and complete copy of enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 of the seventy-fifth regular session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, begun on the 6th day of January, A. D. 1927, which said resolution was filed in my office on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1927, as the same appears on file, as the law directs, in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and affix the great seal of the State of Indiana. Done at my office, in the city of Indianapolis, this 30th day of November, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] F. E. SCHORTEMEIER,
Secretary of State.

Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920

Whereas the President of the United States in a recent message to the Congress of the United States has stated that the Army and Navy of the United States should be strengthened, and that a people who neglect their national defense are putting in jeopardy their national honor; and

Whereas in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920, and amendments thereto, and in order to increase and promote the strength and effectiveness of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States has recommended substantially as follows:

(a) That the Regular Army be brought back to the strength of 150,000 enlisted men and 13,000 officers, and that it be suitably housed and enabled to conduct annual maneuvers on a moderate scale;

(b) That the National Guard be given the support necessary to permit its progressive development toward a strength of 250,000;

(c) That the skeleton organization of the Organized Reserves be adequately maintained;

(d) That all reserve officers receive an average of 15 days' training in each three years;

(e) That the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units be further developed; and

(f) That provision may be made for a gradual increase in the number accommodated annually in citizens' military training camps: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the State of Indiana respectfully and earnestly urges upon the Congress the necessity of appropriating such funds and enacting such legislation as will adequately provide for the effective carrying out of the provisions of the national defense act of 1920 and also the recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States hereinbefore set forth.

SEC. 2. Suitable copies of this resolution shall be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the members of the congressional Committee on Appropriations and Military Affairs.

F. HAROLD VAN ORMAN,
President of the Senate.
HARRY G. LESLIE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

———, ———,
Governor of the State of Indiana.

Filed February 28, 1927, 4.10 p. m.

F. E. SCHORTEMEIER,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

EIGHTH STATE LEGISLATURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION

House Joint Memorial 1

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Eighth Legislature of the State of Arizona, in special session assembled, does respectfully represent:

That there are approximately 500,000 acres of land in the San Simon and Sulphur Springs Valleys of the State of Arizona which are susceptible of successful agricultural development.

That an abundant supply of water is available at shallow depth in both of said valleys.

That in both valleys also are strong flows of artesian water.

That extensive experiments have established the fact that land in the said San Simon and Sulphur Springs Valleys is of great potential value for agricultural purposes.

That in the county of Cochise, wherein both the said valleys are situated, is located some of the largest copper mines in the world, which said mines would consume great quantities of hydroelectric power.

Whereas there is now being constructed on the Gila River the Coolidge Dam for the purpose of the reclamation of arid lands, your memorialist does respectfully represent that the installation of turbine engines at the said Coolidge Dam for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power will assure the future agricultural development and prosperity of the San Simon and Sulphur Springs Valleys and also assure a source of cheap electrical power for the vast mining interests of Cochise County; and

Whereas the construction of a secondary dam on the Gila River adjacent to the Coolidge Dam for the development of hydroelectric power will insure to the county of Cochise, and especially to the mining industries and the potential agricultural development of the San Simon and the Sulphur Springs Valleys, every incentive for development: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to make sufficient appropriation for the installation of turbine engines at the Coolidge Dam for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power and an additional appropriation for the purpose of construction of a secondary dam adjacent to the aforesaid Coolidge Dam on the Gila River within the State of Arizona; it is further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., to the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives in Congress from the State of Arizona.

Passed the house of representatives November 1, 1927—41 ayes, 2 nays, 3 absent, 6 excused.

Passed the senate November 2, 1927—18 ayes, 1 absent.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram which is in the nature of a petition and ask that it be read. I do not enter at all into the merits of the controversy, because I am not advised regarding it, but I ask that the telegram be read by the clerk and then referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *December 15, 1927.*

HON. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senator of New York State,
Washington, D. C.:

Congregation of Shaare Torah, of Flatbush, representing a community of nearly 1,000 American families of the Jewish faith having been shocked by the news of the outrages recently and now being perpetrated against Jews in Rumania, and appreciating the fact that America has ever championed the cause of the oppressed, at a regular meeting held December 13, 1927, at its synagogue, 2252 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That we hereby protest against the Rumanian Government for its failure to prevent the acts of violence perpetrated against its people of our faith; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we respectfully petition Congress, in session assembled, to request the President of the United States to use his good offices with the Rumanian Government to put an end to these atrocities and to afford equal protection to all of its subjects regardless of race, creed, or color, and we implore the Government of this country, in the name of justice and humanity, to protest to the Government of Rumania against any act of violence perpetrated against any of its subjects; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress, to the United States Senators representing the State of New York, and to the Representative representing our district in Congress.

CONGREGATION SHAARE TORAH, OF FLATBUSH,
JOSEPH MILLER,
Rabbi SAMUEL E. BERNSTEIN, *President.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COPELAND presented memorials numerously signed and telegrams in the nature of memorials, from sundry citizens in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENEEN presented the following house resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Patents:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of House Resolution 68, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 17th day of June, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

House Resolution 68

Whereas under the present copyright act a person who has copyrighted a musical composition has not only the exclusive right to print, reprint, publish, copy, and vend that composition but the additional exclusive right to use that composition publicly for profit; and

Whereas the copyright act provides that the copyright proprietor may recover a sum in certain cases of as much as $100, from the offender for the infringement of this exclusive right to use the composition publicly for profit; and

Whereas protected by this act certain copyright proprietors, in addition to the purchase price, charge unreasonable and exorbitant prices for permission to use the composition publicly for profit; and

Whereas the various copyright proprietors have formed an organization known as the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers for the enforcement of the said provisions of the copyright act and for the protection of their interests thereunder; and

Whereas the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers maintains a supergovernmental enforcement agency with investigators always ready to descend upon any offender and bring him to task; and

Whereas this additional fee for permission to use the composition publicly for profit, and the penalties for, infringement of the same are paid to the copyright proprietor, who ordinarily is not the author or composer of the composition; and

Whereas these provisions of the copyright act are inimicable to the best interests of a majority of the people and make it impossible to present this music to them at reasonable prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the copyright act of 1909 to provide that a person who has copyrighted a dramatico-musical or a choral or orchestral composition or other musical composition, which composition is offered for sale to the public, shall not have the exclusive right to perform the copyrighted work publicly for profit nor be entitled to receive any fee or price in addition to the purchase price, for permission to use the composition in a public performance for profit, nor be entitled to any penalty if the composition is so used without the permission of the copyright proprietor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be delivered to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States, and also to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Illinois.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the house of representatives on the 2d day of June, 1927.

B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House.

Mr. GILLETT. I present a petition from the National Race Congress and Equal Rights League which I request may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The honorable Members of the Congress of the United States:

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787, held for the purpose of creating a "more perfect Union," the question of perpetuating the institution of slavery was the cause of acrimonious debate therein. So heated, indeed, became this controversy between those who were for and those who were against the system of slavery that two compromises upon this issue had to be reached before agreement upon the Constitution could be attained.

George Mason, of Virginia, a delegate to the convention, urged the abolition of slavery and stated that unless the institution was abolished a war between the northern and southern sections of the United States would ensue—the clash of opposing sectional interests could terminate in no other way. This prophet found himself without honor in his own land and walked out of the convention, refusing to affix his signature to the instrument as finally adopted.

From 1787 to 1861 the history of the United States discloses the truth that moral issues dodged, no matter how deftly, will one day strike with crushing force.

Slavery was abolished on the battle fields of the Republic, but in its wake there followed peonage, disfranchisement, lynching, civil and political disabilities imposed upon the people who had just escaped from age-long bondage.

After the passage of 60 years we find colored Americans victimized in many parts of the land and especially at the South by the same evil forces of arrogance and hate which had held them so long in slavery with the aid of governments, both State and Federal.

Fortunately the great leaders of the Nation, at the close of the Civil War, so amended the Constitution as to make it square with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of free democratic government, and under the amended instrument Congress was empowered to enforce these new articles wherever and whenever they should be violated.

We therefore most respectfully invite the attention of Congress to the fact that colored American citizens have been deprived of the right to vote by laws enacted and State constitutions adopted. Cunningly worded statutes were devised to accomplish this purpose, so that if possible these regulations might be held to conform to the amended Constitution.

Much success has thus far attended the efforts of reactionary communities to rob colored American citizens of the right to vote upon terms of equality with their white fellow citizens, but the immediate penalty paid by such communities has been to find themselves pushed backward into the least progressive communities of the land. They have fallen behind economically, educationally, and represent politically ideas which have brought and are continuing to bring in many parts of the world upheaval and revolution. They not only are not abreast of the best American thought, but their hideous reaction has given birth to a lawless organization now engaged in spreading corruption and terror in wide sections of our country.

The failure of the Federal Government to carry out the provisions of the Constitution which guarantee republican forms of government to every State within the Union has resulted in lawlessness on such a widespread scale that even southern officials are becoming alarmed over the situation, and are so expressing themselves.

When white women as well as men are being whipped and maimed by a nationally organized band of disguised thugs, we have a perfect demonstration of the extent to which lawlessness will go from its black to its white victims when once it is allowed to take firm root.

Another moral issue now faces the constituted authorities of the land. Will it be met or will it be dodged, as was the slavery issue?

We most respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to carry out its sworn obligation to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, to the end that the rights of all citizens may be secured under republican forms of government. The Constitution provides the way.

We most respectfully urge upon Congress increased Federal aid to southern education, passage of the Dyer antilynching bill, a law making segregation of colored employees of the Federal civil service a statutory offense, enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution to the end that disfranchisement and racial segregation upon common carriers shall be abolished.

We respectfully request Congress to pass a resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of the naval forces from the Republic of Haiti. Haiti won its independence upon the battle field against iron-fisted oppressors who had held them in slavery and exploited them ruthlessly. No matter whether a forward or a backward nation, it has the right that every nation claims for itself of pursuing its national destiny in its own way. This valiant people, who paid the price of liberty with their blood, sent troops to this country during our own Revolutionary struggle, and greatly aided us at a time when we were weak. To strike them down when we have grown strong is an exhibition of national ingratitude and cements no friendships anywhere in the world for the people of the United States. The South American Republics might all to-day still be under the control of a reactionary Spanish monarchy but for the timely aid and assistance given Bolivar by President Petion, of Haiti. Thus did the Haitian people win their own independence and aid both North and South America in their struggle for liberty, and it ill becomes the people of the United States to bolster up political puppets to govern them and to hold them in subjection with American guns.

Respectfully submitted.

The National Race Congress and Equal Rights League; George Frazier Miller, New York, president; W. H. Jernogin, vice president at large; Wm. Monroe Trotter, Massachusetts, secretary; Halley B. Taylor, chaplain; J. L. Neill, Washington, D. C.; W. A. Taylor, Washington, D. C.; Thos. H. R. Clarke, chairman petitions committee; H. T. Medford, first vice president; W. P. Dabney, Cincinnati, Ohio; J. H. Randolph, assistant corresponding secretary.

Mr. WALSH of Montana presented the following senate resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Relative to the policy of caring for the Indians of Montana by the expenditure of Federal appropriations through State agencies," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 26th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 3d day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Senate Joint Resolution 6, relative to the policy of caring for the Indians of Montana by the expenditure of Federal appropriations through State agencies

Whereas there is now pending in Congress of the United States a bill known as the Wheeler bill (S. 3498), in the House of Representatives, providing that funds appropriated for the care and relief of the Indians of Montana under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of Montana; and

Whereas the Montana State board of health, State board of education, and the State bureau of child and animal protection are excellently equipped to handle such Federal appropriations and administer the relief which they are designed to accomplish for the Indians of Montana; and

Whereas the health, economic welfare, and education of the Indians of Montana is a matter in which the people of this State have a growing concern: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and the house of representatives, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of Montana does hereby heartily indorse the principles embodied in said Wheeler bill pending before the Congress of the United States, and believes that the best interests of the Indians of Montana will be served by its speedy enactment; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate of the United States, as well as to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana.

W. S. MCCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 26, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed February 26, 1927, at 4 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana also presented the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, R. N. Hawkins, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "A memorial to the Senate of the United States, protesting against the enactment of House Calendar 204, S. 481 (Rept. No. 911), commonly known as the corn sugar bill," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 8th day of March, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 11th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] R. N. HAWKINS,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate Joint Memorial 4, to the Senate of the United States protesting against the enactment of House Calendar 204, S. 481 (Rept. No. 911), commonly known as the corn sugar bill

To the honorable Senate of the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a bill commonly known as the corn sugar bill, being House Calendar 204, S. 481 (Rept. No. 911); and

Whereas said bill if enacted would permit the adulteration of about 75 per cent of our food products with corn sugar without declaring the presence of such sugar on the package or other container of such foods; and

Whereas such adulteration is contrary to the existing provisions of the national pure food and drug law and would, if permitted, tend to weaken said law in a vital respect and to greatly reduce the efficiency thereof; and

Whereas we regard the passage of such pending legislation as detrimental to the maintenance of the purity of food products: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we do hereby memorialize the Senate of the United States to refuse to enact the legislation aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Montana.

W. S. MCCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 8, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed March 8, 1927, at 4 o'clock p. m.

R. N. HAWKINS, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, R. N. Hawkins, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to abolish the Federal estate tax," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 7th day of March, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.] R. N. HAWKINS,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Substitute for Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to abolish the Federal estate tax

Whereas there has been and now is considerable propaganda being disseminated to influence the repeal of the Federal estate tax, upon the grounds that it was originally passed as a war measure, and interferes with the full freedom of the States to impose succession taxes; and

Whereas we do not agree with the reasons or purposes urged for the abolishment of this source of revenue, but, on the contrary, firmly believe: (1) That this form of taxation is no longer regarded by this country and other civilized nations of the earth as an emergency war measure but as a legitimate, fair, equitable, and just source of revenue, which is paid largely by one who did not earn the property inherited, who is best able to pay it, and who can not pass such tax to the public. (2) That while the war is over, the financial consequence to the Government will remain for years to come, and it is eminently fair that large estates which have been created or enhanced through war opportunities, and whose property is largely invested in tax-exempt securities, should contribute to the liquidation of these war obligations. (3) That the right of the Federal Government and the States to tax inheritance is coextensive, and the one is independent of the other, and consequently the Federal estate tax does not interfere with the rights of any State which honestly intends to retain this source of revenue, and this agitation is largely from States which have already granted immunity from any State inheritance tax, but, nevertheless, can not successfully attract the wealthy to their shores unless the Federal estate tax is repealed. (4) That the present Federal estate tax allows a credit on its taxes to the extent of 80 per cent thereof for State inheritance taxes paid, and thus the question of double taxation therefore urged as an additional reason for abolishing the Federal tax has largely been removed. (5) That if the Federal estate tax is ever repealed, the States which are not earnestly and honestly in favor of

an inheritance tax may immediately repeal their laws as an invitation and inducement to the wealthy to take refuge within their borders, and the innocent States may be compelled in self-defense to abandon this source of revenue, and within a short time thereafter Federal estate and State inheritance taxes may become a mere memory and relic of the World War, and the extra burden will be shifted proportionately to those who are less able to pay and those who have sacrificed their health and wealth in its successful termination. This we believe to be the real purpose and object of this propaganda: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That we hereby request the Congress not to repeal or abolish the Federal estate tax; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to Montana's Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

W. S. McCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 7, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed March 8, 1927, at 9.58 o'clock a. m.

R. N. HAWKINS, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana also presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Memorial to the Congress of the United States praying for the immediate passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill, an act for the relief of disabled emergency Army officers," now pending, enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 24th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate Joint Memorial 1, to the Congress of the United States, praying for the immediate passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill, an act for the relief of disabled emergency Army officers, now pending

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the members of the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, respectfully represent:

Whereas all other classes of officers who fought in the World War have been retired by Congress for their wounds and the disabled emergency Army officers alone have been denied retirement for their mutilations and disabilities; and

Whereas more than 169 of these disabled Army officers have died since this legislation has been before Congress, awaiting in vain the affirmative action of Congress giving them the relief to which they were so justly entitled; and

Whereas it is the claim of the veterans and organizations favoring the passage of this bill that the same is being kept from being enacted into law by parliamentary tactics alone: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take immediate action on said bill to the end that the same be enacted into law and this discrimination against the disabled emergency Army officers be rectified at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward a copy to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to our Representatives in the United States Congress.

W. S. McCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 24, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed February 24, 1927, at 4.37 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana also presented the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, R. N. Hawkins, of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Memorial to the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to require payment of all moneys received from each forest reserve, after deducting administrative and other expenses, to the State or Territory in which such forest reserve is located for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of such State or Territory," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by J. E. Erickson, Governor of said State, on the 26th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 3d day of March, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Senate Joint Memorial 3, to the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to require payment of all moneys received from each forest reserve, after deducting administrative and other expenses, to the State or Territory in which such forest reserve is located for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of such State or Territory.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the members of the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and the house concurring, respectfully represent:

Whereas by an act of Congress of May 23, 1908, provision is made for payment of 25 per cent of all moneys received from each forest reserve to the treasurer of the State or Territory in which said reserve is located for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which said forest reserve is located; and

Whereas it is the belief of your memorialists that each State and Territory is justly entitled to and should receive all of the moneys from the forest reserve in such State or Territory after deducting administrative and other expenses: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana that the Congress of the United States should enact such legislation as may be necessary to require the payment to each State and Territory in which forest reserves are located of all moneys received from such forest reserves, less administrative and other expenses; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives of Montana in Congress.

W. S. McCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 26, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed February 26, 1927, at 4 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "A resolution expressing the desire of the people of the State of Montana to His Excellency the President of the United States of America and to the Congress of the United States that they take into consideration the necessity on the part of the agricultural interests of the State of Montana for legislation to relieve the present depression which exists in that industry and to set forth the cause and some suggestions for a solution," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 18th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 19th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate Joint Resolution 4, expressing the desire of the people of the State of Montana to His Excellency the President of the United States of America and to the Congress of the United States that they take into consideration the necessity on the part of the agricultural interests of the State of Montana for legislation to relieve the present depression which exists in that industry and to set forth the causes and some suggestions for a solution

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring):

Whereas Congress has, through special legislation in the form of protective tariff, protected the product of labor and industry from the competition of foreign people and has so saved the American market for the products of American labor and American industry and made possible the American standard of prices, which is far in excess of the standard of world markets; and

Whereas Congress has, through special legislation, known as restricted immigration, protected the American laborer from the disastrous competition of foreign peoples and has so saved the American job for the American laborer and made possible the maintenance of the American standard of wages; and

Whereas the said special classes of legislation have afforded such ample and effective protection to the American laborer and the American manufacturer as to (quoting our President in his message to Congress) "enable them to live according to a better standard and receive a better rate of compensation than any people, any time, anywhere on earth have ever enjoyed"; and

Whereas the protection so afforded to American labor and American manufacturers, supporting for them an American standard of prices for their products, has forced upon the American farmer an American standard of prices for the things he must buy, the taxes he must pay, and the labor he must hire; and

Whereas protective tariffs for agricultural products are almost wholly ineffective, where the product is produced in excess of demand for home consumption; and

Whereas American agriculture does produce an exportable surplus of all of the major products of agriculture and the American farmer therefore finds himself almost wholly unprotected from that disastrous competition of foreign peoples; and

Whereas the American farmer is, therefore, forced to sell his product on the low standard of world prices in open competition with the South American Indian, the peon of India, the peasant of Russia, whose overhead represents the lowest standards of living in the world, and is at the same time forced to buy his necessities from a protected market, at an American standard of prices, bolstered up and sustained behind the protective tariff and restricted immigration walls; and

Whereas this unbalanced condition is chiefly responsible for the distressed condition of agriculture, a condition which has now continued for over four years, and has brought actual bankruptcy upon thousands of farmers and upon business enterprises wholly dependent upon the farmers' prosperity, having in countless instances swept away the accumulated savings of a lifetime; and

Whereas the present better prices of some farm commodities represent only a temporary and local condition and the fundamental cause of the distress has not been removed; and

Whereas we believe the policy above contended for is sound in principle and, if fairly administered, destined to greatly increase the public welfare: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge that Congress, during its present session, pass and place upon our statute books such legislation as will effectively give to agriculture the same protection as is now afforded to industry and labor; and

Whereas the freight rate on grain to the terminal markets is now 40 per cent higher than during the pre-war period and the market price is but about 20 per cent, we recommend a reduction in the freight rates to equalize this condition; and

Whereas the home market for the agricultural products, particularly wheat, is governed by the price of our product in the markets of Europe, we heartily indorse the proposed plan to construct the St. Lawrence River ship canal, which, by lowering the transportation charge, would add to the value of our agricultural products at the primary market; and

Whereas the exportable surplus of agricultural products, and particularly of grains, depresses the home market below the cost of production; and

Whereas by reason of our geographical location our harvests and marketing occur during a few months, but our domestic consumption and exportation of surpluses continue over the year, we urge upon Congress the construction of terminal storage facilities to the end that storage charges be reduced to a minimum so that the primary producer may not be forced, by reason of excessive storage and interest charges, to sacrifice his product in order to meet current expenses, but can avail himself through his cooperative marketing associations of the credit facilities already provided by the Federal Government; and

Whereas the protective tariff does not protect agricultural products sufficiently because of the exportable surplus, that Congress devise some effective method of segregating the exportable surplus, or some means whereby the agricultural industry may itself segregate its surplus to the end that the protection may be made effective on, and that the American market be saved for, the product of the American farmer and an American standard of agricultural commodity prices made possible: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do most earnestly urge upon the President of the United States of American and upon the Congress of the United States the imperative need on the part of the agricultural interests of the State of Montana for legislation to relieve the present depression which exists in that industry and setting forth the causes and some suggestions for a solution.

That the secretary of state transmit this memorial to the President of the United States and to both Houses of Congress.

W. S. MCCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 18, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed February 18, 1927, at 1.50 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. HOWELL presented resolutions adopted by the Village Board of Trustees of Niobrara and the Board of Supervisors of Knox County, in the State of Nebraska, favoring the making of an appropriation in a sufficient sum to permanently control the Missouri River Channel for approximately 2 miles below the mouth of the Niobrara River, down that stream for about said distance, and along Frankfort Township for a sufficient distance in each place to maintain said channel in its present location, so as to prevent the destruction of properties and to maintain a navigable channel in the Missouri River, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

INVITATION TO VISIT FLORIDA'S CAPITAL

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a resolution was adopted by the Florida Legislature recently inviting certain Senators to visit a portion of Florida, particularly the St. Marks region, during the Christmas recess. I wish to have this resolution printed in the RECORD and to say that if any members of the committees referred to can accept the official invitation of the State of Florida, they may communicate with me on the subject or with Hon. W. C. Hodges, of Tallahassee, the author of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolution is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

Whereas there is situated about 20 miles south of Tallahassee, in Wakulla County, Fla., the harbor of St. Marks, which before the Civil War was one of the most important harbors on the Gulf coast, and which is still available for the uses of commerce and trade, if properly dredged, but which has not been used since the Civil War because of obstructions placed in the mouth of the harbor in the blockade of that port; and

Whereas Congress is interesting itself in the development of harbors along the Florida sea coast and has recently sent an engineer to make some inspection of this port: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Florida (the House concurring) do invite the Rivers and Harbors Committee of Congress and the chairman of the Committee on Reclamation and Drainage, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to visit Tallahassee, the capital of the State, and inspect the port and harbor of St. Marks during the Christmas recess of Congress, 1927, and that a copy of this resolution, signed by the governor and attested by the secretary of state, under the great seal of the State of Florida, be sent the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of Congress, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and the chairman of the Committee on Reclamation and Drainage, and that a copy also be sent to Major General Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, and that he be invited to accompany the members of these committees for this visit and inspection; be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journals of the senate and the house of representatives.

[SEAL.] JOHN W. MARTIN, *Governor.*

Attest:

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CIVIL WAR EXPENSES OF NEVADA

Mr. ODDIE. I present a petition of officials of the State of Nevada, the legislature of that State not now being in session, praying for the reimbursement of the State for money actually advanced and expended by the State in aiding the Government of the United States in the War between the States, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PITTMAN. I suggest to my colleague that he ask that the petition which he has presented be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ODDIE. I request that the petition which I have just sent to the desk may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial from the officials of the State of Nevada (the legislature not being in session) asking for the reimbursement of the State for moneys actually advanced and expended by the State in aid of the Government of the United States during the War between the States

MEMORIAL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the executive officers of the State of Nevada (the legislature not now being in session), respectfully pray that an appropriation be made to reimburse the State of Nevada for moneys actually expended by the State for costs, charges, and expenses incurred in enrolling, equipping, and compensating her military forces during the Civil War in response to the urgent calls of and under proper requisitions made by the commanding officer of the Military Department of the Pacific, under direct authority of the President and the Secretary of War, upon the understanding that all such costs, charges, and expenses actually incurred in raising troops for the United States would be reimbursed to the State.

The expenditures made by the State of Nevada for and on account of the United States, and at its most urgent call, are set forth by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1206), as follows:

"The amount expended by the State of Nevada, with such interest on the same as the State had paid, between February 10, 1865, and June 30, 1889, amounts in all to the sum of $412,600.31. * * * From June 30, 1889, to December 31, 1899, the State of Nevada has paid the sum of $58,401.27 as interest upon money paid by the State in aiding * * * in the Civil War. (The Supreme Court of the United States in the New York case (160 U. S. 598) held interest paid by the State on borrowed money a proper cost or charge.) * * * The total amount expended by the State of Nevada or by the Territory of Nevada and assumed by said State, with such interest on the same as the said State has actually paid, amounts to $471,001.58. * * * The sum of $8,559.61 was allowed and paid the State of Nevada. * * * This amount deducted from the total paid by the State of Nevada leaves the sum of $462,441.97 for which the State has not been reimbursed." (H. Doc. No. 322, 56th Cong., 1st sess.)

No part of the sum actually expended has been reimbursed the State of Nevada other than the small amount credited, although the costs, charges, and expenses, including interest, incurred by other States in aid of the Government during the Civil War have been paid said States.

The State of Nevada is in urgent need of the sum due her from the United States, and your memorialists believe that if the attention of Congress is again invited to this matter it will appreciate the justness of her request for reimbursement.

Your attention is respectfully called to a few salient facts. The Territory of Nevada was created by act of Congress approved March 2, 1861. It embraced a generally mountainous and desert region of nearly 100,000 square miles and comprised a then population, exclusive of Indians, of but approximately 15,000. A Territorial government was made necessary by the then recent discoveries of great gold and silver mines. Early in 1861 the Government withdrew all troops from the Pacific coast, excepting one regiment of Infantry and three batteries of Artillery, to guard practically the entire Mexican cession and the Oregon country, nearly one-third of the area of the United States. In 1863, by reason of activities at sea, the ocean route to the Pacific was closed. The overland route was left the only means of communication. This route also was threatened with closure by warring Indians and bandits. The Territory of Nevada was called upon to furnish troops in this exigency. This required money, which the Territorial treasury did not possess. The Territory authorized a bond issue and answered the Government's urgent calls with a regiment of Cavalry and a battalion of Infantry. The overland route was kept open to California and the Comstock Lode and other Nevada mines permitted to continue operations. These mines turned into the Treasury of the United States during the years of and immediately following the Civil War a half billion dollars of gold and silver. On March 21, 1864, just two months after the people of the Territory had overwhelmingly defeated a proposed State constitution, authorized by act of the Territorial legislative council, Congress passed an enabling act and the people of Nevada were asked to assume the obligations of statehood. So important is this matter that we quote from Charles A. Dana, then Assistant Secretary of War, the following excerpt from his book Recollections of the Civil War:

"The administration had decided that the Constitution of the United States should be amended so that slavery should be abolished. This was not only a change in our national policy, it was also a most important military measure. * * * It was believed that such an amendment would be equivalent to new armies, in the field, that it would be worth at least a million men. * * * When that question came to be considered, the issue was seen to be so close that one State more was necessary. The State of Nevada was organized and admitted into the Union to answer that purpose."

The author proceeds and quotes President Lincoln, when the question of the vote upon admission was in doubt, as saying:

"Here is the alternative, that we carry this vote or be compelled to raise another million, and I don't know how many more men, and fight no one knows how long."

The State was morally bound to assume the Territorial debts and obligations. It did so as a part of the Constitution. President Lincoln, with whom Congress alone left the matter, upon receipt of a copy of the Constitution sent by telegraph, approved the same with that provision.

We call the attention of Congress to the fact that the appropriate committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives have in past years repeatedly made exhaustive investigations of Nevada's war expenditures and have in every instance reported upon the same favorably, and that the Senate on three separate occasions passed measures carrying an appropriation for reimbursement. In this connection we crave the indulgence of the Congress to be permitted to have three distinguished statesmen, among the many who have considered the matter, again speak in behalf of our State:

Senator Hawley, of Connecticut: "There is no sort of question as to its justice."

Senator Hale, of Maine: "The Senate is committed to this State claim by vote, by sentiment, and it is only a question of time when it will pass."

Senator Teller, of Colorado: "If there are any claims that are just and proper which the United States ought to pay, this is one of them. It is as sacred an obligation, in my judgment, as the national bonds." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 56th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 33, p. 6278.)

It is respectfully submitted, in conclusion, that the conditions under which these expenditures were made were in many respects peculiar to Nevada alone; that the justice of reimbursement has not only been established, but we believe a moral obligation is also involved stronger, if possible, than the mere legality of the obligation; that since reimbursement has been so long delayed it would be but an act of tardy justice to appropriate the sum necessary for such reimbursement at the present session of Congress.

Done at Carson City, State of Nevada, this 5th day of December, 1927.

T. B. BALZAN,
Governor.
MORLEY GRISWOLD,
Lieutenant Governor and Adjutant General.
W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.
M. A. DISKIN,
Attorney General.
GEORGE B. RUSSELL,
State Treasurer.
ED. C. PETERSON,
State Comptroller.
GEORGE WATT,
Surveyor General.
WALTER W. ANDERSON,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.
A. J. STINSON,
State Inspector of Mines.

REPORT OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1398) relating to pardons, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 3) thereon.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. DENEEN. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 12, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. MOSES on the 9th instant was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 14) submitted by Mr. JONES of Washington on the 9th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 20) submitted by Mr. CAPPER on the 9th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr. ODDIE on the 9th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 48) submitted by Mr. HALE on the 12th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the session or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 19) submitted by Mr. MCNARY on the 9th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 13) submitted by Mr. WARREN on the 9th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventieth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any sessions or recesses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1706) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1707) to provide for uniform regulation of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1708) to regulate the employment of minors in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 1709) to provide armory facilities for the National Guard of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1710) authorizing the establishment of a national hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and the construction of a building therefor; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1711) to repeal the last proviso of section 7 of an act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska, approved February 26, 1917; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

A bill (S. 1712) granting an increase of pension to Frances Lydia Hanna (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1713) granting an increase of pension to Ardella Wilcox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1714) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Travis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1715) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Cline (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1716) granting an increase of pension to Christina Oney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 1717) to amend the retirement laws affecting certain grades of Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 1718) to authorize the President to detail engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture to assist the governments of the Latin American Republics in highway matters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1719) to limit the period for which an officer appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate may hold over after his term shall have expired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1720) making an appropriation for the survey of public lands in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PINE:

A bill (S. 1721) granting a pension to William F. Branstetter; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Frank S. Nipper; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1723) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a hard-surfaced road across Fort Sill (Okla.) Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 1724) for the relief of the Hellenic Transatlantic Steam Navigation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1725) for the relief of Byron Brown Ralston; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1726) granting an increase of pension to Augusta C. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 1727) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, approved July 3, 1926;

A bill (S. 1728) placing service postmasters in the classified service; and

A bill (S. 1729) extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 1730) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for the development of vocational education in the several States, and I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1731) to provide for the more complete development of vocational education in the several States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 1732) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1733) for the relief of Wade Allen and Ed Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 1734) to amend section 20 a of the interstate commerce act; and

A bill (S. 1735) to reestablish competition in railroad transportation rates as substantially in effect prior to the present increased railway rates and the enactment of the transportation act, 1920, popularly known as the Esch-Cummins law, by limiting the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to establishing and prescribing maximum rates only, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1736) for the relief of Charles Caudwell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1737) to reimburse officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, and their families and dependents or their legal representatives, for losses sustained as a result of the hurricane which occurred in Texas on August 16, 17, and 18, 1915 (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1738) for the validation of the acquisition of Canadian properties by the War Department and for the relief of certain disbursing officers for payments made thereon (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1739) to authorize credit in the disbursing accounts of certain officers of the Army of the United States, and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1740) granting an increase of pension to George P. Ives; and

A bill (S. 1741) granting an increase of pension to Anna Rock; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1742) granting the consent of Congress to the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Corporation, a Delaware corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL (for Mr. NORRIS):

A bill (S. 1743) relating to immunity of witnesses in Federal courts;

A bill (S. 1744) to amend the act of March 16, 1878, chapter 37, Twentieth Statutes at Large 30 (sec. 632, title 28, U. S. Code);

A bill (S. 1745) to amend section 176 of the Judicial Code;

A bill (S. 1746) to amend section 1022 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (S. 1747) to provide for the prompt settlement of cases in the Federal courts; and

A bill (S. 1748) relating to the qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1749) providing for the development of hydroelectric energy at Great Falls for the benefit of the United States Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1750) granting a pension to Nancy E. Dermit; and

A bill (S. 1751) granting a pension to Alice M. Weeks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 1752) to regulate the manufacture and sale of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAYFIELD:

A bill (S. 1753) for the relief of Sella Houghton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

(By request.) A bill (S. 1754) to create a Federal agricultural corporation to give American farmers economic guidance of the production and economic assistance in the marketing of the basic commodities of agriculture to promote the general welfare of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1755) for the relief of Nellie Kildee; and

A bill (S. 1756) for the relief of Lyn Lundquist; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1757) granting a pension to John L. Baxter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 1758) for the relief of Fred A. Knauf; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1759) to appropriate treaty funds due the Wisconsin Pottawatomi Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 1760) to increase the capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1761) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Duluth Ship Canal; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 1763) for the relief of the Sunny Brook Distillery Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 1765) for the relief of Alfred L. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1766) for the relief of R. H. King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1767) to amend section 3207 of the Revised Statutes as amended by section 1030 of the act approved June 2, 1924; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1768) to authorize the city of Muskogee, Okla., to remove and retain title to the boilers from the Municipal Hospital Building recently conveyed by the city to the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 1769) for the relief of the legal representative of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1770) for the relief of certain officers of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 1771) for the relief of Peter S. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1772) granting a pension to Francis N. Dominick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 1773) to increase the pensions of certain veterans of the Civil War; and

A bill (S. 1774) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1775) granting a pension to John P. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1776) relative to retired pay to Rear Admiral J. K. Robinson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 1777) to provide for an examination and survey of Bayou Sennette, Jefferson Parish, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1778) for the relief of Georgianna Brannan; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1779) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act in relation to the execution of declarations and other papers in pension claims," approved July 26, 1892; and

A bill (S. 1780) granting a pension to Harrison H. Bradford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1781) to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1782) granting a pension to Edward Bowden;

A bill (S. 1783) granting a pension to Frank H. Wilson, alias Henry Wencel (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Frank Thompson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 1785) for the relief of William F. Slatton; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1786) for the relief of Finas M. Williams; and

A bill (S. 1787) for the relief of Henry Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1788) granting a pension to Jeff Davis Flowers; and

A bill (S. 1789) granting a pension to Richard L. Gaffney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 1790) authorizing the Crow Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Montana to submit claims to the Court of Claims; and

A bill (S. 1791) providing that Indians and other persons on Indian reservations and superintendencies shall be subject to certain State or Territorial laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1792) to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1793) providing that the act approved December 17, 1919, entitled "An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relatives of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct," shall be executed and administered as though it had been passed and approved October 6, 1917 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1794) establishing additional land offices in the States of Montana, Oregon, Idaho, and South Dakota (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1795) for the relief of Fannie M. Hollingsworth; and

A bill (S. 1796) for the creation of a national monument in Montana, to be known as Battle of the Bear's Paw; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1797) to supplement the act of June 30, 1906, creating the United States Court for China;

A bill (S. 1798) concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

A bill (S. 1799) relating to foreign judgments;

A bill (S. 1800) providing for the revision and printing of the index to the Federal statutes;

A bill (S. 1801) in reference to writs of error;

A bill (S. 1802) to amend the Penal Code; and

A bill (S. 1803) granting immunity to certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1804) concerning the application of certain provisions of section 21 of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921;

A bill (S. 1805) for the relief of Clifton, Applegate & Toole; and

A bill (S. 1806) authorizing the payment of certain sums to Roosevelt County, Mont.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1807) to provide for the erection of a public building at Havre, Mont.;

A bill (S. 1808) to provide for the erection of a public building at Glasgow, Mont.;

A bill (S. 1809) providing for the enlargement of the Federal building at Missoula, Mont.;

A bill (S. 1810) for the erection of a public building at Glendive, Mont., and appropriating money therefor; and

A bill (S. 1811) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., the public building at Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 1812) for the relief of heirs of G. W. Hayhurst (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1813) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1814) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Underwood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1815) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth R. Melrose (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1816) granting a pension to Nathaniel Ellison;

A bill (S. 1817) granting a pension to Anderson M. Jarrett;

A bill (S. 1818) granting a pension to Perry Talbott; and

A bill (S. 1819) granting a pension to William Kyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 1820) to enable members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who have interrupted the course of training prescribed in the act of June 4, 1920, to resume such training and amending accordingly section 47c of that act;

A bill (S. 1821) to authorize the payment of travel expenses from appropriations for investigations and surveys of battle fields;

A bill (S. 1822) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer or loan aeronautical equipment to museums and educational institutions;

A bill (S. 1823) to amend section 2 of the act approved June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 470), entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes";

A bill (S. 1824) to amend section 5a of the national defense act, approved June 4, 1920;

A bill (S. 1825) to amend section 12 of the act approved June 10, 1922, entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," as amended by the act of June 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 680), so as to authorize an allowance of 3 cents per mile, in lieu of transportation in kind, for persons using privately owned conveyances while traveling under competent orders;

A bill (S. 1826) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct," approved December 17, 1919, so as to include nurses of the Regular Army;

A bill (S. 1827) to provide for the purchase of land in connection with the Fort Monmouth Military Reservation, N. J.;

A bill (S. 1828) to amend the second paragraph of section 5 of the national defense act, as amended by the act of September 22, 1922, by adding thereto a provision that will authorize the names of certain graduates of the general service schools and of the Army War College, not at present eligible for selection to the General Staff Corps eligible list, to be added to that list;

A bill (S. 1829) to authorize the collection, in monthly installments, of indebtedness due the United States from enlisted men, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1830) to authorize the Secretary of War to withhold pay or allowances of any person in the military service to cover indebtedness due the United States or its military agencies or instrumentalities;

A bill (S. 1831) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to class as secret certain material, apparatus, or equipment for military and naval use, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1832) to amend section 9 of the national defense act approved June 4, 1920, so as to facilitate procurement of military supplies;

A bill (S. 1833) to amend the act approved June 1, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 680), authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange deteriorated and unserviceable ammunition and components, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1834) to amend section 90 of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize employment of additional civilian caretakers for National Guard organizations, under certain circumstances, in lieu of enlisted caretakers heretofore authorized;

A bill (S. 1835) to authorize an appropriation for the recovery of bodies of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees;

A bill (S. 1836) to amend section 47d of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize an allowance of 1 cent a mile for subsistence of candidates in going to and returning from camp;

A bill (S. 1837) to amend the act approved June 7, 1924, authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of the Carlisle Barracks Reservation;

A bill (S. 1838) to amend section 110 of the national defense act by repealing and striking therefrom certain provisions pre-

scribing additional qualifications for National Guard State staff officers, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1839) to authorize persons connected with the military forces of the United States to accept decorations and gifts from foreign governments; and

A bill (S. 1840) to amend section 47d of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize employment of hostesses for temporary duty at citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1841) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Healy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 1842) for the relief of A. D. Games; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1843) granting a pension to Aaron Angle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Mary P. Spofford (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1845) granting an increase of pension to Ettie M. Fletcher (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1846) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Wellman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1847) granting an increase of pension to Ellen S. Scribner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 1848) for the relief of Frank Dixon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to marriage and divorce laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) directing the Comptroller General of the United States to reopen, readjust, and resettle the account between the State of Nevada and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive, for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, two Chinese subjects, to be designated hereafter by the Government of China; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 44) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive, for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, two Siamese subjects, to be designated hereafter by the Government of Siam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL (for Mr. NORRIS):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) continuing commissioners in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) providing for the completion of Dam No. 2 and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals for the manufacture and distribution of fertilizer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAN FRANCISCO BAY

Mr. JOHNSON. I introduce a bill providing for the construction of a bridge by the city of San Francisco.

The bill (S. 1762) granting consent to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill to a point near the South Mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, in said State, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce a communication from the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco in respect of the bill just introduced by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The communication is as follows:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1927.

HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, by resolution adopted in regular meeting December 5, 1927, authorized me, as chairman of the bridge committee of said board, to deliver to you, with a request for presentation to the Seventieth Congress of the United States, a bill granting to the city and county of San Francisco a permit to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill in the city and county of San Francisco to a point near the South Mole of San Antonio Estuary in the county of Alameda, State of California.

In accordance with the instructions contained in said resolution, I herewith hand to you a certified copy of the proposed bill, and respectfully request that you introduce the same in the Congress. I also hand to you herewith a certified copy of the report of Robert Ridgway, Arthur N. Talbot, and John D. Galloway, board of engineers, which report is referred to in said proposed bill as being on file in the office of the Secretary of War of the United States.

In support of its application for a permit to construct a transbay bridge, San Francisco cites the following reasons:

1. The bridge is necessary for the safety and convenience of the public.

2. The bridge is indispensable to the financial and economic growth of northern California.

In amplification of the above permit me to call attention to the following facts:

San Francisco Bay is overcrowded with ferries. Shipping in San Francisco Bay is second in point of volume only to that of the harbor of New York. Over 11,000 vessels passed into and out of the harbor last year. Eighteen lines of ferries, making an aggregate of over 850 crossings daily, convey 50,000 people over the bay twice a day across the main lines of commercial shipping. In 1926 ferry trips of interurban type between San Francisco and east bay cities numbered 43,550,678; main-line passenger trips numbered 1,676,518. This bay ferry traffic creates a navigation menace. The menace is great and is constantly increasing. It is enhanced by frequent and sometimes very heavy fogs. The time required to cross the bay by ferry—18 minutes—is unduly long. This constitutes a distinct detriment to business and a grave hardship upon business people. Automobile traffic, now so important to the growth of city and State, is impeded. In 1926 over 2,500,000 automobiles were transported by ferry between Oakland and San Francisco. Congestion of automobiles in highway approaches to and from the city is frequent and often acute. San Francisco and adjacent cities and towns of the peninsula suffer from lack of direct and unbroken road connections with highways across the bay.

The bridge as planned by a board of engineers, the personnel of which was recommended by the presidents of four universities of the State of California, represents months of intensive study. It will be of double-deck and will accommodate foot and vehicular travel, as well as suburban trains, to which may be diverted traffic from all main lines of passenger transportation. It will be 12,000 feet long, will have 20 spans, 2 of these with a horizontal clearance of 1,250 feet each. It will have a vertical clearance of 150 feet over 2½ miles of deep water of the bay. This vertical clearance is 15 feet greater than that of the four bridges over the East River at New York and the Philadelphia-Camden bridge over the Delaware River. There will be one movable span, which it is expected will be used only on rare occasions. Shipping men are agreed that the bridge will not interfere with shipping. Indeed, they approve of and urge the bridge on the ground that it will be an aid to shipping. The bridge will not interfere with the proposed United States naval base at Alameda. The city of Alameda, by proper resolution, has indorsed the proposed bridge and is joining in the application for a permit to construct the bridge at the location specified. There will be no interference with Oakland Harbor or with present plans for the development of that harbor. On the San Francisco side of the bay most of the wharves and by far the largest wharves lie north of the bridge and are not affected thereby. The members of the board of engineers are emphatic in saying in their report that there will be "no interference with shipping in any part of the bay." San Francisco Bay, with its area of 463 square miles, is one of the largest natural harbors on the globe; the area of deep water available for anchorage is sufficient to accommodate the navies of the world. Clear-

ances provided by the proposed bridge are more than sufficient to pass the largest ships in the United States Navy. The line of the bridge crosses over the northern portion of the United States fleet anchorage as that anchorage is depicted on paper; this can be obviated by moving this anchorage about 1,000 yards southward, where ample deep-water anchorage exists.

Within the last two years 26 applications for a franchise to construct a bridge across the bay have been made to the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco. Perhaps every possible route and every possible type of bridge have been suggested. Voluminous maps, drawings, engineering digests, and blue prints have been filed. Discussion of and arguments on these various applications progressed before the board of supervisors for over six months. Many noteworthy engineers prepared or contributed to the plans and discussions. The entire subject matter, therefore, has been inquired into most exhaustively. Much money has been spent in research. San Francisco itself has spent some $50,000 of municipal moneys in an endeavor to determine the very best type of bridge and the very best location. It is the sincere belief of city officials that the bridge as now planned between Rincon Hill and Alameda Mole represents the very best of engineering advice and legal counsel.

This San Francisco transbay bridge enterprise is neither provincial in its conception nor local in its significance. San Francisco is the financial center of the great Pacific coast. Her bank clearings are greater than those of any city west of Chicago. Nearly 2,000,000 people are concentrated within 50 miles of her borders. With her destiny is bound up vitally the destiny of many, if not most, of the populous communities of the West. Her success is their success; her prosperity is their prosperity. The transbay bridge will promote the growth and serve the convenience of them all. Indeed, it is the expectation and the hope that it will be of service and advantage to the entire country. The Chief Executive of this Nation in one of his first and most important utterances since the opening of the present Congress stressed the fact that: "It can not be too often said that this is all one country. Agriculture, industry, transportation, and finance should realize," he stated, "that they are interdependent and that each may prosper by extending its services to the others."

San Francisco wants to extend its services to others in this matter of transportation. She wants to make straight and safe the path that leads to her door. She is not fearful of the financial burden that she may have to bear or the construction problems that she may have to solve. She is serene in her confidence that she can meet all these. She wants to be brought into closer contact with her sister cities and towns of the Nation; she wants these cities and towns to be brought into closer contact with her. She aspires to make contribution to the convenience, safety, and prosperity of the people of city, State, and Nation. Her aspirations have been fostered and encouraged by the entire State of California; they have received particular encouragement from the people of northern California. The cities and towns of the entire San Francisco Bay region are in complete accordance with her bridge plan and route. From no civic body, from no political subdivision, from no commercial organization has come any word of dissent. San Francisco has the hearty and undivided cooperation of her sister cities. All she now asks is congressional permission as defined in the accompanying bill. Granted this, she will proceed with all possible expedition to construct across San Francisco Bay a bridge which will serve millions of people of the present generation and anticipate the needs of added millions of people of generations to come.

Very sincerely yours,

JAS. B. MCSHEEHY.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the relief of agriculture and ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill (S. 1764) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to the bill I have just introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, not with the view of delaying the passage of an adequate farm relief measure do I introduce this bill, but I do so with the belief that it may be by the committee so incorporated into whatever measure shall by the committee be reported to the Senate that it will meet the objections of those who honestly wish to be helpful to the farmer but have been unable for reasons that to them seem adequate to support the McNary-Haugen bill.

The bill which I have just introduced has incorporated in it every provision of that measure as to the appointment of the board, their qualifications, powers, and duties. It differs from that measure only in the method proposed for caring for the surplus of any farm product when and after the board shall declare that such a surplus either exists or will exist.

It gives an opportunity to those who have contended that they wish to give the farmers the benefit of the tariff. It will give the farmer the benefit of the highest schedules that are enjoyed by any manufacturing institution within the United States.

The plan is this: Whenever there shall be a surplus, for instance, we will say, of cotton, and it shall have been so declared by the board, then any cooperative association of cotton growers or any such association—it makes no difference under what title it be called—may issue certificates or debentures to those who wish to export cotton, and those debentures shall be presented, together with the bills of lading for the cotton to be exported, to the customs officials of the port from which the cotton is to be shipped and shall receive for the debentures a customs certificate, which shall be negotiable and which empowers its holder to import into the United States, duty free, any merchandise of the value of such exported cotton which the holder of such certificate may wish to import into this country.

Inasmuch as there are many articles, such as aluminum, on which the duty, for instance, is practically 100 per cent, therefore the holder of this certificate would be enabled to import, duty free, merchandise that would otherwise have to pay a duty of practically 100 per cent.

As an illustration, we annually export about $500,000,000 worth of cotton. If such cotton should be exported after the board shall have declared there was a surplus of cotton, the exporter of the cotton could then bring into this country merchandise, duty free, which, if it had been imported under other conditions, would cost in duties about $500,000,000. In other words, by reason of the fact that the purchaser has exported farm products, he will get a rebate in his duties of about $500,000,000. The result will be quite apparent. There will be a high market for farm products which will be exported after the board shall have declared there was a surplus. It is certain that under those conditions farm products to be exported would command a premium easily of 50 per cent above the domestic market for like products.

Europe, which now can not buy farm products from us because we have all the free gold, so they can not pay with that, and our tariff wall is so high they can not trade with us, would be enabled under the provisions of this bill to buy at very much above the market price our farm products, because they could then sell to us their merchandise and have it imported into America duty free.

If it is the desire now to give the farmer the protection of the highest rate of duty now enjoyed by any merchandise in America, the provisions of this bill will give it, and it will take out of this country every dollar's worth of our surplus farm products at a greatly enhanced price.

It will do more than that; it will stop short selling of farm products. It will give a market for surplus farm products far above the world price for such farm products.

With a hope that there are those who really want to relieve the farmer of the unjust burden that he has borne under our present industrial conditions, this bill is introduced, and their support solicited.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have just introduced may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The bill (S. 1764) is as follows:

A bill (S. 1764) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. In order to stabilize the current of interstate and foreign commerce in the marketing of agricultural commodities and to prevent existing suppression of commerce with foreign nations in such commodities and unjust discrimination against and undue restraints and burdens upon such foreign commerce in favor of interstate or intrastate commerce in such commodity, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to that end, through the execution of the provisions of this act, to provide for the control and disposition of surpluses of such commodities, to preserve advantageous domestic markets for such commodities, to prevent such surpluses from unduly depressing the prices obtained for such commodities and from causing undue and excessive fluctuations in the markets for such commod-

ities, to minimize speculation and waste in marketing such commodities, and to further the organization of producers of such commodities into cooperative associations.

FEDERAL FARM BOARD

SEC. 2. (a) A Federal farm board is hereby created which shall consist of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be a member ex officio, and 12 members, 1 from each of the 12 Federal land bank districts, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The terms of office of the appointed members of the board first taking office after the approval of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, 4 at the end of the second year, 4 at the end of the fourth year, and 4 at the end of the sixth year after the date of the approval of this act. A successor to an appointed member of the board shall be appointed in the same manner as the original appointed members, and shall have a term of office expiring six years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(c) Any person appointed to fill a vacancy in the board occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(d) Any member of the board in office at the expiration of the term for which he was appointed may continue in office until his successor takes office.

(e) Vacancies in the board shall not impair the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the board, and a majority of the appointed members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the board.

(f) Each of the appointed members of the board shall be a citizen of the United States, shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the board, and shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year, together with necessary traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, within the limitations prescribed by law, while away from the principal office of the board on business required by this act, or if assigned to any other office established by the board, then while away from such office on business required by this act.

GENERAL POWERS

SEC. 3. The board—

(a) Shall annually designate an appointed member to act as chairman of the board.

(b) Shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia, and such other offices in the United States as it deems necessary.

(c) Shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) Shall make an annual report to Congress.

(e) May make such regulations as are necessary to execute the functions vested in it by this act.

(f) May (1) appoint and fix the salaries of a secretary and such experts and, in accordance with the classification act of 1923 and subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, such other officers and employees, and (2) make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for law books, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the board.

(g) Shall meet at the call of the chairman or of the Secretary of Agriculture or of a majority of its members.

(h) Shall keep advised, from any available sources, of crop prices, prospects, supply and demand, at home and abroad, with especial attention to the existence or the probability of the existence of a surplus of any agricultural commodity or any of its food products, and it may advise producers, through their organizations or otherwise, in matters connected with the distribution and marketing of any such commodity in order that they may secure the maximum benefits under this act.

(i) Shall advise producers, through their organizations or otherwise, in the development of suitable programs of planting or breeding in order that they may secure such benefits.

COMMODITY ADVISORY COUNCILS

SEC. 4. (a) For each agricultural commodity to which the board from time to time determines the provisions of sections 6 and 7 should be extended the board is hereby authorized and directed to create an advisory council of seven members fairly representative of the producers of such commodity. Members of each commodity advisory council shall be selected annually by the board from lists submitted by cooperative associations or other organizations representative of the producers of the commodity. Members of each commodity advisory council shall serve without salary, but may be paid by the board a per diem compensation not exceeding $20 for attending meetings of the council and for time devoted to other business of the council and authorized by the board. Each council member shall be paid by the board his necessary traveling expenses to and from meetings of the council and his expenses incurred for subsistence, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, within the limitations prescribed by law, while engaged upon the business of the council. Each commodity advisory council shall be designated by the name of the commodity it represents, as, for example, "the cotton advisory council."

(b) Each commodity advisory council shall meet as soon as practicable after its selection at a time and place designated by the board and shall select a chairman. The board may designate a secretary of the council, subject to the approval of the council.

(c) Each commodity advisory council shall meet thereafter at least twice in each year at a time and place designated by the board, or upon call of a majority of its members at a time and place designated in the call, notice of such call being sent by registered mail at least 10 days before the date of the meeting.

(d) Each commodity advisory council shall have power, by itself or through its officers, (1) to confer directly with the board, to call for information from it, or to make oral or written representations to it, concerning matters within the jurisdiction of the board and relating to the agricultural commodity, including matters in respect of debentures, and (2) to cooperate with the board in advising the producers through their organization or otherwise in the development of suitable programs of planting or breeding in order to secure the maximum benefits under this act.

LOANS

SEC. 5. The board is authorized to make loans out of the revolving fund hereinafter created to any cooperative association upon such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe for the purpose of assisting the cooperative association (1) in controlling the surplus of any agricultural commodity in excess of the requirements for orderly marketing, or (2) in the acquisition, by purchase, construction, or otherwise, of facilities to be used in the storage, processing, or sale or other disposition of the commodity. The aggregate amount of loans under this section, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, shall not exceed $250,000,000, nor shall the aggregate amount of loans under this section for the acquisition of facilities, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed $25,000,000. Any loan under this section shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

DEBENTURES

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever the board finds—

First. That there is or may be during the ensuing year a surplus above the requirements for the orderly marketing of any agricultural commodity or above the domestic requirements for such commodity; and

Second. That both the advisory council for such commodity and a substantial number of cooperative associations or other organizations representing the producers of the commodity favor the full cooperation of the board in the marketing and exportation of the commodity, then the board, after publicly declaring its finding may promote the exportation of such commodity by the issuance of debentures to cooperative associations producing such commodity or any agent of such association. Debentures shall be issued during a period the time for the commencement and termination of which shall be fixed by the board and which may be extended by it from time to time.

(b) Whenever the board has so found, it shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of its findings, and on and after the date fixed by the board for the commencement of the debenture period the Secretary shall provide for the acceptance of the debentures issued in accordance with the provisions of section 7.

(c) Any decision of the board relating to the commencement, extension, or termination of a debenture period shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed members in office, and of members of the board representing Federal land bank districts which in the aggregate produced during the preceding crop year, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, more than 50 per cent of such commodity.

SEC. 7. (a) On and after the date so fixed for the commencement of the debenture period the board shall issue (as provided in subdivision (c)) to any cooperative association (as defined in section 12) or to any authorized agent of such association, debentures in an amount equal to the export price of the commodity produced by such association (or its members) and exported by such association or agent.

(b) As used in this section the term "export price" means the price at which a commodity is sold, or agreed to be sold, for export by or for the account of the cooperative association producing such commodity.

(c) The board shall issue debentures—

(1) After publication made in accordance with regulations prescribed by it.

(2) Upon submission of proof satisfactory to it (A) in respect of the export price, (B) that the commodity to be exported has been produced by the association or its members, and (C) that no debenture has heretofore been issued on account of such commodity.

(3) At such places, by such officers or agents of the board, and subject to such regulations as it may prescribe.

(d) Debentures may be assigned or transferred in any other manner by any such association or agent, and shall provide that any person

holding such debenture shall be entitled to have it received by any collector (as defined in section 401 of the tariff act of 1922) in lieu of payment for duties otherwise collectible against articles imported by the holder.

(e) The holder of any such debenture shall be entitled to import into the United States free of duty articles equal in value (as defined in section 402 of the tariff act of 1922) to the face value of the debentures so held, irrespective of the nature or amount of duty otherwise collectible against such articles.

(f) The board shall prepare and issue and shall prescribe the terms and conditions in respect of debentures. The Secretary of the Treasury, upon request of the board, is authorized to have such debentures prepared at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, but the cost thereof shall be paid by the board.

(g) Debentures issued under authority of this act shall be obligations of the United States within the definition in section 147 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, and all provisions of chapter 7 of such act, as amended, shall apply in respect of any such debenture.

(h) Any person who shall make any false statement for the purpose of fraudulently procuring, or shall attempt in any manner fraudulently to procure, the issuance or acceptance of any debenture, whether for the benefit of such person or of any other person, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 8. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the board, there shall be established a revolving fund, to be administered by and to be exclusively under the control of the board. The board shall have the exclusive power of expending the moneys in such fund.

(b) For the purposes of the revolving fund there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $250,000,000, to be made available by the Congress as soon as practicable after the approval of this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in the revolving fund such portions of the amounts appropriated therefor as the board from time to time deems necessary.

(c) The deposits to the credit of the revolving fund shall be made in a public depositary of the United States. All general laws relating to the embezzlement, conversion, or to the improper handling, retention, use, or disposal of public moneys of the United States shall apply to moneys deposited to the credit of the fund or withdrawn therefrom but in the custody of any officer or employee of the United States.

(d) In addition to the deposits made by the Secretary of the Treasury, there shall be deposited to the credit of the revolving fund repayments of loans to cooperative associations under section 5, and interest thereon.

(e) There shall be disbursed from the revolving fund the loans to cooperative associations under section 5, and the salaries and expenses of such experts as the board determines should be payable from the fund.

EXAMINATION OF BOOKS AND ACCOUNTS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 9. Expenditures by the board from the appropriation for administrative expenses under section 11 shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the board. Expenditures by the board from the revolving fund shall be made by authorized officers or agents of the board upon receipt of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by such officers as the board may designate. Vouchers so made for expenditures from the revolving fund shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government, except that all financial transactions of the board shall, subject to the above limitation, be examined by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe. Such examinations in respect of expenditures from the revolving fund shall be for the sole purpose of making a report to the Congress and to the board of expenditures in violation of law, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General deems advisable concerning the receipt, disbursement, and application of funds administered by the board.

COOPERATION WITH EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) It shall be the duty of any governmental establishment in the executive branch of the Government, upon request by the board or upon Executive order, to cooperate with and render assistance to the board in carrying out any of the provisions of this act and the regulations of the board. The board shall, in cooperation with any such governmental establishment, avail itself of the services and facilities of such governmental establishment in order to avoid preventable expense or duplication of effort.

(b) The President may by Executive order direct any such governmental establishment to furnish the board with such information and data pertaining to the functions of the board as may be contained in the records of such governmental establishment. The order of the President may provide such limitations as to the use of the information and data as he deems desirable.

(c) The board may cooperate with any State or Territory, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or with any person.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATION

SEC. 11. For expenses in the administration of the functions vested in the board by this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000, to be available to the board for such expenses (including salaries and expenses of the members, officers, and employees of the board and the per diem compensation and expenses of members of the commodity advisory councils) incurred prior to July 1, 1929.

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. (a) As used in this act—

(1) The term "person" means individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

(2) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means continental United States.

(3) The term "cooperative association" means an association of persons engaged in the production of agricultural products, as farmers, planters, ranchers, dairymen, or nut or fruit growers, organized to carry out any purpose specified in section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," approved February 18, 1922, whether or not such association is qualified under such act.

(b) Whenever any agricultural commodity has regional or market classifications or types which in the judgment of the board are so different from each other in use or marketing methods as to require their treatment as separate commodities under this act, the board may determine upon and designate one or more such classifications or types for such treatment.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person, circumstance, commodity, or class of transactions in respect of any commodity is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons, circumstances, commodities, and classes of transactions shall not be affected thereby.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the Federal farm board act.

AMENDMENT TO TAX REDUCTION BILL—METAL MINES

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EDNA A. YOUNT

Mr. WILLIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Edna A. Yount, daughter of Rev. J. J. Muir, late Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION OF AGRICULTURAL COTTON REPORTS

Mr. MAYFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Department of Agriculture, on or about September 1, 1927, made public a report on boll-weevil conditions throughout the cotton belt which contained statements that were inaccurate; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture, on or about September 15, 1927, made public a report purporting to give a reliable estimate of the world carry-over of cotton as of July 31, 1927, which contained statements that were inaccurate and based upon information received from nonofficial sources; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture, on or about September 15, 1927, made public a report relating to the probable farm price situation during the balance of the year which contained predictions that the future trend of cotton prices would be lower; and

Whereas these reports were unauthorized and resulted in a decline of cotton prices with a loss to the farmers of the country of many millions of dollars; and

Whereas it is reported that the New Orleans, New York, and Chicago Cotton Exchanges were concerned with the issuance or publication of such reports: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the accuracy of such reports, to ascertain the sources of information upon which such reports were based, to investigate the activities of the New Orleans, New York, and Chicago Cotton Exchanges in connection with the issuance or publication

of such reports, to investigate such other matters relating to the cotton situation since January 1, 1927, as the committee or subcommittee deems advisable, and to report thereon to the Senate as soon as practicable. For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of such committee or subcommittees, which shall not be in excess of $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HOWELL (for Mr. NORRIS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 64), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. NYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. MCLEAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

THE TARIFF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next business in order is resolutions coming over from a preceding day. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 52, submitted by Mr. MCMASTER on the 13th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Senate favors an immediate lowering of tariff schedules, and tariff legislation, embodying lowered schedules, should be considered and enacted during the present session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over without prejudice, to be called up by the Senator from South Dakota when he sees fit.

Mr. MCMASTER. Mr. President, because of the fact that several Senators who are interested in the adoption of this resotion have requested that it go over for a few days, I have no objection to the request made by the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go over without prejudice.

SIX-YEAR TERM FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, on December 13 I had inserted in the RECORD a collection of statements by notable characters of the country regarding a six-year term for President. I ask unanimous consent that this may be made a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the agreement that was made between the House and the Senate is going to stand on the question of printing matters both in the RECORD and as public documents. A complaint has come to me during the present session that such orders have been made two or three times during this session. If the Senate is going to insist upon that course, the House is going to follow the same course; but the Joint Committee on Printing of the Senate and the House passed a resolution that such matters could be printed either as public documents or in the RECORD, but not in both forms.

I know that the other course has been followed twice at this session, and I do not refer to it now with a view of objecting to this request; but I want to be able to say to the members of the joint committee in the House that I have called attention to the subject here, and hereafter I shall ask that such matters be printed either as public documents or in the RECORD, whichever Senators desire.

Since the Senator from Washington has not been notified of it, if he still asks that this matter be printed as a public document, I have no objection; but that is the reason for the statement I have made.

Mr. DILL. I am not insisting upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed as a public document.

STATUE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON STEPHENS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the proceedings in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol, on the 8th instant, on the occasion of the unveiling of the statue of Alexander Hamilton Stephens.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

Ceremonies at the unveiling of the statue of Alexander Hamilton Stephens, of Georgia, held in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1927, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 3, Seventieth Congress, first session, which is as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Alexander H. Stephens, presented by the State of Georgia, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his distinguished humanitarian service.

"Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Georgia."

The meeting was called to order at 3 o'clock p. m. by Senator WILLIAM J. HARRIS, of Georgia, the presiding officer.

Senator HARRIS. Dr. J. Sprole Lyons, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Atlanta, Ga., will offer the invocation. Doctor Lyons.

INVOCATION

Almighty God, we thank Thee for lives which honor Thee in leading their fellow men in paths of righteousness and peace and true patriotism. As we gather in this great hall devoted to the memory of the best of our Nation, we are grateful for the patriot and statesman whose memory we honor to-day, whose body was all too frail an habitation for his mighty spirit, but whose heroic life has been, and continues to be, a benediction and an inspiration to his country, and especially to his State, which now honors itself in honoring him.

We dedicate this statue to-day, wrought in the beautiful marble of the Georgia which he loved so well and served so faithfully, to be a token of the devotion of the people of that State to his memory, as well as a sacramental seal of the Union of the free and equal States which, please God, shall never be broken. We leave it to-day in the goodly company of the immortals of our Nation under the sheltering dome of its Capitol, and consecrated to the holy mission of keeping alive in the hearts of our Nation those ideals and passions which shall make America, and keep America, that blessed and happy people whose God is the law. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILLIAM J. HARRIS

Senator HARRIS. The United States has every reason to be proud of Alexander Hamilton Stephens. Obstacles to him were only steppingstones to higher and nobler things. For 8 years he was in the legislature of his State, for 16 years before the Civil War he was a Member of Congress of the United States, for 4 years during the Civil War he was Vice President of the Confederate States, for 10 years after the Civil War he was again a Member of the Congress of the United States, and he died while he was governor of his State. Thus he was 38 years in the service of the people of Georgia as their lawmaker and one as their governor.

Few men in the history of the United States have given so great a length of service, and none has rendered to his State and his Nation service that better entitled him to the honor of being acclaimed one of the two greatest men in her history. He was also the peer of the best

ever in the history of the United States in his high character, broad intelligence, and unselfish service. He had all these in such a measure that I am proud that he was a Georgian and that it is my privilege, as one of the Georgia Senators, to take part in accepting this statue, which placed in this hall proclaims to the long ages ahead that both his State and his Nation considered him worthy of the very highest honor.

No man in the world's history ever surpassed Alexander H. Stephens in the steadfastness of his devotion to the principles of truth, justice, and mercy. His private life was without fear and without reproach and full of incidents of helpfulness to those in need, especially to young men seeking aid to attend college. His public career shows him time and again placing loyalty to principles above subservience to political party, time and again refusing to follow where he thought principles were being set aside for party purposes. On the tablet of his heart was written the sentence often quoted by him, "Times change and men change with them, but principles never." No man ever strove harder to be guided by those principles that preserve the permanent interests of humanity. He was—

"One who cared not to be great
But as he served or saved his State."

There are several events in his life that prove that his devotion to principles was superior to his desire for praise or applause. He favored the annexation of Texas, though the Whig Party, to which he belonged, opposed it. He was denounced as a traitor to his party, but he unflinchingly persisted in the path which he had deliberately chosen. Before the Georgia Legislature of November, 1860, and the secession convention of January, 1861, he opposed the secession of his State from the United States. He did his best to stop that resistless tide of public opinion that organized the Confederate States in the winter of 1860–61. In these, and in almost every other position he took, we can now see that he was both patriotic and wise. Time has vindicated his judgment. We now see clearly that he was a great statesman.

He was also a great parliamentarian and a great orator. These gifts he devoted to the highest interest of his country, to the preservation of the Union, and to the cause of constitutional liberty. For 26 years he was a Member of the lower House of Congress, and he was elected by his State to be its United States Senator just after the close of the War between the States, just after he returned from a prison of the United States at Fort Warren, Boston Harbor, Mass.; but he was denied admission to the Senate because of the reconstruction policy then in force toward the once seceded States. Shut out from service in the Halls of Congress, he then devoted his time to the production of his greatest literary work, which he entitled "The War Between the States." This work, in two large volumes, presented what is now generally conceded to be the clearest and strongest statement ever made of the right of secession under the Constitution of the United States, and it stands to-day as the best defense of the conduct of the South during the war. This great defense of the South finished, he accepted service again in the House of Representatives and voluntarily withdrew to become governor of his State.

The career of Alexander H. Stephens is one of the marvels of human history. Though a delicate boy with poor health throughout his whole life he became a tower of strength to his people. His father was a farmer and a teacher of country schools and trained his own children to work and to study. Thus, in his childhood, Alexander H. Stephens worked on a farm after he was 6 years old and attended school two or three months of the year. When he was 15 years old his father died and left him penniless, but a charitably disposed citizen provided for his attendance in a high school, and by borrowing money he was able to attend the university of his State, where he graduated with first honor and obtained the thorough scholarship that enabled him to study law without a tutor and enter the bar. He very soon distinguished himself and was prospering as a lawyer when he was elected to the legislature of his State and began the long and noble service to his country which ended only with his death. His surely was a life devoted to his country. How appropriate now that his country, grateful for his service and proud of his achievements, should wish to preserve his image in this place, the very place where his voice was once heard pleading for the principles of justice. This marble reproduces his form, and its being here will prove to all future generations that he was one of the greatest men who ever lived in Georgia.

Looking back over the years it is interesting and very impressive to note that four of the men whose statues stand in this hall were born in Georgia not far apart. Dr. Crawford Long was a roommate of Mr. Stephens at the University of Georgia. The Confederate general, Joseph Wheeler, who served later in the Spanish-American War, was captured just after the Civil War and sent to prison with Mr. Stephens. Mr. Stephens and General Wheeler in the early eighties served together in the United States Congress. General Wheeler and Dr. J. L. M. Curry's statues were placed here by the State of Alabama. General Wheeler was born in Augusta, Ga.; Doctor Curry in Columbia County, Ga. Sequoia, the Indian chief whose statue was placed here by the State of Oklahoma, was also born in Georgia.

Robert Toombs and Alexander H. Stephens were born in the same county near the same time, and they were close personal friends. They entered the Congress of the United States about the same time, Toombs in 1845, Stephens in 1843. As both were Whigs and both of supereminent abilities and from the same State, they were often called the twins of Georgia. They were, however, of very different temperaments, Toombs impetuous and brilliant and commanding, Stephens quiet and thoughtful and persuasive, but they were linked in friendship so strong that no differences ever affected it. They are still linked so closely in the hearts of all Georgians that whenever one of them is mentioned the other is always thought of, and usually spoken of; and now that one of this noble pair is selected for the signal honor of this occasion the name of the other comes to our lips.

Toombs said at the grave of Stephens, "His acts are written in letters of gold. He was the child of the State, the child of the Republic, yes, the child of humanity, and his was one of the few immortal names that were not born to die. He took his mission from his conscience—the voice of God." [Applause.]

At the time of the death of Governor Stephens, former Gov. N. E. Harris was a member of the legislature and was chairman of the memorial committee. He said of Mr. Stephens:

"He lived for Georgia. There was no drop of blood in his veins that did not bear the image of his mother State. He was a great man, and the fact that he confined himself to the study of what was best for the country and his State gave him a supremacy in those early days following the war that no man could dispute."

My late friend and colleague in the Senate, Hon. Thomas E. Watson, was a member of the Georgia Legislature memorial committee and made the following statement about Mr. Stephens:

"He fell on sleep like a child weary and worn. Great Nature, the common mother, holds him tenderly to her bosom. When he shall awaken it is inspiring to believe that he shall greet the morning in a land where there is no night, where the skies are undimmed by a cloud, where the feet bleed upon no pathway of stones, and the head wears no crown of thorns."

I was requested by the committee to announce that when the names of the following people are called they will please rise. The committee regrets that on account of the length of the program they can not ask them to made addresses.

I will ask Judge Alexander W. Stephens, representing the Stephens family in Georgia, to please rise.

(Judge Stephens rose and was greeted by applause.)

Senator HARRIS. I will ask John M. Graham, private secretary of Mr. Stephens, to please rise.

(Mr. Graham rose and was greeted with applause.)

Senator HARRIS. I will ask Mr. Elias, of Washington, private secretary of Mr. Stephens while in Congress, to please rise.

Mr. HALLMAN. He does not seem to be here.

Senator HARRIS. Will Mrs. Rebecca Latimer Felton, ex-Senator Felton, the only woman Senator of the United States, please rise?

(Mrs. Felton rose and was greeted with applause.)

Senator HARRIS. Mr. Gutzon Borglum will now address us in presenting to the Atlanta Chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy his services as sculptor.

ADDRESS BY GUTZON BORGLUM

Mr. BORGLUM. Mr. Chairman, Senators from Georgia, your excellency the governor of the State, Mr. President, and Daughters of the Confederacy, I have the honor to tell you that the portrait statue of your great citizen, our fellow American, Alexander Hamilton Stephens, late Vice President of the Confederacy, is finished and here safely delivered in the Capitol of the Union, where it will remain under the protection of the United States as a part of the record of the life of this great Nation.

It would be as unbecoming for me, as the sculptor, to praise too much my own as it would be for a mother to say too much about the merits of her child, but we are not dealing primarily with art or its merits to-day, but rather with the record that we are writing in marble in the history of this Nation.

Carlyle once said, "I am a poor man, but I would gladly give one-half of all I possess had some artist in his day drawn a true portrait of the Christ, that humanity might see just how the Son of God looked, how He appeared, just what were His features, what the form assumed by the Son of God."

Mr. Chairman, I have had the honor for many years of serving the people of the South, in helping them develop the record of their great. In that service I have become profoundly impressed with the chivalry, the unique independence, the purity of motive, the spirit of southern knighthood rising to greatness. I have found they have a peculiar solitary quality, and I have found also that the South has been strangely prolific in her contribution of both men and women who have played a necessary and constructive part in the shaping of our great civilization. I have also found that no part of America's history to date is so wanting a true record, true portraiture, as the story of the South.

I am not going to discuss the virtue of Stephens—that will be left to others who will follow—further than to say that he hardly needs a monument, and, like Lee and Jackson and Forrest and Johnston, Hoke and Jordan, we can do little, if anything, to add to his fame; but lest we forget the price they paid that they might be honest before their God and their country, and that we and our children and our children's children shall not be without example of the kind of men they were, we, their contemporaries, must erect monuments to pass on to posterity true records of what manner of men they were.

God in his judgment chose the better part of mankind to rear our children, and so it was to the mothers of men he entrusted the youth of the world. It is almost while at our mother's breast we hear the first stories of our father's greatness and there fall in our first sleep and dream of the adventure and the romance of life. How natural, then, it should have been that the Daughters of the Confederacy, the United Daughters, should have been entrusted in the South with keeping the faith and making the record. It is to you, dear women, who have played the parent to the veteran of the Confederacy, that is due the credit of the preservation of what we have of art and memory of the great. You have long known that I hold that the War between the States was a necessary tragedy for the founding of a greater Union, and you also know that I have long held that the record of that whole war, North and South, is an integral part of our Union history. We want to know, and we want it written down in marble, in bronze, yes, in gold, who of our brothers fought brothers, frankly and fearlessly. For that, and that alone, I have labored, but it was also because of my awakening to the truth of the imperishable part you sisters, wives, and mothers of our fathers, which showed me how sacred, how imperative the need of the record was, that I have given so much and will continue to give to help. Please accept this from me in that spirit.

Senator HARRIS. There will now take place the unveiling of the statue by little Miss Ida Stephens, great grandniece of Mr. Stephens, and Sam Venable Mason, young son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank T. Mason, of Atlanta.

(The statue was thereupon unveiled amid the applause of the audience.)

Senator HARRIS. "Alexander Hamilton Stephens" is the subject of an address to be given now by Dr. Garnett W. Quillian, of Atlanta, Ga., in presenting the statue to the State of Georgia in behalf of the donors. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY DR. GARRETT W. QUILLIAN

Doctor QUILLIAN. That man is great who has the strength to serve, the patience to suffer, who seeks not to conquer the world, but, mastering himself, spends his life and energies in unselfish service for his fellow man.

Such a man was Alexander Hamilton Stephens. His entire career was one of devoted sacrificial public service.

With patience and fortitude in overcoming in early life difficulties multiplied, he was laying for himself a foundation for true greatness which was exemplified in what he did, the spirit in which he did it, and its usefulness to his fellow man.

Never seeking office, but seeking rather to avoid political life, he was drafted repeatedly to serve his constituency, and was elevated first as representative in the legislature; then to the senate of his State; then to the United States Congress; then as Vice President of the Confederacy. He was elected to the United States Senate immediately following the War between the States, but was refused a seat in the Senate because of the dissensions which arose during the period of reconstruction. He was later returned to Congress, and finally in 1882 retired, after a service all told of 26 years, to become Governor of Georgia, accepting this responsibility in spite of his age and feebleness because her people, who loved him, assured him that he alone could unite jarring factions and heal her political wounds.

In the history of Georgia and America there may have lived men as great as he, but as we have with care studied his marvelous career the evidence is convincing that in the glorious history of our beloved Commonwealth and common country there has not lived in our Nation a greater man, a greater statesman, nor a more perfect patriot than Alexander Hamilton Stephens.

In a peculiar way this man personified the maxim: "The heights by great men reached and kept were not attained by sudden flight, but they, while their companions slept, were toiling upward in the night."

He was born on February 11, 1812, and died March 4, 1883. His father was Andrew Baskins Stephens, of English descent; a good man and a thrifty farmer. His mother was Margaret Grier, of Irish descent. She was a frail little woman, mild, industrious, charitable, intelligent, and he, but a tender babe of three months, lying in her fragile arms, and clinging with his tiny fingers to his loving mother's breast, she left him. Being deprived of a mother's care in infancy, he lost his father when only 14 years of age. In the character of Alexander we observe a marked blending of parental traits. He was thrifty, generous, progressive, and always as tender and as pure as a child.

When a mere lad he was given a Bible by his father and started to Sunday school. With it two passages of Scripture, as a guiding influence for his life, were suggested. These he often repeated. The first, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom"; the second, "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."

While a mere boy he became a teacher in the Sunday school. His renown as a Bible student quickly spread, and later this experience opened up the way for him to continue and complete his education.

There was a desire on the part of his teachers and others to educate him for the ministry, but this troubled him greatly, for, said he, "Whether I should be fit to preach when I should grow up, I could not know."

In after life his accurate knowledge of the Bible served him well in many of his wonderful speeches and debates. In writing of these formative years he said, "I studied with intense interest by the light of blazing pine knots, the only light in our house for readers in those days. By the fire I read long after the whole household was asleep, and after a hard day's work."

Later in life, when a student of law, he would not infrequently study his law books all night long, retiring only with the rising of the sun.

"My college days were my happiest days," said Mr. Stephens. He was a favorite with both faculty and students, and made the highest grade of any in his class.

As a young lawyer he had periods of intense despondency. He never weighed in all his life more than 101½ pounds, and most of the time less than 100, though he was 6 feet, less 2 inches, tall.

His chestnut hair was brushed away from a thin brow and bloodless cheeks. In his diary he wrote: "I believe I shall never be worth anything, and the thought is death to my soul. I am too boyish and simple in my manners and address."

In addition to his early orphange and poverty he was handicapped by a constitution so frail that his continued existence seemed a miracle.

"His form was the most slight and slender I have ever seen, he never looked as if he had a two weeks' purchase on life," said his intimate friend, Robert Toombs. He was frequently mistaken for a boy, and on one occasion while he was a distinguished delegate to the Southern Commercial Convention at Charleston, when lounging on a sofa, his landlady admonished him: "Sonny, get up and give the gentleman a seat." With his fondness for the humorous he rose smilingly, to the great amusement of his companions.

But woe to the opponent who rated him by his physical size. It was the fashion to speak of him as "intellect incarnate" and a "bodiless brain."

Colquitt, judge, Senator, and leading debater and speaker in the State, hearing how others had gone down before young Stephens, casually remarked his hands itched to get hold of him. When Stephens, with courtesy, humor, and facts—a store of which he always kept at hand—had decisively defeated his opponent in debate, some wag in the crowd cried, "Your hands itch to let him go now, don't they, Judge?"

His maiden speech in the Legislature of Georgia, a brilliant effort, saved the measure for the building of the State railroad and paved the way for his election to Congress. The bill was all but lost when he arose, with black eyes gleaming from an unearthly white face, and proved by indisputable data and argument both the value and practicability of the road.

He was appointed chairman of the committee on education in 1836, and when, like the railroad project, the College for Women at Macon, Ga., was being ridiculed, his support saved the charter for Wesleyan College, the first institution for women in the world authorized to confer degrees. He championed the cause of his alma mater, the University of Georgia, and advanced in many ways the cause of learning.

In the United States Congess Mr. Stephens was considered as the ablest Member of the House. When it was known that Stephens, of Georgia, was to speak, at an early hour the gallery was filled to overflowing with the families of distinguished statesmen, members of foreign legations, dashing belles, and the best citizens of Washington.

There was something grand in this shadowy figure, binding up the very breath of the House. Senators deserted the other wing of the Capitol and sat under a spell which they could not break. "The speaker seems the mere organ of some hidden power," said the Charleston Courier. "His unearthly white face seems to brighten into fuller and ghostlier meaning; his eyes shine like sunken pits of fire suddenly disclosed; his attenuated form seems to dilate to his dilating soul—a deathlike silence reigns over the Hall, broken only by the reverberating tones of Mr. Stephens's matchless voice." Horace Greeley, that brilliant statesman and journalist, said of him, "You forget that you are listening to the most eloquent man in Washington, and only feel that he is right." And yet Mr. Stephens did not strive after oratory; his first aim was to convince by fact and argument, and not by a play upon the emotions. He was a skillful debater and quick at repartee.

On one occasion when Mr. Stephens had outclassed his opponent, Judge Francis H. Cone, during a debate, his antagonist, in desperation,

cried, "You little slim, emaciated, dried-up runt! I could pin your ears and swallow you whole"; to which Mr. Stephens replied: "And if you did, kind sir, you would have more brains in your belly than you now have in your head!"

He was an adviser of great leaders, a counselor of Presidents. He was a consummate parliamentarian. He was a bold and finished diplomat.

His faculty for foresight seemed intuitive, even mystical. He read the future by the past and by his knowledge of the minds of men.

From his first speech in Congress to his last before the war he made consistent endeavor to preserve the Union under the Constitution, and was often accused of abolitionism by his enemies among his own constituency, and of laboring for slavery extension at the North. He repudiated the doctrine, "the greatest good for the greatest number," and maintained that "If slavery, as it exists with us, is not best or can not be made the best for both races, the African as well as his master, it ought to be abolished." He insisted, however, that it was a question under the Constitution of the United States for each individual State to determine for itself.

His system of ethics was often quoted by him: To do unto others as he would have them do unto him, conditions being reversed.

He made many prophetic utterances. In his celebrated "Union Speech," delivered at Augusta in 1860, he condemned the secession movement and made a prophecy for which some called him insane: "The signs of the times portend evil," said he. "You need not be surprised to see these States now so peaceful, contented, prosperous, and happy, embroiled in civil war in less than 12 months."

He refused to be put in nomination for President of the United States at the Charleston Convention in 1860, though strong pressure was brought to bear upon him, but he supported with all of his energy the candidacy of Douglas; but the split in the Democratic Party at Charleston and Baltimore put three Democratic candidates in the field against the Republican candidate and resulted in the election of Mr. Lincoln on a platform declaring against Government toleration of any form of slavery in the Territories.

South Carolina promptly seceded, several States followed her; Georgia, trembling on the brink, was held back by Stephens.

President Lincoln and Mr. Stephens had much in common; the boyhood of each had been a struggle with poverty; each had learned his lessons by a pine-knot fire; both were lawyers. In Congress both were members of the same political club, and each admired the peculiar abilities of the other. Stephens in a public speech following the untimely death of Mr. Lincoln said: "I knew Mr. Lincoln well; he was warm-hearted; he was generous; he was magnanimous; he was most truly with malice toward none, with charity for all."

Lincoln, in a letter to his own law partner, said: "I take up my pen to tell you that Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, a little, slim, pale-faced, consumptive-looking man has just concluded in Congress the very best speech of an hour's length I ever heard. My old withered dry eyes are full of tears yet."

And here to-day in our National Capitol it is significant that after a lapse of 62 years Mr. Lincoln, war-time President of the Federal Government, in marble quarried from Mr. Stephens's native soil, sits at the far end of the Mall, and Mr. Stephens, war-time vice president of the Confederate Government, also in Georgia marble, sits secure in this sacred Hall at this end of the Mall.

In our fancy we can see them in the Eternal City, clasp hands to-day, where with virtue that is celestial, truth that is radiant, and love that is Godlike they shall separate no more forever, and listening may hear them in unison with Lee and Grant, Jackson and Sheridan, Gordon and Hooker, Zeb Stuart, and all the grand choir invisible, join their celestial voices in one grand according chorus:

There is no North, no South,
We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in faith, one in hope, one in charity,
One through all eternity.

Mr. Stephens, in his celebrated union speech delivered at Augusta, Ga., in a futile effort to avert the War between the States and to preserve the Union, said: "I have looked and do look upon our present Government as the best in the world. I have ever believed and do now believe that it is to the best interest of all States to remain united under the Constitution. My judgment is against secession."

President Lincoln wrote him requesting a copy of his union speech. In replying Mr. Stephens said: "The country is in great peril, and no man ever had heavier or greater responsibilities resting upon him than you have in the present momentous crisis." To this letter Mr. Lincoln wrote a historic response, and marked "for your eye only," assuring Mr. Stephens that a Republican administration would not directly or indirectly interfere with the slaves in the South. But, said he, "You think slavery right and should be extended, while we think it wrong and should be restricted, and that is certainly the only substantial difference between us." Mr. Stephens wrote another long letter to Mr. Lincoln, entreating him to clarify his position, saying: "A word fitly spoken by you now would be like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

Before Georgia seceded Mr. Stephens made many addresses against secession, and used all of his influence possible to avert the tragedy of war, as did his younger brother, Judge Linton Stephens, who was considered by many as distinguished a lawyer and as bright an intellect as Alexander. After Judge Linton Stephens had completed a masterful address in 1860, at Dalton, against secession, calls were made for Alexander, who had gotten up from a sick bed to be present at this meeting, at which a vast concourse of people had gathered. In his weakened physical condition and in prophecy of impending ruin, with great reverence, he exclaimed, in the language of the Christ as he wept over the Holy City, "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how oft would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chicks under her wings, and ye would not!"

In his battle for the Union, Stephens, with his brother, Herschel V. Johnson, and Benjamin H. Hill, led a forlorn hope against Robert Toombs, Tom and Howell Cobb, and Gov. Joe Brown. An idea expressed by Tom Cobb and capitalized by his brother Howell, "We can make better terms out of the Union than in it," turned the scale of fate and caused Georgia to secede. It was the consensus of opinion of the best minds that had Georgia not seceded Virginia and the other States would not have pursued this course, and there would not have been—at this time at least—a civil conflict.

Finally, when in spite of his logic, prophecy, and persuasive eloquence, Georgia did secede, Mr. Stephens, loyal to his State, and as champion of the doctrine of "State rights" seceded with her.

He continued his battle for the Constitution, demanding that the new Government formed be modeled on the old.

He declined to allow his name to be presented for the Presidency of the Confederacy, and in the interest of harmony and only as a duty from which he felt he could not escape he accepted the Vice Presidency, being sworn in on February 11, his 49th birthday. A week later Jefferson Davis was inaugurated as President.

Concerning his efforts during the war to be useful in economics and diplomacy, to which fields his gifts and training peculiarly fitted him, and the subsequent differences which arose between Mr. Stephens and Mr. Davis, I will not speak other than to say that Mr. Stephens remained consistent in his attitude of loyalty to the Constitution.

Immediately following the close of the war, and after the tragic death of Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Stephens, as were most of the prominent leaders of the Confederacy, was arrested on the order of the new Republican administration and was thrown into prison, being confined for approximately six months at Fort Warren, located just across the bay from Boston. When he entered prison his hair was chestnut brown; when he was finally released his hair had changed to white.

Mr. Stephens died one year preceding my birth, hence I was deprived of the privilege of being his contemporary. As I have read the history of his wonderful life, written by various authors, I have been fascinated as I have never been in reading any novel. I have read the history of his life night after night, until 1, 2, 3, and 4 and even 5 o'clock in the morning without growing weary.

I have merely given to-day a suggestive outline of his statesmanship and patriotism. I would delight to speak at length of various incidents in his life; of his riding the circuit, without a horse and with saddlebags upon his shoulders; of his first law case, which he won; of his bravery and personal encounter with Judge Cone, in which he received 18 knife wounds; of his distressing experiences during his unjust imprisonment. To relate details of his railroad accident, in which he suffered several fractured bones, and of his many serious illnesses, might prove of interest.

I would like to tell of his aid in assisting not less than 55 young men in securing an education, and of his many charities in helping various institutions and needy persons whenever opportunity was given. I would like to enumerate some of his accomplishments in Congress. He was the father of the Weather Bureau, and encouraged the development of the telegraph and Atlantic cable.

I would like to tell you of his charming social life and hospitality. He gave his home, which still stands at Crawfordsville, Ga., the name "Liberty Hall," for said he, "Here I do as I please, and expect my guests to do the same."

I would like to mention his various publications, and praise especially his War Between the States, recognized as the ablest defense of the Confederacy ever published. This alone would make his name immortal.

To me it would be a peculiar fascination to give suggestive outlines of many of his political and literary speeches, and I would delight to speak of his purity of life and loyalty to his friends—but this would require hours to present, even suggestively. Any address would be quite inadequate, however, if reference were not made to an important influence in his life.

Mr. Stephens was never married, but he loved. This experience which should have brought him life's joy, brought him but sorrow. He kept silent because of his poverty and ill health. So sacred he held

this experience that only once or twice in after life did he mention it—all that tradition preserves of the object of his attachment is that she was lovely in person and character; was his pupil and learned rapidly; and she had "dark eyes and curls, and rosy cheeks."

Years afterwards, when in Congress, he loved again. The lady, a woman of beauty and distinction, was not indifferent to him, but again he kept silent; a woman's due, he thought, was a husband on whom she could lean and not an invalid whom she must nurse.

The love of which I wish to speak more particularly was that between himself and his young half-brother, Linton. Like Jonathan and David, their souls seemed to be knit together. Linton's mother died when he was only 1 year old, Alexander himself, only a boy, assuming the responsibility of guardian of him. Neither had known a mother's care. While in prison, he wrote in a letter to Linton, "This little messenger of love goes as the embodiment of the tenderest and strongest affections of my heart to the dearest one to me on earth." Again he wrote when Linton had been ill: "My greatest mental disquietude, my greatest suffering, has been on your account. Would to God I could know this day how you are, and that you are well again!"

At various times he would dream of Linton and write a full description of his dreams in his Prison Journal. "Will Linton come to-day? My earnest wish and prayer is that all may be well with him and that I may yet see him." Finally Linton came to visit him at the prison, and a short time afterwards, October 12, while he was away for a day in Boston, orders for Mr. Stephens's release were received, and his first thought was, "I wish Linton were here!" And later, in 1875, when Linton died, he exclaimed, "The light of my life has gone out." I have never known of a sweeter, more wonderful love than this between brothers.

Mr. Stephens in a literary address at his alma mater in 1879, after enumerating various accomplishments of distinguished Georgians, paid a beautiful tribute to the true and original discoverer of ether as an anesthetic in surgical operations, who died June 16, 1878, and suggested that he, in company with Gen. James Edward Oglethorpe, its founder, should be selected as the two men who should represent Georgia in Statuary Hall.

I shall never forget the humiliation which was mine when a young man just out of college 23 years ago when on my first visit to Washington and being conducted through Statuary Hall in the National Capitol, with a large party, the statues of great men from the various States were pointed out by our guide, I, with great temerity said, "Now show us the statues of the men from Georgia," and was informed: "Georgia has no statues."

At that moment I pledged myself that I would do my utmost to remove this stain of neglect from the fair escutcheon of our State.

When the resolution creating the National Statuary Hall in the Capitol at Washington was under consideration in 1864, Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, the author of the resolution, said: "Will not all of the States with generous emulation proudly respond, and thus furnish evidence that the Union will clasp and hold forever all its jewels, the glories of the past, civil, military, and judicial, in one hallowed spot where those who will be here to aid in carrying on the Government may daily receive fresh inspirations and new incentives?

"To scorn delights and live laborious days, and where pilgrims from all parts of the Union, as well as from foreign lands, may come and behold a gallery filled with such American manhood as succeeding generations will delight to honor, and see the actual form and mold of those who have inerasably fixed their names on the pages of history."

On July 1, 1902, a commission created by the Legislature of Georgia, on motion of Hon. Madison Bell, of Atlanta, and appointed by Gov. Allen D. Candler, verified the sacred maxim: "That he who would be least among us, should be the greatest," and chose, not General Oglethorpe, not discounting his greatness, because he was one of the greatest characters in all history, but selected the names of Crawford W. Long and Alexander H. Stephens whose statues should be placed in this Hall representing Georgia's two most distinguished sons.

Though I may have contributed little toward the fruition of my dream, I rejoice that on March 30, 1926, the statue of Crawford W. Long was placed in this sacred Hall, and that here to-day, through the generosity of Mrs. J. M. High, Atlanta's foremost citizen, and Mrs. Elizabeth Venable Mason, of Atlanta, who merits equal recognition because of her invaluable aid, and that gifted and intrepid sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, but for whose genius the wonderful memorial proposed to the Confederacy, to be chiseled in enduring granite upon the face of Stone Mountain, would never have been conceived, who has so graciously and generously contributed his services as sculptor; it is the privilege of the Atlanta Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy to present to the Nation, through his honor the Governor of Georgia, the actual form and mold of Alexander H. Stephens, and I rejoice that I am privileged to have a part in it.

The intrinsic value of these monuments will be as real as the sun that shines, the flowers that grow, as a mother's love, and the inspiration which will come to the young manhood of the State and Nation can not be measured in pecuniary value.

In the last illness of Mr. Stephens, there are two citizens of Georgia—one here to-day—who were very close to him.

To ex-Gov. Nat Harris, who has been the recipient of his generosity, he being among those whom Mr. Stephens had aided in securing an education, and one to whom he was strongly attached, he whispered this message: "Give Harris my love."

To Judge E. C. Kontz, his warm personal friend, and who officially represents on this occasion his honor, the mayor of Atlanta, and who stood by Mr. Stephens in his death chamber, we are indebted for an accurate description of his dying moments.

Just before the spirit of Alexander Hamilton Stephens winged its flight into the glory world, he said: "Alex—get ready, get ready—we are almost home!"

When Mr. Stephens died, not only in Georgia, not only in the South, was public tribute paid to his memory. In far off Vermont, State offices were closed on the day of his funeral, and the flag was displayed at half-mast over the capitol.

When the news of his death reached Washington City, the House of Representatives, of which he had so long been a Member, unanimously adopted resolutions expressing "heartfelt sympathy with the people, not only of Georgia, but the whole country, in the loss of such a statesman and such a patriot."

Go with me into the Library of Congress at the National Capital, or that one on Copley Square in Boston, or that one on the corner of Fifth Avenue and Forty-second Street in the metropolis of America. I dare say we will find there two freight cars full of biography commenting on the good and great people of the ages, but the greatest biography ever written was expressed in just five words, and was written of Him whose birthday the world will celebrate on the 25th day of this month, "He went about doing good." This, ladies and gentlemen, is typified perfectly in the life and character of Georgia's two most distinguished sons! After all, there is nothing grander than such living! We may say of them, as was said of another distinguished Georgian, Henry Woodfin Grady, who died literally loving a Nation into peace:

"I have seen the light that gleamed at midnight from the headlight of some giant engine rushing onward through the darkness, heedless of opposition, fearless of danger, and I thought it grand! I have seen the light come over the eastern hills in glory, driving the lazy darkness like mist before a sea-born gale until leaf and tree and blade of grass glittered in the myriad diamonds of the morning ray, and I thought it was grand! I have seen the light that leaped at midnight athwart the storm-swept sky, shivering over chaotic clouds, mid howling winds, until cloud and darkness and the shadow-haunted earth flashed into midday splendor, and I knew it was grand! But the grandest thing, next to the radiance that flows from the Almighty throne, is the light of a noble and beautiful life, wrapping itself in benediction round the destinies of men and finding its home at last in the blessed bosom of the Everlasting God!"

That man is great who has the strength to serve, the patience to suffer, who seeks not to conquer the world, but, mastering himself, spends his life and energies in unselfish service for his fellow man.

Such a man was Alexander Hamilton Stephens, whom, not having seen, I love!

Senator HARRIS. Governor Hardman, of Georgia, will present the statue to the United States of America. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY L. G. HARDMAN, GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA, IN PRESENTING THE STATUE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Governor HARDMAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Senators, Congressmen, Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, and I would not forget to recognize old guards and the young women and the young men of Georgia. [Applause.] I rise not to address you, but it is an honor and a privilege to receive for the State of Georgia this statue from the Daughters of the Confederacy.

I want to say, before I tender this statue to this great Nation, that as I stand here I can in my mind hear this imperishable marble address the friend and compatriot of Alexander Stephens, Dr. Crawford W. Long, whose statue is right over there: "Crawford, I have come. Here am I. You and I were roommates in the University of Georgia. You left that institution seeking to serve mankind in your efforts and in your life. You made a contribution not only to this Nation but to the entire world and to mankind in the discovery of sulphuric ether, the conquerer of pain, and in that you followed the Great Nazarene. But I, Crawford, gave my time, my effort, my love, to service to mankind for liberty, for freedom, and for peace. I come now to room with you in the Statuary Hall of the National Capitol of the greatest Nation on earth; and here it is, with our fellows, representing the highest ideals of government, that we shall spend eternity; and here it is that these principles and the service that we have rendered shall live throughout all time." [Applause.]

Through you, Mr. Vice President of this great Nation, it is a real joy to tender the statue of this great man to this unparalleled Nation. Thank you. [Applause.]

Senator HARRIS. Because of the esteem in which he is held by the people of Georgia and the United States, and because of the devotion of the soldiers from Georgia who served under him during the last war, and because he is one of the great men of the world, the Vice President of the United States, Hon. Charles G. Dawes, has been asked to receive the statue from the State of Georgia. [Vice President Dawes was greeted by the audience rising and applauding.]

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT DAWES ACCEPTING THE STATUE ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Vice President DAWES. This statue is of a man whose place in the esteem of his fellow citizens was won by the force of a character which irresistibly held him to his high convictions irrespective of personal interest. Possessed of commanding intellect and born with instinctive sympathy for the poor, the weak, and the suffering, his recognition of the relation of a constitutional bill of rights to their welfare made him its champion at all times and under all circumstances, notwithstanding that in war self-preservation is the first right of nature, and its expedients must then often take the place of constitutions.

Thus in the awful stress of civil conflict, when the Constitution itself was involved, his position was often misunderstood, both in the North and in the South. Yet, he always trod the painful path to which his sense of duty pointed the way. The war ended, and as to him there gradually formed that ultimate calm judgment of the people which is only asserted when time, dulling passion, and prejudice clears the way for reason. Then the voice from the heart and conscience of a people became finally articulate and hailed him as a great leader and friend.

This statue is erected by the people of Georgia as a tribute of enduring gratitude to a beloved son of the State.

As representing the Government of the United States, a government whose flag inspires the love of a united people no longer divided, either by section or sentiment, a government under which the North is proud of the South and the South of the North, the East of the West, and the West of the East, I accept this memorial in its name, in accordance with the act of the Congress. [Applause.]

Senator HARRIS. I now introduce Georgia's distinguished junior Senator, Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE. [Applause.]

RESPONSE BY SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

Senator GEORGE. With the statue of Alexander Hamilton Stephens, Georgia is content to complete her contribution to Statuary Hall.

Tortured by poverty in his youth, and receiving his own education at the hands of kindly and noble women, he gave educational opportunity to the youth of his State; many of the State's most illustrious men are directly indebted to him for their educational advantages. Under his own roof he made provision for the homeless wanderer. His carriage was at the command of the common vagabond in the public highway.

In the days of national stress and strife he differed from the leaders of southern thought upon matters of the supremest importance, and with sublime moral courage he opposed the strongest prejudice of his own people.

He loved the State; he loved the South; he was never among the traducers of his State or of his section, though he openly and fearlessly questioned the wisdom of their course. From the beginning he set his face like flint against secession, although he was the first and only Vice President of the Confederacy. In the memorable convention in which the sovereign State of Georgia solemnly expressed her decision to go out of the Union, and amid threats of personal violence, his character and his courage enabled him to say that if he should die, he wished his body wrapped in the old flag of the Republic and buried in the soil of Georgia.

Of him Myrta Lockett Avary said: "He was the one public man of his day who remained throughout the war neither southern nor northern but American." [Applause.]

Upon his calm and unerring judgment the people of his State early learned to rely. His judgment was successively justified by events. Above other men of the South, his life, his exalted character, and his public service fitted him to serve the State and the Nation through the era of passion. He lived to see the bonds of union again cemented.

Lawyer, historian, chief executive of the State which now so signally honors his memory, and for 26 years a Member of the Congress of the United States, the statue of Alexander Hamilton Stephens is well at home in the company of the illustrious representatives of sister States here in the Nation's Hall of Fame. [Applause.]

Senator HARRIS. We have heard to-day of the deeds of a great man; and the half has not been told. We often hear of the deeds of men, but not so much of the deeds of women. In the humble hut, as well as in the palace, the deeds of devotion and self-sacrifice of women surpass those of the men; and that is illustrated to-day. Doctor Quillian told us that Mrs. High, with the assistance of Mrs. Mason, made possible this event; and yet at their request they have both been left off this program. I know I am expressing the sentiments of this audience when I ask these ladies to please come to the platform and let the audience see them.

(Mrs. High and Mrs. Mason went upon the platform and were greeted by the audience rising and applauding.)

Senator HARRIS. We will now receive the memorial wreaths. Mrs. P. H. T. Lane, the national vice president, United Daughters of the Confederacy. [Applause.]

Mrs. LANE. In the name of the United Daughters of the Confederacy I place this wreath in memory of our first and only Vice President of the Confederate States of America, Alexander Hamilton Stephens, for—

> "Plato was not more supremely just;
> Augustus was not greater in the state,
> Or Brutus truer to a public trust."

Senator HARRIS. Mrs. High, in behalf of the chapter of United Daughters of the Confederacy of Crawfordsville, Ga. [Applause.]

Governor Hardman will place the wreath on the statue of Crawford W. Long. [Applause.]

The sponsors will place the bouquets on the statue of Alexander Hamilton Stephens. [Applause.]

On the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate Veterans will place the wreath. That statue is on the other side of the hall. [Applause.]

I will now call for the representatives of the governors of the several States, and ask them to rise.

John Trotwood Moore, representing the Governor of Tennessee. [Applause.]

Mr. Hampson Gary, representing the Governor of Texas. [Applause.]

Gen. Lucien Powell, representing the Governor of Virginia. [Applause.]

Mrs. Holden, a relative of Mr. Stephens, and wife of the distinguished Judge Horace M. Holden, of Athens, will place a wreath upon the statue. [Applause.]

Mrs. HOLDEN. As official representative of the Daughters of the Confederacy, Georgia Division, I place this wreath on the statue of their Vice President of the Confederacy. [Applause.]

Senator HARRIS. The Confederate soldiers are placing the wreath on General Lee's statue on the other side of the Hall. [Applause.]

Governor Hardman will present to the audience one of the old slaves of the Stephens family. [Applause.]

Governor HARDMAN. I have the distinguished honor to present to this audience Dora Stephens, the only living slave of Alexander H. Stephens. She lived at the old home place; and it is a great honor to be able to present one of these slaves to the people of America.

(At the request of the Presiding Officer, the audience rose and sang the first and last verses of "America.")

Senator HARRIS. After Doctor Small has pronounced the benediction, Doctor Quillian will place a wreath on the colossal bust of President Lincoln, by Gutzon Borglum, which reposes in the adjoining hall. [Applause.]

BENEDICTION BY DR. SAM W. SMALL, OF GEORGIA

Doctor SMALL. Our Heavenly Father, we have paid our last possible mortal tribute to the memories that flow down to us from the personality and the great services of one of Thy sons who made himself illustrious by his loyalty to Thee, and his love of humanity, and his fidelity to his country. We pray that Thy rich benedictions may be upon this event, the like of which would be impossible at any time in the past, or in any country of the present except our beloved America; and we pray Thee that from this silent figure carved in imperishable marble, succeeding generations may receive the inspirations of love and loyalty to Thee, of sacrifice for fellow man for whom Christ died; and this we ask in His name, and in the name of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

(At 4.35 o'clock p. m. the proceedings were concluded.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the exercises attending the unveiling of the Statue of Alexander H. Stephens an address prepared by Judge E. C. Kontz, of Atlanta, Ga., representing the mayor of Atlanta.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection leave is granted. The address of Judge E. C. Kontz is as follows:

On this momentous occasion as under this dome of the Capitol we unveil this statue of one who never held a sword, alongside of that of Crawford W. Long, the country doctor, as the chosen sons of all of Georgia's noble and worthy children, we are forcibly impressed that "Peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war."

Alexander Hamilton Stephens, as great as were his mental powers; unsullied as was his moral character; attractive in personal appearance, and charming as was his personality; his interests as broad as the outlook of humanity; great in every sphere of his activities, as student, as teacher, as lawyer, as legislator in State, Federal, and Confederate Governments; great in diplomacy; he was a friend of the outcast and counsellor of Presidents. Effective as were his powers, as a leader of men, as individuals and in mass; as an orator, not only noted for sublimity of thought and beauty and clarity of diction, he was ever forceful and efficient in the presentation of his cause, whether on the hustings, at the bar, or in the forum. Keen in mental grasp;

his spiritual nature was attuned to the music of the spheres; and capable of interpreting the message of the violet. Friend of every living creature—he loved his dog; his dog loved him. His purse was ever open to the call, not only of every human being—he never turned out an animal grown old in his service. His knowledge of men was prodigious; he remembered names, and was adept in genealogy, especially of Georgians. Much confined by illness, he became profound in learning and versed in the whole range of human knowledge. His statesmanship was founded not only upon brilliance of his intellect but upon acquaintance with the history of government from the earliest recorded times; and his innate conception of the motives that move men; and he led men because they knew he knew, and those who knew him best felt that if it might be said of any mere human being, he never had a selfish thought. Though slight of statue, he was majestic in physical as well as in moral courage; with 18 cuts, a stab just barely missing his heart, when called on to retract a statement or receive the final thrust, his only answer was, "Never; cut." He refused to prosecute his assailant.

What Alexander Hamilton Stephens said of Robert E. Lee we may likewise say of Stephens as his highest eulogy, "What I have seen General Lee to be at first, childlike in simplicity and unselfish in character, he remained unspoiled by praise and by success." Such was the recognition of his power and his hold on the hearts of men that Lincoln sought his cooperation in an effort to avert the war. Sherman, after reaching Georgia, sought his cooperation to end it. He suffered as a prisoner at Fort Warren in Boston Harbor, and yet when the war was ended he, too, "with malice toward none and charity for all," spoke in this Capitol at the unveiling of the picture of Lincoln with such magnanimity that President Barnard, of Columbia College, wrote in 1878, that he "continued to command equally North and South a homage, a respect, and a confidence which are awarded by the people to hardly any other." His life radiated the atmosphere of the pure, the good, and the true, and he thought on these things. He believed that man must not live by bread alone; but he knew, too, that man needs bread, and thus he was a man of action, and great was his influence in the practical affairs of his State and country; and among the constructive benefits which he conferred on Georgia was his successful advocacy of the construction of the Western & Atlantic Railroad. He was the father of the Weather Bureau as we know it. His influence was substantial in the chartering of Wesleyan, the oldest chartered female college of the world; and such was the breadth of his patriotism that in a speech in Atlanta in 1872 he said: "There are true men at the North, men true to Democratic principles in New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts. It is a great mistake to suppose that there are not true men there, as true liberty-loving men as you are."

When returned to Congress in 1872 he addressed himself to his old task of reconciling sections, preserving peace, and as always, of proclaiming the sacredness of the Constitution. Modest he was, but when attacked in the Georgia convention he did not hesitate to claim his due, and thus having, with his brother, Linton, drafted the platform of 1870, he said that it contained "the principles that brought you into power." But the outstanding service of his long, useful life was borne by his clear comprehension of the character of the Federal Government and of the sovereignty of the States. He did not in 1861 favor the policy of secession; he opposed it; but he never questioned the right of the convention of his State; and it is now, not because he was Vice President of the Confederacy; not because he was a Member of Congress nor because he was Senator elect; not because he was Governor of Georgia; not because of the mere brilliancy of his intellect, nor, indeed, because of the purity of his soul; but because there was in him that which flowered in his matchless defense of the South and his vision of the soul of liberty which dwells in the principle of the sovereignty of the States, without which our American Government would be a sham and a delusion, the cloak of tyranny, and the instrument of oppression.

Grady died "literally loving a nation into peace," and although (as stated by Senator Hill) we were "back in the house of our fathers," our reception was as of a prodigal returned; but since Alexander Hamilton Stephens wrote his Constitutional View of the War Between the States, men no less reverence the towering form of the Union which he loved; but they also saw the majestic figure of the sovereign States as never before, and thus he struck from them the last vestige of reproach, and made clear that the Confederate soldier never was a "rebel"; and it was because of this supreme effort of him whom we here honor that the way was opened for the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States to authorize the minting of a coin with the no less significant superscription, "E Pluribus Unum," as a "Memorial to the valor of the soldier of the South."

As brave and true men of the South honor the leaders of the North in the fratricidal strife, so do patriots of every section stand before the now quickly emerging effigies of Lee, of Davis, and of Jackson as they ride out of the granite sides of Stone Mountain, just as has come the figure before us, in pristine purity, from the marble quarries of the State he loved so well, for even our hills and our valleys pay tribute to his greatness, and on our hearts is written the story of his matchless worth. As Gen. James Jackson, who in 1795 resigned from the United States Senate to enter the State legislature, said, that should his heart be opened "Georgia" would be found legibly written there. So let us as we rejoice together in a reunited country, which, may it please God, shall stand until the heavens shall roll up as a scroll and time shall be no more, a model to liberty-loving people in every clime in all generations, not by force of arms or by the mandate of any entangling alliance, but as God shall give us to see the right, for the protection of each other; for the advancement of their common interest, the peace and prosperity of all the world, and a beacon light to the nations of the earth; so may Maine and California, Missouri as well as Georgia, be written on the hearts of men, and let others in like spirit say of theirs as we of Georgia:

O proud Georgia, mother of soldiers, scholars, statesmen, grand men, and noble women, seated on your everlasting hills, clothed in the rich drapery of forest and of plain, decked in your rich rude jewels and with lap well filled with amaranth of immortality, sheaves and choicest gifts for your children; in one hand cities, the other outstretched in benevolent deeds and ever ready for the protection of your people; your feet resting at the sea mid orange blossoms, emblems of your worth; your tresses bound with mountain laurel, fit symbol of your virtue and your glorious achievements; palms strew your pathway; with your sisters go on in your majesty while the nations, wondering, watch your sure and steady march to new victories and to greater glory.

Our sons freely offered their lives in the Spanish-American War, and without stint they gave themselves in the World War, and it was a son of Virginia who so long kept us out of the great struggle, and who, when the people were ready, led a united people to victory in the greatest conflict of the world's history. So will we of the South support the Union and fight its battles, never forgetting, however, that the Union is a confederacy of many States; and if this day's proceedings shall cause men to again inspect and study the foundations of our Government, as they march shoulder to shoulder with those of their sister States in a union of hearts greater than any written constitution, Alexander Hamilton Stephens will not have lived in vain nor died without a patriot's reward; and it shall indeed be true that "he, being dead, yet speaketh."

CLAIM OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I introduce a resolution calling upon the Comptroller General to make a report to the Senate regarding an old claim of the State of Connecticut similar to the reports which have been made as to the State of Maryland and the State of New York at previous times; and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It simply calls for a report to be made by the Comptroller General to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 67), as follows:

Resolved, That the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and reexamine the account between the United States and the State of Connecticut with respect to advances and expenditures made by such State for military purposes during the War of 1812–1815 with Great Britain, and, after applying to such account the rules applied to the settlement of a similar account between the United States and the State of Maryland under the act entitled "An act authorizing the payment of interest due to the State of Maryland," approved May 13, 1826, as amended by section 12 of the civil appropriations act, approved March 3, 1857, to submit to the Senate a report containing a restatement of such account with interest computed according to such rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than the Members of Congress. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress which now exists be filled by the appointment of Charles Evans Hughes, of New York.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 69), as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, be, and he hereby is, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March, 1890, on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas by striking out the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and inserting in lieu thereof the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRISON. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], which I transfer to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). For obvious reasons, on this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS's name was called). The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. PITTMAN (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I am informed that if he were at liberty to vote he would vote "yea"; in which case, if I were at liberty to vote. I should vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. COPELAND. My colleague [Mr. WAGNER] is detained from the Senate by the funeral of an intimate friend of his family. He has a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HALE. My colleague [Mr. GOULD] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—39

Ashurst	Ferris	Kendrick	Simmons
Barkley	Fletcher	King	Steck
Bayard	George	McKellar	Stephens
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Swanson
Bratton	Glass	Neely	Thomas
Broussard	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Bruce	Harrison	Ransdell	Tyson
Caraway	Hawes	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Heflin	Sheppard	

NAYS—42

Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Schall
Blaine	Gillett	McNary	Shipstead
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Shortridge
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Smoot
Capper	Hale	Nye	Steiwer
Couzens	Howell	Oddie	Warren
Curtis	Johnson	Phipps	Waterman
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Watson
Deneen	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Edge	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.	
Fess	McLean	Sackett	

NOT VOTING—13

Blease	Gould	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
du Pont	Jones, N. Mex.	Smith	
Edwards	Moses	Tydings	
Gooding	Norris	Wagner	

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the original resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

The resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President pro tempore elect will present himself at the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. MOSES advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 70), as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 71), as follows:

Resolved, That Edwin P. Thayer, of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move as an amendment to the resolution to strike out the name of Edwin P. Thayer, of Indiana, and insert in lieu thereof the name of Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called.) Making the same announcement as to my general pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). I repeat the announcement with reference to the absence of my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. WAGNER] has been called to New York to attend the funeral of a very intimate friend. He is paired on this question with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. If my colleague were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair and transfer as before, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HALE. Making the same announcement as before as to the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOULD], I will state that if present he would vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is necessarily absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—41

Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Stephens
Barkley	George	Mayfield	Swanson
Bayard	Gerry	Neely	Thomas
Black	Glass	Overman	Trammell
Bratton	Harris	Pittman	Tyson
Broussard	Harrison	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Bruce	Hawes	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Caraway	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Copeland	Heflin	Sheppard	
Dill	Kendrick	Simmons	
Ferris	King	Steck	

NAYS—43

Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Sackett
Blaine	Gillett	McNary	Schall
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Shipstead
Brookhart	Greene	Moses	Shortridge
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Smoot
Couzens	Howell	Nye	Steiwer
Curtis	Johnson	Oddie	Warren
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Waterman
Deneen	Keyes	Pine	Watson
Edge	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Fess	McLean	Robinson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—10

Blease	Gooding	Norris	Wagner
du Pont	Gould	Smith	
Edwards	Jones, N. Mex.	Tydings	

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

The resolution was agreed to; and the Vice President administered the oath prescribed by law to Edwin P. Thayer as Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 72), as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Edwin P. Thayer, of Indiana, as Secretary of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 73), as follows:

Resolved, That David S. Barry, of Rhode Island, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move as an amendment to the resolution, to strike out the name of David S. Barry, of Rhode Island, and to insert in lieu thereof the name of J. L. Dobell, of the State of Montana.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I desire to ask the chairman of the Senate committee appointed to inquire into campaign expenses in connection with the election of 1926 to give to the Senate a statement of the facts in relation to the reported recalcitrancy of the present Sergeant at Arms in the matter of the service of subpœnas for that committee, and the discharge of other duties for that committee.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I have not with me the correspondence which was exchanged between the committee and the Sergeant at Arms. I would have to send for it in order to state the matter with that degree of accuracy which I would like to employ if I make any statement. I did not bring the papers because I had concluded, in view of what has transpired, not to bring the matter before the Senate. That view was arrived at after some discussion with the members of the committee. So, while I am perfectly willing to give the information, I want it understood that I am doing it simply because it has been requested. I shall give it as accurately as I can recall it.

After the Congress adjourned the committee desired to have certain papers served in the State of Pennsylvania relating to the procuring of the ballots. The proper documents were prepared for service. Mr. Barry was called before the committee and was asked to serve them.

I will say to Mr. Barry that if I make any error in my statement, I would be glad to have him step to my desk and call my attention to it, and I shall be glad to correct it.

Mr. Barry inquired where the money was to come from with which to pay the expenses, and the statement was made either by himself or some one else that the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate had stated that he would not approve the vouchers of the committee and that Mr. Pace, financial clerk of the Senate, had indicated that under the circumstances he would not pay money on vouchers unless so approved. Thereupon Mr. Barry was informed that the money would be advanced by the committee or one of its members.

Mr. Barry expressed the opinion that he was in doubt whether he had the right to receive the money for his expenses from any source except the regular channels, through the financial clerk as disbursing officer of the Senate, and said that he desired time to consult with his counsel. My recollection is that he said he would like to have a day or two. The committee, after consultation, wrote Mr. Barry a letter saying that they desired an answer from him by 3 o'clock on that day—I believe that was the hour—which allowed him, as I now recall, something like three hours to ascertain what he would do; and that the committee required an answer from him within that time as to whether he would carry out the directions of the committee. In a short while we received a reply saying, in substance and effect, that within the time limited he would be unable to have the consultation he desired. This is all in letters, and since I am making an oral statement I will get the letters as soon as I can have them brought from my office.

Mr. Barry informs me that he did not ask for the privilege of advising with his attorney, that he had no attorney, but that he did ask time in which to advise with somebody.

Taking up the matter where I left off, the substance of the reply was that he declined to carry out the directions of the committee under the circumstances if required to carry them out at that time and without consultation. Thereupon the committee appointed an agent to execute its orders and sent that agent to the State of Pennsylvania to serve the papers which the committee desired to have served. I think I ought to say that at the time I felt very indignant over the matter.

Mr. Barry a day or two ago called at my office and said that the real trouble which he had in mind was that he was in doubt about the authority of the committee to proceed at all, that he had not meant any disrespect to the committee, and that he stood ready to carry out any proper orders of any committee of the Senate at any time.

I think that is as fair a statement as I could make of the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. HALE (when Mr. GOULD'S name was called). Making the same announcement as before, if my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HOWELL (when Mr. NORRIS'S name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER'S name was called). Repeating the announcement previously made regarding my colleague [Mr. WAGNER] and his absence, I wish to say that if he were present and at liberty to vote he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I am not able to obtain a transfer and therefore I am compelled to withhold my vote. If I were voting, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRATTON. Making the same announcement that I have already made with reference to the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], I desire to announce that if he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I desire to make the same statement as before with reference to the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS].

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—40

Ashurst	Fletcher	King	Simmons
Barkley	George	McKellar	Steck
Bayard	Gerry	Mayfield	Stephens
Black	Glass	Neely	Swanson
Bratton	Harris	Overman	Thomas
Broussard	Harrison	Pittman	Trammell
Caraway	Hawes	Ransdell	Tyson
Copeland	Hayden	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	Kendrick	Sheppard	Wheeler

NAYS—42

Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Sackett
Blaine	Gillett	McNary	Schall
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Shipstead
Brookhart	Greene	Moses	Shortridge
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Smoot
Couzens	Howell	Nye	Steiwer
Curtis	Johnson	Oddie	Warren
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Waterman
Deneen	Keyes	Pine	Willis
Edge	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	
Fess	McLean	Robinson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—12

Blease	Edwards	Jones, N. Mex.	Tydings
Bruce	Gooding	Norris	Wagner
du Pont	Gould	Smith	Watson

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Vice President subsequently administered the oath prescribed by law to David S. Barry as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word on the question of the election of the Sergeant at Arms.

In view of the fact that the so-called Reed special committee saw fit not to bring in any charges against the Sergeant at Arms, I felt constrained to vote for his election. I wish it distinctly understood, however, that if any occasion again arises when an employee of the Senate refuses to obey an order

of the Senate or of any committee of the Senate, I shall stand ready at any time to vote for his discharge.

Everyone makes mistakes; I think the Sergeant at Arms made a serious mistake. An employee of the Senate is the servant of the Senate and Senate committees. The Senate and its committees are responsible for orders given him, but, I repeat, in view of the fact that the special committee did not see fit to bring in a report, and in view of the fact that all people sometimes make mistakes, I felt constrained to vote for the election of Mr. Barry as Sergeant at Arms upon this occasion.

ELECTION OF ASSISTANT DOORKEEPER

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 74), as follows:

Resolved, That Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF ACTING ASSISTANT DOORKEEPER

Mr. CURTIS. I offer a further resolution and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 75), as follows:

Resolved, That Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected Acting Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I offer and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and which I ask to have read.

Mr. CURTIS. Let the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 68), as follows:

Whereas on the 4th day of March, 1927, the Senate referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections the pending contest between WILLIAM S. VARE and William B. Wilson, involving the question whether the said VARE or the said Wilson, or either of them, is entitled to membership in the United States Senate as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections is hereby authorized to hear and determine said contest, and to take such evidence as it may deem proper in order to determine the questions involved, and certify its conclusions to the Senate.

Said committee is authorized, by itself or by any subcommittee, to investigate the questions aforesaid, and shall have authority to act by or through such agents or representatives as it may see fit to designate.

Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to issue subpœnas and require the production of all papers, books, documents, or other evidence pertinent to said investigation, and said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of the Congress and to hold its sessions at such places as it may deem proper.

It shall have authority to employ clerks and other necessary assistance and to employ stenographers at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per hundred words, and to cause to be taken and recorded all evidence received by the committee, and to have said evidence printed for the information of the Senate.

The Senate, having heretofore created a special committee to inquire into certain matters in connection with said election and the primary preceding the same, and having continued said committee in force, it is ordered that the Committee on Privileges and Elections may, in its discretion, consider such evidence as has heretofore or may hereafter be taken by the said special committee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolutions 195, 223, 258, and 324, Sixty-ninth Congress, and Senate Resolution 10, Seventieth Congress; and the said special committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to consider such evidence as may be taken by the said Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and his deputies and assistants are hereby required to attend the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or of any subcommittee thereof, and to execute its directions.

The chairman of the committee, and each and every member thereof, is hereby empowered to administer oaths and generally have such powers and perform such duties as are necessary or incident to the exercise of the powers and duties imposed by this resolution.

Said committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The cost of investigations and proceedings in pursuance of the foregoing to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and not to exceed $50,000.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, before this resolution shall be adopted there may be a word to be said.

Mr. CURTIS. The resolution will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in any event, and the Senator from Missouri will have an opportunity to read and consider it in the meantime.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The resolution does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. It authorizes the employment of stenographers, and that authorization has to be passed upon by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. The resolution has to be referred to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the statute the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO SATURDAY

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it adjourns to meet on Saturday next. I would have asked that it adjourn until Monday, but the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill will be ready for presentation on Saturday, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would like to have it disposed of on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It is expected that the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill will be considered by the Senate on Saturday.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; it is expected that it will be considered on Saturday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent submitted by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the agreement is entered into.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 12 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Saturday, December 17, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 15, 1927

SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Ephraim F. Morgan to be Solicitor Department of Commerce.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Elliott Northcott to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leonard E. Wales to be United States attorney, district of Delaware.

Charles H. Tuttle to be United States attorney, southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John T. Barrett for appointment as marshal of the Canal Zone.

James G. Buchanan to be United States marshal, southern district of Mississippi.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Robert S. Cartledge, Mobile.

ALASKA

Earl T. Stannard, Latouche.
James H. Anderson, Nome.

ARIZONA

Winchester Dickerson, Ashfork.
Anna L. Rybon, Humboldt.
Henry M. Hall, Mesa.
George H. Staiger, Ray.
Chester A. Williamson, Willcox.

COLORADO

Ethel M. DeBerry, Keenesburg.
Victor L. Waters, Kim.
Thomas E. Amick, McPhee.
Leona E. Backus, Two Buttes.

CONNECTICUT

Clifford B. Reed, Collinsville.
Albert G. Spiers, Glenbrook.
Minnie Rosenblatt, Newington.
Henry R. Carignan, North Grosvernor Dale.
Wilson T. Johnson, Silver Lane.

HAWAII

Thomas C. White, Kealakekua.
Antone Fernandez, Kekaha.
Antone F. Costa, Wailuku.

ILLINOIS

Raymond C. Moon, Annawan.
Fred Humm, Bethalto.
Martha K. Fredrickson, Bureau.
Clarence Duckles, Chesterfield.
Fred E. Rose, Crystal Lake.
John M. Bradley, Cypress.
William C. Lewnan, Danville.
Forrest E. Peterson, Depue.
Luther M. Kimmel, De Soto.
Edith M. Tuxhorn, Edwardsville.
Elizabeth B. Wetmore, Eola.
Aaron K. Hirstein, Fairbury.
William F. Temple, Fairmount.
Walter J. Fagan, Flossmoor.
Robert E. Stephen, Frankfort.
Mamie A. Eisenmayer, Granite City.
Eugene Saunders, Harvard.
George F. Sutton, Harvey.
Leo. H. Borgelt, Havana.
Earl Cory, Hazel Crest.
George E. Hull, Kinderhook.
Lawrence J. Boyd, Lewistown.
William P. Volz, Lockport.
Clifford C. Wimpress, Lombard.
Enno A. Karstens, Mascoutah.
Roland K. Cumming, Midlothian.
Katherine Dickson, Minier.
Alonzo M. Spaeth, Mount Carmel.
William E. Tharp, Nashville.
James H. Cawthon, Oakwood.
Bernie N. Griffin, Patoka.
John S. Burnett, Pittsburg.
Oliver E. Ray, Poplar Grove.
Mary C. Guest, Reddick.
James T. Livingston, Royalton.
Lina S. Paschal, St. Charles.
Leonard F. Richardson, Sheffield.
Bond B. Blackman, Stonefort.
Robert W. Zumwalt, Taylor Springs.
William M. Repine, Tiskilwa.
William C. Karr, Vermont.
Ernest L. Crain, Villa Ridge.
Lloyd R. Winn, White Hall.
Herbert Tucker, Williamsfield.

KANSAS

Thomas A. Biggs, Barnard.
Reuben H. Funk, Durham.
James W. Way, Elmdale.
Charles R. Braden, Elsmore.
Goldia E. Smith, Hudson.
Charles A. Connelly, Independence.
Walter A. Carlile, Jamestown.
Charles S. Smith, Lakin.
John A. Bryan, Leoti.
Harold R. Starbuck, Lincoln.
John Quin, Ottawa.
Everett G. Gillidett, Plains.
Charlie Gray, Pretty Prairie.
Esther Wetterau, Princeton.
Earl R. Ispon, Rolla.
C. Harold Keiter, Scammon.
Arthur F. Rader, Smith Center.
Oliver R. Durham, Udall.
Gertrude M. Blair, West Mineral.

MAINE

Donald W. Stackpole, Bridgewater.
Perry J. Murphy, Bridgton.
Leslie D. Ames, Camden.
Sarah J. Jordan, Ellsworth Falls.
George A. Palmer, Monroe.
Clarice O. Small, Ridlonville.
Robert L. Cyr, Van Buren.
Henry G. Suett, Weld.
Marjorie R. Dudley, West Enfield.

MARYLAND

Nettie Fowler, Bowie.
Samuel T. Ragan, Conowingo.
Julian M. Richardson, East New Market.
Mary B. Workman, Fort Howard.
Beatryce B. Bounds, Fruitland.
Anna B. Bowie, Kensington.
Jacob H. Reinhardt, Lansdowne.
Aureila Day, Marion Station.
George E. Lane, Queenstown.
Robert H. Phillips, Salisbury.
Joseph P. Cooper, Sharptown.
Victor F. Cullen, State Sanatorium.
Leon Clifton, Stockton.
George W. Stevens, Sudlersville.
Howard R. Damuth, Thurmont.

MASSACHUSETTS

Gertrude A. Davis, Assonet.
Charlotte M. Everett, Bolton.
Russell B. DeWolf, Duxbury.
Godefroy de Tonnancour, Fall River.
Joseph J. Tebo, Fisherville.
Arthur F. Cahoon, Harwich.
Charles E. Hamblin, Huntington.
William R. Farrington, Middleboro.
George M. Campbell, Rutland Heights.
Osgood L. Small, Sagamore.
Ella M. Ovenden, West Boylston.
Eugene B. Tobey, West Hanover.
Stanley H. Matthews, Yarmouth Port.

MICHIGAN

Maurice Kenel, Ahmeek.
Clara Kellsy, Bannister.
Claud E. Ford, Caledonia.
Hilda M. Hammer, Carney.
Carrie B. Daly, Carrollton.
Emile J. Crete, Caspian.
Martin Donohue, Center Line.
Gladys E. Daniells, Coleman.
Lila Botsford, Comstock.
Dana Stowell, Comstock Park.
Stanislaus M. Keenan, Eloise.
Christena T. Murphy, Gaines.
George H. Florian, Grand Junction.
Ray C. Wood, Highland.
Mac W. Thomas, Lawrence.
Linton E. Cosand, Lupton.
Cornelius G. Schuur, Marne.
Kate Turner, Michigan Center.
Kathryn I. Stanley, Morrice.
Victor Gustafson, Nahma.
Gwendolyn E. Stockman, Oscoda.
Otto L. Sprague, Owosso.
Mary E. Morrison, Rapid City.
Mattie D. Read, Richland.
Napoleon Valrance, Rockwood.
Louis A. Lowen, Roseville.
Fred H. Johnson, St. Ignace.
Addie F. Martindale, Southbranch.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Frank E. Webster, Farmington.
Herman P. Gleason, Ossipee.
James A. Reed, Union.

NEW JERSEY

William T. Birkhead, Beverly.
Clarence W. Gaskill, Bridgeboro.
Charles W. Foster, Grenloch.
Dallas G. Young, Keyport.
Weston Rice, Lake Como.
Thomas J. Willis, Lake Hopatcong.
Harold R. Fife, Linwood.
Forrest Green, Long Branch.
George C. Kloss, Manasquan.
Winfield L. Smith, Mantua.
John S. Inman, New Egypt.
William B. Havens, Toms River.
Daisy R. Beekman, Towaco.

NEW MEXICO

Angelo Frazzini, Dawson.
Bert C. Wright, Fort Sumner.
Leroy H. Brock, Mosquero.
Dennis J. Walsh, Santa Rita.
Agnes C. Evans, Shiprock.

NORTH CAROLINA

James H. Ramsay, Salisbury.

OHIO

Robert O. Cady, Bay Village.
Joseph T. Scheutle, Beaver.
Janet Boster, Chesapeake.
Lawrence W. Hall, East Sparta.
John W. Darling, Elmore.
Wilber S. Bush, Jeffersonville.
Elmyra L. Griswold, Macedonia.
Jerry F. Koster, Mayfield Heights.
Nellie Maddock, North Ridgeville.
Karl S. Schiller, Petersburg.
Arthur W. Cummings, Uhrichsville.
George P. Ewing, Vinton.
Florence M. Brakeman, Warrensville.
John A. Gatchell, Wharton.

OKLAHOMA

Myrtle E. Harrell, Apperson.
John R. Hibbard, Asher.
Otto S. Allred, Boynton.
William S. Wilhite, Butler.
Viola Smith, Clemscot.
John W. Dagenhart, Gage.
Lynn McDonald, Goodwell.
Jean C. Buell, Holdenville.
Andrew G. D. Elswick, Manchester.
Bruce W. Hutton, Oakwood.
Robert F. Rind, Pine Valley.
Etta B. Sellers, Quapaw.
William R. Carteel, Sapulpa.
Alvin L. Derby, Shidler.
James B. Cox, Stilwell.
Thomas J. Winters, Stringtown.
James M. Adkison, Tulsa.
Fred Hudson, Webb City.

TEXAS

George W. Ragland, Abernathy.
Eugene C. Arnold, Agua Dulce.
John A. Meyer, Archer City.
Antonia R. Garcia, Benavides.
William R. Black, Bessmay.
John K. Ford, Bogata.
Harold Rothschild, Borger.
Pearl G. Boynton, Bronte.
Charles S. Myers, Bryan.
Ray C. Kelley, Caddo.
John T. Watson, Caddo Mills.
Fred R. Ridley, Campbell.
Claude H. Martin, Crane.
William F. Manning, Crossett.
Frederick V. Blesse, Dilley.
Wiley Fox, Dumas.
Ferman Carpenter, Franklin.
Lillie Brinkley, Howe.
Clifford C. Burrows, Iowa Park.
Clara C. Redford, Johnson City.
James T. Davis, Kopperl.
Alex E. Jungmann, Lacoste.
William R. Wagle, Lampasas.
John H. Anderson, Lawn.
Newton L. Craven, Leander.
Jessie L. Kay, Lytle.
Dudley L. Gibbs, Manning.
Tryon Lewis, McCamey.
Oscar J. Adcock, Merkel.
Joel D. Cranford, Mineral Wells.
Elmer J. Mayo, Nevada.
Charlsie S. Witham, New Braunfels.
Fannie H. Miller, Newton.
Willie L. Casey, Olney.
Joseph F. Wiles, Olton.
Neeta Shaw, Ovalo.
Jesse R. Davis, Pearsall.
Belle H. Shelly, Plemons.
Thomas E. Franklin, Poteet.
Andrew J. Sitton, Pyote.
Andrew J. Bushong, Rankin.
Henry L. Goodwin, Roaring Springs.
Efren M. Ramirez, Roma.
Nicholas K. Lidstone, San Saba.
George W. Leonard, Shiro.
Thomas C. Murray, Sonora.
Turner H. Perry, Stephenville.
Daniel W. Thurman, Stinnett.
Ira B. Davidson, Strawn.
Winfred C. Wilson, Sunset.
Minnie L. E. Walton, Swenson.
John E. Kimsey, Texon.
Miles B. Earnheart, Trenton.
D. Calvin Hutton, Truscott.
Thomas W. McCormick, Tuscola.
Alfred S. Maddox, Valley View.
Julia E. Fones, Village Mills.
Laura E. Tidwell, Whittenburg.

UTAH

Wallace L. Holst, Brigham.
Charles E. Torgerson, Emery.
John H. Hall, Hurricane.
Corty D. Larsen, Mammoth.
Verona G. Fullmer, Orangeville.
T. J. Wadsworth, jr., Santaquin.

WYOMING

Charles P. West, Bairoil.
George F. Seeman, Kaycee.
Daniel C. Carson, Pinedale.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, *December 15, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Not unto us, O Lord, but unto Thee give glory for Thy mercy. Come unto us that we may hallow Thy name and fulfill Thy law. Strengthen us to do Thy will. This day may we put some touches of sunlight into the lives of others. Guide us in the way of right living. May we not live by bread alone, but by the inspiration of the noblest pursuits of life. We thank Thee for our rich privileges; may we use them for the honor and glory of Thy name and for the good of our fellow men. In the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House for printing in the RECORD a communication from the Speaker of the House of Venezuela, who recently occupied a seat in the gallery:

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I wish to extend to you and through you to the Members of the august body over which you preside my deep appreciation and sincere thanks for the courtesies extended to me on my recent visit to Washington.

G. MANRIQUE PACANINS.

THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the revenue bill, with Mr. NEWTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] just prior to adjournment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINEY: Page 193, strike out lines 8 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment strikes out section 431 of the bill on page 193. This amendment is one of the most important amendments submitted to this bill; it is far-reaching in its consequences. The item in question I have here as it was incorporated in the original draft of the bill before the committee and before this draft was made. In effect it increases the excise taxes on foreign-built boats 500 per cent. The language as the section was originally drafted was so objectionable and so obnoxious that the committee struck it out and simply increased five times the excise duties on boats for other than trade purposes brought into the United States.

It is admitted and it will not be denied that the section as drafted now operates as a complete embargo on foreign-built ships of this class. None of them can come in. I can not better commence this argument than by calling attention to our treaty with Germany. Most of these foreign boats which come in—and the number that come in is negligible—are built in Germany, and now I want to read article 8 of our treaty of friendship with Germany, signed at Washington on December 6, 1923, ratified by the Senate, and proclaimed on the 14th day of October, 1925. This is our agreement with Germany. I read article 8 of this convention:

> The nationals and merchandise of each high-contracting party within the territories of the other shall receive the same treatment as nationals and merchandise of the country with regard to internal taxes, transit duties, charges in respect to warehousing and other facilities, and the amount of drawbacks and bounties.

A most far-reaching clause. It affects internal taxes and it goes much further than treaties usually go. This clause, as we have drafted it now, increases 500 per cent the excise duties on boats constructed in Germany.

I do not know, at any rate I am not at liberty to say, whether or not this section is now being considered in our State Department; but we do not need any declaration from our State Department to indicate to this Congress and to the country that we are grossly violating our treaty with Germany if we write this clause into the law, which has the effect of absolutely excluding boats manufactured in Germany from entering our ports under American ownership and from sailing under the American flag. They make no such discrimination as this against our boats. We can build as many boats in this country for German ownership as we want to build, and, therefore, she has made no discrimination against us. Our nationals are not receiving this kind of treatment there, but if we enact this into law her nationals will be receiving this kind of treatment here.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Is it not true that there is already a tariff rate on these foreign-built pleasure boats and power boats?

Mr. RAINEY. No; not directly, if they come in under their own power. The larger boats that come in come in under their own power and they do not pay a tariff duty. In order to evade this provision of our law—and that is the main reason for this clause—in 1926 they built in Germany 13 small racing yachts, to be used in the races off Long Island. They brought them on the decks of ships to Halifax and then brought them down here under their own power, their own sailing power or their own steam power, as the case might be. These boats cost $13,000 apiece to build in Germany, and the evidence shows they would have cost $22,000 if built in the United States. It is an inconsiderable item, and it does not amount to anything.

I might say, however, to the gentleman from Texas that there is a tariff on everything which goes into the manufacture of a boat. For example, engines of the Diesel type—and they are now putting them in all ships on account of their economy of operation—carry a tariff of 40 per cent, and a Diesel engine, according to the testimony, amounts to 20 per cent of the entire cost of building a boat, and the tariff on a Diesel engine is so high that no Diesel engines are brought into the United States. Therefore the tariff protects the boat builders of this country and manufacturers as to every item used in the construction of a boat. The tariff is so high that none of those things come in. The machinery which goes into a boat carries a high rate of duty.

There are 178 manufacturers in the United States who are demanding this paragraph, and they are manufacturers of machinery and manufacturers of boats, including manufacturers of Diesel engines. I suggested to the gentleman who appeared for them before the committee that if we had free raw material for boats or if we should take the tariff off of Diesel engines and off of these other things that go into the manufacture of a boat, they would be able to build boats cheaper. They do not want to do this because they have already got a tariff on these things which is absolutely exclusive. You can not bring any of them in and the proponents of this legislation are largely engaged in the manufacture of engines of the Diesel type.

Therefore manufacturers of engines of the Diesel type will not only get the 40 per cent which operates to exclude such engines from the United States, but in addition to that, under this bill, they will in effect get 500 per cent more.

There never has been in the history of bills levying tariff duties or excise duties before a clause which increased 500 per cent excise charges or tariff charges.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Then I understand from the gentleman's argument that the real purpose of this section is not to raise revenue for the Government, but really to act in the place of a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. RAINEY. Absolutely. Not a tariff, of course; the tariff is not involved, but it is a prohibitive charge in direct violation of article 8 of our Washington convention with Germany. It has the same effect, but the tariff is not involved, I will say to the gentleman on my left, in this amendment which I am offering to the bill. The tariff will remain just exactly as it is.

The effort is being made, in literature sent to Members of the House and in the hearings before the committee, to show that American boat building is in a decline. I might say before going to that branch of the subject that we have a user's tax now on foreign-built boats imposed each year. On a boat of any considerable size—a boat of 500 tons displacement—this user's tax will be $1,600 a year. This was a tax imposed during the war on all boats of this character, but we afterwards took it off as to American-built boats. So American manufacturers still have the user's tax as applied each year to foreign-built boats, in addition to the present excise tax they have, which is only 20 per cent of the proposed taxes. These taxes are five times as great.

Now, the American shipbuilding industry is prospering, prospering more than the shipbuilding industry of any other country in the world. Figures, as I obtain them from the Commerce Yearbook, run something like this:

In 1926 there was a decided decline in the tonnage under construction in the world, a decline of 1,933,000 tons. Therefore, in all the world, outside of the United States, there is an appreciable decline in the shipbuilding industry. In the United States we had under construction at the end of 1926, 151,000 tons, a gain over 1925 of 44 per cent. Therefore, this claim made by representatives of the shipbuilding industry that they are in a desperate condition is not borne out by the facts. They had under construction in shipyards in the United States 44 per cent more tonnage in 1926 than they had in 1925.

Most of the world trade, the transoceanic trade, is carried on in 5,575 ships—ships of more than 4,000 tons displacement—and we have our full share of that tonnage.

In 1926 we carried in American ships 118 per cent more tonnage than we carried in 1914; a slight decrease of 0.5 per cent in the tonnage carried in American ships in 1926 under 1925, which is absolutely negligible. We carry in American ships 36 per cent of our transoceanic tonnage, and, of course, in the coastwise trade we carry it all; and on the Lakes we carry it all.

So this charge that the American shipbuilding industry is declining is not borne out by the facts, and the statements made are misleading.

This proposed increase in charges on foreign-built boats can in no particular be construed as a proposition to raise revenue. It is frankly the very opposite. It will act as a complete embargo, and there will be no revenue derived from that source in the future if this provision is enacted into law. We only collect $7,000 now, and that small amount indicates how negligible is this German competition. The demand for it is an unconscionable demand, presented by prosperous shipbuilding industries, whose business is not declining but is increasing at a greater rate than the shipbuilding industry of any other nation; in fact, the shipbuilding industry of every other shipbuilding nation in the world is declining.

We now build in our yards more ships every year than is built in the yards of any other nation in the world except Great Britain, Italy, and Germany. In 1924 we constructed in American shipyards a tonnage of only 58,000. On June 30, two years later, we had under construction in American shipyards a tonnage of 133,000, and six months later, on December 31, 1926, our tonnage under construction in American shipyards had increased to 151,000 tons. During the period I have mentioned tonnage construction has declined in the shipyards of every other nation of the world. We carry 47 per cent of our foreign commerce now in our own ships, and only 6 per cent of this amount is carried in our Shipping Board vessels.

This is not a proposition which affects only the very rich. This is not an attempt merely to compel the very rich to buy their yachts from American shipbuilders. It affects principally men of moderate means, and we would never have heard of this unconscionable attempt to place an embargo on foreign-built ships if it had not been for the fact that 15 small sailing boats for racing purposes were brought in from Germany about a year ago. These boats of this small type came in in an unusual way. They were brought on the decks of freighters and unloaded at Halifax—a foreign port—and then came in under their own power to United States ports.

These small boats only cost $13,000 each, including the costs of delivering them at Halifax. If they had been built in this country, protected as materials are by tariffs, they would have cost $22,000 each. Therefore American shipbuilders figure that they have lost in profits $8,000 on each of these 15 small sailing boats, a total of $120,000 for all of them. We are asked now, in order to prevent a recurrence of this situation, to imperil our trade relations with Germany by placing this unconscionable tax on foreign-built boats. It will probably be a long time before conditions are such in the yacht-racing sport as to again bring about this situation.

American shipbuilders are not worrying about large yachts being constructed for American millionaires in German shipyards. According to the Marine News for December, 1927, there are eight large yachts being built in German shipyards for prominent leaders in American industry, and about that many are being built in American shipyards. What they are afraid of is that the smaller boats used by people of moderate means for pleasure on our waterways will be brought in, after being landed at Halifax, under their own power. This is the thing that worries American shipbuilders, and this embargo will affect not so much six or eight rich men in the United States who may buy large yachts abroad each year as the small men who may buy small sailing craft and small power boats abroad and land them at a near-by foreign port and bring them in under their own power. They are afraid that others may follow the precedent set by the few men who brought in a few small sailing boats last year in this way. Of course, if a boat is so small as to make it impossible to bring it in from a near-by port under its own power, it would have to come on the deck of a ship, and when it does it pays a duty.

The user's tax, the present excise taxes, and the indirect methods of tariff protection we have now in effect constitute all the protection builders of Diesel engines and builders of boats ought, in good conscience, to ask at the present time. Our trade relations with Germany and with other foreign nations are now being endangered by the greed of American manufacturers and already tariffs are being raised against us in practically every commercial nation in the world, until in some nations they amount practically to an embargo on our agricultural products. Such legislation as is proposed in the section I am trying to strike out of this bill will simply accentuate the conditions to which I am calling attention. The agricultural condition of the country, now in such dire straits, will be the first to feel the effect of the retaliatory legislation made inevitable in foreign countries by just such legislation as is proposed in the section I am endeavoring to strike out of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a matter that does not require very much discussion. This is a tax on the wealthy yacht owner who prefers to spend his money in Europe rather than patronize an American shipyard.

I would like at this time to take about 5 or 10 minutes on the tariff aspect of the situation as presented by the gentleman from Illinois, but it is hardly worth while, and this is really not the time for a tariff discussion.

This is an excise tax for the use of these boats, and it is graded according to their size. Witnesses who appeared at the hearings on this subject were the only people, strange to say, who came before the committee asking for an increase of taxation, asking that the rates be increased. Of course everybody else that appeared at the hearings wanted taxes reduced.

These boats arrive from the other side and when they come in under their own power, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, they do not pay a tariff. The method employed in handling the smaller ones is to unload them from freight steamers at Halifax or St. Johns and bring them into this country under their own power and thus escape the penalty imposed by our tariff law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And pay no tariff whatever.

Mr. CROWTHER. Pay no tariff whatever; and in addition to that, one of these yachts that will cost from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000, or even more, comes into port here under her own power, and very frequently has equipment running as high as half a million dollars, consisting of tapestries, rugs, crockery, dishware, engines, electrical apparatus, silverware for the table, and they arrive here with the linen and silver on the table and all ready for the owner to enter just the same as you would enter your private home; and not one cent's worth of all these magnificent furnishings pays a cent of duty because it is recognized as equipment, and it is all made in European countries.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. Under the law, are they not required if they dock at an American port and remain any length of time to remove such things from the vessel and put them in lockers and lock them up?

Mr. CROWTHER. Of course they are not allowed to remove the equipment under the law, but we know now that there is a great deal of smuggling going on under the guise of bringing such things in on these big yachts as equipment. It is only one of the many difficulties that face us at the various customs ports in the attempt to stop smuggling.

Now, this tax we believe is fair, and we believe it is necessary, because our shipyards are not prosperous to-day, despite what the gentleman from Illinois said. The evidence given by men who represent them show that they are not prosperous. The reason boats are built over there is because there is 33⅓ per cent differential between the cost here and in Germany. This is largely due to low wage scales in Germany.

That is all there is to this proposition. It is not complicated; it is not tied up in any way with the tariff. The tariff proposition as it exists is futile, because it is avoided by their coming in under their own power.

I recently read the statement that the German shipbuilders submitted estimates to the Cunard Steamship Co. for the construction of three boats, and their bids were £500,000 less than the British bids. Boats can be built over there for 66⅔ per cent of what it will cost here.

Now as to the Diesel engine. I asked a prominent engineer if it was a fact that because of the duty we did not import Diesel engines, and he said it was not a fact; it is because we made an engine equally serviceable in this country. If the United States Government desires to use Diesel engines on their battleships or cruisers, under the law they could bring them in without a tariff. The gentleman from Illinois knows that. So there is no difficulty about the tariff on Diesel engines. The only trouble with the tariff is that it falls far short of protecting many of our key industries from foreign competition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAINEY) there were—28 ayes and 81 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART V.—STAMP TAXES

SEC. 441. TAX ON SALES OF PRODUCE ON EXCHANGE

Subdivision 4 of Schedule A of Title VIII of the revenue act of 1926 is repealed, to take effect on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I realize that the members of the Ways and Means Committee, without much partisan feeling, have worked hard to make this bill. In the making of tax laws they are doing better each year; but it seems to me that not only the members of the Ways and Means Committee but many of the other Members of the House and the people fail to realize that generally we will have an income tax as long as this Government endures. Some people seem to have a fixed idea that the levying of an income tax resulted from the Great War. But

we had the income tax prior to that and we will continue to have it in some form or other. Therefore I hope and pray that the time will soon come when the Committee on Ways and Means will do something to simplify the methods with regard to the reporting of incomes so that the great bulk of the people who pay taxes on incomes under $12,000 can make their returns simply, properly, and without unnecessary expense. The cost to the Federal Government in printing and paper alone is enormous, and you all know of the costs and labor to the average payer of a medium income tax.

The Chairman, I venture to say that 20 per cent of all the membership of this House can not properly make their own returns without the aid of the income experts from the Treasury Department, who are sent over here from Baltimore each year to help us out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is aware that the returns of those having an income of $5,000 have been simplified. I know of clerks and women that have no trouble in making up their returns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I know. I said that each year the committee was doing better, but they can do still better. The process should be simplified so that the great body of the people who pay a tax under $10,000 income might do it on one sheet of paper with one affidavit. Plans have been outlined, and submitted to the committee, but the plan seems to have become fixed in the beginning, and no one seems willing to start on a new and simpler line. Then, again, the small taxpayers are unorganized. No lawyers represent them. They have no experts to appear for them. The committee is occupied with the big, hard problems of taxation, and can not find time for consideration of a simple process for the modest man with taxable income, who is anxious and willing to pay his bit to the Federal Treasurer, and who will appreciate a simple plan by which he can pay a small flat percentage of his gross income in lieu of paying under the present cumbersome plan. At least, an optional plan might be tried for his benefit.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 442. TAX ON SALES OR TRANSFERS OF CAPITAL STOCK

Subdivision 3 of Schedule A of Title VIII of the revenue act of 1926 is amended, to take effect on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act, by striking out "on each $100 of face value or fraction thereof, 2 cents, and where such shares are without par or face value, the tax shall be 2 cents on the transfer or sale or agreement to sell on each share" and inserting in lieu thereof "on each $100 of face value or fraction thereof, 1 cent, and where such shares are without par or face value, the tax shall be 1 cent on the transfer or sale or agreement to sell on each share."

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. That will not interfere with gentlemen who want to offer amendments. I want to say a word to these gentlemen over here on the Republican side who are worrying about the loss of revenue by amendments to the bill. I want to call attention to this particular section and stress upon you the fact that a mere change of a word—2 cents to 1 cent—loses you $8,500,000. Out of that $8,500,000, $8,000,000 of it is paid by New York State alone. In other words, they paid more in one transaction when the Du Ponts bought General Motors than you people from Iowa pay in five years. You are going to repeal it, and then you are going to say that you are sorry to lose the revenue. You are not willing to give the small corporations relief, and the probability is that Mr. GREEN'S excuse will be that he could not afford to lose the revenue. Yet he donates $8,000,000 to the New York Stock Exchange without a word. I am in favor of reducing taxes, and I have no objection to reducing these taxes so far as the principle is concerned, but I call the attention of you gentlemen to the fact that in the reduction of taxes in this bill you are not favoring the average man except in the automobile tax and in the small corporations, and here you are, without a word, giving up $8,500,000 worth of taxes, 90 per cent of which is paid on the New York Stock Exchange. I merely call attention to it, so that you can do as you please. I do not propose to offer an amendment, for I favor repeal of all taxes of this nature. I do not want you to say in the future that you are reducing these and then did not have enough revenue. Here you are voluntarily surrendering $8,500,000 by this provision.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] would make a logical argument, which he is capable of doing, if he so desires, but he has not made such an argument. The stamp taxes, as everyone knows, are passed on. They are not paid by the party who buys the stamp, and they are not in this case. This is a tax on doing business. It is a war tax that has not been reduced since the beginning of the war, and is paid, not by big corporations, but by individuals.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I imagine that that is probably true, that all taxes are merely passed on. That is what I said about the corporation tax. The gentleman took the other end of it. I call the gentleman's attention, however, in passing on this tax to the fact that seats on the New York Stock Exchange are going down in value every day. They are now worth between three and four hundred thousand dollars, while at the beginning of this year they were worth only $200,000. Evidently the business is not profitable, and it looks as if it might go broke, if you do not take off this tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought the gentleman was not through with his argument and would need to add something else. The fact of the matter is that this tax is burdensome on some transactions. A large number of corporations, especially mining corporations, issue stock very low in value, as low as 25 cents, do they not, I ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY]?

Mr. HADLEY. Oh, yes; it is not unusual to see it floating at far below that. I have seen it as low as 2 cents a share.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A gentleman at my right tells me that he bought some the other day as low as 2 cents a share.

Mr. HADLEY. I know of stock transactions where the 2-cent tax would absorb the entire value of the stock, and they are bona fide transactions. On a sale of $100,000 worth of stock, where the rate is 2 cents, as it is in the present law, the tax will be $2,000. This is all dust that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is throwing into the eyes of the committee here when he talks about the New York Stock Exchange. He talks about the New York Stock Exchange to draw attention away from the effect of the amendment he has fostered, which will result in reductions greatly in excess of estimated revenues. He now seeks to escape this by pointing out where you can save eight and a half million dollars at the expense of those people who are sustaining a great burden.

The fact is, as the chairman has just said, that this is a tax on business. I call attention to the fact that it is a tax on the par value. It is not a tax upon the intrinsic value. If stock is worth par, it will operate equitably; but it is upon the par value and not the intrinsic value. Mining concerns and other development concerns, which have any prospective development, frequently capitalize upon a prospective basis, and the prospective development is the warrant for it. On the transfer of stock the tax is burdensome, unreasonable, and operates to deter business and industrial activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], or any other Member, thinks that this is a tax on the members of the New York Stock Exchange, he is greatly deceived. The people who are on the stock exchange do not pay this, except in the first instance. They buy the stamps and charge it to the people who are selling the stock. It is the same way with these little mining concerns, where the stock is transferred. The gentleman from Texas is about as logical on this as he has been in some of the other arguments that he has made.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: Page 195, after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 443. SALE OF STAMPS AT POST OFFICES

Title VIII of the revenue act of 1926 is amended by adding after section 807 a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 808. The commissioner shall furnish to the Postmaster General without prepayment a suitable quantity of adhesive stamps to be distributed to and kept on sale by the various postmasters in the United States in cities of over 50,000 inhabitants. The Postmaster General may require each such postmaster to give additional or increased bond as postmaster for the value of the stamps so furnished, and each such postmaster shall deposit the receipts from the sale of such stamps to the credit of and render accounts to the Postmaster General at such times and in such form as he may by regulations prescribe. The Postmaster General shall at least once monthly transfer all collections from this source to the Treasury as internal-revenue collections."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I accept that amendment, and I think there is no objection to it upon the part of any member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Just before adjournment yesterday I made considerable effort, unsuccessfully, to get the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] to yield. The gentleman from South Carolina stated with great emphasis that there was a time in our history when the country was out of debt and distributed a surplus among the States during a Democratic administration under Andrew Jackson.

My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield was to remind him and the House that the surplus which he mentioned, being the only one he could remember under a Democratic administration, and that nearly a hundred years ago, was not the work of Democratic statesmanship; it was not revenue growing out of a revenue bill; it was not the result of a scientific study and adjustment of sources, rates, and estimates. Every dollar of that surplus was derived from the sudden unprecedented and unexpected volume of sales of the public lands.

It was not only a surprise, but it was so foreign to Democratic experience that it was viewed with dismay and apprehension. They did not know what to do with it. They could not comprehend then, as they can not now, the idea of an adequate reserve or margin. They decided to loan the sum—$28,000,000—to the existing States, numbering at that time 26. This was done at the suggestion of Calhoun to Jackson, and carried into effect by the Democratic Congress.

History recites the effect of this act as follows:

The 80 banks of deposit in which it was lying had regarded this sum almost as a permanent loan and had inflated credit on the basis of it. The necessary calling in of their loans in order to meet the drafts in favor of the States, combining with the breach of the overstrained credit between America and Europe and the decline in the price of cotton, brought about a crash which prostrated the whole financial, industrial, and commercial system of the country for six or seven years. The crash came just as Jackson was leaving office; the whole burden fell on his successor, Van Buren.

Again, with the peculiarity of government and legislation characteristic of Democracy when it attempts business statesmanship, this was done in such a manner that the nature of the transaction is far from clear. It was a gift, in effect, to the States, yet technically it was a loan, a loan which had no due date. It is carried hopelessly on the books of the United States Treasury as "unavailable funds." It was a Government financial transaction which seems to have served as a precedent for Democratic administration uncertain loans of doubtful authorization made to foreign countries after the armistice.

Such is the history of the boasted sole and last surplus of a Democratic administration, in 1836, so strenuously declaimed by the gentleman from South Carolina. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is a political debate which I do not think I can permit to go on. The gentleman from South Carolina spoke yesterday——

Mr. STEVENSON. I spoke for two minutes on yesterday. That is all the time I have taken this session, and I will not take much more. It seems to have attracted attention, however, on the other side, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] is entirely wrong in saying that history shows the Democratic Party has never turned in a surplus, and this gentleman [Mr. WINTERS] undertakes to excuse and defend Mr. BEGG's mistake by saying it was an accidental surplus. I will call your attention to a little more. When Grover Cleveland went out of office on the 4th of March, 1889, he turned over a surplus to the Treasury for a Republican administration. What happened? In 1893 when Benjamin Harrison went out of office he left a Treasury which was bare and depleted, with a gold reserve that had been actually impaired so that the Government had to go out and sell bonds to replenish the gold reserve. There was not enough money to meet the obligations. [Applause.] Mr. Cleveland held for four years during the most distressful period the country has ever seen, and when he went out of office he left a solvent Treasury, with all the dollars of the United States worth a dollar all over the world and with a gold reserve which protected our Government, which in the many years of the Republican administration had never been adequately provided for until Mr. Cleveland did so. And Mr. Wilson, of New Jersey, the Democratic President for eight years, left an ample reserve and an ample credit in the Treasury of the United States to meet its obligations and turned over a surplus.

Mr. SNELL. What were Liberty bonds selling for when President Wilson retired from the White House?

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman from Ohio did not know the difference between the Republican campaign book and the history of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART VI.—LIQUOR TAXES

SEC. 451. TAX ON STILL WINES

(a) So much of section 611 of the revenue act of 1918 as reads as follows:

"On wines containing not more than 14 per cent of absolute alcohol, 16 cents per wine gallon, the per cent of alcohol taxable under this section to be reckoned by volume and not by weight;

"On wines containing more than 14 per cent and not exceeding 21 per cent of absolute alcohol, 40 cents per wine gallon;"

is amended to read as follows:

"On wines containing not more than 14 per cent of absolute alcohol, 4 cents per wine gallon, the per cent of alcohol taxable under this section to be reckoned by volume and not by weight;

"On wines containing more than 14 per cent and not exceeding 21 per cent of absolute alcohol, 10 cents per wine gallon."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof two new paragraphs to read as follows:

"Any such wines may, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, be sold or removed tax free for the manufacture of vinegar or for the production of dealcoholized wines containing less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume.

"The taxes imposed by this section shall not apply to dealcoholized wines containing less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume."

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 196, line 13, add the following: "The payment of the tax provided in this section shall be conclusive evidence of the lawful possession and subsequent sale of such wine, the provisions of any existing law to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the Chairman desire to hear argument against the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman if he insists.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I expect I will have to make an argument to the point of order and not to the merits of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands the rules of the committee and the House. The point of order is sustained.

The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. LINTHICUM, is recognized.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take up much time of the House because what I want to say now is a matter of press record. I noticed in the Friday edition of the Star last week an account of a meeting at which our former colleague, Mr. Upshaw, of Georgia, was present, a meeting of the Anti-Saloon League; and when Mr. Kresge——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not go on with that. I know of no reason why he should talk on something that is not related to this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is related to this bill, because I moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I moved to strike out the last word, which is the word "act." Under that you can speak upon almost any subject, and I am speaking of the action of a gentleman who was formerly a Member of this House, a Member from the State of Georgia, at the meeting of the Anti-Saloon League, when Mr. Kresge offered to contribute $500,000 toward the Anti-Saloon League campaign.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think I have the right to discuss the last word, "act."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland will confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly I am speaking in order when I speak on a question of taxation in an act of this kind, where an attempt is made to tax certain wines and liquors brought into this country. I want to discuss that, and I want to tell how the gentleman from Georgia, when Kresge made that offer, led in singing Praise God, from Whom All Blessings Flow. [Laughter.]

With that statement I will extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include the article that I referred to and one from the Sun of to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object. I have objected to the insertion of all editorials and newspaper extracts and memorials.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then I will take occasion to read this article entitled "Dry Georgia tops list with 4,000 stills seized" in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have not been allowed time in which to discuss this bill heretofore.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not going to discuss this particular amendment, but I do want to say something about the bill in general.

If the people of the United States knew the contents of this bill, and knew what it will really do, I doubt that there would be 100 votes cast for the bill in the House. But the people do not know. They read the headlines in the large city dailies and the copies of those headlines in the weeklies about tax reduction, and the average man throughout the country actually thinks his tax will be reduced when this bill becomes law.

The fact is that the average man gets nothing from this bill, even less than nothing. We have to operate the Government, and it takes $167,000,000 a year to pay the interest on the war debt alone. Some of us think that those people who made money out of the war ought to pay the greater part of that debt. But now the tax heretofore imposed upon those people has been reduced, and hence the taxes will be increased for the little fellow, though indirectly. If we retain the Garner amendment and the repeal of the automobile tax there will be a little relief for the average man. And the finest feature about the bill is that the estate tax has been left in, and the greatest credit for that belongs to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]. I, of course, appreciate what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] have done; but inasmuch as they are progressive Democrats, and therefore for the people instead of for the special interests, I should naturally expect them to be for the retaining of the estate tax. But not so for the chairman of that most powerful committee on earth to-day—the Committee on Ways and Means.

In spite of the pressure that has been brought to bear upon him by Andrew Mellon and all the powerful money interests, he has consistently stood his ground and never wavered an inch under the terrific barrage. I think the people of this Nation owe to the gentleman from Iowa an eternal debt of gratitude for the stand he has taken, because it is due to his work more than that of any other individual that the estate tax shall go on. [Applause.]

But outside of those three features I can not see how the farmer of my district or the laboring man or the small business man gets anything. This bill, when enacted into law, will increase instead of reduce the taxes for more than a hundred million American citizens. The bill is shaped in iniquity in the $400,000,000 brain of Secretary Andrew Mellon; it is conceived in sin in the $50,000,000 mind of Undersecretary Ogden Mills, and it is brought to life by the millionaires on the majority side of the Committee on Ways and Means, and there are many of them on that committee.

Having in mind the oath I took on December 5 I can not vote for a bill of this kind. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 453. TAX ON CEREAL BEVERAGES

Section 903 of the revenue act of 1926 is repealed, to take effect on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph covering section 453.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: Page 97, line 5, strike out section 453.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on June 10 of this year the President indicated his great concern about the future revenues of this country. There has been a great deal of discussion on the floor of this House about the sources of revenue to carry on the business of the Government of the United States, but there has been little discussion by anybody in the high public life of this country about a great source of revenue which a few years ago was destroyed by sumptuary legislation. I do not think it would be out of order at this time to call attention to the loss of revenue due to prohibition. I think it is interesting on a revenue bill, no matter what one's political views may be on the wet and dry question.

The revenue derived in 1919 by the United States from the sale of beer was over $100,000,000. It can be safely estimated that could we have modification of the Volstead Act the revenue derived by the United States from a similar source would be largely in excess of that.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; I do not choose to yield. [Laughter.]

Let us look on the other side of the books. What has this thing cost us on the expenditure side? It has cost the Federal Government, as well as various units of the United States, untold sums in ludicrous and ridiculous attempts to enforce the law. It has cost the United States great sums of money to maintain an increased census in the Federal jails, and similarly in the States it has cost great sums to maintain a greater census in these State jails. As an offset against that the Attorney General simply says we get about $4,000,000 in fines from the enforcement of the prohibition law.

Now, what about the farmers? On the barley crop alone the farmers have suffered a deficit of over $700,000,000. This is true as well of hops. In 1922 there were 34,000,000 pounds of hops used.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. No. I am still a Coolidge man. I do not choose to yield.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I wish the gentleman would yield for a question.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Well, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman tell us how many hundred millions of bushels of barley were used in the liquor business?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I have not the figures now, but I have put them in the RECORD year after year. The gentleman should have read them, because I put them in the RECORD for his benefit.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I wish the gentleman would put them in the RECORD again.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Perhaps the gentleman is still emulating the President; he finally yields under pressure?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I do. I yield, but I do not run. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], that great Republican from the State of New York, for whom I have the greatest admiration because he is a real Republican, and my friend from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] had a discussion about yachts that are smuggled into this country without paying any revenue, but what about the beer that comes into this country from Canada and which does not pay any revenue? The Canadian Government tells us there were 4,000,000 gallons of beer sent into this country last year and a great deal of whisky sent into this country last year. On the revenue side alone this is a mighty serious proposition, and when you consider further that the people have scrapped this proposition of prohibition it is time the Government thought of doing the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read down to and including line 17 on page 199.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa. In line 1, page 199, after the word "assessed," there is a period, which the Chair believes should be a comma.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is a clerical error which, by unanimous consent, the clerks were authorized to correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 504. SUSPENSION OF RUNNING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

(a) Section 277 (b) of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The running of the statute of limitations provided in this section or in section 278 on the making of assessments and the beginning of distraint or a proceeding in court for collection, in respect of any deficiency, shall (after the mailing of a notice under subdivision (a) of section 274) be suspended for the period during which the commissioner is prohibited from making the assessment or beginning distraint or a proceeding in court (and in any event, if a proceeding in respect of the deficiency is placed on the docket of the board, until the decision of the board becomes final), and for 60 days thereafter."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall apply in all cases where the period of limitation has not expired prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Of course, we have to follow the committee in these recommendations as to these administrative features of this bill; but the thing I am afraid of is that Congress is not giving enough attention to the taxpayer's side in tax controversies, but is turning everything over to the Government's side of such controversies.

In the first place, a taxpayer can not go into court and restrain the Government. He has no relief in the courts. You deny him any right to go into the courts. Let us see what happens. Here is a corporation which sells out and here is a shareholder and director of that corporation. They have their tax assessed and they put up the money with which to pay that tax. It is discovered later on that there should have been more tax assessed. What do they do? They go out and take the property of this stockholder and director and tie up all of his property. He can not go into court. He is engaged in another business, a separate business, but he can not go into court and relieve himself at all because you have barred the doors of the courts to him. An officer has distrained his private property and tied it up because of the assessment due from the corporation that has failed to pay all of it. You tie up his individual property and do not give him any chance.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, this man owns the corporation the gentleman is describing, does he not?

Mr. McKEOWN. No; he has sold out and gone into another line of business, and they go out and tie up his private property and all of his money in the banks.

Mr. MADDEN. But if he is a man who has failed, he would not have any money in the banks.

Mr. McKEOWN. The man did not fail, but the corporation sold out.

Mr. MADDEN. Then your man did not fail, but he just ran away?

Mr. McKEOWN. No; he sold his interest in the corporation.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, that is worse.

Mr. McKEOWN. He was simply a director in a corporation that sold to another company. Then they come along and tie up his individual property and tie him up so he can not have any relief.

Mr. MADDEN. He ought not to be in such a corporation.

Mr. McKEOWN. Well, it is not a fair proposition to him.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We must protect the Government in some way. I do not think my friend has read section 613, which has to do with those cases. Of course we can not permit a man who owes a tax to transfer his property and beat the Government out of the tax.

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand you have to protect the Government. I know that; but in the passage of these administrative rules, if you give too much credence to the demands of the department you do not give any protection to the taxpayer. That is what I am speaking about.

I will give you another illustration of what happens. There was a business man who gave certain properties to his wife. He executed the deeds, but did not put them on record. They then made two returns, his wife making a return as well as himself. Then what took place? They came back and said, "You are not entitled to make two returns; you must make one return and pay additional tax." He paid the additional tax, but they would not allow him any credit for the money his wife had paid under her tax return and said they would return that to the wife and told him to make out an application for its return. He made out the application for its return; it went in, and for five years it stayed there, and then they said, "We can not give it back to you; it has to be given to the wife, and she did not make the application for its return. The statute of limitations has run and she can not recover it."

If this is not mistreating of our Nation, I do not know what that term means.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the Ways and Means Committee has presented us a reasonable, fair, just tax-reduction measure. They have had at their command the best information available to help make up the bill. As far as I am able to learn from conversation with various people from different parts of the country and from reading newspaper editorials, the average thinking man of this country, the man who thinks in the unit of the good of the whole country rather than the simple unit of his own pocketbook, is absolutely satisfied with this tax-reduction measure.

I have listened to the debate quite carefully, especially the debate from the Members on the minority side of the Ways and Means Committee. In my judgment they did not make a single dent in the general propositions or principles carried in this bill. I did not think they tried to, and they left the floor giving me the impression they expected to support this bill.

Now, what is the situation in which we find ourselves? Of course, I and every other man would prefer never to have to vote for taxes. Unfortunately we all can not take the position that one of our late colleagues took when he stated he voted for every appropriation and against every tax. The millenium has not yet come and unfortunately we have to put money in the Treasury before we can take it out, and what have we done in the actual consideration of this bill?

Every single amendment that has been offered on this floor, or very nearly every one, except the estate tax, that was intended to emasculate this bill or to keep the bill from returning money to the Treasury, has had the almost unanimous support of the Democratic side of this House.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, that some of you very men within the next 30 days will ask for the most unprecedented appropriations for your local sections that were ever asked on the floor of the American Congress. You are going to ask this for flood control and river and harbor improvements to meet your industrial growth. I have been down through that country for three weeks and I talked with some of your people and they said to me, "Mr. SNELL, I hope you and our other Northern friends will help take care of our situation." I looked over the situation. I thought their demands were fair, and I promised to do the right thing by them. I came back here with the intention of doing everything that was right to protect them in their flood-control proposition and also in their demands for appropriations in connection with rivers and harbors to take care of the increased development in industrial growth along the Gulf of Mexico; and I want you gentlemen who represent that part of the country to go back home and tell them that Mr. SNELL stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and voted to put taxes on his own people so that we would have money in the Treasury to do our part when the time came; and practically every one of you voted against me every time.

Now, these are cold facts. You have voted against your own interests and the interests of your people and I want them to know it. This tax reduction is not political as far as I am concerned. You have voted to put the Treasury in such a condition that they can legitimately say they have not the money to meet the appropriations you are asking for and that you ought to have. I have stood here and have done everything I could to get enough money in the Treasury to meet every reasonable and legitimate demand that should be made on it and you have consistently voted against them. If you people who are more interested in these local propositions than I am will not cooperate with me in getting some money in the Treasury for that purpose, you need not expect my cooperation to help you jimmy money out of a depleted Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. No; I do not yield at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in line with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has just said, I want to call your attention to a question that was asked Mr. Mills, the Undersecretary of the Treasury, at his last appearance before the committee, when he gave us a résumé of the methods that had been used in arriving at the surplus which we could expect.

Mr. TREADWAY. My question is this: The Treasury submitted a suggested reduction of $225,000,000 in taxes. Can you tell us whether in that estimate you considered—and if so, what consideration was

given—the probable action of Congress at the coming session in regard to appropriations?

Mr. MILLS. I think that same question was asked at the hearing 10 days ago, and the answer was that we have not taken into consideration such new expenditures as might be provided for in the next session of Congress. In other words, the figures do not include any payments that might have to be made on account of ships and radios, if the alien property bill goes through; they do not include the $25,000,000 that will be required for the purchase of the triangle; they do not include Mississippi flood reliefs; they do not include increased naval expenses; they do not include Muscle Shoals; they do not include Boulder Dam; and they do not include agricultural relief. That being so, the figures given by the Treasury must be considered as maximum figures and not minimum figures.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. OLDFIELD rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object, of course, to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, speaking, but if there is any more talk on this section I will have to object. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate greatly what my friend from New York [Mr. SNELL] said a moment ago. I am glad that he intends that his heart shall be in the right place on the proposition of flood control. But let me call attention to two or three things. We have lost only $33,000,000 to the Treasury, and that is on the automobile tax. On the proposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] we took from the Treasury $24,000,000, but on the second proposition we put back $24,000,000 or $25,000,000.

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. I voted for the second proposition of the gentleman from Texas, but the gentleman from Arkansas knows that in any event it does not take effect for two years.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The excess revenue for the next fiscal year is far in excess of the reduction at the present time.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I take the position that we have lost nothing on the two propositions.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. And the gentleman must not forget that we have retained the estate tax.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I was coming to that. This year we get $75,000,000 out of the estate tax. The Secretary of the Treasury came before our committee and said that he wanted to repeal the inheritance tax because we did not need the money. They were perfectly willing to relieve Mr. Ford and the Garys and the Rockefellers of taxes after they die, but he did not want to relieve the automobile purchasers and the little corporations of taxes. That is the situation here.

Now, that is the situation as far as these three propositions are concerned. We have voted on them and lose only $33,000,000, and we have saved $75,000,000 by retaining the inheritance tax over the protests of the President, Secretary Mellon, and Undersecretary Mills.

Now, I am going to offer an amendment to page 226 which will save the Treasury $2,000,000 a year. That is not a great deal, but it is something. The committee once placed it in the bill, but for political reasons and under a misapprehension the Republican Members backed up and took it out of the bill. I hope that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] will think about this. They thought that Republican officeholders would lose their offices, but the Civil Service Commission has said they would not, but, on the contrary, they would be covered into the classified civil service. I hope you gentlemen will think of that, because it will be a great convenience to the taxpayers of the country, and the Treasury Department is for it. [Applause.] I want you to realize that you are saving $2,000,000 by it and conferring a great convenience on the taxpayers throughout the country. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 505. SAME—TRANSFEREE CASES

(a) Section 280 (d) of the revenue act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The running of the statute of limitations upon the assessment of the liability of a transferee or fiduciary shall, after the mailing of the notice under subdivision (a) of section 274 to the transferee or fiduciary, be suspended for the period during which the commissioner is prohibited from making the assessment in respect of the liability of the transferee or fiduciary (and in any event, if a proceeding in respect of the liability is placed on the docket of the board, until the decision of the board becomes final), and for 60 days thereafter."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall apply in all cases where the period of limitation has not expired prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, petulance and irritation often cause wise and patriotic gentlemen to say things they do not mean. I am very much distressed at the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] a few moments ago, when he appeared to be deeply grieved because gentlemen were voting for some amendments to the bill, and he seemed to be alarmed over the danger that these amendments, if adopted by the House, would necessarily cause him to change his views on the question of Mississippi flood control.

Like the gentleman from New York, I do not come from the Mississippi Valley, but I know the gentleman from New York did not mean what he said. I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] views that matter as a statesman and not as a pork-barrel politician. I know that his petulance will pass in a few moments and that he will realize that his irritation for the moment caused him to express thoughts that are at variance with the gentleman's conduct here and at variance with the great responsibility which he carries as chairman of the Rules Committee and as one of the outstanding leaders on the Republican side of this Chamber. [Applause.] I would suggest to the gentleman from New York that when he says that if these amendments are adopted the gentlemen from the Mississippi Valley need not expect him to vote for public improvements to control Mississippi floods when the Treasury will not warrant it, he fails to properly interpret his duties here.

Let me suggest to the gentleman from New York that his obligation on this floor is not to gentlemen from the Mississippi Valley, but his obligation here is to the people of the United States, and when he says that he has visited that stricken section, that he viewed conditions there, that he believes the conditions call for relief, that he believes that it is the duty of the Federal Government to step in and undertake that relief, and that he has come to that conclusion, then he has transferred any responsibility from the shoulders of the people of that section to his own shoulders as a Member of the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

I suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that in editing his remarks, a privilege granted to all Members of the House, he bear in mind the suggestion I have dared to make. I am sure that the gentleman does not mean what critical people might infer. I know the gentleman, and I know that deep down in his heart his conscience will not permit his hand to execute a threat which his tongue may have impatiently uttered. A different conclusion might be drawn by those who are disposed to attribute to the gentleman the qualities of a pork-barrel-trading politician.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I moved a little while ago to close debate, but I do not think that motion has been acted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made his motion before there had been any debate, and the Chair, under the rules, could not put the motion.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, if that motion has not been agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am compelled to make the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman now to make his motion to close debate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5800) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agrees to the conference asked

by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. OVERMAN.

THE REVENUE BILL

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 506. WAIVERS AFTER EXPIRATION OF PERIOD OF LIMITATION

Section 278 (c) and (d) of the revenue act of 1926 are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Where before or after the expiration of the time prescribed in section 277 for the assessment of the tax, both the commissioner and the taxpayer have consented in writing to its assessment after such time, the tax may be assessed at any time prior to the expiration of the period agreed upon. The period so agreed upon may be extended by subsequent agreements in writing made before or after the expiration of the period previously agreed upon.

"(d) Where the assessment of any income, excess-profits, or war-profits taxes imposed by this title or by prior act of Congress has been made (whether before or after the enactment of this act) within the period of limitation properly applicable thereto, such tax may be collected by distraint or by a proceeding in court (begun before or after the enactment of this act), but only if begun (1) within six years after the assessment of the tax, or (2) prior to the expiration of any period for collection agreed upon in writing by the commissioner and the taxpayer before or after the expiration of such six-year period. The period so agreed upon may be extended by subsequent agreements in writing made before or after the expiration of the period previously agreed upon."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Members on both sides of the aisle have frequently expressed their admiration for and confidence in Mr. McCoy, the Actuary of the Treasury Department. No one has more earnestly commended him for his estimates on matters of taxation than my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. I have just had a conversation with Mr. McCoy, and I asked him whether he had made an estimate or would make an estimate of the possible gain in revenue by the adoption of the second Garner amendment, which relates to the returns of so-called affiliated corporations.

Mr. McCoy told me that he could not make an estimate on that subject; that he had never made one; that he had told Mr. GARNER of Texas that he was in doubt whether the entire elimination of the consolidated-returns provisions in the law eventually would bring any increase in the collection of taxes, for the reason that these corporations, whether they be consolidated or affiliated, whether they file consolidated returns or returns as affiliated corporations, are able to so conduct their business among themselves and between themselves that where the control is in the same set of people, in the same individuals, the entire management of the business will benefit by offsetting losses in the making of tax returns. It is to be understood that these corporations have a common management; they are engaged in a common business. They may have affiliations in other parts of the country, but they do business with themselves, among themselves, and between themselves, and there is no reason why, with all the ingenuity and ability at their disposal, not only in their own ranks but from the ranks of attorneys and accountants and other experts, they may not so manage their affairs that eventually there will be no gain in revenue to the Federal Government.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. I understand, then, that the books may be so manipulated that they can really evade the law, but if you could catch them you really could put them in the penitentiary?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not think it is a question of manipulation. I think it is a question of conducting the business. One can well realize what are the possibilities, where there is a common control, where the same people manage two or more corporations engaged in the same business. Why should they not be able to so manage their business that they will not be compelled to pay an increased amount of taxes by reason of the fact that they are so organized? And in addition to that, if it does transpire that their present organization results in a larger payment of taxes, of course, they will reorganize, and instead of having fifty or sixty subordinate corporations they will organize into a larger corporation and refrain from this division of power and authority and management.

On the other hand, Mr. McCoy is convinced that the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will result in the loss to the Treasury of approximately the amount of revenue which the gentleman has stated, which I understood to be about $24,000,000. Therefore we will find ourselves mistaken if we think the second Garner amendment will offset the first Garner amendment in the loss of revenue.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I want two minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then make it seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] was on his feet and had been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not intend to cut out the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the gentleman from Iowa wants to stop this debate, he ought to stop debate on his side by Mr. SNELL and Mr. CHINDBLOM, which does not apply to this amendment. I am anxious to stop it. I want to pass this bill to-day. We are likely to have five roll calls if the gentleman from Iowa wants a separate roll call on each amendment. If we must have debate, let us apply it to these various provisions of the bill rather than to indulge in general debate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I shall follow the gentleman's suggestion and move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I want two minutes in which to call attention to certain things, and I do not want to take the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] off his feet.

Mr. GIFFORD. Have I not been recognized, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts was recognized by the Chair. The Chair can not entertain a motion to close debate now, but will at some future time if the gentleman from Iowa desires to make it. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, some of the remarks recently made reflected rather upon me. The Associated Press carries a story "that one Republican, GIFFORD, of Massachusetts, voted with the Democrats" on the second proposition in reference to affiliated corporations. It may be a real honor or a doubtful honor, but as many other Republicans voted on the proposition as I did certainly they ought to share the honor, and I ought to correct that statement and suggest that the press take notice thereof so that many other Republican Members may receive proper mention. The Ways and Means Committee frame a tax bill before we come to Washington wherein policies or methods of taxing the people are involved. We want to be as loyal to the committee as possible, but must have the privilege of opinion. Certain members of the committee itself find it all right not to be regular. In the matter of affiliated corporations, I inquired if there is not some danger in framing a new law—section 118 being absolutely new—of juggling or washing sales, as later termed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have not time to yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman does not mean that section 118 restricts corporations. The provision has been the law for years and years.

Mr. GIFFORD. We believe in the making of consolidated returns and returns by each corporation in its own entity. This matter was, belatedly, carefully discussed in the House yesterday, and the statements made fully justified our anxiety when it was stated that possibly under the present method they could wash sales, amply justifying our inquiry, could it be possible or really encouraged under the new method. But, Mr. Chairman, it does seem too bad in the matter of a policy or method taking people's money that after arriving in Washington we are not able to get upon our feet and plead for the things for which our constituents expect or our own opinions demand. The automobile people from their districts have voted to have the auto tax repealed and registered the wishes of their constituents. It is, of course, not true that I am the one Republican who joined with the Democrats. It takes more than one to effect such a result.

If one Republican can beat this tax bill, I must be of some importance in this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK of Texas rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman desire time?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In view of the fact that my colleague from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is going to speak on the same phase of the bill that I was going to discuss, I shall not ask for time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. In five minutes the debate on this section will be closed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]? It may be that pointing him out as the only Republican who is associated with the Democrats on this amendment is unfortunate. But that is not true, because we know that without the help of some dozen other Republicans the Democrats could never have put this amendment through.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] and others were chiding this House, and undertook to convince you that you were reducing the taxes more largely than they should be reduced. Mr. McCoy, the Actuary of the Treasury, in a statement that appears in the RECORD this morning, declines to make an estimate, but when I asked Mr. McCoy how much it would be he said, "I can not make an estimate."

Mr. MADDEN. He says he has not looked into it carefully.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I want to say that there is not a man in the House or in the Senate who does not take Mr. McCoy's say so as worth 100 per cent.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why did not the gentleman take it on the bill?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. He said he can not make an estimate on this bill because he can not make an accurate one. As a final reduction in this bill, if you permit the small corporation amendment to remain in the bill and strike out section 118, you will not lose a cent of revenue in the long run.

Mr. HOCH. It could not apply to next year, but according to the terms of the bill it must apply to 1929.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It commences on the 1st day of January, 1929, so that the taxes for 1929 would apply.

Mr. HOCH. You say, "1929," but not for the fiscal year 1929.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Yes. You talk about your wash sales. You can do it now. You have got your preference to make it either as a separate corporation or as a unit. Turn to section 141 and read it. Corporations at the present time have the right to make a separate return for affiliated corporations. If they wanted to make wash sales and get credit for capital losses they can do it now. You give these corporations a preference that you do not give other corporations. The principle of it is wrong, and that is the reason why I want to strike it out. Under the present law the United States Steel Corporation can make it as a unit or as 147 corporations, and if they wanted to wash their assets and get the benefit of capital loss they can do it now, if you have a Secretary of the Treasury who will permit it. But if you had the right kind of administration in the Treasury they could not do it now and can not do it in the future. You are giving the great corporations this morning $8,000,000 reduction. You give them that $8,000,000 reduction, but you do not want to give the little corporations anything. I want to do it, and that is the reason why I offered the amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV.—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. BOARD OF TAX APPEALS—PROCEDURE

Sections 906 and 907 (a) and (b) of the revenue act of 1924, as amended, are further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 906. (a) The chairman may from time to time divide the board into divisions of one or more members, assign the members of the board thereto, and in case of a division of more than one member, designate the chief thereof. If a division, as a result of a vacancy or the absence or inability of a member assigned thereto to serve thereon, is composed of less than the number of members designated for the division, the chairman may assign other members to the division or direct the division to proceed with the transaction of business without awaiting any additional assignment of members thereto. A division shall hear and make a report to the board upon any proceeding instituted before the board and any motion thereon, assigned to such division by the chairman.

"(b) The report of the division, and any findings of fact made or opinion or memorandum opinion rendered by the division in connection therewith, shall become the report and the findings of fact and opinion of the board within 30 days after such report by the division, unless within such period the chairman has directed that such report shall be reviewed by the board. Any preliminary action by a division which does not form the basis for the entry of the final decision shall not be subject to review by the board except in accordance with such rules as the board may prescribe. The report of a division and any findings of fact made or opinion or memorandum opinion rendered by the division in connection therewith, shall not be a part of the record in any case in which the chairman directs that such report shall be reviewed by the board.

"(c) If a petition for a redetermination of a deficiency has been filed by the taxpayer, a decision of the board dismissing the proceeding shall be considered as its decision that the deficiency is the amount determined by the commissioner. An order specifying such amount shall be entered in the records of the board unless the board can not determine such amount from the record in the proceeding, or unless the dismissal is for lack of jurisdiction.

"(d) A decision of the board (except a decision dismissing a proceeding for lack of jurisdiction) shall be held to be rendered upon the date that an order specifying the amount of the deficiency is entered in the records of the board. If the board dismisses a proceeding for reasons other than lack of jurisdiction and is unable from the record to determine the amount of the deficiency determined by the commissioner, or if the board dismisses a proceeding for lack of jurisdiction, an order to that effect shall be entered in the records of the board, and the decision of the board shall be held to be rendered upon the date of such entry.

"(e) If the assessment or collection of any tax is barred by any statute of limitations, the decision of the board to that effect shall be considered as its decision that there is no deficiency in respect of such tax.

"(f) The findings of the board made in connection with any decision prior to the enactment of the revenue act of 1926 shall, notwithstanding the enactment of such act, continue to be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated.

"SEC. 907. (a) Notice and opportunity to be heard upon any proceeding instituted before the board shall be given to the taxpayer and the commissioner, and a report upon the proceeding and a decision thereon shall be made as quickly as practicable. The decision shall be made by a member in accordance with the report of the board, and such decision so made shall, when entered, be the decision of the board. If an opportunity to be heard upon the proceeding is given before a division of the board, neither the taxpayer nor the commissioner shall be entitled to notice and opportunity to be heard before the board upon review, except upon a specific order of the chairman. Hearings before the board and its divisions shall be open to the public, and the testimony, and, if the board so requires, the argument shall be stenographically reported. The board is authorized to contract for the reporting of such hearings, and in such contract to fix the terms and conditions under which transcripts will be supplied by the contractor to the board and to other persons and agencies. The proceedings of the board and its divisions shall be conducted in accordance with such rules of practice and procedure (other than rules of evidence) as the board may prescribe and in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in courts of equity of the District of Columbia. Such rules of practice and procedure shall have the same force and effect as Federal equity rules. The mailing by registered mail of any pleading, decision, order, notice, or process in respect of proceedings before the board shall be held sufficient service of such pleading, decision, order, notice, or process.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the board and of each division to include in its report upon any proceeding its findings of fact or opinion or memorandum opinion. The board shall report in writing all its findings of fact, opinions, and memorandum opinions. No decision of the board shall be modified or reversed because the board or any of its divisions has failed to consider evidence not adduced before the board or division."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. I do it for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] a question or two.

I was very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Texas. I am always interested in everything he says. What he says he says well. One of the particular statements of his in which I am interested is the statement to the effect that this bill proposes to relieve the large corporations of $8,000,000, and, if left to the Republicans—he did not say this in so many words, but that was to be inferred—there would be nothing done for the small corporations.

Now, I want to know on what basis the gentleman made his statement that the large corporations were being relieved of $8,000,000 tax?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that in my judgment, of the $18,000,000 now collected through stamp taxes on the transfer of stock, more than 90 per cent of that tax is collected from the larger corporations doing business either on the stock exchange or on the curb in New York City.

Mr. MADDEN. Do the corporations pay the tax?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. On the transfer they do, when you issue new stock.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. How do you get it, then?

Mr. MADDEN. They get it from the man who buys the stock. But the corporation does not pay it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Certainly not. The man who buys the stock buys it on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. MADDEN. He buys it at any place.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Ninety per cent of it is sold up there in New York.

Mr. MADDEN. What I am interested in is whether the corporation pays the tax or not.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The man who buys the stock pays it, or the man who transfers it.

Mr. MADDEN. As to relieving corporations, as the gentleman stated, I believe we are relieving the man who buys the stock, not the corporation. For instance, we are relieving the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Certainly, the man who buys it.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, where does the corporation come in?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Corporations are made up of men who own the stock. That is all a corporation is.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is wrong in that statement. I do not think he intended to leave a wrong impression, but I am afraid he did, because he almost convinced me he was right. I generally follow him on many things because I believe in his veracity. I am sure the gentleman wanted to be truthful when he made this statement and I am sure he would not have made the statement if he did not think he was right.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I am; and I am as certain of it now as I was before the gentleman asked me his question. For instance, you relieve the small corporations of $24,000,000 under the amendment I offered Monday and in doing that you only relieve the stockholders from $24,000,000, because the corporation is nothing but a name. The stockholders are the ones who get the relief and the stockholders are the ones who pay the stamp tax on a transfer of stock.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid there is a difference between a small corporation and a large corporation. I do not think the same condition applies. I do not think you have to pay the tax on the exchange in a transfer of the stock of a small corporation. You can do that over the counter in your own office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words as a pro forma motion only. I rise for the purpose of adding a word of explanation with reference to section 601 of the bill, which amends sections 906 and 907 of the revenue act of 1924 with reference to the Board of Tax Appeals.

The changes made in section 906 (a) and (b) for the most part merely set out what the law heretofore has generally been understood to be and as Congress intended it when the 1924 act was passed. It was not the intention of Congress that the board should be an investigating body or that it should consider any other evidence than that which had been submitted to it or one of its divisions. Its functions were judicial and such as were necessary to carry out such functions. Nor was it intended that a case heard by a division should be tried de novo before the whole board, but only that a review under the rules prescribed by the board should be had when the chairman ordered such review within the time prescribed.

More than all this, Congress did not intend that the board in the exercise of its judicial functions should be subject to mandamus from some court except in cases of such nature that any court might properly be the subject of a writ of mandamus from some higher court. In fact subdivisions (a) and (b) and other portions of these two sections from the 1924 act, which are amended in the bill, are merely declaratory of the law as it now stands and as Congress thinks it ought to be construed, without these amendments being made.

Members will ask why, then, should the amendments be made at all. In answer I would say the situation is as follows:

Certain decisions have been made by some of the Federal district courts or courts of appeal which construe the law differently or from which the inference might be drawn that it should be construed differently. I think that most of the courts, whenever the question has come up, have been inclined to construe the law as I have stated. But be this as it may, an appeal from these decisions which appear to me to wrongly construe the law can not be finally determined for several years, and on account of the difficulty in getting a review of a decision of the circuit court of appeals in the Supreme Court it might be many years before the 1924 act was finally construed in the Supreme Court. In the meantime those that have cases before the board do not know just exactly what rights they have and how they should proceed. If we leave the matter in this confused state litigation will be prolonged, difficulties will arise in the trial of these cases, and no one will be benefited thereby. If the Board of Tax Appeals is obliged to give a trial de novo to every case that is heard before a division, the board might as well be abolished.

In the interest of uniform decisions it is probably best that the most of the cases tried before a division be reviewed by the board and the decision of the division either approved or disapproved. But if all of them were to be given a new trial on demand the delay would be such that many years will elapse before decisions could be rendered. The Board of Tax Appeals was created to furnish a speedy opportunity for appeals from the decision of the commissioner to be heard before a body of trained experts. When about 500 appeals are taken to it in a month there must be some provision for speedy disposition thereof both in the interest of the taxpayer and the Government. The taxpayer wants a speedy disposition of the case, and the Government can not afford to have hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes tied up by appeals to the board.

In order to effectuate this intention and make it perfectly clear we have inserted in the bill a new provision to the effect that the rules and practice of procedure described by the board shall have the same force and effect as Federal equity rules. I suppose Members of the House understand that this practically means they shall have the force and effect of law.

The work of the board is of the highest importance. No other court in the world—for it is practically a court—tries cases that involve such an enormous amount of money, or indeed cases that at all compare in this respect. Cases that involve from $10,000,000 up are not uncommon. In order that Members may understand better how hard the board is working to dispose of the great task that has been put upon it I wish to invite the consideration of the following table taken from the report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

	June 30, 1925	June 30, 1926	June 30, 1927	Grand total
Appeals filed	5,220	12,867	11,338	29,425
Cases disposed of by the board in formal decisions	616	947	1,080	2,643
Cases disposed of without rendering formal decisions	1,110	3,022	4,176	8,308
Total number of cases disposed of during each year	1,726	3,969	5,256	10,951
Total number still pending at close of each year (including cases reopened)	3,494	12,392	18,481	

You will observe in the fiscal year of 1927 the board disposed of more than 5,000 appeals. I am informed that it is likely to do better this year.

It is not likely that in the future there will be so large a number of appeals. For reasons that are not necessary to explain here there was a flood of appeals last year. At present the board is disposing of cases about as fast as appeals are taken, and undoubtedly as the decisions on difficult matters are promulgated and as we get rid of the old excess-profits cases, where a large portion of the appeals come from, the appeals will greatly decrease and the board will have its work current.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 604. SUITS TO RESTRAIN ENFORCEMENT OF LIABILITY OF TRANSFEREE OR FIDUCIARY

No suit shall be maintained in any court for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of (1) the amount of the liability, at law or in equity, of a transferee of property of a taxpayer in respect of any income, war-profits, excess-profits, or estate tax, or (2) the amount of the liability of a fiduciary under section 3467 of the Revised Statutes in respect of any such tax.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Before the House votes to accept the amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole increasing this tax reduction by $60,000,000, I think we should pause and consider where the estimates of the surplus available for tax reduction purposes came from. Yesterday the gentleman from Illinois tried to show that the Treasury Department had been seriously in error in previous estimates. The gentleman did not, however, tell the House that such excesses as appeared in previous estimates came from unforeseen collections, such as from the sale of capital assets, disputed tax items, and nonrecurrent items that made up the total amount.

The present estimate of the Budget is a surplus of $252,000,000, and in that estimate is included $75,000,000 of nonrecurrent items. We must pause and consider the details of our available surplus. Here is the manner in which the Ways and Means Committee reached this agreement of $232,000,000 for tax reduction: We called before us the Undersecretary of the Treasury and a request was made by certain members that his statement be taken down stenographically. He explained to the committee, as shown in his testimony, where the estimate came from. Three of the leading experts on financial matters made the estimates independently. These experts were representatives of the department, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the Actuary, being Messrs. Ebersole, Nash, and McCoy. The Treasury arrived at its figures as the result of those independent estimates. The question was asked Mr. Mills whether the probable amount of appropriations by this Congress had been taken into consideration and his reply was that no extraordinary expenditures had been considered whatever. We face in this Congress appropriations of an extraordinary nature. Yesterday we received the estimate of a naval building program; we were informed that large expenditures are also possible for flood control, Muscle Shoals, Boulder Dam, the public buildings program, the payment of German war claims, and farm relief. I ask the Members of this House in sober judgment to consider where the money is coming from to pay those extraordinary appropriations unless we incur a deficit.

If we adopt the three pending amendments calling for a further reduction of $60,000,000, we have three courses before us: We can pass the bill with full knowledge of the likelihood of a deficit, or we can have no tax reduction at this session, or we can eliminate the items of reduction which have been added to those recommended by the Ways and Means Committee in submitting this bill.

I appeal to the good judgment of the Members of the majority who are responsible to the country for legislation and urge them not to be carried away by specious arguments and popular clamor for special items of reduction. The people of the country want tax reduction, but they do not want it to the extent of creating a deficit in the Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in an attempt to explain the mistakes made by the Treasury Department in estimating receipts for fiscal years. There was a time in the history of this country, and it was not very long ago, when estimates made by the Treasury Department had a real value. I remember that the Treasury Department estimated the amount of money we would get out of the Payne-Aldrich bill during the first year of its operation and missed it less than $6,000. The Treasury Department estimated the amount of money we would get out of the Underwood bill during the first year of its operation and missed it less than $10,000. The Treasury Department estimated what the population of the United States would be under the census just before the last census and missed it less than 15,000. The Treasury Department estimated the population as it was indicated by the last census of the United States and missed it just a few thousand.

So we have kept on making accurate estimates in the Treasury Department until the present administration of the department, and their mistakes have all been most fortunate mistakes for that side of the House.

I remember that in 1922 when we had up the question of a soldiers' bonus bill and when they wanted something better than the graveyard insurance which we did give them, Secretary Mellon sent a letter down to the Ways and Means Committee and told us there would be a deficit for that year. I have forgotten the amount, but twenty or thirty or forty million dollars, and a deficit for the next year of $250,000,000, and stated that this was not the time to engage in new enterprises, to wit, a bill like the soldiers' bonus bill, which made a charge on the Treasury.

The result of this estimate—and it was grossly inaccurate, and I am using a moderate term, indeed, in describing it—the effect of that estimate was to defeat the soldiers' bonus bill, and the estimate showed a mistake of over $500,000,000, and we did not apply that tremendous surplus to the debts of the United States. An election was approaching and we gave it back to the taxpayers of this country, and it formed a most valuable political document for that side.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. RAINEY. I will yield later if I have the time.

The Treasury Department so arranges these reductions that they come just before national elections. Under the present administration we always effect a reduction of taxes just before a national election. The Treasury has a method of carrying over a tremendous surplus for the benefit of the party now in power, and it makes a tremendous burden upon the business men of this country.

Why, talk about reducing taxes and expenditures!

In 1920, the last year of Democratic control, we reduced the expenditures of this Government $13,000,000,000, and if the Democrats had remained in control, we would have completed the reduction of taxes long before now, and we would have reduced these burdens upon the people of the country to the amount they ought to have been reduced.

I think it might be proper for me now to call attention to the fact that in 1923, when Secretary Mellon himself was before the Committee on Ways and Means, I asked him how the mistake occurred in the estimates of 1922 and in the estimates of 1923 which resulted in the mistake to which I have called attention for one year alone of at least $500,000,000. In fact, the mistake was much greater than that. He turned to one of his Assistant Secretaries to answer the question, and the answer made was that in 1922 and in 1923 "we had overestimated the expenditures and underestimated the receipts," and with this very clear statement the matter was gladly dropped by the Treasury Department. In other words, the explanation was to the effect that they made one mistake in grossly overestimating the expenditures and they made another mistake in grossly underestimating the receipts, and the result was the tremendous error to which I have called attention. The use of these flexible figures and this flexible and convenient method of estimating the expenditures and receipts resulted, first of all, in the defeat of the soldiers' bonus bill—and that is what the administration wanted. It also made it possible in the next year to rebate to taxpayers all over the country a very considerable part of the taxes they had already paid and which many of them had evidently "passed on," and this rebate occurred just before a national election and contributed much to the success of the administration in that election. The most powerful campaign argument a voter can receive is a check just before the election. It had the effect to an appreciable degree of corrupting the electorate of the United States. Later on I might also say that when we had Mr. McCoy, the Government actuary, on the stand, I asked him if he furnished the figures which led to the mistake in the estimated revenues of 1923. His reply was that he furnished figures, but his figures were not used. The figures used were the figures furnished by some employee of the revenue section of the Treasury Department, whose name to this day remains undisclosed, but they were the convenient figures upon which the Treasury Department relied, and they were the figures which led to this tremendous error. As I explained yesterday in my speech on the floor, these convenient errors have continued.

The surplus for 1926 was $300,000,000 more than they said it would be and this mistake is more than the amount of reduction they say we can now make. The inexcusable but convenient mistakes of the Treasury Department are disclosed always just after an election. This method of making reductions in the tax burdens of this country results in a piecemeal reduction, so that the administration can say before each election, "See how much we have reduced your taxes; give us another chance and we will reduce them some more"; but the time has come when this method of imposing a continuing burden upon the business of the country for purposes of securing partisan victories each two years at the polls is drawing to a close. Fortunately, we have operating here in Washington a great organization, the United States Chamber of Commerce. They function with economic experts, whose conclusions are much more reliable than the conclusions reached by the Treasury Department. The figures they have prepared through their committee of experts on taxation show that the revenues and the expenditures of this Government will sustain a tax reduction this year of $400,000,000. After the approaching national elections we will find that the estimates of the United States Chamber of Commerce are correct and the estimates of the Treasury Department we will then again find are grossly inaccurate. This will make it possible two years from now to promise another tax reduction, and that will be on the eve of another national election. We are escaping slowly, indeed, under this administration from the burden of war taxes, and the business men of the country are beginning to rebel, and they ought to rebel. The reason for the continuance in power of a party which makes these con-

venient mistakes is not now as apparent to the real business men of the country as they seemed to think it was two years ago.

The present prosperity of the country is not due to anything the party in power has done. It is due to the Federal reserve system, which inaugurated in this country a correct banking system. It is due to our system of income taxes, which the party in power have tried so hard to destroy. It is due to the constructive measures of the Wilson administration. The present administration has simply inherited the wealth-creating factors of the Wilson administration. The Federal reserve system, the estate tax, the income-tax system, the hours lessening the labor of the men who toil—all of these would have been impossible under a Republican administration, and all of these and many other propositions to which I might call attention have resulted in the favorable economic position we now occupy among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TEMPLE). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 606. CLOSING AGREEMENTS

(a) Authorization: The commissioner (or any officer or employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including the field service, authorized in writing by the commissioner) is authorized to enter into an agreement in writing with any person relating to the liability of such person (or of the person or estate for whom he acts) in respect of any internal-revenue tax for any taxable period ending prior to the date of the agreement.

(b) Finality of agreements: If such agreement is approved by the Secretary, within such time as may be stated in such agreement, or later agreed to, such agreement shall be final and conclusive, and, except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance, or misrepresentation of a material fact—

(1) the case shall not be reopened as to the matters agreed upon or the agreement modified, by any officer, employee, or agent of the United States, and

(2) in any suit, action, or proceeding, such agreement, or any determination, assessment, collection, payment, abatement, refund, or credit made in accordance therewith, shall not be annulled, modified, set aside, or disregarded.

(c) Section 1106 (b) of the revenue act of 1926 is repealed, effective on the expiration of 30 days after the enactment of this act, but such repeal shall not affect any agreement made before such repeal takes effect.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the question of the reliability of the estimates of revenue and financial conditions of the Treasury has been questioned, the House ought to know how very wrong some estimates have been.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has said that the Treasury Department, advising President Harding and causing the veto of the soldiers' bonus bill, was mistaken only $500,000,000 on its estimate of the condition of the Treasury.

The statement made by the President in his address based upon the Treasury estimates, to justify the veto of the soldiers' adjusted compensation or bonus bill, was followed later by an analysis made by a Member of this House, a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. It indicates that the Treasury Department in its estimate for a single year made a mistake of over $1,200,000,000. This is the reason I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois, in extending his remarks, to look into the matter more closely in the interests of accuracy.

The Clerk read, as follows:

SEC. 608. EFFECT OF EXPIRATION OF PERIOD OF LIMITATION AGAINST TAXPAYER

A refund of any portion of an internal-revenue tax (or any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to such tax) made after the enactment of this act, shall be considered erroneous—

(a) if made after the expiration of the period of limitation for filing claim therefor, unless within such period claim was filed; or

(b) in the case of a claim filed within the proper time and disallowed by the commissioner after the enactment of this act, if the refund was made after the expiration of the period of limitation for filing suit, unless within such period suit was begun by the taxpayer.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 212, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a new clause in the bill, and something that I do not think received proper consideration from the Ways and Means Committee. I am hoping it may be possible for the chairman to accept this amendment. Under the law as it now stands, a test suit can be brought in a matter of a refund and the practice is such that a great many other claimants do not file suit but await the issue of the pending suit, which involves exactly the same question. If the decision settles the question then they are permitted, at the discretion of the Secretary, to come in and put in their claims for a refund.

Under this clause as it is drafted, none of the claimants can await the issue of the suit; they must all bring suit, although there may be 100 or 500 and the result will be a clogging of the docket with proceedings which might be avoided if this clause were not in the bill.

I have recently, within the last few hours, received a letter from John F. McCarron, attorney at law in this city, making an analysis of this clause in the bill, and which I send to the desk to be read. It presents the case in favor of the amendment better than I can hope to present it.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1927.

Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAINEY: With further reference to my telephone conversation with you in regard to subparagraph (b) of section 608 of the new tax bill (H. R. 1), which is set forth on the top of page 212 of said bill, I have to say that in my judgment the entire paragraph of subsection (b) should be stricken from the bill. The subsection will certainly bring about a multiplicity of suits. Under the law at the present time when a claim is filed within the statutory time and is rejected by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or if not acted upon by him within six months after the date of the filing of the claim, suit may be commenced within two years from such date or from the date of the rejection of the claim. Under subsection (b) if a test suit is pending in court and there are 500 other cases involving the same point it will be necessary to file a suit in each of said cases in order to protect the rights of the taxpayer. This ought not to be, and it will mean greatly increased work for the Department of Justice and the general counsel's office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue as well as added expense to the taxpayer. It is bound to bring about a great congestion of the dockets in the courts and can serve no useful purpose. The present practice of reopening a refund claim filed within the statutory time where the erroneous ruling is overturned by a court decision or by a subsequent ruling of the commissioner is very satisfactory. The Government does not lose anything, because if it is an erroneous ruling it should be corrected, and if the ruling is correct there will be no need to reopen the refund claim. Furthermore, the small taxpayer who is unable to afford the expense of filing suit in court will be denied relief in the event of a favorable court decision in a test case involving the same situation as in his claim.

I call your attention to this paragraph in the hope that something may be done toward eliminating it from the bill, as it is bound to work an injustice to a large number of taxpayers, causing them added expenses, and it is also bound to cause a large expenditure by the Government in defending such suits.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. MCCARRON.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think if we allow the lawyers of Washington to dictate the provisions of this bill we will have a long one and an unjust one. This matter was fully considered by the Ways and Means Committee. The provision is fair, but quite technical, and I do not need to go into it at this time. The matter presented by the gentleman from Illinois was passed upon by every member of the committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Why should every individual be compelled to bring a suit on precisely the same question that is before the court?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why does the gentleman from Tennessee assume anything of that kind? That is simply a statement in the letter. This simply means that individuals can not sit back and wait until after the limitation expires and come in at a later date.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There might be a provision drawn to have them file some claim. I am talking about the filing of the suits. It looks to me as if it could be framed so that it would not require the institution of a lawsuit. It may be right to require them to make some claim, but this language requires them to bring a suit.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Their claims have already been filed and rejected; why should not they bring suit?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. You are here making permanent law, covering perhaps a large class of cases. I can see the desirability of there being some record of the claim being

made in the department. What strikes me is that in this language you are requiring every individual to institute a lawsuit—they can not combine to bring a test case. I am addressing myself to the matter not because of what was said in the letter but from common reasons.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Why should not the right of the taxpayer be reserved, so that he can get the benefit of the court's decision if he has filed a claim or protest? Here is a complete innovation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes; heretofore if you filed a claim, even though it was overruled by the commissioner, it gave you a standing, so that if the court decision came along in a test case which sustained the contention you made the amount of the additional tax that you had paid would be refunded to you. This is a complete reversal of the present practice as I understand, a complete innovation in practice. I can see no reason why they should not be allowed to do so.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman from New York will permit, here is the result in practical work: If the test case is brought and decided against the Government—and there are numerous cases where suits have not been brought and are therefore barred—that will naturally compel an appeal to Congress to consider the equities of this plan, and we will be confronted with that question.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It seems to me that the present practice is simpler, when your rights are protected by having filed your claim, rather than in all these cases where there will be thousands of taxpayers involved, going to the United States court in all the various districts with suits. In order to protect his rights everyone would have to bring suit and, I assume, file a complaint.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the gentleman from New York is eminently correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We might just as well in a great many cases do away with the statute of limitations, if we are going to strike out this provision. I do not know what the statute of limitations is for if it is not to provide that people must present their claims, and if not respected commence suit. It would mean that somebody might put in a claim and hold it there for 5 or 10 years or a longer time and then come in, notwithstanding the statute of limitations, and get his refund. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] is aware that in State taxes no such practice is invoked or used. There is not a State in the Union that permits anything of that kind, and there is no reason why it should be done with reference to Federal taxes in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAINEY) there were—ayes 70, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 611. COLLECTIONS STAYED BY CLAIM IN ABATEMENT

If any internal-revenue tax (or any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to such tax) was, within the period of limitation properly applicable thereto, assessed prior to June 2, 1924, and if a claim in abatement was filed, with or without bond, and if the collection of any part thereof was stayed, then—

(a) the payment of such part (made before or within one year after the enactment of this act) shall not be considered as an overpayment under the provisions of section 607, relating to payments made after the expiration of the period of limitation on assessment and collection; and

(b) a distraint or proceeding in court for the collection of such part may be begun within one year after the enactment of this act.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 611. I think I understand what this section means, and if I do understand it correctly, it is a question that has two sides to it and I am anxious to find out just which is the right side. As I understand it, where these claims in abatement have been filed they were filed because it was a practice which grew up in the department. It was permitted.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It was permitted for quite a while.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And it had not the express sanction of law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was a practice. Eventually, however, the courts in passing upon some cases held that the statute of limitations applied.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Treasury Department was of the opinion that as long as this claim of abatement had been filed and the case was still pending the statute of limitations did not apply as against the Government in proceeding by distraint. In that connection, if the gentleman will permit, I would like to make a statement. There is no amendment that has been offered here that would reduce the revenues of the Government so much as the amendment which the gentleman offered, though he may have offered it just as a pro forma amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What I want to know is, how it is going to affect the revenues and what effect it is having on the statute of limitations. I said in the beginning, if the gentleman heard me, that I thought it was a two-sided question and I am anxious now to find out just the right side. I am asking for information.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It would cost the Government somewhere from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000, and the provision that is inserted here does not require anybody to pay any taxes which he does not justly owe. The only persons required to pay taxes are those that the courts hold and must hold liable for the taxes, while on account of this unexpected decision by the Supreme Court, because the most of us did not expect it—at least I did not—the statute of limitations has now run, and it has run by reason of the taxpayer getting an extension on his own request through this claim of abatement—not on account of any delay by the Government.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Perhaps it was on account of a suggestion by the Treasury Department.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. They were given this privilege of filing a claim in abatement, both sides at the time thinking that the case would still be kept open, and that if it was found that the taxpayer was really liable to pay the taxes, even after the statute of limitations had expired by a number of years, the levy or distraint might still be made.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will this apply as far back as 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes. All it does apply to are old taxes under the excess-profits tax, at a time when people were making enormous sums, in some cases unsconscionable profits; and by reason of filing these claims in abatement the whole case was carried along, almost everyone thinking that the statute of limitations was being tolled by this agreement; but the Supreme Court held otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I just want to ask the gentleman this question. We all want these matters settled. The taxpayers want them settled. The time has about come when a citizen of the United States, a taxpayer, should be free from having some one look into his office and say that he wants to go through his books. I know of cases where the books on the same account have been examined as many as eight times.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We are trying to correct that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will this open up the question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This will not enable anybody to look over the books. This is to take things exactly as they are and stop the Government from refunding $100,000,000 to people who made enormous profits, people who got extensions that everybody supposed would toll or extend the statute of limitations.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is the only thing we want to find, because we want some time to have these things settled. We do not want our constituents bothered or deviled all the time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if I may have a moment. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Iowa as to the effect upon the Treasury, I do not feel like taking the responsibility of insisting upon this provision going out of the bill. My attention was directed to it by reason of the fact that it was evidently a move to repeal a decision of the court, and except in very rare instances I do not much believe in repealing a decision of the courts of the country. But it is a very important matter, and the facts and the figures and its effect upon the Treasury we are not in possession of except as given to us by the gentleman from Iowa. I accept his statement, and therefore shall not take the responsibility of pressing the amendment and will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 616. COMPROMISES—CONCEALMENT OF ASSETS

Any person who, in connection with any compromise under section 3229 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or offer of such compromise, or in connection with any closing agreement under section 606 of this act, or offer to enter into any such agreement, willfully (1) conceals from any officer or employee of the United States any property belonging to the estate of a taxpayer or other person liable in respect of the tax, or (2) receives, destroys, mutilates, or falsifies any book, document, or record, or makes under oath any false statement, relating to the estate or financial condition of the taxpayer or other person liable in respect of the tax, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McSWAIN offers the following amendment: At page 218, end of line 25, strike out period, insert semicolon, and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That such tax or penalty shall not be collected under threat of criminal prosecution, and any claim or charge that the taxpayer has committed a crime shall not be employed to aid in collecting any tax or penalty, and no criminal charge, action, case, or indictment shall be ended on condition that a certain sum of money be paid as tax or penalty, but all such criminal actions shall proceed in the regular way to final judgment in open court."

Mr. McSWAIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, gentlewomen, and gentlemen, the purpose of that amendment is not to defeat one copper cent of lawful and proper revenue to which the United States Government is legally entitled. The purpose is simply to separate the matter of crime from the matter of a civil tax liability. The United States Government does not need to collect tax money in the form of what is virtually blackmail, nor should the United States Government be engaged as a matter of practice in aid of collecting taxes in the custom of compounding a crime and agreeing that it will not prosecute a case that it claims by an officer is a crime, if the taxpayer will pay so many dollars as penalty.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not believe I understand what the gentleman is getting at. This is a criminal section. A case has to be proved beyond all liability of doubt or otherwise the man could not be found guilty. The man is entitled to a jury and entitled to have this evidence showing that beyond all reasonable doubt he is guilty. To what is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yesterday I tried to explain the purpose of this amendment, and I have written it pretty carefully. It is this, if the gentleman will permit me. An officer representing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue should not be permitted to go to a taxpayer and say, "Here, if you do not pay 50 per cent penalty, or 10 per cent penalty of the tax liability, we will prosecute you in the courts criminally; but if you pay, as one who has made a futile effort to conceal your income and thereby defraud your Government of a part of the revenue, we will accept it and not prosecute you." You need not say that is not being done. I not only know of one flagrant case where it was done, but I submit I have information of numbers and numbers of cases where good citizens have been virtually blackmailed out of their money by the threat of criminal prosecution.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think anybody could blackmail me in that kind of a way.

Mr. McSWAIN. Did the gentleman hear what I said yesterday?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but this is a criminal provision here. What the gentleman proposes to put on would emasculate this provision.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman has not heard the amendment read. This is a qualification upon the Government through its district attorney in prosecuting these criminal propositions and it is to this effect, that when you make a charge criminally you have got to go to judgment in the case in open court; that the Government by district attorney and the officer representing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue can not go behind closed doors in a little office somewhere and whisper around and say, "Oh, well, if you will pay $30,000 penalty we will let you out."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McSWAIN. Just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McSWAIN. The purpose is this, if a man has committed a crime, seeking to defraud his Government of revenue, he ought to be tried to judgment, and if he is innocent, rather than be blackmailed and the press taking up the matter of his being under charges for defrauding the Government, let the Government not start, but if it starts it must go to judgment in open court. So that, gentlemen, the purpose is this, to make it impossible for the criminal machinery of the Government to be used as an engine of collection of civil liabilities, because the Government is protected in its lawful tax money; there is the property of the taxpayer to secure the Government its money. The Government makes its levy upon his property, and it is a lien above any other lien and prior to purchase money, mortgage, or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like a division on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 40, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. DEFINITIONS

(a) When used in this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual, a trust or estate, a partnership, or a corporation.

(2) The term "corporation" includes associations, joint-stock companies, and insurance companies.

(3) The term "domestic" when applied to a corporation or partnership means created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory.

(4) The term "foreign" when applied to a corporation or partnership means a corporation or partnership which is not domestic.

(5) The term "fiduciary" means a guardian, trustee, executor, administrator, receiver, conservator, or any person acting in any fiduciary capacity for any person.

(6) The term "withholding agent" means any person required to deduct and withhold any tax under the provisions of section 143 or 144.

(7) The term "stock" includes the share in an association, joint-stock company, or insurance company.

(8) The term "shareholder" includes a member in an association, joint-stock company, or insurance company.

(9) The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(10) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(11) The term "commissioner" means the Commissioner of Internal revenue.

(12) The term "collector" means collector of internal revenue.

(13) The term "taxpayer" means any person subject to a tax imposed by this act.

(14) The term "military or naval forces of the United States" includes the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Army Nurse Corps, Female, and the Navy Nurse Corps, Female.

(b) The terms "includes" and "including" when used in a definition contained in this act shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, section 701, paragraph 9, as you will notice, includes the Territory of Hawaii. Two thousand one hundred-odd miles out in the Pacific lie the Hawaiian Islands, a Territory of the United States and an integral part of this Union. We have a population down there of three hundred and thirty thousand and odd people. We pay income and internal-revenue taxes. In the year 1921 we paid more than 17 States of this Union. In 1922 we paid more than 19 States of this Union, and in the last year we paid more than 13 States. We have more population than 3 of the States. We are painfully aware of the fact that we are still a Territory and have no vote in this House. We have to rely on the sympathy of this House.

And in that connection I wish to call your attention to one of the paragraphs that have been passed over. That paragraph refers to teachers in Alaska and Hawaii. They are exempted from the income tax, and we, through our legislature in the Territory at its last session, asked that not the teachers alone should be exempted but that the officers and employees of the Territory of Hawaii should be exempted, in order that there

might be a parity between the States and the Territory and that they might be relieved of paying an income tax on the salary paid to them by the Territory.

Now, it has been said that the people of the District of Columbia would perhaps be disturbed by such a situation. May I call your attention to the fact that in the paragraph you have adopted yourselves you use this wording:

This section shall not exempt compensation paid directly or indirectly by the Government of the United States.

The officials, officers, and employees of the District of Columbia are in receipt of at least $9,000,000 from the Federal Government for the support of the administration of the District, whereas the Territory of Hawaii is not in receipt of any such contribution.

I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 706. TAXABILITY OF TRUSTS AS CORPORATIONS—RETROACTIVE

If a taxpayer filed a return as a trust for any taxable year prior to the taxable year 1925 such taxpayer shall be taxable as a trust for such year and not as a corporation, if such taxpayer was considered to be taxable as a trust and not as a corporation either (1) under the regulations in force at the time the return was made or at the time of the termination of its existence, or (2) under any ruling of the commissioner or any duly authorized officer of the Bureau of Internal Revenue applicable to any of such years, and interpretative of any provision of the revenue act of 1918, 1921, or 1924, which had not been reversed or revoked prior to the time the return was made, or under any such ruling made after the return was filed which had not been reversed or revoked prior to the time of the termination of the taxpayer's existence.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLDFIELD: On page 226, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 707. REORGANIZATION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE FIELD SERVICE

(a) The President is authorized to reorganize the field service engaged in the administration of the internal revenue laws, in such manner as he determines necessary for the efficient administration of the internal revenue laws and in order that there will be at least one collection district in each State. In making such reorganization the President is authorized to abolish, consolidate, or create internal-revenue districts and offices, to assign any officer or employee, if he determines him qualified, to any office created or consolidated, and to do such other things as in his judgment may be necessary to effect such reorganization.

(b) Collectors of internal revenue and all officers and employees in the field service shall, after the date of the enactment of this act, be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is not germane to any provision of the bill or to the bill itself, and that in effect it will be, as construed by the courts, a repeal of certain laws that are not mentioned either directly or indirectly in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has indicated the ground of his point of order. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard?

Mr. CRISP. I would like to submit a few observations on the point of order if the Chair is in doubt. I do not care to address the Chair if his mind is made up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary law, like all law, is supposed to be common sense.

What is the purpose of the bill? It is to raise revenue. The Chair and Members of the House are of necessity familiar with the various provisions of the bill, because the bill has been read through. It is apparent that the bill deals with all phases of the collection of internal revenue. It deals with a Tax Board of Appeals. It changes the classified service as to the personnel of the department by allowing them to appoint a great number of employees at salaries in excess of what the classification law authorizes. It deals with every phase of collecting our internal revenue.

What does this amendment do? It simply authorizes the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to reorganize the internal-revenue force. For what? For the purpose of collecting over $2,000,000,000 of revenue that is to be produced under this bill.

I could talk on further, but it is impossible, to my mind, to have an amendment that is more germane to a revenue bill than the personnel and machinery for the collection of that revenue.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Is there anything in the bill at all that deals with the power of the Executive? That can be answered yes or no.

Mr. CRISP. No; it can not. There is nothing in the bill which especially deals with the power of the President, but this proposition authorizes the President, who is the head of Government—and, of course, his action will be based on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury—to reorganize his personnel for the collection of this revenue; and the amendment goes on to say that the appointees, when this reorganization is effected, shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the official of the Government whose duty it is to look after the collection of this revenue. That is the effect of the amendment. I can add nothing more, but I could repeat. As I said at the beginning, parliamentary law is common sense, and it certainly will be straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel to say that this amendment is not germane to this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I regret to differ from my esteemed friend, Mr. CRISP, who is an authority on parliamentary law and who has had long parliamentary experience, but I think he has worked himself into believing that this proposition is germane rather than from anything he has stated in his argument.

As has already been stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], the bill does not refer to the power of the President. This proposed amendment actually repeals laws that are not mentioned directly or indirectly in the bill.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Are there not many provisions in this bill that repeal existing law?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But no point of order has been made against them, so far as that is concerned. Besides, they were within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the theory is that a point of order could be made against a bill of this character because it repealed existing law, then we could not bring in a bill which contained any provision repealing existing law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the theory is that every time you refer to the revenue law in the bill that is now before the House you open up the whole revenue law for new amendments, then you could not get anywhere with the particular bill under consideration.

Mr. CRISP. I will answer the gentleman's question by saying there are precedents in this House that where you bring in a bill dealing with a general subject matter, like a general tax revenue act, and amend sundry and divers provisions of it that then the whole act is open for amendment; that if the bill is dealing with one particular section or schedule you can not affect the other, but that when you have a blanket bill dealing with the entire matter germane amendments are in order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is not the universal rule by a great deal. I do not think I need to refer to the decisions. The Chair has probably looked up this matter and gone over them, so that it would be a waste of time to read from the decisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This amendment confers special power on the President with reference to the Internal Revenue Bureau. As to a bill amending a general law on a specific point, it was held that an amendment relating to the terms of the law rather than to the bill under consideration was not germane. That was held by Speaker Clark and Speaker Reed. This amendment relates to the terms of a certain law which now do not authorize the President to make this change and it does not relate to anything that is in the bill. In fact, it does not relate to the terms of the bill at all. It comes clearly under those two decisions made by Speaker Clark and by Speaker Reed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Suppose the committee in its wisdom had seen fit to bring this in as an integral part of this bill, would it have been in order?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the committee can report anything that comes within its jurisdiction.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, does the gentleman wish to bring the House to a situation where the Committee on Ways and Means will have more power than the House itself?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The committee has more power than the House itself under its rules in a great many instances, I will say to the gentleman. I should not say more power but more jurisdiction.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I never heard of the Committee on Ways and Means having more power than the Committee of the Whole. I thought the Committee of the Whole had as much power as any other committee of the House. I never heard it suggested before that an agent of the House had greater power than the House itself.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. According to that, if the Committee on the Judiciary brought in a bill, then the Committee of the Whole would have the power to put on anything that related to the revenue.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. It is very true that the Committee on Ways and Means has rather broad jurisdiction. It can bring in one bill under one part of that jurisdiction and another bill under another part of its jurisdiction—a dozen different bills that may not be germane to each other at all. So in this case the committee has brought in a bill on one subject and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] attempts to hitch on a matter which might be germane to some other bill that this committee might have brought in. Because this committee has jurisdiction over the matter proposed in the amendment is not a good reason why it should be germane to this bill or to any bill the committee might report.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. My friend, if he reads the amendment, will be forced to the conclusion it is an amendment for a more efficient and economical collection of the revenue which is to be raised by this bill, the title of which is to raise revenue. Therefore, how can my friend urge that an amendment which provides for the personnel to do this is not germane.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Suppose they should bring in an amendment of the tariff act over which we have jurisdiction, would the gentleman contend such an amendment would be germane?

Mr. CRISP. But this is not a tariff bill and this amendment seeks in no wise to deal with the tariff. The amendment simply seeks to give your own President and your own Secretary of the Treasury the right to reorganize his personnel to collect the duties provided for in this bill.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, if I understand what this bill does, it attempts to equalize and reduce taxes. It says nothing about the appointment of collectors.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Now the gentleman wishes to bring in as an amendment a provision regarding the President's power to appoint personnel.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Why, under the very next section, section 707—

the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix the compensation, without regard to the provisions of the classification act of 1923, of the following officers and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. TILSON. It says nothing whatever about appointments.

Mr. OLDFIELD. But he can fix the salaries and disregard the civil service act.

Mr. TILSON. But where does it say anything about appointments or increasing the power of the President to make appointments?

Mr. OLDFIELD. In the same section.

Mr. CRISP. May I correct my friend as to the title of the bill:

To reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Now, listen to line 24, page 226:

In accordance with the civil service laws: Twenty-three assistants to the general counsel at a compensation not in excess of $7,500 a year each; 26 administrative or technical employees at a compensation not in excess of $7,500 a year each; and 50 administrative or technical employees at a compensation not in excess of $6,000 a year each.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman wish to change their salaries? If so such an amendment would be germane to the section.

Mr. OLDFIELD. But under this provision he can get these employees from any place and does not have to select them from the employees of the Treasury Department.

Mr. TILSON. But where does it say anything about appointing these men?

Mr. OLDFIELD. That language gives him such authority because he does not have to go to the Treasury Department to get the men, but can appoint men not in the Government service if he thinks they are the men that ought to be appointed. There is no question about it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is ready to rule, I do not care to take any further time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I simply want to make the observation that the whole purpose of the bill, the wording of it from beginning to end, is dealing with the tax-collecting machinery as to the quantity of taxes and the salary of the employees under the established machinery. There is not a line or a word in the whole bill from first to last that either seeks to add to or substract from the power which the Chief Executive now has. The amendment, in its very first line, seeks to confer additional power on the Chief Executive or else the amendment is meaningless. It has to be one or the other. It says the President is authorized by the adoption of this amendment which presupposes that without the amendment he has not such power. Going on that assumption, there is no question in my mind at all about the lack of germaneness of the amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NEWTON). The Chair is ready to rule.

The question is not without difficulty, as is true of a great many questions pertaining to germaneness; but upon reading the amendment it seems very clear to the Chair that it proposes to inject into the consideration of the bill a foreign subject matter.

The amendment provides:

The President is authorized to reorganize the field service * * * in such manner as he determines necessary * * * and in order that there will be at least one collection district in each State.

Then the amendment goes on to say—

In making such reorganization the President is authorized to abolish, consolidate, or create internal revenue districts and offices—

And then to assign officers and employees in that connection. Then the next subdivision provides—

Collectors of internal revenue and all officers and employees in the field service shall, after the date of the enactment of this act, be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations.

The Chair is very clearly of the opinion, from the sweeping character of the amendment which is proposed, that this is attempting to confer upon the Executive tremendous powers for purposes of reorganization, affecting not only the powers of the Executive but also going into the question of their status as civil-service employees, they not now being civil-service employees or officers.

The question now comes whether or not with this sweeping language in the amendment, under the precedents, it is germane. Fortunately for the Chair, he was given a copy of the amendment by the gentleman from Georgia and has had an opportunity to go over the precedents quite carefully. The Chair has also gone into the history of the legislation pertaining to revenue agents, their powers and duties. This dates back to the Revised Statutes of 1878, section 3152. Then further on in the history of the development of legislation pertaining to revenue agents the Chair finds at 37 Statutes at Large, page 434, an appropriation bill extensively enlarging and changing the powers of revenue agents; and then, of course, the various laws pertaining thereto are found in the code compilation which was adopted in the preceding Congress.

No reference is made in the amendment itself to a repeal of any of these specific provisions, but in effect and in substance it does repeal those provisions by changing them and enlarging them, and the Chair is unable to find any change in the bill which is now before the committee to which a change in the laws to which the Chair has just referred would be germane; and after going over the various precedents, and going over them carefully, and also bearing in mind an experience which the present occupant of the chair had when he first entered this Chamber, when he offered an amendment in reference to a measure for the control of prices of food, clothing material, and so on, and was of the opinion that when he offered an amendment to include raw cotton that that was clearly germane. Much to his surprise it was ruled not germane by the Chair, and the House accepted the decision without question.

So after going into the matter thoroughly, the Chair is of the opinion that in line with the general policy of the House to be strict on this question of germaneness the point of order must be sustained.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask the indulgence of the committee during this five minutes to discuss the merits of the proposed amendment of Mr. OLDFIELD. In the first place, while I acquiesce in the decision of the Chair and know that the Chair is sincere, I desire to say this. Of course, the amendment was legislation, but I thought it was germane.

Now, here is an amendment that does not add to your tax reduction; it makes no drain on the Treasury, but, on the contrary, according to the Treasury, it would save to the Treasury $2,000,000 and would effect a more efficient economy in the administration of the revenue laws and would be of great benefit and saving to the American citizens who are taxpayers.

What are the conditions to-day? You have 64 internal-revenue collectors. You have 36 revenue field agents. There is a duplication of work. The taxpayer goes to the collector of his State to inquire about his taxes. He is sent by the revenue agent's office somewhere else—frequently in another State. The department at Washington desires information as to a taxpayer and writes to the collector of the internal revenue of the State. He gets his information by writing the revenue field agent and then sends the information to Washington. There is a duplication. Many unnecessary letters are written and useless time consumed.

Here is another illustration. The States of Idaho, Montana, and Utah each have an internal-revenue collector. There is one revenue field agent for the three States with an office in Salt Lake City. An Idaho taxpayer files his return with the collector in Boise and an additional assessment is levied against him in Washington and is sent to the collector in Boise. If any question arises as to the tax, he—the taxpayer—must go to the Salt Lake City office to the revenue agent to have it adjusted. It simply entails unnecessary work, labor, and duplication upon the taxpayer and the Government.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. BEGG. If the supposed abolition of some of these officers is going to make such a wonderful reduction, why not abolish all of the State revenue officers and let the business be done in Washington? I do not believe the Government in its tax laws should go to the point of disadvantage to the taxpayer. In other words, I believe the Government owes the service to the taxpayer and should bring the point of collection as nearly to the individual's place of business as it is possible to bring it.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They can not do that under the law as it is now.

Mr. CRISP. I am going to agree with the gentleman, and the effect of this amendment will do it. In the illustration just given by me the taxpayer in Idaho could go to the collector in Idaho to have his tax adjusted and handled and would not have to go to the revenue agent in Salt Lake City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Now, gentlemen, I am not going to discuss anything that took place in the Ways and Means Committee in executive session. I am going to discuss things that were given to the public. When we began the executive session on this bill it was agreed that the chairman was to give out to the press such matters as he thought advisable. What was given out to the press? That the Committee on Ways and Means had adopted an amendment for the consolidation of these offices. Look at the bill to-day and that provision is eliminated. There is no use in stating what took place in the committee; your own common sense will tell you that the action of the committee on this amendment was reconsidered. Why? There can be only one answer—they were afraid that some good Republican office-holder might lose his job in the consolidation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman remembers that a while ago there was an effort made through the work of a joint committee to reorganize the departments of the Government and that the bill was introduced to carry out the committee's recommendations. The gentleman also remembers that following the failure of the reorganization bill, which Mr. MAPES introduced, it was understood that in administration circles there was a strong desire that the President should be authorized to effect reorganization by changes which he might think proper to make in any department to do away with duplications, promote efficiency, and so forth.

If the attitude of the administration was correctly represented in the newspapers, and I think it was, this proposition offered by the gentleman is certainly in line with the policy which the administration favored.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted by my friend I had just come to the proposition that the advisory tax committee recommended this provision. Mr. Nash, the deputy collector of internal revenue before the Ways and Means Committee, in the presence of the very able and delightful Undersecretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mills, advocated this consolidation as in the interest of the taxpayers, as in the interest of the efficient administration and collection of internal revenue, and he stated that if it was put into effect, of course the department would retain in its service the most efficient of its employees. That it would save the Government $2,000,000 and be a convenience and great monetary saving to the taxpayers.

I do not want to burden the House. The Secretary of the Treasury is a very able man, a man for whom I have the highest respect. In none of his private affairs, in none of his business organizations would he permit these duplications. If he had the power, I do not think that he would permit this constant annoyance of the taxpayer, shuffling him from one Government office to another. Any sane business organization would put into effect this economical provision. There is only one reason why you gentlemen do not do it. It saves $2,000,000 a year, but you fear that some good Republican might lose a job.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This amendment permits the President to exercise his discretion?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] for whom I have not only the highest respect, but who is one of the most useful legislators in the House, I think has unwittingly conveyed a wrong impression with reference to this situation. As I say, I think the gentleman from Georgia is one of the most useful legislators we have in the House, and I have for him a personal respect. I think a warm personal feeling exists on the part of both of us.

Mr. CRISP. I will say that it is reciprocated.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This amendment was never really properly considered by the committee and the whole subject was not properly considered by the committee. That is the reason the committee reconsidered its decision. This amendment in my judgment would work a great deal of harm. It would take out the public service some of its most efficient and useful servants, viz, the general field agents whom the public invariably consults with reference to these matters, and who I am sure are more familiar with the revenue law than anyone else. It is not because I wish to oppose any efficiency in the department, but I want this subject to be further considered, and I say now to the House that I expect as soon as there is opportunity for the Ways and Means Committee to consider it to offer a bill upon this subject which will not, however, coincide with the terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD]. I hope it will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and that that committee will consider it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But this amendment is not mandatory. This amendment simply authorizes the President to do certain things in his discretion. He could leave it just as it is or consolidate it. Are you not willing to trust your President?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman think that we would direct the President what to do?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This amendment does not direct him to do anything. It merely authorizes him to do it, and you are afraid to trust your President.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is the term that we always use when we wish him to do something, and that is the reason I object to it.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does not the gentleman know that the Treasury and the administration are for it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. The Treasury is not in favor of it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 708. BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE—DETAILS TO WASHINGTON

The commissioner may order any officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service engaged in field work to duty with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia, for such periods as the Secretary may prescribe, and to any designated post of duty outside the District of Columbia upon the completion of such duty.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 707, paragraph A.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to make a point of order against my friend, but I think he has slept on his rights, because we have read section 707.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I was following with the bill, but somebody tore out the last two pages.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Illinois was on his feet.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, no; they had read section 708. I merely want to warn my friend, when he is in charge of one of the appropriation bills and the Clerk is reading very fast and somebody overlooks a bet, not to be too technical.

Mr. MADDEN. I never yet objected to a man having all his rights.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I shall not make the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out paragraph (a) of section 707, on page 226 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that that section has been passed.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, they read a word or two on the other one before I could get the eye of the Chair. I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to section 707.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not admit that we have gone by it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 226, beginning in line 18, strike out paragraph (a), ending in line 4 on page 227, as follows:

SEC. 707. BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE—PERSONNEL

(a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix the compensation, without regard to the provisions of the classification act of 1923, of the following officers and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, appointed (whether before or after the enactment of this act) in accordance with the civil service laws: Twenty-three assistants to the general counsel at a compensation not in excess of $7,500 a year each; 26 administrative or technical employees at a compensation not in excess of $7,500 a year each; and 50 administrative or technical employees at a compensation not in excess of $6,000 a year each.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, a year or two ago, at the earnest solicitation of everybody employed by the Government, we enacted what is known as the classification law, under which a classification board was authorized to fix the compensation of all of the employees of the Government.

Here we have a proposal from the Ways and Means Committee in a revenue bill to take 100 men or women, as the case may be, out from the classified act and to increase their compensation beyond that paid to anybody doing like work anywhere else in the Government. Now, why this preferential class? Why shall we create an aristocracy in the Treasury Department, and particularly in the Revenue Service of the Treasury Department? In days gone by these men employed in this section in the Treasury Department have been especially favored. We have had their compensation fixed at higher rates than the compensation of anybody else in the Government service. Their work is no more important than the work of other people.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will undertake to give the gentleman some reason. He has asked the question and is entitled to an answer.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be glad to do so. I may have to ask some more time afterwards.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman can get more time. Here is the situation as I understand it in the Treasury Department. I have never been in favor of increasing salaries; the gentleman knows that. I have stood on the floor of the House and fought them, but we have in the Treasury Department a condition now that is absolutely indefensible, and it can not be attributed to anything else except inefficiency, say what you please. You can not have 19,000 cases unsettled at the present time with the taxpayers and say the Treasury Department is functioning. Now, we made inquiry in every instance, "Why is it, Mr. Secretary of the Treasury, you can not bring about a more efficient service in the Government?" and the reply was this: "In the first place, you do not give me authority to make closing agreements." We give it in this bill. It is the most far-reaching section of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is an answer to the whole business.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then he said this: "If you will give me salaries so I can keep my men, we can turn off 25 per cent more work than we are now doing." I said, "How can you do it?" He said, "The turnover in the Treasury Department in the last three years has been 70 per cent, because men have gone in and gone out because of getting better salaries." And so it was my thought that if you are going to collect two and a half billion dollars and you are going to give them discretion to close the case with the taxpayer, you have to pay a higher salary to the employees, and that was my reason for supporting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, about four years ago, as I recall—I may be wrong as to the number of years—the Treasury Department came to the Committee on Appropriations and wanted $10,000,000 to employ auditors, and an investigation showed that if they got the $10,000,000 to employ auditors they could employ them for an average of about $3,000 a year. They got the $10,000,000, and then there was another condition imposed upon them; that if they get that $10,000,000 that they would devote the force to be employed as a result of this appropriation of $10,000,000 to a rapid audit of schedules that had been filed since 1917, up to that time, and they promised to collect $500,000,000 a year from back taxes and on unpaid schedules if they got those auditors. They got them. They collected the money.

The money has been coming into the Treasury. It has been one of the great sources of revenue. Nobody asked $7,500 a year for those jobs. Nobody asked for $6,000, but now they come with a special mandate from the Ways and Means Committee to set them up as a superior class, making the Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department into an oligarchy, taking them out from the reclassification act, placing superiority on the brows of these men over that of any other men or women employed by the Government.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BEGG. Does not the gentleman believe that it is simply affording an opportunity for every other department to ask that their salaries be raised?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course. I maintain there is no justification whatever for this. I maintain and say that in the Appropriations Committee it keeps close track of appropriations, both in the Treasury and in other departments of the Government. And I make bold to say that there is no justification whatever for this increase of salary, notwithstanding what the men in the Treasury may say to the contrary.

Moreover, I say that it is not the question of the amount nominally involved here. The nominal amount involved here is a bagatelle. But the ultimate amount involved as a result of this action it is impossible to calculate.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Does not the gentleman think this is a discrimination in favor of the Treasury Department?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. That is what I say.

Mr. CONNERY. I disagree with the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] when he says this is a drive for increased wages everywhere. I am in favor of that, but I say it is simply for the Treasury Department.

Mr. MADDEN. It is unfair to the people in the other departments of the Government. There is no higher order of intelligence possessed by those employed in the Treasury Department than that possessed by the people in the other departments of the Government. I undertake to say without fear of successful contradiction that the people of the Treasury Department are no better, no more able, and no more patriotic than those in other departments, and the turnover in this department is no greater than there may be in other departments. And if you talk about the turnover, much of the turnover is due to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has demanded, and successfully demanded, the discharge of an overload of people on the pay roll of the Treasury Department. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no feeling between myself and the gentleman from Illinois, whom I usually follow. But in this instance the gentleman has drawn an entirely wrong picture of the case. We are not talking about the discharged employees. In the last four years several thousand of these men have resigned to accept places elsewhere at larger salaries.

Mr. MADDEN. They were not fired, but they were allowed to resign.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In some places they get several thousand dollars more than they received in the Treasury.

Now, what is the situation? So far as the amount of these salaries is concerned it is a fly speck; only about $70,000 is involved. But what is really involved is the sum of $550,000,000, involved in the collection of tax returns. There is $550,000,000 involved in cases pending before the Board of Tax Appeals. We pay members of the Shipping Board $20,000 to act upon cases of less importance than these cases. We lose men off the Board of Tax Appeals because they will not stay at the salaries provided. We do not have enough proper men to prepare these cases. We lose ten times the amount of the salaries in a single month.

Mr. MADDEN. How many cases have been tried by the Board of Tax Appeals?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Many thousands.

Mr. MADDEN. No; only about 300.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not mean 300,000, but I say more than 3,000. The Board of Tax Appeals has disposed of cases lately at the rate of 500 a month. That is the situation.

Now, what does Mr. Nash want in the Treasury? He wants to preserve his key men, not these auditors at $3,000; but these men who are competent to take up cases involving millions of dollars, to come up against men who sometimes make in a single case as much as is involved in this matter—as much in a single case. Those are the men they have to combat—men of long experience and of the highest rank. It is folly to go on as we have been doing in that matter heretofore. What we want is not to increase the expense in the department. Mr. Nash told us that if he could keep those key men he would not ask for an increased appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what they say all the time, but nevertheless they come in and ask for it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then I say keep it down. I will join with the gentleman from Illinois in keeping it down. With competent men they can properly dispose of these cases. Without competent men they lose money nearly every day. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] just asked the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if there had not been 400 cases before the Board of Tax Appeals. On page 554 of the committee hearings the chairman of the Board of Tax Appeals, Mr. Littleton, testified that 10,000 cases had been decided by the Board of Tax Appeals. I submit that the description by the gentleman from Illinois of the work of the Board of Tax Appeals and of these salaried men is about as right as his estimate of the number of cases that have been before that board for adjudication. There are about 19,000 cases pending before the board at the present time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman assert that the men whose salaries he is proposing to increase are going to have much to do with the Board of Tax Appeals?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do. I say the greater part of the cases these men will handle as key men will never reach the Board of Tax Appeals, and therefore money will be saved by the taxpayers and less time will be consumed in the settlement of the cases before the board in the Treasury Department.

Further, I want to call attention to the error of the gentleman from Illinois, where he contends that for like work some of the auditors have been kept down at $3,000 a year. I assert that no auditor can undertake to do the work of these men on the Board of Tax Appeals.

It is a different kind of work entirely than that of figuring up and auditing accounts. That is not the question involved. A question of legal judgment is involved. When one man can handle cases involving $360,000,000 in behalf of this Government, it seems to me we are stooping very low to say that that man's services are not worth $7,500 per year.

Further than that, no matter has been investigated more carefully by the department, by your advisory committee, and by the joint committee on taxation than this subject of salaries for a few special employees. While my time does not permit me to quote in detail I refer the House to the report of a survey made by the Treasury Department, a very carefully prepared survey, in which this is one of the outstanding requests it makes in behalf of simplification and in behalf of efficiency of service.

We can not complain, gentlemen, if we refuse these salaries to men of judgment and they resign from the service in order to enter more profitable employment. There are 11 men left in the department to-day who have been there seven years. That is all. Four thousand seven hundred have resigned to go into other lines of work. We can not compare the work of these men with the work done by auditors, a clerical position. There is no such thing there. The duties of those men require an extreme exercise of judgment and a knowledge of intricate laws. It is that type of men which is required for this work, and I am surprised that many of them can be retained even at the advanced salaries suggested in this paragraph. For efficiency, prompt adjudication of many claims, and simplified administration these increases should be made. The result will be the saving of many thousands of dollars. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 88, noes 158.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 708. BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE—DETAILS TO WASHINGTON

The commissioner may order any officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service engaged in field work to duty with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia, for such periods as the Secretary may prescribe, and to any designated post of duty outside the District of Columbia, upon the completion of such duty.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 227, after line 14, insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 709. SALE OF REAL ESTATE—RETROACTIVE

If in the return of a taxpayer for the taxable year 1924, 1925, or 1926 there was included income from the sale of real estate, and part of the consideration received upon such sale consisted of evidences of indebtedness, and it appears that the fair market value of such evidences of indebtedness, on the date of the enactment of this act, is less than 50 per cent of their face value, then, at the request of the taxpayer, the tax for such taxable year shall be redetermined, so far as relating to the income from such sale, substituting the fair market value of such evidences of indebtedness on the date of the enactment of this act for their fair market value on the date of their receipt by the taxpayer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. CHINDBLOM reserved a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped a point of order would not be made against this amendment. I do not think it is subject to a point of order. Briefly, I want to say this, perhaps, affects more people in your districts than it does in mine. Many people in New York, Ohio, Tennessee, and other States have written me calling my attention to the injustice that is being done the taxpayers.

Briefly, I want to give you an illustration. A lot costs you $2,000 and you sell it for $10,000; you take $2,500 in cash and $7,500 in notes. The gain reported for tax purposes would be $8,000, and the assessment is made on that basis. The notes have not been sold; they are still in your hands, and the notes are now only worth $1,500. Then his gain would be recomputed by reducing the actual price to $4,000, and there would be a gain of but $2,000 as the amount actually realized on the transaction. You can take $50,000, or any amount, and work it out by the same principle. I call your attention to this one case, and then I will leave it to the committee, because I know you are restless. I know of one case where a party paid the Government $28,000 in taxes—this a partial payment—on the sale of real estate. It was found that he had overpaid the Government $8,000, and the Government now is threatening to place a lien on all of his property in the sum of $18,000 additional on worthless notes, when, as a matter of fact, he overpaid the amount actually due the Government, as stated, by $8,000. If these conditions are not remedied many people will be ruined.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We have a provision in the bill with reference to those liens.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. On real estate?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. And on worthless notes?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; we do not go that far.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. You may have a lien on the land; but I am talking about where they have threatened to place a lien on all of this person's property and where in that particular case he has actually overpaid the Government. Besides I am told there is nothing in the bill to give relief to those who made out income tax reports on sale of real estate for the years 1924, 1925, and 1926.

Now, I will be frank with you. I would like to phrase my amendment so it would give them all the amount they are entitled to; but I was informed by the Treasury Department if I made it more than 50 per cent or worded it covering worthless notes that perhaps the House would not consider it. Therefore, against my better judgment, I made it 50 per cent, believing the House would treat equitably with the citizens of our country. For myself I believe the Government above all others should be the last to take taxes it is not entitled to. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the Government should refund all moneys collected on income taxes, from whatever source, which were wrongfully collected, or afterwards discovered were wrongfully collected, and to which the Government has neither a legal nor moral right.

However, my colleagues are tired, are anxious to vote on the bill, and I am satisfied no further amendments will be adopted, regardless of the merits.

When the income tax bill was before the House in 1925 I stated I could not vote for it because of the inheritance-tax feature and because that part of it was an invasion of State rights. I therefore voted against the bill. This bill does not have that feature in it. We made the fight to repeal that feature and also repeal the 80 per cent refund, but were not successful. This bill as amended materially reduces the tax on small corporations; repeals many nuisance or excise taxes, such as the automobile tax, and so forth; and I will therefore vote for the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment perhaps ought to be called an amendment to exempt a lot of real estate speculators in Florida from taxation and from the operations of the statute of limitations. That is about all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the reservation of a point of order by the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from Illinois withdrawn?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think we will dispose of it quicker by withdrawing the point of order.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My point was that the amendment is not offered at the right place in the bill. We have passed the section to which it should be offered, but I do not care about pressing the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 710. SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent to turn back to section 116 (b), page 83, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]? Do I understand it is to be the policy to have unanimous consent requests to return to various portions of the bill? I have a number of such requests on this side, and if that is to be the policy of the gentleman, I think we should know it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Texas, or any Member, can object if he so desires.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Is it the gentleman's policy to permit one to return and not permit others?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have not agreed to this, so far as that is concerned. This gentleman was not present at the time this portion of the bill was read, on account of an accident that detained him.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. There are some Members who have come to me and have wanted to get unanimous consent to return to a section of the bill in order to have an amendment considered. I think if the gentleman is going to pursue the policy of permitting one gentleman to get unanimous consent to return, the gentleman can hardly refuse unanimous consent to the membership of his own committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why does not the gentleman object then?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I ask the gentleman to take the responsibility. The gentleman is chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Of course, I am.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And the gentleman ought to take the responsibility of saying whether you want to return or not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not want to return.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then why does not the gentleman say so?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But I think we might give the gentleman a fair chance.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEWTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to file the conference report at any time up to midnight to-night on the deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think there will be a full agreement?

Mr. MADDEN. There may be some items in disagreement; we can not tell.

THE REVENUE BILL

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Garner amendment to section 13 of the bill relating to the tax on corporations; on the Garner amendment striking out section 118, relating to affiliated corporations; and on the McLaughlin amendment to section 421, repealing the excise tax on automobiles.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, after line 6, insert:

"(b) Taxable income, not more than $15,000. If the amount of the net income in excess of the credits provided in section 26 is not more than $15,000, then in lieu of the rate described in subsection (a) the rate shall be: (1) Five per cent if such amount is not more than $7,000; (2) 7 per cent if such amount is more than $7,000 and not more than $12,000; (3) 9 per cent if such amount is more than $12,000 and not more than $15,000."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 182, not voting, 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—212

Abernethy	Bowling	Cartwright	Davis
Allgood	Box	Celler	Deal
Almon	Boylan	Chapman	De Rouen
Andresen	Brand, Ga.	Clague	Dickinson, Mo.
Arnold	Briggs	Cochrane, Mo.	Dominick
Aswell	Brigham	Cohen	Doughton
Auf der Heide	Browne	Collier	Douglass, Mass.
Ayres	Browning	Collins	Drane
Bankhead	Buchanan	Connally, Tex.	Drewry
Bell	Bulwinkle	Connery	Driver
Black, N. Y.	Busby	Cooper, Wis.	Edwards
Black, Tex.	Byrns	Cox	Eslick
Bland	Canfield	Crisp	Evans, Mont.
Blanton	Cannon	Crosser	Fisher
Bloom	Carley	Cullen	Fitzpatrick
Bohn	Carss	Davey	Fletcher

Frear	Kent	Moorman	Shallenberger
Fulbright	Kerr	Morehead	Sinclair
Fulmer	Ketcham	Morgan	Sirovich
Furlow	Kincheloe	Morrow	Somers
Gallivan	Kindred	Nelson, Mo.	Speaks
Gambrill	Knutson	Nelson, Wis.	Spearing
Gardner, Ind.	Kunz	Norton, Nebr.	Steagall
Garner, Tex.	Kvale	Norton, N. J.	Stedman
Garrett, Tenn.	Lampert	O'Brien	Steele
Garrett, Tex.	Lanham	O'Connell	Stevenson
Gibson	Lankford	O'Connor, La.	Sullivan
Gifford	Larsen	Oldfield	Sumners, Tex.
Gilbert	Lea	Oliver, Ala.	Swank
Goldsborough	Leavitt	Oliver, N. Y.	Tarver
Goodwin	Lindsay	Palmisano	Taylor, Tenn.
Gregory	Linthicum	Parks	Thatcher
Green, Fla.	Lowrey	Peavey	Tillman
Greenwood	Lozier	Peery	Tucker
Griffin	McClintic	Pou	Underwood
Hammer	McDuffie	Prall	Updike
Hare	McKeown	Quayle	Vinson, Ga.
Harrison	McMillan	Quin	Vinson, Ky.
Hastings	McReynolds	Ragon	Ware
Hill, Ala.	McSwain	Rainey	Warren
Hill, Wash.	McSweeney	Rankin	Weaver
Howard, Nebr.	Maas	Rayburn	Weller
Howard, Okla.	Major, Ill.	Reed, Ark.	White, Colo.
Hudspeth	Major, Mo.	Romjue	Whitehead
Igoe	Mansfield	Rubey	Whittington
Jacobstein	Martin, La.	Rutherford	Williams, Mo.
Jeffers	Mead	Sabath	Williams, Tex.
Jenkins	Milligan	Sanders, Tex.	Wilson, La
Johnson, Okla.	Montague	Sandlin	Wilson, Miss
Johnson, Tex.	Mooney	Schafer	Woodruff
Jones	Moore, Ky.	Schneider	Woodrum
Kading	Moore, N. J.	Sears, Fla.	Wright
Kemp	Moore, Va.	Selvig	Yon

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Dowell	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers
Adkins	Dyer	Johnson, Wash	Rowbottom
Aldrich	Eaton	Kahn	Sanders, N. Y.
Allen	Elliott	Kearns	Sears, Nebr.
Andrew	England	Kelly	Seger
Arentz	Englebright	Kiess	Simmons
Bacharach	Estep	King	Sinnott
Bachmann	Evans, Calif.	Kopp	Smith
Bacon	Faust	Korell	Snell
Barbour	Fenn	LaGuardia	Sproul, Ill.
Beers	Fish	Langley	Stalker
Begg	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Leech	Stobbs
Berger	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Lehlbach	Strong, Kans.
Bowles	Fort	Letts	Strong, Pa.
Bowman	Free	Luce	Summers, Wash.
Brand, Ohio	Freeman	McLaughlin	Sweet
Buckbee	French	McLeod	Swick
Burdick	Frothingham	MacGregor	Swing
Burtness	Glynn	Madden	Taber
Burton	Golder	Magrady	Tatgenhorst
Bushong	Green, Iowa	Manlove	Temple
Butler	Griest	Mapes	Thompson
Campbell	Guyer	Martin, Mass.	Thurston
Carter	Hadley	Menges	Tilson
Chalmers	Hale	Merritt	Timberlake
Chase	Hall, Ill.	Michener	Tinkham
Chindblom	Hall, Ind.	Miller	Treadway
Christopherson	Hall, N. Dak.	Monast	Underhill
Clancy	Hardy	Morin	Vestal
Clarke	Hawley	Murphy	Vincent, Mich.
Cochran, Pa.	Hersey	Nelson, Me.	Wainwright
Cole, Iowa	Hickey	Newton	Wason
Colton	Hoch	Niedringhaus	Watres
Connolly, Pa.	Hoffman	Palmer	Watson
Cooper, Ohio	Hogg	Parker	Welch, Calif.
Crail	Holaday	Perkins	Welsh, Pa.
Cramton	Hooper	Porter	White, Kans.
Crowther	Hope	Pratt	White, Me.
Curry	Houston	Purnell	Williamson
Callinger	Huddleston	Ramseyer	Winter
Darrow	Hudson	Ransley	Wolverton
Davenport	Hughes	Rathbone	Wood
Dempsey	Hull, Morton D.	Reece	Wurzbach
Denison	Hull, Wm. E.	Reed, N. Y.	Yates
Dickinson, Iowa	James	Reid, Ill.	
Doutrich	Johnson, Ill.	Robinson, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—33

Anthony	Dickstein	Kendall	Strother
Beck, Pa.	Douglas, Ariz.	Leatherwood	Taylor, Colo.
Beedy	Doyle	Lyon	Williams, Ill.
Boies	Garber	McFadden	Wingo
Britten	Gasque	Michaelson	Wyant
Carew	Hancock	Moore, Ohio	Zihlman
Casey	Haugen	O'Connor, N. Y.	
Combs	Hull, Tenn.	Robsion, Ky.	
Corning	Irwin	Shreve	

So the amendment was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

Mr. Carew (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Anthony (against).
Mr. O'Connor of New York (for) with Mr. Hancock (against).
Mr. Doyle (for) with Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania (against).
Mr. Lyon (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).
Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Michaelson (against).
Mr. Casey (for) with Mr. Wyant (against).
Mr. Wingo (for) with Mr. Britten (against).
Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Beedy (against).
Mr. Hull of Tennessee (for) with Mr. Moore of Ohio (against).
Mr. Gasque (for) with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky (against).
Mr. Douglas of Arizona (for) with Mr. Williams of Illinois (against).
Mr. Combs (for) with Mr. Kendall (against).

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce the necessary absence of my colleagues Mr. O'CONNOR of New York and Mr. CAREW. If they were here they would vote "aye."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the same announcement in reference to my colleague from New York, Mr. DICKSTEIN.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Maine, Mr. BEEDY, voted?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. BLANTON. It was understand by several colleagues that he answered on the first roll call, and I noticed that his name was called on the second roll call.

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, line 11, strike out all of section 118.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 188, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—209

Abernethy	Douglas, Ariz.	Kindred	Ragon
Allgood	Douglass, Mass.	Kunz	Rainey
Almon	Drane	Kvale	Ramseyer
Andresen	Drewry	LaGuardia	Rankin
Arnold	Driver	Lampert	Rayburn
Aswell	Edwards	Lanham	Reed, Ark.
Auf der Heide	Eslick	Lankford	Romjue
Ayres	Evans, Mont.	Larsen	Rubey
Bankhead	Fisher	Lea	Rutherford
Bell	Fitzpatrick	Lindsay	Sabath
Black, N. Y.	Fletcher	Linthicum	Sanders, Tex
Black, Tex.	Frear	Lowrey	Sandlin
Bland	Fulbright	Lozier	Schafer
Blanton	Fulmer	McClintic	Schneider
Bloom	Gallivan	McDuffie	Sears, Fla.
Bowling	Gambrill	McKeown	Selvig
Box	Gardner, Ind.	McMillan	Shallenberger
Boylan	Garner, Tex.	McReynolds	Sinclair
Brand, Ga.	Garrett, Tenn.	McSwain	Sirovich
Brand, Ohio	Garrett, Tex.	McSweeney	Somers
Briggs	Gasque	Major, Ill.	Speaks
Browning	Gifford	Major, Mo.	Spearing
Buchanan	Gilbert	Mansfield	Steagall
Bulwinkle	Goldsborough	Martin, La.	Stedman
Busby	Gregory	Mead	Steele
Byrns	Green, Fla.	Milligan	Stevenson
Canfield	Greenwood	Montague	Sullivan
Cannon	Griffin	Mooney	Summers, Wash.
Carley	Hall, Ill.	Moore, Ky.	Sumners, Tex.
Carss	Hammer	Moore, N. J.	Swank
Cartwright	Hare	Moore, Va.	Tarver
Casey	Harrison	Moorman	Tillman
Celler	Hastings	Morehead	Tucker
Chapman	Hill, Ala.	Morgan	Underwood
Clague	Hill, Wash.	Morrow	Vinson, Ga.
Cochran, Mo.	Hoch	Nelson, Mo.	Vinson, Ky.
Cohen	Howard, Nebr.	Nelson, Wis.	Ware
Collier	Howard, Okla.	Norton, Nebr.	Warren
Collins	Huddleston	Norton, N. J.	Weaver
Connally, Tex.	Hudspeth	O'Brien	Weller
Connery	Hughes	O'Connell	White, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor, La.	Whitehead
Cox	Igoe	Oldfield	Whittington
Crisp	Jacobstein	Oliver, Ala.	Williams, Mo.
Crosser	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	Williams, Tex.
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	Wilson, La.
Davey	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Wilson, Miss.
Davis	Jones	Peavey	Woodrum
Deal	Kading	Peery	Wright
De Rouen	Kemp	Pou	Yon
Dickinson, Mo.	Kent	Prall	
Dominick	Kerr	Quayle	
Doughton	Kincheloe	Quin	

NAYS—188

Ackerman	Bushong	Davenport	Frothingham
Adkins	Butler	Dempsey	Furlow
Aldrich	Campbell	Denison	Gibson
Allen	Carter	Dickinson, Iowa	Glynn
Andrew	Chalmers	Doutrich	Golder
Arentz	Chase	Dowell	Goodwin
Bacharach	Chindblom	Dyer	Green, Iowa
Bachmann	Christopherson	Eaton	Griest
Bacon	Clancy	Elliott	Guyer
Barbour	Clarke	England	Hadley
Beers	Cochran, Pa.	Englebright	Hale
Begg	Cole, Iowa	Estep	Hall, Ind.
Bohn	Colton	Evans, Calif.	Hall, N. Dak.
Bowles	Connolly, Pa.	Faust	Hardy
Bowman	Cooper, Ohio	Fenn	Haugen
Brigham	Crail	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Hawley
Browne	Cramton	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Hersey
Buckbee	Crowther	Fort	Hickey
Burdick	Curry	Free	Hoffman
Burtness	Dallinger	Freeman	Hogg
Burton	Darrow	French	Holaday

Hooper	McLaughlin	Reece	Thurston
Hope	McLeod	Reed, N. Y.	Tilson
Houston	MacGregor	Reid, Ill.	Timberlake
Hudson	Maas	Robinson, Iowa	Tinkham
Hull, Morton D.	Madden	Rogers	Treadway
Hull, William E.	Magrady	Rowbottom	Underhill
James	Manlove	Sanders, N. Y.	Updike
Jenkins	Mapes	Sears, Nebr.	Vestal
Johnson, Ill.	Martin, Mass.	Seger	Vincent, Mich.
Johnson, Ind.	Menges	Simmons	Wainwright
Johnson, Wash.	Merritt	Sinnott	Wason
Kahn	Michener	Snell	Watres
Kearns	Miller	Sproul, Ill.	Watson
Kelly	Monast	Stalker	Welch, Calif.
Ketcham	Morin	Stobbs	Welsh, Pa.
Kiess	Murphy	Strong, Kans.	White, Kans.
King	Nelson, Me.	Strong, Pa.	White, Me.
Knutson	Newton	Sweet	Williams, Ill.
Kopp	Niedringhaus	Swick	Williamson
Korell	Palmer	Swing	Winter
Langley	Parker	Taber	Wolverton
Leavitt	Perkins	Tatgenhorst	Wood
Leech	Porter	Taylor, Tenn.	Woodruff
Lehlbach	Pratt	Temple	Wurzbach
Letts	Purnell	Thatcher	Yates
Luce	Ransley	Thompson	Zihlman

NOT VOTING—30

Anthony	Corning	Leatherwood	Shreve
Beck, Pa.	Dickstein	Lyon	Smith
Beedy	Doyle	McFadden	Strother
Berger	Fish	Michaelson	Taylor, Colo.
Boies	Garber	Moore, Ohio	Wingo
Britten	Hancock	O'Connor, N. Y.	Wyant
Carew	Irwin	Rathbone	
Combs	Kendall	Robsion, Ky.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Carew (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Anthony (against).
Mr. O'Connor of New York (for) with Mr. Hancock (against).
Mr. Doyle (for) with Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania (against).
Mr. Lyon (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).
Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Michaelson (against).
Mr. Wingo (for) with Mr. Britten (against).
Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Beedy (against).
Mr. Combs (for) with Mr. Moore of Ohio (against).

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I again announce the necessary absence of my colleagues Mr. CAREW and Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If they were present, they would vote "yea."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I announce that my colleague Mr. DICKSTEIN, if present, would vote "yea." He is absent as the result of a necessary engagement in New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the McLaughlin amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MCLAUGHLIN: Page 188, strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive, and insert: "Section 600 (1) of the revenue act of 1926 is repealed."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 151, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—245

Abernethy	Cartwright	Edwards	Hughes
Adkins	Casey	Eslick	Hull, Tenn.
Allgood	Celler	Evans, Mont.	Igoe
Almon	Chalmers	Fisher	Jacobstein
Arnold	Chapman	Fitzpatrick	James
Aswell	Chase	Fletcher	Jeffers
Auf der Heide	Clancy	Frear	Johnson, Ill.
Ayres	Cochran, Mo.	Fulbright	Johnson, Okla.
Bachmann	Cohen	Fulmer	Johnson, Tex.
Bankhead	Collier	Gallivan	Jones
Bell	Collins	Gambrill	Kading
Berger	Colton	Gardner, Ind.	Kelly
Black, N. Y.	Connally, Tex.	Garner, Tex.	Kemp
Black, Tex.	Connery	Garrett, Tenn.	Kent
Bland	Cooper, Wis.	Garrett, Tex.	Kerr
Blanton	Cox	Gasque	Ketcham
Bloom	Cramton	Gilbert	Kincheloe
Bohn	Crisp	Goldsborough	Kindred
Bowling	Crosser	Gregory	Kopp
Box	Cullen	Green, Fla.	Kunz
Boylan	Davey	Greenwood	Kvale
Brand, Ga.	Davis	Griffin	Lampert
Briggs	Deal	Hall, Ill.	Langley
Browne	De Rouen	Hammer	Lanham
Browning	Dickinson, Iowa	Hare	Lankford
Buchanan	Dickinson, Mo.	Harrison	Larsen
Bulwinkle	Dominick	Hastings	Lea
Busby	Doughton	Hickey	Leavitt
Bushong	Douglas, Ariz.	Hill, Ala.	Lindsay
Butler	Douglass, Mass.	Hill, Wash.	Linthicum
Byrns	Doutrich	Hooper	Lowrey
Campbell	Dowell	Howard, Nebr.	Lozier
Canfield	Drane	Howard, Okla.	McClintic
Cannon	Drewry	Huddleston	McDuffie
Carley	Driver	Hudson	McKeown
Carss	Dyer	Hudspeth	McLaughlin
McLeod	Norton, N. J.	Sabath	Tillman
McMillan	O'Brien	Sanders, Tex.	Tucker
McReynolds	O'Connell	Sandlin	Underwood
McSwain	O'Connor, La.	Schafer	Vincent, Mich.
McSweeney	Oldfield	Schneider	Vinson, Ga.
Major, Ill.	Oliver, Ala.	Sears, Fla.	Vinson, Ky.
Major, Mo.	Oliver, N. Y.	Selvig	Ware
Mansfield	Palmer	Shallenberger	Warren
Mapes	Palmisano	Sinclair	Weaver
Martin, La.	Parks	Sirovich	Welch, Calif.
Mead	Peavey	Somers	Weller
Michener	Peery	Speaks	White, Colo.
Miller	Pou	Spearing	Whitehead
Milligan	Prall	Steagall	Whittington
Montague	Quayle	Stedman	Williams, Mo.
Mooney	Quin	Steele	Williams, Tex.
Moore, Ky.	Ragon	Stevenson	Wilson, La.
Moore, N. J.	Rainey	Strong, Pa.	Wilson, Miss.
Moore, Va.	Rankin	Sullivan	Woodruff
Moorman	Rathbone	Summers, Wash.	Woodrum
Morehead	Rayburn	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
Morrow	Reed, Ark.	Swank	Yon
Nelson, Mo.	Robinson, Iowa	Tarver	Zihlman
Nelson, Wis.	Romjue	Taylor, Tenn.	
Niedringhaus	Rubey	Thatcher	
Norton, Nebr.	Rutherford	Thompson	

NAYS—151

Ackerman	England	Johnson, Wash.	Sears, Nebr.
Aldrich	Englebright	Kahn	Seger
Allen	Estep	Kearns	Simmons
Andresen	Evans, Calif.	Kiess	Sinnott
Andrew	Faust	King	Snell
Arentz	Fenn	Knutson	Sproul, Ill.
Bacharach	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Korell	Stalker
Bacon	Fort	LaGuardia	Stobbs
Barbour	Free	Leech	Strong, Kans.
Beers	Freeman	Lehlbach	Sweet
Begg	French	Letts	Swick
Bowles	Frothingham	Luce	Swing
Bowman	Furlow	MacGregor	Taber
Brand, Ohio	Gibson	Maas	Tatgenhorst
Brigham	Gifford	Madden	Temple
Buckbee	Glynn	Magrady	Thurston
Burdick	Golder	Martin, Mass.	Tilson
Burtness	Goodwin	Menges	Timberlake
Burton	Green, Iowa	Merritt	Tinkham
Carter	Griest	Monast	Treadway
Chindblom	Guyer	Morgan	Underhill
Christopherson	Hadley	Morin	Updike
Clague	Hale	Murphy	Vestal
Clarke	Hall, Ind.	Nelson, Me.	Wainwright
Cochran, Pa.	Hall, N. Dak.	Newton	Wason
Cole, Iowa	Hardy	Parker	Watres
Connolly, Pa.	Haugen	Perkins	Watson
Cooper, Ohio	Hawley	Porter	Welsh, Pa.
Crail	Hersey	Pratt	White, Kans.
Crowther	Hoch	Purnell	White, Me.
Curry	Hoffman	Ramseyer	Williams, Ill.
Dallinger	Hogg	Ransley	Williamson
Darrow	Holaday	Reece	Winter
Davenport	Hope	Reed, N. Y.	Wolverton
Dempsey	Houston	Reid, Ill.	Wood
Denison	Hull, Morton D.	Rogers	Wurzbach
Eaton	Hull, Wm. E.	Rowbottom	Yates
Elliott	Jenkins	Sanders, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—31

Anthony	Dickstein	Kendall	Robsion, Ky.
Beck, Pa.	Doyle	Leatherwood	Shreve
Beedy	Fish	Lyon	Smith
Boies	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	McFadden	Strother
Britten	Garber	Manlove	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Hancock	Michaelson	Wingo
Combs	Irwin	Moore, Ohio	Wyant
Corning	Johnson, Ind.	O'Connor, N. Y.	

So the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Carew (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Anthony (against).
Mr. O'Connor of New York (for) with Mr. Hancock (against).
Mr. Doyle (for) with Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania (against).
Mr. Lyon (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).
Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Michaelson (against).
Mr. Wingo (for) with Mr. Britten (against).
Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Beedy (against).
Mr. Combs (for) with Mr. Moore of Ohio (against).

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to announce the necessary absence of my colleagues Mr. CAREW and Mr. O'CONNOR, and desire to state that if they were present they would vote "aye."

Mr. CELLER. I desire to make a similar announcement on behalf of the gentleman from New York, Mr. DICKSTEIN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and being the minority on this side, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means, and on that I move the previous question.

Mr. CLARKE. If a second is necessary, put me down for a second.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the gentleman from New Jersey was going to be converted in such a short period of time. He is a member of the committee. I do not know what the custom is. I know it is——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I make the point of order——

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I know it is customary to recognize this side of the House, as I recall it, but I am not sure as to who has the right to make the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question on a motion to recommit is not a question of a division politically.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. But in general practice if a member of the committee announces to the Chair that he is opposed to the bill and makes a motion to recommit, he is recognized.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. In other words, he has preference over every other Member.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to recommit the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BACHARACH and Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. They are demanded by the gentleman from New Jersey. Evidently there is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 94, nays 300, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—94

Ackerman	Denison	Kvale	Rowbottom
Aldrich	Dickinson, Iowa	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Allen	Dowell	Leech	Schneider
Bacharach	Eaton	Lehlbach	Seger
Bacon	Elliott	Lozier	Simmons
Begg	Fenn	Luce	Sinclair
Berger	Fort	McDuffie	Snell
Bowles	Frear	MacGregor	Sproul, Ill.
Brand, Ohio	Free	Merritt	Strong, Kans.
Brigham	Freeman	Morgan	Sweet
Burton	Gifford	Murphy	Taber
Butler	Glynn	Nelson, Me.	Temple
Campbell	Golder	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Cannon	Guyer	Parker	Wainwright
Chindblom	Hale	Peavey	Wason
Christopherson	Hall, Ill.	Perkins	Watres
Clarke	Hersey	Porter	White, Kans.
Cole, Iowa	Hoch	Pratt	White, Me.
Colton	Hoffman	Ramseyer	Williams, Ill.
Connolly, Pa.	Holaday	Ransley	Williamson
Cooper, Ohio	Hope	Reece	Wolverton
Crail	Hull, Morton D.	Reed, N. Y.	Wood
Crowther	Hull, Wm. E.	Reid, Ill.	
Davenport	Kading	Romjue	

NAYS—300

Abernethy	Celler	Fisher	Howard, Nebr.
Adkins	Chalmers	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Howard, Okla.
Allgood	Chapman	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Huddleston
Almon	Chase	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Andresen	Clague	Fletcher	Hudspeth
Andrew	Clancy	French	Hughes
Arentz	Cochran, Mo.	Frothingham	Hull, Tenn.
Arnold	Cochran, Pa.	Fulbright	Igoe
Aswell	Cohen	Fulmer	Jacobstein
Auf der Heide	Collier	Furlow	James
Ayres	Collins	Gallivan	Jeffers
Bachmann	Connally, Tex.	Gambrill	Jenkins
Bankhead	Connery	Gardner, Ind.	Johnson, Ill.
Barbour	Cooper, Wis.	Garner, Tex.	Johnson, Ind.
Beers	Cox	Garrett, Tenn.	Johnson, Okla.
Bell	Cramton	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, Tex.
Black, N. Y.	Crisp	Gasque	Johnson, Wash.
Black, Tex.	Crosser	Gibson	Jones
Bland	Cullen	Gilbert	Kahn
Blanton	Curry	Goldsborough	Kearns
Bloom	Dallinger	Goodwin	Kelly
Bohn	Darrow	Gregory	Kemp
Bowling	Davey	Green, Fla.	Kent
Bowman	Davis	Green, Iowa	Kerr
Box	Deal	Greenwood	Ketcham
Boylan	Dempsey	Griest	Kiess
Brand, Ga.	De Rouen	Griffin	Kincheloe
Briggs	Dickinson, Mo.	Hadley	Kindred
Browne	Dominick	Hall, Ind.	King
Browning	Doughton	Hall, N. Dak.	Knutson
Buchanan	Douglas, Ariz.	Hammer	Kopp
Buckbee	Douglass, Mass.	Hardy	Korell
Bulwinkle	Doutrich	Hare	Kunz
Burdick	Drane	Harrison	Lampert
Burtness	Drewry	Hastings	Langley
Busby	Driver	Haugen	Lanham
Byrns	Edwards	Hawley	Lankford
Canfield	England	Hickey	Larsen
Carley	Englebright	Hill, Ala.	Lea
Carss	Eslick	Hill, Wash.	Leavitt
Carter	Estep	Hogg	Letts
Cartwright	Evans, Mont.	Hooper	Lindsay
Casey	Faust	Houston	Linthicum
Lowrey	Morin	Sabath	Thurston
McClintic	Morrow	Sanders, Tex.	Tillman
McKeown	Nelson, Mo.	Sandlin	Tilson
McLaughlin	Newton	Schafer	Treadway
McLeod	Niedringhaus	Sears, Fla.	Tucker
McMillan	Norton, Nebr.	Sears, Nebr.	Underhill
McReynolds	Norton, N. J.	Selvig	Underwood
McSwain	O'Brien	Shallenberger	Updike
McSweeney	O'Connell	Sinnott	Vestal
Maas	O'Connor, La.	Sirovich	Vincent, Mich.
Madden	Oldfield	Smith	Vinson, Ga.
Magrady	Oliver, Ala.	Somers, N. Y.	Vinson, Ky.
Major, Ill.	Oliver, N. Y.	Speaks	Ware
Major, Mo.	Palmer	Spearing	Warren
Manlove	Palmisano	Stalker	Watson
Mansfield	Parks	Steagall	Weaver
Mapes	Peery	Stedman	Welch, Calif.
Martin, La.	Pou	Steele	Weller
Martin, Mass.	Prall	Stevenson	White, Colo.
Mead	Purnell	Stobbs	Whitehead
Menges	Quayle	Strong, Pa.	Whittington
Michener	Quin	Sullivan	Williams, Mo.
Miller	Ragon	Summers, Wash.	Williams, Tex.
Milligan	Rainey	Sumners, Tex.	Wilson, La.
Monast	Rankin	Swank	Wilson, Miss.
Montague	Rathbone	Swick	Winter
Mooney	Rayburn	Swing	Woodruff
Moore, Ky.	Reed, Ark.	Tarver	Wright
Moore, N. J.	Robinson, Iowa	Tatgenhorst	Wurzbach
Moore, Va.	Rogers	Taylor, Tenn.	Yates
Moorman	Rubey	Thatcher	Yon
Morehead	Rutherford	Thompson	Zihlman

NOT VOTING—33

Anthony	Dickstein	Leatherwood	Taylor, Colo.
Beck, Pa.	Doyle	Lyon	Timberlake
Beedy	Dyer	McFadden	Welsh, Pa.
Boies	Evans, Calif.	Michaelson	Wingo
Britten	Fish	Moore, Ohio	Woodrum
Bushong	Garber	O'Connor, N. Y.	Wyant
Carew	Hancock	Robsion, Ky.	
Combs	Irwin	Shreve	
Corning	Kendall	Strother	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Shreve (for) with Mr. Carew (against).
Mr. Anthony (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
Mr. Hancock (for) with Mr. O'Connor of New York (against).
Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Doyle (against).
Mr. McFadden (for) with Mr. Lyon (against).
Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
Mr. Britten (for) with Mr. Wingo (against).
Mr. Beedy (for) with Mr. Taylor of Colorado (against).
Mr. Moore of Ohio (for) with Mr. Combs (against).
Mr. Wyant (for) with Mr. Woodrum (against).

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, again I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleagues Mr. CAREW and Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If they were present they would vote "no." I also make the same announcement for Mr. DICKSTEIN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Those desiring this vote to be taken by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. Those in favor of the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 24, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—366

Abernethy	Brand, Ohio	Cohen	Douglas, Ariz.
Ackerman	Briggs	Cole, Iowa	Douglass, Mass.
Adkins	Brigham	Collier	Doutrich
Allen	Browne	Collins	Dowell
Allgood	Browning	Colton	Drane
Almon	Buchanan	Connally, Tex.	Drewry
Andresen	Buckbee	Connery	Driver
Andrew	Bulwinkle	Connolly, Pa.	Dyer
Arentz	Burdick	Cooper, Ohio	Eaton
Arnold	Burtness	Cooper, Wis.	Edwards
Aswell	Burton	Cox	Elliott
Auf der Heide	Busby	Crail	England
Ayres	Butler	Cramton	Englebright
Bachmann	Byrns	Crisp	Eslick
Bacon	Campbell	Crosser	Estep
Bankhead	Canfield	Crowther	Evans, Mont.
Barbour	Cannon	Cullen	Faust
Beers	Carley	Curry	Fenn
Begg	Carss	Dallinger	Fisher
Bell	Carter	Darrow	Fitzgerald, Roy G.
Black, N. Y.	Cartwright	Davenport	Fitzgerald, W. T.
Black, Tex.	Casey	Davey	Fitzpatrick
Bland	Celler	Davis	Fletcher
Blanton	Chalmers	Deal	Free
Bloom	Chapman	Dempsey	Freeman
Bohn	Chase	Denison	French
Bowling	Chindblom	De Rouen	Frothingham
Bowman	Clague	Dickinson, Iowa	Fulbright
Box	Clancy	Dickinson, Mo.	Fulmer
Boylan	Cochran, Mo.	Dominick	Furlow
Brand, Ga.	Cochran, Pa.	Doughton	Gallivan

Gambrill	Kearns	Morrow	Stedman
Gardner, Ind.	Kelly	Murphy	Steele
Garner, Tex.	Kemp	Nelson, Me.	Stevenson
Garrett, Tenn.	Kent	Nelson, Mo.	Stobbs
Garrett, Tex.	Kerr	Newton	Strong, Kans.
Gasque	Ketcham	Niedringhaus	Strong, Pa.
Gibson	Kiess	Norton, Nebr.	Sullivan
Gifford	Kincheloe	Norton, N. J.	Summers, Wash.
Gilbert	Kindred	O'Brien	Sumners, Tex.
Glynn	Knutson	O'Connell	Swank
Golder	Kopp	O'Connor, La.	Swick
Goldsborough	Korell	Oldfield	Taber
Goodwin	Kunz	Oliver, Ala.	Tarver
Gregory	Lampert	Oliver, N. Y.	Tatgenhorst
Green, Fla.	Langley	Palmer	Taylor, Tenn.
Green, Iowa	Lanham	Palmisano	Temple
Greenwood	Lankford	Parker	Thatcher
Griest	Larsen	Parks	Thompson
Griffin	Lea	Peery	Thurston
Guyer	Leavitt	Perkins	Tillman
Hadley	Leech	Porter	Tilson
Hall, Ill.	Lehlbach	Pou	Tinkham
Hall, Ind.	Letts	Prall	Treadway
Hall, N. Dak.	Lindsay	Pratt	Tucker
Hammer	Linthicum	Quayle	Underhill
Hardy	Lowrey	Quin	Underwood
Hare	Lozier	Ragon	Updike
Harrison	Luce	Rainey	Vestal
Hastings	McClintic	Rankin	Vincent, Mich.
Haugen	McDuffie	Ransley	Vinson, Ga.
Hawley	McKeown	Rathbone	Vinson, Ky.
Hickey	McLaughlin	Rayburn	Wainwright
Hill, Ala.	McLeod	Reece	Ware
Hill, Wash.	McMillan	Reed, Ark.	Warren
Hoch	McReynolds	Reed, N. Y.	Watres
Hoffman	McSwain	Reid, Ill.	Watson
Hogg	McSweeney	Robinson, Iowa.	Weaver
Holaday	MacGregor	Rogers	Welch, Calif.
Hooper	Maas	Romjue	Weller
Hope	Magrady	Rowbottom	White, Colo.
Houston	Major, Ill.	Rubey	White, Kans.
Howard, Nebr.	Major, Mo.	Rutherford	White, Me.
Howard, Okla.	Manlove	Sabath	Whitehead
Hudson	Mansfield	Sanders, Tex.	Whittington
Hudspeth	Mapes	Sandlin	Williams, Ill.
Hughes	Martin, La.	Schafer	Williams, Mo.
Hull, Morton D.	Martin, Mass.	Sears, Fla.	Williams, Tex.
Hull, Tenn.	Mead	Sears, Nebr.	Wilson, La.
Hull, Wm. E.	Menges	Seger	Wilson, Miss.
Igoe	Michener	Selvig	Winter
Jacobstein	Miller	Shallenberger	Wolverton
Jeffers	Milligan	Sinnott	Wood
Jenkins	Monast	Sirovich	Woodruff
Johnson, Ill.	Montague	Smith	Woodrum
Johnson, Ind.	Mooney	Snell	Wright
Johnson, Okla.	Moore, Ky.	Somers	Wurzbach
Johnson, Tex.	Moore, N. J.	Speaks	Yates
Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Va.	Spearing	Yon
Jones	Moorman	Sproul, Ill.	Zihlman
Kading	Morehead	Stalker	
Kahn	Morin	Steagall	

NAYS—24

Aldrich	Fort	Kvale	Ramseyer
Bacharach	Frear	LaGuardia	Schneider
Berger	Hale	Madden	Simmons
Bowles	Hersey	Merritt	Sinclair
Christopherson	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Wason
Clarke	James	Peavey	Williamson

NOT VOTING—37

Anthony	Doyle	McFadden	Sweet
Beck, Pa.	Evans, Calif.	Michaelson	Swing
Beedy	Fish	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Boies	Garber	Morgan	Timberlake
Britten	Hancock	O'Connor, N. Y.	Welsh, Pa.
Bushong	Irwin	Purnell	Wingo
Carew	Kendall	Robsion, Ky.	Wyant
Combs	King	Sanders, N. Y.	
Corning	Leatherwood	Shreve	
Dickstein	Lyon	Strother	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Shreve with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Hancock with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Lyon.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Corning.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Wingo.
Mr. Beedy with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Combs.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I again announce the necessary absence of my colleagues Mr. CAREW, Mr. O'CONNOR of New York, and Mr. DICKSTEIN. If they were present, they would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GREEN of Iowa, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. In view of the fact that the minority has predominated in the consideration of this bill, and the rules of the House requiring the majority to have a majority of the conferees to carry out the will of the House, I want to ask the Speaker whether or not he will consider the question of appointing as a majority of the conferees those who are in accord with the views of the House as expressed to-day?

The SPEAKER. For the time being the Chair would say he would regard that question as being more Democratic than parliamentary. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let me say to the Speaker that the Democrats having succeeded, it becomes the majority of the House of Representatives, and the majority ought to have a majority of the conferees to carry out the wishes of the House with reference to this legislation. I beg the Speaker to take into consideration the universal rule in this House for the last 25 years, that where the minority becomes the majority they are always given a majority of the conferees in order to carry out the wishes of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair always gives consideration to questions, no matter how propounded.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas sure he will find he has a majority of the votes on his side when it comes to the final passage of the bill?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Well, we had to-day, because we just passed the bill.

Mr. TILSON. No; I do not think so. I think the gentleman will find, upon an examination of the roll call to-morrow, that more Republicans voted for the bill than Democrats.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Oh, well, you were forced to that because one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee made a motion to recommit and members of the Ways and Means Committee, including the gentleman I am looking at, voted to recommit.

Mr. TILSON. Certainly a number of Members on this side voted to recommit the bill in the hope that the Ways and Means Committee would soon report out a new bill without some of the amendments which the gentleman from Texas and his colleagues on that side were responsible for placing in the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then the gentleman from Texas also had in mind a majority that was really for the bill and not a paper majority.

Mr. TILSON. I think we may leave this matter to the record; but at any rate when the bill comes back to us again it may be a very different bill; at least, we hope that it will be in some respects.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let us hope that when the bill comes back from the Senate it will be in such shape that we will all be able to support it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and disposition of the conference report to-morrow, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there was a conditional consent given to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONNERY.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The request is subject to that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The condition on his request was that the alien property bill was not up. I understand now the alien property bill is to be up for consideration to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think the request was contingent upon following the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The consent given the gentleman from Massachusetts was contingent on the alien property bill not coming up.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I had in mind in submitting my request to follow the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York would follow under any circumstances.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, let us include the three requests in one, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] each may have 15 minutes. I believe that is the time they have asked for.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Thirty minutes was allotted to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. TILSON. Thirty minutes for the gentleman from Massachusetts and 15 minutes each for the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Nebraska, to follow immediately upon completion of consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ALIEN PROPERTY BILL

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the flood of oratory just scheduled, the House begin consideration of H. R. 7201, being the bill known as the alien property bill; to be considered under the rules of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has been stated to me that it has been impossible to obtain copies of the report on the bill. I do not know whether the print is exhausted or what the difficulty is, but I wanted to call attention to that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The report was only put in to-day and the Printing Office has not the copies out; but I would say that the report is practically the same as the report on the bill which passed the House before. It is simply brought up to date.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That was my understanding, but some gentlemen are very much interested in getting the report before we have to finally pass on the bill.

Now, one other question, if I may. It is not expected, I understand, that this bill will be completed to-morrow?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] and myself had an understanding that if agreeable to the House we would take to-morrow for general debate. We may now, perhaps, need a little longer time, but I think we may get through general debate in that time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That means that the bill will probably not be again before the House until next Tuesday.

Mr. TILSON. I should hope that the bill might come up again Monday. We have only a few bridge bills on the consent calendar and two suspensions, which I understand will not be contested, so that half of the day Monday ought to be available for the consideration of the alien property bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. At any rate, it will not be up on Saturday.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TILSON. I now ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Friday, it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock. I think many of the Members would like to have an opportunity to buy Christmas presents and attend to other matters. We have had a very strenuous week thus far.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will permit, has consent been given to consider the alien property bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; it has not been granted.

Mr. TILSON. Then I should like to have that consent granted first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that it be in order to consider to-morrow the bill H. R. 7201—the alien property bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I now renew my request that when the House adjourns on Friday, it adjourn over until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Iowa with respect to the report which was published to-day. I have not seen the report, but I understand it is practically the same as the report we had when the bill was under consideration last year.

I have had only one request for time from a gentleman who is opposed to the bill. This gentleman has not seen the report, and, furthermore, by reason of being on a committee which has been meeting both during the day as well as holding night sessions, his time has been very much occupied.

Not having seen the report, he does not feel prepared to go on to-morrow. Now, the request I wish to make is that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] may use 30 or 40 minutes on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not like to make any objection to that.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will probably not more than finish general debate to-morrow.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Very well; I have no objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut that when the House adjourns on Friday it shall stand adjourned until Monday next?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 16, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, December 16, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

Caucus room

To hear Edward E. Spafford, national commander of the American Legion; Col. Edward Schulz, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, chairman diversion channel board; Col. William P. Wooten, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, chairman spillways board; and Col. W. Kelly, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, chairman reservoir board, on projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

233. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, amounting to $12,000 (H. Doc. No. 118), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 278. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 483. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 349. A bill to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 82. A joint resolution to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 164. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at the Pacific Branch, Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MICHENER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. p. 220); without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7201. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Library. H. R. 48. A bill to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the battle of Perryville, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. J. Res. 81. A joint resolution for the amendment of the act of March 3, 1927, by authorizing an annual appropriation to carry out the cooperative experiments contemplated by the act; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Sellers, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NEWTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 7448) to promote the safety of the people and to benefit them in their daily lives through the ingenuity of independent inventors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 7449) granting the consent of Congress to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate two bridges across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Devon, Mingo County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7450) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7451) for the erection of a tablet or marker to be located at the home place of Nancy Hart, in Elbert County, State of Georgia, on War Woman's Creek, being near Dyes and Will Ferries, and what was then known as Fish Dam Ford, on Broad River, to indicate where Nancy Hart lived during the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7452) for the erection of a tablet or marker to be placed at some suitable point at Alfords Bridge, in the county of Hart, State of Georgia, on the national highway between the States of Georgia and South Carolina, to commemorate the memory of Nancy Hart; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 7453) to amend the act approved August 23, 1912, as amended by the act of February 28, 1916, providing for establishment of efficiency ratings and preference for persons honorably discharged from military or naval service employed in the civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 7454) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7455) to acquire land suitable for a forest tree nursery in State of California north of Mount Diablo base line; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7456) to promote temperance in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7457) to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7458) to reduce night work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 7459) to authorize the appropriation for use by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain funds for wool standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 7460) for the protection of persons employed on railway baggage cars, railway express cars, and railway express-baggage cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 7461) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 7462) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new post-office building at Hudson, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 7463) amending an act entitled, "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 7464) to authorize the Secretary of War to accept conveyance of the cemetery at the New York State Camp for Veterans to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 7465) granting the consent of Congress to the Randolph Bridge & Terminal Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 7466) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or Valley County, in the State of Montana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Glasgow, Mont.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 7467) granting consent to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill to a point near the south mole of San Antonia Estuary, in the county of Alameda, in said State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 7468) to prohibit a railroad upon any right of way leading to a national cemetery and to limit repairs to roadways leading to national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 7469) to authorize the moving of explosive ammunition in Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7470) authorizing appropriations for the construction of a highway in the Hawaiian Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7471) to authorize construction of utilities for the storage of explosive ammunition at Fort Shafter, Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 7472) to grant the town of Cicero, Cook County, Ill., an easement over certain Government property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 7473) to prevent the use of stop watches or similar devices in the Postal Service and guaranteeing to postal employees their lawful rights; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7474) to provide for the payment of amounts expended in the construction and maintenance of a hangar and flying field for the use of the Air Mail Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 7475) to provide for the removal of the Confederate monument and tablets from Greenlawn Cemetery to Garfield Park; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WILSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7476) establishing a national board of magazine censorship and designating the duties and powers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7477) for the relief of dependents of men who were killed in the explosion on the battleship *Mississippi;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7478) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 7479) to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 7480) to authorize the transfer of the geodetic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Department of Commerce to the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 99) for the relief of flood-stricken farm areas in the United States, with special reference to aid in the employment of county extension agents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to assume control of and to operate as the property of the United States Government the bituminous-coal mines now idle on account of the suspension of labor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 101) proposing an amendment to the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution relating to intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALKER (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 102) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Mississippi: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, and to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across Lake Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A resolution (H. Res. 57) protesting against the persecution of the Jewish race in Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEERS: A resolution (H. Res. 58) providing for the printing of the report of the forty-sixth annual encampment by the commander in chief of Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona favoring the construction of public roads leading into and through national forests, Indian reservations, and other public lands; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, urging appropriations for roads over Indian reservations; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 7481) granting an increase of pension to Honora Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 7482) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Burris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7483) granting a pension to Henry Clinton Hanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 7484) for the relief of W. B. Ford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BECK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7485) granting a pension to Annie C. Lawless; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7486) for the relief of the estate of John H. Christy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7487) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7488) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7489) for the relief of Mrs. William F. Baxley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7490) granting a pension to Rebecca Bristol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 7491) granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7492) for the relief of Capt. Louis C. Brinton; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7493) granting a pension to Eliza J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7494) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Samuel Woodfill to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States and immediately retire him with the rank of and pay of a captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 7495) for recognition of meritorious service performed by Lieut. Commander Edward Ellsberg, Lieut. Henry Hartley, and Boatswain Richard E. Hawes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 7496) for the relief of Kenneth A. Rotharmel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7497) for the relief of Alfred E. Staps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 7498) granting an increase of pension to Bettie A. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7499) granting an increase of pension to Addie C. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7500) granting a pension to Emma J. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7501) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hertzler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 7502) granting an increase of pension to Margaretta Gloss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 7503) granting an increase of pension to David Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7504) for the relief of John Sullivan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7505) granting a pension to Kate S. Callender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7506) to correct the military record of Simon L. Addison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 7507) granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7508) for the relief of Frank Lange; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7509) granting an increase of pension to Sallie H. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7510) for the relief of Homer C. Parker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7511) for the relief of R. Bluestein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 7512) for the retirement as ensign of George E. Tarbox, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 7513) to authorize the appointment of Louis Vauthier to the grade of captain, United States Army, and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7514) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Donston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7515) granting an increase of pension to Almira Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7516) granting a pension to Emma Voelker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7517) granting a pension to Nancy E. Clifton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 7518) for the relief of the Farmers National Bank, of Danville, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 7519) granting a pension to Janette L. Goodrich; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 7520) granting a pension to Dora E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7521) granting a pension to Mattie E. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7522) granting a pension to Sarah E. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 7523) providing for the examination and survey of the Combahee and Big Salkehatchie Rivers, and removing obstructions therein, all within the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7524) providing for the examination and survey of the South Edisto River, and removing obstructions therein, within the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 7525) authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Shark River, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 7526) for the relief of Charles Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7527) to provide for compensation for Ona Harrington for injuries received in an airplane accident; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 7528) granting a pension to Frances Jane Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 7529) granting a pension to Amanda Pierson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 7530) granting an increase of pension to Teresa Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7531) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Newfisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7532) granting a pension to William J. Carah; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 7533) granting a pension to Julia E. Hotchkiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 7534) granting a pension to Samuel E. Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 7535) granting a pension to Eliza A. Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 7536) granting an increase of pension to Jeanette P. Merchant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7537) granting an increase of pension to Cansady McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 7538) for the relief of the High Clothing Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 7539) for the relief of W. Roderick Dorsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 7540) granting a pension to John E. Quinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 7541) granting a pension to Benjamin Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 7542) granting a pension to Henry L. Tripp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 7543) granting an increase of pension to Susanna List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7544) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 7545) for the relief of Mabel Rees Coffin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 7546) for the relief of Gertrude Skeel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 7547) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7548) granting an increase of pension to Esther M. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7549) granting an increase of pension to Effie A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7550) granting a pension to George F. Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7551) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. Sitton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 7552) for the relief of Bertina Sand; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 7553) for the relief of James Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7554) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Broderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRALL: A bill (H. R. 7555) for the relief of William S. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7556) for the relief of Andrew Kline; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7557) for the relief of Louis J. Stroud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 7558) granting a pension to Cordie Nave; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 7559) granting an increase of pension to John Prater; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7560) for the relief of James P. Hamill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7561) to provide for the retirement of David E. Lunsford as a corporal in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 7562) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7563) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Putnam, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7564) granting an increase of pension to Carrie P. Prentice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Ruth C. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7566) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7567) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Pelham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7568) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Parshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7569) granting an increase of pension to Alida Parkhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7570) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Louisa B. Newcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7572) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7573) granting an increase of pension to Mary Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 7574) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia A. Mettler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7575) granting an increase of pension to Jessie McManus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7576) granting an increase of pension to Jennie McGovern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7577) granting an increase of pension to Etta A. Mayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7578) granting an increase of pension to Adellia C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7579) granting an increase of pension to Marietta Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7580) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Loomis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7582) granting an increase of pension to M. Frank Lantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7583) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Lanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7584) granting an increase of pension to Mary Landon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7585) granting an increase of pension to Mary Krener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7586) granting an increase of pension to Mary Alida Kilpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7587) granting an increase of pension to Lucy M. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7588) granting an increase of pension to Esther E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7589) granting an increase of pension to Betsey J. Keener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7590) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E Keck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7591) granting an increase of pension to Isadora Judson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7592) granting an increase of pension to Miranda Jenks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7593) granting an increase of pension to Estella P. Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7594) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7595) granting an increase of pension to Diana Tillyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7596) granting an increase of pension to Evaline R. Tuton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7597) granting an increase of pension to Lillian M. Van Housen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7598) granting an increase of pension to Adelia Van Wormer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to Belle R. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7600) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7601) granting an increase of pension to Temperance C. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7602) granting an increase of pension to Alice D. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7603) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe R. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7604) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7605) granting an increase of pension to Anna Marie Zwilling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7606) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Winship; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7607) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Wrightman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7608) granting an increase of pension to Lillian H. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7609) granting an increase of pension to Amanda A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7610) granting a pension to Savannah Kintner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7611) granting a pension to Josephine Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7612) granting a pension to Nellie B. Hoagland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7613) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7614) granting a pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7615) granting a pension to Eleanor D. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7616) granting a pension to Lydia Hendershot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7617) granting a pension to Eva Sanborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7618) granting a pension to Phebe Evland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7619) granting a pension to M. Lee Wolcott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7620) granting a pension to Charlotte Westcott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7621) granting a pension to Sarah F. Perrigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7622) granting a pension to Rose Mary Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7623) granting a pension to Rissa Vene Goodell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7624) granting a pension to Cora M. Bogardus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7625) granting a pension to Hiram H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7626) granting a pension to Harriet E. Charles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7627) granting an increase of pension to Jennie A. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7628) granting an increase of pension to Sylvia A. Hollenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7629) granting an increase of pension to Aggie Holcombe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7630) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7631) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7632) granting an increase of pension to Sarah G. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7633) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7634) granting an increase of pension to Sara A. Giles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7635) granting an increase of pension to Emma Furey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7636) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Freese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7637) granting an increase of pension to Susan L. Fero; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7638) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Evland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7639) granting an increase of pension to Sarah B. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7640) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7641) granting an increase of pension to Eunice M. Denmark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7642) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. De Coursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7643) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7644) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7645) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Cushing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7646) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Crout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7647) granting an increase of pension to Libbie C. Cronk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7648) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cromer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7649) granting an increase of pension to Lida Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7650) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7651) granting an increase of pension to Prudence Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7652) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7653) granting an increase of pension to Alice Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7654) granting an increase of pension to Laura Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7655) granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7656) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7657) granting an increase of pension to Celestia A. Antes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7658) granting an increase of pension to Clara S. Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7659) granting an increase of pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7660) granting an increase of pension to Maria Blossom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7661) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ackley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7662) granting an increase of pension to Cora E. Stuart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7663) granting an increase of pension to Michael H. Daly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7664) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7665) granting an increase of pension to Catherine B. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7666) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7667) granting an increase of pension to Nettie L. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7668) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7669) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Sanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7670) granting an increase of pension to Hariet A. Sarlls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7671) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7672) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7673) granting an increase of pension to Addie Skinner; to the committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7674) granting an increase of pension to Anna D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7675) granting an increase of pension to Lydia H. Squires; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7676) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7677) granting an increase of pension to Mary Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7678) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Swartwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7679) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7680) granting an increase of pension to Anna Tharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7681) granting an increase of pension to Erselia Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7682) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Coon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7683) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7684) granting an increase of pension to Mertella T. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7685) granting an increase of pension to Ida B. Chesebrough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7686) granting an increase of pension to Addie Champion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7687) granting an increase of pension to Emeline L. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7688) granting an increase of pension to Nellie F. Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7689) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7690) granting an increase of pension to Caroline S. Byam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7691) granting an increase of pension to Orinda L. Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7692) granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7694) granting an increase of pension to Mary Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7695) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7696) granting an increase of pension to Fanny Brayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7697) granting an increase of pension to Augusta C. Bittmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7698) granting an increase of pension to Harriett E. Beary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 7699) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7700) for the relief of Willard Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7701) granting a pension to Eliza Vandergriff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7702) granting a pension to Chloe Cate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7703) granting a pension to Amanda Baker Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7704) granting a pension to Swin Leadford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7705) granting a pension to Ravon Cawood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7706) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Pardue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) granting a pension to Herman R. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 7708) for the relief of John M. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 7709) granting a pension to Mary E. Bradshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 7710) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Mulford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 7711) granting a pension to George Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7712) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Denney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 7713) for the relief of George H. Koerner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7714) to extend the provisions of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to James E. Dethlefsen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7715) for the relief of William Michael McMahon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7716) for the relief of Francis Michael Tully; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7717) granting a pension to Mitchell Zimmerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 7718) for the relief of John Hill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7719) for the relief of W. T. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7720) granting an increase of pension to Emma K. McHenry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7721) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7722) authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the opening of the grave containing the remains of the late Nellie Richards; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

177. By Mr. BERGER: Memorial of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, declaring that the colossal diversion of waters from the Great Lakes through the Chicago Drainage Canal aggravates the flood dangers on both the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, and that any conservation program designed to deal with flood control must eliminate unlawful abstractions of water; to the Committee on Flood Control.

178. Also, memorial of the Rho Sigma Phi, an organization of Milwaukee, Wis., urging the construction of the St. Lawrence ship canal at the earliest moment; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

179. By Mr. CELLER: Petition for protection of foreign-born workers, 41 Union Square, New York City; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

180. By Mr. COHEN: Petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

181. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

182. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

183. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

184. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

185. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

186. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

187. Also, petition of constituents regarding Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

188. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of Mark Zalabak and others, of Dickson, Tenn., protesting against the Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

189. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 52 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the defeat of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

190. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Post Falls, Idaho, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

191. By Mr. GARBER: Petitions of approximately 1,300 residents of Cimarron County, Okla., and adjacent counties urging, as part of a flood-control program, the construction of a dam across the Cimarron River somewhere along said stream in Cimarron County, Okla., the exact location to be determined by engineers and experts of and for the United States Government; to the Committee on Flood Control.

192. Also, affidavit of William E. Baker, county agent of Cimarron County, Okla., in regard to soil productivity in that county and possibilities for development through aid of irrigation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

193. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of H. E. Moon and 1,358 other residents of Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday-observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

194. Also, petition of Fred Whitney and 32 other citizens of Reading, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday-observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

195. Also, petition of Isaac McCormick and 75 other citizens of Hillsdale County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

196. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Mr. F. T. Mann and 150 others of Winnebago, Nebr., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill or any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, or any such resolution proposing such legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

197. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district of Michigan, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill or any national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

198. By Mr. KADING: Petition of 107 citizens of Watertown, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

199. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 50 residents of Morgan, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

200. Also, petition of 25 residents of Ganges, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

201. Also, petition of 38 residents of Glenn, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

202. Also, petition of 131 residents of Niles, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

203. Also, petition of 73 residents of Buchanan, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

204. Also, petition of 183 residents of Douglas, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

205. Also, petition of 299 residents of Fennville, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

206. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Paw Paw, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any

other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

207. Also, petition of 60 residents of Bloomingdale, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

208. Also, petition of 94 residents of Gobles, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

209. Also, petition of 102 residents of Bangor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

210. Also, petition of 13 residents of Nashville, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

211. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of adult citizens of Eagle Bend, Minn., against passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

212. Also, petition of adult residents of Aitkin County, Minn., against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

213. Also, petition of adult residents of Aitkin, Minn., against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

214. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Mrs. J. M. Carnahan and 59 other residents of Glenwood, Minn., protesting against enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation or of any bills dealing with national religious problems; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

215. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Meeker County, State of Minnesota, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

216. Also, petition of Mary Lindahl, Kensington, Minn., and 19 residents of Traverse and Douglas Counties, Minn., protesting against enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

217. Also, petition of Mrs. William Stoltz and 42 residents of Pope and Grant Counties, Minn., remonstrating against enactment of any legislation designed to enforce Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

218. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Fond du Lac County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

219. By Mr. MAPES: Petition signed by 283 adult citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other national religious legislation which may be pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

220. Also, petition of numerous adults, residents of Grand Rapids, Bedford, Battle Creek, Cloverdale, Doster, Dowling, Jackson, Urbandale, Cadillac, Wellston, Dublin, White Cloud, Muskegon, Fremont, Michigan City, Irons, Baldwin, Peacock, Empire, Harrietta, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other national religious legislation which may be pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

221. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, Munith, and Hudson, Mich., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

222. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., relating to the inclusion of motor-propelled vessels under the regulations of the Steamboat Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

223. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition against tax on Chautauqua tickets, signed by Dr. J. B. Cole et al.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

224. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of J. P. Gaede, 27 Charles Street, Jersey City, N. J., and 500 others, protesting against House bill 78, otherwise known as the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

225. Also, petition of J. Marion Campbell, of 56 Atlantic Street, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against House bill 78, known as the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

226. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Actors Equity Association of New York City, favoring the removal of the tax on spoken drama; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *December 16, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

He that cometh unto Thee with an honest heart, blessed Heavenly Father, Thou wilt surely harken. Encourage us to draw near with our needs, with our limitations, and with our appeals for wisdom. Make us able to bear the vision of the truth and may we have the determination to dedicate ourselves to it. Oh, the love of truth secures ineffable peace, when the flower of life's summer lies withered and dead. We would not seek love of praise, hope of gain, nor delusive happiness, but the stability and the good of the Republic. May Thy plan and purpose be shadowed in our deliberations. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE RESOLUTION RESPECTING REPRESENTATIVE JAMES M. BECK

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a rather humorous error which I think should be corrected. Whether it is in the Journal or the RECORD or in both I can not say, but here is the matter.

There came to me from the document room a few moments ago House Resolution 1, which purports to have been introduced on December 5, 1927, by "Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee," and it reads as follows:

Resolved, That the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] be now permitted to take the oath of office.

[Laughter.]

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced a resolution touching that subject, but that was not the tenor of my resolution. My recollection is that the resolution which I have just read was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], and in view of the fact that that is the only matter upon which we have had a roll call in which the Republicans have won a victory during this Congress, I think it ought to be credited where credit is due, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. Therefore I ask that the Journal be corrected, if the error be there.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, both the Journal and the RECORD will be corrected.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose the Speaker has no authority to order the print of this resolution destroyed.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the resolution is in proper form. The original Resolution No. 1 was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and was amended by way of substitute by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. The resolution as amended was passed. That was Mr. GARRETT'S resolution amended.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the resolution, so far as I know, which was introduced by myself, has not been printed in bill form. This which I hold in my hand is printed in bill form. I do not understand that you can attribute to me a resolution which I never introduced at all. I do not know what the Journal shows about this matter, because I have not had an opportunity to look at it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The resolution should show how the gentleman introduced it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is that the resolution as introduced, or the resolution that passed?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This shows the introduction of the resolution and not the passage.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman from Tennessee introduced a resolution, No. 1, and the resolution itself, it seems to me, ought to show the language introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee and the amendment placed on it by the House. That is the only way in which you can properly reflect it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The theory, of course, is that the resolution was dropped in the basket.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And thereafter on the floor an amendment was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. Therefore the original printing should be in the form in which the gentleman from Tennessee presented it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course I do not know whether the resolution that I introduced has been printed in bill form or not. The RECORD shows the text of the resolution

that I introduced. There ought not to be a print in bill form showing the introduction by a Member of a resolution that he never introduced at all.

The SPEAKER. The resolution might be printed in the form in which it was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There could be a star print making it correct.

The SPEAKER. Which would show the resolution that was introduced originally by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want done whatever is necessary to give the gentleman from New York credit, because there credit is due, and to eliminate me as the author of this resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Is not the gentleman from Tennessee unduly solicitous this morning about giving credit to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the author of a resolution is entitled to credit for it.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Tennessee recognizes his resolving clause, does he not? So much of the gentleman's original resolution was left and all the rest stricken out.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. All I see here that I recognize is "Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee" and the word "Resolved." [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will confer with the clerks as to the best method of making the correction.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 70

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

Senate Resolution 72

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Edwin P. Thayer, of Indiana, as Secretary of the Senate.

BRIDGE ACROSS BAY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the bill (H. R. 7467) granting to the city and county of San Francisco a permit to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill, in the city and county of San Francisco, to a point near the south mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, State of California, which bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication from the city and county of San Francisco in respect to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an official communication from the city of San Francisco with reference to the bridge about which he has introduced a bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long is this?

Mr. WELCH of California. It is very brief—four small pages.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has it been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. WELCH of California. It has.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is a rather unusual thing, Mr. Speaker, to have propaganda resolutions put in the RECORD. I will not object, although it is a rather bad practice.

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will yield, this contains the conditions under which the city of San Francisco desires to build this bridge?

Mr. WELCH of California. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me, I extend my remarks by inserting a communication from the city of San Francisco.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
CLERK'S OFFICE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
December 14, 1927.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, by resolution adopted in regular meeting December 5, 1927, authorized me as chairman of the bridge committee of said board to deliver to you with a request for presentation to the Seventieth Congress of the United States a bill granting to the city and county of San Francisco a permit to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill, in the city and county of San Francisco, to a point near the south mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, State of California.

In accordance with the instructions contained in said resolution, I herewith hand to you a certified copy of the proposed bill and respectfully request that you introduce the same in the Congress. I also hand to you herewith a certified copy of the report of Robert Ridgway, Arthur N. Talbot, and John D. Galloway, board of engineers, which report is referred to in said proposed bill as being on file in the office of the Secretary of War of the United States.

In support of its application for a permit to construct a transbay bridge, San Francisco cites the following reasons:

1. The bridge is necessary for the safety and convenience of the public.

2. The bridge is indispensable to the financial and economic growth of northern California.

In amplification of the above, permit me to call attention to the following facts:

San Francisco Bay is overcrowded with ferries. Shipping in San Francisco Bay is second in point of volume only to that of the harbor of New York. Over 11,000 vessels passed into and out of the harbor last year. Eighteen lines of ferries, making an aggregate of over 850 crossings daily, convey 50,000 people over the bay twice a day across the main lines of commercial shipping. In 1926 ferry trips of interurban type between San Francisco and Eastbay cities numbered 43,550,678; main-line passenger trips numbered 1,686,518. This bay ferry traffic creates a navigation menace. The menace is great and is constantly increasing. It is enhanced by frequent and sometimes very heavy fogs. The time required to cross the bay by ferry, 18 minutes, is unduly long. This constitutes a distinct detriment to business and a grave hardship upon business people. Automobile traffic, now so important to the growth of city and State, is impeded. In 1926 over 2,500,000 automobiles were transported by ferry between Oakland and San Francisco. Congestion of automobiles in highway approaches to and from the city is frequent and often acute. San Francisco and adjacent cities and towns of the peninsula suffer from lack of direct and unbroken road connections with highways across the bay.

The bridge as planned by a board of engineers, the personnel of which was recommended by the presidents of four universities of the State of California, represents months of intensive study. It will be of double deck and will accommodate foot and vehicular travel as well as suburban trains to which may be diverted traffic from all main lines of passenger transportation. It will be 12,000 feet long, will have 20 spans, 2 of these with horizontal clearance of 1,250 feet each. It will have a vertical clearance of 150 feet over 2½ miles of deep water of the bay. This vertical clearance is 15 feet greater than that of the four bridges over the East River at New York and the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge over the Delaware River. There will be one movable span which it is expected will be used only on rare occasions. Shipping men are agreed that the bridge will not interfere with shipping. Indeed they approve of and urge the bridge on the ground that it will be an aid to shipping. The bridge will not interfere with the proposed United States naval base at Alameda. The city of Alameda, by proper resolution, has indorsed the proposed bridge and is joining in the application for a permit to construct the bridge at the location specified. There will be no interference with Oakland Harbor or with present plans for the development of that harbor. On the San Francisco side of the bay most of the wharves, and by far the largest wharves, lie north of the bridge and are not affected thereby. The members of the board of engineers are emphatic in saying in their report that there will be "no interference with shipping in any part of the bay." San Francisco Bay, with its area of 463 square miles, is one of the largest natural harbors on the globe; the area of deep water available for anchorage is sufficient to accommodate the navies of the world. Clearances provided by the proposed bridge are more than sufficient to pass the largest ships in the United States Navy. The line of the bridge crosses over the northern portion of the United States Fleet anchorage as that anchorage is depicted on paper; this can be obviated by moving this anchorage about 1,000 yards southward where ample deep-water anchorage exists.

Within the last two years 26 applications for a franchise to construct a bridge across the bay have been made to the board of supervisors of San Francisco. Perhaps every possible route and every possible type

of bridge have been suggested. Voluminous maps, drawings, engineering digests and blue prints have been filed. Discussion of and arguments on these various applications progressed before the board of supervisors for over six months. Many noteworthy engineers prepared or contributed to the plans and discussions. The entire subject matter, therefore, has been inquired into most exhaustively. Much money has been spent in research. San Francisco itself has spent some $50,000 of municipal moneys in an endeavor to determine the very best type of bridge and the very best location. It is the sincere belief of city officials that the bridge as now planned between Rincon Hill and Alameda Mole represents the very best of engineering advice and legal counsel.

This San Francisco transbay bridge enterprise is neither provincial in its conception nor local in its significance. San Francisco is the financial center of the great Pacific coast. Her bank clearings are greater than those of any city west of Chicago. Nearly 2,000,000 of people are concentrated within 50 miles of her borders. With her destiny is bound up vitally the destiny of many, if not most, of the populous communities of the West. Her success is their success; her prosperity is their prosperity. The transbay bridge will promote the growth and serve the convenience of them all. Indeed, it is the expectation and the hope that it will be of service and advantage to the entire country. The Chief Executive of this Nation in one of his first and most important utterances since the opening of the present Congress stressed the fact that "It can not be too often said that this is all one country, agriculture, industry, transportation, and finance should realize." He stated, "That they are interdependent and that each may prosper by extending its services to the others."

San Francisco wants to extend its services to others in this matter of transportation. She wants to make straight and safe the path that leads to her door. She is not fearful of the financial burden that she may have to bear or the construction problems that she may have to solve. She is serene in her confidence that she can meet all these. She wants to be brought into closer contact with her sister cities and towns of the Nation; she wants these cities and towns to be brought into closer contact with her. She aspires to make contribution to the convenience, safety, and prosperity of the people of city, State, and Nation. Her aspirations have been fostered and encouraged by the entire State of California; they have received particular encouragement from the people of northern California.

The cities and towns of the entire San Francisco Bay region are in complete accordance with her bridge plan and route. From no civic body, from no political subdivision, from no commercial organization has come any word of dissent. San Francisco has the hearty and undivided cooperation of her sister cities. All she now asks is congressional permission as defined in the accompanying bill. Granted this she will proceed with all possible expedition to construct across San Francisco Bay a bridge which will serve millions of people of the present generation and anticipate the needs of added millions of people of generations to come.

Very sincerely yours,

JAS. M. SHEEHY.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 5800, the first deficiency appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 28, 29, 30, 38, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 24 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Oklahoma," insert the following: "are authorized to execute and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out and at the end of the matter so restored, after the numerals "1925," insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the inmates of the United States Industrial Reformatory shall be employed only in the production and manufacture of supplies for the United States Government, for consumption in United States institutions, and in duties necessary for the construction and maintenance of the institution"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the sum $370,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 19, 23, 32, 33, 34, 36, and 37.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WILL R. WOOD,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for expenses of the Senate in the amounts and in the manner provided by the Senate amendments.

On No. 10: Appropriates $5,500 for maintenance of the House Office Building for the fiscal year 1928, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 11: Strikes out the appropriation of $100,000, inserted by the Senate, for the construction of roads in the Virgin Islands.

On No. 12: Appropriates $10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for administration of the produce agency act.

On No. 13: Appropriates $25,000, as proposed by the Senate, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the parlatoria date scale.

On No. 14: Appropriates $869.80, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $815, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims under the Department of Commerce.

On No. 15: Appropriates $609.52, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $584.79, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims by the Lighthouse Service.

On No. 16: Extends the availability of the appropriation for repair of the fish hatchery at Springville, Utah, to the fiscal year 1929, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 17 and 18: Relating to the claim of the Shawnee Indians and certain Delaware Indians: Appropriates $463,732.49 for payment of the claims of these Indians, as proposed by both Houses, but accepts the language of the Senate appropriating specifically and directly for the payment of the claim without any reference to House bill 5218 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, as embodied in the language of the House bill.

On No. 20: Appropriates $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to determine the property loss by flood sustained by certain property owners residing at or in the vicinity of Hatch and Santa Teresa, N. Mex.

On No. 21: Restores the appropriation of $100,000 for facilities at the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, stricken out by the Senate, modified in such manner as to limit the employment of inmates thereof in accordance with section 6 of the act of January 7, 1925.

On No. 22: Appropriates $36,782.02, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $16,817.84, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims under the Post Office Department.

On No. 24: Appropriates $6,467.37, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,838.80, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims under the Treasury Department.

On No. 25: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation upon expenditures of the Farm Loan Bureau for personal services in the District of Columbia during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

On Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, relating to public buildings: Eliminates from the appropriation for the Marcus Hook quarantine station, as proposed by the Senate, the authority for repairing a gangway and for a boat landing; makes the appropriation for the San Francisco Mint Building available for using the vault doors now in the Subtreasury Building, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the appropriations of $200,000 and $50,000, respectively, inserted by the Senate, for the public buildings at Juneau, Alaska, and Durango, Colo., such buildings being provided for in the regular Treasury appropriation bill.

On No. 31: Appropriates $336.72, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $322.13, as proposed by the House, for payment of damage claims under the War Department.

On No. 35: Appropriates $370,000, as proposed by the Senate, for improvement of the water supply at Fort Douglas, Utah, modified so as to eliminate from the amendment the provision for the sale of surplus water.

On No. 38: Appropriates $5,500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $11,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property.

On No. 39: Strikes out the limitation, inserted by the Senate, to prohibit the payment of a judgment of the Court of Claims certified to Congress for payment in accordance with existing law.

On No. 40: Makes retroactive to the fiscal year 1926, as proposed by the Senate, the provision permitting payment of expenses of employees of the field services upon transfer from one official station to another.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments as follows:

On No. 19: Appropriating $15,000 for relief of distress among needy Indians of the Turtle Mountain Band of North Dakota.

On No. 23: Providing for the deposit in the Treasury of the United States of certain money received from the Republic of Mexico.

On Nos. 32, 36, and 37: Appropriating $3,110,000 for removal of certain ammunition from the ordnance depots at Curtis Bay, Md., and Raritan, N. J.

On No. 33: Relating to the use of $30,000 of the appropriation for military posts for the employment of the services of architects and technical and professional services.

On No. 34: Relating to the appropriation of $126,000 for the construction of officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WILL R. WOOD,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a couple of questions. I should like to ask the gentleman if he will make a very brief statement stating clearly what is meant in relation to the brick plant that is provided for at the Chillicothe Reformatory, and if there is any change in the established law as to other penal institutions in employing prisoners?

Mr. MADDEN. The conferees wrote a proviso into the appropriations act, which is section 6 of the substantive law authorizing the creation of the Chillicothe penal institution, and I would like to read that; it is short:

That the inmates of the United States Industrial Reformatory shall be employed only in the production and manufacture of supplies for the United States Government for consumption in the United States institution and in duties necessary for the construction and maintenance of the institution.

And the conferees understand that to mean that no inmate shall be employed in any other capacity than that described in this proviso, and that the bricks to be made under the appropriation shall be used as far as we know only for the construction of buildings connected with the institution itself.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is entirely satisfied that by no interpretation of the general law in reference to prison labor with this proviso could they manufacture brick in this institution and sell to a school district to build a schoolhouse in Ohio?

Mr. MADDEN. I am quite sure they could not. They can not deal with anything except the United States institutions.

Mr. BEGG. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the conference report. Before doing that I desire to make a short statement. The amount of the bill as it passed the Senate and which is now pending before us is $210,411,668.02. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was $200,359,997.40. The net sum added by the Senate is $10,051,670.62. The House recessions embodied in the report, which has been read, amount to $450,670.62, and the Senate recessions amount to $6,350,000. The items in disagreement are Turtle Mountain Indians, relief of distress, $15,000. Officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans., where they had a serious fire, $126,000. Removal of ammunition at Curtis Bay, Md., and Raritan, N. J., $3,110,000. Total disagreement, $3,251,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a vote on the conference report, and then we will take up the matters in disagreement.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Relief of distress among certain Indians: For relief of distress among the needy Indians of Turtle Mountain Band of North Dakota, fiscal years 1927 and 1928, $15,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House further disagree to the amendment of the Senate. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Any moneys received from the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of securing information on which to base a treaty between the United States and Mexico relative to the use of the waters of the Rio Grande, Lower Colorado, and Tia Juana Rivers as authorized by the act of March 3, 1927, shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur. I would like to explain it for a moment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is that the amendment I was interested in?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

As the matter came to the House in the first instance, it was proposed that a certain amount of money to be paid by the Republic of Mexico should be paid into the hands of the joint commission having jurisdiction over the boundary waters. But the Committee on Appropriations demurred to that, because it would not be wise to put money into any less unit or authority than the Treasury of the United States and then have it reappropriated to meet the needs of the activity. That is just what this does. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: For transportation of the Army any its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $2,200,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a suggestion for a compromise on this subject.

The SPEAKER. What is the motion of the gentleman?

Mr. MADDEN. My motion is to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I have a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is in order now. My motion has not yet been reported.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the motion to recede and concur would take preference over the motion of the gentleman from Illinois. However, the gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, the amendment has not yet been reported to the House by the Clerk.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion of the gentleman from Illinois will be reported first.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, or will make the point of order when the time comes, that it is not germane to the subject.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 32: Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 32, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by such Senate amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, through a joint board composed of persons appointed by them, shall make a survey of the points of storage of supplies of ammunition and components thereof for use of the Army and Navy, with special reference to the location of such ammunition and components as are in such proximity to populous communities and industrial areas as to constitute a menace to life and property. The result of such survey shall be embodied in a joint report which the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall make to Congress, not later than March 15, 1928, with their recommendations as to what changes, if any, should be made in such storage facilities and their points of location and the feasibility of the joint use thereof by the Army and Navy. Such expenses of the survey as may not otherwise be chargeable to current appropriations may be defrayed in equal parts from current appropriations for 'Ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department,' and 'Current expenses, Ordnance Service, War Department.'"

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The motion has been read only for information.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to explain the whole situation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Maryland can not take the floor without my yielding it anyway.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask if the gentleman from Illinois retains the floor when my motion is a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois retains the floor, but the gentleman from New Jersey will have an opportunity to make his motion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most extraordinary proposals I have seen for a long time. The proposal here, including Senate amendments 32, 36, and 37, is to appropriate $3,100,000 to transfer the ammunition now stored at Curtis Bay, Md., and at Raritan, N. J. They propose to send this ammunition across the country to other places and to expend this money for that purpose.

There are 50,000 tons of ammunition to be removed, the value of which is $60,000,000. The people of Baltimore, in the vicinity of Curtis Bay, object to having the ammunition stored there. The people at Raritan, N. J., object to having it stored there. The Committee on Appropriations went thoroughly into this case. It is proposed to send some of this ammunition to Charleston, S. C.; part of it to Ogden, Utah; part of it to Pig Point, Va.; and part of it to Savanna, Ill. We gave a very careful hearing to the War Department on this question. General Williams, the head of the Ordnance Department, testified before the committee quite elaborately twice, and said that there is very remote danger of explosion where the ammunition is stored, but if there is serious danger where it is stored steps will be taken to remedy the situation and eliminate that danger. Then we gave a hearing to the delegations in the House from both Maryland and New Jersey.

Some of these gentlemen testified that there would be danger to life and property for a distance of 20 miles from the point of storage. And yet they propose to force the removal of these explosives to Savanna, Ill., and other places where it will not be much more than 5 miles away from large cities.

What the Committee on Appropriations wants to do is to protect both life and property and to be sure that when we do remove the ammunition from where it is stored, if we should do it, we shall remove it to some place where it will not have to be removed again the next day. That is a fair proposition, and that is what we propose, and to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] wants to make a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The only objection I have to the gentleman's proposition is this, that he is proposing to have the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy create a new board and not a board made up of officials within the Army and the Navy.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; of the Army.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment does not read that way.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what it means.

Mr. BLANTON. But that is not what it says. It says "persons," not "officers." If the gentleman will so word it that the personnel of this board must be selected from officials of the Army and the Navy, I will not make the point of order against it. If we leave it as the gentleman has written it, we all know that civilians will be put on this board, and we will then have to provide salaries for them; and we will never be able to get rid of the board. I will have no objection to it if you will require this board to be made up of officers, but I am against creating new outside boards, and I hope the gentleman is, too.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what we intend.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will read this language, he will see that the board is simply to be made up of "persons," which means civilians.

Mr. MADDEN. It probably does not say so, but that is what it means. I have no objection to amending it in that way.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman offer an amendment requiring the personnel of the board to be officers from the Army and the Navy?

Mr. MADDEN. We could change the word "persons" to "officers."

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will offer that amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. All we want to do is to insure the safety of life and property. If we can not get an amendment of this proposal we are going to move to insist on our objection to the Senate amendment, which will be to strike out the appropriation altogether. We do not want to do that, and we come here with this proposal as the result of a well-thought-out plan in which the conferees of the Senate and the House are in unanimous accord. I submit we have given evidence of a desire to dispose of this question and surround it with every safeguard. We have manifested no selfish disposition in the settlement of the problem. I am authorized to say to the House that this proposal represents the unanimous opinion of the Senate conferees and the House conferees, and we ask you, if you will, to adopt it in place of one of the items in dispute. If that is done, we will then move to strike out the appropriations for the other items, and we will be in a position, not later than the 15th of March, to come back to the House and to the Senate and know what we are doing.

Why should Maryland insist on imposing upon Illinois, on Virginia, and on South Carolina, and why should New Jersey propose to insist upon imposing on these States, a thing which they do not want themselves, and why should they not join us in an effort to solve the problem so that it will be satisfactory to everybody in the United States and safe at the same time?

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest that the gentleman now move that the word "persons" be stricken out and the word "officers" inserted.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I think my motion takes precedence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will change the word "persons" to "officers."

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I notice that in the bill we passed there is an appropriation to rehabilitate the Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey to the amount of $2,300,000. Why should we rehabilitate and start up those arsenals anew if the people are opposed to them, do not want us there, and will not allow us to store our products after they are made? That is the same general proposition, so why not move them all and get them away from New Jersey?

Mr. LEHLBACH. If the gentleman will permit, the Picatinny Arsenal is not in the same class with the Raritan Arsenal. There is no objection to Picatinny Arsenal. It is located in an isolated spot, and the only town surrounding it is made up in large part of the population that is employed in the arsenal. They have no objection to anything stored at the Picatinny Arsenal.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield me five minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, this is merely postponing the consideration of this subject until the 15th of March. The War Department can deal with it just as effectively at this time if we make the appropriation as it can if you form a commission and have that commission report in March. The whole intent and purpose of the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois is that you appoint a commission of the Army and of the Navy to consider this matter and report. If you are going to leave it to the Army and the Navy, why can you not trust it to the Army now and let them remove the menace and not wait until the 15th of March and then follow along with legislation, so that no one can tell when an appropriation will be made? If you would only appropriate the money now and give it to the Army, or give it to the Army and the Navy, so far as that is concerned, and then go ahead with the work that would be all right. This is merely to form a commission to report in March, and the same people who would determine it now are the ones who will report it to Congress in March. Why, then, wait for a commission report?

I have tried to impress upon this House and I have tried to impress upon the people generally how important it is to the city of Baltimore, a city of 850,000, at whose very gates this menace lies, consisting of 25,000,000 pounds of high explosive, and yet we can not get enough money to remove even the high explosives from this depot.

I do not know how you gentlemen feel about it, but they have mentioned General Williams and have stated what he said before the committee. What could General Williams say? I ask each man in this House, What could General Williams say? Suppose he had said, "Mr. MADDEN, this ammunition is very dangerous; it may go off at any time; it may explode at any time." How many people do you suppose would be living around Curtis Bay to-day? He could not tell just how dangerous this situation is. If word should go out to the people of Baltimore city generally that the War Department had stated how dangerous this is, you would not be able to keep the people within 5 miles of the place. General Williams did the best he could under all the circumstances.

I do not think we are asking too much, because we only ask you to leave it to the Army, giving them an appropriation and letting them remove it to some safe place. I am sure the War Department will not endanger any locality.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that the people of Baltimore have even more confidence in the gentleman from Maryland than they have in General Williams, and yet the gentleman from Maryland has said that this is dangerous, but we have not noticed any hegira of people from Baltimore.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We brought here a number of people who have stated how dangerous it is, and we had an explosion there in September which demonstrated how dangerous it is, and yet it seems impossible for us to have you meet the situation.

History tells us Nero fiddled while Rome burned, and I think Congress is going to fiddle on this matter, perhaps, until we have some great disaster there, and then we will all wake up to the situation. It is true old Nero never expected the modern and beautiful part of Rome to burn. He perhaps only expected to burn that part which was not much good and very unsightly, but the wind changed, and, just so, an electric spark may strike this magazine at any time and destroy the magazine and likewise destroy a vast amount of property and a great number of people.

I plead with you to help us by your vote and not delay by a commission and its report.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the committee on conference was confronted with a difficult situation. We appreciate the attitude of the gentlemen from Maryland and the gentlemen from New Jersey upon this matter, although personally, in view of the statements made by General Williams, I do not think the danger is quite as serious as they seem to think. But I am frank to say if these explosives were situated anywhere near my section I would want to see them moved under the circumstances.

However, the situation that confronted your committee is this, and I want the gentlemen of the House to understand what they are doing if they vote to recede and concur on this amendment. It is not a question of the $3,100,000 which is necessary to move these explosives, but it is a question of whether you are going to take these explosives from their present location and place them in the neighborhood of other congested centers of population or of other cities.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] asks why not adopt this amendment permitting the Secretary of War to dispose of them or to move them. The Secretary of War has stated to the committee that he proposes to move them only where he can move them under present legislation, down here within 4 or 5 miles of Norfolk, Va., to Charleston, S. C., and over to Savanna, Ill., and, of course, a great quantity to Ogden, Utah. When you send them to Norfolk, to Charleston, or to Savanna, of course, you are going to be met with the same sort of situation, and certainly, while we want to relieve the fears of the people of Baltimore and of New Jersey, we do not want to do other sections and other congested centers an injustice.

So your committee did the only thing it could do. It proposes the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois has offered, which provides that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall make a survey and jointly report to Congress not later than March 15 some locality where these explosives can be stored without danger to citizens. It seems to me it is a perfectly reasonable proposition. They can not report to-morrow or next week, but we provide that this shall be done by March 15.

I think the gentleman from Maryland and the other gentlemen who are interested in this proposition ought to appreciate the fact that other sections of the country are involved and accept the proposition which the gentleman from Illinois has offered and which meets with the entire approval, as the gentleman has stated, of the Senate conferees as well as the House conferees.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has not Senator ODDIE, of Nevada, asked that this ammunition be sent to his State, where it will not be dangerous?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand they have asked that it be sent to Ogden. But the War Department and the Navy Department, or rather, in this instance, the War Department, naturally does not want to send all of its explosives beyond the Rocky Mountains. It is necessary to keep some of these reserves this side of the Rocky Mountains, and they do not propose to send them all there. They propose to store at the places I have mentioned the reserves they want on the east coast, and we think before any action is taken and before any money is expended this survey ought to be made, so that when they are moved they can be stored permanently or so long as the two departments may keep them.

Personally I approve very heartily the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which proposes a joint survey, because I can see no reason why the Government should expend millions of dollars for the storage of explosives of the War Department in one place and then spend millions of dollars to purchase land to store the explosives of the Navy Department in another place.

This is a reasonable proposition and the only proposition that could be proposed under the circumstances, and I hope the gentleman will accept it and the House adopt it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, representing territory that has been repeatedly stricken through explosions that have been attended by a tremendous loss of life and property, I want to say that I am ready to go along with the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MADDEN] in the thought that it will provide some permanent relief for a condition under which the War Department continues the storage of high explosives in populated sections of the country.

At Camp Raritan to-day there are stored nearly one and one-half million high explosive shells and other munitions embodying in the gross aggregate over 1,000,000 pounds of T. N. T. It is my belief that there are more explosives stored to-day in Middlesex County—an industrial county—than anywhere in the United States. This is generally known; it keeps the people of my district in continual fear that they may suffer a repetition of the disastrous Morgan explosion of 1918, or of the ammonite disaster that took a toll of 20 lives—yes, and because of the quantities stored they know that the results of an explosion at Raritan may be far more appalling. We want these explosives removed. Yet I recognize, gentlemen, that the weakness in our request is that we are asking the removal of these explosives to existing Government arsenals where they may endanger the people of other municipalities.

With the exception of the Ogden depot, in Utah, the other arsenals suggested by General Williams in his testimony be-

fore the Appropriations Committee—Savanna Proving Ground, Ill.; Pig Point, Va.; and the Charleston depot, Charleston, S. C.—are so situated that the storage of explosives there would place other cities in an area of danger. It must be admitted, gentlemen, that there is danger—this has been agreed to by the President, by General Lord, Director of the Budget, and by the Secretary of War, who, in a letter to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, dated January 20, 1927, referred to the high explosives as "constituting a real menace."

We do not want other municipalities to be subjected to the same fears that are now entertained by the people of New Jersey and Maryland. For 10 years we have been advocating the removal of the explosives from Camp Raritan; to-day we have a constructive idea advanced that holds out hope of bringing this about. It will bring it about through the medium of a survey by Federal officials to determine where these explosives, now at Curtis Bay and at Raritan, may be moved without endangering the welfare and economic progress of other communities. When the location is determined, I feel sure that Mr. MADDEN and other members of the Appropriations Committee will aid in procuring funds for the removal of explosives to that point.

The report is to be made before March 15 next, and it is my hope that at this session we will secure legislation that will not only give relief to the localities affected, but will forever commit the Government to a policy under which the storage of explosives will no longer endanger lives and property of its citizens.

Appreciating this evidence of friendly cooperation on the part of the committee, I feel that all the Members of the New Jersey delegation will support the sane and constructive thought advanced in this amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the purpose and expectation to move some of these high explosives to the Army magazine at Pig Point, Va. Pig Point lies on the outskirts of Portsmouth and Norfolk, with 250,000 people. We should object to the storage of any considerable amount of high explosives at Pig Point. We have St. Julians magazine, belonging to the Navy, that lies on the other side of the city of Portsmouth, at which point there has heretofore been stored a large amount of high explosives. Our people have been complaining of that, although we have made no demand that it be moved.

We do not want to increase the danger of that situation by bringing any large amount of explosives to Pig Point. We feel that it would be a menace to the lives and property of our people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland to recede and concur.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Illinois to ask for a division of the question. The motion to concur with an amendment would have priority over a motion to recede and concur. But that is not true until the question is divided. However, I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were 16 ayes and 118 noes.

So the motion was lost.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 86, line 1, after the figures "1927," insert: "without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, including also in connection with the erection of barracks at Fort Jay, Governors Island, not to exceed $30,000 for the employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of architects, or firms, or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be deemed necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, could not the gentleman consider those three amendments at one time, with the consent of the House?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not until we act upon each separately. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 86, after line 14, insert: "For construction and installation of officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans., including utilities and appurtenances thereto, as authorized by an act entitled 'An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1927, without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, $126,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the Clerk reads I ask that amendments 36 and 37 be considered together, and also ask unanimous consent that the proposal for the appointment of a commission apply to all.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Could not the gentleman get unanimous consent that 32, 36, and 37 be considered together?

Mr. MADDEN. No; we could not do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that amendments numbered 36 and 37 be considered together, and without objection the Clerk will report both amendments.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendments 36 and 37: Pages 87 and 88, after line 22 on page 87, insert:

"Ordnance service: For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $340,000.

Repairs of arsenals: For repairs and improvements of arsenals and depots, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, $570,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that is all.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER. Under order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, through paid representatives, propagandists, and publicity agents, including its own consular agents and diplomatic representatives in our country, the Calles government of Mexico has been distributing in the United States books and pamphlets and other carefully prepared material for the American press, all designed to justify and defend before the American public a system of laws totally subversive of the fundamental principles of human liberties. In this way and through interviews published in the daily press and in periodicals of great influence in our country, President Calles has appealed to public opinion in the United States to support his attempts to subjugate the Mexican people and deprive them of their spiritual heritages and of their natural rights.

In his efforts to secure the sympathy and approval of the American people President Calles has sought to create the impression that the Mexican people themselves support his government and approve his interpretation of the laws of that country and his drastic decrees for their enforcement. By imposing a policy of rigid censorship over the Mexican press and over international news agencies he has kept from the American public all knowledge of the real attitude of the people of Mexico toward his government. Thus little has become known in our country of the protests of the Mexican people against the policies of the present government of that country and of the attitude of the Mexican press toward the Calles régime. The truth is that the Mexican people have valiantly and persistently resisted all of President Calles's attempts to destroy their liberties and have sought by every lawful means to secure a modification of the laws.

The crisis grows more intense in Mexico. The tyranny of Calles has been challenged by the people of Mexico. Issues have been more clearly defined, responsibilities more precisely

established. Catholic men and women in Mexico have refused longer to tolerate a system which denies to them the human rights and dignity which, in civilized nations, are deemed to be inalienable and of the very essence of justice.

Unmoved by the protests of his people, Calles is enraged. He defies that people; he defies public opinion throughout the world, and announces that the fight which he is waging upon religion is to be a fight to the finish.

Thus, at last, on the American Continent, we are witnesses of a new phase of that age-old struggle between liberty and tyranny; between those who hold that man, as man, is endowed with certain rights: Freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of education, equalities before the law, the right to life and to the pursuit of happiness, and that these rights are inalienable and may not be denied by any human authority; and those who hold that man, as man, is nothing, that society is everything, that government, alone, has rights that are supreme; the doctrine of absoluteism; the doctrine enforced by Carranza and the red flaggers, which they, refusing even to march under their own national banner, embodied in the constitution of Mexico in 1916, and imposed upon a prostrate people in 1917.

There are still some who hold that this contest between liberty and tyranny concerns only Mexico and the people of Mexico, that it does not concern the United States; that hands off Mexico is the only attitude and policy which the people of the United States and our Government may, in justice, assume toward Mexico.

The Mexican question is more than a rivalry between the Catholic bishops and priests of Mexico and the government of President Calles. It is more even than a contest between the Catholic Church and the Government of Mexico.

The constitution and laws of Mexico are a challenge to our institutions.

No man who has a love for the free institutions which we have inherited can look with complacency upon this movement. Through 50 consulates, maintained by the Government of Mexico, in continental United States, through a press that is owned or subsidized, and through other agencies, the advocates and defenders of this system are attacking our own institutions and seeking to engender national hatreds, the evil consequences of which no man can foresee. We are interested not alone in defending the person and the property of American citizens in Mexico; it is our patriotic duty to defend our institutions against the insidious attack to which they are subjected.

But we have a responsibility even more direct than this. The Government of the United States, by acts, direct and indirect, over a period of years, has thrown itself deliberately and unmistakably into the very heart of the Mexican problem. The Wilson administration violated the sovereignty of Mexico, actually waged war on Mexican territory, invading by force the ports of that country, in order to prevent a shipment of arms and supplies of war from reaching President Huerta. Huerta could not stand up against the opposition of the United States; his supporters abandoned him. He was driven from Mexico.

Our Government entered into relations with Villa, Zapata, Carranza, and no man knows just how many other insurgent chieftains in Mexico. The United States supported Carranza and, by arbitrarily imposing and lifting the embargo on arms, it gave force to its moral support and Carranza came into power and the constitution of 1917 was enacted.

Our State Department similarly gave its support to Obregon and again to Calles when there seemed a likelihood that they might not be able to resist successfully the opposition which their arbitrary acts and tyranny aroused. The people of the United States have a responsibility to the people of Mexico and to the world for the acts of a Government which, in truth, owes to us its very existence.

No doubt you will be interested to know what a famous international correspondent, Francis McCullagh, noted for his remarkable series of articles on Russia, has to say, in part, about the Mexican situation:

THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO[1]

By Francis McCullagh

The American press prides itself on letting the limelight of publicity penetrate into every nook and cranny of public life; nevertheless it maintains a strange silence about Mexico, although that country is in a worse state of disintegration than ever it was. Mexico has, in fact, reached such a condition that sometimes an impartial foreign observer like myself can not help asking himself, "Are we witnessing the break-up of a nation?"

[1] From the National Review (London Tory monthly), October.

Of this condition I myself was an eyewitness during six weeks that I have just spent in Mexico, through which I traveled "on my own," in the same way as I traveled through Bolshevist Russia in 1920.

I found that the critical condition of the country was admitted by all the foreign diplomatists, and especially by the American diplomatists. I was shown incontrovertible proofs of general disintegration, chaos, murder, misgovernment, and unbelievable financial corruption—proofs which make me fear that the condition of Mexico is more hopeless than even that of Russia, where, at all events, the existence of the Russian race is not in danger. These proofs I shall try to present in a few words; but, incredible as the picture may seem to be, it is weak and neutral in comparison with the lurid canvas which exists in the American Embassy at Mexico City, in the State Department at Washington, in the British Foreign Office, in every foreign office in Europe, and in the private offices of the great newspaper owners here in New York.

For once in the amazing history of the American press you have the New York reporter telling a much more restrained and dignified "story" than that which is told by the elderly, sedate diplomatists—and by fact itself!

You have in Mexico City American "news gatherers" with a talent for irresponsible writing and a thirst for the sensational sending dull and monotonous narratives of events south of the Rio Grande, wiring descriptions of presidential election meetings which (judging from these descriptions) seem to have been so irreproachably correct and stagnant that, in comparison with them, the dullest county council meeting that ever sat in Shropshire would seem riotous and even revolutionary.

And, on the other hand, you have old, experienced, and scholarly diplomatists, men with an ingrained habit of understatement and a professional hatred of journalistic exaggeration, writing secret dispatches calculated to make one's flesh creep and one's hair stand on end.

To describe a few of the amazing things that are happening in Mexico: The Catholic churches are all closed, and the people who go to mass in private houses are frequently arrested by the police, but are released on paying fines which provide something for the Government and about a thousand pounds weekly of private "graft" for certain police officials.

Even the Government statistics show an alarming decrease in the population, already most dangerously small. President Calles is robbing foreigners and Mexican landowners of their land for the sake (he says) of the workman and the peon; but the workman and the peon are rushing out of the country like people escaping from a house on fire. According to Mexican statistics, Mexicans are leaving Mexico at the rate of 5,000 per day.

There are now 3,000,000 Mexicans permanently established in the southern part of the United States, and their places are being taken by Japanese and Chinese. Thirty-three Japanese families landed at Manzanillo while I was on the Mexican west coast. They are to colonize the hacienda of Estranzuela in Jalisco and other haciendas in adjoining States. Twenty-seven Japanese families were due to arrive a few days later.

In some places there are more Orientals than Mexicans; in Mexicali, for example, there are 7,000 Chinese to only 4,000 Mexicans. President Calles tried hard to get Jewish agricultural colonists and managed to get 50 Jewish families from Europe; but no sooner did they have a look around than they all disappeared in the direction of the United States.

As for the political situation there is every sign of a three-cornered civil war and a general smash up before the end of the present elections. A fight between Obregón, Serrano, and Gómez is certain to take place before the middle of next year.

Though the "election" will not be held till July, 1928, everybody is getting ready for trouble, which may come sooner and quite suddenly.

With characteristic foresight the British community in Mexico City has just decided to enlarge its cemetery, and with that object in view has started a vigorous "drive" for subscriptions; while, in view of the federal capital being isolated before the end of the year, the American Club is busy importing alcoholic refreshments.

The head of one diplomatic mission expressed to me his regret that "we shall be cut off from the sea when Gómez takes Vera Cruz. No more mail, no more supplies from home. Very awkward! I am doubtful if the wine we ordered will get here before the trouble begins.

The law of the ejidos, enabling any set of ruffians to carve a choice bit out of an expensively irrigated and developed ranch, and the agrarian law permitting the confiscation of part of the ranch, have ruined agriculture.

Every Mexican recognizes the imminence of a dreadful crisis. Callista and conservative alike, when they have been able to do so, have sent their families and their funds to the safety of the United States. The hotels of Los Angeles and San Antonio are filled with Mexican guests, and the American banks are bursting with Mexican money. Many of Calles's own relations, much of his fortune, are north of the border.

Mines are closing down all over Chihuahua and Durango. Oil production is falling off. In June, 1926, it was 9,400,000 barrels; in June, 1927, it was 5,500,000 barrels, though the production should have been doubled instead of halved. Owing to the operation of the ley de estranjeria, the breath of life which American enterprise breathed into

the Mexican west coast is leaving it again, and the land reclaimed from the great Sonora Desert is going back again to its primitive wildness.

I do not maintain, of course, that there has been absolute silence in the press, for on several occasions a corner of the curtain was lifted. But on such occasions there was always some unseen but agitated interference from behind that curtain—and the corner was hastily dropped again. There was a tussle behind the scenes and vigorous whispering—then silence as before.

America is an amazing country, but it never before presented such an amazing problem as this. For the last hundred years it has been scolding Europe about freedom of the press—and, lo, its own press is shackled. For the last 50 years it has been denouncing secret diplomacy—and now we find the secret files in the Mexican section of the State Department at Washington guarded with a care worthy of the Tsardom. For the last nine years it has been lecturing Europe on the mess it was making of its foreign diplomacy and explaining how it, the United States, would manage if it were in the Balkans or on the Polish corridor, or master of Trieste. But meanwhile the appalling situation on its own southern border has been rapidly getting worse—and, instead of tackling that situation, the United States hastily buries its head in the sand like an ostrich.

Its newspapers, now the richest in the world, sent scores of the best American journalists to China, although the State Department has formulated no definite policy on the Chinese question, except the policy of doing nothing. It will leave England to protect American interests in China, but it will see that a good-sized crowd of American reporters are there to criticize her while she is doing it.

But in Mexico City, where there is not a single British journalist, the United States has only one regular correspondent, and, unfortunately, he writes for the World, a paper which constantly takes the part of Calles against Coolidge and of the Mexicans against Yankees—a paper whose attitude on the Mexican question reminds me of the attitude of the London Daily News on the Transvaal question about a quarter of a century ago. Consequently this correspondent has a double reason for caution—the Mexican censor and his own editor. He has already been expelled once, and is determined not to send news that will lead to his expulsion again.

A week ago there was another American correspondent in Mexico City, a Mr. Joseph de Courcy, but, though he was extremely cautious, he was summarily kicked out on August 12, after having been arrested and lodged in a cell whose walls were pitted with bullet holes (having been evidently used as a place of execution). When a member of the American Embassy tried to see him the police denied that he had been arrested, but the embassy, the State Department, and the New York Times bore the insult with touching humility. The whole story will be found in the New York Times of August 13. It is that of a man who has been beaten and kicked by a bully and has no redress.

One asks one's self in amazement if this is the America which used to be so fond of tail twisting.

The British Foreign Office adopts a different policy. When the Soviet Government imprisoned Mrs. Stan Harding, who was the correspondent, not of any English newspaper, but of the New York World, Lord Curzon made the Soviet Government apologize to her and pay her $15,000 compensation. The result was that English correspondents in Russia felt that they would not be punished for telling the truth—and they told the truth.

Apart from the one regular, but muzzled, correspondent, there are, of course, the usual news agencies, which, as in other countries, accept official news and circulate it without examination.

If a Massachusetts missionary is captured by brigands on the Acroceraunian Mountains, or if the Estonian Navy fires a salute of only 19 instead of 21 guns in honor of the American representative at Reval, or if there is one star missing in the American flag displayed at the Quai d'Orsay on the occasion of Colonel Lindbergh's official reception at Paris—well, the U. S. A. will want to know why such things are possible in the twentieth century, and from New York to San Francisco the famous Sunday supplements will be full of Albania and Estonia and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs; but if Mexico confiscates half a million acres reclaimed from the wilderness by mere American farmers, or the Governor of Puebla has French families slaughtered in order that he may seize their land, then the State Department strikes a sphinxlike attitude and America's one panic-stricken correspondent in Mexico City is sternly warned to say nothing (as if he would dare to open his lips, poor fellow!).

* * * * * * *

Some months ago Mr. Ybarra, an able American journalist, was sent to Mexico by one of the leading American newspapers, and began a series of articles on the situation. Having a complete command of Spanish, he was able to get a perfectly true picture, and, being an honest journalist, he started to paint that picture in a series of articles such as that which I am now writing, only far stronger and better. The situation was so critical, the condition of affairs so frightful, that he sent the whole of the first article by radio from the steamer whereon he left Vera Cruz for the United States. That article appeared exactly as it had been written. A corner of the curtain had thus been lifted. But then took place the amazing performance which I have already described, and which has taken place more than once under similar circumstances. There was a mysterious scuffle behind the scenes; the corner of the curtain went down suddenly. There was an interval of silence, after which the rest of the articles began to appear. But how different from the first article! They were like Ella Wheeler Wilcox after Homer, like In the Gloaming after Chaikovskii's 1812. They had been rewritten and so severely edited that they might all have been taken from some placid old guidebook.

* * * * * * *

Part of the responsibility is due to high finance; part of it is due to sundry great American capitalists who have land in Mexico; and, strange to say, part of it is due to the State Department at Washington.

There are Wall Street financiers who are getting interest from Mexico and can offer opposition to any exposure of the Mexican situation. There are American landowners who have Mexican ranches that are not touched by the agrarian law—as the estates of Calles himself, of his sons and his generals, and of Obregon, are not touched by it. Finally, the State Department, which tried, with extraordinary inaptitude, to raise an anti-Mexican storm here last winter, has now gone to the opposite extreme. Not only has it prevented attacks on Calles from appearing in the American press; it has actually prevented them from appearing in the European press! This latter fact I discovered while negotiating the sale of a series of articles on Mexico to the representatives in America of great foreign newspapers. These men told me bluntly that what I said was true, but that they could not afford to offend the State Department. The curious part of the story is that American consuls and diplomatists now in Mexico, or who recently were in Mexico, take exactly the same view of the Mexican problem as I take in this article—only that their detestation of the Calles régime is infinitely stronger than mine.

But religion, of course, plays an important part in producing the journalistic reticence to which I have alluded. In the United States the religious issue—that is, the good old Protestant versus Catholic issue—is as strong to-day as it is in Belfast. It is a thousand times stronger than it is in England, from which, if we except Liverpool, it has almost died out. * * *

America is a Protestant country, in the same sense as England is, and her Protestantism has always tinged very strongly her relations with Mexico. For the last century she has hailed with joy the appearance in Mexico of any "liberal" and anticlerical leader, just as England, from whom she inherited her prejudices against "Dagos" and Catholics, hailed with joy the appearance of Garibaldi. Save in the time of Porfirio Diaz, she invariably helped such anticlericals, because she honestly believed that if Mexico only became Protestant all the ills from which she suffered would at once be cured. Moreover, if she became Protestant, there would no longer be any danger of her setting up a monarchical system of government, dangerous to her great northern neighbor.

Consequently, the United States allowed Mexican "liberals" and anticlericals to launch revolution from Texas and Arizona, but she sternly prevented Mexican conservatives from doing so. She raised the arms embargo in favor of Juárez, Madero, and Carranza, but she slammed it firmly on Victoriano Huerta, on Adolfo de la Huerta, on Felix Diaz, and on the Mexican conservatives who are at present engaged in gun running along America's southern border.

* * * * * * *

But what of the radical newspapers in America? Strange to say, it was from one of them, the New Republic, August 17, 1927, that the worst attack on President Calles came; but the American radical press is not prepared for such a strange state of things. Calles professes to be a radical, and, if the capitalistic papers refrain from attacking him, there is all the more reason why the radical papers should refrain.

"But," I hear the reader ask with a malicious chuckle, "what about oil?"

Some of the American oil barons in Mexico are undoubtedly rich, corrupt, powerful, and extremely unscrupulous, but those very qualities make the American public distrust them, as a section of the British public, 28 years ago, distrusted the gold barons of the Rand. The oil scandal and the tales that filter north about the crime and corruption in American circles in Tampico * * * have helped to bar Mexican news from most American newspapers. It does not, however, excuse the editors who have repeatedly sent trusted members of their staff to Mexico but afterwards refused to publish their articles because they condemned the Calles régime. Surely the best course for the American press to take would be to send its "star" men, not to China, but to Mexico, to make a determined investigation of the whole Mexican question, and not to ignore it.

Last but not least, the American newspaper reader is "tired" of Mexico.

There are still other causes, which I have not time to analyze; but here I might say that this hush-hush policy is not only un-American,

pettifogging, and unworthy of a great Nation, but it is also dangerous. Indeed, it is extremely dangerous, because of the bolshevist and anti-American turn which events have taken in Mexico during the last six months. I have been traveling for the last two years in Central and South America, and my conclusion is that in Central America, at all events, the Russo-Mexican poison is working so well that all these little Republics may go Red within a few years. And it will not be the ordinary Latin-American revolution this time; it will be an economic bolshevist revolution, entailing partial expropriation of foreign property—as in Mexico. Nicaragua was a foretaste. The United States was able to deal with Nicaragua, but she will not be able to put out the flames if they involve a dozen republics at once and are encouraged by the very large, powerful, and wealthy army of pacifist cranks who are rapidly becoming as strong in the United States as the prohibitionists.

In the very hotel where I am writing this article one of the guests is the notorious Luis N. Morones, the Mexican Minister of Industry and Labor, and the head of the great bolshevist organization known as the Crom.

New York City may look back on this visit of Morones with the same feelings that London looks back on the visit Lenin paid it in 1903, when he first organized his party.

And while Morones is enjoying the luxury of the Waldorf-Astoria and receiving innumerable, swarthy visitors, a different scene is being enacted not five miles off, on the Hudson River, where a gun-running steamer is being rapidly equipped by a number of revolutionaries from Colombia. And this is not the only gun-runner which South American revolutionaries are fitting out at present in the United States. A Venezuelan gun-runner was seized some time ago by the United States police. Others are under observation. Some, perhaps, have escaped suspicion.

Most New Yorkers laugh at these preparations. "We have always had them," they say joyously. "New York has always been a center for the South American revolutionist. We do not suffer by it. We are used to it."

You are not used, however, to the new or bolshevist brand of revolution, which is the only kind you are going to get now. You refrain even from sending a stiff note to Mexico lest it should lead to expense and annoyance and should affect the markets and should lose you, perhaps, several hundred thousand dollars. But this a "penny wise, pound foolish" policy, bad even in a small New England store, but fatal in the Government of a great Nation. The result of your inaction may be a conflagration involving the loss of the $3,000,000,000 worth of investments which you have in Latin America, and perhaps of another $3,000,000,000 spent by you on the naval and military measures necessitated by this situation.

The situation in Mexico is very different in many ways, of course, from the situation in China, but these two countries have one thing in common—huge foreign investments. Taught by Moscow, the Chinese have discovered that the confiscation of these investments is not only possible but can be justified by texts from Karl Marx and converted into an act of heroic patriotism by the waving of the nationalistic flag, and will be applauded by various humanitarian and religious associations in the country whose nationals are thus plundered.

There are three billions of American dollars in Latin America (I seem to hear Comrade Morones murmur the words "Oh, joy!" from the apartment underneath me).

There are, I repeat, three billions of American dollars in Latin America, and poor old effete, much-lectured Europe is not likely to help Uncle Sam to keep hold of them. Moreover, Europe has been sternly warned off by the United States, which undertook, in effect, to protect European interests in South America, since she will not let Europe do so herself. But the United States is powerless to keep that implied undertaking even in Mexico, where, during the last 10 years, there have been innumerable outrages on Europeans and much confiscation of European property. Europe has said nothing officially, because she owed America money, was otherwise occupied, and saw that the Yankee in Mexico was more neglected by Washington than the European. But Europeans whispered among themselves some extremely pungent—though unofficial—comments. One European diplomatist in Mexico City spoke to me most irreverently of "Uncle Sam Micawber" waiting for something to turn up in Mexico and save him from the trouble of taking a decision. Another drew a humorous picture of a water-logged State Department manned by cowboys and country lawyers, sailing around in circles, without map or course or compass or any clear idea of their destination. A third pointed out the remarkable resemblance between the State Department under Kellogg and the Most Holy Synod under Pobydonostsev.

But the matter has now got beyond the jocose stage, and the European diplomatists accredited to the court of Chapultepec are becoming genuinely alarmed at the prospect of Mexico's example being followed by all Central America.

The powder train is being lighted in Mexico, while Uncle Sam looks with determination in another direction.

For America the year 1927 is the calm before the storm.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I wonder if, before the gentleman concludes his own part of these remarks, he is going to tell us what he thinks we ought to do with regard to Mexico.

Mr. CONNERY. I would say now that with the conditions as they are in Mexico I am not one of those who desire to interfere with the President of the United States or with the State Department in suggesting to them exactly what they shall do in respect to Mexico. I do not wish to interfere and I do not think any good American wishes to interfere. We want friendly relations with Mexico, but we want the truth from Mexico, coming from the Mexican people and not the propaganda of their despotic government. We do not want this paid propaganda spread throughout the United States, falsely telling the American people that the people of Mexico are in accord with their Government, that they are behind the Calles government, and are satisfied with that Government, when the people down there in Mexico are struggling and suffering under tyranny and oppression, persecution and murders.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I say to the gentleman that I think his statement is very proper and a very temperate one.

Mr. CONNERY. Furthermore, let me say a word to the gentleman with respect to Colonel Lindbergh, that distinguished and wonderful young man [applause], who was so charmingly introduced to this House by the Speaker a few days ago. I hope that Colonel Lindbergh's visit to Mexico will do much to help relations with the people of Mexico as distinguished from the Government of Mexico. Colonel Lindbergh, a hero, modest, every inch a man, well might say to the Mexican people, if the State Department would allow him to, "The American people from the bottom of their hearts are with you in your fight for liberty and freedom of conscience." I understand also that Will Rogers is down there in Mexico or has been there. To divert for a moment, you gentlemen will recall that only the day before yesterday we defeated an amendment here calling for the repeal of the admission tax. We have down there in Mexico, or we did have until lately, an unofficial ambassador, Will Rogers, of the United States, who came from the American stage, and who represented the spoken drama, which we are penalizing by keeping on the admission tax. Mr. Rogers, together with Colonel Lindbergh, are on a sort of unofficial visit to cement friendly relations between the United States and Mexico. I can not believe that the State Department by this move contemplates telling the world that it approves of Mexico's present Government. If they do mean that, then they are deliberately fooling the American people and using two honest Americans as cat's-paws in their game.

All thinking Americans have the friendliest of sentiments for the Mexican people, but must condemn unreservedly the Mexican Government, which subjects the people of that unfortunate country to tyranny and has taken away from them the last vestige of freedom and liberty.

You know they say laughter is good for the soul. Medical men tell us laughter lengthens life; that it is good for the body, good for the muscles, and is a tonic. If this be so, let us hope that Mr. Rogers's good humor and laughter may develop a soul in Calles that will bring forth other attributes than cruelty, rapacity, and persecution of the Mexican people. These seem to be the most apparent attributes of his soul at the present time.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I will yield.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think there is an indication on the part of the Government of Mexico to change its policy, and the fact that they have received these Americans is it not part of that indication? May we not hope that there will be a gradual change and finally a complete one?

Mr. CONNERY. That is what I am hopeful for. I hope the visit of Colonel Lindbergh to the Republic of Mexico will bring about an understanding such as we have never had before. Gentlemen of the House will remember the President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, sent a note to the German people over the heads of the German Government asking the German people to believe the United States was fighting for democracy. I hope the Mexican people will realize that the people of the United States are in sympathy with them and not their Government.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Certainly.

Mr. BOX. The gentleman indicates that the American press had suppressed the truth.

Mr. CONNERY. I do.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman indicate to the House who he thinks is responsible. Is it the Mexican Government or the American Government who did it?

Mr. CONNERY. Later on we will see about the American Government. Right now I will say the Mexican Government, the American press, some big oil interests, and other big moneyed corporations who have interests in Mexico are responsible for suppressing the real news.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Is it really Mexican money you speak of, corporations doing business in Mexico, money being employed in Mexico?

Mr. CONNERY. I do not quite get the gentleman's question. Does he refer to Mexican money spent in the United States?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I believe it is Mexican money; yes.

There, gentlemen of the House, you have the opinion of an unbiased critic.

Those who defend President Calles and the program which he is imposing on the Mexican nation ask the people of the United States to accept as valid the claim that, after all, the oppression which is being practiced upon the people of Mexico is nothing more than the natural consequence of an honest effort to enforce the law in a country where people are lawless by tradition.

We have a right to expect that men who claim to be directing a program of law enforcement will themselves respect the law, and, above all, that they will administer justice with scrupulous honesty and impartiality. That this is not being done in Mexico is evident to anyone familiar with recent events. Under the flimsiest pretexts, peaceful and defenseless men and women are being arrested, tortured, thrown into jail, deported, and even put to death. This is done in open violation of the constitution and the laws of the country.

Fragmentary reports of atrocities committed under authority and even by direction of the Government have come to the American people, but a rigid censorship makes it impossible for our news-gathering agencies to keep us adequately informed of what is really happening in Mexico. A partial and sometimes a false presentation of the facts has misled public opinion in our country.

The following statements presented by me are taken wholly from the editorial columns of Mexican newspapers of wide circulation in that country. They are the deliberate statements made by responsible men having full knowledge of the facts. These spokesmen for the Mexican nation have a right to be heard in our country. The force of public opinion in America acting on the Government and people of Mexico will aid in solving the problems which confront that unfortunate nation.

The verdict of the Mexican press itself is that those who control Mexico's destinies are holding the nation captive; are drying up its sources of virtue and morality; are erasing its traditions and leading the nation straight on the road to tyranny; that democracy lies rotting in Mexico.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN MEXICO—THE VERDICT OF THE MEXICAN PRESS

THE MEXICAN PROBLEM STATED

There are in Mexico those who hold that everything in our national life which in any way has been derived from Christianity or from Spain must at once be discarded. They are willing to brook no delay. Their fanaticism is such that it does not stop even at violence and bloodshed.

In their madness, these "liberals" are not to be satisfied until they have torn from the soul of our nation all of her traditions; until they have brutally cut the people adrift from its past to launch it, without rudder or compass, into the uncertainties of a reform which can hold nothing but shipwreck. * * * They have convinced themselves that in this way alone can happiness be brought to the nation or the national welfare assured. Obstinate in this conviction, they devote themselves with a zealous fury to a work which can end only by drying up the very sources of virtue and morality; turning back the currents of civilization and of culture to set up in their place a secularism, primitive and obsolete. * * *

To suppress the past of the people is to suppress the people itself, to erase the traditions of the nation is to destroy the life of the nation, to turn our backs on our spiritual heritage is to march straight on the road to tyranny. (El Pais, February 22, 1926.)

November 20 we will celebrate the sixteenth anniversary of the first shot fired in the revolution. Sixteen years ago the revolution received its first holocaust of blood. How frightful has been the conflict! How agonizing the convulsions! How bloody the sacrifices! Following that tragic day at Puebla, what dreams have remained unrealized! What projects defeated! (La Prensa, November 12, 1926.)

Our public men look to material force for everything. They never have recourse to the arts of persuasion. The revolution sought neither to convince nor to persuade. It knew nothing but physical force. It sought only to impose its will at the point of the bayonet. The governments set up by it have never sought to govern with the approval of the nation. They have sought only an approval that is partisan, excluding everything not of the revolution. Can we in this way ever bring peace to men's consciences, ever restore that union of souls which to a true republic is as the blood of life and alone can sustain its vigor? * * *

Few pages indeed in the history of Mexico exhale such rottenness as do those written since 1913. We search them in vain for anything bright. Crimes, ambitions, assaults make up the tragedy which is our national life.

What moral conquest has been won since the fall of Porfirio Diaz? Do you say respect for the suffrage? Recognition of the rights of State governments? Honesty in public administration? The independence of the courts from pressure by the executive? Greater culture in the legislature? Greater respect for public opinion? Greater personal security guaranteed to the people? Look where we will, we search in vain for any evidence of real progress. * * *

The spiritual breakdown of the revolution is apparent. The revolution has failed to bring happiness to Mexico because it has chosen brute force for its idol, because it has held the people of Mexico in such low esteem as to disdain to seek its approval. * * * Such a revolution is not progress. It is retrogression, degradation. (El Universal, December 14, 1926.)

In our country there is but one political party—the victorious. Its sole preoccupation is to surround itself with men who will support it, enabling it to go on gleaning the profits to be derived from its control of the nation. (El Universal, November 19, 1926.)

The most discouraging fact in our public life is the fact that nothing is done to check our descent to standards that are ever lower and lower. Beginning with the revolution of 1910, that lowering of standards has been in progress until to-day its results are apparent to all. * * * Day by day the exercise of the suffrage is being abandoned. * * * (El Universal, September 29, 1926.)

We know only too well that the suffrage is a lie, a mockery; the vote of the people decides nothing in Mexico. * * * In the States, the officer who is in command of military operations has the last say in deciding the results of an election and, in this he is supported by orders received from headquarters. Our Federal Republic no longer, in reality, exists. (Excelsior, December 27, 1926.)

People do not vote in Mexico, because they are not encouraged to vote. Our election machinery is complicated. The ballot is not respected. * * * The suffrage has been converted into a public calamity by the brutality of the ruffians who actively engage in politics. Far from being schools from which civic action is to be learned, the polls harbor only rottenness and violence. Responsibility for this failure to realize the aspirations which grew up around the revolution of 1910 belongs to those professional politicians who, unable to understand the aspirations of a people, have failed to give to these that direction which the common good required. Had they devoted themselves to that task intelligently, they would never have trampled under foot the hopes that were born of the revolution, and Mexico to-day would be holding elections in which the will of the people would find an adequate expression. (El Universal, July 3, 1926.)

Power is in the hands of a minority who hold the nation captive to be exploited. * * * Corruption is on every hand. The dead body of democracy in which the men of 1910 thought they still could see the spark of life lies rotting to-day in Mexico where, like Lazarus, but, in vain, it hopes for the miracle that is to bring it to life again. (El Universal, September 29, 1926.)

ANTIRELIGIOUS DECREES

In the debate which preceded the delegation by Congress to the President of authority to revise the criminal code, the support of public opinion was won for the project because it was at the time declared that the purpose was to so amend our laws as to adjust them to the tendencies of modern jurisprudence and make them more adaptable to the practical conditions of present-day life. It was publicly announced that a committee of experts would have charge of the work of revision. Now, to our surprise, long before the work of codification is completed, without any plan that can be considered scientific, a law is promulgated changing the penal system with regard to acts of religious worship, creating new crimes in both the common and the federal order. * * *

We are astounded at this amendment of the criminal code. It breathes the spirit of harshness. In article after article it sets down new penalties, imprisonment, arrest, fines, one year, two years, even six years in jail, as punishment for acts which, by the moral standards publicly accepted amongst us, can not be held to be criminal. * * * If a stop is not put to this practice of stretching the scope of the constitution by the acts of the courts and of the police, we are bound in the end to set up a system as inhuman and inquisitorial as that which long ago was condemned in our own history. * * *

The great difficulties as well as the great hopes which fill our national life to-day are the difficulties and hopes of reconstruction. They are industrial, commercial, social, agricultural, educational. Anything which breeds dissension and controversy or leads to a disturbance of the public order or to the revival of the religious problem is not only profitless but can be accounted for only on the grounds of personal feeling and intolerance. (El Universal, July 5, 1926.)

LAWS REDUCING THE NUMBER OF PRIESTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The attempt to enforce the State law reducing the number of priests in the State of Michoacan has resulted in an appeal to the courts for an order restraining the State authorities.

The constitution, as is well known, guarantees to all Mexicans, without distinction, the liberty to exercise the profession of his choice and that "the exercise of this liberty can not be denied excepting by judicial order when the rights of third parties are infringed, or by executive order issued under the conditions prescribed by law when the rights of society are violated."

In Fraction VI of article 130 of the constitution the ministry is declared to be a profession. The exercise of that profession can not be said to injure the rights of others or to violate the rights of society. The prohibition, therefore, which the state legislature has decreed is a flagrant violation of the law itself. It is, moreover, a violation of the liberties guaranteed by both the law and the constitution. * * *.

The district court has denied the petition for a restraining order in the following terms: "* * * The court finds the decree to be within the authority of the State legislature." * * * But the provision of the constitution by which this authority is granted to the State legislature is not a mandate by which the legislature is obliged to restrict the number of priests. On the contrary, the constitution itself clearly states the limitations within which this authority should be exercised and provides that in all cases due consideration be given to local conditions and necessities. * * * From the capital of Michoacan down to the last village in the State this antireligious law is protested by the people, and this hateful regulation, far from corresponding to any public necessity, is a serious injury to the spiritual interests of the whole people. (El Pais, April 23, 1926.)

TYRANNY IN THE MEXICAN STATES

Yesterday we published the news that a group of women circulated for signature a petition which this morning they are to present to the State legislature. The petition circulated in the city of Chihuahua alone carries thousands of signatures, and it is apparent that sentiment is unanimous against the enactment of a law regulating article 130 of the constitution. * * * Later dispatches show that numberless telegrams are being received by Congressmen from all parts of the State. From Cusihuiric and San Antonio alone 250 telegrams were received yesterday and five petitions with more than 3,000 signatures. The same is true of every section of the State.

One of the telegrams from Cusihuiric reads as follows:

"We command the chamber to let the religious question alone. We withdraw our confidence from our own representative."

The Knights of Columbus, Chihuahua Council, filed a protest from which we quote the following:

"In the name of the 250 citizens members of this council of the Knights of Columbus, we request that, acting as becomes true representatives of the people, you turn not a deaf ear to the voice of the great majority of the people of Chihuahua who do not want any law regulating article 130 of the constitution."

* * * The deputies, if they insist on the enactment of this regulatory law contrary to the religion of their constituents, will justify the charge that is made that they have repudiated their character as representatives of the people. * * * (El Correo de Chihuahua, May 29, 1926.)

LOCAL AUTONOMY SUPPRESSED

The life, the public administration, the prosperity of every State of the Union, in spite of everything our so-called politicians say, depend upon whether or not the Secretary of Gobernacion gets up in the morning in good humor. * * * The all-important question is, How do the scribes and pharisees who surround the secretary feel toward the parties to any controversy? No one can be so stupid as not to see that the system he has adopted of recognizing and refusing to recognize governors who have been elected in the States can have no other consequences than the complete repudiation of our federal system. (Excelsior, February 9, 1927.)

PERSECUTION OF THE PRESS—LIBERTY OF THE PRESS IN MEXICO

Liberty is as necessary to the press as breath is to life. Without liberty there can be no press. * * * Liberty of thought and expression, guaranteed though it is by our laws, has in reality been suffocated by the censorship. Great daily papers capable of supporting themselves from their own resources, looking to the Government for neither orders nor subsidies, having no resources apart from the good will and material help of the public, are only now beginning to make their appearance in Mexico. * * *

Let us never lose sight of the fact that liberty has made possible the development of the press in Mexico and that without it the press can not subsist. We are performing only our duty when we repeat and insist that any censorship, no matter how it may be disguised, and which men dare not write into our laws because to do so would bring upon them the charge of being reactionary, of having repudiated the spirit of the revolution, is the poison which in the end will inevitably bring death to the young and vigorous organism, the new-born periodical press of Mexico. (El Universal, June 14, 1926.)

Article 13: "No religious periodical publications nor any other periodical publications of a marked religious tendency, manifested either in the name or in the policy of the publication, shall comment on questions of national politics nor report any acts of the public authorities of the country nor of any private person when these are in any way directly or indirectly related to the public administration." (Diario Oficial, July 2, 1926.)

Regardless of the opinion held by the Secretary of Gobernacion, this paper maintains and will continue to maintain that this article 13 is a violation of the constitution. * * * The provisions of the decree of July 2 are such that the agents of the Department of Justice may interpret them so as to include newspapers which can by no stretch of the imagination be fairly held to be "confessional" and this they can do with no other justification than the charge made by themselves that the periodical has published news or comment of a religious nature Article 130 refers exclusively to "periodicals of a confessional character." (Excelsior, July 23, 1926.)

If the press of the Republic were subject to no restrictions but those justified by a strict interpretation of the constitution, the liberty of the press would be practically assured. * * * But article 13 of the law of July 2, 1926, because of its indefinite phraseology, will make it inevitable that the press subject itself to a restraint which is wholly unworthy of the epoch in which we live or the degree of culture to which we have attained. Hereafter, no writer will have the courage to face the dangers in which he is inevitably exposed by this grant of authority to agents of the Attorney General. * * * There is no gainsaying the fact that hereafter the press is to be a puppet in the hands of the Secretary of Gobernacion and his agents. (El Universal, July 21, 1926.)

Assaults on the liberty of the press are now taking place all over the Republic. What has happened at Chihuahua, Tampico, and Guanajuato leaves no doubt of the dangers which now threaten the press. The persecution to which El Correo Del Centro has been subjected is but a symptom. The arrest of the editors and even of the pressroom employees leaves no ground for hope. These humble men, imprisoned in the historic castle of Granaditas, speak with greater eloquence than could ever speak the inflamed paragraphs of any protest we might make. (El Universal, Aug. 31, 1926.)

Not even the constitution is complied with. Those who are loudest in their demand that the opposition obey the constitution are the first themselves to refuse to obey it. * * * We need only mention the closing of 70 printing establishments, under orders not yet made public, in violation of the expressed command of the constitution, which in article 7 says: "Under no circumstances shall a printing press be sequestrated as the corpus delicti."

In these cases, there certainly has been sequestration, * * * and, what is even more serious, defense under article 103 is impossible. That article is no longer in force, because no one to-day obeys orders issued by the district courts, nor even those issued by the supreme court. Federal justice, so called, is a toothless old lady, besmirched and decrepit, gone out of style, at the point of toppling into the grave which has been opened for her. (Excelsior, July 16, 1926.)

We could count on the fingers of one hand the cases in which our history has been written otherwise than in the service of some usurper. In our schools, in our books, in our press, on the platform, everywhere, we have had instilled into us a well-defined official interpretation of our national life. * * * And if, perchance, there has ever arisen a man with courage to study the facts and interpret them contrary to the official standards, * * * he has had to pay for his temerity by rendering homage to the liberty we so loudly proclaim, being sent into exile, as was Bulnes, or thrown into prison, as were the editors of El Tiempo on July 18 of the present year. (Excelsior, December 15, 1926.)

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION SUPPRESSED

There were recently made public two documents of unusual interest. Both documents are extensive. The discussion is ample. The one represents the general conviction not alone of the teachers but of the thousands of families which have been outraged by the imposition on the private schools of the regulations prescribed for them by the Department of Public Education. The other is the expression of the Government's position which, without regard for social standards or even for the most elemental principles of equity, of liberty, and right, is bent upon enforcing in all its severity the law, inflexible and unchanging, with a zeal that is truly fanatic and in strange contrast with the refusal of the authorities themselves either to obey or enforce other

precepts of the same constitution. * * * The constitution of Queretaro, forged as it was from metal heated in the flames of the basest passion at a time when fanaticism was at its height, has been the law of the land since 1917 under administrations none of which can be said to have been reactionary. * * * By none of these has the law ever been strictly enforced, because it has been realized all along by them that to enforce such laws would meet with determined opposition and, if successful, would put an end to the work of the private schools, whose cooperation no patriotic Mexican can reject so long as 95 per cent of our people are illiterate.

The secretary contends that neither the regulations prescribed by him nor the constitution itself interferes with the natural right of parents to direct the education of their children. * * * His error is fundamental and lies in his contention that laicism is neutral and that therefore the regulations in no way violate the rights of parents to direct the education of their children. These regulations remove the education of children from all parental control precisely at the time when the very foundations of all education must be laid. (El Pais, April 16, 1926.)

But even if we accept the claim of the secretary that laicism is nonsectarian, his action loses none of its despotic character. Education begins in the cradle. At his mother's knee the heart of the little one is formed. * * * How can the secretary contend that this sacred right of the parent is preserved and not violated by a decree which, in its enforcement, tears the child from the school which the parent controls to send it to the school conducted by the state, to be returned to the parent only when it has been prepared to enter high school, with its mind loaded down with prejudices, with habits that can never be eradicated, and with its moral standards forever determined? (El Pais, April 17, 1926.)

Our education is laical, atheistic, antireligious if we are to call things by their true names, not because the people demand that it be so but because a minority in power despises the religion which the people of Mexico profess. They care nothing for the protests by which parents assert their right to direct the education of their children. (Excelsior, February 11, 1927.)

In the schools it would be well if there were more work and less display. It may be all right for boys to have Babe Ruth for their model in baseball and Kid Martinez for their football hero. It may be all right for girls to dance the shimmy with the agility of Eleanor Smith and sing the Borrachita more rhythmically even than Lupe Rivas Cacho. But this should not be allowed to interfere with their learning to read and write. It may be all right for girls to have their pals, their chums, and their friends, but that does not signify that they should not learn to cook and to sew. * * *

In the primary schools the things that are being done would be ludicrous if they were not so tragic. Little boys in the fourth and fifth grades are obliged to memorize the "lay sermon." We are told that this lay sermon is a rival for the letters of Melchor Ocampo to a bride, and the suppression of these is one of the most praiseworthy and most profitable achievements of the revolution. * * * (Excelsior, January 31, 1927.)

To-day we wish to dwell briefly on what we consider the reason for the failure of our public-school system. We have before us a textbook. Its use is prescribed for boys and girls of 10. It was prepared by Jose Maria Bonilla. Its title is "Civics." It costs $1.50. Its use is compulsory for second-grade pupils in all government schools of the "third group."

It treats of such intricate problems as easements, leaseholds, mortgages, and company organizations. It does not leave untouched even such controversial questions as divorce. * * * What can a boy or a girl of 10 do with our civil code, no matter how thoroughly abridged or how well explained? He is totally without preparation for such a study. Even his knowledge of language is inadequate. He may read and reread the text of Mr. Bonilla; he may even commit it to memory, but he will never understand or master it. His time and effort will have been wasted and, what is even worse, the little scholar may become injured from the effort he has made. At the age of 10 he can have neither the physical nor the spiritual maturity required for work of this kind. But even this is not all nor even the more serious. On ethical grounds alone the book is not fit to be in the hands of children. The chapter on the conditions for the granting of divorce in the hands of these children is nothing short of a poem to indecency. How are teachers of the public school going to explain to boys and girls 10 years old the things which in our laws and in this book are listed as conditions for the granting of divorce.

We may be charged with being reactionary, but we are sure that the fathers and mothers of Mexico would a thousand times prefer to have their sons and daughters preserve the innocence of infancy even at the sacrifice of having to remain in ignorance of some of the realities and indecencies of life which, alas, they need not go to school to learn. (Excelsior, February 11, 1927.)

The constitution of 1857, regardless of everything said to the contrary by those who call themselves constitutionalists, has been completely supplanted by the constitution of 1917, prescribing that education be laical, gratuitous, and compulsory.

The new constitution given to the people of Mexico to elevate and enlighten them contains changes which are revolutionary. It says, simply and boldly, "in the public schools primary education will be gratuitous." That is to say, secondary and higher education may be paid for by the student.

And they are paid for to the scandal of all who, with us, hold that education is a public service of first importance and should be absolutely gratuitous.

We are not speaking of insignificant charges, but of charges which are a heavy burden to the poor who are most in need of the help of the government in their effort to provide for the education of their children.

In the high schools a matriculation of 40 pesos is collected, and that certainly is a sum not easily within the reach of a day laborer with a family to support on his low wages.

But what is worse, Juan Holgium, a teacher in one of these schools, is the author of a textbook on experimental physics which he sells to second-year students for 5 pesos. A pupil who fails to buy this textbook is not permitted to attend the courses.

Another, Mr. Diaz, sells an arithmetic, of which he is the editor, and which is prescribed for first-year students. It is not at all improbable that the purchase of this book is required as a condition for entrance to the school. * * *

Is it not ridiculous to pretend to the nation that unheard-of efforts and sacrifices are being made to promote education while, at the same time, 40 pesos are collected as a matriculation fee in the high schools and a book on physics is sold to the students at 5 pesos? (Excelsior, February 5, 1927.)

THE CATHOLIC RESISTANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION AND DECREES

The reason why we have had so often to amend our constitutions, both in their form and in their substance, is due, above all else, to the attempt that has been made to embody in them things which have no place in such a charter. Instead of making a simple declaration of principles and outlining a general plan of organization, an effort has been made to elaborate an all-embracing code like the Pentateuch, the Gospel, or the Koran. Things which are properly material for organic laws, for secondary codes, and for administrative regulations are engrafted into the constitution in a futile attempt to justify the classic name of Magna Charta applied to it. The result is a confusion of details, and when the written code comes face to face with the realities of practical life it is found to be a tissue of incompatibilities and a fruitful source of controversy and hatred.

The provisions of the constitution of 1917 are not yet all in force, and already there is a demand for amendments of a substantial character. We hold that the constitution not only can but should be amended whenever the welfare of the nation or the voice of a majority of the people expressed clearly and regularly requires that it be amended. (El Universal, April 19, 1926.)

The orders that have lately been issued have provoked a collision between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. * * * The church exercising the right, which, by human as well as by divine law, belongs to her, with a moderation that does her credit, asks that the laws be modified; that the constitution be amended so as to remove effectively every obstacle which prevents the full exercise of the authority which properly belongs to either power, preserving at the same time intact the rights and prerogatives of both.

In our opinion the demand for the amendment of the constitution is entirely reasonable. And there should be no difficulty in reaching an agreement because the method that has been proposed is both simple and fair. The demand is made in a spirit of justice which requires that to everyone be given and made secure that which by right is his.

Time and again it has been charged that the church interferes with things not properly belonging to her sphere of action. Why do those who make the charge never refer to specific cases? If they did this, it would be possible to bring out the facts by discussion and thus determine who is right and who is wrong. So long as the charge is general and vague there can be only uncertainty, nothing can be proved, and no definite conclusion can be arrived at. * * * How are you ever going to prove that the church goes beyond the sphere of her legitimate action when she demands liberty to teach? Who can deny that the clergy have a right to be interested in education? * * * And what we say with regard to education can, with equal justice, be said with regard to every question that has been raised in this controversy. The church is in no way seeking to invade a field that does not belong to her. Standing firmly on her own rights, armed only with justice, repudiating all violence, the church demands that to God there be given "that which is God's." * * * (La Controversia, September 26, 1926.)

The Attorney General in a recent circular interprets (?) the second paragraph of article 24 of the constitution, which reads: "Every religious act of public worship shall be performed strictly within the churches and these shall be at all times under Government supervision."

Worship is of two kinds, public and private. The constitution orders that all acts of public worship be "performed strictly within the churches." The constitution is silent with regard to acts of private worship.

With what authority, therefore, does the Attorney General hold it to be an offense against the law, a crime, for a priest to perform an act of worship such as the celebration of the mass, the marriage ceremony, baptism, etc., in private homes from which the public is excluded? (Excelsior, February 18, 1927.)

We hold it to be illogical and unsocial to make of the constitution an idol, as do some Mexican politicians, who look upon it as a thing too sacred to be touched by man, like the Koran, before which the faithful bow in daily homage, * * * There can be no such thing as an immutable human law, as some pretend. All laws enacted by man are subject to change. Every act of man is subject to error, and, therefore, to correction, and with far more reason is this true of an act performed under excitement as was the drafting of our constitution in surroundings which precluded the very possibility of keen judgment and by men who acted under impulses which sprang from basest of passions.

There are those who seem to think that the standards of civilization can be changed by law, that the spirit of a people can be altered by the imposition of this or that precept as if the law were a mold into which the soul of the nation can be formed. Nowhere in history do we find a single example of legislation which, being imposed upon an unwilling people, has had the power to bring about its own infusion into the spiritual nature of that people. (El Pais, April 21, 1926.)

Once more the teaching of history is confirmed and the Catholic Church is again, as she has always been, the staunch defender of human rights and liberty.

The bishops of Mexico * * * have addressed themselves to competent authority demanding, as they have a right to demand, liberty and justice not for themselves alone, but for all. * * * "What is it that we ask," they say, "not tolerance, not condescension, above all, not favor nor privilege. We demand liberty, we demand liberty alone, and we demand that liberty for every religion." * * * The church demands only liberty, liberty with justice and law, liberty of thought, liberty of conscience, liberty of education, liberty of worship, liberty of property. (La Controversia, September 12, 1926.)

One of the first acts of the new Chamber of Deputies has been the rejection of the petition in which the Catholic bishops ask for the amendment of the constitution of the Republic. This action is a surprise to no one, certainly not to the bishops who signed the petition. What would have been a surprise would have been for the Congress to have devoted itself to the study of that document with the care and zeal demanded by its importance. But it never occurred to us that the deputies would reject this petition on grounds so futile, so unworthy of a body which speaks of itself as the representative of the nation, but which, in reality, represents nothing but the ambitions of a few men without principle and without ideals. * * * Eulalio Martinez was the only deputy who made any attempt at an argument. Deputy Martinez had a suspicion that those who signed the memorial had compromised themselves in the manner prohibited by the constitution and, therefore, he argued that they had forfeited their citizenship and with it their right of petition. This argument is sophistic, and the man making it is ignorant of the first principles of justice. No one should be judged without a hearing and certainly not condemned on mere "suspicion." * * * Before anyone can have the right to declare that Bishop Mora and Bishop Diaz have forfeited their Mexican citizenship, a formal investigation must be held to ascertain the facts and there must, at least, be a definite charge that the bishops have pledged themselves in a manner prohibited by the constitution.

But such "little things" as these, although in other countries they are held to be of great importance, among us are ridiculed as absurd scruples, which, like withered leaves in the whirlwind, are to be swept away by the onrushing torrent of radicalism which engulfs us.

We are not defending the memorial of the Catholics. That is not the subject of this editorial. We leave that to the million of Catholics, whose names, attached to the voluminous memorials that have been rejected, constitute the best evidence of the low esteem in which the will of the people is held in our Republic.

But one voice of the chamber was raised in opposition. It was the voice of a newspaper man. He, alone, voted against the committee report by which the bishops' memorial was rejected. And, oh, how our colleague was insulted. Never before had he listened to such abusive language even from the tongues of market women. * * * He was not permitted to develop his reasons for holding that the memorial should be considered. He was heckled and interrupted by the members. * * * We have a right to expect that any assembly, and above all, an assembly which pretends to represent the people, adopt for its first rule to be obeyed on all occasions that every member of the assembly be assured an opportunity to speak. * * * How is the chamber to function at all if its members are to be denied the right to speak? (Excelsior, September 27, 1926.)

It has been nine long years since the constitution of Queretaro was published, and even during that time the full scope and significance of that legislation have not yet been determined with precision. None of us, not even the Government itself, have ever doubted that that legislation, like so many others, was destined to remain a mere scrap of paper. Out of this fact springs the conflict. The Government, on the one hand, now contends that laws are enacted to be obeyed and it is the duty of public authorities to enforce them. The church, on the other hand, contends that this law, enacted at a time of great political excitement, never having been enforced, is now no longer applicable and must sooner or later be amended. * * *

As we see it, the best interests of the country require that this controversy be brought to an early close. We do not speak especially of the material interests. The spiritual welfare of the country is involved in this controversy. * * *

Can we be charged with partisanship if we say that our most earnest desire is that an end be put to this disagreement which threatens again to disrupt the union of the Mexican family? Can we be accused of any wrong if we add our voice to that of those who demand a solution of this problem which has again arisen?

A few days ago the press of the United States published a statement by the Bishop of Tabasco. That prelate was quoted as having said: "The bishops, the clergy, and the Catholic people of Mexico hold the fundamental laws and the authority of the Government in as high esteem as any man." This can mean only one thing, and we here make record of the fact that the Catholic Church in Mexico has no intention whatever to rise in rebellion against laws which are in this way, by one of its best-informed spokesmen, declared to be held in esteem by it. This statement eliminates the most serious of all the difficulties of this controversy. * * * There remains, however, another point raised by the Bishop of Tabasco. It is the consideration of the fact that the law violates not only interests, but rights alike, rights which * * * are held to be inalienable in countries having liberal institutions. In a case like this, says the bishop, criticism of the law is in order. It is not illegal. It certainly is not an act of rebellion. Respect for the law can prevent no one from pointing out the defects of the law.

Practically the same thought is found in another statement, that of the President of the Republic, which also was recently published in the American press. * * * Bishop Diaz said: "If, as a result of the progress achieved by the country or for any other reason, it becomes necessary to amend a law, it can be amended and the means for amending it are provided by the law itself."

President Calles said: "The President admits the possibility of amending the law, and it is clear that before the law can be amended it must be subjected to criticism."

Thus, in principle, at least, are brought together the two views which seemed divided and utterly irreconcilable * * *

Fortunately, the day of religious wars is passed. Tolerance is a characteristic of every civilized nation and liberty of conscience is held as a thing sacred and inviolable, the supreme expression of spiritual liberty. The same Catholic Church, having accepted this condition and living in it, makes no attempt to dominate the temporal power even in countries where her followers are in the majority. It is not conceivable, therefore, that she should adopt a different attitude in Mexico. * * * (Excelsior, August 14, 1926.)

What really is at the bottom of this religious controversy is a difference of opinion with regard to our present laws. The Catholics refuse to accept certain clauses of the constitution and certain regulations by which the Government seeks to put these into effect. The proper thing, therefore, was to discuss these laws, as it appears the C. R. O. M. and the League for the Defense of Religious Liberty proposed to do, but to discuss "The Church and the Mexican Revolution," as did Mr. Luis Leon, can have no other purpose and serve no other end than that of inflaming the passions and making the discord even deeper than it already is. Such disputes are utterly futile * * *. Nothing but that which is actually before us should have been introduced into this discussion.

General Calles, himself, in a recent telegram to the Evening Post, of New York, admitted, without reserve, that Catholics in Mexico enjoy the right of petition, and that certainly means the right to ask for the amendment of the law by which their liberty is restricted. If those who defend the policy of the Government really believe that in Mexico there is true religious liberty, true liberty of education, true liberty of worship, there is ample room for an argument dealing only with concrete things and from such an argument much enlightenment might flow as a result. (Excelsior, August 3, 1926.)

There are those who are more Callista than Calles himself. They are to be found in Saltillo, in Cecilia, near Tampico, and in other parts of the Republic. We say this because the policy of the central Government with regard to religion which has been clearly announced by both the President and his Attorney General is to keep all churches open in order that the faithful may in them engage in their exercises or devotion. In the places above mentioned the local authorities have driven the Catholics from the churches with violence and abuses.

The Secretary of Gobernacion in a circular has disapproved this as an excess of Jacobinism, which he holds to be contrary to the policies of the Federal Government. But the secretary should do more than issue

this paternal reprimand. It is his duty to enforce the law with the severity he shows on other occasions. * * * Did the alcalde of Cecilia offend against no law when, gun in hand, he drove the Catholics from the church, abusing them in an insulting and cowardly manner? Did the Saltillo authorities commit no crime when they obliged the Catholics to sweep the streets of their town for no better reason than that they had been found assembled in a church? And what has the Secretary of Gobernacion done? He has sent his fatherly counsels to the guilty, who, doubtless, will go on doing the same things every time the opportunity presents itself. (Excelsior, August 21, 1926.)

Perhaps the worst abuse which the Catholics have had to support is to be found in the penalties that are being imposed on those who worship in their homes. This is a violation of the constitution. Article 24 reads: "Everyone is free to embrace the religion of his choice and to practice all ceremonies, devotions, or observances of his respective creed, whether in places of public worship or at home." To defend his rights is the duty of every man. The attitude assumed by the Catholics is in no sense excessive. In taking it they are within the law. They have done nothing which is not permitted by the law when they have organized for the purpose of bringing to bear on Congress all the influence they have in favor of the amendments which they have proposed. As yet we have no clear evidence that the legislators will open their eyes to the real demands of the Mexican people. (Restauracion, September 9, 1926.)

Our constitution prohibits the formation of any political party in whose name there is any word or symbol by which it is related to any religious creed. That constitution does not, however, prohibit, nor can it ever prohibit, to the Catholics of Mexico the exercise of the political rights which are theirs by virtue of their Mexican citizenship.

Under the constitution the citizen is free to profess the religious faith which he prefers. The liberty to believe and to be affiliated with any church coexists with the rights of the citizen to engage in activities of a civil character. These two rights are not in conflict. The one in no manner excludes the other.

Yesterday we published an interview in which the Archbishop of Durango stated clearly the position of Catholics on this question.

Liberty can not long survive in a democracy where there are no political parties, no contest between platforms based on principles and not on personal interests and ambitions. * * * We long for the day when Mexico will enjoy as she should to-day enjoy * * * this, the normal condition of every true democracy. Political parties in Mexico exist only in embryo. There are no platforms; we do not mean one-sided, narrow programs, but programs broad in their scope and embodying the conflicting theories held by their members regarding the manner in which our social problems would be solved; theories which in their definition of, as well as in their mode of handling, these problems are, of necessity, conflicting and thus give rise to controversy which is wholesome and productive of good.

One of these problems, and certainly not the least important, is the demand for the amendment of the religious clauses of the constitution. Therefore, we find both reasonable and opportune the exhortation which the Archbishop of Durango addresses to the Catholics of Mexico calling upon them to do their duty politically and exercise effectively the rights which flow naturally from that duty. * * *

The Catholics have no desire nor intention to organize a political party of a religious character. The action which they have a right to take and which is guaranteed to them as citizens under the law is that of directing the current of public opinion, of which they are an important factor, thus bringing about the inclusion of this demand as an integral part of the program of those secular parties which make up the political life of the nation. (El Universal, May 22, 1926.)

TYRANNY AND CRUELTY RULE MEXICO, THE VERDICT OF THE MEXICAN PRESS

REIGN OF TERROR IN MEXICO

The systematic application of extreme penalties by men subject to no restraint is a thing which we can not accept. * * * Such a thing should be tolerated only in exceptional cases at a time when the national safety is in danger or when the public peace is disturbed. * * * We demand leniency for no one; at times severe measures are necessary for the protection of society. But we do demand that the law itself be respected. * * * An authority which knowingly violates the law, * * * easily becomes accustomed to this and in the end recognizes no law other than its own caprice. Citizens who meekly endure or even who are made to witness such a systematic disregard for law soon lose their respect for all authority. Seeing justice prostituted, they soon lose even the esteem they might have inherited for justice itself.

Thus is public morality undermined, the rule of force set up, and the sense of right destroyed. Thus are men reduced to their primitive savagery. * * *

We demand not only the suppression of all those direct and arbitrary acts which are being imposed contrary to law but we demand that the law itself be respected by those who are called upon to enforce it. * * * (El Universal, April 26, 1926.)

EXECUTIONS IN COLIMA

Yesterday we published a news item from Colima regarding abuses, for which no condemnation is too severe, which had been committed by Gen. Benito Garcia and the officers under his command. At first it was reported that a plot against the Government had been discovered, and that eight of the conspirators had been executed by General Garcia. Such an execution even as this, without trial, without having given the victims an opportunity to make any defense, no matter what may be said in explanation, is simply murder and deserves nothing but our condemnation.

But now we know that no such plot ever existed at all, and that the killing of these men was a bloody orgy, a crime of the worst sort, against which the voice of an outraged society should be raised in protest, demanding that the guilty ones be brought to justice. How are we ever going to convince people in other countries that we are a civilized nation if we confide authority to men capable of murder as these men were at Colima, where eight innocent and peaceful persons were done to death, feloniously and willfully, with malice and extreme cruelty and every aggravating circumstance? (Excelsior, September 14, 1926.)

ASSASSINATIONS AT NAYARIT

Not long ago we brought to the attention of the higher authorities certain murders which had been committed at Colima by a high-ranking officer of the army. We submitted proofs, which the officer accused has never denied, and the criminal continues to enjoy the emoluments and privileges of his office. * * * Now we have to report that the example of Colima has been imitated at Nayarit. * * * The victims this time are not simple, defenseless private citizens. These are assassinated on the most futile pretexts, as happened in Colima, where, in last analysis, the only excuse offered was the fact the assassin had been drinking alcohol to such an extent that he no longer had control of his reason. * * *

We are daily informed in official statements that we are not in a state of revolution, but of full constitutionality; that Mexico is a nation governed under the law by men who are the legitimate representatives of the people. * * * There can, therefore, be no excuse for authorities who commit crimes such as that reported from Nayarit. Although in the Colima case our voice was lost as that of "one crying in the wilderness," we now hope that the Secretary of War will take action against those who are responsible for this new crime. * * *

All bounds have been exceeded by the abuses that are daily being committed on the pretext of conspiracies, later shown to be imaginary. It is, indeed, carrying things to great extremes when an order of amparo is treated as a joke by authorities whose names we do not mention, for whom there is no law but the law of force. * * * (Excelsior, December 16, 1926.)

THE CYCLONE OF POLITICAL CRIME

We can no longer remain silent in face of the wave of violence which, like a veritable cyclone of political crime, is sweeping over the Republic. It may to some seem wasted effort to go on as we have been doing, insisting on publishing the political assaults which day after day are repeated and which, in spite of all the protests that have been made, seem to be increasing.

It is to us a duty, as it is a solemn obligation of every citizen, to do everything within our power to bring to an end the epidemic of murders which, if it goes on unchecked, must in the end reduce us definitely to a state of savagery. No other action being possible, we can appeal only to the courts, but we must never grow faint in that appeal. Weak and ineffective as that defense may seem to-day, in the end it will be irresistible. Respect for human life must be restored if the life of our nation is to be preserved.

In far-off Nayarit the tragedy assumes proportions such as to satisfy even a Cæsar Borgia. A senator and practically every member of his family have fallen, put to death while in the very act of appealing to the military authorities for protection. * * * One crime seems to beget another. * * * We now have a telegram from the officer in command at Nayarit reporting to the Secretary of War that he is in danger of being assassinated by a justice of the supreme court, who, together with a member of the State legislature and other officials of the local government, have threatened him. We can only leave to the imagination of our readers the task of forming their own notion of the fear and anxiety which will be expressed in the telegrams which, as an S O S from some sinking ship, must even at this moment be coming in from the men who have thus been accused.

But even closer to home we have seen carried through our own streets the dead body of one who, only a few days ago, was the representative of labor in congress. The circumstances in which he was killed are not yet fully known. He was shot in the back while he was engaged in the performance of his official duty during the elections that were held last Sunday.

To make this picture complete, we recall the municipal official at San Angel, who, being carried off by a mob, was tied to a tree and riddled with bullets.

We do not desire to be sensational. Far from exaggerating, we have omitted the most shocking details and have limited ourselves to a cold

recital of a few simple facts of recent occurrence already known to the public. These crimes can not be justified. * * * They are an evidence of the moral disease from which the nation is suffering. They are to be traced to two causes: The refusal of political parties to comply with the law and the failure of the authorities to bring the guilty to justice. (El Universal, December 16, 1926.)

EXECUTIONS AT LEON

Since the crime committed in Nayarit * * * no further complaint against the army for shootings of this sort have for some time been received, but now, not 1 nor 2 but 11 people are reported to have been assassinated at Leon. In a statement issued by the Undersecretary of War, we are told "the federal troops became involved together with the municipal authorities in a fight against an armed body of Catholics, who are believed to be a part of a band which committed the assault on San Francisco del Rincon," and that the War Department could assume no responsibility nor take any action with regard to these executions because they had been ordered by the civil authorities.

What authority had the municipal officials to order these executions? What authority have municipal officials? What are their duties? What right had they to usurp functions which belong to the courts of justice? How, we demand, is it that municipal officials in a place like Leon, in utter disregard for every other authority, including the army, have had the temerity to destroy the lives of 11 persons, every one of whom, it seems, was a resident of that city? (El Universal, January 6, 1927.)

THE WAVE OF BLOOD

At no time in our history has the death penalty been free from abuses. * * * This fact, greatly to our discredit, is now manifesting itself in a truly alarming manner. All rights and guaranties seem to be suspended. Justice and law are treated as playthings, subject to the caprice and violence of even low-ranking army officers or simple alcaldes in the most insignificant townships.

In recent reports of encounters with rebel bands we no longer find the term "summary." Executions are now described as immediate and their victims are almost without exception civilians. * * * Respect for human life seems to have disappeared altogether in our country. * * *

Shootings are the order of the day. We could cite many cases in support of that statement. We will, however, refer only to one which because of the public scandal aroused and the cruel, barbarous, inhuman, and illegal manner in which it was perpetrated has aroused the most profound indignation of the people.

A correspondent whom we know to be worthy of every esteem, who was an eyewitness of the facts, describes them in a letter we received from Leon. * * * He says an attack was made on the town of Leon on Monday, January 3. The affair, he says "seemed at first to be of no significance, but now it does assume importance when there becomes known some of the blood-curdling details of the manner in which five boys, all under 20 years, were executed."

"These victims were Jose Valencia Gallardo, Salvado Vargas, Nicolas Navarro, Ezequiel Gomez, and one other named Rios. They were boys of good character. Seduced by no one knows what influence, they may have taken part in this adventure, but whether that be so or not, there is no excuse for the fact that they were killed like dogs and subjected to cruel torture before being shot."

These boys were arrested on the morning after the attack. At the time they were not armed. "A detachment of mounted gendarmes," the letter continues, "captured them and, driving them to the center of the town, shot them almost immediately without preferring any charges against them or making any investigation whatever." * * * "Before the volley was fired, one of these boys, losing courage, broke in tears. Valencia Gallardo, who, from the moment of his arrest, had manifested great courage, tried to comfort him. Then, turning to his companions, he called upon them to place their trust in God. Infuriated, the gendarmes seized him and, tearing out his tongue, shot him."

"The gendarmes placed the bodies on public exhibition at the main entrance to the Municipal Palace. It was an awful sight. While the bodies lay there in a great pool of blood, their relatives were scarcely able to make their way to them so great was the crowd that had assembled. No words can describe that scene."

Once more, we demand, Are crimes like this to go unpunished as did those committed at Colima and at Acaponeta? Are they to be repeated at other places in the Republic? Have the authorities finally adopted for their policy the summary execution of their victims without trial or hearing, in defiance of all law and of all the standards of civilization? (Excelsior, January 13, 1927.)

THE CONSTITUTION FLOUTED AGAIN

Can Mexico truly be said to enjoy a régime of law at the present time? Are the acts of Mexicans controlled by and in conformity with the principles of law and justice which our own constitution embodies?

If we may base our judgment on the things which are every day happening among us on the treatment, not only illegal, but immoral, inhuman, brutally oppressive, which the Government is meting out to some Mexicans, we can reach no other conclusion than that the political constitution of the United States of Mexico has been suspended.

Let us look the facts in the face. At Colima, without even the semblance of a trial, men are shot to death; if we are to speak plainly, assassinated. In Nayarit, an entire family perished barbarously; at Leon, to complete the picture of black savagery, there was wanting nothing but the banquet at which the flesh of the victims could have been devoured.

But that is not all. Only yesterday, the public read in our columns the account of the shooting of 27 individuals carried out with no more formality than a simple order from the Secretary of War.

We are not alarmed particularly about the fact that the death penalty is being inflicted in Mexico. Our constitution sanctions the death penalty. But that which does fill us with alarm is the fact that Mexicans are being put to death with no formality or trial whatever, without being permitted to make any defense, in violations of our own laws.

We do not raise the question here as to whether or not those who are being shot have by their crimes merited the death penalty. We are even willing, for sake of argument, to admit that these men who, only the other day, were done to death by the Government, were all criminals of the worst kind. We are willing to admit that their elimination was a service to the public and a credit to the fair name of the nation and a protection to the peace of the community. But even criminals are human beings. They are not savage beasts. They are not mere things to be disposed of at the caprice of those in power and, as human beings, they have a right to the protection of our laws. * * *

How are we to account for this flouting of the law by our Government in its dealings with the people?

Doubtless, there is not a self-respecting man in Mexico to-day but who, in fear and trembling, is asking himself that question, than which none more momentous could be asked. It must be apparent to everyone that this matter is one which affects the very life of our nation which is impossible if there is to be no respect for the constitution and no justice in the enforcement of the law.

What has the Government to say? Will it say anything? Will it remain silent? * * * Whatever it does, there is only one way in which it can restore quiet to the public mind, and that is by giving some tangible and irrefutable evidence of a practical character that here in Mexico the relations that are to exist between the people and their Government are not to be those which are found among savage nations, but those which are found among peoples of enlightenment. It must show by facts that are indisputable that human life is respected in Mexico in the manner prescribed by our constitution. (Excelsior, February 2, 1927.)

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN MEXICO

Article 22 of the constitution is perfectly clear. Its third paragraph reads: "Capital punishment is likewise forbidden for all political offenses; in the case of offenses other than political it shall only be imposed for high treason committed during a foreign war, parricide, murder with malice aforethought, arson, abduction, highway robbery, piracy, and grave military offenses."

To demand that this provision of the law be obeyed with the same scruple as is being shown in the enforcement of the clauses referring to education and to religion would be like going to a thorn tree for apples, and we are not so ingenuous as to insist on the letter of the law.

Civilians in great numbers are being subjected to the military law in all its severity. These civilians, we insist, are not armed rebels. They are noncombatants. They have been charged with nothing but conspiracy. Only a few days ago in Michoacan a man whose name was Calderon, a civilian, widely known, was arrested in spite of the fact that he was known to be leading a peaceful life. He was shot in defiance of the law and of the rights which, under the law, are guaranteed to him. * * *.

We have seen reports from army men which would be ludicrous were it not for the awfulness of the tragedy to which they refer. In these reports we find these men gloating over executions, boasting cynically of shootings which they have executed in defiance of the law, as though these were the glorious deeds of some victory won on the field of battle. * * * Unfortunate though it may be, we can only admit the fact that there is left in our country only one foundation upon which national morality stands, * * * respect for the law. If respect for the law is lost, if the laws are no longer obeyed by our army, military discipline will disappear and our army will degenerate until it is no better than a band of marauders attached by fear or favor to some chieftain whom it may desert at any time. More important to the Government and to the nation even than the annihilation of conspirators and the suppression of rebellion is the maintenance of discipline and the respect for law in the army. Experience gained through a long and painful history is proof enough of this. (Excelsior, March 1, 1927.)

SUMMARY EXECUTIONS

If we were to ask ourselves what has the Government of the Republic done in its action against rebellion to extenuate the ferocity which, serving no useful end, invariably is aroused in Mexico by what should

not be more than a mere political controversy, we would, unfortunately, find it necessary to confess that it has done nothing, absolutely nothing, of a practical character.

There is no one who does not know the savage violence with which the campaign in Jalisco is being waged. There is no one who does not know the carefree manner in which large numbers of men are being shot in many other parts of the country. Chiefs of operations, commanding officers, even officers of low rank in command of mere detachments, are condemning to death combatants and noncombatants with a nonchalance that one would expect only of highwaymen and bandits. As has always been the case, to-day the number of those slaughtered is far greater than those killed on the field of conflict. * * *

The most recent example of a killing executed many kilometers away from the scene of battle occurred in Morelia, Michoacan. The victim was Mr. Alfonso Arce, a citizen who stood high in that community. The facts reported indicated that, on the 10th of the present month, a band of rebels entered the village of Puruandiro. Mr. Arce, as is proven by the facts which were not disproved, was in Morelia on the 9th and continuously thereafter. He could not, therefore, have been present at the attack on Puruandiro. Nevertheless, it was enough for some one to denounce to the officer in command of the detachment at Morelia Arce as a participant in that attack to cause his arrest on the 12th, followed by his execution within 24 hours without any trial nor any effort to verify the charges. * * *

* * * * * * *

For a government like ours which pretends, above all else, to be a government of law enforcement, the constitution should alone be the guide. If the government holds that the constitutional guaranties stand in the way of the restoration of order, article 29 of the constitution tells it what it must do. By that article, the executive must go to the permanent committee of congress with a request that these guaranties be declared in suspension. It must defend that request before the nation and, in the briefest time possible, put an end to this abnormal condition by suppressing the rebellion. But, if the Government holds that this action is not necessary, it has a solemn obligation to do everything possible to restrain the ferocity of its officers, who, like jackals, are devastating the Republic by giving free reign to their bloodthirsty instincts. (El Universal, April 18, 1927.)

MEXICO A BANKRUPT DEMOCRACY

LEGISLATION

We Mexicans make of the law a sort of fetish. We do not indeed always obey the law, but in speaking of it we laud its efficacy to the heavens. No matter what problem arises, our first thought is to pass a new law. We seem to legislate for the sake of legislating, to-day in one direction, to-morrow in another. We seem to feel that the mere inscription of a proposition in our laws is sufficient to work miracles. * * *

Thus, we have gone on passing laws since the day of our independence. Congresses have come and Congresses have gone since the days of Apatzingan and we have pursued our merry course of law making. If we were to stack all of our laws one upon another, we would have a mountain of laws. Constitution upon constitution, regulation upon regulation, reforms great and small, we have never stopped, nor is there now any sign that we are about to stop legislating.

And what is worse, we seem to learn nothing from experience. Even now we are not sure that it is not the law from which national customs spring rather than the reverse. The result is that our legislation, far from serving to standardize and crystallize the habits we have developed, thus having its roots in our traditions and being a true reflection of our national character and the conditions in which we live, is more apt to be the expression of some exalted idealism or, what is worse, to have no idealism at all, being mere schemes of men who, though not generally in office, have great political influence, seeking only their own interests, having no inspiration but that of their own caprice, subject to no control, enforcing their own notions of that which suits their purpose best.

It is not to be wondered at that so many of our laws have been dead letters from the day of their enactment. It could not be otherwise, because of the unjust and unpractical things they embody. It is not strange that in our legislation we find much that is exotic, borrowed from abroad and almost nothing that is original, national, nor are we to wonder when we find that when an attempt is made to enforce these laws, which are utterly out of harmony with conditions, the result is opposition, disorder, and conspiracy. (El Universal, July 15, 1926.)

To-day we publish an item in our news columns which in other countries would go unnoticed, but which among us is truly sensational. The president of the Chamber of Deputies of the State of Nuevo Leon, Rodolfo Hinajoso, has suspended action on a bill providing for the enforcement of article 130 of the constitution until an opportunity has been given to the people to make known their will regarding the provisions of this bill.

With all sincerity we confess that when this item came to our attention we doubted if such a thing could really have occurred anywhere in the Republic of Mexico. We have seen the will of the people treated with such contempt, the petitions of the nation so often flouted, that we could not bring ourselves to believe that there might still be found even one honorable man whose action is a credit to his title of representative of the people.

In our legislation the thing least thought of is the people. Party advantage, the will of caciques, these are carefully considered in the inner circles, but it never by any chance occurs to anyone in our Government to give the least thought to how his action will be received by the people. (El Pais, Apr. 15, 1926.)

THE COURTS

Passing in review the hopes and aspirations around which the revolution of 1910 was fought and which gave to it its truly popular character, we recall the prophetic words of Justo Sierra: "The people hunger and thirst after justice," * * *

The revolution of 1910 inscribed on its banners in flaming characters one reform in demanding which, above all else, the nation was united—the reform of the courts of justice. The solemn pledge was given to the people that thenceforth the rights of all would be safeguarded. It was declared that favoritism was at an end forever and that the new régime would insure absolute integrity, with perfect equality guaranteed to all men before the law. The law thenceforth would be supreme and all the relations between man and man or man and the government made subject to it, without discrimination and without regard to political affiliations. * * *

It is all the more painful, therefore, now that 16 years have passed since the people of Mexico were inspired by that demand to deeds of heroism, to have to record the fact that the people have been defrauded, that all the sufferings have been in vain, useless all the sacrifices. * * * In the administration of justice we have made no advance toward the high ideals of 1910. We are confronted with the same immorality in our courts, the same contempt for the law. We can only confess that in this, as in so many other things, the aspirations of the revolution are still unrealized. We have exhausted our energies in an effort that has borne no fruit, that has been a failure.

To-day we are not only no better off, but our condition is even more deplorable than it was in 1910. Judges, prosecutors, magistrates, all are guilty at least of excessive leniency, if indeed they have not rendered themselves justly liable to the charge of corruption which on all sides is being brought against them. Under the revolution, justice, like democracy itself, is a farce and a fraud, and this we can only confess and lament.

Postrevolutionary justice is in bankruptcy. Corruption dominates many of the courts. In some of these judgments are sold to the highest bidder. The citizen finds himself defenseless, at the mercy of the police and the army. (El Universal, Oct. 2, 1926.)

Justice is sold. It is hired out. No one who cares to take the trouble finds it difficult to violate justice. Justice is cheated miserably. Immorality has reached the point where cases in our courts are no longer won by consideration of the law, but only by the consideration of the size of the bribe that is offered.

This is no idle talk. We are not making charges we can not prove. * * * The officers of the army, especially, have had nothing but contempt for the decrees of the so-called federal courts. So brazenly has the law been flouted time and again that even the supreme court recently found it necessary to order action to be taken against army officers who refuse to comply with the decisions of courts in the federal district. * * * But we have no reason to expect that, in the case of some of these officials, even the supreme court will press for action. We can only feel that, here again, the law is to be enforced only against those who are without influence or without wealth as, for instance, the alcalde of Tepetlaxco, and not enforced against those who have power.

Things can not go on as they are without plunging the nation into lawlessness and anarchy. (Excelsior, October 8, 1926.)

It is absolutely necessary that something be done at once to reform the courts of justice. No action can be too severe against judges who prostitute their office and tolerate corruption in their courts. Their crime is worse than that of the thieves, who without mercy are thrown into prison; it is worse even than the crimes of highwaymen, who are being shot down at sight.

Society can live without paved roads, without agricultural schools, without great irrigation works, admirable and useful as all these are, but society can not long survive the death of justice. (Excelsior, November 11, 1926.)

SUFFRAGE

Accounts which have appeared in the daily press show that already more than 300 men have presented credentials showing themselves to have been elected to the chamber of deputies at the recent elections. There is every reason to believe that when all the credentials issued have been presented there will be on hand enough pretenders to make up two or three chambers. We have grown used to this, and would think nothing of it were it not for the fact that this year the announcement that the chief executive of the nation himself would exercise the most scrupulous vigilance over the elections and that he would sup-

press all fraud and abuses led us to hope that, at last, we might see a change of the system. * * *

In our country the holding of elections is a difficult and complicated undertaking because of the great mass of citizens are incapable of understanding even the meaning of public suffrage or of manifesting any interest in the exercise of their political rights.

The election laws are complicated. The preelection campaign is a campaign of lies and falsehoods. The freedom of the ballot is always subject to the arbitrariness of subordinate officials and to the violence of those who balk at nothing in their determination to remain in office. The result is that elections held in Mexico are fraudulent and, judged by the standards of our own law, productive of no valid results. That is why conscientious men have ceased to have anything to do with elections, having reached the conclusion that, after all, these elections exercise no influence over public administration. * * * As stated above, 300 credentials have already been presented. Two or three times this number will be presented before the end is reached. How many crimes, how many deeds of violence, how many irregularities have been committed throughout the Republic to make this possible, and what measures is the Minister of Gobernacion going to adopt against those in office and out of office who have committed them? (Excelsior, July 15, 1926.)

To call oneself a democrat is easy, but to be a democrat in Mexico is all but impossible, especially to those in office. Nevertheless, the time has come when the revolution must give some evidence of respect for the will of the people and that, at least with regard to our elections, some advancement is being made. (Excelsior, August 21, 1926.)

Formerly no elections at all were held in Mexico because it was useless to hold elections. People had grown tired of the comedy, knowing perfectly well that the list of deputies and senators who would in the end hold office had already been prepared in the office of the Secretary of Gobernacion.

To-day, likewise, no elections are held in Mexico. The people have learned that the results of the elections are determined not at the polls but in the Office of Gobernacion or by some inner circle of the Congress itself; to-day, whether a pretender has a credential or not, whether he has received votes or not, whether he is qualified or not, provided only that he is looked upon with favor by the powers that be, nothing can prevent him from taking his seat.

Having lost all faith in the integrity of the ballot, the people have no confidence in the elections, and improvement will not be possible until the faith of the people and its confidence in this, the highest function of democracy, is restored. (El Universal, July 15, 1926.)

The all-important thing in our decadent democracy in Mexico is not the ballot. Candidates make little or no effort to win votes. Their only worry is to gain control of the man who presides at the election booth. To accomplish this they are willing to resort to chicanery and even to violence, knowing perfectly well that these men, having authority to pass on the results of the election, will substitute whatever votes may be lacking.

The chairman of the committee is in reality the one elector, the one important agent in this pseudo-democratic function, the election in Mexico.

All the energies of our political parties are devoted to winning the control of these men. Election boards are reduced to servility by bribery and threats. It is commonly said among the people that men on these boards have to face $10,000 or daggers 10. Election booths are assaulted with impunity and ballot boxes openly purloined.

This is not democracy; it is a brutal abuse of the suffrage which our politicians go on committing with utter contempt of the popular will. (El Universal, November 17, 1926.)

CITIZENSHIP

Under the name of Civil Union for the Defense of Liberty there has been organized a new group which proposes to take up the defense of liberty both of the individual and of society. The organizers are conservative men of high ideals. They have already held several meetings and they now make public the principles for which the new organization is to stand.

Social problems, they declare, are not to be solved by war. Strife and violence bring only destruction and are the fruitful sources from which spring crime, poverty, and anarchy.

The deplorable crisis through which the Republic is now passing has come to us precisely as the fruit of bloody revolution and is due, above all, to the fact that those to whom the masses had a right to look for leadership, through cowardice, indifference, and selfishness have held themselves aloof.

We have no just complaint. If we are slaves, it is because we have not known the value nor been willing to pay the price of liberty. Abuses most degrading have been heaped upon us, and instead of standing for our rights we have had recourse only to mean and cowardly grumblings.

Seeing victory go so often to force, we have lost faith in the efficacy of moral measures. We have failed to understand that the victory of material force is never lasting and that in the end liberty and justice are sure to assert themselves.

Tyrannies that seemed impregnable in the past, but which did not stand on the firm foundation of moral truth, have been overthrown by an opposition seemingly powerless, but strong, nevertheless, in the fact that it stood for right. Our defense, therefore, must depend not on arms nor on the shedding of blood but on the development of those forces of morality and culture which, seated in the soul of the nation, alone in the end can do away forever with the rule of force and the imposition of tyranny in the hands of a minority. * * * The Mexican problem is essentially a social, a moral problem. Proposals and plans without number and of infinite variety have been advanced for its solution. All have failed because none in its practical working out has elevated the ethical character of the people. * * *

Throughout our history we have resorted to war as the final arbiter of all our disputes. We have had nothing but contempt for education as a factor of our national progress. We have sought to transform the people on the field of battle, and we have only intensified the instincts of hatred and destruction. * * *

The Civil Union for the Defense of Liberty has been formed for the purpose of undertaking an organized campaign, the purpose of which will be the promotion of citizenship and civic virtue throughout the country in the defense of liberty and rights. The new union is not a political party. It has no desire for office. It has no political purpose. Its action will at all times be in compliance with the law. It seeks to accomplish results that will be lasting. It strikes at the root of our national problem. The means which it proposes to employ, always peaceful, will be directed toward the creation of a condition in which every competent factor of national life will actively participate in the government of the country and in the defense of justice, without recourse to armed action.

To this end the civil union will conduct a campaign of social education through the columns of the press, by holding public meetings, distributing literature, cooperation with the schools, and with every other agency through which its purpose may be accomplished. (La Controversia, September 26, 1926.)

The formation of this new Civil Union for the Defense of Liberty comes as a ray of sunshine and of hope in the confusion to which we have so long been condemned in Mexico.

The campaign to promote civic virtue and civic action will develop public morality and enlighten public opinion, and in the end will render impossible the very existence of laws that are oppressive and unjust, put an end to corruption in public administration, and restore to Mexicans that true liberty which is the fruit of civilization. (Excelsior, September 27, 1926.)

FOREIGN MEDDLERS

A group of Protestants recently visited Mexico. After spending less than a month in the country, they announce that upon their return home they will publish news items in the press, special articles, even books, and that they will lecture on the platform, give interviews, and act as expert advisers concerning the Mexican question. What is even more absurd, the instructors, the women along with the men, who came for the summer school, have promised to make known the truth regarding Mexico, a thing which we ourselves have not yet discovered, and we have grown gray in studying it at close range. * * * The problems of Mexico do not all arise out of oil and land; nor are they all related to the redemption of the Indian. All of these are, of course, serious. But we have problems of race, of language, of climate, of geography, of education, and of a thousand other kinds which are not to be solved by one who has no better preparation than the fact that he has stood with his foot on the rail of some Mexican bar. (Excelsior, September 2, 1926.)

TWO END-OF-YEAR STATEMENTS

The year 1926 has failed to bring the realization of those hopes which, with the suppression of the revolution of De la Huerta, were entertained by everyone truly interested in the rehabilitation and the pacification of our country.

It is not necessary here to pass in review the events which have followed each other or the controversies out of which they sprang. They have all been commented upon in these columns. Why should he now recall the long list of errors, the mistakes, which have filled these 12 months? Every one of them, taken separately as it occurred, has been supported with more or less suffering, but, looking at them all at the same time, we can but wonder that the nation had strength to stand up under such a burden.

The most complicated, as well as the most serious and painful of all these conflicts, is one which strikes at the very life of the nation. It springs from the fact, daily becoming more pronounced, that the Mexican nation is torn by dissension and that new motives for dissension are being daily invented. Not satisfied with the old controversies over politics, out of which sprang hatreds and feuds, daily new fuel is being thrown on the fire and we are faced with a war between classes. As if even that were not enough, to this class war is being added a race war, and we, who should be united because we all enjoy the same civilization, are being forced into irreconcilable antagonisms. Of all the political and economic problems with which we are confronted, serious though they are, none is more to be feared than this. It threatens the nation

with destruction, tearing our national unity into fragments. The year has witnessed a campaign conducted by certain elements in favor of socialism, which, if it is successful, must inevitably end by throwing labor into conflict with that which labor needs most—capital and industrial enterprise. We have been saddened by the injection of the religious question which, long ago, ceased to be a source of disturbance among peoples, finding its solution in liberty, which is tolerance and which respects the rights of others, making it possible for all to live in peace and harmony, regardless of the differences of opinion and ideals. (Excelsior, January 1, 1927.)

The greatest good which we can wish for Mexico during 1927 is that a solution be found for the serious problems with which we are confronted and that this solution be made possible by the loyal cooperation of all the factors of our national life. If that cooperation is to be attained it is, above all, necessary that there be complete peace, tolerance, true and independent patriotism, and above all the suppression of all hatreds between classes and groups. This should be the program for the accomplishment of which we all unite. Peace, prosperity—these are beautiful words, but they will be empty words unless we are all willing to do our part in giving them reality. (El Universal, January 1, 1927.)

A RAY OF HOPE

The program of the revolution, which has been a complete failure in the internal affairs of the country, is now on the point of producing an even worse failure in our international affairs, especially with regard to our relations with the United States. The welfare of a nation is not a thing to be trifled with, and patriotism now demands that there be a radical change in that program. Looking these things in the face, we can but be alarmed when we see our radicals pursue their high-handed course, committing the most serious mistakes, as, for instance, the arming of the agrarians, which is nothing less than the arming of an undisciplined mob which, a sad experience has convinced us, will in the end make evil use of the rifles which should, from the beginning, have been intrusted only to the army.

A program of economy in the public administration of financial and fiscal reorganization, a program of public works executed with energy in the interests of agriculture and commerce is doomed necessarily to failure if it is accompanied with a stubborn determination to hostilize capital, the owners of rural property, and the men of enterprise and labor devoted to the agricultural upbuilding of the country.

The promotion of the interests of labor, the raising of the standard of life is incompatible with the attack that is being made on capital, the source from which the laborer must derive his income.

These and other things we have often repeated. They are axiomatic. They admit of no discussion. Unfortunately, however, vanity is a factor in public life more than is at first apparent, and through vanity men are driven to seek methods which are new and original but which in the end will be found to be extravagant fancies. * * * The first and most important thing for us to do is to clothe ourselves with modesty, with simplicity, with common sense. (Excelsior, January 20, 1927.)

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. As I have only two minutes remaining I would like to read excerpts from two editorials in the American press, in which they tell what they think of the Calles government. The editorials are from two American papers, evidently papers not subsidized or afraid to talk about Mexico. One is from the Washington Post, the other the New York Evening Post. I find that they are rather too long to read in two minutes, but I shall put them in the RECORD.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. I ask that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, after the gentleman from Massachusetts has had his 30 minutes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is entitled to 15 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not wish to encroach upon the time of the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Nebraska who are going to speak after me. I merely wish to bring these facts before the Congress of the United States and the American people. I am not making a wild statement. I am asking you to look over these facts, which you will find are absolutely true, and obtain the real truth with reference to Mexico.

The Mexican people are suffering under oppression. They have not the rights to which they are entitled, their rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and freedom of conscience, which we have here in the United States. I am asking the consideration of Congress and of the American people to realize the truth of this matter. Find it out for yourselves and then let the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and the State Department do what they see fit to help Mexico.

We want to help Mexico, but we want to help the people of Mexico and not the rulers of Mexico, who in their zeal are desirous of wiping out all religion—not only the Catholic religion but all religion—and are trying to introduce bolshevism not only into Mexico but into the United States and into the South American Republics. They will never succeed in the United States, but they may succeed in South America, and if they do we shall have plenty on our hands trying to put out the fires of bolshevism which they are lighting in their fanatical zeal to destroy all the ideals for which we stand—love of God, respect for law, freedom of conscience, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, our inalienable rights. [Applause.]

I now quote from two great American newspapers on this subject:

AN AMERICAN OPINION

MEXICO'S LAW ON RELIGION

[Editorial from the Washington Post, August 4, 1926]

The policy adopted by the Mexican Government in dealing with ministers of religion and religious organizations is attracting world-wide attention on account of the novel and drastic details of the law issued by President Calles under date of June 14. While the Catholic Church is most vitally affected, this is merely because the Mexican membership of that church is larger than that of all other denominations combined. All religious organizations, including religious orders, are affected by the law, as well as all ministers of the gospel and all church property.

The law issued by President Calles purports to be in pursuance of the constitution, and in many sections the constitution is clearly obeyed. Other sections, however, seem to be in direct conflict with the constitution of Mexico.

The purpose of the law is stated to be the elimination of religious influence in national political affairs and the complete separation of church and state. If this were the only purpose, and if the law accomplished no more and no less than this, it would command the respect of those who are convinced that church and state must be kept separate in a republic. It confiscates church property, denies the right of the clergy of any denomination to hold services or administer sacraments elsewhere than in churches under governmental scrutiny, denies the liberty of the press, strips all religious persons of distinctive garb, prohibits all religious organizations from acquiring real estate, and confiscates seminaries, colleges, and asylums, as well as churches, bishoprics, parish houses, etc.

The law conforms to the Mexican constitution by requiring that no person not of Mexican birth shall exercise the ministry of any cult.

Rigorous penalties are prescribed for violations of the law and for failure on the part of any official authority to enforce the law.

The right of the Mexican nation to deal with religion as it sees fit can not be questioned by any other nation so long as no other nation's citizens are injured. Any injury to foreigners resulting from the execution of Mexico's new law would be properly the subject of inquiry by the government affected, notwithstanding the declarations that the law is a purely domestic measure.

Without raising the question of President Calles's authority to issue a law which in important particulars seems to transgress the constitution of Mexico it can not be doubted that the Mexican nation is deeply injured by this reactionary and intolerant action. Even if the law were well within the bounds of the constitution, it strikes a blow at religious freedom and freedom of speech and of the press. The fact that the law is enthusiastically approved and supported by the communistic elements of Mexico leads the outside world to suspect that communism has a firm hold upon the Mexican Government and has led it into the folly of imitating the Russian Soviet in attempting to destroy religion. Nothing but disorder, misfortune, and ultimate disaster can come from such a course in a free country in the twentieth century. Mexicans, with all their misgovernment, are free men, having the right of free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, and the power to set up their own government. The destruction of religion and freedom of speech and of the press in Mexico is impossible, and only communists or other madmen would attempt to destroy the rights of a free people.

AMERICAN OPINION FORMING ON MEXICO

[Editorial from New York Evening Post, August 3, 1926]

American opinion is forming itself upon the mighty drama now being played in Mexico. Our people are watching the developments with an interest and an absence of passion that is as rare with us as it is grateful.

It might be taken for granted that American feeling would instinctively sympathize with any effort to bring about that separation between church and state which we have in this country. This is undoubtedly true. Yet our people, we believe, are watching Mexico to make sure whether there is in its governmental program a real effort to make the separation with due regard to freedom of conscience and of religious worship. They are also watching to see whether the church, in defense, may not go too far in its use of both lay and ecclesiastical weapons.

That the issue is not directly the concern of the United States seems to be an opinion generally held by our press. Yet a surprisingly general idea is spreading, despite whatever sympathy there may be with the fundamental idea of Calles's actions, that it appears clear that the church is a stabilizing influence in Mexico, that it is a bar against present bolshevic tendencies, and that without it the country may tend to slip back into a period of re-Indianization. Here there is at least an indirect development that may be of great importance to the United States in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time I have I shall ask my colleagues not to request that I yield until I shall have finished reading part of the convention between the United States and England of May 22, 1924.

This treaty is popularly known as the "12-mile" treaty. At the time it was negotiated the country was informed that a great victory had been obtained by the United States and that the treaty would be of incalculable assistance in the enforcement of the prohibition laws. First, the country was led to believe that the right of search and seizure for liquor was extended 12 miles out at sea. Secondly, when the drys complained of the traffic of liquor on foreign steamships and insisted that the Government take action it placed the United States Government in a most peculiar and difficult situation, so the people of the country were told that satisfactory arrangements had been made with England in this treaty placing liquor under absolute control. The drys were happy, passengers on board foreign steamships, many of them ardent and active drys at home, got all the liquor they want, and everybody was happy. This treaty with England formed the basis for similar arrangements with other countries whose ships are engaged in regular passenger traffic to and from ports of the United States. Now, let us see just what the treaty does. In the first place, the 12-mile idea is little more than fiction. The very first article is a declaration on the part of both contracting parties to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles constitute the proper limits of territorial waters. Then it simply provides that the British Government will raise no objection to a boarding of private vessels under the British flag in order that "inquiries may be addressed to those on board and an examination be made of the ship's papers" for the purpose of ascertaining if the ship's papers contained a list of liquor on board or if the ship's officers will admit having liquor on board. It provides that the ship may be seized if it is caught engaged in violation of any laws of the United States; but that right, I submit, the United States Government always had. But note that the right conferred to board the ship is not 12 miles, as the public was led to believe, but is limited to "no greater distance from the coast than can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected," and so forth, or if any other vessel is engaged in conveying the liquor from that vessel to shore the distance is one hour of speed of the vessel conveying from the ship to the shore and not the ship itself. If it is a sail ship, this so-called 12-mile treaty does not extend the distance beyond territorial waters an inch. What is the speed of a vessel? That is a matter of fact which must be determined in each individual case. So that I fail to see where any advantage was obtained by the United States Government in the extension of territorial waters or of its right of search and seizure. On the other hand, the United States surrendered entirely, it seems to me, its right to prevent foreign steamships from having liquor on board while in territorial waters.

If liquor is found on the *Leviathan* or any other American ship—and I say if it is found, or perhaps it would be better to say if the prohibition officials look for it and find it—it constitutes a crime, for such possession being unlawful, and the officers of the ship and the ship itself is liable. In other words, an American ship is not permitted to have liquor on board at any time, but in article 3 of the convention the United States Government specifically and expressly contracted and agreed that—

> no penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attached to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors, when such liquors are listed as sea stores or cargo, etc., provided that such liquor shall be kept under seal.

That sure is one big concession. Why, it makes everybody on board ship immune and legalizes the ship to carry all the liquor it wants. Of course, there is a technical requirement of placing the liquor under seal. There is no provision as to what happens if the liquor is taken, the seal notwithstanding. There is no provision as to how this liquor should be listed or how the list should be verified by United States officials. So that it would be an extremely difficult thing to convict or even to indict a foreign vessel knowingly bringing liquor into the United States conforming simply with the technical requirements of the treaty and permitting the liquor to be removed after it is here. Why, actual knowledge of the removal would have to be brought home not only to the officers of the ship but to the owners of the ship before the ship could be held liable in the face of the provisions of the treaty. So I do not hesitate to say that if anyone believes that the so-called 12-mile treaties are for the benefit of prohibition enforcement they are surely laboring under a gross misapprehension. It is another instance that shows that the enforcement of prohibition, considering usage and customs in other countries of the world, the commercial relations which we as a Nation must maintain with other nations, the traffic which must necessarily exist between this country and other countries, is simply impossible.

With permission of the House, I shall insert the whole of the treaty at the conclusion of my remarks, and if time will permit I will revert to it.

Now, I want to inform the House, as I have informed the Secretary of the Treasury to-day, of the existence of a bootleg syndicate in New York City and, as I am informed, at other ports of the United States, whereby the socially select can receive all the pure and good liquor they want as long as they have the price, the liquor coming direct from Europe on foreign ships. The syndicate operates in this way:

The first list of customers was obtained from the first-class passenger lists on the big steamers. During the summer travel contact is established, trade created, and during the fall and winter business in liquor flourishes. The list is naturally growing. They now know that on the arrival of any of the big steamers a fresh supply of aged and pure liquor is available. The syndicate employs a traffic manager, who receives orders and directs deliveries. This manager has his office down at 32 Broadway. His room number—well, perhaps I had better not give you that—but if the department takes the two winning points of America's favorite indoor sport, commonly known as "galloping dominoes," there will be little difficulty in finding it. The manager receives a salary, it is stated, of $12,500 a year.

How is the liquor gotten out? I will tell you. When a ship arrives at port, as you know, the baggage is inspected, and after it passes the customs inspector a customs stamp is put on the baggage. This [indicating] is one of the stamps. After the baggage leaves the pier and clears the customs line these stamps are surreptitiously taken from the baggage. The market price of these stamps now is one bottle of whisky for three used stamps.

I want to make it clear that I am convinced the customs inspectors are in no way involved in this. The stamps are taken off the baggage after the baggage leaves the pier and is out of the jurisdiction of the custom inspectors. I do believe that the collector of customs in New York has not been sufficiently diligent and, surely, far from alert. These stamps are given to the men on the ships in charge of the liquor. Then empty trunks are sent on the pier. The orders are filled and these stamps are placed on the trunks, which gives them clearance and delivered to the customer. Here [exhibiting] are some of the original orders for the liquor. So painstaking are these patrons in giving the order that with the order a diagram of the route showing exact location of place of delivery is often given with the order, so that there can be no mistake as to the delivery. I show you here [exhibiting] several such diagrams.

Here [exhibiting] is a large photographic copy of the diagram. Here is the original order from which the photo was made of an order from the executive office of a very large business. You would all know the name if I told you. Here is the order [exhibiting] and here is the diagram of place of delivery of another customer located in Westchester County of my State. Only a few days ago a certain gentleman assumed a hypocritical attitude in making a speech on prohibition and law enforcement before the Seamen's Institute, and I find him among the ready customers of this bootleg syndicate. Six thousand dollars' worth of liquor was delivered in one office in the Gray-Bar Building. A very fashionable store on Fifth Avenue in the thrifty thirties, dealing with women's apparel, receives orders openly, the liquor coming from this source. Here is a gentleman engaged in the insurance business in Philadelphia and New York who puts in an order for several cases of liquor.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In a moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Here [exhibiting] is another order coming to Pelham, with a careful diagram of the locations. Here is a lady on Fifth Avenue; I have her order here [exhibiting]. This lady is prominent socially, sure has a versatile drinking taste, and her home will at least be well furnished for a cheerful Yuletide. Let me read her order, and I am reading from the original:

Six cases of Bollinger, 1919; 6 cases Old Tom gin; 6 cases Scotch; 2 cases French Vermouth; 1 case Italian Vermouth; 1 case Cointreaux and Chartreuse; 1 case liqueur brandy.

This little woman knows her liquor. It has been suggested to me that I give a typical order of a prominent business man. That is easy to do. I have quite an assortment here. Here is one, on the pad of a very prominent business man, and the pad bears the dignified caption, "Executive offices" [exhibiting]. Every New York Member would know this man, and I am sure a great many of the eastern Members know him by name. Here is his recent order from one of the large ships:

Five cases champagne, Paul Roger, 1917—

Apparently particular in the choice of his vintage—

5 cases whisky, Haig & Haig; 5 cases Gordon gin; 3 cases M. & R. Vermouth; 3 cases French Vermouth; 1 case Cointreaux; 1 Chartreuse, yellow; 1 Martel brandy.

That ends his order. Here is an order [exhibiting] from a hotel supply company. They use their own letterhead, but this firm seems to go in for Rhine wine, champagne, and not so strong on the whisky.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? If the gentleman gets all this evidence, what is the reason why the prohibition enforcement officers could not get it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can not answer why any official can not or will not get information that everyone else knows. The gentleman knows that every statement I made in this House in the last three or four years on flagrant violations of law has been substantiated. I gave the facts in the Ohio case, in the Indianapolis case; in the New York prohibition office I gave the facts straight in the Government-operation cases.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am not questioning the accuracy of the evidence.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have recommended to the Secretary of the Treasury, gentlemen, that it is simply ridiculous to have a stamp like this [exhibiting] on baggage, and I recommended in my letter a different colored stamp for each pier and each day, and the particular stamp not to be known until the baggage is ready for delivery, the baggage which remains overnight to be inspected anew.

I am pointing this out, gentlemen, in the course of the attitude I have assumed in attempting to convince you gentlemen who believe the prohibition law is being enforced that it is not being enforced and that it is humanly impossible to enforce it.

These are not exceptional cases. I would have had several hundreds of these orders but my informant weakened. He believed he might be identified through particular orders and he feared for his life. I can assure you the facts are just as I have stated and we have photographs of trunks that are used over and over again, besides original orders. It is an organized business.

On the door of this traffic manager's office appears the name of a reputable director of scenarios, who knows nothing about this and is out somewhere making pictures. Certainly the department can run this system down and put an end to it. I will give the Secretary of the Treasury all the information I have.

Now, let us get back to the treaty.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman give the names?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. Of the sellers.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is the gentleman willing to give the names of the consumers, the purchasers?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; it is no crime to buy.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Well, it ought to be.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can not help that. This is what you have done in your treaty of May 22, 1924, in order to obtain the privilege of boarding a vessel 12 miles out, which you do not do. You have provided in Article III that—

No penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attach to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors.

All they have to do is to constructively place liquor under seal, which means absolutely nothing.

The liquor I am talking about comes from such well-known ships as the *Majestic, Olympia, Homeric, Aquitania, Berengaria, Mauretania, I'le de France, Paris, Conte Brancamano, Conte Rosso, Duilio*, and others.

There are your facts. Now, gentlemen, is it fair to the people in New York who are being poisoned by the stuff that is being sold, and if one of my constituents has a pint in his possession he is hailed to court and is put on trial while those who are mighty and favored have this means of having distributed to them large quantities of their favorite brands and choice vintages?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for just one more brief question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think it is his duty as a citizen and as a Member of Congress to put the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice in possession of all these facts?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have already done so, and in my time I will ask the Clerk to read this letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1927.

Hon. ANDREW W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have learned of a system of liquor importation prevalent in all large ports which I believe can be stopped by administrative measures and not requiring any special legislation. It is just another instance illustrating the hopelessness of ever enforcing the prohibition law. Nevertheless, until the law is changed, action should be taken to prevent the continuance of the disgraceful conditions now in vogue.

Customs stamps placed on passengers' baggage after due inspection and for the purpose of passing the custom guard on the piers are removed from the baggage after it leaves the jurisdiction of the custom officials and then sold to a bootleg syndicate operating from the big passenger ships. One bottle of whisky for three used custom stamps is the last market price. I want to make it clear that these stamps are taken from the passengers' baggage after it leaves the piers, and I am certain that custom officials are in no way involved in these illegal transactions. I believe, however, that the collector of customs at New York has not been sufficiently diligent and far from alert.

Patrons desiring liquor of imported brands send their orders either through a representative of the syndicate, who operates from an office in lower Manhattan, or direct to the ship. Old trunks are brought on the pier and filled with liquor. These trunks are used over and over again. The purloined stamps are applied to the trunks and thereby get clearance from the piers. I have before me several original orders for liquor and have some custom stamps which were so used. I would have had possession of a great amount of original orders, but my informant weakened, as he was in fear of his life if his identity were established through the original orders to which he had access.

The liquor is brought here by large, first-class de luxe passenger ships engaged in trans-Atlantic service.

I make the following suggestions:

Immediate change of customs stamps; the use of different colored stamps for each day and each pier, the color not to be known until all baggage is ready for clearance from the dock; also baggage remaining overnight or leaving the pier another day should be again inspected. Strips should be pasted across the openings of the trunks or baggage and escorted to the pier exit by custom guards.

I submit these suggestions, based on my information of what is going on in New York and other ports, and feel that as long as this impossible law is on the statute books and the poor people of my city are being poisoned or haled to court for the possession of a pint, this source of special vintages for the mighty and favored should be stopped without further delay.

Yours very truly,

F. LAGUARDIA.

[Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The treaty referred to in my remarks is as follows:

Convention between the United States and Great Britain for prevention of smuggling of intoxicating liquors. Signed at Washington, January 23, 1924; ratification advised by the Senate, March 13, 1924; ratified by the President, March 21, 1924; ratified by Great Britain, April 30, 1924; ratifications exchanged at Washington, May 22, 1924; proclaimed, May 22, 1924

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas a convention between the United States of America and Great Britain to aid in the prevention of the smuggling of intoxicating liquors into the United States was concluded and signed by their respective plenipotentiaries at Washington on the 23d day of January, 1924, the original of which convention is word for word as follows:

The President of the United States of America;

And His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

Being desirous of avoiding any difficulties which might arise between them in connection with the laws in force in the United States on the subject of alcoholic beverages;

Have decided to conclude a convention for that purpose;

And have appointed as their plenipotentiaries

The President of the United States of America;

Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

The Right Hon. Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, G. C. M. G., K. C. B., his ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

Who having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coastline outwards and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

ARTICLE II

(1) His Britannic Majesty agrees that he will raise no objection to the boarding of private vessels under the British flag outside the limits of territorial waters by the authorities of the United States, its Territories or possessions, in order that enquiries may be addressed to those on board and an examination be made of the ship's papers for the purpose of ascertaining whether the vessel or those on board are endeavoring to import or have imported alcoholic beverages into the United States, its Territories or possessions, in violation of the laws there in force. When such enquiries and examination show a reasonable ground for suspicion a search of the vessel may be instituted.

(2) If there is reasonable cause for belief that the vessel has committed or is committing or attempting to commit an offense against the laws of the United States, its Territories or possessions, prohibiting the imporation of alcoholic beverages, the vessel may be seized and taken into a port of the United States, its Territories or possessions, for adjudication in accordance with such laws.

(3) The rights conferred by this article shall not be exercised at a greater distance from the coast of the United States, its Territories or possessions, than can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected of endeavoring to commit the offense. In cases, however, in which the liquor is intended to be conveyed to the United States, its Territories or possessions, by a vessel other than the one boarded and searched, it shall be the speed of such other vessel and not the speed of the vessel boarded which shall determine the distance from the coast at which the right under this article can be exercised.

ARTICLE III

No penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attach to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors when such liquors are listed as sea stores or cargo destined for a port foreign to the United States, its Territories or possessions, on board British vessels voyaging to or from ports of the United States, or its Territories or possessions, or passing through the territorial waters thereof, and such carriage shall be as now provided by law with respect to the transit of such liquors through the Panama Canal, provided that such liquors shall be kept under seal continuously while the vessel on which they are carried remains within said territorial waters, and that no part of such liquors shall at any time or place be unladen within the United States, its Territories or possessions.

ARTICLE IV

Any claim by a British vessel for compensation on the grounds that it has suffered loss or injury through the improper or unreasonable exercise of the rights considered by Article II of this treaty, or on the ground that it has not been given the benefit of Article III, shall be referred for the joint consideration of two persons, one of whom shall be nominated by each of the high contracting parties.

Effect shall be given to the recommendations contained in any such joint report. If no joint report can be agreed upon, the claim shall be referred to the claims commission established under the provisions of the agreement for the settlement of outstanding pecuniary claims, signed at Washington, August 18, 1910, but the claim shall not, before submission to the tribunal, required to be included in a schedule of claims confirmed in the manner therein provided.

ARTICLE V

This treaty shall be subject to ratification and shall remain in force for a period of one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications.

Three months before the expiration of the said period of one year either of the high contracting parties may give notice of its desire to propose modifications in the terms of the treaty.

If such modifications have not been agreed upon before the expiration of the term of one year mentioned above, the treaty shall lapse.

If no notice is given on either side of the desire to propose modifications, the treaty shall remain in force for another year, and so on automatically, but subject always in respect of each such period of a year to the right on either side to propose as provided above three months before its expiration modifications in the treaty, and to the provision that if such modifications are not agreed upon before the close of the period of one year, the treaty shall lapse.

ARTICLE VI

In the event that either of the high contracting parties shall be prevented either by judicial decision or legislative action from giving full effect to the provisions of the present treaty the said treaty shall automatically lapse, and on such lapse, or whenever this treaty shall cease to be in force, each high contracting party shall enjoy all the rights which it would have possessed had this treaty not been concluded.

The present convention shall be duly ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Britannic Majesty, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at the city of Washington this 23d day of January, A. D. 1924.

[SEAL.] CHARLES EVANS HUGHES.

[SEAL.] A. C. GEDDES.

And whereas the said convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratifications of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington on the 22d day of May, 1924;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America, have caused the said convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 22d day of May, A. D. 1924, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-eighth.

[SEAL.] CALVIN COOLIDGE.

By the President:

CHARLES E. HUGHES,

Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I do not come to carry to the House this morning an argument in behalf of any great governmental problem. I come rather to speak for a moment with reference to the soul of sentiment, if you please—a sentiment which it seems to me must animate every American citizen.

A sage once said that the best protection a republican form of government could possibly have is a satisfied ex-soldiery. I think this House has been doing fairly well in trying to prove its loyalty to the expression of that sage, but I ask it to take one step more in that good direction.

I come this morning to offer to my friends not an oratorical effort. You were told by our Speaker, who is always kind, that somebody would come to-day and bring down the oratorical stars and juggle them before you. But that is not for me. I come to you simply to call your attention to a modest little bill which has been introduced here—a bill to provide a plan for the holding in this Capital City next year of a joint reunion of the survivors of the armies of the blue and of the gray.

I do not know what better service in my capacity as a Member of this Congress I might render to my people and to my country generally than the service of doing my part in every way possible to obliterate the last remnant of ill feeling between the sections of the North and the sections of the South as we once knew them. [Applause.] Some might ask who inspired me to introduce this bill, which I now refer to as House bill No. 5577. Well, my inspiration might be said to have come directly from a wonderful veteran of the Civil War who lives in my own country, Hon. Lucius D. Richards, of Fremont, Nebr., aided and abetted by his able coadjutor, Judge Morley Cain, a prince of the house of Humanity. Those two, I presume, more than any others, are responsible for the inspiration. I feel I have a perfect right to propose this legislation because of the fact that I am about as far removed from sectional feeling with reference to that great struggle as any man might be. I recall, by recitation of my elders, that in the days of the strife about one-third of the men of the blood of my kinsmen were in the Union Army, about one-third in the Confederate Army, and about one-third (being Quakers) were

ministering to the sick and wounded on both sides. So I feel fully authorized to bear to the attention of the House a proposition of this kind.

Mr. JONES. May I interrupt the gentleman to ask a question?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Can the gentleman give us any estimate of how many are left among the old soldiers on either side?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Oh, yes; I can give you an estimate, and not only an estimate, I can give you the facts; and in the presentation of a case of this kind I want to deal with fact as well as with sentiment.

According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, who has better knowledge on this score, perhaps, than any other, I am informed that on the last day of November of this year there were still living 84,478 men who served in the Union Army. Now, I take it for granted that approximately the same number survive with reference to the Confederate side. How many would be able to attend such a reunion? I have talked with many of the old soldiers on both sides, and the general estimate is that the number would be less than 10,000. How do I gather that, or, rather, how do they reach that estimate? They reach it by taking the figures of the Pension Commissioner, which show that in round numbers 50,000 of the 80,000 living Union soldiers are now physically incapacitated, requiring the constant aid and attention of some other person to care for them because of infirmity; and of the remainder, the estimate is made by those who have taken account of the attendance at the annual reunions of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the United Confederate Veterans.

Oh, my friends, it is not so much the number; it is not so much the cost that this will be, for, indeed, while I am an extreme economist, as you all know, with reference to a sentiment of this kind the subject of cost does not come into or under my own consideration.

Out here this morning on the steps of the Capitol we witnessed the return of some captured Confederate flags by the people of the Northern State of Maine to the people of North Carolina. Those people up there in Maine, whom the southerners used to call the cold-blooded Yankees, are now warm, and they come down here bearing their captured flags to the North Carolinians, and I understand that if North Carolina did capture flags from the Maine regiments she has already or is to return them to the State of Maine.

I recall an incident a little while ago when the State of New Jersey, through its governor, returned some Confederate flags to a Southern State—I think it was North Carolina also—and here I have a little editorial from the New York Times, which says of that action:

The decision of the Governor of New Jersey to return to North Carolina flags of that State captured by New Jersey regiments during the Civil War will be approved in the North as well as in the South. Ever since the World War brought the sons of northern and southern veterans into close contact, the last remaining vestige of regional feeling has disappeared. The North has taken Lee to heart as a great American. The South has recognized the splendor of Lincoln. As one mark of the new spirit, many Confederate flags taken by northern troops and Union flags taken by the southerners have been returned. In following this custom New Jersey is contributing her share to the obliteration of unpleasant memories.

My friends, I would have you understand that my greatest thought, my greatest desire in presenting this little bill for this proposed reunion is that I may play a small part in obliterating those unhappy memories.

Now, the bill is very simple. It provides that there shall be a commission appointed, consisting of the General of the United States Army, the governors of the several States, and such persons as the President of the United States may be pleased to appoint, to have general charge of the reunion.

Some might say that a commission comprising all of the governors of the States would be unwieldy and that the governors could not come to Washington to meet very frequently; but you all know that here in the city of Washington is domiciled a splendid citizen from every State in the Union, many of them, and it would always be easy for the governor to appoint a proxy from his own State. I do not think this would be objectionable. I do not think of any better plea that I might leave with you, my friends, as a last remark on this subject, than to quote some of the utterances by the splendid ones who have represented us in high capacity in our Government in peace and in war.

I recall—it may have been at Appomattox, I do not know, but certainly soon thereafter—when the great General Grant uttered that immortal expression, "Let us have peace." It was only a little while after that that the wonderful Lee said, "We are all one now." It was not long after when dear, old General Gordon said, "The American people will forever remain an unbroken brotherhood from sea to sea"; and it was not long after when the princely McKinley said, "Let us strew flowers alike on the graves of those who wore the Blue and those who wore the Gray, for American valor is the common heritage of the Nation."

Living here in Washington to-day is a wonderful old soldier of the Confederacy. Ah, he knew what service was and he knew what suffering was. He was in the war for four and a half years, and the last part of it he spent in prison. His heart is so full of a desire to accomplish a final wiping away of all thought of bitterness between the two peoples that he has written a poem which has been set to music under the caption "The blend of the blue and the gray." I refer to Maj. John Alleine Brown, of Washington City. I know that many of you are personally acquainted with him, and I would like to leave as my closing plea in behalf of the proposed joint reunion the inspiring lines by Major Brown:

THE BLEND OF THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

By J. Alleine Brown

Oh, swell the song of kindred fame,
And blow, ye bugles, blow;
Nor more doth burn with heated flame
The passion of the foe;
The battle long hath ceased to rage,
There is no battle line.
The Nation's pride engraves the page,
Its joy invests the shrine.

The blend of blue lights up the gray,
The blend of gray the blue;
Together now those colors sway
With inspiration new.
'Tis patriot hands that sweep the lyre;
They chant on high their lay;
The blue invokes the Nation's choir,
"My country," sings the gray.

Then chant the blended blue and gray,
Tho' once they faced each other;
Those tattered ensigns furled away
Proclaim the name of brother.
We've found at last the vaulted sky
For us o'erspread alway;
Eternally the blue on high
Blends with the morning gray.

[Applause.]

THE ALIEN PROPERTY BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, commonly known as the alien property bill.

Pending that motion I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] if we can agree on time for general debate?

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman from Iowa want general debate confined to the bill? I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think it will be necessary, and I will not ask for it.

Mr. COLLIER. An agreement was practically made yesterday that the general debate would go on to-day and be concluded to-day with an additional hour when we took up the bill again on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the general debate on this side can be concluded to-day, and I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he can not get along with less than an hour on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] informs me that he can get along with 40 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, perhaps we better make it an hour, for I may want to make a few observations myself.

Mr. COLLIER. I have one or two other Members who say they want a little time on Monday, but I know that was not in the request that I made yesterday. Does not the gentleman think we can conclude the bill on the first legislative day?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not; because there are some other matters that will come on before it.

Mr. TILSON. Can not the other gentlemen that the gentleman from Mississippi speaks of go on to-day? There will be plenty of time to-day for all who wish to speak, with the exception of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLIER. I think the hour will be sufficient unless the gentleman from Iowa wants to take up too much of the extra 20 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Let the gentleman from Mississippi ask for an hour and 20 minutes on Monday or Tuesday; he need not use all of it.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; I will ask for an hour and 20 minutes, providing 1 hour of that time is given to me.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue during this day and not to exceed 1 hour and 20 minutes on the next day that the discussion of the bill is resumed; that the time to-day be controlled one half by the gentleman from Mississippi and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate shall continue to-day until the House adjourns, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], and not to exceed 1 hour and 20 minutes on the next day on which the bill is taken up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. GREEN of Iowa was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, before making any remarks on the bill, if any gentleman on this side of the aisle wants time in general debate I would like to have him make known his wishes to-day.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which is now presented to the House is in all its essential features the same as the one passed by an overwhelming majority in the House at the last session. There is no change whatever in its principles, in its policies, its ratio of payment, or in any particular except to make some improvements in its wording and on some comparatively unessential matters to make provision for certain things that were overlooked in the former bill.

Mr. Chairman, the aftermath of a great war always brings problems, and none of the problems that have been presented by reason of the conclusion of that war have been so perplexing as those arising out of the seizure of German property and the claims of American citizens against the German Government.

Whenever a solution has been sought it has been found that the discussion involves not only international law but also international policies of the Government from the very day it first came into existence. It must take into consideration the treaties of Versailles and of Berlin, which fixed the terms upon which peace was restored. It must examine negotiations and agreements between our diplomatic representatives and those of other countries. In short, it includes a study of the policies, treaties, and agreements in order to determine the proper basis of settlement; but even when all this is done, there remains one matter which has contributed more than anything else to the difficulties of settlement, and that is that Germany is not in any position to make immediate payment of the claims which may be established against her and which she rightfully ought to pay. If this was out of the way the solution would be comparatively easy.

Out of this tangled web of international policies, of treaties, of diplomatic negotiations, claims against our Government on the one hand and against the German Government on the other, threads can be picked out here and there upon which fine-spun and plausible arguments can be and have been constructed in favor of various theories, none of which, when considered by itself alone, leads to a solution of the problem. So difficult was this solution that four years passed after the war before anybody even ventured to make the suggestion as to how it ought to be solved. I do not think that any committee ever worked harder than the Ways and Means Committee did over the various bills that were submitted to it. It struggled for more than two months to no avail. The complications were such and the claims of the various parties so conflicting that there seemed to be no way of reconciling them, and no possible way out of the difficulty. Various plans were proposed and several submitted in the form of bills. I shall not discuss the propositions. Those who were Members of the House at a previous session are more or less familiar with them. I shall only say that so much opposition developed to all of them that none gave rise to any reasonable expectation that any of them could be passed by Congress, and upon none of them was the committee in complete accord. Nothing was done, and the whole matter went over to another session of the committee held a year ago last fall in advance of the session of Congress. In the meantime the demands of the claimants became more urgent and more pressing. Many of the claimants were experiencing severe financial stress by reason of this long and, as it appears to them, unwarranted delay.

After having had all of these hearings—and we had three separate sets of hearings—and after all our proceedings so far had come to naught, I said in the presence of the representatives of the various claimants that if this matter continued in the present form very much longer the chances would be that nothing would ever be done for any of the claimants on either side, and that the claims in this case might eventually be carried along and carried along until their fate was similar to that of the French spoliation claims—perfectly good—but those claims have been before Congress for more than a hundred years and nothing has ever been done with them. I said to the respective parties at that time that unless each party was willing to make some concession, come to some form of compromise about this matter, that we never would be able to get anywhere, and that it was imperatively necessary that they do so if they ever expected to realize upon their claims. Very much to my surprise, when I made this statement the claimants manifested a great deal of interest in the situation in the way of meeting and seeking out some sort of compromise in the matter. I made a suggestion to them at the time that instead of each claimant demanding that his claim be paid in full at once that each claimant concede that he should get only a part of his claim now and the rest of it later, but that all on both sides should eventually be paid and satisfied according to some just and fair rule; and I told them that if they were willing to do that it was probable that the committee could reach a solution of the problems that were before it. So the representatives of the German claimants and the representatives of the American claimants finally got together, and they agreed on this plan which is stated in the bill. I do not present it as an ideal solution of the problems which were presented to the committee. I do not say that in all respects it is fair and just in the abstract. I say that it is the best practical solution that could be worked out under the circumstances, and one which is so nearly just and so nearly fair that the parties on both sides are willing and desirous, I might say eager and anxious, to have it accepted.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is it provided under the bill that enough German property shall be retained in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian to insure the payment of claims that Americans hold against Germany for property destroyed by that country during the war and before we went into the war?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is provision made for that, though not entirely out of the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, but in other ways, as the gentleman will see as I proceed.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is not seeking to exercise the powers reserved to the Government under the Berlin treaty; that is, the holding of alien-enemy property as security for the payment of claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; and if the gentleman will read the report he will see that.

Mr. COX. I read the report, but I did not put that construction upon it. In part, the idea may be involved in the solution the gentleman offers, but I do not see that it is fully carried out.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is what I am interested in—whether you retain enough to insure the payment of our claims against the German Government for property of Americans that was destroyed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Let me go a little further with my statement, and I think, if the gentleman pleases, I will answer these questions. At the previous session of Congress there were many propositions for the disposition and settlement of these claims. The first involved a virtual confiscation of the German property which was in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian and its application to the payment of American claims. This plan, I think, met with so little support in Congress that it hardly needs be discussed at this time. I am quite sure that a great majority of the House were against the confiscation of private property seized in time of war, and believe that such property should ultimately be returned.

Mr. COX. What definition does the gentleman give to the term "confiscation"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will let me proceed I will be obliged.

The other plan required a large appropriation, not only to pay what the Government might owe for the ships, radio stations, and patents to which I have referred, but also to pay the American claimants. There was one other plan, I believe, which contemplated taking that portion of the reparation funds which was to be paid on account of our army of occupation, and applying it on the American claims. These plans were carefully considered by the committee. So much objection was made to making an appropriation on behalf of the Government to pay claims of individuals, or even to the use of the funds that were to be paid on account of our army of occupation, that no action was taken on the bills which carried these plans, and the whole matter, as I have said, went over until this session.

The lack of funds to pay the American claims required some new plan to be devised. Germany was a bankrupt nation. Whatever it could pay was being seized by the Allies. The committee also considered that any plan which would be acceptible to the House and to the Congress must provide for four matters which are stated in the report.

First. The settlement of the claims of the United States and its nationals against Germany and its nationals;

Second. The settlement of the claims of Germany and its nationals against the United States.

Third. The return of the property held by the Alien Property Custodian which was seized during the war as the private property of citizens of the countries with which we were at war.

Fourth—and I think this a very important and essential feature of the bill. The temporary retention of sufficient German property to reasonably insure the payment of American claims and a return of the property which is properly held as fast as American claims are paid.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield there? What does the gentleman mean by "temporary retention of a part of the alien property"? In the statement of policy you promise ultimately to return it. In this same statement of policy you undertake to have the Government guarantee the ultimate payment of claims of our nationals.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman please make his speech in his own time?

Mr. COX. If the gentleman does not desire to yield to a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know how I could make it any more plain. The expression "temporary retention" means we will retain it for a time and eventually turn it over.

Mr. COX. But the gentleman certainly does not object to informing the House what he means by "temporary retention"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I say, holding the property for a time until the American claims are paid, and gradually, as they are paid, we will release the property.

Mr. COX. This is the question, if the gentleman will yield: Do you condition the promise made by the bill for the ultimate payment of the German nationals upon the German Government fulfilling its obligations under the Dawes plan?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. The gentleman will have plenty of time to make his argument.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With pleasure.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the question of the gentleman from Georgia is more pertinent than the gentleman thinks it is. I had something to do with alien property matters in the beginning. The gentleman from Georgia is trying to differentiate—and very properly—the indefinite holding of property and confiscation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought I made it plain.

Mr. RAYBURN. What the gentleman means by this temporary business is possibly the very principle which underlies this bill.

Mr. COLLIER. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I think, with all deference to both of my colleagues the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas, it strikes me they have got the matter confused between a long-delayed payment and confiscation. This is simply a long-delayed payment. There is nothing indefinite. Any man can take a pencil and by figuring obtain the very last year of payment.

Mr. COX. Not at all. The point I am trying to develop, and which is supported by the admission of the gentleman having the floor, is that this bill means confiscation of alien private property. What if the German Government fails to keep its engagement under the Dawes plan with this Government acting not only in behalf of both itself and its nationals? That is the point I want to see developed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is open to my friend to make his argument later on. If the gentleman will examine the bill, he will find it does not provide for anything of the kind. I hope the gentleman will not state that I admit matters which I expressly deny.

The committee also considered it to be essential to any of the plans to be considered to make no discrimination for or against the German payments on the one hand or the American payments on the other. I think I can state the essential features of the plan in a few words.

Under this plan the German and the American claimants are each and all to receive the greater part of their claims when the proposed law goes into full effect and operation, and the remainder is to be deferred and paid out of the 2¼ per cent of the Dawes reparation fund.

It will be observed that there were three existing items requiring funds for payment.

First. The German claims for property seized by the Alien Property Custodian. The funds for the payment of the undeferred part of these claims were available in the hands of the custodian himself, and under the control of this Government.

Second. The payment of the part not deferred of the German claims for ships or radio stations, and so forth, taken over by the American Government. For the payment of these claims an appropriation must be made, it being generally conceded that our Government was liable therefor and ought to settle these claims. I am aware that that is a matter as to which there may be some discussion. I am speaking now only in general terms, but I will say this in this connection, that in negotiations had between the diplomatic representatives of our Government and those of England it was conceded that if we finally appropriate any of these ships or confiscate the radio stations or the patents, the value thereof should be taken out of our share of the reparation payments. In other words, we must pay for them one way or the other, and I am quite clear that it is better that we pay under a plan whereby we determine the measure of their value.

You will find a full report of that in Senate Document No. 173, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, which contains the correspondence of our Secretary of State with the representative of the English Government with reference to the reparation claims.

Now, as I said, this bill is not an ideal solution of the question. If it were possible to do so, the best way would be to pay all these claims in full on both sides, but there is no way in which that can be done. We worked faithfully and long upon the bill.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. I understand this is practically the same bill that was passed at the last session?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; with some slight differences.

Mr. ARNOLD. Can the gentleman state briefly what the differences are?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can take them and point them out to the gentleman, outside of verbal changes.

Mr. COX. There are a number of changes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Only a few outside of purely verbal changes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I think if the gentleman from Iowa can state specifically in his remarks in the RECORD just what the changes are it will be helpful, so that anyone can readily ascertain the facts. It will be helpful to the entire membership of the House if it appears in the RECORD. Please state just what the changes are in the bill from the bill of last Congress.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is a change on page 3, lines 19 and 20. That is a technical, clarifying change. It provides that "The amount so deducted shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. HUDSPETH. What did the old bill provide?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It left it to implication.

There is a change also on page 12, lines 6 and 7, which is merely a verbal change. It does not alter the effect of the bill.

There is also a change on page 20, subsection (d), a rewording, carrying out the purpose of the former law. Subsection (d) is rewritten in a more simple form. It provides now that—

> Fifty per cent of the amounts appropriated under the authority of section 4 shall be available for payments under paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (c) of this section, and shall be available only for such payments until such time as the payments authorized by such paragraphs have been completed.

Then on page 21 there is a new subsection (g) added, which the committee deemed necessary to prevent any possibility of double payment. Subsection (g) provides:

> That there shall be deducted from the amounts first payable under this section to any American national in respect of any debt, the

amount, if any, paid by the Alien Property Custodian in respect of such debt which was not credited by the Mixed Claims Commission in making its award.

Now, the reason for this paragraph is that the American nationals who had claims against any German who had property with the Alien Property Custodian could file his claim with the Alien Property Custodian and might get his claim allowed against this property. He could also proceed before the Mixed Claims Commission and get it allowed there. This resulted in a situation where it was possible to get a double allowance, and the purpose of subsection (g) is simply to prevent any party from getting a double payment.

Now, there is a change on page 24, line 13. The matter inclosed in parenthesis is added to make it certain that the rights of American creditors against property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian will not be interfered with in the retention of property of the German Government. This is in harmony with the new subsection (p), on page 34 of the bill.

On page 26, paragraph (e) has been added to make it certain that future payments from the fund to the Alien Property Custodian will be distributed pro rata to the German owners of the property.

On page 32 there is a change in the wording in the parenthesis in lines 6 and 7, where we have provided that the valuation by the Alien Property Custodian, in preparing for the return of the property, should be made "at the time, as near as may be, of the return."

There is also a sentence added on lines 19 and 20 and 21 in the wording, in harmony with the provision on page 24, line 13, heretofore explained.

On page 34 there is a new paragraph, subsection (p), which is inserted to take care of a situation not covered by the previous bill.

Then, in lines 24 and 25, at the bottom of page 34 and at the top of page 35, the wording has been changed somewhat in order to clarify the provision. It reads now:

The Alien Property Custodian shall allocate among the various trusts the funds in the "unallocated interest fund (as defined in section 28). Such allocation shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be based upon the average rate of earnings (determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) on the total amounts deposited under section 12."

Subsection (b), on page 35, has also been rewritten, because the payment of interest out of the unallocated interest fund is now well cared for by court decisions and opinions of the Attorney General not in existence at the time the bill was under consideration last Congress.

On page 36, section 28 has been rewritten, but there is no substantial change in policy.

Section 29 is new, for the purpose of carrying out further the purposes of the act.

There was some objection made to the original bill reported by the committee last year by the Alien Property Custodian in that it prevented him from seizing further property when under the law it ought to be seized and should be taken. Also, there was an objection made that if the law stood as we had it in the original bill he would have to take the whole property seized, if he enforced the outstanding demands, when the bill provided for the return of 80 per cent.

Mr. COX. Are we to understand that the Alien Property Custodian is to exercise war power in these times of peace by the further seizure of alien property?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no question but what all Germans ought to be treated in the same kind of way, as far as that is concerned. All of section 29 is new, to prevent the harsh enforcement of demands made during the war.

Section 14, on page 38, is also new. It deals with the return of income, and provides for unlimited return of income accruing after the bill becomes law, and considers all income prior thereto the same as other property held by the custodian.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. What is the total amount found by the Mixed Claims Commission to be due to American claimants, approximately?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The awards, with interest, as stated in the report, amount to $186,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. How much of this German property will be retained to insure the payments provided under the bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Twenty per cent of it will be retained.

Mr. COX. It will be more than that when you add unallocated interest.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; with the unallocated interest it will be more.

Mr. COX. That is a part of the principal, of course.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a part of the German property, as I view it.

Mr. COX. There will be about 40 per cent, will there not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, it may be very nearly that; I am not sure.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HOOPER. Has the Mixed Claims Commission entirely completed its work of adjudicating these claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They have practically completed their work.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman tell us what is the proportion of German claims against Americans and American claims against Germans?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The property of Germans in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, as stated in the report, amounts to $264,000,000, including the Austrian and Hungarian property, which, however, is not covered by this bill. Of German property alone it amounts to $245,000,000.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Then do we understand that only 20 per cent of that amount is to be retained to pay the $186,000,000 worth of claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but that 20 per cent is not the only amount to be available. A large part of the American claims will be paid at once.

Mr. COX. The bill also provides for the retention of other moneys making, as I recall from a reading of the report, about 40 per cent?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It may be pretty nearly 40 per cent of the German property. Then there is also provision made for the use of the 2¼ per cent that is paid under the Dawes reparations.

Mr. HUDSON. Just in a word or two, how much of this $186,000,000 worth of claims of American citizens will the taxpayers of America have to pay?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not anything, except claims for the German ships, patents, and radio stations.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Which went to the Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That went to the Government. It is a debt of the National Government.

Mr. COX. But only 50 per cent of that is being appropriated.

Mr. HUDSON. A debt of the National Government to our claimants?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; it is a debt of the National Government to the German nationals whose property was seized.

Mr. HUDSON. When we seized their ships of war did we pay them for them?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; furthermore, these are not ships of war. These are private ships.

Mr. HUDSON. Were they not their reserve cruisers, though, which were unarmed?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. HUDSON. I think they were.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; they were not. They were passenger vessels. It was private property, and what is more, we have directly admitted through our diplomatic representatives our liability for them.

Mr. DENISON. Did I understand the gentleman to say they were seized before the war began?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Before the war began they were interned in our harbors, not exactly seized.

Mr. COX. They came here for safety.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And they were seized at the time the war began.

Mr. DENISON. They were interned and when we got into the war our Government confiscated them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We took them the same as other property, but the Government itself used these ships and used the radio stations. This is the reason the Government is liable for them, as our diplomatic representatives have agreed.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. My recollection is that at the time the ships were seized, at least a considerable number of them had been very seriously damaged by the German crews; and as I understand it, that is to be taken into consideration in arriving at the value of the ships at the time they were taken.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes, of course. The bill provides for the appointment of an arbiter to hear the evidence and determine how much these ships were worth; not worth to the German owners before the war, but what they were worth under the particular circumstances under which they were seized and the particular condition in which our Government found them.

Some of them were injured to some extent and some were not. The *Leviathan*, for example—the former *Vaterland*—was not injured at all, except it had been in the harbor there for quite a while and some of its machinery was rusty.

Mr. NEWTON. But the *Crown Princess Cecile*, which was later the *Mount Vernon*, was very badly damaged in its internal machinery?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes, it was; but we pay for it only in the condition it was in when seized and what it was worth considering the fact also that these people could not use these ships until after the war was over.

Mr. NEWTON. That was my understanding.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All these matters are to be considered and the total amount to be allowed for these ships, radio stations, patents, and so on is not to exceed, under the bill, $100,000,000. We have put a stop limit on it.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HOOPER. There is no return of property involved in any one of these settlements between Germany and the United States, but it is all a money transaction? There is no return, in other words, of ships or of property or of anything of that sort?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think not, but I would not be sure about that. Where they have the identical property in the form of real estate in some cases it may be the property itself is to be returned.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Possibly the gentleman has already stated it, but what is the total amount of the claims of the German nationals against the American Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The German nationals have no claims against the American Government itself, except for the ships, radios, and so forth. They have claims against this property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How much is that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I stated that a short time ago. The total amount of the German property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian is a little over $245,000,000.

Mr. COX. The claims of the German nationals are represented by these claims of the German citizens for ships taken by this Government.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The purpose of my question was really to also ascertain the amount of the claims of American citizens against the German Government; the total of the claims already adjusted by the Mixed Claims Commission?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is given on page 23 of the report, and the total estimated awards is $186,000,000.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Those claims in the first instance will be paid out of the United States Treasury? This bill directs that they shall be paid at once with interest?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; this bill provides for the creation of a fund by taking 20 per cent of the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, the unallocated interest, 50 per cent of the amount appropriated for the payment of the German ships, on the one hand, and all together creating a fund.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Amounting to about how much as a preliminary fund?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The total amount of that fund immediately avaliable will be $138,000,000.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Then there will be the difference between $138,000,000 and $186,000,000, which will be paid by the Treasury.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That will be deferred.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will be deferred in part and eventually paid.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How will the Treasury be reimbursed for that $48,000,000, being the difference between the $138,000,000 and the $186,000,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Treasury will not pay this. It will be paid out of the fund for which provision is made in the bill.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. But in the first part of the bill the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay these claims out of money in the Treasury.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; the provision in the bill is for payment out of a fund which is created.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is not that to be met out of the annuities?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am referring to section 3, paragraphs (a) and (b), where it is stated—

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay an amount equal to the principal of each award so certified, plus the interest thereon.

This contemplates payment out of the Treasury, does it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That refers to the wards of the Mixed Claims Commission, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay an amount equal to the principal of such award at the rate fixed in the award so certified.

And they are only taken out of the special-deposit accounts created by section 5. The gentleman will find that in section (d).

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And there are no moneys to be paid out of the Treasury except those represented by the special-deposit fund for the value of the ships——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will read the report he will find how the fund is created.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And that will equal the amount claimed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will equal it all together.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. What some of us are worrying about is whether the taxpayers are going to pay claims of our citizens against the German Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; our taxpayers pay nothing in the end except for the German patents, the vessels, and the radios.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will pardon me, might it not work out so that the Government would have to pay its own nationals by taxation—in the event that the German Government should fail to meet its obligations under the Dawes agreement, would not this Government in the fulfillment of the promise here made its nationals in this bill have to make good their claims? I think that follows logically. It is only in that event that a considerable, or any, burden would be put on the taxpayers of this country, except it may be fairly said that the appropriation of the $50,000,000 may be somewhat of a burden, but half of it is to be used for the purpose of reimbursing the claims of the German nationals for the value of the ships seized by the American Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman may be correct about that, but I do not think any harm will result from it.

Mr. COX. I do not, either. I am taking the position that this Government owes it to its nationals to make good their claims against the German Government, because this Government sought to represent its nationals in a treaty made with Germany, and it entered into such an agreement that practically denies its nationals all hope of having their claims satisfied because of the indefinite time of payment under this arrangement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman does not mean that our Government could have gone over and collected the claims of Germany? Germany is a bankrupt Government.

Mr. COX. I know; I agree with the gentleman. Our nationals had to act through the Government. The Government represented its nationals in the adjustment of their claims against the German Government and made arrangements that could not possibly be satisfactory to anyone. The plan of payment by the German Government, if followed, would mean that few would ever be paid. I am prepared to accept the idea that this Government, because of its blunderings made in arranging for satisfaction of its nationals' claim, owes them the duty of seeing their claims are satisfied without unnecessary delay.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think our Government did well to get what it did.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. What amount has the German Government paid American claimants?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It has not paid anything. It has paid considerable sums to the American Government, which it now holds.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It returned all property in kind.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; the gentleman from Illinois is correct. The German Government did not confiscate any American property.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Are those claims to that extent paid?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The money has not been turned over to them; there is quite a large sum in the hands of the Government which can be used, something like $12,000,000 to $15,000,000—possibly more.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has the convention between the United States and Germany been extended? My understanding is that the period of time for filing claims has been under negotiation between the State Department and Germany.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A further extension for the presentation of claims I think has been dropped, but I can not state that positively.

Mr. PEERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. PEERY. In fixing the value of the vessels under the survey made by the Navy Department I note that they say that the aggregate value would not exceed $33,000,000. Now, I understand that the value of the ships is to be fixed by an arbiter.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PEERY. Are there any rules governing the exercise of his judgment as to value?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They are laid down in the bill. In reference to the value being fixed at $33,000,000, we sold a small portion of the ships, and some of the poorest ones brought $17,000,000. So I think it absurd to say that the value was not more than $33,000,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that we have spent some ten or twelve million dollars in reconditioning some of them?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but that does not enter into the situation at all. We only pay for those ships as we found them at the time, and we pay for them taking into consideration the fact that the owners could not use them until the end of the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Take the *Leviathan*, for example. Have we not spent something like $8,000,000 on that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think we have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And does our Government get that back when we return that ship to Germany?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; but we will not return the ship. We will pay for the ship in the condition in which we took it and we shall keep it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I wish the gentleman would inform us what is the reason, in his judgment, why the fundamental provisions of the treaty between the United States and Germany with regard to all this property and this whole subject are not lived up to and followed rather than this new plan which is brought in?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The reason is that you can not get it through Congress. You could not get a bill passed by the House and the Senate, and I do not believe by either House, which would provide for our confiscating all the German property and paying it on American claims, or, on the other hand, of our paying the German claims in full, and paying no attention to the provisions of the Berlin treaty that provided that we should hold that property until suitable provision had been made for the payment of the American claims.

Mr. COX. But will not the gentleman agree that the arrangement proposed by this bill does violate the terms of the Prussian treaty of 1828, which was in force at the time that war was declared against Germany and which was entered into for the express purpose of taking care of war conditions?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There are about a dozen reasons that I could give in answer to that. In the first place, the Prussian treaty was not a treaty with the governments that subsequently existed. It is true it did announce a principle which this Government has consistently adhered to ever since, but the matter that finally decided it was the Berlin treaty, which set aside all other treaties and which now controls the matter. This provided that we should hold that property until suitable provision had been made for the American claims.

In the face of that I do not believe that you could get 25 Members of this House to vote for absolutely turning back all of the German property without making any provision for the American claims.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And did not the treaty provide that Germany should remit all liability for the claims of its citizens, equitable or otherwise, upon the funds in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no. The provision to which the gentleman refers was with reference to other claims outside of the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Under the Berlin treaty Germany has made so-called suitable provision for the payment of these claims. Is not that right? The agreement was entered into, and Germany could not make a different agreement with the United States, if she wanted to, because the allied countries would not let her.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not see how you can construe a provision in a treaty having reference to future arrangements so as to apply it to arrangements that had already been made.

Mr. KEARNS. The arrangements have already been made, and they have agreed to pay 2¼ per cent. Suppose she had agreed to pay 2¼ per cent additional to us; what would England and the rest of the countries say?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not agree with the gentleman. I do not think suitable arrangements have been made.

Mr. COX. Let me make this suggestion. Under the Berlin treaty the American Government obligated itself to return all alien enemy property whensoever Germany should make suitable arrangements for the payment of American nationals in their claims against Germany. Now, when this Government entered into arrangements with Germany whereby agreement was made as to terms by which American nationals should be paid, then suitable arrangements, sanctioned and approved by this Government, had been made, and the obligation was upon this Government to make immediate return of all of the alien private property.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think I need answer that statement, but I will state this: The situation is just the same as though I held the property of a debtor and he wanted to have it back and I said, "I will give you back some of it; I will give you back all of it when you make suitable arrangement for the payment of debts that you owe me." That refers to future action. It does not refer to past action.

Mr. COX. All right; but when I execute you a lien on my property have I not made suitable arrangements?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly; we are merely enforcing the lien.

Mr. COX. But there is no such provision in the Berlin treaty.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is what it does provide. It says it shall be retained until—and what does that "until" refer to? It refers to the future.

Mr. COX. Absolutely; and the terms to be made in the future are fulfilled by the agreement made.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Making an agreement with reference to the future does not provide that the present arrangement is sufficient. We shall still retain this property until suitable arrangement has to be made. I do not care to argue the matter further.

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman understand to be meant by the agreement made with Germany under which Germany was to undertake the payment of our nationals? Was not that the arrangement referred to in the first treaty?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; that is exactly what it did not mean.

Mr. CROWTHER. I would like, with the permission of the gentleman, to ask the gentleman from Georgia to what he refers as a suitable arrangement having been made. Is that for the Dawes reparation plan?

Mr. COX. Absolutely.

Mr. CROWTHER. It is not considered a suitable proportion——

Mr. COX. The American Government, representing the American nationals, considered it suitable by agreeing to it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Not for the payment of these claims.

Mr. COX. Absolutely.

Mr. CROWTHER. No. I want the gentleman to show me where that is. No such decision has been made.

Mr. COX. There has been no adjudication of the question except that made by the Government in making it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I must decline to permit the gentleman to argue this matter. I think I have proceeded far enough, but I want to say a few words in conclusion, and I want to repeat in answer to remarks of gentlemen that the use of the word "until" refers to the future, until they made these suitable arrangements, and up to this day "suitable provision" has not been made.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am sorry I said anything. The gentleman can make his own argument. Now, I am perfectly aware there are some features of this bill, some details, which Members prefer to have changed. Probably that is true in reference to every other committee having these matters reported from a committee; but the committee unanimously agreed to sink its little differences they might have in the preparation of the bill and report this bill to the House as the best solution, possibly, which could be made.

The bill has been worked out as a compromise on the part of the committee, as well as on the part of the claimants. I do not assert that it will result in exact justice being done. The complicated nature of the situation makes this practically impossible. I do insist that it offers a practical solution of the difficult problem, and in general it is fair and equitable. There may be some who do not favor the bill, because they consider that some claimants have not received everything to which they

are entitled. Before they speak and before they vote on this bill let me say to them that the very persons on whose behalf they are acting hope they will refrain from any opposition to the bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to one more question, and I promise that I will not ask another? Does the gentleman think Congress ought to permit an arrangement between private parties to control our policy as to the course Congress ought to adopt?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think when opposing claimants agree and say they are perfectly satisfied, that they want to have Congress pass it, it is the best Congress can do. There is one feature I omitted. This bill provides that American claims not exceeding $100,000 shall be paid, and it also provides that all death claims on the part of American citizens shall be paid. Now, that resulted in deferring American claims a little further off; but the large claims, such as the Standard Oil and others, all were agreeable to that provision. They said they could wait, but those people suffering such losses could not wait.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Many of us are not concerned at all about these claims, but the question with us is, Is it fair to the American Government and the American taxpayer? I wonder if the gentleman, in whom we have such great confidence, will assure us, some of us have not been able to master all the details of this complicated plan—and I am approaching the matter with some little trepidation—if the gentleman would be willing to assure us that in his solemn judgment as far as the danger to the taxpayer is concerned, as far as our Government is concerned, it is a perfectly proper and perfectly just proceeding.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think so. I do not believe it will cost the American Government a cent except what it justly owes for the ships, radios, and other properties which we seized.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am in favor of the bill and shall vote for it. When it came up last year I asked the question then and I ask it now. Did the committee give further consideration to the claims made by private insurance companies who were amply rewarded by their premiums during the war? Does the gentleman think they ought to be paid 100 cents on the dollar after they were paid in part for claims against Germany?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Personally and as an abstract matter of justice I think they ought not to be paid, but as a matter of law and of treaty I do not know of any way to get out of paying them. The treaty provided that these claims should be submitted to the Mixed Commission. The Mixed Commission found that these insurance claims were proper and just, and so in my opinion we are bound by the treaty to pay them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will not the gentleman take another minute to answer the second part of that question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I would like to proceed for just a few minutes further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not have to ask unanimous consent. Half of the time belongs to him. We are on general debate. That was our agreement at the time. I am saying that for the guidance of the Chair in his ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi, the Chair thinks he ought to say that according to the understanding of the Chair no man has the right to occupy more than one hour except by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa to proceed for 10 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I was very glad to get that answer, but I take issue with the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on this, however, that it seems to me that it is reserved to Congress only to say whether that right is well established. I am not a lawyer, much less an international lawyer, but it seems to me that Congress ought to assume the responsibility of declaring what that policy shall be.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think when we make a solemn treaty we ought to abide by it. I do not like this arrangement myself, but we are bound to it.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly.

Mrs. KAHN. I would like to know if there are included in these insurance companies those German insurance companies that welshed on the payments of their policies?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think so. These are American insurance companies of which we have been speaking.

Mrs. KAHN. Some of those German insurance companies welshed. I wanted to know if they were going to get back good American money.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. I think the lady, if she will pardon me, is mistaken as to that. Some persons wanted to put in the bill a provision to withhold from the companies to which the lady refers property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. There was before the committee some argument favoring that, but the committee was opposed to it.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. There are some German insurance companies whose property is now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. DENISON. I am sure of it; and when this property is returned to the German claimants those insurance companies will get their payments just as other German nationals will get theirs. These German insurance companies referred to failed to pay the losses.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know how that could occur. If the property was here in America, they could get their claims paid if the claims were legal.

Mr. DENISON. It was in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. It must have been in the United States before the Alien Property Custodian seized it. It must have been here, otherwise the Alien Property Custodian could not have seized it, and if there was any legal claim it could have been collected.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. I agree perfectly with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] as to the German insurance companies.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The Alien Property Custodian is one funtionary and the Mixed Claims Commission is another. So far as the Mixed Claims Commission is concerned, they have not had anything to do with it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The passage of this bill is urgent. There are certain people who are actually praying that this bill should be passed. At present we are getting nowhere and doing nothing. Our further failure to act would be a proof of inefficiency and it would constitute a reproach upon our honor and a conviction on the part of people abroad that even with funds set aside in the Treasury for this purpose we are not willing to make the payments which are already too long deferred. It is true that some of these payments are deferred 20 years. This bill makes only the first step in the settlement of these claims, but, in my judgment, within five years the situation in Germany will be such that all of these claims can be concluded. I think action here should be no longer delayed and I trust the bill will be passed by so large a majority as to demonstrate to the German Government that the American Government insists on being fair in its national dealings and at the same time protects the rights of its own citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to make a request of the committee. I believe that the questions asked by the Members are very important and very illuminating and do much toward bringing out the real facts, but owing to the fact that the report on this bill came out only on yesterday and several Members have asked me to make an explanation of the bill itself, I would like to proceed about 8 or 10 minutes without any interruption, and then I shall be glad to yield for any question which any Members desire to ask, because I have always tried to answer questions as best I could.

Now, I want at the outset to say that this bill is a nonpartisan measure, like other measures that were connected with the war.

During the period of the war the members of the Ways and Means Committee sat around the committee table and raised $35,000,000,000, more or less, necessary to carry on that war. During that entire time, if a stranger from another country had been present, he could not have told on which side the Democrats sat and on which side the Republicans sat, because it was nonpartisan and we were all for America. This bill grows out of the war, and actuated by that same nonpartisan spirit we have considered it. I want to reiterate what the chairman of the committee has said that no bill has ever come before our committee that was more technical in its nature. We studied it longer and spent more time on this bill than perhaps any other bill considered by the committee for some time.

Let us see what the bill is. This bill has two purposes: First, to return to Germany the property we seized belonging to German nationals; and, second, to return to American claimants the money Germany owes them. The American claims may be divided into two classes. First, claims of the United States; and, second, claims of American nationals. When war was declared in Europe the German Army went into Belgium and destroyed or took over and converted to their use a great deal of American property. Germany owes American nationals $180,000,000, in round figures, for property they destroyed and for property they took. This includes death claims arising out of such catastrophes as the sinking of the *Lusitania* and other ships. In addition to that they owe the Government of the United States $60,000,000. This claim for the most part is for ships that were owned by the United States and which Germany sunk on the high seas before war was declared. To recapitulate, Germany therefore owes, in round figures, to both the nationals of America and the Government of the United States $250,000,000 or $255,000,000.

Before war was declared a great many German ships, in order to escape capture, came into our ports. Two months before war between the United States and Germany was declared the President of the United States, speaking through the Secretary of State, gave an assurance that German vessels which had sought an asylum of refuge in America would not be taken over by the United States in the event of war; that we would not take advantage of the fact that we had permitted them to come in and then afterwards confiscate them in the event of a war between the two countries.

Then as soon as war was declared anywhere from $350,000,000 to $400,000,000 worth of property in the United States belonging to various German citizens and German interests was seized and placed in the hands of an Alien Property Custodian. The Alien Property Custodian sold some of that property and there is to-day $180,000,000 received from those sales in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, all of which was put into Liberty bonds.

It has been nearly 10 years after the war and the question arises: What are we going to do with this money? And what are we going to do with the rest of the German property? How are we going to satisfy both the German claims and the American claims? We could do, my friends, like the Allies did, and I am not criticizing them. The treaty of Versailles provided that the Allies should take the property of German nationals that they had seized and apply that property to claims that their nationals had against Germany. We were not a party to the treaty of Versailles, but in the treaty of Berlin, when we made our treaty with Germany, we reserved the right to take advantage of any provision given to any other country in the treaty of Versailles.

Under the provisions of the Berlin treaty, under a decision of the United States Supreme Court, and under many rules of international law the United States has the legal right as well as the power, if it so desires, to confiscate all of the property now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, including all of these ships and 2,200 patents amounting to about $7,500,000. We took over a couple of radio stations valued at $1,000,000, and we could also confiscate them. We have the right under international law, we have the right under an opinion of the Supreme Court, and we have the right under the treaty of Berlin, if we so desire, to confiscate and take that property. But, my friends, we have precedents in America from the time this country took its place among the nations of the earth to the contrary. In 1802, when we had a population of less than three and a half million people, the United States Government paid out of the Public Treasury $3,000,000—an enormous sum in those days—to reimburse the nationals of England for property that we had taken during the Revolutionary War.

There are two courses open to this House; that is, to follow the plan of our allies and confiscate this property or to return it to German nationals. To me it is abhorrent to every idea of justice to take the property of individuals to pay the debts of a nation. I believe we should return this property to its former owners. But what are we going to do about the money they owe us? My friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is very much concerned over this matter. My friends, I want to say to you and to the gentleman from Georgia that I believe in giving exact justice to Germany. But I do not believe in granting more justice to Germany than that granted to our own American citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit me, may I say my chief concern is in seeing this Government fulfill its every engagement, whether made with its own nationals or with the other powers of the world.

Mr. COLLIER. I am sure of that. I have the highest opinion of both the gentleman's purpose and the splendid ability which he has shown on this and many other occasions and which I know he will show Monday when he makes the great speech which I know he is going to make on the question at that time. I will be pleased a little later on when I get through with the elementals to discuss this with my friend from Georgia further. I would like to proceed now a few moments more on the bill. I have not told you yet what is in the bill; in fact, neither the chairman nor myself have gone into the details of the bill.

In the treaty of Berlin the American Government was given a priority with respect to the cost of the army of occupation. This has really nothing to do with the bill, but I want to state it for the reason the question is asked why we preferred in priorities the citizens of the United States above the Government of the United States. My answer to that is that the Federal Government reserved to itself priority in the treaty of Berlin. The $13,000,000 that Germany pays for the cost of the army of occupation must be paid first, and we did not feel the Government ought to take priority over its citizens all the time.

In the treaty of Versailles it was determined by a commission appointed for that purpose that Germany should be assessed damages of 132,000,000,000 gold marks, which amounted in our money to about $35,000,000,000. It was absolutely impossible for Germany to pay this, and if I may use a common expression used in connection with business concerns, Germany did just like a corporation would have done if it found its liabilities far beyond its resources. They practically went into the hands of a receiver, and the result was the Dawes Commission and the Dawes annuities.

Under the Dawes annuities—and this is a very important matter in connection with this bill—the various nations received a pro rata part of Germany's annual reparation payments based on what was believed to be Germany's capacity to pay. The part of the United States was two and a quarter per cent, or, to be accurate, about $10,700,000 annually. This was the part the United States was to receive on the Dawes annuity to be applied to the settlement of American claims.

The Allies were anxious for the United States to adopt the same principle which they had adopted for two reasons: One was because, perhaps, it would have looked better, although I do not care to dwell on that phase of the matter. We are not concerned with reasons which actuated other nations; but the Allies had a business reason for wanting us to adopt their plan.

If we had taken the German property in our hands and turned it over to American claimants, then we would not have participated in this $10,700,000 Dawes annuity, and that amount would have gone into the common fund and the share of the Allies on a pro rata basis would have been increased accordingly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman is a member of the committee which drafted this bill, and I know is always able to explain any bill that comes out of his committee. I have claimants both ways on this matter, and what they would like to know is this: How much money has the Alien Property Custodian, either the property of Germany or of the nationals of Germany?

Mr. COLLIER. That is a very pertinent question, because I want to show you now how we provide for these payments.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] asked a very pertinent question when he asked the chairman of the committee if he thought the Congress in the settlement of claims ought to be controlled by the desires and wishes and agreements of the claimants themselves. I will answer that question like, I presume, the chairman did, although I was called out of the room just as the gentleman propounded his question. I say that

Congress should not be so controlled, but when we have other people's money and when we have been trying for 10 years to distribute and properly return it and those on both sides get together and say if we distribute it in this way it will satisfy them, while we might not be bound by that, I will say it was a very persuading factor in the consideration of this matter.

In answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] it is variously estimated that the amount of German property seized by the Alien Property Custodian is between $350,000,000 and $400,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Belonging to Germany?

Mr. COLLIER. Belonging to the citizens of Germany. Our claims are $255,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Our claims are $255,000,000?

Mr. COLLIER. Two hundred and fifty-five millions dollars.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, said we are holding only a portion of that money. How much are we reserving for payment of the claims of Americans?

Mr. COLLIER. I will give the gentleman the plan which we adopted. I do not consider it is an ideal plan because there is one feature in the plan which I do not like at all, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] put his hand on it—the insurance feature. I do not like that at all. I do not think it is fair. But we are dealing with a commission which is an international commission. We can not amend its report. Its report was made by a representative from Germany, a representative from the United States, and a third party, the umpire; and when the report is made, if we attempt to amend it, the two representatives of the countries and the umpire have to get together again; and while there may be, and there is, a technical and legal right to give these insurance companies the money, yet I am not in sympathy with that part of the bill. However, I am not going to permit that to prevent me from supporting this measure and restoring this money to these people, because it has been delayed so long it is now time for us to get away from these war claims.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, who is on a committee that at one time looked into this matter.

Mr. RAYBURN. I presume neither the gentleman nor the committee he represents contends that the recommendation of this commission is building on the Congress?

Mr. COLLIER. Certainly not; but whenever we change a question of fact, after it has practically been agreed on, while it may not be binding upon this House, yet it jeopardizes the proceedings, and Germany itself, through its agent, was willing to pay this money. It is an American claim against Germany, and if their representative was ready and willing and agreed to pay it, I am not going to get mad myself enough to jeopardize this bill on that account.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was simply trying to establish what was the committee's idea of the principle involved. My conception of this whole matter is that Congress is always supreme in such matters and is not bound by any finding of any commission anywhere; not even commissioners to bring about a peace treaty, or anything of that sort.

Mr. COLLIER. That is true; and if a majority vote of this House and the Senate so declares, and the President signs such a bill, we can confiscate every dollar of this property and every single ship, if we want to, and we would be acting within our rights under the law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The committee was controlled largely, at least I was, by the provisions of the treaty. These awards have been made in pursuance of the treaty, and although we have the power to enact some law to violate the treaty, I do not think it ought to be done. Nobody has suggested a solution as to where the money should go. The Germans have agreed, and are willing to pay it, and where should it go?

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if it appeared that the insurance companies had charged war insurance rates?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It was shown that the insurance companies had made no unreasonable profits.

Mr. JONES. Why should they have a return of the money?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a well-known principle of law that they are subrogated to the rights of the parties insured.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said that he did not think the insurance companies were entitled to it, but he does not want to jeopardize the passage of the bill. Why can not we amend the bill to exclude payment to the insurance companies.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And then have no bill.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Why can not the bill be amended and the insurance claims be thrown out?

Mr. COLLIER. I suppose it could, but they tell me it would defeat it. Oh, I see so many things done that I think can not be done, and so many things not done that I think can be done that I do not know.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I understand they propose to return a part of the money at once and not to hold it for the debts of the Americans.

Mr. COLLIER. I am coming to that. It is a complicated arrangement. If the House will give me its attention I will explain it now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. You are not holding all the money for the payment of the American citizens' claims?

Mr. COLLIER. We are going to pay Germany 80 per cent at the start.

Mr. COX. But you have already paid claims under $10,000?

Mr. COLLIER. Now, I want to say two things. First, the value of the ships was a matter of great controversy and probably will be a matter of great controversy under the five-minute rule. That is where the only appropriation lies. The bill authorizes the appropriation of $100,000,000 to pay for the ships that Germany brought into the country before the war and which we seized. It provides further for the appropriation of only $50,000,000, the other $50,000,000 being deferred as we hope forever.

Now, there is going to be a great deal of complaint on that. I want to say to the Members on both sides that as far as we can learn, after making all the inquiry everywhere we could, we find that the American Government is not going to lose a cent, even if the entire $100,000,000 is appropriated. We have used a good many of the vessels—we used them during the war—and their value to us at the time when we needed vessels was very great. We have also sold a number of these vessels, and even if we have to expend the entire $100,000,000, I repeat, I do not believe the Federal Government will be out anything on the shipping business. We hope that we will not have to appropriate over $50,000,000.

What is the value of the ships? There is a real conflict between the United States and Germany. We claim they are worth $33,000,000 and they claim they are worth $330,000,000, or ten times as much.

Now, we made an arbitrary yardstick to measure value of the ships. Here is the yardstick. We assess the value of the ships, what they were worth when they entered the American ports, minus the loss to Germany in not being able to use them during the war; the fact that they were laid up and out of use and thereby was a loss to Germany over an indeterminate period which meant the end of the war.

It might have been five months or six months or three years or five years. That is for the arbiter to decide what this would amount to. Taking that into consideration he is going to determine the valuation of the ships. We get $10,700,000 a year under the Dawes plan to pay for American claims, and Germany has agreed to pay every year this $10,700,000 to pay off American claimants until all claims are satisfied. Why do we not turn the German property over to them then and accept the Dawes payment in return? Because it would take the American claimants 75 years to get their money back under that plan. And suppose—although we hope not—that after 10 or 15 years Germany quits making those payments. Then American claimants would never get their money. So, while I say we want to be fair and just to Germany, we do not want to give the German claimants any priority over our own citizens.

What are we going to do? The bill provides that German nationals shall be paid 80 per cent of their claims at once, but that "at once" does not mean right now. [Laughter.] I have had several men come up and say, "I am never going to vote to pay 80 per cent of Germany's claims right now and not settle the American claims until 1933." Amongst the German claimants there have been a great many deaths and other changes in ownership. I believe implicitly that a great part of the American claimants will be paid long before a considerable part of that 80 per cent will be paid to Germany, because of the difficulty they are going to have in adjudicating and proving their claims, while our claims are already adjudicated. Now then, we will give them 80 per cent when they prove the claims. We now come to American claimants. We are going to sell all of the

German property. The Alien Property Custodian is empowered to do that, and we are going to arbitrarily take 20 per cent of what we receive from the sale of German property, which will be $40,000,000, and we are going to put that in a fund from which we will pay American claims. For convenience we will call this fund the pot. On the $180,000,000 of Liberty bonds that we purchased from the sale of German property unallocated interest has accrued which amounts to $23,000,000. We are going to put that in the pot. That gives us $40,000,000 and $33,000,000, so that we have $73,000,000 in the pot. Then we appropirate $50,000,000 for ships, and we are going to give $25,000,000 of that to the fellows that lost the ships and we are going to take the other $25,000,000 and put that in the pot. That makes $98,000,000. We have already received two payments under the Dawes plan amounting in round numbers to about $23,000,000, and we are going to put that in the pot. We have now put in the pot about $120,000,000. What are we going to do with that money? We are going to pay every dollar in that pot to American citizens and claimants, and we are going to pay under a certain order of priority. The first priority will be the expenses of the commission. The second priority, which amounts to $4,000,000, and that which comes first of all claims, are what are called death claims and personal-injury cases. We are going to pay $4,000,000 and satisfy every claim resulting from the deaths and personal injuries where awards have been granted to American claimants by the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. DEAL. And are you going to pay that "at once"?

Mr. COLLIER. Pay them at once; and that means right now, as soon as the bill is passed. There will be no delay about those claims, because they have all been adjudicated. These claims amount to $4,000,000. Then we are going to take $29,000,000 out of that pot and pay off every American claim that amounts to $100,000 or less. That leaves a balance in the pot of about $82,000,000. The payment of this $33,000,000 satisfies the claim of every American national less than $200,000. We will then take $17,800,000 and award $100,000 on account of all other American claims, which will cut down the pot to $64,000,000; $6,000,000 will then be used to pay accrued interest to American claimants, leaving in the pot approximately $58,000,000. All American claimants will participate in the remainder, share and share alike, until the pot is exhausted.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that the claims of the German nationals have not yet been adjudicated. Did they come before the same Mixed Claims Commission that our people presented their claims to?

Mr. COLLIER. What I meant by not being adjudicated is that they have not been adjudicated before our Claims Commission.

Mr. SNELL. Do they come to our Claims Commission for final approval?

Mr. COLLIER. They will have to go to the umpire. He is the man charged with the sale of these ships and paying off those claims. It is a tremendous responsibility for one man, but the bill provides it.

Mr. SNELL. Are they adjudicated over there or settled to a certain extent that a certain amount belongs to one man; and has that been referred to this umpire over here?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; and the umpire is the final arbiter.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is not that limited to ships, radios, and patents?

Mr. SNELL. I am asking about German nationals.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Oh, that is a matter of bookkeeping; that is all settled.

Mr. COLLIER. Gentlemen, the difficulty is going to be in Germany, not over here. We will have deaths, and so forth, and the delay is going to be caused in Germany.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is not there a confusion in the mind of the gentleman from New York. The claim of the average German property owner we know how much it is, but what we do not know is the property taken by the German Government—ships, radio, and patents.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They are all together.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. We know how much the claim of the individual German property owner is.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman made the statement that some Members objected to paying 80 per cent of the German claims, and the reason the gentleman approved doing that is because the German claims have not yet been adjudicated.

Mr. COLLIER. Perhaps I had the wrong idea. The gentleman from New York states that as far as the nationals themselves are concerned the difficulty which we understand has arisen in Germany would delay very materially.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is to be made by a new officer set up in this bill, that of arbiter, a new position created in this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. To make it clear, there are three tribunals. The Alien Property Custodian, before whom the German claims go except those relating to ships, radio, and patents. The owner of those will go to the arbiter, for whose election there is a provision in this bill. The American claims all go before the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. COLLIER. That is right.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. You have those three different tribunals.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLIER. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. What does the gentleman say is the amount of our Government claims?

Mr. COLLIER. Our own Government claims $60,000,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. The next question. How much of this money has been put in the pot? Will not all of that money be exhausted by it being paid to our American nationals before our Government claims are paid?

Mr. COLLIER. If Germany fails to keep her agreement at all? That is the idea of holding 20 per cent.

Mr. HASTINGS. Are we holding enough of German property to be absolutely sure that all the claims of our nationals and all the claims of our own Government will be paid?

Mr. COLLIER. I think so.

Mr. HASTINGS. Now, does the gentleman have any doubt about that?

Mr. COLLIER. I will say this to the gentleman——

Mr. HASTINGS. Has the gentleman any doubt about that? That is the point I am after.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me say this to the gentleman: I have a note here that in 1933 the entire pot will be exhausted.

Mr. HASTINGS. Under this arrangement when will all the claims of our Government be paid—through what series of years?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, I could not say.

Mr. HASTINGS. Run over 62 years, as with some——

Mr. COLLIER. Oh, no; nothing like that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, 25 years?

Mr. COLLIER. I could not answer the gentleman accurately.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. About 17 years for final payment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do we take the German Government's lien on the property?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. For part of it.

Mr. HASTINGS. What part of the security will remain after this pot is exhausted?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Twenty per cent.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is another question——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will call attention to the fact the American claimants are perfectly satisfied with that.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am looking after the American Government. Is it not going to give the Government anything?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We have forty or fifty million dollars of claims arising against the German Government.

Mr. HASTINGS. How is the American Government to be paid, or when? Are we reserving enough money in this pot to pay for the next few years?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They go under the Dawes agreement.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is another question.

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman does not give me time to answer either one.

Mr. HASTINGS. What I want to get down to in the last analysis is, I want to know when we can expect the American claims to be paid, and when the Government of the United States claims are to be paid, which are fifty or sixty million dollars?

Mr. COLLIER. That would depend, of course, solely and alone upon the question whether or not we collected the promissory notes of the other governments. Whenever you accept a series of promissory notes and can go before a committee and say positively that you know when these notes will be paid, then I can speak positively about this.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then we are releasing some property we have now as security and are taking our chances to collect?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. You say that according to the treaty of Berlin it was agreed between our Government and the Government of Germany that the property of the German nationals in this country should not be confiscated and the proceeds applied to the payment of these debts to our nationals and our own American Government?

Mr. COLLIER. I would not go so far as to say we agreed to such a proposition. But in the very preamble of that

treaty we stated that we were not going to do it. But there is an implied statement running all through that treaty showing that we could do it. There is no question on that. The United States has absolutely got the legal right, sanctioned by international law and the Supreme Court decisions, if it wanted to, to take every dollar of that fund.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then the gentleman is not as positive now as he was a few moments ago as to the effect of that law and the treaty of Berlin?

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman will permit, I think I can shed some light on the question involved in the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Oklahoma. I want to say that this is the most complete report ever submitted by the committee in explanation of a very complicated bill, and I commend the consideration of it to our Members.

But in answer to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, he will find on page 12 of the report, item 2—

Awards on behalf of the United States Government: Principal of awards entered, $42,034,794.41; interest to January 1, 1928, on awards entered, $19,203,567.03; a total of principal and interest of $61,238,361.44.

Now, as I understand the inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma to the gentleman from Mississippi, it is whether or not we have security for the $61,000,000 of indebtedness, that it will be in the hands of our Government if we pay the claims of the German nationals?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. The reply I would make the gentleman is this: While we have an indisputed right, as he has time and time again said, to confiscate this property, that is not the duty of our Congress. I do not think that any of us want to do that. And further than that, the money that we are now holding under the Mixed Claims Commission—or, rather, under the Alien Property Custodian—is the property of German individuals. Therefore we can not pay that individual money of a German citizen and call it as part of the German national fund to pay our national debt.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did we provide that in our treaty of Berlin?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is in the treaty.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why did we put it in?

Mr. TREADWAY. You should ask that question of the officials who made the treaty. It is not for us to answer. It is fair to say this, however, that this being public money, not being collateral for a private claim, we must pay under the treaty with Germany in so far as our security for the payment of the national claims can admit it.

Mr. HASTINGS. If we put that in the treaty for priority, why do we turn around now and relinquish that right?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Suitable provision should be made. The gentleman from Georgia thinks suitable provision for that should be made now. I do not think so.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Certainly.

Mr. RAINEY. How much does the German Government owe us on our expenses of occupation?

Mr. COLLIER. Two hundred and fifty-five million dollars.

Mr. RAINEY. We could scale that down a little bit?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. That is to be paid out of the Dawes reparations?

Mr. COLLIER. That has nothing to do with the treaty of reparation and the treaty of Berlin. The Government took priority on that. If they make only one payment it would go on the army of occupation.

Mr. RAINEY. How are we going to get paid the money due us for our army of occupation unless we get it out of the reparations?

Mr. COLLIER. There is no way that I know of except to declare war.

Mr. RAINEY. If we are to depend on that alone, and they pay it without interest, it will take 30 years under the Dawes Commission plan to reimburse us for the expense of our army of occupation. If they pay it with interest it will take from 40 to 50 years; and if you add to that $60,000,000 to be paid to the Federal Government last of all, and that would include the reimbursing of this Government for damages due to loss of life on the *Lusitania*, you will find it will be 70 or 80 years before we can recover this money, and it would not be surprising if we had to pay those claims out of our Treasury.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I have not the floor, but I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. This bill itself in no way fixes the amount due us for the occupation of American troops or anything of that kind?

Mr. COLLIER. It has nothing in the world to do with it.

Mr. RAINEY. Except that it postpones that until last of all, and the Treasury may not get that back for 70 or 80 years.

Mr. COLLIER. Does my colleague from Illinois think we should confiscate that money and apply it to American debts?

Mr. RAINEY. I will say to my colleague that if we confiscate it we would only be following our own precedents when we confiscated the cotton that we seized in the South.

Mr. COLLIER. But two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. RAINEY. We would be following all our own precedents and also the precedents that every nation in the world has set if we confiscated it. We would be doing just what all the allied nations are doing to-day. We are abandoning all precedents and we are making history in this bill. In giving this money back we are not following the precedents already set; we are establishing a new precedent.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield for information?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. The German alien property custodian seized a great deal of property belonging to nationals of our country during the war. Can the gentleman tell us how much was so seized?

Mr. COLLIER. I have not the different allocations of that, but there were some seizures made.

Mr. BYRNS. This bill proposes, as I understand it, to return to German nationals 80 per cent of the property seized by the Alien Property Custodian of this Government?

Mr. COLLIER. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNS. Has there been any reciprocal action on the part of Germany to return to American nationals the property seized during the war by the alien property custodian of Germany?

Mr. COLLIER. There has been reciprocal action on the part of Germany.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Germany has returned all of the property taken in kind, and that was done long ago.

Mr. BYRNS. That relates to property seized in Germany?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Germany was not in a position to decide what to do with that property. The Allies took that property.

Mr. BYRNS. When was it returned and in what way?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It was simply turned back to them when the war was over.

Mr. BYRNS. I know of one or two instances where money was seized in the banks of Germany belonging to American nationals. Those gentlemen now have claims pending against Germany and they have been denied payment for many, many years. Has Germany returned the money?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Germany was willing to pay them, but at the time she only had depreciated currency, which they would not accept. But so far as any property is concerned, like real estate, machinery, buildings, and the like, everything was returned.

Mr. BYRNS. How about money that was seized?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They tried to pay them in their own currency at the time the war closed, but they had nothing but depreciated currency, and, of course, it would not make a sufficient payment. So now those claims have been submitted to the Mixed Claims Commission and the Mixed Claims Commission is making awards to them.

Mr. BYRNS. Then I understand that what this bill proposes to do, if the gentleman will pardon me for a moment, is to return to German nationals 80 per cent of the property seized, whereas Germany will retain the money she seized and the property she seized.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But it is being paid to them now through awards made by the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I must ask the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Illinois to permit me to proceed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. COLLIER. I have allowed this to go on in this way because I believe that by the asking of these questions we bring out the facts and save a great deal of time. However, I would like now to reserve two or three minutes to myself, and I ask the indulgence of the House.

Mr. COX. At some point will not the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLLIER. I see the gentleman from Georgia is not going to let me do it.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman one question, which will lead to another. The whole structure of this bill, from your interpretation, is founded upon the certainty of the fulfillment of the Dawes plan.

Mr. COLLIER. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. If the Dawes agreement falls through, under the bill there will be confiscation of at least a part of German private property?

Mr. COLLIER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COX. If the Dawes plan falls through, there will be a failure on the part of our own nationals to receive payment in full of their claims against the German Government?

Mr. COLLIER. That will not be so as long as we have that 20 per cent; but, of course, if that falls through, then there will be some confiscation of German property, but it will be because Germany does not pay and it will not be because of the confiscation of any German property.

Mr. COX. Does it not logically follow that if the Dawes arrangement falls through and there is no action on the part of this Government looking to the satisfaction of the claims of its nationals against the German Government that there will be a failure to fulfill the promise of the bill to eventually satisfy German claims and likewise failure of the promise which is made that American nationals will eventually be paid?

Mr. COLLIER. That may be true. Now, I want to take about three minutes and talk to some of these Members who are so afraid that some of our nationals are going to lose their money. I want to say that by 1933—and I believe the Dawes payments will be kept up until then—nearly 80 per cent of this amount will be paid, and that the only American claimants then left will be some of the very large claimants, some of the greatest business concerns in this country, which themselves are willing to take this chance. When we take $33,000,000 out of the pot we have paid for the expenses of the commission and have paid off every death claim and every claim of $100,000 or less. After $50,800,000 has been taken out of the $113,000,000 pot, the death and personal-injury claims will have all been paid, every claim of $100,000 or less will have been paid, and all other American claimants will have received an additional $100,000, and we will still have left in the pot over $62,000,000 to help satisfy the remaining claimants, all of whom have already been paid $200,000.

What are we going to do when the pot becomes exhausted? The Dawes payments, as they are paid, will go into the pot. American claimants remaining unpaid after 1933 will have received 80 per cent of the sum due them from Germany. After that, out of the Dawes annuities, as they are paid, German and American nationals share and share alike.

Mr. ABERNETHY and Mr. CHINDBLOM rose.

Mr. COLLIER. I yield first to my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to say to the gentleman I am not concerned so much about our citizens getting paid, but I am very much concerned, and I think a number of other Members are, at the very pertinent question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and that is, How is this Government going to be taken care of when we are taking at least $50,000,000 out of the Treasury at the present time and turning that money over and waiting 80 years to get back what they owe the Government? That is the thing that is bothering me.

Mr. COLLIER. Well, the Government stands a better show than any of the others, if you want it put in plain language, because we are retaining $50,000,000, the value of the ships, to be appropriated by a future Congress at a future date; and when that money is appropriated 50 per cent of the $50,000,000, or one-half of it, will go back into the pot, to be turned over to American claimants.

Mr. COX. And if the gentleman will permit, that $50,000,000 is private property and not the property of the German Government.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not talking about the individuals. I know there would not be any bill if it was not for the individuals pressing it. I am thinking of the Treasury of the United States, and the gentleman says it is able to stand it. Is that the only reason we are appropriating this $50,000,000 which we will not get back for 80 years?

Mr. COLLIER. In order to make myself understood I will say the Government has got just as much right to expect payment as any of the individuals, and the Government will be paid. I do not anticipate any trouble the Federal Government will have in getting its money back.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words, we have got to wait until the other Governments pay us.

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, if the Dawes payments stop, if Europe blows up, if people do not meet their obligations, if all the countries here and abroad go to the bowwows, and the currency of every nation is depreciated until it gets like it was immediately after the war, then perhaps somebody is going to lose some money.

We have got to take something on trust, gentlemen. All of our business is based on confidence. The material as well as the moral prosperity of every community, as well as of every nation, in a large measure depends upon the degree in which the people of that community and of that nation trust each other, and we have got to allow for something along the lines of confidence.

I can not say that Germany is going to make the payment next year or 20 years from now. I do say that Germany has met her payments in the past. The reparations were fixed by a commission at what they believed to be Germany's capacity to pay, and for one I can not say that she is not going to pay, and none of you can say she will or will not pay. We have got to trust something to our confidence in the nations of the world.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to my colleague, of course.

Mr. RAINEY. Is it not true that the Reparations Commission on the petition of Germany, at any time in the future, on a showing made by her that she can not meet these reparation payments of $600,000,000 a year, or whatever the amount is—I think it is more than that—can be relieved and another adjustment made by which she pays a still smaller amount?

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, if that becomes necessary. The gentleman is very helpful.

Mr. RAINEY. And that will postpone still further beyond the 80 years our opportunity to get back the money we are now advancing.

Mr. COLLIER. Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say that I have talked much longer than I intended——

Mr. CHINDBLOM (interposing). Before the gentleman concludes, some one inquired about the American claimants who will have to wait a while——

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; I wish the gentleman would read who they are, because some of the gentlemen are so much concerned about them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM (reading):

International Harvester Co	$3,316,765.92
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	990,000.00
Western Electric Co	1,585,089.48
The Texas Co	547,845.63
International Mercantile Marine Co	175,000.00
The Pfaudler Co	125,000.00
United States Steel Products Co	195,000.00
Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co	337,957.00
United Shoe Machinery Corporation	1,660,000.00
Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co	400,000.00
Security Eyelet Co	700,000.00
United Shoe Machinery Corporation	140,000.00
Samuel Ullmann, Emanuel S. Ullmann, and Joseph Ullmann, jr., as surviving partners of the firm of Joseph Ullmann Co	237,000.00
Standard Oil Co. of New York	900,000.00
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	134,531.25
Max Selliger	393,806.15
Marshall Field & Co	104,000.00
Fred W. Gravenhorst and George Gravenhorst, of Brooklyn, N. Y., doing business under the name of Gravenhorst & Co	167,000.00
The Singer Manufacturing Co	4,000,000.00

And many others, all of which will be found in the hearings.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to reiterate that all claims under $200,000 will be satisfied by 1933.

Mr. HASTINGS rose.

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman want to ask a question along this line?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, I think there is not any concern about the big claims——

Mr. COLLIER. They are the only ones that will be delayed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Because, as I understand from this debate and from the report, those having the larger claims have agreed to this.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They have.

Mr. HASTINGS. But what some of us are very much concerned about is when the claims of the American Government are to be paid or how long they are to be postponed? We are not concerned about these large claims which the gentleman from Illinois has read into the RECORD because, as I understand it, with their eyes open they have come in and agreed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed one hour.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Inasmuch as the gentleman has asked me a question, I may say that first there will be $13,000,000 received from the German Government on account of the expense of the army of occupation. The total of that claim by our Government is $255,000,000. Then there is the 2¼ per cent out of the Dawes reparations payments, which amounts to about $10,700,000 per annum, and that can be used only for these claims.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does that go to pay the Government claims?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It could not be used to pay the Government claims. The Government will get its pay after the private claims have been paid.

Mr. HASTINGS. When does the gentleman estimate that the payment of the Government claims will begin?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The total time required to pay off 2¼ per cent of the priority mixed claims together with interest thereon, and the interest on deferred payments, is 5 years. To pay off the principle of $123,825,000 with interest, 17⅔ years; to pay off $25,000,000 unallocated interest fund without interest, 2⅓ years; making in all 25 years to pay off the private claims.

Mr. COLLIER. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in conclusion I want to say that this is the best bill that we could get. This matter has been pending for nearly 10 years; we have children and widows in this country whose husbands and fathers and brothers lost their lives, and for 10 years that money has been held in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, and we have been letting it stay there. Do you not think it time that we ought to settle this matter? We have claims of thousands of American citizens who were damaged to the extent of a few hundred dollars. This bill immediately pays off all of them, practically, you might say, under $200,000.

Now, the first question is whether we are to appropriate $50,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury and authorize the appropriation of $50,000,000 more for ships which the evidence shows was worth that much to us. Another question is whether we are going to let this thing go on forever, or go ahead and confiscate the property.

We have solved the question according to our plan. The solution, I believe, has met the approval of the claimants. That is not binding, but it is gratifying to know that those interested approve the bill.

The question with us is, What will we do? I believe every safeguard possible has been thrown around the debt Germany owes to the Government of the United States. I am not concerned about those American claimants who have to wait, because, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has shown, they are not only limited in number and possessed of great means but also they have voluntarily taken the chance of getting their pay out of the reparations made by Germany.

Now, I did not intend to take up so much time to-day in general debate, but one question brought on another, and I have let Members ask each other questions, because I believed in doing so it would facilitate the discussion. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not expect to discuss the bill before the House. I give you fair warning of that. I do want to discuss the 92 per cent index figure which the Secretary of Agriculture proclaims is the comparative situation of agriculture with other groups in the United States. He says there are only 8 points difference between the condition of agriculture and the condition of other groups. If that is true, it seems to me that agriculture has little cause to complain and has a poor case to come before the Congress and ask for special legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture in his annual report said:

> The index number indicating the purchasing power of agriculture was 92 on September 15 last, with 100 representing the average for the five years preceding the war.

This report no doubt caused the President to say in his annual message to Congress that the purchasing power of the farmer is approaching a normal figure.

These optimistic words go out over the country and news columns and editorials proclaim that agriculture is again all right—everybody from the President down taking this report from the Department of Agriculture as the literal truth.

I wish to say that I am thoroughly convinced that these figures do not reflect the true condition of agriculture and that you can not get a true picture by price comparison. You must take into consideration the quantity of an article produced on the farm as well as the price before you have any knowledge of the farmer's revenue.

Prices may be high for an agricultural product, but that generally accompanies small productions and reduced revenue. For example: Cotton is high this year, but quantity produced is low, and as a result the cotton crop this year will produce $350,000,000 less for the farmers of the South than the crop produced in 1925. Again, corn was high in 1924 because of an exceedingly small crop, and the farmers suffered that year in revenue from the sale of corn and the livestock to which it was fed.

The index figure referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture has been raised many points this year by the price of cotton, but the revenue of cotton farmers is less than in a normal year.

The index figure in 1924 was raised many points by the high price of corn, but the revenue of farmers was reduced.

The real economic condition of the farmer is not indicated by the price he secures unless you also take into consideration the amount of the product he produces and thereby secure his actual revenue.

I have before me an article written by Mr. L. H. Bean, division of statistical and historical research, United States Department of Agriculture, on the subject of "Measures of agricultural purchasing power," in which he discusses the reliability and correctness of their index figure used so conspicuously by the Secretary of Agriculture in showing the purchasing power of the American farmer.

In this article Mr. Bean states:

> The three phrases "the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar," "the purchasing power of the farmer's product," and "the purchasing power of the farmer or the farmer's income" have been used interchangeably. Much publicity has been given to the first two of these phrases without recognizing that it is the third concept, namely, the purchasing power of the farmer, which is of greatest importance. This brief paper will attempt to deal only with the outstanding differences between these three forms of agricultural purchasing power and to indicate briefly the practical significance of the purchasing power of the farmer's income as a measure of agricultural welfare.

Mr. Bean says again:

> Not only have most comments on agricultural price movements been lax in their distinction between the buying power of units of farm products and the buying power of a unit of the farmer's money, but the comparisons used have resulted in questionable conclusions.

Again Mr. Bean says:

> The third form of agricultural purchasing power, the purchasing power of the farmer's income, is by far the most significant, since it takes into account both the price per unit and the number of units sold.

Again Mr. Bean says:

> If it is the purpose to indicate the real progress or condition of the agricultural producer, it would be best accomplished by measuring the purchasing power of the farmer's net income.

These excerpts from Mr. Bean's address are conclusive evidence that in the department of research in the Agricultural Department they look upon this index figure used by the Secretary of Agriculture as proving farm prosperity as a questionable calculation, and that the net income of the farmers of the country is the true measure of the condition of agriculture, and that while I seem to be criticizing the Department of Agriculture to-day, yet I am really in harmony with the research department.

Just to show you that the comparison using the prices only of agricultural products leads us astray I call your attention to two different tables issued by the Department of Agriculture. In one we have index numbers which are generously spread over the country, and in 1924 this index figure was 83.

Now, in the other table we have the net income of capital invested in land in the United States, which in 1924 was stated to be 3.2 per cent. A very low percentage, but, nevertheless, that is the report of the Department of Agriculture.

Now we will take these tables in 1926 and we find the index figure, developed from prices of agricultural products, shows an increase of 2 points, and came up to 85 since 1924, and therefore the farmer is more prosperous according to the Secretary of Agriculture than he was in 1924.

However, we turn over to the other table and we find in 1926 the Agricultural Department says that the net income of capital invested in land in the United States amounts to 2.7 per cent in that year. So then, according to their own reports, the index figure went up and the net returns of the farmers of the country went down probably a billion dollars.

The people in the Department of Agriculture know that this index figure, heralded over the country as evidence of the prosperity of agriculture, is not a true index of agricultural conditions.

Prices of industrial articles are different. When there is a big demand for pig iron, more is produced and prices are advanced. When the farmer raises more pigs he oversupplies the market and the price goes down. You can not compare the prices of agricultural products with the prices of industrial products and fail to reach wrong conclusions.

In my opinion there is but one way for the Agricultural Department to show to the country the condition of agriculture as it relates to all other groups, and that is to arrive at the

production of each of the articles, ascertain the price of each, and arrive at the total income of agriculture. Then compare that income with the total income of the other groups in the United States. Of course, this is done and has been done and we have the figures, but they are not heralded to the country.

Agriculture is receiving about $12,000,000,000 a year now as its total revenue. The total national income is about $90,000,000,000 per annum. The people engaged in agriculture are about one-third of our population and they are receiving about one-eighth of the national income.

These figures likewise come from the Agricultural Department and there is full knowledge there of this discrepancy, but the real situation does not get out to the public and is not heralded abroad by the Secretary. If this information filled the columns of the newspapers, then everybody would understand why land continues to drop in price. It would be understood why the Department of Agriculture has to report this year that land again went down in value all over the United States last year 4 per cent, 6 per cent in Ohio, and 11 per cent in Iowa.

An interesting sale of farm land was made in Champaign County, Ohio, last week. In making out the deed it was discovered that the property had been previously transferred, the last time in 1877, and the price named in the deed was 20 per cent less than the price named in the deed in 1927, which was 50 years later. It would be interesting to show the large increases in value of other kinds of property in the United States during this same 50 years.

If this true statement of the comparative conditions was everywhere known it would explain why the Department of Agriculture must report this year that one million and twenty thousand left the farm last year, the largest number to leave the farms since war-time conditions.

I think the Agricultural Department should continue to show the comparative conditions of agriculture with others, but I feel that they should use the figures in their department that give the actual comparative condition and not adopt figures that are manifestly misleading. We have a condition that must be studied and remedied and all the people of the United States must know that there is an unfair and unequal condition and they should be prepared to grant equality to the people who produce the food and the material for clothing which is, undoubtedly, the most important production in the United States.

If we are to continue to compare price levels, I would like to make a price-level comparison—that of the actual results of my farming experience in Ohio, and the experience of a farmer in Ohio is very much the experience of a farmer in all of the Middle Western States.

I sell corn, oats, hay, milk, hogs, and wheat.

My expenditures are taxes, lumber, paint, fence, tile, and labor.

In selling corn this year I find the price, according to the Department of Agriculture in November, is 73 cents; and the price in the five years preceding the war was 64 cents, which is an increase of 14 per cent.

Now, I sell corn and pay taxes and I find taxes according to the Department of Agriculture have increased 253 per cent. If you will figure that out you will find that I have in paying taxes by selling corn a 45-cent dollar as compared with the situation before the war.

I might add here that the Department of Agriculture in arriving at their index figure eliminates taxes as one of the things the farmer pays or buys. Of course, it would spoil their index figure, but the department does report that farmers are paying in some agricultural States as much as 50 per cent of their net incomes for taxes, so it seems to me that any item that takes that proportion of an income is sufficiently a part of a farmer's expenditure.

The corporations of the country are appealing now to Congress to reduce their income tax which is to-day 13½ per cent and the Congress will comply. Of course, this does not represent all of the taxes paid by corporations, but the corporations of the country have never paid 50 per cent of their income for taxes.

Again, I sell oats and I find, according to the Department of Agriculture, that oats are now selling at 45 cents and did sell at 39 cents for the five-year average before the war, so we are receiving 112 for oats as compared with the prices before the war.

When I sell these oats, I buy lumber and I find the lumber price was $30 before the war and is now about $60, so lumber stands at 200. When you figure this out you have a 56-cent dollar when the farmer buys lumber with oats.

Again, I sell hay and the Department of Agriculture says that hay is $10 per ton in 1927 and $11 per ton in the five years before the war, so the price of hay is lower now than it was before the war and the farmer has a 90-cent dollar when he sells hay. He buys fencing. We find fencing has gone up from about 38 cents per rod to 62 cents, so that fence is 63 per cent higher than it was before the war. With his 90-cent hay dollar, the farmer buys fencing and when he figures it out he finds he is paying with a 55-cent dollar.

Then I want to paint the building and I sell wheat. According to the Department of Agriculture the price of wheat is $1.11 and it was 88 cents before the war, so I have a $1.26 dollar as compared with conditions before the war. I buy oil, white lead, and I find they are higher by 100 per cent than they were before the war, so the farmer finds he has a 63-cent dollar when he exchanges wheat for paint for his building.

Now, I have some milk to sell and I want to tile some land. Milk per hundred pounds before the war was $1.80 for 4 per cent and last month was $2.55, and we have in milk a $1.39 cent dollar. We buy tile with the dollar and we find 4-inch tile before the war cost 25 cents per rod and now 45 cents, or it takes a $1.80 dollar to buy it.

Therefore when you trade milk for tile you have a 77-cent dollar.

Again, we have hogs to sell. The price before the war was $7.23, and the price at home to-day is $8.50, and the hog dollar is therefore a $1.18 dollar.

We have labor to buy, and the Agriculture Department says that it takes a dollar worth $1.63 to buy labor.

When you use the hog dollar to buy labor you therefore have a 70-cent dollar. I could go on trading agricultural products for other things the farmers buy—farm machinery, clothing, groceries, and so forth—if I had the figures at my command, and it may be necessary at another time to go into them, but I have compared the principal exchanges, and the value of the dollar used by the farmer is as follows:

The corn dollar exchanged for tax	$0.45
The oats dollar exchanged for lumber	.56
The hay dollar exchanged for fencing	.55
The wheat dollar exchanged for paint	.63
The milk dollar exchanged for tile	.77
The hog dollar exchanged for labor	.70
	6)3.66
Average dollar worth	.61

Are these exchanges fairly computed? Would weighting them make any radical change? Would the addition of farm machinery, clothing, gasoline, furniture, and groceries make any material difference?

What becomes of this 92-cent dollar of the Department of Agriculture? My own experience indicates that the northern farmer has a 61-cent dollar and that the price comparison alone is unfair to the farmer, because when he secures a high price he has low production and small actual revenue.

Leaving out labor and taxes, as the Agriculture Department does, does not explain all this discrepancy between 92 and 61 as the value of the farmer's dollar. What else have they subtracted or added? But leaving out all this price comparison, which leads to error, why does the Department of Agriculture not herald to the world that the total revenue of the farmer is twelve billion as against seventy-eight billion for the other groups? Then the country would know why the farmer is trying to be heard. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is not, and I doubt in the circumstances if it could be made, entirely satisfactory to but few if any persons. The bill relates to the settlement of transactions arising during the war more than nine years ago. The long delay in effecting these settlements chiefly accounts for the extremely difficult problems one must face in attempting a belated settlement. The bill presents a sorry situation, a situation which there would doubtless be every disposition to correct or improve were it not for the fact that the only alternative to this bill is probably something worse, although some changes might be made to an advantage. In this situation I feel constrained, without discussing the merits or demerits of the course of our Government since the war in dealing with reparations, to trace and describe that course and policy, and to base my action in voting for the pending bill upon the unavoidable conditions that are presented to us to-day as a direct result of the long failure and delay of our Government to take seasonable and effective steps to settle these claims. I shall therefore repeat in substance what I have said on a former occasion, the history of the general repara-

tions problem since 1918 and the strange course of nonaction and delay on the part of our Government in connection therewith.

The Reparation Commission was organized in 1919 by the delegates to the Versailles Peace Conference. The relation of the United States to reparations has always been unofficial. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Albert Rathbone was instructed to attend the meetings from December, 1919, to the spring of 1920, when R. W. Boyden succeeded him until February 19, 1921, when, as a courtesy to the incoming Republican administration, he was withdrawn. In May, 1921, Boyden was instructed by Secretary Hughes to sit again unofficially on reparation commission. He was succeeded by James A. Logan August 1, 1923. On October 15, 1923, Secretary Hughes notified the allied governments that the United States could only take part in the conference on German reparations, provided the conference should be merely advisory and that the United States could not appoint a member of the Reparation Commission since such appointment could not be made without the consent of Congress. In other words, the United States could not officially participate in the proceedings of the Reparation Commission. Again, on December 12, the United States turned down another invitation to participate officially in the proposed work of the Reparation Commission. The separate Berlin treaty contained a Senate reservation prohibiting the United States from being represented on the Reparation Commission without consent of Congress. President Harding in a letter to Senator Lodge on December 27, 1922, urged the removal of this prohibition, but no action was taken. Secretary Hughes on October 15, 1923, suggested that competent American citizens would be willing to participate in an economic inquiry relating to the balancing of the German budget, measures to be taken to stabilize her currency, and the further development of the reparation problem.

The first suggestion on this general subject culminated in an agreement for the appointment of the so-called Dawes committee of experts on November 30, 1923. This committee met at Paris January 14, 1924. The Dawes committee made its report to the Reparation Commission April 9, 1924. This report was accepted by the Reparation Commission as a suitable basis for a new solution of the reparations problem. The London reparation conference convened July 16, 1924, to consider the Dawes report, and out of it to develop a modified reparations plan. This meeting was successful and adjourned on August 30 following. The United States sent delegates to the London conference, but "with strictly limited powers." Frank B. Kellogg, ambassador to London, on July 16 stated that—

> we do not come in the same capacity, with the same powers, as the other delegates, because we are not parties to the Versailles treaty or the sanctions now in force, etc.

The American delegates, therefore, refrained from signing the final act of the London conference on August 16, 1924.

The Paris conference was held January 7 to 14, 1925, to agree upon and allocate to the allied governments their respective shares of German reparations under the Dawes plan. American delegates participated in the Paris conference. Secretary Kellogg, in a letter dated August 5, 1924, announced that—

> in view of the fact that the purpose of this conference will include the question of the allocation of German payments since January 1, 1923, etc., the United States should be represented.

The Paris conference resulted in an agreement between all the allied governments and the United States relative to the distribution of the German reparations to each Government in the future. The Dawes plan as adopted by the London conference provided, among other things, that—

> the payments made by Germany are to comprise all amounts for which Germany may be liable to the allied and associated powers for the costs arising out of the war, including reparation, restitution, clearing-house operations, etc.

In other words, all charges payable by Germany to the allied and associated powers for these war costs. This included the United States. It was due to this agreement that the United States was cut off from receiving any payments from Germany for any purpose under the separate Berlin treaty between our Government and Germany, but all payments that might be received could only come out of reparations provided for by the Dawes Commission. It was in these circumstances that the United States, speaking through Ambassador Kellogg, hastened to request permission to sit for the first time as a full-fledged delegate in the Paris conference convened to allocate reparations to the allied governments under the Dawes plan. The final outcome was that the United States was allowed out of the Dawes annuities 55,000,000 gold marks per annum, beginning September 21, 1926, in payment of the costs of our Army occupation in Germany after the war, or from November 11, 1918, to the date of withdrawal of our army of occupation on January 24, 1923. The American delegates to the Paris conference were so afraid of becoming "involved" even in the single problem of associating with the allied governments in collecting reparations that they strenuously protested against signing the full Paris agreement. When they discovered that America would get nothing under the Dawes plan unless they did sign the entire agreement, they proceeded to do so. This agreement was dated January 14, 1925. At this time the American debt against Germany for Army occupation was around $255,000,000 and the estimated debts due American nationals was $350,000,000. The pittance allowed for these estimated amounts under the Dawes plan would not pay interest, much less any part of the principal. The figures as to claims of American nationals, however, have been reduced so that the allowance of 2¼ per cent would pay off these claims within 60 to 80 years. This is the kind and character of settlement that our Government made with respect to the payment of these two debts against Germany in January, 1925, more than six years after the armistice. To the past year not one dollar had accrued to our Government either in payment of Army occupation debt or American claims, save the amount just recited and certain small amounts in the nature of requisitions made by our Army in Germany under the Rhineland agreement, which the allied governments had placed in operation.

It is important to contrast the steps of the allied governments taken during all the years prior to 1925 to collect from Germany their Army occupation costs and claims of their respective nationals, while the American Government was pursuing its chosen policy of utter inaction, aloofness, and isolation, even with respect to the operations of the allied Reparation Commission, dealing alone with the question of collecting money due from Germany for war costs. In the first place, the Allies collected for themselves from Germany during the period prior to June 30, 1923, in cash and in kind, the sum of $1,280,000,000 through the Reparation Commission. The United States having failed to ratify the treaty of peace with Germany of June 28, 1919, proceeded on August 25, 1921, to negotiate a separate treaty of peace with Germany. This treaty proposed to give the United States all rights, privileges, indemnities, or advantages stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the treaty of Versailles. Article 2 of that treaty specified among other rights accruing to the United States should be those under parts 8, 9, and 10 of the treaty of Versailles, relating, respectively, to reparation, financial, and economic matters. These included claims of our nationals. The treaty of Versailles provided that the costs of the armies of occupation should be the first charge upon reparations. The United States, however, having made a separate treaty with Germany, which was designed to enable the United States, acting separately from the allied governments, and individually, to collect from Germany direct her Army costs and the claims of her nationals, the allied governments proceeded to demand and receive the chief portion of their army costs, which were accordingly paid through the Reparation Commission; but America, failing either to request or to accept payment through this agency, received nothing, not even direct from Germany, as the Berlin treaty contemplated.

During the years 1919 to 1925 the allied governments, acting under articles 296 and 297 of the treaty of Versailles, which provided for the liquidation of debts of the nationals of either side due to the nationals of the other, proceeded to set up clearing offices for handling these mutual claims and arbitral tribunals for matters involving questions of law. These clearing offices functioned for more than five years and settled the majority of the claims. When the value of Germany's claims did not offset that of the creditor States, Germany made special monthly payments to balance the clearing-office accounts. The United States refusing to avail itself of the clearing-office system, did not, of course, have any claims of this character disposed of and has not to this day collected and paid to our nationals a penny of their claims against Germany. It, of course, is true that 2¼ per cent of the Dawes annuities commenced in the first year of the Dawes plan, September 1, 1924, to August 31, 1925. It is also true that in an effort to pursue relations direct with Germany under our separate Berlin treaty, and hence not to look to the Reparation Commission or to avail ourselves of the clearing-office system, our Government did, on August 10, 1922, effect an agreement with Germany for a Mixed Claims Commission to determine the amount to be paid by Germany on account of our nationals and our Government from

the German Government and German nationals. That commission has not even yet concluded its work. The allied governments, on the other hand, proceeded with dispatch to collect from Germany vast amounts both on account of army occupation and debts due their nationals while Germany was able and in a humor to pay.

It is remarkably strange that although the allied governments during the years following our separate Berlin treaty were constantly inviting the American Government to participate in the work of the Reparation Commission, thereby utilizing both the Berlin treaty and the Reparation Commission as agencies through which to secure payments for Army expenses and on claims of our nationals. The inevitable result was that until 1925 our Government failed to realize a penny on any obligation by Germany, either under the Berlin treaty or through the Allied Reparation Commission. These facts strikingly reveal how and why American rights and claims are to-day unpaid in whole or in part.

The general result of our course left our Government in the position, finally, of an agreement with Germany that the property of her nationals seized by our Government should be retained as security for debts due our Government and nationals or until such debts were discharged, while at the same time we were later forced to become parties to the Paris agreement, under the Dawes plan, which would require the German Government 80 years to pay obligations to our nationals. This conflicting situation imperatively required our Government either to confiscate German property held by the Alien Property Custodian or provide for its release within a far shorter period than 80 years, the time necessary for payment of the American claimants. It was this course and these conditions resulting which have rendered it impossible for our Government now to make a really satisfactory adjustment pro or con of indebtedness between our Government and Germany and our nationals and German nationals. In point of fact, the Dawes plan requires our Government to turn back as a credit on our annuities under the Dawes plan any excess or final balance, or, in fact, any property finally retained by our Government must be credited on the annuities of the Dawes Commission otherwise due us.

It seems that our Government, in the spring of 1923, for the first time awakened to the fact that neither the debts for Army occupation nor those due our nationals might ever be paid separately and directly under the Berlin treaty. It was decided, therefore, to send Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Wadsworth to Europe to secure, if possible, an agreement for payment of Army costs as specially provided by the armistice agreement. This Army cost agreement was negotiated on May 25, 1923, but was never ratified by France, although Belgium, in the meantime, had deposited 62,500,000 gold marks in New York to be turned over to the American Government whenever France ratified the agreement, which she never did. Our Government declined to accept payment in kind at any time. The fact that the Allies did accept payments in kind to a measurable extent greatly aided in balancing off and settling indebtedness between them and their nationals and Germany under articles 296 and 297 of the treaty of Versailles.

It seems that Ambassador Kellogg in his letter of August 5, 1924, not only sought to have America represented in the Paris conference later to be held, but also sought an understanding to the effect that the right of the United States to share in reparation distributions for debts due our nationals as well as Army costs should be recognized, and that this gave rise to an extended debate in the plenary meeting of August 12. This controversy appears also to have been renewed at the outset of the Paris conference. It was charged by the British representative that the United States had several times been requested to present a detailed schedule of the claims of our nationals in order that the allied experts could examine them, "but this request has not been acceded to." The American expert contended that he had formerly raised the question of the participation of the United States in the plan annuities, although it was admittedly at a belated stage. The facts seem to warrant the conclusion that the unratified Wadsworth Army cost agreement of May 25, 1923, was recast at the instance of the United States Government as a condition precedent to the allowance of the 2¼ per cent annuity for the payment of American nationals under the Dawes plan. Under the Wadsworth plan our Army debt was payable in 12 annual installments, or $21,000,000 per year. In order, therefore, to secure any share of the Dawes annuities with which to pay any part of the claims of our nationals, it was agreed that the payment of our Army cost should be 55,000,000 gold marks per annum, or about $13,000,000, and extending over a period of nearly 20 years. It was only then that the 2¼ per cent was squeezed through the Paris conference as a last-minute and very grudging concession. The United States, therefore, secured nearly $23,000,000 of the total annual amount of German reparations when they become payable in full of $625,000,000. To the stage of the Paris conference, or from November 11, 1918, to February 28, 1925, the total amount of German reparation payments of every kind aggregated $2,250,000,000, not including income from the Ruhr occupation amounting to near $300,000,000.

The question has been asked whether the Paris agreement surrendered or modified any treaty right of the United States or in any way limited the amount of the claims of the United States. It is true that no treaty right nor the amount of the claims of the United States was limited or modified by the Paris agreement, but the opportunity or chance for securing payment of American claims was tremendously limited. It is true that in the event the Dawes plan of reparations should break down, all unpaid American claims and debts would stand intact against Germany. It is equally true that they would no more be collectible from Germany under our separate Berlin treaty than they were collectible under this treaty from 1921 to 1925. It is greatly surprising that our Government negotiated and entered into the separate treaty of Berlin upon the assumption and belief that we could secure payment for debts due our Government and our nationals direct from Germany under the Berlin treaty. It is even more surprising that our Government did not awake from this patent delusion until 1924 when, in the language of Secretary Kellogg, "it was believed that participation in payment under the Dawes plan would be advantageous to the United States." This fatal lapse on the part of our Government during these years accounts for our present predicament in attempting to deal with the American and German debt situation. We lose as a result all interest on our Army cost bill of $240,000,000 principal. Assuming that the principal will be ultimately paid, the interest loss to our Government will aggregate much over $100,000,000. Long delay and substantial losses have also been suffered by American claimants. Let me make more clear the conclusions just stated. America embraced and ratified the Berlin treaty upon the plea, among others, that according to article 1 the United States should enjoy "all the rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages, and so forth, stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the treaty of Versailles, which the United States shall fully enjoy notwithstanding the fact that such treaty has not been ratified by the United States."

The allied governments, when the United States sought to participate in the London and Paris conferences for the purpose of securing payment of amounts due from Germany, called attention to article 248 of the Versailles treaty by which Germany "constituted the reparation obligations the first charge upon all her assets," and that she could not, therefore, legally acknowledge any new obligations to a separate government which had not ratified the Versailles treaty. Attention was further called to the terms of the treaty of Versailles to the effect that the amount of damage for which compensation was to be made by Germany should be left to the Reparation Commission. The fact should be kept in mind that the original Reparation Commission of 1919 is still alive and functioning. The allied governments also insisted in this connection that at no time prior to the London conference in 1924 did the American Government offer the slightest hint or suggestion to the Reparation Commission of any claim against Germany which it was desired to have paid through the Reparation Commission. To the further contention of the United States that nothing in the Versailles treaty prohibited or incapacitated Germany from making separate and direct settlements with and payments to the United States, the allied governments again emphasized article 248 of the treaty of Versailles, and insisted that according to the terms of this treaty the assessment of the reparation claims of the Allies is the exclusive business of the Reparation Commission, and that it is a "general controlling agency set up by the treaty with jurisdiction over all the reparation claims of the powers contracting with Germany," and so forth; that the Reparation Commission both before and after the Dawes plan has sought to collect off Germany to the limit of her ability to pay. The allied governments made the final reply that "one or more of the allied and associated powers could properly make a separate agreement" relative to the payment of its own claim, but that when a joint treaty in behalf of 25 associated powers and creditors has been negotiated and entered into, it would not be justifiable for a single associated power to undertake to enter into a separate treaty with provisions that would deprive the other 25 creditor nations of German payments contemplated by the joint treaty previously entered into with the knowledge of all nations. At least some notice and some understanding with the 25 joint creditor countries was necessary at the time the separate treaty was made. In other words, when 25 crediters adopt a plan of dealing with the assets of a debtor, it is doubtful whether a twenty-sixth creditor may later proceed to

deal with the assets as though the 25 creditors and their previous arrangement were not in existence. Some sort of concert is naturally necessary and logical.

I have sought briefly to detail the substance of the conflicting views of our Government and those of the allied governments as they have related to the course of the American Government in dealing with our claims against Germany for Army costs and for our nationals. Without expressing definite opinions relative to the merits of these international discussions, it does seem that our Government at least was driven to the resort of invoking "all defenses." At any rate, our Government was overwhelmingly overruled and somewhat sheepishly abided the decision. While it is true that our indebtedness against Germany will stand intact in the event the Dawes plan should fail, it has been demonstrated also to be true that any payments thereafter made to us by Germany would come through the Reparation Commission and not direct under the Berlin treaty. In addition to the losses I have already pointed out due to the failure of this Government to keep in touch with the Reparation Commission prior to 1925, our Government must now take the position of a deferred creditor with possible payments far in the future, even if the provisions of the pending bill are carried out. I shall as the only possible way out of an extremely bad situation vote for the pending bill, but I shall never be able to excuse the obtuseness and unpardonable negligence of our Government in handling its claims and the claims of its nationals. In the grossly unsatisfactory and now impossible situation, we can only charge off to profit and loss more than $100,000,000 interest on German debt for Army occupation, and later charge off likewise such portions of the debt of $60,000,000, with interest, due our Government and payable after 25 years, which may not then be paid. Such losses will of course constitute a penalty which our people must pay on account of our Government's policy of delay, inaction, and aloofness since the war. I say this because the only alternatives to the passage of some such bill as this, which makes the Government a long-deferred creditor, would be to confiscate the property of the German nationals we hold, or make individual claimants the long-deferred creditors rather than the Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, as evidence that there is a widespread belief upon the part of a very large body of our citizens that they are denied the equal rights guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States, I wish to read the petition of the National Equal Rights League and Race Congress on behalf of the colored citizens of the United States for the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is as follows:

To Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States:

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787, held for the purpose of creating a "more perfect Union," the question of perpetuating the institution of slavery was the cause of acrimonious debate therein. So heated, indeed, became this controversy between those who were for and those who were against the system of slavery that two compromises upon this issue had to be reached before agreement upon the Constitution could be attained.

George Mason, of Virginia, a delegate to the convention, urged the abolition of slavery, and stated that unless the institution was abolished a war between the northern and southern sections of the United States would ensue—the clash of opposing sectional interests could terminate in no other way. This prophet found himself without honor in his own land and walked out of the convention, refusing to affix his signature to the instrument as finally adopted.

From 1787 to 1861 the history of the United States discloses the truth that moral issues dodged, no matter how deftly, will one day strike with crushing force.

Slavery was abolished on the battle fields of the Republic, but in its wake there followed peonage, disfranchisement, lynching, civil and political disabilities imposed upon the people who had just escaped from age-long bondage.

After the passage of 60 years we find colored Americans victimized in many parts of the land, and especially in the South, by the same evil forces of arrogance and hate which had held them so long in slavery with the aid of governments, both State and Federal.

Fortunately the great leaders of the Nation, at the close of the Civil War, so amended the Constitution as to make it square with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of free, democratic government, and under the amended instrument Congress was empowered to enforce these new articles wherever and whenever they should be violated.

We therefore most respectfully invite the attention of Congress to the fact that colored American citizens have been deprived of the right to vote by laws enacted and State constitutions adopted. Cunningly worded statutes were devised to accomplish this purpose, so that, if possible, these regulations might be held to conform to the amended Constitution.

Much success has thus far attended the efforts of reactionary communities to rob colored American citizens of the right to vote upon terms of equality with their white fellow citizens, but the immediate penalty paid by such communities has been to find themselves pushed backward into the least progressive communities of the land. They have fallen behind economically, educationally, and represent politically ideas which have brought and are continuing to bring in many parts of the world upheaval and revolution. They are not only not abreast of the best American thought, but their hideous reaction has given birth to a lawless organization now engaged in spreading corruption and terror in wide sections of our country.

The failure of the Federal Government to carry out the provisions of the Constitution, which guarantees republican forms of government to every State within the Union, has resulted in lawlessness on such a widespread scale that even southern officials are becoming alarmed over the situation, and are so expressing themselves.

When white women as well as men are being whipped and maimed by a nationally organized band of disguised things, we have a perfect demonstration of the extent to which lawlessness will go, from its black to its white victims, when once it is allowed to take firm root.

Another moral issue now faces the constituted authorities of the land. Will it be met or will it be dodged, as was the slavery issue?

We most respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to carry out its sworn obligation, to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, to the end that the rights of all citizens may be secured under republican forms of government. The Constitution provides the way.

We most respectfully urge upon Congress increased Federal aid to southern education, passage of the Dyer antilynching bill, a law-making segregation of colored employees of the Federal civil service a statutory offense, enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, to the end that disfranchisement and racial segregation upon common carriers shall be abolished.

GEORGE FRAZIER MILLER, *New York, President National Equal Rights League and Race Congress.*
W. H. JERNAGIN, *Vice President at Large.*
MAURICE W. SPENCER, *Vice President.*
HALLEY B. TAYLOR, *Chaplain.*
H. T. MEDFORD, *Vice President.*
WM. MUNROE TROTTER, *Secretary.*
J. H. RANDOLPH, *Assistant Corresponding Secretary.*
THOMAS H. R. CLARKE, *Chairman Petitions Committee.*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, on general principles I do not advocate Government ownership or Government operation of industries. In the first place, such operation is generally both extravagant and inefficient. In the second place, the citizen hardly gets a fair deal when the Government comes into competition with him in some line of enterprise, and then collects taxes from him to establish and maintain this competition. Such a policy if generally pursued by the Government would tend both to destroy private initiative and to dry up the streams of public revenue. In spite of these views, however, I have revised and reintroduced my bill for at least indirect and temporary Government operation of Muscle Shoals.

I say "indirect," because the bill provides for a Government corporation rather than direct management through some Federal department; and "temporary," because the life of this corporation is fixed at only 10 years. So the Congress may perpetuate this plan or arrange for private control as may seem wise after the proposed scheme has been sufficiently tested.

For these years the Congress has been trying in vain to arrive at some conclusion as to what should be done with the Muscle Shoals enterprise. The plant looks like a great public asset, and I trust that it will finally prove such. Yet so far it has been only a problem and a burden. We have hesitated about Government operation and yet we have been unable to secure a bid for private operation upon which we could agree. Certainly these conditions should not continue longer.

The chief trouble seems to be that nobody is prepared to take hold of this business with full confidence or certainty. Neither the Congress nor the business organizations of the country have sufficient experience of such a plant to enter with full assurance into a contract for its permanent operation.

The Government has spent huge sums of money upon the enterprise, and large sums will yet be needed to get it to working at full capacity. Government management may be or may not be the final solution of the problem, but our experience so far convinces me that the Government would for the present best keep the property in hand and operate it at least through the experimental stage.

The original purpose of the Muscle Shoals development was to provide explosives for the use of the Army and Navy in times

of war and fertilizer for agriculture in times of peace. Later there has come into the problem the very large question of hydroelectric power to be used in public utility and for industrial and commercial development. This great enterprise therefore concerns especially three phases of our country's welfare—agriculture, national defense, and commerce and industry. Therefore in framing my bill I have provided that the operation of Muscle Shoals should be directed by a Government corporation of which the three directors should be the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Commerce. The immediate management of the business is to be in the hands of a general superintendent selected by the directors with two assistants selected by the general superintendent. One of these assistants must be a man of information and experience in the fixation of nitrogen and the production of nitrogenous materials, and the other an expert on hydroelectric power.

I have intentionally provided that the directors shall have large powers and broad latitude, because I am sure that they will need that if they successfully meet the conditions and work out the problems.

The plan proposed contains a very vital provision for national defense and a provision for very large industrial and commercial development through the production and distribution of power. Yet I should say that in its finality it is a farm-relief measure. The production and distribution of fertilizer and the consequent relief of agriculture are made primary; and any net profits derived from the sale of power are to be used for production of fertilizer and improvement of soils.

I invite my colleagues to read this bill carefully, and I presume to believe that you will find its provisions worthy of very careful consideration. The bill was introduced to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would not ordinarily at this time in the evening ask your indulgence, because I know it is rather trying after a day's session to expect the few gentlemen who are always on guard to listen to one to whom you have listened probably many times on unimportant subjects, but flood control is of paramount importance to any Member representing a district from that section, and particularly to those born and bred in that section. What I am going to say might not appear strictly relevant to the discussion of this bill under consideration, but I think it has some bearing upon it. I have heard several gentlemen here discuss this bill from the same standpoint, that the funding bill was so generally and so ably and adroitly considered and discussed last year and two years ago. Capacity to pay was the outstanding feature of almost every speech and with each gentleman was the controlling factor of the main point in every speech, and all the changes were rung upon it in the consideration of the funding of the debts due us by European nations—the capacity to pay. I believe that is a correct doctrine. At any rate I have no fault to find with it. I am going to vote for this bill. I believe it is a proper thing, as the American attitude, to vote for a bill of this kind in order to preserve our national prestige and in order to maintain our traditions. I voted for all the debt bills logically based upon the capacity of the peoples involved to pay. I know our country is generously disposed to European nations, and I believe when those people are in affliction or sorrow or financial distress that our people and our country, our Government, should be generously inclined. That is a duty we owe to humanity, and as long as we remain a free, liberty-loving, fine people we will continue to dream and do noble things and discharge the moral obligations we owe the world and mankind. Not only do we discharge very generously our obligations to the alien beyond the seas, but we legislate benignly for the well to do, the rich, the opulent, the powerful, as is evidenced in the several tax reduction bills passed since the termination of the war. We have made a reduction when there was no general demand for it. The bill passed yesterday was not very popularly demanded by the people of the United States. I do not think they paid much attention to it. But I voted for that bill, even while recognizing that its main provisions practically brought about a reduction of $274,000,000, which was in the nature of a gift to the corporations, for the bill remits a tax which had already been collected, as it was made a part of the price of the goods sold by the corporations.

In other words, instead of applying the reduction to 1928 and subsequent incomes it is retroactive and includes 1927 incomes. Now, this generous and overgenerous disposition may be all right. But I have always thought that charity and related sentiments should not only begin at home but always be applied when and where most needed. The thing that has always occurred to me as one of the inexplicable characteristics of the American people is that they hesitate to deal as generously with their own when in absolute distress, but who do not want to solicit charity, believing that if granted the relief which they think they are entitled to that they would be able to stand erect and work out their own salvation by their toil and patience as they unfailingly and emotionally do by the stranger and the kinsman who does not need the helping hand. I know we get up a Red Cross movement very quickly when any disaster suggests, but these are temporary impulses that soon pass away. What I mean is that as a general thing there is more national concern over the misfortunes of other nationals than any disposition to recognize a great national obligation to an immense section of our own country, such as the Mississippi Valley, where dwell millions and millions of our own—our American countrymen, our kith and kin, blood of our blood, and bone of our bone. Read the refunding bills and the legislative literature on those bills and then read up to this moment the written word by the administrative branch of the Government. Render unto Cæsar at home and abroad all that is due unto Cæsar. If I thought it would promote the welfare of the world and make mankind a little more happy, a little more contented, and I had the power, I would cancel all of the debts due us. I would give industry and commerce every chance and opportunity to give vast permanent employment to our toilers, our working people in factory and foundry, in field, on the farms, and in the mines by removing every tax that might slow up the wheels of prosperity; all of which brings me back to a repetition of what I have already said, and that is that we are in many respects a most generous people, particularly to those we owe the least, while with our kinswomen and kinsmen, people who have been struggling for many, many years to keep up their civilization in spite of tremendous difficulties—war, famine, disease, disaster, the breaking of the Mississippi River levees—we find a disposition to be most exacting.

That is illustrated by the engineers' report recently made with reference to the proposed flood control and the President's message on the subject. I wish to say now, with all the deference that it is possible for me to express the thought in, that the attitude of the President of the United States could be more generous under all the circumstances without even in the slightest or remotest way impinging or violating any economic or governmental principle or well-established policy. And it is our hope that upon a further reflection of a matter that I know has been one of gravest concern to him, that he will realize that we of the valley have nothing to contribute.

What is the use, my friends, of submitting a proposition legislatively to a people who can not meet the conditions? What is the use of asking the people of that section, broken on the wheel of adversity, bowed down in their grief, prostrate, and absolutely ruined, to make a contribution of 20 per cent, which, after all, does not represent the exact contribution they have to make? It is almost adding insult to injury. It is laughing at them in their woe to ask them for money which they have not got, something that it is impossible for them to secure. In my judgment it is not treating the matter as solemnly as it should be treated.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. COLLIER. I recently read in an editorial in one of the large newspapers of the country—I forget which one of them, now—in which they seemed to treat 20 per cent as the maximum contribution, and, in fact, all the contributions that those people would make. As the gentleman from Louisiana has the floor, will he tell us how much more they have to make in buying lots and turning that property over to the Government for the purpose of flood control?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Yes; 20 per cent, my friends, is really the minimum. I was born and reared behind the banks of the Mississippi River. I have witnessed many crevasses. Like all those to the manner born, I have never been in terror of a break in the river bank, though I know that a crevasse is not a trifling thing. Our people will continue to live where they were born and reared, regardless of river danger. And when you reflect upon the peculiarities of human nature and consider that men and women have lived on the slopes of Vesuvius and Ætna during all the ages, notwithstanding the volcanic eruptions which always threaten, and have gone back and resumed their habitations after every catastrophe, it is no great matter for wonderment that our own people want to struggle back to their homes behind the levees after a flood, however disastrous it might have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman kindly let me have five minutes more?

Mr. COLLIER. Subject to the approval of the gentleman from Iowa, I will agree to give the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Our people have done so repeatedly and will continue to do so, and dwell along the banks of the Mississippi River because it is home, which means and says it all. But I want to answer the point raised by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER]. Twenty per cent is the minimum that it will cost to try to live up to that report, and that is an impossible condition. Why should not the Government bear the full cost of acquiring and operating spillways? If the engineers had recommended exclusively larger and stronger levees, I do not think the recommendations would be taken seriously by the House, because it is entirely logical and it appeals to your sense of reason that if you raised the levees and restricted the waters within them the result would be in the nature of a dam and would not have been different from the plan the engineers have been following for 40 years. During my lifetime I have seen reclaimed practically 20,000 square miles of that area which were formerly reservoirs of the great river. The White River, the St. Francis, the Yazoo, and the Tensas Basins were once the great natural storage reservoirs for the Father of Waters.

I believe in one of the recent magazine issues of the Isaak Walton League it is stated that 20,000 additional miles were taken up and reclaimed of a once swampy and alluvial nature soil and made habitable. It is these tremendous reclamations that have done a whole lot in bringing us into the perilous position we are in to-day. I repeat, and I can not repeat it too often, the spillway sites should be paid for by the General Government.

Now, gentlemen, I would like, if you would give me your attention, to speak for a few moments on that angle or slant of the flood problem, because it is all important. As I say, if the proposition were brought before the House just simply to enlarge the levees, I do not think it would take the country by storm, for it would simply be an enlargement of the present situation, and, what is more, the subsoil of Louisiana would not permit of much larger levees.

Without the spillway site, which, in my judgment, is sine qua non and absolutely essential in order to make for the success of the new plan, we might as well not legislate on the plan. Therefore the spillways, being a part of the whole system and being for the benefit of the whole river, should be considered a part of it and should not be looked upon merely as a local proposition, for our people in Lousiana and the people of Louisiana be expected to furnish that site and devote a tremendous area to the carrying off of the waters that pour down upon us from 34 States of the Union. I want to get that to Mr. TILSON and Mr. LONGWORTH, who are doing me the honor to listen to me, because probably that obvious observation may not have occurred to them. Sometimes we do not look at our feet because we are busy looking at the horizon. That struck me as being important and that a higher levee system would not mean much, and I do not know that you could get it through the House at the expense involved without spillways and outlets. And that is the only logical way to take the water out of the river before it strikes and drowns us as a result of an accumulated volume that will not suffer restraint.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means by spillways not only the site where it leaves the main river but the entire land that would be covered by these overflows? That is what the gentleman means by spillways?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Yes; all of the land covered by these overflows through what is known as a spillway.

Mr. TILSON. And the gentleman's idea is that that should be paid for as a part of the expense, the same as the levees?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I think so.

Mr. TILSON. Then to whom would this land belong?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. To the National Government. There should be national responsibility in toto. I do not think the States or local communities ought to have anything to do about it, because it is a national proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. TILSON. In these spillways there would be a considerable territory that would be covered by water in time of flood. To whom would these lands belong and who would use the lands during the years when there are no floods?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. They would belong exclusively to the National Government.

Mr. TILSON. They would lie fallow and not be cultivated?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I do not think we can have a divided responsibility or a divided ownership with the States or localities. It is a national responsibility, a national obligation, and there can not be divided ownership. Divided ownership simply means the confusion that has followed up to this time. If it is a national obligation the country ought to discharge that obligation exclusively, and the States should not be permitted to have anything to say about the manner in which that discharge should be made. I want to thank the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 19, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, December 17, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(9 a. m.)

Interior Department appropriation bill.

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

(Caucus room)

To hear William P. Wooten, chairman of the spillways board and members of the Mississippi River Commission, discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

Monday, December 19, 1927

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended (to include within the act "live poultry" wherever the term "livestock" is used) (H. J. Res. 85).

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

To discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes (H. R. 5641).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the sale of surplus War Department real estate (H. R. 86).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

234. A letter from the chairman of the United States Board of Tax Appeals, transmitting report of publications issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, by the United States Board of Tax Appeals; to the Committee on Printing.

235. A letter from the Public Printer of the United States Government Printing Office, transmitting report that from January 5 to December 13, 1927, 8,832 pounds of useless papers were sold as waste, and the proceeds, $39.74, deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

236. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill, "Authorizing custodians of Federal buildings to administer oaths of office to employees in the custodian service"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

237. A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting report, accompanied by exhibits, briefs, maps, etc., pursuant to "An act authorizing negotiations for the acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

238. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled 'An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve'"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

239. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the equalization of promotion of officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy with officers of the line,' approved June 10, 1926"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

240. A report from the Temporary Committee on Accounts, pursuant to House Resolution 453, Sixty-ninth Congress, adopted March 3, 1927, transmitting report to the House concerning the abolishing of useless offices and what adjustments, if any, should be made in the employment, duties, and compensation of the officers and employees of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1589. A bill for the relief of John J. Waters; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1590. A bill to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker and Calton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 431) to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Okanogan County, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 491) authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 812) for the relief of Kratzer Carriage Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 1030) for the relief of the Rochester Country Club, Rochester, Ind.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 1975) for the relief of the State hospital of the State of Florida; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of J. C. McConnell; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2134) to extend the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 22, 1920, entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," to Lon Snepp; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of Annie McColgan; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of Francis A. Grennen; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Morris Dietrich; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2943) for the relief of the African-American Importing Co. (Inc.) of New York City, N. Y.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of the Burt Wool & Leather Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3740) for the relief of Homer J. Williamson; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3945) for the relief of Compere & Wyatt; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of the estate of Alvin C. Laupheimer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4028) for the relief of Lewis C. Hopkins & Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4045) for the relief of the Alaska Products Co; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4097) for the relief of the McGilvray-Raymond Granite Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4445) to refund to Kramp & Gaskill income tax erroneously and illegally collected; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4593) for the relief of the Cudahy Packing Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of Raphael Levy; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of A. L. Jacobs; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4658) for the relief of M. F. Powers; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4659) for the relief of Alice Hackney; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5293) for the relief of Horton B. Herrin; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5317) for the relief of Addie Belle Smith; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5376) for the relief of Alfred A. Winslow; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Laura O'Dwyer; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of Jesse W. Boisseau; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5974) for the relief of Whitney Supply Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 5976) for the relief of the heirs of Gen. Dick Taylor; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5990) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6183) to reimburse W. B. Donelson for revenues wrongfully paid; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6360) for the relief of Edward S. Lathrop; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6361) for the relief of Frank Rizzuto; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6368) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to refund to the Farmers' Grain Co., of Omaha, Nebr., income taxes illegally paid to the United States Treasurer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6388) for the relief of Ruth Gore; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6551) for the relief of H. A. Griffeth; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of the estate of William Bardei; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 7723) to increase the pay of the officers and members of the Fire Department and of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7724) giving preference to American materials and equipment in highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 7725) granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware & New Jersey Bridge Corporation, a corporation of the State of Delaware, domiciled at Wilmington, Del., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 7726) for the improvement of Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORIN. A bill (H. R. 7727) to amend section 47d of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize employment of hostesses for temporary duty at citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7728) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the city of Buhl, Twin Falls County, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7729) to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7730) to create an additional judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7731) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Batesville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7732) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Lawrenceburg, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7733) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Aurora, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7734) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Franklin, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7735) for the erection of a public building in Greensburg, State of Indiana, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 7736) to amend Penal Code of the United States as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 7737) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of sites and the erection of Federal buildings at various cities in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) to encourage the development of the agriculture resources of the United States and the establishment of rural homes through Federal and States cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of such homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7739) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to create the farmers' finance corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) to authorize the construction of a memorial statue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) to authorize the construction of jetties and other works necessary to stop and prevent erosions of the shore line of Jekyl and St. Simons Islands, in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7742) to amend an act providing for the restoration of Fort McHenry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) to increase the efficiency of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOWREY: A bill (H. R. 7744) to provide for the national defense and to aid agricultural and industrial development by creating the United States Muscle Shoals Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7745) granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7746) to authorize the erection of a monument on the battle field of Saratoga; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 7747) to regulate the manufacture, printing, and sale of envelopes with postage stamps embossed thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7748) to authorize appropriations to be made for the disposition of remains of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7749) to regulate the appointment and duties of the superintendent of the Antietam battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7750) to restrict expenditures from the annual appropriations for the Organized Reserves, except for medical officers and nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7751) to authorize the free issue of surplus or reserve uniforms and other equipment or material to the citizens' military training camps and to limit the cost of stocks furnished by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7752) to limit the issue of reserve supplies or equipment held by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7753) to authorize the disbursement of an accounting for the appropriation "Pay, etc., of the Army," as one fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7754) to prevent the use of a stop watch or time-measuring device, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7755) to restrict expenditures from the appropriation "Military supplies and equipment for schools and colleges"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7756) to authorize the purchase of options on materials for engineer operations and temporary construction at camps, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7757) to authorize reimbursement of travel expenses of officers for instruction purposes in connection with the Engineer School; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7758) to authorize the employment of consulting engineers for the Air Corps and the Ordnance Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 7759) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) providing for the completing of Dam No. 2 and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, for the manufacture and distribution of fertilizer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHAFER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) appointing William Mitchell, of Wisconsin, a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to provide that the United States extend to the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses an invitation to hold the sixth session of the association in the United States, and for the expenses thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) to provide for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Second Pan American Conference on Highways at Rio de Janeiro; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 109) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a statue of Oscar S. Straus in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenses and services rendered in behalf of the Eastern, Emigrant, and Western Cherokees by blood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARENTZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) directing the Comptroller General of the United States to reopen, readjust, and resettle the account between the State of Nevada and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 59) relating to officers and employees and services of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 7761) granting an increase of pension to Mary Schoske; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) granting an increase of pension to Maria Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7763) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta C. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7764) granting a pension to Agnes Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 7765) granting an increase of pension to Julia Burkard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Dudrow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7767) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Fortney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7768) granting an increase of pension to Ethel L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7769) granting a pension to Nancy Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 7770) for the relief of Edward Beebe, alias Edward Coyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 7771) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hanchett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7772) for the relief of Frank Schultz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7773) granting a pension to Missouri Ganson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7774) granting a pension to Bertha Belle Lasley, Ruth Norine Lasley, Wanda Evelyn Lasley, Josephine Lois Lasley, Wilma Henriette Lasley, minor children of William Henry Lasley, deceased; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVILA (by request): A bill (H. R. 7775) for the relief of Sucs. de L. Villamil & Co., of San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 7776) granting an increase of pension to Mary Trouts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 7777) for the relief of M. Zingarell and wife, Mary Alice Zingarell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 7778) granting a pension to Kit (Christopher) Dougherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7779) for the relief of William H. Wagoner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 7780) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Spellman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7781) granting a pension to Peter M. F. Gallant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7782) granting a pension to Vina Bertch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7783) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7784) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7785) granting an increase of pension to Melissa Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7786) granting an increase of pension to Samantha J. Wykoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7787) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7788) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7789) granting an increase of pension to Hannah R. Troup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7790) granting an increase of pension to Mathilda M. Bear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7791) granting an increase of pension to Ida V. Brecount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7792) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7793) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7794) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Ingerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 7795) for the relief of Ella S. Brown; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7796) to authorize the payment of certain expenses and disbursements incurred by William A. Brown, William K. Kennedy, and the city of Manila, P. I.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7797) granting a pension to Anna A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7798) granting a pension to Nancy E. Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7799) granting a pension to Nancy J. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7800) granting a pension to Ebbie Allstott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7801) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7802) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7803) granting a pension to Eleanor Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7804) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda C. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7805) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Ingle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7806) granting an increase of pension to Iadna Coward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7807) granting a pension to James A. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 7808) providing for the examination and survey of the Mississippi River in and in the vicinity of Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 7809) granting an increase of pension to Tony Clyde Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 7810) for the relief of Marion M. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7811) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 7812) for the relief of the Security Trust Co. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7813) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7814) granting a pension to Sarah M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Anna E. Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7816) granting an increase of pension to Hulday Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 7817) granting a pension to Rebecca Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7818) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Block; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7819) granting a pension to Drucilla Ellen Petts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7820) granting a pension to Eliza Towell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7821) granting a pension to Rachel F. Burdg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7822) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7823) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7824) authorizing the Court of Claims to render judgment in favor of the administrator of or collector for the estate of Peter P. Pitchlynn, deceased, instead of the heirs of Peter P. Pitchlynn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 7825) to correct the military record of Michael S. Spillane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 7826) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Maxey to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7827) for the relief of R. H. King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 7828) for the relief of William H. Esterbrook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7829) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7830) granting a pension to Nannie Flener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7831) granting a pension to Edgar J. Hobdy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7832) for the relief of Guy R. Conklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7833) granting an increase of pension to Louis Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7834) granting an increase of pension to Alice Spence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7835) granting a pension to Rosa E. Postel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7836) granting a pension to Mary A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7837) granting a pension to Fred Libbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7838) granting a pension to Mary Demaree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7839) granting a pension to May Yoder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7840) granting a pension to Fannie Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7841) granting a pension to Roy Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7842) granting a pension to Jesse Beason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 7843) granting a pension to Mary De Vos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7844) granting a pension to Hattie F. S. Traver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 7845) for the relief of Paul D. May; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7846) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Cansler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 7847) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Reiber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 7848) granting a pension to Emeline E. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7849) to require the Secretary of War to cause to be made a preliminary examination and survey for an extension of the East Coast Canal of Florida from Miami or Florida City to Key West for the purpose of completing the inside canal and waterway route from New York to Key West via the East Coast Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7850) providing for the examination and survey of the Miami River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7851) granting a pension to Mollie E. Metzler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7852) granting a pension to Virginia E. Esty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7853) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Hills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7854) granting an increase of pension to Katie McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 7855) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7856) granting a pension to Ida B. Pittenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7857) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Vernatter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7858) granting an increase of pension to Lelia E. Brunker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7859) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Lockbaum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7860) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7861) granting an increase of pension to Martha Queen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7862) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7863) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca G. Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7864) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Tinkham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7865) granting an increase of pension to Matilda F. Axline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7866) granting an increase of pension to Anna Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7867) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Gormley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7868) granting an increase of pension to Julia Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7869) granting an increase of pension to Caroline F. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7870) granting an increase of pension to Emma McCameron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7871) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Littlejohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7872) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7873) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7874) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7875) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Euans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7876) granting an increase of pension to Josie Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7877) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7878) granting an increase of pension to Mary O'Kane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7879) granting an increase of pension to Esther M. Bunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7880) granting an increase of pension to Maggie A. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7881) granting an increase of pension to Joanna P. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7882) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Groves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7883) granting an increase of pension to Adell C. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7884) granting an increase of pension to Lavina C. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7885) granting an increase of pension to Addie Hursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7886) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Berkshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 7887) for placing Cadet Adrian Van Leeuwen on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 7888) for the relief of Casey McDannell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 7889) for the relief of William S. Bartlett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 7890) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Ruper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 7891) for the relief of William J. Cocke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7892) for the relief of Mrs. Charles Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7893) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Holtz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7894) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Botts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7895) for the relief of the Lagrange Grocery Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7896) for the relief of Mary F. Crim; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7897) to ratify the action of a local board of sales control in respect of contracts between the United States and the West Point Wholesale Grocery Co., of West Point, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7898) to ratify the action of a local board of sale control in respect of contracts between the United States and the Lagrange Grocery Co., of Lagrange, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 7899) for the relief of George Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

227. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Irrigation Districts Association of California, indorsing the Swing-Johnson bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

228. Also, petition of the Stockton Chamber of Commerce, Stockton, Calif., urging the passage of the Sacramento and San Joaquin flood control bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

229. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition from the citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

230. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of various citizens of West Frankfort, Ill., protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance bill, and especially protesting against the Lankford Sunday compulsory observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

231. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition to Congress protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation by 22 citizens of Clinton, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

232. Also, petition to Congress by 45 citizens of Lockwood, Mo., protesting against the passage of legislation in favor of compulsory Sunday observance, particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

233. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 50 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the defeat of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

234. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Horace Mann and more than 125 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

235. Also, petition of Harriet F. Quigley and 19 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

236. Also, petition of Miss Mildred Carlton and 102 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

237. By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of Martin J. Clayton, of South Coventry, Conn., and others, against compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

238. Also, petition of Charles F. Kingfield and others, against Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

239. Also, petition of French Press, of Willimantic, Conn., and 500 others, against compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

240. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Mercedes, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

241. Also, petition of citizens of Lyford, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

242. Also, petition from citizens of Harlingen, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

243. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Mr. George W. Shields and 25 other citizens of Hillsdale County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

244. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of A. G. Johnson, S. P. Meade, and other residents of Birmingham, Ala., in opposition to House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

245. By Mr. KADING: Petition of 80 citizens of Fort Atkinson, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

246. Also, petition of 51 citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

247. Also, petition of 77 citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

248. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Rev. E. O. Valberg, pastor, and 168 voting members of the First Lutheran Church, Lake City, Minn., urging the present immigration quotas be retained, and that the "national-origins" clause in the immigration act be repealed; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

249. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

250. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of J. M. Lowder, Rube Davis, Will Berry, Judge Wood, and 68 other citizens of Neosho, Mo., Fairview, Mo., and surrounding community, praying for the defeat of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

251. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, in opposition to compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

252. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Owners and Tenants Association of the city of New York concerning the erection of a new Federal building in the city of New York and the removal of the old post-office building in said city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

253. Also, petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, national headquarters, Washington, D. C., favoring certain legislation affecting United States war veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

254. By Mr. SCHAFER: Petition of Rho Sigma Phi Fraternity, of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence Ship Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

255. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., against the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

256. By Mr. WARE: Petition of John S. Murchison and others against House bill 78, the Sunday closing law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

257. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of citizens of the State of New York protesting against the enactment of the compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

258. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Louisville, Ill., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford bill, Sabbath observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

259. By Mr. WINTER: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by residents of Casper and Big Horn County, Wyo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

260. By Mr. ARENTZ: Memorial of officials of the State of Nevada (the legislature not being in session), asking for the reimbursement of the State for moneys actually advanced and expended by the State in aid of the Government of the United States during the War between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

261. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of National Equal Rights League and Race Congress, on behalf of colored citizens of the United States, for the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

262. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of citizens of New York State, opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

263. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Mr. George Badt and others, of Farmington, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

264. Also, petition signed by Mr. A. J. Nixon and others, of Tekoa, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory

Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

265. Also, petition signed by Mr. A. P. Johnson and others, of Garfield, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

266. Also, petition signed by Mr. H. W. Hanford and others, of Oakesdale, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, *December 17, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God.

Almighty and everlasting God, who art always more ready to hear than we to pray, and art wont to give more than either we desire or deserve, grant to us, Thy children, such a consciousness of Thy indwelling presence as may give us utter confidence in Thee. In all our doubts and perplexities may we throw ourselves upon Thy besetting care, that knowing ourselves fenced about by Thy loving omnipotence we may serve Thee always with singleness of heart. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on the request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 23, 33, and 34, and agreed to the same; that it had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 32 and agreed to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that it further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 19, 36, and 37 to the said bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	King	Schall
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	Frazier	McKellar	Shipstead
Bingham	George	McMaster	Shortridge
Black	Gerry	McNary	Simmons
Blaine	Gillett	Mayfield	Smoot
Blease	Glass	Metcalf	Steck
Borah	Goff	Moses	Steiwer
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Stephens
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Swanson
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Thomas
Bruce	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Pine	Tyson
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Ferris	Keyes	Sackett	

Mr. COPELAND. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is detained from the Senate, attending the funeral of an intimate friend.

Mr. HOWELL. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT OF PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Eighth Annual Report of Perry's Victory Memorial Commission for the year ended December 1, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF PORTO RICO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 12 of the act of Congress of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, including the reports of the heads of the several departments of the government of Porto Rico and that of the auditor for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

I recommend that the report of the Governor of Porto Rico, without appendixes, be printed as a congressional document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

COMPENSATION TO THE RELATIVES OF EDWIN TUCKER (S. DOC. NO. 20)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, concerning a claim against the United States, presented by the Government of Great Britain for compensation to the relatives of Edwin Tucker, a British subject who was killed by a United States Army ambulance in Colon, Panama, on or about December 6, 1924. The report requests that the recommendation as indicated therein be adopted and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to compensate the claimants in this case.

I recommend that in order to effect a settlement of the claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation of $2,500.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

CLAIM ON ACCOUNT OF DEATH OF SAMUEL RICHARDSON (S. DOC. NO. 21)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of a claim against the United States presented by the British Government for the death on November 1, 1921, at Consuelo, Dominican Republic, of Samuel Richardson, a British subject, as a result of a bullet wound inflicted presumably by a member or members of the United States Marine Corps, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to me on April 3, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated April 5, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 92, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

Concurring in the recommendation made by the Secretary of State, that in order to effect a settlement of this claim the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $1,000, I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

WILLIAM WISEMAN, BRITISH VICE CONSUL (S. DOC. NO. 22)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in regard to the services in behalf of the United States of William Wiseman, British vice consul at Salina Cruz, Mexico, during the period from April 12, 1914, to December 13, 1917, when, with the permission of the British Government and at the request of this Government, he had charge of the American consulate at Salina Cruz and of American interests in the district surrounding that place. The conclusion reached by the Secretary of State has my approval, and I recommend that the Congress authorize an appropriation of $9,200, to be paid to Mr. Wiseman in recognition of the services which he so generously rendered.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN GERMAN NATIONALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report concerning the claims against the United States presented by the German Government on behalf of the heirs or representatives of the German nationals, John Adolf, Hermann Pegel, Franz Lipfert, Albert Wittenburg, Karl Behr, and Hans Dechantsreiter, for various amounts aggregating $461.59, which have been covered into the general fund of the Treasury Department as required by the statutes relating to the disposition of effects and unpaid wages of deceased seamen on American vessels, it appearing that each of the German nationals referred to lost his life while in the status of seamen in the American merchant marine. The report requests that the Congress be asked to authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay these claims.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of these claims in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress authorize an appropriation of the sum of $461.59.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

CLAIM ON ACCOUNT OF THE FRENCH STEAMSHIP "MADELEINE" (S. DOC. NO. 24)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of France against the Government of the United States on account of the losses sustained by the owner of the French steamship *Madeleine* as the result of a collision between it and the U. S. S. *Kerwood*, which at the time of the collision was being operated by the War Department, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

CLAIM BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT RELATIVE TO MR. SUN JUI-CHIN (S. DOC. NO. 23)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State respecting a claim against the United States presented by the Chinese Government for compensation arising out of an assault in China on Mr. Sun Jui-chin on June 11, 1923, by a private in the Marine Corps, a member of the legation guard, with a request that the recommendation of the Secretary of State, as indicated therein, be adopted and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay the indemnity.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress, as an act of grace, and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in a sum equivalent to $500 Mexican.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PUBLICATIONS OF UNITED STATES BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Board of Tax Appeals, transmitting, pursuant to law, the board's report of publications issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

FARMERS' PRODUCE MARKET IN THE DISTRICT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, pursuant to law, a report from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia relative to negotiations for the acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market in the District, which, with the accompanying exhibits, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1927, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill (S. 806) for the transportation of foreign mails of the United States, the creation and maintenance of auxiliaries for the use of the Army and Navy, the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, recalled from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and that committee discharged from its further condition, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CURTIS. What is the request?

Mr. MOSES. It is a bill which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The subject matter being such as to be more appropriately and speedily dealt with by the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from New York asks for a change of reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, in view of the character of the necessity for flood-control legislation at this session, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a most admirable speech delivered by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT] before the National Republican Club of New York City on the 10th of this month.

I also ask in connection with that subject to have printed in the RECORD two editorial gems. One appeared in the Baltimore Manufacturers Record on the 15th of this month, and I understand that it was written by Mr. George Woods Edmonds. The other appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday, the 16th instant, and I am informed that it was written by Mr. Ira W. Bennett. I commend these two editorials to every Member of the Senate. They are real gems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The speech and editorials are as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. FREDERIC M. SACKETT, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

The results of the Mississippi flood of 1927 give clear indication that the whole system of flood control in that valley has broken down, to the extent that a new and much more effective plan must be evolved before safety can be assured to the vast territory that lies between the Ohio River and the sea.

That great valley is one of the most valuable portions of the United States. It is wonderfully fertile. It grows the long staple cotton. It has yielded to the call for diversification of crops in the South and is producing a wide variety of agricultural products.

Within the last few years the Mississippi Valley has been recognized as preeminently adapted by climate, transportation facilities, and labor conditions for industrial expansion. Its industries are growing rapidly, and capital of all sections is seeking industrial investment throughout the South. The new factory building now evident in the valley is the most important development in America to-day.

It is of tremendous moment to the country that adequate protection from almost yearly inundation be provided in order that this valuable

section shall be preserved. Its money resources have been called upon for more than a hundred years, until financially its limit of local ability has been reached.

The recommendation of the Government engineers was laid before the Congress on December 7.

It is not my purpose to discuss with you to-day the kind of a plan of flood control that should be adopted by the Congress but to present arguments which may appeal to a thinking public as reasons why the flood-control work of the Mississippi Valley should be a national project—designed, constructed, and paid for by the National Government.

If you had stood in the broad valley of the Mississippi in April and May of the current year and had seen the raging water, descending through the main funnel of the river, eating its way through the protecting dikes that line its banks, you would more readily appreciate the tremendous task that lies before the Nation in providing a protection against the death and destruction that year after year have followed in the wake of the recurrent floods. Can you picture the danger point of threatened levee; the intensive, desperate work of all hands to strengthen the dikes; the failure of brawn and brain in this titanic struggle; the first break in the dike; the widening crevasse as the water plows its way through the levee, flooding the countryside; the destruction of homes and fields; the drowning of livestock; the desperate people clinging to the higher places as yet unsubmerged; the rescues just ahead of the rising waters; the despondency of the ruined; the utter hopelessness that follows the subsiding flood?

That is the vivid story that was told as the mighty flood left its trail of desolation in the valley of the Mississippi. Eighteen thousand square miles of land suffered from this destruction in 1927. The economic loss upon the country will run to $400,000,000. It represents a national disaster that affects every section. No such money loss can fall upon this country but what its ramifications must be felt in every city of the land. In financial cost the present ineffective control of the Mississippi floods involved an economic disaster that is national in scope. In the rapidly growing evolution of the valley into industrial communities there resulted a destruction of capital that is felt in every avenue of trade. Such a national loss is indicative of a national responsibility for prevention.

The early settlers of the valley began in their own limited way a local method of protecting their immediate neighborhoods through the building of dikes to keep out the waters in time of flood. These efforts, puny in comparison with the force of the river in its turbulent state, grew and gradually assumed the form of heavy levees constructed along each side of the river, confining the waters as nearly as practicable into a main channel. Every levee so built reclaimed large sections of overflow land. In so doing it destroyed a natural reservoir that had previously served to flatten the volume of the water in time of flood and relieve the main channel of the necessity of discharging excessive quantities. These overflow lands served in a sense as safety valves against the onrushing waters of the flood. As these overflow areas were eliminated by protective dikes, the congestion of flood waters in the lower reaches of the river was augmented. It became necessary to build new levees higher and stronger to maintain protection of the lower section. The cost of this levee protection became greater year after year and it was early recognized that there must be a continuing charge for levee maintenance upon the lands reclaimed and protected from the danger of the flood. In recent years the cost of this protection mounted to such heights and became so impossible a burden that the Federal Government, in a sense of fairness, became a large contributor to the general funds of flood protection in the valley.

The finances locally provided for flood protection took the form of voluntary levee district charges and were supposed to be distributed according to the benefits to be received. As the organization of each levee district was voluntary, no complete system of flood control could be compelled. Such control as resulted from the organization of these levee boards became only as strong as the weakest link in this voluntary protective chain. The collapse of "protection by levees only" in the 1927 flood through the 17 crevasses that relieved the pressure of the river, resulted in inundation by flood water for more than 50 miles on either side of the river. Is brings poignantly before the Congress the need of an adequate system of flood control for the Mississippi.

In any democracy the subject of flood control and the part which the Federal Government is to play in such control must be applicable to all sections of the country. The enormous expense which would be placed upon the Federal Treasury were the Government to take over the whole expenditure of protection from floods in all parts of the country gives pause to the generous impulses of the people, even when involving the saving of life and property. The President in his message transmitting the engineer's report sounds such a warning. The vastness of the damage, the danger to life, and the effect upon the economic welfare of the Nation of so great a disaster as the flood of 1927, calls for every reasonable effort within the power of the Government. To justify the exclusive application of Federal funds to the problem of the Mississippi Valley requires some reasonable differentiation of that situation from the normal flood problems arising in the country at large. Some degree of differentiation becomes apparent when it is recognized that the Mississippi flood of 1927 constituted the greatest disaster affecting life and property in the whole history of the Nation. The ramifications of that disaster financially were more widespread than any actual loss of property that America has suffered. The people of the valley feel that such differentiation exists in the problem here presented as to permit such a criterion to be established for exclusive Federal expenditure as will protect the Treasury and at the same time enable the Government to afford adequate protection.

The Mississippi forms the boundary of many States, and in that particular it is differentiated from any intrastate stream. Levees have been built and maintained largely with local funds. On the main river alone $170,000,000 have been expended from local sources. The levee system there constructed at local cost would be sufficient to protect the territory if the same methods were effective as are required to confine the flood waters of every other drainage system within the country. However, the complete failure of the levee system so provided is due in no sense to the waters of the territory affected but to the run-off of the rainfall of the 31 States of the drainage area, and requires the adoption of a new protective plan.

The report of the Army Engineers, formulated under the direction of the Federal Government during the past several months, indicates a cost of the execution of these plans that is unfair to the already depleted finances of the people of the valley. The characteristics of the plan call for a kind of flood protection that is different in form from that which it is necessary to use in any other overflowed areas in the United States. The need of the new plan is due to confining the flood waters by the levees of the entire length of the stream and the consequent congestion in the lower stretches of the river. They find that there can be no adequate protection to the menaced territory save by drawing off the accumulated flood waters through newly constructed parallel channels. Such a plan means the adoption of a spillway and by-pass system for withdrawing from the lower stretches of the river a large part of the accumulated waters rushing down from the higher reaches. The building of such parallel channels interconnecting with the now existing rivers estimates an expenditure of $300,000,000. It will require a period of years to complete, and a positively operating plan of construction. No system of voluntary associations, such as the present levee boards that have functioned for building the levees heretofore, can be contemplated in creating such a complicated system of spillway outlets. The actual cost which the adoption of such a plan makes necessary for the adequate protection from the Mississippi floods staggers the imagination of the people who have heretofore exhausted their strength and treasure in the building of the levee system as it now exists.

It falls upon the lower sections of the river through no fault of their own. It is due to waters which do not originate with them and serves again to differentiate the problem of the Mississippi from the normal problems of flood control which face the other sections of the country. It furnishes a criterion to determine the national aspect of the flood-control project. Other drainage districts, after having contributed to their own protection as have the people of the Mississippi Valley, would be justified in requiring flood protection at the expense of the National Government wherever the situation demanded a new system of improved works of a relief character because of burdens placed upon them from regions more remote. Such differentiation serves to protect the Federal Treasury against unjustified calls for flood protection. Federal expenditure for this purpose is analogous to that approved for sea-coast harbors and those other internal improvements which have ever been held to be the portion of the Federal Government under the general welfare clause. The valley has been saved through the financial resources of its own people, voluntarily supplied, up to a point where the growing needs of the country as a whole require a new undertaking which would place a burden upon it beyond any benefits to be received in increased values.

The engineers' plan will disclose an estimated cost to the Nation of some thirty millions a year spread over a period of 10 years. It will show the need of repairing the crevasses of the present works and their careful maintenance for the best protection they can afford until the new work can be completed. These figures should readily relieve the people of the United States of any legitimate fear of any raid upon the National Treasury. We must find the way to accomplish protection to the valley which will protect. If contributions to these new works is required of the States and communities of the lower valley, who have already done their full part, it will seriously delay, if not foreclose, their construction. The Federal Government can well afford the price. By paying that price a national benefit is bought. The Federal Treasury is protected since no other drainage system can present to Congress similar characteristics that will warrant exclusive national aid. The country will be relieved not only of a great menace to American progress but of a drain upon the charitable impulses of private citizens who are under constant call to relieve suffering and loss through the wonderful organization of the Red Cross. Under

such circumstances there seems to be indicated such a reversion from local to national needs in the valley of the Mississippi as to justify exclusive Federal expenditure to secure this new protection for the whole country's good.

THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE BLUNDERS ON FLOOD CONTROL

[From the Baltimore Manufacturers Record, December 15, 1927]

When President Coolidge, in his message to Congress, took the position that because the land of the Mississippi Valley would be benefited by protection from floods, it must therefore bear a special assessment to pay for such reclamation, he revealed the fact that in spite of his unmatched opportunity for viewing the situation as a whole and studying it in a broad and comprehensive fashion, he is nevertheless peeping at it through a knothole. His thoughtless use of the word "reclamation" alone reveals a woeful failure to grasp the essentials of the problem, a failure that could hardly have persisted had he once visited the flooded area. We speak of reclaiming land that has not yet been put to use—swamps or deserts. We do not speak of reclaiming long cultivated and highly developed farming sections, cities, factories, and the intricate and costly networks of highways, railways, telegraph, telephone, and electric power lines necessary to serve such farm and urban communities.

To think of reclamation is to think of barren lands or swamps that may some day be made productive. That section which Mr. Coolidge speaks of is already producing farm and factory products worth half a billion dollars annually. Such a section does not need reclamation. It needs protection.

But this misuse of a word would not be worthy of editorial comment if it did not indicate the attitude that is responsible for a grievous blunder in policy. In the same paragraph the President said that the land to be protected must be assessed for a special share of the cost of protection. But the land is only a small part of all that is to be protected. There are several thousand miles of highways, and a similar mileage of railways. Millions of dollars are invested in them. There are the telephone, telegraph, and electric power lines. There are factories. The ownership of these things is not local; it is national. Every man, woman, and child, who has a dollar invested in the securities of the nation-wide telephone or telegraph companies, in one of the power companies serving the district, in one of the great railroad systems traversing the valley, or in one of the factories located there, is interested in protection in exactly the same fashion as a man whose property interest happens to be in farm land or city lots. We can not protect the railways and leave the land exposed. We can not protect the land and leave these other forms of property exposed. Is it, then, just or reasonable to require the farmers who live on the land in the seven affected States to pay a special assessment on their particular form of property, while exempting the owners of the other forms of property who live in the other 41 States?

The President's proposition leads directly to a reductio ad absurdum. The question answers itself. All of them will be taxed, directly or indirectly, to provide the Federal funds. Discrimination between classes of property owners would be as unnecessary as it would be unjust. Furthermore, it would be a flat contradiction of the President's earlier utterances on the same subject. The problem of the great river's control, he said last spring, is national. The flood he called a national disaster, and he declared it must never occur again. Now he has backed down from this position and declared it is only partly national. His present proposition is unsound. It can not stand.

LET THE NATION PAY

[From the Washington Post, December 16, 1927]

The financial features of the flood-control plan prepared by the Army engineers, and now awaiting action by Congress, are not acceptable to the States that have suffered inundations. It is proposed that they shall pay a large proportion of the cost of flood control. They give notice that they are not able to bear the burden.

The Mississippi River will never be put under control if the feeble resources of the flood States are called upon to finance the work. Those States are suffering enormous and almost fatal losses already. They have paid out millions in ineffectual efforts to control the river. Their people are paying taxes for work that has long ago been swept away. Now, it is proposed that these same people shall vote crushing taxes upon themselves in assisting the United States Government to perform a purely national task.

It is not fair to the flood States to demand that they should pay more than any other States. The control of the Mississippi is a problem of national defense not against a foreign enemy but against a still more dangerous and powerful enemy—nature itself. The elements that have defied man's control must be mastered if the Mississippi is to be kept in its channel. Only the Nation can achieve that mastery.

Flood control is not a question of reclaiming lands that have been damaged or which may be submerged. It is a question of protecting American life, which will surely perish unless the United States extends protection. The millions that are generously forthcoming whenever disaster occurs will be spent again and again with utterly futile results if the Mississippi is not placed under control. The people can not be moved away. They can not ward off the floods. They are at the mercy of two powers—the river and the national authority which can overpower the river.

If any project of a purely national character was ever presented to Congress it is the project for control of the Mississippi River. The entire cost of this work should be borne by the Treasury. The people inhabiting the flood regions should pay no more and no fewer taxes than are paid by the inhabitants of Maine or California to defray the cost of this national work.

When the flood-control legislation is enacted it should provide for exclusive jurisdiction over the undertaking by the United States. The States affected by floods should have no voice in this enterprise, except to contribute what they can from their slender resources. They should not be permitted to influence the location, size, cost, or arrangement of any levees, spillways, by-passes, or other devices included in the national plan. As the work is a national duty, the authority over the work should rest in the Government exclusively.

ARMISTICE DAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, through an error Senate Joint Resolution No. 25 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and that the joint resolution may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, what is the nature of the joint resolution, may I ask the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MAYFIELD. It is a joint resolution declaring November 11, armistice day, to be a legal holiday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Texas will be agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association at its recent annual meeting in the city of Baltimore. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD, treated as petitions, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ATLANTIC DEEPER WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION AT ITS TWENTIETH ANNUAL MEETING IN THE CITY OF BALTIMORE MD., SEPTEMBER 9–15, 1927

The Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association convened in its twentieth annual session in the city of Baltimore, Md., with delegates in attendance from every State along the Atlantic seaboard, respectfully submits the following statement of its purposes and policies and also certain resolutions:

STATEMENT

This association takes pride in its achievements. Its announced purpose at its organization in 1907 was to secure the construction of an intracoastal waterway from Maine to Florida. Physical conditions divide this waterway into several links or sections. Through its manifold activities several of these links have either been adopted by Congress or their construction has been completed. From north to south the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal has been authorized and it only awaits an appropriation; the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal has been completed to the project depth of 12 feet; the Norfolk-Beaufort waterway has been authorized and is still under construction; the waterway from Beaufort to Cape Fear River has been authorized and awaits construction; another survey has been authorized for the link from the Cape Fear River to Georgetown, S. C.; the series of natural waterways from Georgetown to Jacksonville are under improvement and maintenance; and, finally, the Florida East Coast Canal has been authorized with a project depth of 8 feet. These achievements are momentous in their results, and their importance can only be realized by a more careful study. Substantially the most important link still remains unauthorized, and that is the waterway across New Jersey, to which reference will be hereinafter made.

At the last meeting of this association in Richmond the following declaration was adopted:

"This association has combined utility with its service. It has realized that channels are intended for navigation and the promotion of commerce. It has encouraged the construction and operation of adequate boat lines. It has emphasized the necessity of water terminals. It has recognized that transportation by water constitutes only one instrumentality of commerce and has insisted that boat lines must be coordinated with the railroads and the highways. It took note of the fact that our great system of transportation by railways was predicated upon a free interchange of traffic between different railroads

on a through bill of lading and with fixed joint and proportional rates. This association has urged that carriers by water should be made an integral part of this system, to the end that they should be made an equal factor in the distribution of products by water and rail under similar joint and proportional rates. Under the leadership of this association much progress has been made in the enactment of legislation providing for the coordination of rail and water carriers."

After due consideration the above declaration is hereby approved and reaffirmed.

The route of the intracoastal waterway, which may be termed the trunk line, and its feeders and tributaries in the way of rivers, bays, and inlets to the ocean, are so varied as to demand specific attention by this association.

CAPE COD CANAL

Congress, in the last river and harbor bill, approved January 21, 1927, authorized the purchase of this privately owned canal and undoubtedly at the coming session will make the appropriation therefor. This marks the consummation of years of effort by this association. We congratulate New England and the country.

NEW ENGLAND RIVERS AND CANALS

New England has been richly endowed with navigable rivers and spacious harbors. We again recommend for consideration the extension northward of the intracoastal waterway from Boston Harbor to a suitable point on the coast of Maine, the importance of which will be appreciated with further study. Such extension would augment opportunities for enlarged commerce on the Merrimac, Kennebec, and other rivers. The Taunton River serves a great industrial section, and we recommend its further improvement as an important artery of interior communication. The Connecticut River well deserves further improvement, both for navigation and the development of water-power.

SEEKONK OR PAWTUCKET RIVER, R. I.

Local interests are seeking the further improvement of Seekonk or Pawtucket River to the city of Pawtucket, with the view of procuring greater depth and width and easier bends in the channel. We recommend this work to the favorable consideration of the Army Engineers.

NEW YORK RIVERS AND CANALS

The Hudson River is under improvement by authorization of Congress and will afford a more adequate channel between Hudson and Albany. We recommend an extension of the 27-foot channel to Troy. When these improvements on the Hudson are completed there is no good reason why the industrial cities along the river should not engage in overseas commerce.

The Erie Canal represents a great enterprise, constructed at the expense of the Empire State. When certain obstacles are removed, we believe that its purpose in creating a through waterway between the ports of the Great Lakes and the sea, by way of the Hudson River, will be realized. We have faith that the same intelligence and foresight on the part of the people of New York and of the country which effected the construction of the Erie Canal will provide for its full utilization for industry and commerce.

We again recommend the further improvement of the Harlem River, Spuyten Duyvil and Bronx Kills, which is necessary to meet the demands of local commerce and a further connection between the Hudson and the waterways of New England.

LONG ISLAND

We again recommend the proposed waterway along the south shore of Long Island, connecting Jamaica Bay, Peconic Bay, and also the Coney Island Ship Canal, and the harbor and terminal developments in Jamaica Bay.

NEWARK BAY

Port Newark is distinctly on the map and is now classed among the most modern water terminals. We congratulate the citizens of Newark upon the foresight and enterprise which made possible this development.

PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY

The wisdom of the States of New York and New Jersey in entering into a compact as provided in the Federal Constitution, with the consent of Congress, whereby was created the Port of New York Authority, has been vindicated. Jurisdiction over the harbors and waters of the port of New York, and certain harbors and waters in the State of New Jersey, has been consolidated under the above name. Much progress has been made in facilitating and cheapening the distribution of commodities to and from this great port, both in domestic and foreign movement. It has been fortunate in the personnel of the officials who have administered this responsible trust. The intracoastal waterway between the Cape Cod Canal and the entrance to the proposed New York-New Jersey waterway intersects the waters under the jurisdiction of the Port of New York Authority. We respectfully invoke the sympathetic consideration and aid of the Port of New York Authority, not only in providing the approaches to the New Jersey waterway, but in securing the authority of Congress for the construction of this most important link connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River.

PORT RARITAN DISTRICT COMMISSION AND THE SOUTH JERSEY PORT DISTRICT

We have observed with interest the creation by the Legislature of New Jersey of the Port Raritan district commission, upon which jurisdiction has been conferred to promote the improvement of the Raritan, South, and Woodbridge Rivers and the Arthur Kill, and also the construction of appropriate terminal facilities. The activities of this commission augur well for the future, and we extend our good wishes and promise of cooperation.

It is also gratifying to note that the Legislature of New Jersey has created the South Jersey port district, upon which jurisdiction has been conferred to promote channels and terminals on the Delaware River, including the terminus of the proposed New Jersey canal and the city of Camden. Under the jurisdiction of this port district, the city of Camden is now considering the construction of a modern terminal on its Delaware River front. The personnel of this port district is gratifying, and we believe they will be able to report substantial results during the coming year.

CHESAPEAKE BAY-DELAWARE RIVER SECTION OF THE INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

The improved waterway connecting the Delaware River with the head of Chesapeake Bay is now a reality. With a mean depth of 12 feet, with ample width, with its conversion into a sea-level canal, and with all modern improvements, it represents in its completion a most valuable contribution to interior navigation and commerce. Its completion was fittingly celebrated by this association, and it may be truthfully classed as one of the monumental achievements of this association. But it is clear to those who have taken advantage of the new waterway that a larger channel must be provided. The big task was to convert an inadequate lock canal into a sea-level waterway. That was achieved. Commerce is responding to facilities offered by the new utility. Larger boats are being employed to traverse the waterway. A 12-foot depth will not meet the future requirements of commerce or of war. We urgently recommend that Congress authorize an immediate survey for a 25-foot channel, depth and width to correspond.

NEW YORK BAY-DELAWARE RIVER SECTION OF THE INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

This proposed waterway across the State of New Jersey is still unauthorized by Congress. Its outstanding relation as a link in the intracoastal waterway is obvious. It connects directly the metropolis of New York with the city of Philadelphia and other cities on the Delaware River. It is an essential link between the Cape Cod Canal and the sections south of the Delaware River. It is manifestly obvious that it will attract a large commerce. Under authorization of Congress, it has been under examination by the engineers for more than two years. This association at large expense has completed what it believes to be reliable data, showing a prospective annual commerce of more than 10,000,000 tons. A favorable report has not yet been submitted by the engineers. This association has the privilege of again emphasizing its importance and of urging speedy and favorable action by the engineers, to the end that a favorable report may be submitted to Congress. Until the proposed deeper waterway across the State of New Jersey shall be authorized and completed, we recommend that the present Delaware and Raritan Canal be continued in operation as formerly, in accordance with the provisions of existing law. The president of this association is requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the engineer having immediate charge of the examination of this waterway and also to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and to the Chief of Engineers.

DELAWARE RIVER

The Delaware River, simply considered in its relation to Philadelphia, Camden, Wilmington, Chester, and other cities located thereon, is one of the great commercial highways of the country. It is traversed in part by the intracoastal waterway. We recommend to Congress the further improvement of this river, to the end that the 35-foot project may be completed. The improvement of the channel in the upper river between Philadelphia and Trenton to a depth of 20 feet has been authorized, and we earnestly recommend that this work of construction proceed promptly. The ultimate depth of the Delaware River below Philadelphia should, in the judgment of this association, be not less than 40 feet, and we recommend a survey therefor.

INLAND WATERWAY FROM CHINCOTEAGUE, VA., TO DELAWARE BAY

This is an important waterway and is substantially the only means of transportation for the section intersected by it. We recommend its further improvement, with the view of securing easier navigation.

THE PORT OF BALTIMORE AND CHANNELS

The port of Baltimore embraces substantially the Patapsco River and its estuaries and Curtis Bay. The existing project provides generally for a depth of 35 feet and a width of 600 feet. The growth of the commerce of this port has been progressive. Its foreign-trade tonnage last year was 11,562,458 long tons. Its aggregate water-borne commerce, including both foreign and coastwise, for 1926 was approxi-

mately 16,600,000 cargo tons. The port is rightfully demanding enlarged channel and anchorage facilities. The Baltimore Association of Commerce and its affiliated commercial interests, after deliberate consideration, have submitted to the engineers requests for the following improvements: They ask for increased depth to 40 feet for the main harbor and essential subsidiary channels, with a width of 1,000 feet and with a further width of 1,500 feet at the necessary turning basins. They submit that these increased channels are necessary to provide for the expanding water-borne commerce of the port and to enable Baltimore to extend adequate navigation facilities to the large tonnage vessels which are now unable to enter the port under existing conditions. They further submit that existing anchorage basins at the port of Baltimore are entirely inadequate to accommodate ships drawing more than 30 feet, and they recommend that an anchorage 3 miles long and 4,000 feet wide be provided along the northeast side of the Fort McHenry Channel, and that the proposed anchorage basin have a minimum depth of 35 feet, and that, in the event a 40-foot channel is authorized, a part of the anchorage basin be provided with a depth of 40 feet.

This association congratulates the port of Baltimore upon its commercial progress and is sympathetic with its aspirations for increased channel facilities, and we recommend to the Congress and the engineers that favorable consideration be given to the justifiable demands of this port.

NORFOLK HARBOR

Hampton Roads is replete in our historic annals and affords one of our most capacious harbors. The port of Norfolk, as consolidated, embraces the Elizabeth River and its three branches and the channel leading to Newport News and the Thimble Shoal Channel. The cities of Norfolk, Portsmouth, Berkley, Newport News, and other communities are served by these waters. We recommend the maintenance of the 40-foot channel leading to the navy yard, and the further improvement of the channel to Newport News to a depth of 40 feet, as heretofore authorized by Congress.

JAMES RIVER, VA.

At the last meeting of this association at Richmond the following resolution was adopted, which we now reaffirm:

The James is the premier among the rivers tributary to Hampton Roads. Considering its fine natural channel and prospective commerce, we submit that its improvement has not kept pace with many other rivers of like commercial resources. This association has learned with interest of the important cooperative work by the city of Richmond in the making of extensive surveys and plans for its improvement, particularly of the upper river. These plans include the elimination of four circuitous bends which impede navigation between City Point and Richmond by the construction of intervening canals, and also the construction of a deep-water terminal for larger vessels about 2 miles below the city limits, and also an intermediate terminal farther up the river. The recognition of the necessity of terminal construction, both for facilitating local commerce and for coordination with the railroads and highways, is most creditable to the intelligence and enterprise of the officials and citizens of the capital city. The offer of local cooperation with the Federal Government should remove any remaining obstacle to the further improvement of the James River by Congress. The strategic relation of the James River to Chesapeake Bay and Hampton Roads lends national significance to the necessity of its adequate improvement. We urgently commend to the Congress and to the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers the commercial importance of the James River from Richmond to Hampton Roads in furtherance of and in cooperation with the plans of the city of Richmond. To the Federal Government we pledge the active assistance of this association.

APPOMATTOX RIVER

The Appomattox River is an important tributary of the James, and we again recommend its further improvement to a minimum depth of 12 feet to correspond with the standard depth of the intracoastal waterway.

EASTERN SHORE OF VIRGINIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

This organization has made report to this association of its activities in behalf of the improvement of waterways in its section of that State. The results have been gratifying. We extend our felicitations and best wishes for continued good works.

THE STATE PORT AUTHORITY OF VIRGINIA

The Commonwealth of Virginia has exhibited faith in its waterways by creating the State Port Authority of Virginia. We have observed the activities of this organization and commend its example to other Atlantic seaboard States.

NORFOLK-BEAUFORT WATERWAY

This was the first link adopted in the chain of the intracoastal waterway. While still uncompleted, the work of construction is progressing and in a few years the route recommended by the engineers will be open to navigation. In the meantime a depth of 12 feet is available through the open waters of the Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds. We recommend that funds for further construction be allotted in a more generous way to the end that this waterway may be completed from Norfolk to Beaufort along the route recommended by the engineers.

BEAUFORT INLET, N. C.

Until such time as the Beaufort-Cape Fear link shall be completed, Beaufort Inlet will remain as the southern entrance to the intracoastal waterway. It has an authorized project depth of 20 feet from Beaufort Harbor to the sea. We recommend that this depth be secured and maintained.

HARBOR OF REFUGE AT CAPE LOOKOUT

This is a natural harbor located in the bight of Cape Lookout and is immediately accessible from the ocean. Its improvement was authorized some years ago, but work was suspended during the war period. Its improvement is not only of importance as a harbor of refuge, but presents possibilities of a great commercial harbor. We note with interest the present agitation for connecting this harbor by rail with the mainland, and express our faith in its practicability and our hope for ultimate success.

BEAUFORT-CAPE FEAR WATERWAY

As stated in the preamble, Congress in the last river and harbor act authorized the construction of this link between Beaufort and the Cape Fear River to the standard depth of 12 feet, in accordance with the plans of the engineers. The completion of this improvement will promote through commerce between the North and the South by way of the inland route. Access to the ocean from the mouth of the Cape Fear River for navigation southward will avoid the dangers of Cape Fear and Frying Pan Shoals. It will greatly facilitate inside navigation between the North and the South and, incidentally, will greatly augment the movement of pleasure yachts and other small craft.

CAPE FEAR-GEORGETOWN WATERWAY

This association has marked another milestone in the progress of the intracoastal waterway southward. Congress at its last session authorized an additional examination and survey of the waterway from Cape Fear River to Georgetown, S. C. We congratulate the communities immediately tributary to this extension and hail the day when it shall be completed. This association approves this extension and offers its services in any available way in securing and preparing data justifying its commercial importance.

COOPER RIVER, S. C.

At our last meeting we emphasized the importance of this river as a lateral feeder to the intracoastal waterway, which we again renew. We also renew our recommendation for the construction of the Santee-Cooper Canal for navigation and power, thereby linking central South Carolina by water with the intracoastal waterway.

FLORIDA EAST COAST CANAL

For years this association has recommended that the Government purchase and improve the privately owned canal intersecting the east coast of Florida. Congress at its last session authorized this inland waterway with a depth of 8 feet at mean low water from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla. This will be an important addition to the commerce of Florida and will also attract through commerce. We offer congratulations and recommend the improvement of this waterway at the earliest practicable date.

WATERWAY ACROSS FLORIDA

This association has always realized that the construction of the intracoastal waterway must be undertaken link by link, and that ultimately connection with the Gulf would be essential by the construction of a waterway across the State of Florida. In the last river and harbor act, approved January 21, 1927, a survey was authorized of this waterway "from Cumberland Sound, Ga. and Fla., to the Mississippi River." Congress has heretofore authorized the construction of an intracoastal waterway along the Gulf coast from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande. This proposed waterway across the peninsula of Florida will connect the inside routes along the Atlantic and the Gulf, and thereby promote through traffic. We urge upon the commercial interests of the State of Florida the submission of appropriate data, which will demonstrate the importance of this waterway across the State, to the end that a favorable report may be submitted by the engineer.

SAVANNAH RIVER AND HARBOR

The commercial growth of Savannah, both coastwise and overseas, has afforded just pride to its citizens. This commerce justifies an ample channel from Savannah to the sea. We again recommend the extension of the 21-foot project up the river from the lower end of Kings Island to the coastal highway bridge.

FLORIDA HARBORS AND WATERWAYS

Jacksonville, Miami, Key West, Tampa, and other ports are not only essential to the commerce of the State, but of the country. We have been gratified at the progress made in providing for adequate channels at the port of Miami. We recommend the improvement and maintenance of the many important rivers of Florida penetrating the interior.

We have observed with increasing interest the activities of the Gulf-Okeechobee-Atlantic Waterway Association, and have faith in the ultimate accomplishment of its purposes.

FLOOD CONTROL AND THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

The members of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association have keenly felt the suffering and tremendous losses which have been brought about in flood regions of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. To those who have suffered in one way or another we would extend our deepest sympathy. In view of the fact that the Mississippi River and its tributaries, stretching from the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghenies, and from the Lakes to the Gulf, drain more than one-third of the total area of the United States, or 1,200,000 square miles, and these rivers are under the control of the Federal Government, we would express the hope that the Government will promptly come to the rescue of those who have suffered, actively cooperate in the rehabilitation of the overflowed districts and begin as promptly as possible a campaign for safeguarding the Mississippi Valley forever from such a disaster as that of the present year. We recognize the fact that this will involve the safeguarding of all of its tributaries from damaging overflows. Every disaster from these floods, whether it be on the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Red River, the Mississippi, or any of the tributaries of the Mississippi, is a disaster to the entire country. The protection of all of the country tributary to these rivers is a problem for the Federal Government, and the entire country must unite whole-heartedly in this great campaign.

WATER TERMINALS

This association has emphasized in previous years the essential importance of water terminals for the proper utilization of waterways and harbors. This proposition is now understood by the country, as illustrated by the number of water terminals which are under construction or have been completed. At this time we simply reaffirm our declaration of their necessity and recommend to all towns and cities the importance of constructing terminals with a view to utilizing improved channels and promoting water-borne commerce, and also as an essential for interconnection between the railways and the waterways.

CONNECTING TOWNS AND SHIPPING POINTS WITH THE MAIN LINE OF THE INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

There are towns and shipping points located in each State intersected by the intracoastal waterway which are more or less distant from the main channel of this waterway. These towns and shipping points should be physically connected by an adequate channel leading to this waterway. We recommend that all such towns and shipping points be provided with adequate channels, preferably of the standard depth of 12 feet, leading to the main channel of the intracoastal waterway.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION

Commendable progress has been made by the Department of Commerce in establishing the necessary aids to navigation. Wherever these are lacking we urge upon localities the importance of properly marking all improved channels.

OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION

The proposition that the navigation of channels should not be impeded by obstructions, except where absolutely essential, is obvious. The accelerated movement in recent years in the construction of improved highways and the increasing use of automobiles and trucks, typifies an important innovation in transportation. This has augmented, in large degree, the demands for bridges across navigable waters, and has proceeded to such an extent as to seriously obstruct navigation. We realize that bridges for railroads and for connecting highways are sometimes so essential as to justify their construction, but the present movement indicates that we are proceeding far beyond the limits of prudence and necessity. We urge upon the people of the country the importance of unobstructed navigation upon our navigable waters. As the country grows in industry and distribution, we will find increasing need for our rivers. This heedless demand for additional bridges should be checked to the end that these natural highways may remain as an unimpaired heritage for the future.

POLLUTION OF WATERS

It is gratifying to note the success of the movement seeking to prevent the unnecessary pollution of our waters. Public sentiment has secured both Federal and State legislation. We recommend continued activity in this respect.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Powell, Wyo., protesting against any amendment of the immigration act for the purpose of further restricting the immigration of citizens of Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented a resolution adopted by the quorum or levying court of Chicot County, Ark., favoring the enactment of legislation to replace the bridges destroyed by the recent floods in Arkansas and to appoint emergency agents in the flooded counties, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the printing industry of Wichita, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation restoring the 1924 basis of postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials numerously signed by citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENEEN presented a petition numerously signed by citizens of Chicago, Ill., and Toledo, Ohio, favoring a prompt and favorable response by the United States to proposals of M. Briand for the settlement of international disputes by the use of peaceful methods, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials numerously signed by citizens of White Hall and vicinity, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLAINE presented petitions of sundry citizens of La Crosse and of Adams Counties, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution relating to the outlawry of war

Whereas war between nations under existing international law is a lawful institution, and any nation, with or without cause, may declare war against any other nation; and

Whereas war is the greatest existing menace to society, and the next great war is almost certain to be more terrible than any previous war and is likely to engulf and destroy civilization: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That war between nations should be outlawed as an institution or means for the settlement of international controversies by making it a public crime in international law, and that every nation should be encouraged by solemn agreement or treaty to bind itself to indict and punish its own international war breeders or instigators and war profiteers under powers similar to those conferred upon our Congress under Article I, section 8, of our Federal Constitution, which clothes the Congress with the power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and Congress be, and are hereby, memorialized to take the necessary steps to make this country the leader in the movement for the outlawry of war through agreements with other nations and through legislation curbing all instigators of war and war profiteers; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each House of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. BLAINE also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Joint resolution relating to the Menominee Indian Reservation

Whereas the Federal Government has indicated its intention to allow a survey of the potential water power of the Wolf River in the Menominee Indian Reservation to be made by private interests; and

Whereas published news reports from Washington City carry the story that Indian Commissioner Burke "assumed a bullying attitude toward Indian witnesses" at the hearing recently held; and

Whereas it is thought that this proposed damming of the Wolf River may destroy one of the last spots of natural beauty in Wisconsin, and may also increase the flood danger to a region already sorely harassed by periodical inundation; and

Whereas Wisconsin has no national park, with the exception of the Winnesheik Bottoms, which is a game refuge; and

Whereas the last extensive stand of virgin timber in Wisconsin is located on the Menominee Reservation and is rapidly being cut off by the Government and private interests: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Federal Indian Bureau be, and is hereby, requested to refrain from finally leasing the power site to private interests until Congress has convened and until after a full, fair, and properly announced hearing or hearings have been conducted; be it further

Resolved, That Wisconsin's Representatives in the Congress of the United States be requested to investigate the feasibility of making a national park of the river and timber tract on the said Menominee Indian Reservation so that its natural beauty will be saved for future generations, and that these representatives make every effort possible to carry this plan to fruition should they deem it practicable and necessary in order to save the reservation from spoliation; be it further

Resolved, That Wisconsin's representatives be requested to use every effort to protect the interests of the Indians with regard to the proposed damming of the Wolf River and the leasing of the power site to private interests; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, suitably attested by the presiding officers of the senate and assembly, be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to the Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. BLAINE also presented the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to provide for earlier seating of Senators and Representatives elect

Whereas Members of Congress are elected in November of even-numbered years, but under the present Constitution of the United States do not meet in regular session until December of the year following; and

Whereas in the so-called short sessions of Congress, which convene in December following each general election, there are always many Members who were defeated for reelection and repudiated by their constituents; and

Whereas this provision of the Constitution operates to prevent the will of the people from being expressed in legislation within a reasonable time: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin hereby earnestly requests and petitions Congress to adopt and submit to the States the so-called Norris amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the earlier commencement of the terms of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress and for the convening of Congress in January of the year following its election.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of the senate and assembly, be forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act

Whereas the voters of the State of Wisconsin at a recent referendum registered their disapproval of prohibition by a majority of approximately 176,000 votes; and

Whereas the people of Wisconsin have emphatically expressed themselves in favor of a modification of the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer; and

Whereas a nation-wide test on the question of modifying the Volstead Act would afford the means of accurately measuring the sentiment of the entire country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby goes on record as respectfully memorializing Congress to provide the necessary machinery for the holding of a nation-wide referendum on the question of modifying the Volstead Act to legalize the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution duly attested by the proper officers of the assembly and senate be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of Congress.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. BLAINE also presented the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Joint resolution relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project

Whereas the prosperity of Wisconsin, as well as the whole of the United States, is in large measure dependent upon lower rates of transportation on agricultural and manufactured products to markets in Eastern States and foreign countries; and

Whereas it is possible to secure such lower rates of transportation through the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project, which would enable ocean-going vessels to enter the Great Lakes; and

Whereas this project has been repeatedly pronounced by qualified engineers to be practicable in all respects and a good investment from a business point of view, most recently by the joint international board of engineers and by Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to make possible the early completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly signed by the presiding officers of both houses and attested by the chief clerks thereof, be sent to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from Wisconsin.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to grant Federal aid in the construction of interstate bridges

Whereas the boundaries dividing the several States in many instances consist of natural watercourses and rivers; and

Whereas the cost of interstate bridges is very great, since the rivers in many instances are wide and the engineering and construction problems difficult to solve; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States vests in Congress control over all interstate communication and the Federal Government is vitally interested in developing national highways cutting across State lines: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin earnestly requests and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to give Federal aid for the construction of interstate bridges; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN W. EBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present the memorial to Congress from the Elks and other fraternal negro organizations and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United this memorial is respectfully addressed by the undersigned representatives of America negro organizations and citizens:

1. We urge the sustaining of the entire Constitution of the United States and the enforcement of all its provisions and laws. No greater blunder could be committed by Government than to make the avowal or allow the impression that it has power to enforce all of its laws with certain exceptions. Such policy would to the man of ordinary mind and common sense mean one of two things, or both of them: (a) That the Government has no real power to enforce any of its laws, or (b) that Government officials are consummate hypocrites, who are resolved to enforce only such laws as they favor.

2. It is our conviction that every amendment of the National Constitution is as vital a part of fundamental law as is the first article of that instrument; and that every act passed by the lawfully constituted legislative body, until such legislation is repealed or properly nullified by the courts, is as sacred as the Constitution itself. In the call for enforcement we therefore make no implied exception of so-called unpopular laws, since, and as long as, the people have the remedies of protest, agitation, further legislation, amendment, and repeal.

3. We therefore deplore the dangerous policies of those time-serving political leaders of any party or section, who are disposed to compromise with the sentiment that certain of our laws and constitutional provisions can not be enforced because of the fact that a minority, even a powerful minority, is opposed to such laws and provisions. For if the opposition to such constitutional and legislative acts be not a mere minority, then such acts can be, and should be, regularly and legally amended or repealed. In a democratic-republican form of government there is no logical and reasonable excuse either for violation by the citizen or for failure of enforcement by the administration. The violation is a crime; the failure to enforce is betrayal to anarchy. Such tactics on the part of private citizens and officers of law tend to bring the whole business of government into weakness and disrepute even among those for whose favor such tactics are employed.

4. If the foregoing is a true statement of the general principle of just government and sane statesmanship, then it is easy to specify; that the thirteenth, the fourteenth, the fifteenth, and the eighteenth amendments to the Constitution should be as honestly enforced as the fifth or sixth. For the statesman the only alternatives are respect or repeal. To flagrantly violate or neglect certain parts of the law is not statesmanship, but it is contemptible and even dangerous politics.

5. Similarly, the community of interests that obtains among our laws obtains also among our citizens. When the rights of one citizen are willfully violated by other citizens or shamefully neglected by officers of law, the rights of all citizens are at least jeopardized. No informed American doubts that the administration of suffrage laws in many of the States aims to limit unfairly and does unfairly limit the number of negro voters, but many otherwise intelligent Americans have not yet penetrated far enough into the matter to see that the unfair curtailing of negro votes has resulted in a curtailment of the votes of white people, so that in some States where more than half a million citizens should go to the polls, we may see a "rotten borough" election with less than 50,000 votes cast. In the last analysis, white people and black people in America have a common interest in the sacredness and the security of the ballot and of all constitutional rights.

6. It is the same with the nature of freedom and liberty; either both races must have the freedom of expression and the liberty of action or neither race can fully enjoy these blessings. We note with concern that in those parts of the country where the negro is not free to express himself the white man is also not free to express himself about the negro. In such a society even the so-called freest white must conform in his expressions and overt acts toward the negro and about the negro, which leads inevitably to a smothering of liberalism and a paralyzing conformity on subjects that are alien to the "negro question." Liberal and progressive ideas do not prosper in such communities. The human mind is a unit, or a unitary resultant at least, and it can not be very narrow on the great issues of life in one direction and very liberal on the same issues when directed toward others; it can not be a criminal for some and a saint for others. Oppressive discrimination is dangerous, because it creates a type of mind which may no longer descriminate but which will continue to oppress. The signers of this memorial could, therefore, just as logically and reasonably address their appeal to the country in behalf of the freedom and liberty of the white American, which necessarily includes the freedom and liberty of the black American.

7. In this conviction, and as patriots of the Republic, we wish to register our belief that no politician and no party which declares an unwillingness or confesses an inability to enforce any part of the Constitution can be trusted to enforce any other part, and that they who so declare and confess, if they be not conscious enemies of the Republic, are at best its unwise friends.

Signed by J. Finley Wilson, grand exalted ruler of the Elks; William Pickens, field secretary of the N. A. A. C. P.; Cæsar Blake, imperial potentate of the Shriners; W. H. Jernagin, National Equal Rights League and Race Congress; Charles T. Freeman, Grand Encampment K. T.; Mrs. Ora B. Stokes, presiding shepherd of Order of Shepherds; Robert F. Leftridge, Citizens' League; Mrs. Ella G. Berry, grand daughter ruler, Daughter Elks of the World; Mrs. Emma V. Kelley, grand secretary; Robert J. Nelson, executive director Civil Liberties Commission of the Elks; Dr. S. H. George, grand esteemed leading knight of the Elks; John R. Hawkins, National Negro Bankers' Association; Bishop J. J. Higgs, Modern Educational and Religious Bureau; Nannie H. Burroughs, National League of Republican Women; Mary McLeod Bethune, National Association of Colored Women's Clubs; Robert L. Vann, editor Pittsburgh Courier; Mrs. Maggie L. Walker, Independent Order of St. Luke; Sydney B. Thompson; Rienzi B. Lemus, president Brotherhood Dining Car Employees; George W. Harris, editor of New York News; Charles E. Robinson.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency a resolution adopted at the recent meeting of the Indiana Farm Bureau Federation at Indianapolis, Ind., the minutes of the annual meeting of the National Association of Federal Farm Loan Borrowers, of Chicago, Ill., and the report of a special committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, indorsed by the National Association of Federal Farm Loan Borrowers.

There being no objection, the papers were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was passed at the recent annual meeting of the Indiana Farm Bureau Federation at Indianapolis:

"Believing that the Federal farm-loan system was formulated with the idea of helping the farmer, and believing that it has been honestly and intelligently administered in the past, we view with alarm the raid on the Federal farm-loan system by Mr. Mellon and the Treasury Department, whereby certain directors representing the farmers of the country were replaced by President Coolidge with the appointment of Mr. Eugene Meyer and his associates, who we know are representing New York financial interests and are known to be hostile to the real interests of the farmer.

"We therefore demand that the appointments of Mr. Meyer and his associates be contested and all influence possible be used to prevent the United States Senate from confirming these appointments."

MINUTES OF ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN BORROWERS, CHICAGO, ILL., HOTEL SHERMAN, DECEMBER 6, 1927

The annual meeting was called to order by President Carl S. Vrooman. The following persons were present: Carl S. Vrooman, president; O. M. Kile, secretary-treasurer; C. H. Gustafson, honorary vice president; Herman Steen, member of board of directors; C. A. Sorensen, counsel; F. W. McLean, vice president of the Wheat Growers' Cooperative Association, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Robert Cowles, secretary Illinois Agricultural Association; Mr. Wood, secretary of Farm Loan Association in Missouri; Lieut. Gov. F. O. McCormack, of Montana, director in the Spokane land bank; Mr. Martin, director of the St. Louis land bank; and Mr. Kraft, representative of a Chicago commercial bank.

In addition, the following were in touch with the meeting, either by brief visits or through close contact with other members: Murray D. Lincoln, secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation; Charles A. Hearst, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; L. J. Taber, master of the National Grange; Samuel R. Guard, editor of Breeder's Gazette; Earle Houghton, president California Farm Bureau Federation; Mr. Hartshorn, of Kansas; Gray Silver, of West Virginia.

Messages from Vice President Huelle, of Nebraska, and Director W. B. Hanly, of Oklahoma, were read by the secretary, expressing regret that they were not able to be present.

The secretary read extracts from the report sent to members at the close of the Sixty-ninth Congress reviewing activities down to that date. He also reported verbally on activities since the close of Congress, mentioning particularly the brief prepared by the secretary for use of a special committee appointed by the American Farm Bureau Federation to investigate the shortcomings and legislative needs of the Federal farm-loan system. The secretary reported that he had been invited to work with this committee in formulating proposed amendments to the Federal farm loan act and had spent several days meeting with that committee. The secretary also called attention to the situation that had arisen through the appointment of Eugene Meyer and his two associates to the Federal Farm Loan Board despite the protests of farm organization leaders. The secretary asked for definite instruc-

tions as to the organization's viewpoint and desires in this latter matter.

The secretary reported also that while much interest had been shown in the formation of a national federation of local farm-loan associations, and that a considerable number had contributed to this end out of their own funds, yet rapid expansion of the organization is impossible as long as the 1920 Farm Loan Board ruling against financial participation in such activities still stands on the books, even though it apparently is not now being enforced and could not be legally enforced, according to the opinion of leading lawyers.

Following the secretary's report, President Vrooman discussed briefly the accomplishments of the association to date, the need for active work at this time, and the future scope of the activities of our organization. He pointed out particularly the advantages of an organization such as ours to be used as a coordinating agency for activities carried on by other national farm organizations. He emphasized the necessity, however, of continuing our organization as a separate unit, since our ultimate purpose is mainly along the lines of upbuilding and representing the local units.

Under the order of new business the secretary read the report of the special farm bureau committee above mentioned. This report is attached hereto. After general discussion, Mr. Sorensen made the following motion:

"That we indorse the amendments to the Federal farm loan act proposed by a committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation as being in line with the present efforts and policies of our organization and that we add thereto an amendment providing for the separation of the Federal intermediate credit banks from the Federal farm loan banks."

This motion was seconded by Mr. McLean and on vote carried unanimously.

General discussion brought out the fact that often it is the aribtrary rulings of the Federal Farm Loan Board in conflict with the spirit of the act, rather than any specific shortcoming of the law itself, that causes the difficulty. The consensus of opinion was that in revamping the act every effort should be made to insert prohibitions which would guard against these arbitrary rulings in conflict with the spirit of the act.

The question of opposing the confirmation of the recess appointments to the Farm Loan Board was discussed at some length and resulted in the following resolution offered by Mr. McLean, seconded by Mr. McCormack, and passed without a dissenting vote:

"As a prerequisite to the sympathetic administration of the act—indeed, as a prerequisite to the enactment of necessary amendments—we urge the absolute necessity of a Federal Farm Loan Board made up of members known to be thoroughly familiar with the credit needs of agriculture and recognized as being entirely in harmony with the sympathetic administration of the act.

"And believing that the recent arbitrary removal of three farmer-minded members of the Federal Farm Loan Board and the substitution during a recess of Congress of members representative of commercial banking and Treasury Department interests is a clear violation of the principles set forth above.

"We therefore urge that the officers and members of the National Association of Federal Farm Loan Borrowers make every effort to prevent the confirmation of the pending recess appointments of Messrs. Meyer, Cooksey, and Harrison; to secure the appointment of capable men better fitted by training, experience, and environment to represent agriculture; and that following this a bill be drafted and urged in accordance with memoranda attached herewith."

The "memoranda" mentioned in this resolution refers to the suggested amendments listed at the end of this report.

Mr. Sorensen moved the reelection of the officers of the past year, with the substitution of Mr. F. W. Lingquist, of Helena, Mont., to replace Mr. Hearst on the board of directors, and the addition of Mr. F. W. McLean as an honorary vice president. The motion was duly seconded and passed.

The president appointed an auditing committee consisting of Messrs. McLean and Sorensen, to audit the accounts of the organization. After checking over the receipts and expenditures and comparing the latter with canceled checks, the committee reported that the accounts were correct.

The organization authorized the secretary-treasurer to carry on a campaign for increased membership and funds and to use every means available to carry out the purposes for which it was formed.

President Vrooman indicated that he expects to be in Washington much of the time during the coming winter and will render all assistance possible.

On motion the association adjourned.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INDORSED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN BORROWERS

Since the capital stock of the Federal land-bank system originally advanced by the United States Treasury has now been almost entirely repaid and the system is now owned by farmers, the time is opportune to effect certain desirable readjustments in administrative practice and to make certain modifications in the policies that have grown up during this period of management by the Treasury Department.

This rural credit system has made good progress in the face of severe opposition and has come through a period of extraordinary agricultural depression with its credit standing unimpaired and its bonds universally recognized as gilt-edge securities. The safety and solidity of the system has been severely tested and found to be of the best.

Such criticisms as your committee has investigated and such recommendations as we desire to make have to do chiefly with safeguarding the system against encroachments from interests inimical to those of the farmer, securing a more sympathetic administration of the act as originally conceived, developing greater flexibility in the use of credit facilities and their better adaptation to the peculiar needs of agriculture, and the encouragement of increased activity and responsibility among local borrower-stockholders who are now the real owners of the system.

As a means of bringing about these desired changes your committee recommends amendments to the Federal farm loan act and rural intermediate credit act in accordance with the following 18 suggestions:

1. That the law be so amended as to establish the Federal Farm Loan Board as an independent body, removing same from its present status as a bureau of the Treasury, and endeavoring to assure its autonomy.

2. That the Federal Farm Loan Board consist of seven persons, one of whom shall be the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be ex-officio chairman of the board, and the other six of whom shall be residents of and selected, respectively, from regions as follows:

First region, consisting of the districts served by the Springfield and Baltimore Federal land banks.

Second region, the Louisville and Columbia land-bank districts.

Third region, the St. Louis and New Orleans land-bank districts.

Fourth region, the Omaha and St. Paul land-bank districts.

Fifth region, the Houston and Wichita land-bank districts.

Sixth region, the Berkeley and Spokane land-bank districts.

3. Whenever there is a vacancy on the Federal Farm Loan Board it shall be the duty of each of the Federal land-bank boards in the region which is not represented on the board by reason of the vacancy to suggest to the President of the United States two or more persons who may be considered suitable for such position.

4. Federal land-bank appraisers shall be selected and employed by the respective land-bank boards, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and such banks shall have the power to remove appraisers so employed, but the Federal Farm Loan Board shall have and retain full power and authority to appoint and remove reviewing appraisers.

5. The board of directors of each Federal land bank shall consist of seven persons, who shall be residents of their respective districts, two of whom shall be known as regional directors and shall be appointed by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and five of whom shall be known as local directors and shall be elected by the national farm-loan associations of the district. The directors may elect one of their number as president of the land bank, but no other director shall be or become an official or other salaried employee of the land bank or intermediate credit bank of which he is a director, but this shall not be construed to prevent his receiving special pay or per diem as a director or executive committeeman. No member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, director, or official of any Federal land bank, or employee of the system shall use any influence in or take part in the election of local directors of any land bank, under penalty of forfeiture of his position upon charges preferred before the Farm Loan Board, but this shall not be construed to interfere with the candidacy of any such person for any office.

In the election of local directors the national farm-loan associations shall have 20 days' notice for the purpose of nominating candidates, and also 20 days' time in which to elect. There shall be no redistricting within six months preceding an election in any district.

That it shall be a part of the duty of the directors of each land bank, when and as ordered by the board of directors, to confer with the officers and directors of the farm-loan associations of the district from time to time in an effort to encourage such associations in the proper performance of their duties.

6. That national farm-loan associations be authorized at their discretion to appropriate out of their funds an amount not to exceed 25 cents per member per annum for the purpose of forming and/or maintaining associations of shareholders, district, state, or national in character.

7. That when the Farm Loan Board makes the annual report of its operations to the Speaker of the House, as is required by law, it shall also furnish a copy thereof to each Federal land bank and to every director thereof.

8. That each national farm loan association shall receive annually one-tenth of 1 per cent of all interest collected on loans made through such association, which fund shall be paid to it by the land bank regardless of whether such association is entitled to receive dividends or not, and shall be used by the association for its necessary expenses or for reserve.

9. That the joint-stock land banks and Federal farm-loan banks be put on a basis of equality as to eligibility of loans and as to loan limit.

10. The amount represented by real estate acquired by any land bank as the result of the foreclosure of a mortgage shall be charged off at the rate of 20 per cent per year from the time of the final acquisition of title to such real estate.

11. That the board of directors of each Federal intermediate credit bank shall elect a vice president thereof, who shall be considered the active executive officer of such credit bank, and shall be charged with the duty of seeing that such bank functions properly subject to the general direction of the board of directors.

12. That section 202–C be so amended as to permit Federal intermediate credit banks to discount paper having a maturity at the time of making or discounting of not less than 60 days.

13. That section 202, paragraph A–3 be so amended as to permit Federal intermediate credit banks to make loans to cooperative associations when the notes or other such obligations representing such loans are secured by real estate or by other tangible property owned by such cooperative.

14. That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall have power, and it shall be its duty, to select and appoint land-bank examiners.

15. That production credits of the intermediate credit banks be as a policy limited in the future to farmer-formed organizations or corporations, or to such organizations as can show that the funds will not be used against the interests of cooperative-marketing organizations.

16. That extension of installment payments be granted at discretion of the land bank, with the requirement of suitable and full assurance of such payment.

17. We request of the Federal Farm Loan Board that the recent ruling of the intermediate credit bank at Berkeley, Calif., prohibiting the forward sale of mortgaged crops, be suspended until a field investigation be made.

18. That a separate section of the Federal intermediate credit banks be created for the purpose of loaning funds to cooperatives to purchase or build physicial properties, the security to rest on crop pledges, as set forth in the Neely amendment to the McNary-Haugen bill of 1926–27.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 747) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Kettle Falls, Wash., reported it without amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. At the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and on his behalf, I report back with amendments from the Committee on the Judiciary the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress, and I submit a report (No. 5) thereon.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Mr. DENEEN. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report a number of resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if all the resolutions are of a similar character?

Mr. DENEEN. They are all of a similar character, authorizing certain committees of the Senate to hold hearings, with the exception of one which provides for the employment of an additional page and one which authorizes the Committee on Privileges and Elections to consider the contested-election case from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent, then, that the reading of the resolutions may be dispensed with, and that the clerk at the desk may merely mention the names of the committees, respectively, covered by the resolutions.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The names of the committees should be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 41) submitted by Mr. WATSON on the 12th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventieth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably the resolution (S. Res. 49) submitted by Mr. REED of Pennsylvania on the 12th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 55) submitted by Mr. PHIPPS on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventieth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 56) submitted by Mr. METCALF on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 57) submitted by Mr. FRAZIER on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS COMMITTEE

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 58) submitted by Mr. KEYES on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably

without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 59) submitted by Mr. HOWELL on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 60) submitted by Mr. BORAH on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 61) submitted by Mr. SMOOT on the 13th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Seventieth Congress at such times and places as they may deem advisable; to make investigations into internal revenue, customs, currency, and coinage matters, and other matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary; and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such expert stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all of the expenses of such committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee is authorized to order such printing and binding as may be necessary for its use.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 64) submitted by Mr. HOWELL (for Mr. NORRIS) on the 15th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 65) submitted by Mr. NYE on the 15th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 66) submitted by Mr. MCLEAN on the 15th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PAGE

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 42) submitted by Mr. CURTIS on the 12th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized and directed to employ an additional page from the 5th day of December, 1927, to the 30th day of June, 1928, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $3.30 per day.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 68) submitted by Mr. SHORTRIDGE on the 15th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas on the 4th day of March, 1927, the Senate referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections the pending contest between WILLIAM S. VARE and William B. Wilson, involving the question whether the said VARE or the said Wilson, or either of them, is entitled to membership in the United States Senate as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections is hereby authorized to hear and determine said contest, and to take such evidence as it may deem proper in order to determine the questions involved, and certify its conclusions to the Senate.

Said committee is authorized, by itself or by any subcommittee, to investigate the questions aforesaid, and shall have authority to act by or through such agents or representatives as it may see fit to designate.

Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to issue subpœnas and require the production of all papers, books, documents, or other evidence pertinent to said investigation, and said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of the Congress and to hold its sessions at such places as it may deem proper.

It shall have authority to employ clerks and other necessary assistance and to employ stenographers at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per hundred words, and to cause to be taken and recorded all evidence received by the committee, and to have said evidence printed for the information of the Senate.

The Senate, having heretofore created a special committee to inquire into certain matters in connection with said election and the primary preceding the same, and having continued said committee in force, it is ordered that the Committee on Privileges and Elections may, in its discretion, consider such evidence as has heretofore or may hereafter be taken by the said special committee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolutions 195, 223, 258, and 324, Sixty-ninth Congress, and Senate Resolution 10, Seventieth Congress; and the said special committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to consider such evidence as may be taken by the said Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and his deputies and assistants are hereby required to attend the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or of any subcommittee thereof, and to execute its directions.

The chairman of the committee, and each and every member thereof, is hereby empowered to administer oaths and generally have such powers and perform such duties as are necessary or incident to the exercise of the powers and duties imposed by this resolution.

Said committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The cost of investigations and proceedings in pursuance of the foregoing to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and not to exceed $50,000.

The preamble was agreed to.

TENNESSEE RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute the bill (S. 1090) to authorize the construction of a highway toll bridge across the Tennessee River in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn., and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Tennessee to the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is an ordinary bridge bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tennessee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation on the Linden-Lexington Road in Perry and Decatur Counties in the State of Tennessee, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in the State of Tennessee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 1849) providing that funds appropriated for the care and relief of Indians of California, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1850) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Sheldon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 1851) for the relief of Charles Wellesley Berrington (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1852) to correct the naval record of John Lewis Burns; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1853) for the relief of Henry C. Wilke; and

A bill (S. 1854) for the relief of Herman P. Ulmer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1855) to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1856) for the relief of the Gunnison-Mayfield Land & Grazing Co.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 1857) granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware & New Jersey Bridge Corporation, a corporation of the State of Delaware, domiciled at Wilmington, Del., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1858) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions to compute service of the Fifth and Sixth Delaware Regiments from enlistment to discharge;

A bill (S. 1859) granting a pension to Sadie C. Peters (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1860) granting a pension to Sallie T. Freeman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 1861) to create an additional judge in the district of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1862) for the relief of Eugene D. Mossman, James B. Kitch, and certain Indians of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1863) to authorize final rolls of various bands of Sioux Indians; and

A bill (S. 1864) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, hear, and determine the claims of individual members of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against tribal funds or against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1865) to provide for the protection of municipal watersheds within the national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1866) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Milbank, S. Dak.; and

A bill (S. 1867) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Winner, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1868) for the relief of Hannah Nielson Larsen; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1869) granting an increase of pension to Louise A. Wood;

A bill (S. 1870) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1871) granting a pension to Fred W. Fox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Diantha M. Jarvis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1873) granting an increase of pension to Reuben J. Reals (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1874) granting an increase of pension to Amanda D. Holcomb (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1875) granting an increase of pension to Oral E. Osbon;

A bill (S. 1876) granting an increase of pension to George Cuts-Half (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1877) granting a pension to Ellen H. Morrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 1878) to amend section 5137 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1879) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge Co., of Lansing, Iowa, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Lansing; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1880) granting increase of pension to soldiers, sailors, and marines of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition, and to widows, children, and dependent relatives of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, granting pensions to World War veterans, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1881) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Brownfield (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 1882) for the relief of the Farmers National Bank, of Danville, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1883) granting a pension to Martha R. Pack (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1884) granting an increase of pension to Margaret P. Long;

A bill (S. 1885) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Snow (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1886) granting an increase of pension to Lavina Craig (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1887) granting an increase of pension to Zorada Finch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 1888) for the relief of Charles Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1889) granting a pension to Gustavus A. Cutter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1890) to provide for the filling of certain limited vacancies in the grade of warrant officers, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT:

A bill (S. 1891) for the relief of Edmund L. Moore; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KEYES (by request):

A bill (S. 1892) to provide for the world-wide extension of education by the cooperation of national governments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 1893) to designate a building site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 1894) to increase the efficiency of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:
A bill (S. 1895) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Cunningham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. DENEEN:
A bill (S. 1896) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to amend the contract executed by the Treasury Department for the construction of the Edward Hines, Jr., Hospital at Broad View, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 1897) granting a pension to Gertrude Taylor; and
A bill (S. 1898) granting a pension to Nettie E. Kimery; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. RANSDELL:
A bill (S. 1899) for the relief of Clifford D. Ham, collector general of customs, administrator of Corinto Wharf, Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. MOSES (for Mr. DU PONT):
A bill (S. 1900) to provide for the construction of a post road and military highway from a point on or near the Atlantic coast to a point on or near the Pacific coast, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
By Mr. PITTMAN:
A bill (S. 1901) granting a pension to Adam H. Kramer; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. NEELY:
A bill (S. 1902) granting an increase of pension to George Milams; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. THOMAS:
A bill (S. 1903) to authorize the creation of Indian trust estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there has been considerable complaint about the congestion of business in the district courts of the United States. In the hope of meeting that in an economical way, I desire to introduce a bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges to be known as associate district judges, and for other purposes, and to have it referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JONES of Washington:
A bill (S. 1904) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges to be known as associate district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CAPPER:
A bill (S. 1905) to prevent fraud respecting securities offered for sale within the District of Columbia, to provide a summary proceeding therefor, to license persons selling securities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 1906) authorizing the transportation of all miscellaneous refuse collected in the District of Columbia to the workhouse or reformatory tract near Occoquan, Va., and its disposition at that place;
A bill (S. 1907) to establish a woman's bureau in the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 1908) to amend section 12 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 1909) to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia; and
A bill (S. 1910) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code for the District of Columbia approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
By Mr. FRAZIER:
A bill (S. 1911) to amend sections 311 and 313 of the tariff act of 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. NYE:
A bill (S. 1912) to remit the duties on certain materials, machinery, and equipment to be imported for the Lehigh Briquetting Co., Lehigh, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Finance.
(By request.) A bill (S. 1913) to authorize the transfer of the geodetic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.
By Mr. McNARY:
A bill (S. 1914) to make an award of $10,000 and grant a pension to Michael A. Donaldson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1915) to reconvey to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Sand Island, near the mouth of the Columbia River, in the State of Oregon, reserving to the United States the right to the perpetual use of the said land for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.
A bill (S. 1916) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. FLETCHER:
A bill (S. 1917) to legalize a bridge across Hillsboro Bay at Twenty-second Street, Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:
A bill (S. 1918) for the relief of George H. Koerner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 1919) granting a pension to George Frye, alias Walter Davison; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:
A bill (S. 1920) for the relief of William E. Bliss; and
A bill (S. 1921) for the relief of Margaret T. Head, administratrix; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1922) making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid, at the request of the President, in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims and Senate Report No. 764, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session; to the Committee on Appropriations.
By Mr. TYSON:
A bill (S. 1923) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1924) granting a pension to Charles H. Sills; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1925) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
A bill (S. 1926) providing for a Presidents' Plaza and memorial in the city of Nashville, State of Tennessee, to Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson, former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.
A bill (S. 1927) for the relief of Capt. George R. Armstrong, United States Army, retired;
A bill (S. 1928) to provide for appointing Robert J. Burton, a former field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, a warrant officer, United States Army;
A bill (S. 1929) providing for the promotion of certain noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army; and
A bill (S. 1930) to establish a national military park on the site of Camp Blount, Lincoln County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1931) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Jefferson City, Tenn.; and
A bill (S. 1932) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:
A bill (S. 1933) granting an honorable discharge from the military service to Charles Morton Wilson (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Thomas B. Wikoff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1935) granting a pension to Thomas Miller (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1936) granting an increase of pension to George Milholland (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1937) granting a pension to Charles Bess (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1938) granting a pension to Ernest Cooper (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1939) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. HAWES:
A bill (S. 1940) to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
By Mr. BRATTON:
A bill (S. 1941) to provide for the acquisition of rights of way through the lands of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. KING:
A bill (S. 1942) to repeal part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes," approved January 12, 1927; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) providing that the Secretary of Agriculture be directed to give notice that on and after January 1, 1929, the Government will cease to maintain a public market on Pennsylvania Avenue between Seventh and Ninth Streets NW.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOSES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commander Albert Cushing Read, United States Navy, for his achievement in completing the first trans-Atlantic airplane flight, and providing for his advancement on the list of commanders of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) providing for the transfer of certain funds for the purpose of certain channel improvement at St. Petersburg, Fla.; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) providing for a survey from Florida Bay to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. ODDIE, the Committee on Mines and Mining was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 707) to cede unreserved nonmineral public lands to the several States, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

AMENDMENT TO TAX REDUCTION BILL—DUTY ON HIDES, ETC.

Mr. PITTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PRICES OF GASOLINE

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post of this morning in reference to the report made by the Federal Trade Commission on the prices of gasoline. I wish to read to the Senate the concluding sentence of the editorial, which is as follows:

It is difficult, in view of these figures, to accept the statement of the Federal Trade Commission that gasoline prices are controlled by conditions of supply and demand.

Mr. President, the Washington Post is a conservative newspaper, and when a conservative newspaper draws a conclusion such as that it is a sad commentary upon the Federal Trade Commission, which was organized and instituted for the purpose of protecting the public interest. I ask that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

THE PRICE OF GAS

[From the Washington Post, December 17, 1927]

About a week ago the Federal Trade Commission issued a clean bill of health to the oil companies that produce and distribute motor fuel and lubricants. The commission, acting under the authority of a Senate resolution, reported to Congress that it had been unable to find "recent evidence" of agreements or manipulations of any size among large oil companies to raise or depress prices of crude petroleum or refined products. The report added "that the inquiry tended to show that price movements over the longer periods were controlled by conditions of supply and demand, but that these conditions were reflected in shorter periods partly because crude prices are determined by the decisions of a few large purchasing companies, among which there is generally very little real competition."

Just how long a time was devoted to the investigation by the Federal Trade Commission is not revealed in the report. But judging from the known celerity of the movements of that ponderous body it is probable that many months and much travel were necessary to reach the conclusion that "no recent evidence" is obtainable.

While the Federal Trade Commission was preparing to send its report to Congress in response to the resolution of the Senate another organization made a somewhat similar "survey" of the gasoline situation and its findings are, to say the least, slightly at variance with those of the commission.

This independent survey was carried on by 950 motor clubs affiliated with the American Automobile Association. The inquiries extended into every section of the country. The reports from these unofficial inquirers indicate that there are in use, or were as late as November 22, no fewer than 47 varieties of gasoline prices. High-test gas sells in some sections as low as 13 cents per gallon and in others the price is 29 cents. "Straight run" prices range from 10 to 27 cents. It was found also that proximity to the source of supply has no bearing on prices, or, if any, it is the reverse of what would be expected. Nor was there found to be an advantage in favor of the buyer in the tidewater region as against the buyer in the interior, for it was learned that on the whole prices at tidewater were higher than those charged at inland points.

It is difficult, in view of these figures, to accept the statement of the Federal Trade Commission that gasoline prices are controlled by conditions of supply and demand.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. BINGHAM submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee of Congress to consist of two members of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is hereby authorized to visit American Samoa, and to investigate fully existing conditions there with a view to the recommendation of necessary legislation in respect thereof. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members. For the purposes of this resolution such committee is authorized to hold hearings and to sit and act at such times and places within American Samoa or the United States, to employ such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, including interpreters, to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of such committee, which shall not exceed the sum of $15,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The committee shall make a report to the Congress as to its findings, with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, on or before December 13, 1928.

INVESTIGATION OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. HARRISON. I submit a Senate resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 76), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized and directed (1) to investigate the administration of the act entitled "An act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1924, as amended, and particularly the work of the Foreign Service Personnel Board, for the purpose of determining what results have been obtained under the provisions of such act, and (2) to report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its investigation, with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think that the resolution is entirely proper. It relates to a matter of which the Senator spoke in the committee the other day. I will ask the Senator, Is it necessary that the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. HARRISON. No; it is not.

Mr. BORAH. Unless some member of the committee thinks otherwise, I see no objection to the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to ask, Is this such a resolution as will require bye and bye another resolution authorizing the payment of money for the employment of stenographers to report the hearings, and so forth?

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator from Washington that the resolution does not ask for the appointment of any special committee or anything of that sort. It merely calls on the Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate the results of the administration of the so-called Rogers Act of 1924. There has been considerable dissatisfaction in the Consular Service. We may be able to iron out the difficulties in some way by having an investigation.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HARRISON. I did ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator will recall the discussion that took place in the committee the other morning and will recall that there were a good many members of the committee who were in full sympathy with the general proposition, but I think, under all the circumstances, the resolution had better go to the committee inasmuch as the committee meets regularly and will have a meeting on Wednesday, I presume.

Mr. HARRISON. I have no objection to the resolution going to the committee, but I did not think there would arise any opposition to it, and I am sure there is no opposition to its adoption.

Mr. MOSES. I think the preponderant sentiment of the committee is in favor of some sort of an investigation in view of certain things that have taken place particularly in the personnel board under the operation of the Rogers Act.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ANNA KENYON

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Anna Kenyon, widow of Harold Kenyon, late Capitol policeman, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FORECASTS OF FARM PRICES

Mr. HARRIS. I offer a resolution and ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 78) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the Department of Agriculture in the month of September, 1927, made public a report relating to probable farm-price situation during the balance of the year, which contained predictions that there would be a decline in the price of cotton and of other agricultural commodities; and

Whereas this report was not authorized by law and resulted in decline of prices of such commodities, with a loss of many millions to the farmers; and

Whereas similar reports issued in the future would tend to have a similar effect upon farm prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the practice of issuing such unauthorized reports is detrimental to the farmers throughout the country, and that the activities of the Secretary of Agriculture and any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the issuance or publication of any such reports are hereby disapproved and condemned.

SURVEY OF CONDITION OF INDIANS

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Whereas there are 225,000 Indians presently under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, who are in contemplation of law citizens of the United States but who are in fact treated as wards of the Government and are prevented from the enjoyment of the free and independent use of property and of liberty of contract with respect thereto; and

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs handles, leases, and sells Indian property of great value, and disposes of funds which amount to many millions of dollars annually without responsibility to civil courts and without effective responsibility to Congress; and

Whereas it is claimed that the control by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the persons and property of Indians is preventing them from accommodating themselves to the conditions and requirements of modern life and from exercising that liberty with respect to their own affairs without which they can not develop into self-reliant, free, and independent citizens and have the rights which belong generally to citizens of the United States; and

Whereas numerous complaints have been made by responsible persons and organizations charging improper and improvident administration of Indian property by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas it is claimed that preventable diseases are widespread among the Indian population, that the death rate among them is not only unreasonably high but is increasing, and that the Indians in many localities are becoming pauperized; and

Whereas the acts of Congress passed in the last hundred years having as their objective the civilization of the Indian tribes seem to have failed to accomplish the results anticipated; and

Whereas it is expedient that said acts of Congress and the Indian policy incorporated in said acts be examined and the administration and operation of the same as affecting the condition of the Indian population be surveyed and appraised: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians and of the operation and effect of the laws which Congress has passed for the civilization and protection of the Indian tribes; to investigate the relation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the persons and property of Indians and the effect of the acts, regulations, and administration of said bureau upon the health, improvement, and welfare of the Indians; and to report its findings in the premises, together with recommendations for the correction of abuses that may be found to exist, and for such changes in the law as will promote the security, economic competence, and progress of the Indians.

Said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ such clerical assistance as is necessary, to sit during any recess of the Senate, and at such places as it may deem advisable. Any subcommittee, duly authorized thereto, shall have the powers conferred upon the committee by this resolution.

G. TOM TAYLOR

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Whereas in 1921 an examination was held by the Civil Service Commission at Memphis, Tenn., for postmaster at that place; and

Whereas G. Tom Taylor, then claiming to be a resident of Memphis, made application and took the examination, but the Civil Service Commission declined to certify him as one of the eligibles; and

Whereas in 1925 another civil service examination was held in Memphis for postmaster in that place, and the said G. Tom Taylor again became an applicant and again was refused a place on the list of three eligibles; and

Whereas no appointment was made for about a year after said 1925 examination because apparently it was not desired by the political powers that any one of the three eligibles should be appointed postmaster; and

Whereas the political powers finally induced Mr. Bugg, the third man on the list of eligibles, to withdraw his name; and

Whereas the Civil Service Commission again refused to certify the said G. Tom Taylor, but did have a reexamination made into his application and qualifications; and

Whereas the report of the examiners in 1921, in 1925, and in 1926 all showed that the character and reputation of said G. Tom Taylor unfitted him for postmaster at Memphis, and held he was not qualified for postmaster by reason of not possessing the proper character and fitness; and

Whereas, notwithstanding these facts and findings of its own examiners, the Civil Service Commission on or about the 1st of June, 1927, placed the said G. Tom Taylor on the list of eligibles by a majority vote; and

Whereas the said G. Tom Taylor was at once appointed acting postmaster and took charge of the office; and

Whereas his name was sent in to the Senate for confirmation early in December, 1927; and

Whereas opposition appearing to the confirmation of G. Tom Taylor his nomination has been withdrawn; and

Whereas the said G. Tom Taylor has been continued an acting postmaster at Memphis, notwithstanding his lack of qualifications and fitness as required by the civil service laws: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, authorized, ordered, and directed to send for persons and papers and report at the earliest possible day its findings on the following questions:

First. What were the facts as ascertained by the Civil Service Commission as to the character and qualifications and fitness of the said G. Tom Taylor to be postmaster in Memphis.

Second. What reasons actuated the Civil Service Commission in disregarding the findings of its own examiners and in certifying the said G. Tom Taylor as eligible for postmaster at Memphis, notwithstanding his lack of qualifications and fitness as found by the examiners.

Third. That the said committee is authorized to report any other pertinent facts concerning the eligibility of the said G. Tom Taylor for postmaster or as to the action of the Civil Service Commission, or any member thereof, in certifying the said G. Tom Taylor as eligible for postmaster at Memphis.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Mr. WILLIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 81), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per

100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pensions, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

PRODUCTION OF COAL IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wheeling Register of the 16th of December, 1927, written by Mr. Hugh W. Roberts, a Washington newspaper correspondent, entitled "West Virginia becomes greatest coal State in Union."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA BECOMES GREATEST COAL STATE IN UNION—PENNSYLVANIA DISPLACED, AND RANK WILL STAND PERMANENTLY, BELIEF

By Hugh W. Roberts

WASHINGTON, December 15.—In the production of bituminous coal, Pennsylvania, after a reign of countless years as monarch in that field, will be displaced by January 1, 1928. The new king will be West Virginia.

A definite statement to that effect is possible because of the officially reported production of bituminous coal in the two States for the first 10 months of the current year. The figures, as prepared by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Commerce, follow:

Pennsylvania, 110,600,000 tons.

West Virginia, 131,000,000 tons.

From unofficial reports West Virginia maintained its proportionate advantage in November. Apparently nothing can prevent its victory. It is possible, from what is indicated, that the full year's production will increase West Virginia's lead as established at the end of October.

STATE GAINING FOR YEARS

While the officials of the Bureau of Mines do not issue comparative figures or do not state the case in the form of a comparison, and thus avoid the kindling of State pride and State jealousy, its figures are readily obtainable at all times. From past reports it is made evident that never before at the conclusion of any 10-month period was West Virginia found in advance of Pennsylvania. The trend has been, however, for the past several years in favor of West Virginia. Each year West Virginia gained. And now it goes over the top.

It is the fact that West Virginia the past several years has gained rather than the fact that this year it will win the prize that is regarded as significant of the probability that West Virginia in future years will make fast its present victory. While Pennsylvania is contending that the strike in its coal fields has more seriously handicapped production this year than the strike in West Virginia no argument is offered to offset the gains scored by West Virginia in each of the past several years. The statisticians of the Bureau of Mines, while withholding expression, indicate a conviction that West Virginia has simply come into its own and come to stay indefinitely.

CRITICISM OF PUBLICATION IN HEARST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to an able editorial written by Hon. William E. Chilton, a distinguished former Member of this body, which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of the 16th day of December, and which is as follows:

ROTTEN JOURNALISM

No one with an iota of sense entertains for an instant the slightest belief that four United States Senators were the recipients of large sums of money from a slush fund provided by the Mexican Government. The public has implicit faith in the complete and absolute integrity and unswerving loyalty of Senators BORAH, NORRIS, LA FOLLETTE, and HEFLIN. One may differ with these men in matters of opinion, but their sincerity goes unquestioned with the American people. Moreover, no sensible person will think for a minute that the Mexican Government would resort to such underhand tactics, even if the purpose of these tactics were clear, which it decidedly is not. The prompt denial of the four will be accepted at full face value.

The matter was brought on entirely by agitation and propaganda in the Hearst chain of newspapers. Pictures were published, with names carefully blocked out, which purported to be originals from Mexican files. They were submitted to at least two Senators some time ago, and these men said at the time that an investigation of them showed such illiteracy as to brand them as forgeries at once, regardless of the content. But Mr. Hearst secured the documents in some way, perhaps through one of his own multifarious agents, and sprang what was intended to be a sensation upon the two countries just at the time when Ambassador Morrow and President Calles were reported to be reaching a complete rapprochement, and when of all times calm and friendly feeling were imperative in both countries. Mr. Hearst has always stood in the front rank of the jingoes where Mexico is concerned, and this latest "scoop" is strictly in line with his wretched policy of agitation. Mr. Hearst, of course, has immense holdings in Mexico. Is there any connection? He says he has published these documents through patriotism, but from where we sit it looks like a piece of rotten journalism that will fall as flat as the proverbial pancake.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution and ask to have it read. Then I shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 84), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate, or any subcommittee thereof appointed by its chairman, be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the administration and transactions of the War Finance Corporation during the period of its existence and to report to the Senate the result of such investigation. For the purpose of such investigation the said committee or subcommittee is hereby authorized to call upon any department or establishment of the Government to aid and assist in the examination of the books, records, accounts, and data of and pertaining to the transactions of the said War Finance Corporation, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby requested to make available such books, records, accounts, and data for that purpose and to facilitate the examination thereof.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, it occurs to me that before we actually order an investigation—if I understood the purport of the resolution from its rapid reading—it should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration at least to the extent of ascertaining whether we could secure sufficient information by sending for members of the board; in other words, to be enlightened as much as it is possible to be enlightened.

As I understand, this resolution orders an investigation. Is that correct?

Mr. FLETCHER. It orders an investigation.

Mr. EDGE. I think before we actually order an investigation the Committee on Banking and Currency should at least ascertain as far as they can, to their satisfaction so far as possible, just the situation, and then they can vote for an investigation if they desire it. I think that is the method usually pursued.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, it depends on how far the committee wants to go in that connection.

Mr. EDGE. Will not the Senator be satisfied to have it referred to the committee?

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to have immediate action on it. I make that request. I do not think there can be any real ground of objection.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I ask to have the resolution read again.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator will not agree to have it referred to the committee, I must ask that it lie over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. FLETCHER subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning I offered a resolution to investigate the operations and transactions of the War Finance Corporation, and asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] objected, and was under the belief at that time that the resolution ought to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency for their report, inasmuch as it directed them to make this investigation.

I now ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which was passed over until the following day under the rule by reason of that objection, be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRATTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLIC UTILITY CORPORATIONS

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 83), as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of five Members of the Senate be appointed by the President thereof, and be hereby empowered and directed to inquire into and report upon: (1) The growth of the capital assets and capital liabilities of public-utility corporations supplying either electrical energy in the form of power or light, or both, however produced, or gas, natural or artificial, of corporations holding the stocks of such public-utility corporations, and of nonpublic-utility corporations owned or controlled by or affiliated with such holding companies; (2) the method of issuing, the price realized, or value received, the commissions or bonuses paid or received, and other pertinent facts with respect to the various security issues of all classes of corporations herein named, including the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness thereof, as well as the stocks of the same; (3) the extent to which holding companies or their stockholders control or are financially interested in financial, engineering, construction, and/or management corporations, and the relation, one to the other, of the classes of corporations last named, the holding companies and the public-utility corporations; (4) the services furnished to public-utility corporations by holding companies and/or their associated, affiliated, and/or subsidiary companies, the fees, commissions, bonuses, or other charges made therefor, and the earnings and expenses of such holding companies and their associated, affiliated, and/or subsidiary companies; and (5) the value or detriment to the public of holding companies owning the stock or otherwise controlling such public-utility corporations immediately or remotely, with the extent of such ownership or control, and particularly what legislation, if any, should be enacted by Congress to correct any abuses that may exist in the organization or operation of such holding companies.

The committee is further empowered and directed to inquire and report whether, and to what extent, such corporations or any of the officers thereof or anyone in their behalf or in behalf of any organization of which any such corporation may be a member, through the expenditure of money or through the control of the avenues of publicity have made any, and what effort to influence or control public opinion on account of municipal or public ownership of the means by which power is developed and electrical energy is generated and distributed, or to influence or control elections.

That the said committee is hereby authorized to sit and perform its duties at such times and places as it deems necessary or proper, and to require the attendance of witnesses by subpœnas or otherwise; to require the production of books, papers, and documents; and to employ counsel, experts, and other assistants, and stenographers, at a cost not exceeding $1.25 per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses and sign subpœnas for witnesses; and every person duly summoned before said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, who refuses or fails to obey the process of said committee, or appears and refuses to answer questions pertinent to said investigation, shall be punished as prescribed by law. The expenses of said investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers of the committee or subcommittee signed by the chairman and approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the sessions or the recesses of the Senate, and until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Montana if he would object to having the resolution referred in the first instance to the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I see no occasion whatever for that.

Mr. MOSES. The resolution is a long and somewhat involved one; and it might be well to have some standing committee of the Senate consider the merits of the various proposals contained in it, rather than to send it immediately to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not know any reason why that subject could not as well be taken up on the floor. The resolution is merely a redraft of a resolution that I offered at the last session of the Senate. I made a somewhat elaborate speech at the time, in which I attempted to set forth all of the reasons why this investigation should take place.

Mr. MOSES. From the Senator's own point of view.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. From my point of view; yes. I do not know any reason why the matter should go to the committee. I dare say that some of the Senators, at least, did me the honor to listen to my speech and perhaps read what I said.

Mr. MOSES. I did the Senator the honor to read it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But if they did not it is available to them, and there is no reason why the matter could not be debated upon the floor just as well as in the committee.

Mr. MOSES. Then, Mr. President, in view of the Senator's position, and inasmuch as there may be some Senators who have not read the speech of the Senator from Montana which was delivered last February, I shall have to ask that the resolution go over, in order that those Senators who have not read the speech may occupy Sunday in doing so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON STOCK DIVIDENDS (S. DOC. NO. 26)

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I move that the report of the Federal Trade Commission on stock dividends of December 5, 1927, be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the Federal Trade Commission have not already had this report printed?

Mr. HOWELL. They report that they have not the funds.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just the trouble. If we begin the practice of printing here as public documents reports from all of the commissions and departments there will be no end to it. The practice has been in the past that under no circumstances would we do it. We appropriate all the money they ask for the purpose of printing. I certainly must object to the printing of this document, not because it is a report of the Federal Trade Commission, but because that has been the practice for years now. Therefore I must object to its being printed as a public document.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will not the distinguished Senator withdraw the objection? The particular report to which the Senator from Nebraska refers is the gasoline report, is it not?

Mr. HOWELL. No; it is a report on stock dividends.

Mr. SMOOT. It would not make any difference what report it was if it was a report which ordinarily is printed by the body issuing it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska to what the report relates, and whence it comes?

Mr. HOWELL. It comes from the Federal Trade Commission. It is a report on stock dividends. It was made in response to a resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] of date of December 17, 1926. This report was made on the 5th day of December of this year. The commission has not the facilities to print the report, and I am merely asking that it be printed as a document.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, is it available for the use of the Senate without printing? Is there any way a Senator can get a copy of it without now making an order to print?

Mr. MOSES. In other words, was it ever printed under the printing appropriation for the commission?

Mr. HOWELL. No.

Mr. MOSES. Is there a letter of transmittal with it?

Mr. HOWELL. I presume that there are enough copies of the report available, though I am not informed as to that, to supply a reasonable number of Senators; but it is an important report, and it ought to be printed as a public document.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to the request.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I objected to the request; but I understand it is not a report of the affairs of the Federal Trade Commission. From what the Senator has said, it is a report submitted to the Senate in response to a Senate resolution. Am I correct?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection to its being printed. I thought from what the Senator said that it was a report of the Federal Trade Commission, but it is not; it is a report from the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. HOWELL. To the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. To the Senate. Therefore I do not object.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Nebraska stated, in answer to my question, that it was in response to a Senate resolution, and I felt that it should be printed.

Mr. SMOOT. I withdraw my objection to the request because of the statement of the Senator that it is in response to a Senate resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would the Senator have any objection to referring it to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. HOWELL. I do not think that is necessary. It is a report to the Senate, and it ought to be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the report made in response to Senate Resolution 304, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, agreed to December 22, 1926, will be printed as a document.

REPORTS OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an order for the printing of the annual report of the 10 public utilities of the District of Columbia, in accordance with the usual custom.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator if the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia does not carry sufficient funds to meet the necessary requirements of the Utilities Commission?

Mr. CAPPER. It never has been handled in that way. For years and years the reports have been printed in the manner stated in my request.

Mr. KING. That is undoubtedly true, but I thought that when we created the present Public Utilities Commission we enlarged their powers and gave them a sufficient appropriation to meet all legitimate demands for printing and otherwise of that commission.

Mr. CAPPER. I do not think it contemplated the printing of these reports.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let us have the order read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the annual reports of the following-named public utility companies in the District of Columbia, for the year ending December 31, 1926, heretofore transmitted to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document:

Capital Traction Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington Gas Light Co., Georgetown Gas Light Co., Washington Railway & Electric Co., City and Suburban Railway of Washington, Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co., and Washington Interurban Railroad Co.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator object to the order going over until Monday to enable us to ascertain whether or not provision has already been made?

Mr. CAPPER. I have no objection to its going over until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will go over until Monday.

TAX REDUCTION

The bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HEARINGS ON FLOOD CONTROL

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed, with illustrations, 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the Seventieth Congress, first session, on the control of the destructive flood waters of the United States, of which the Public Printer shall deliver 1,400 copies to the folding room of the House of Representatives and 600 copies to the folding room of the Senate for equal apportionment to the Members of each House, respectively, and 1,000 copies shall be delivered to the House folding room and placed to the credit of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 28, 29, 30, 38, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 24 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Oklahoma," insert the following: "are authorized to execute and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out and at the end of the matter so restored, after the numerals "1925," insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the inmates of the United States Industrial Reformatory shall be employed only in the production and manufacture of supplies for the United States Government, for consumption in United States institutions, and in duties necessary for the construction and maintenance of the institution"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the sum $370,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 19, 23, 32, 33, 34, 36, and 37.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WILL R. WOOD,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I move the adoption of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, with the permission of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the consent of the Senate, I should like to make a few observations on one of the matters involved in this report. I feel that it is my duty to myself and, what is more important, to my people that I should do so. I refer to the people of Baltimore city and of the State of Maryland generally.

When the World War came along the Government thought it expedient to establish an ammunition depot at Curtis Bay, on the southern boundary of the city of Baltimore, and there, for the purposes of the war, were stored vast quantities of high explosives—T. N. T., tetrol, and the like—and great quantities of black and smokeless powder, too. At the present time these explosives amount to some 16,800 tons in bulk, and to some $20,000,000 in value.

As I am informed, the purposes for which this ammunition depot was established were not realized at the time by the people of Baltimore. They supposed that the structures the Government was erecting were being erected for the assembling of airplane materials on an immense scale, and therefore had no opportunity to protest against the storage of ammunition in that locality, even if they had been disposed to do so. But it is hardly necessary for me to say, in the light of the military record that the people of Baltimore made for themselves during the bombardment of Fort McHenry in 1814, the Revolutionary War, and the World War, that even if they had known the object for which the depot was established they would not have uttered any remonstrance whatever. At that time their patriotic zeal was aroused to the highest degree and, like the people of every other portion of the United States, they were prepared to make any and every sacrifice to bring the World War to a successful issue.

That war passed. Shortly afterwards full knowledge of the purposes for which the Curtis Bay depot was being used was brought to the attention of the people of Baltimore, and they commenced to beseech—that is not too strong a word for the occasion—the National Government to remove at least the greater part of the high explosives from that site.

It is on the southern boundary of the city of Baltimore. Right across the Patapsco from it is Fort McHenry. Near it are such great industrial plants as those of the Davison Chemical Co., one of the largest manufacturers of sulphuric acid in the world, and the United States Industrial Alcohol Co., and elevators and terminals of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Western Maryland Railroad Cos., to say nothing of other important business improvements. The city hall of Baltimore itself is only 6 miles away, and at a much less distance is the very heart of the great commercial interests of Baltimore.

The board of inquiry that was organized by the Government after the Picatinny and Lake Denmark explosions reported that for purposes of safety there should be a 2-mile zone around

every place where high explosives are stored by the Government. If that is true, were there to be a general detonation of the high explosives now at the Curtis Bay depot, terrible destruction of property would follow not only in the Curtis Bay industrial district of Baltimore but at Canton, one of the most important of all the business sections of Baltimore, and in other business areas of Baltimore. Of course, I might mention also the destruction of homes and the fearful loss of life that would result from such an explosion.

Moved by the keen edge of this sword of Damocles perpetually suspended above their heads, the people of Baltimore in every possible way in which an appeal can be made by a community to the humanity of the Government, to which it has a right to look for protection, have besought the President, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of War, and Congress to extricate them from the frightful, the appalling situation in which they are involved.

I am glad to say that, so far as the President is concerned, he promptly and generously responded to our appeal. He has too kind a heart not to have done so. The mayor of Baltimore solicited his help, the Governor of Maryland went before him, I and my colleague, Senator Weller, went before him, the leading citizens of Baltimore City, including representatives of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, went before him, and we implored him to come to our rescue; and he did come to our rescue as fully as he had the power to do. He approved at the last session of Congress an appropriation of upward of $800,000 for the removal of the great mass of high explosives from the Curtis Bay depot, and the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of War united in his approval. The recommendation came down to the House of Representatives, and there, for reasons which it is all but impossible for me to understand, the item which had been inserted in the deficiency bill of last session was disallowed by the House Committee on Appropriations, of which Mr. MADDEN is chairman.

When that bill reached the Senate I presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations the perilous predicament of Baltimore, and it unanimously restored the item. Then the bill became the subject of a conference between the two Houses, and the Senate conferees insisting upon their amendment, the House conferees finally acceded to it, but when the bill came back to this body with the item the bill perished in the filibuster which followed, and with it perished, of course, the item itself.

When the present session came on representatives of the people of Baltimore again appealed to the President and the Director of the Budget for an appropriation for the removal of the high explosives from Curtis Bay. Again the President honored our appeal, though in a somewhat smaller amount. Again the Director of the Budget honored it. Again the Secretary of War honored it in his estimates, as he had done at the last session of Congress. But again the House Committee on Appropriations, under the lead of Mr. MADDEN, disallowed the appropriation, with the result that the deficiency bill of this session came over to us without it. But the Senate Committee on Appropriations restored the item. Then the deficiency bill of this session went to conference, and the most that our conferees could secure was a compromise between the Senate and House conferees, pursuant to which there is to be a survey by Army and Navy officers, to be rendered not later than March 15 next, of the points of storage of supplies of ammunition and components thereof for the use of the Army and Navy, with special reference to the location of such ammunition and components as are in such proximity to populous communities and industrial areas as to constitute a menace to life and property.

For six years, with the most tense, the most distressing anxiety, our people have been knocking at the door of the central Government for relief. As far back as 1919 a promise was given to Senator John Walter Smith, of Maryland, and Mr. Daniel Willard, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, that orders would be issued for the removal of certain of the more dangerous explosives at the depot. In 1920 Maj. Gen. George W. Burr, Assistant Chief of Staff, in writing assured Senator John Walter Smith, of Maryland, that the Ordnance Department of the Army had taken steps to remove all the T. N. T. and tetryl at the depot. I have omitted to say that the Maryland Legislature, too, has adopted a resolution begging the Federal Government to relieve Baltimore of the menace to which it is exposed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow an interruption?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Secretary of War is in favor of the removal of these explosives and everybody seems to want it, why does he not proceed to do it? Is it necessary to have additional legislation or is it necessary to have a special appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. BRUCE. The trouble is that each time that the House Committee on Appropriations has met, Mr. MADDEN, who is chairman of that committee and seems, for some reason or other, to be actuated by a spirit of bitter partisanship in the case, has produced before him Gen. Clarence C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance of the Army, and obtained from him testimony which has afforded him a pretext for his obstruction. At the present session General Williams went so far as to use the following language with regard to the matter:

> Of course, there is an element of danger in those explosives, but we do not consider that it is a very great danger. However, there is a danger.

Note how measured this language is. When the deficiency bill of last session came up General Williams said that the danger was remote. Now he speaks in an entirely different tone—and why? Because since Congress adjourned last spring there has been an explosion at that depot. Thanks to the God of mercy, it did not lay flat a large part of our city and destroy the lives of great numbers of our people, but this was only because the explosion took place at a comparatively isolated point on the site. I was at my home at Ruxton, 9 miles out from the city of Baltimore, when a reporter of the Baltimore Sun called me up and said, "Senator, shells are going off at the Curtis Bay depot." My feelings can readily be imagined, thoroughly familiar as I was with all the dangers which surrounded the depot. In all my life I do not think that my soul has ever been tortured by such sensations of fear, anxiety, and distress as it was then, because I knew that some of the foremost experts of the country employed by the mayor of Baltimore and the Baltimore Association of Commerce had testified that should a general explosion take place at the Curtis Bay depot a large part of the city of Baltimore would be laid low and hundreds of human lives extinguished.

For all I knew, out in the country where I was at the time those frightful results were about to follow; that is to say, all of those great industrial plants and structures at Curtis Bay were about to crumble into dust, and all those great commercial warehouses across the Patapsco River were about to be shattered. Not only that, for all I knew, trust companies and bank buildings, too, might be more or less demolished, with the millions of dollars of securities and valuables in their vaults.

Fortunately, as I have said, this explosion, which took place on the 23d day of September last, occurred on a spot at the depot too isolated to be communicated to the main structures in which the great bulk of the explosives are stored. So it is perfectly natural that General Williams, when he was put on the stand at this session of Congress, should speak a very different language from that which he spoke at the last session of Congress. Then he said that the danger was remote. Now he says, to repeat his words:

> Of course, there is an element of danger in those explosives, but we do not consider that it is a very great danger. However, there is a danger.

I quote these words from page 461 of the House hearings at this session.

In 1925, when the peril threatened by the Curtis Bay depot was brought to the attention of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Davis, now Secretary of War, his confident reply was that the value of their method of storage was reflected by the fact that not a single explosion or fire of any magnitude had occurred among World War stocks of ammunition on the ground of any ordnance depot which resulted in any damage.

Hardly were these words out of his mouth before those frightful explosions took place at Lake Denmark and Picatinny Arsenal, which resulted in the destruction of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property and the loss of many lives.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] will correct me if I am in error in the statement that in New Jersey they have had explosions due to the storage of Army ammunition at Raritan, near South or North Amboy, at Toms River, and at Lake Denmark and Picatinny. I think that the latter are two different points, are they not?

Mr. EDGE. They are two different points, but in very close proximity.

Mr. BRUCE. So frightful was the effect of the explosion at Lake Denmark that the town of New Hope, 2 miles away, was wrecked.

As I said, Mr. MADDEN, for some reason or other, has proved himself to be, as I look at it, a blind—I was about to say

a passionate—partisan in this matter. He ignores all testimony except that of General Williams, and attaches no importance to the great mass of testimony which fully contradicts the statements of General Williams with regard to the degree of danger created by the Curtis Bay depot. "I believe in my soul," Mr. MADDEN declares, "that there is no menace, based on what the Chief of Ordnance has said" and he deprecates the expense that the Government would incur in making Baltimore safe. If the explosives could not be removed to points where there would be no danger to the people living in their vicinity that would be a different situation. If we must have ammunition, and its storage is inevitably attended with peril, there is no reason, of course, why the people of Baltimore should not incur that peril as justly as the people of any other community in the United States. But the testimony taken in the House hearings last year and again this year shows that the Army has ammunition depots at different points in the United States where, if the Curtis Bay high explosives were stored, there would be no danger to the surrounding territory. One is Fort Ogden, in the State of Utah. It is in a sparsely settled community, 7 miles away from the town of Ogden. Then there is Savanna, on the Mississippi River, in the northwest corner of Illinois. The Government ammunition depot there is seated on a Government tract of some 13,000 acres in a secluded region.

There is another Army storage depot situated on a Government tract of more than 850 acres, in South Carolina, which is 11 miles distant from Charleston, in a very thinly populated community. Then there is another storage point at Pig Point, 8 or 10 miles away from the town of Portsmouth, Va., which is situated on a Government tract of 650 acres. The country around Pig Point is quite thinly settled, I believe.

I want to be perfectly accurate in every statement that I make. So far as Ogden is concerned, not a protest has come from the people there.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator refer to Pig Point?

Mr. BRUCE. No; to the depot at Ogden.

Mr. SWANSON. That is true as to Ogden.

Mr. BRUCE. No protest has come from any individual at that place. General Williams has so testified. The same thing is true as to Savanna, in the State of Illinois, and whilst some inquiries have been made by the people of Charleston and its vicinity with regard to the removal of munition to that quarter, no remonstrance of any kind has come from them to the War Department. The same thing is said by General Williams of Pig Point. He testifies that inquiries have come from citizens of that region in regard to the proposed transfer of ammunition to Pig Point, but that no serious objection has been raised to the transfer.

Mr. SWANSON. I have repeatedly received remonstrances opposed to that proposition. They have a large supply of ammunition there. It is so large they have been reducing it, as it is dangerous to everything in that section. I would not consent, if I had power enough to prevent it, to have any bill pass the Senate that would remove any more ammunition to the depot at Pig Point. I have aided the Senator in his effort to give relief to Baltimore, but that relief to Baltimore should not be given by increasing the danger to other communities which already have more dangers than they ought to have. I have been assured that if a transfer shall be made, the ammunition will not go to Pig Point, Va. Consequently, I have aided Baltimore in every way I could.

Mr. BRUCE. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I know the Senator is moved by nothing but perfectly proper motives about the matter. I am sure that he does not want Pig Point to be known as Hog Point because of mere local selfishness. I am bound to admit that the least desirable one, for one reason or another, of all the points of removal that I have mentioned is Pig Point. So far as the other points of removal are concerned, there is no objection on the part of the people, and I do not think that there could well be any.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say to the Senator that I have complete and full assurance that if the removal shall be made the depot will not go to Pig Point. Consequently, with that assurance I have not interfered with the Senator in any manner in his effort to secure the removal he desires.

Mr. BRUCE. Precisely. We do not want the depot removed to Pig Point. We are perfectly satisfied that it should not go there. But there is Ogden, for instance, which appears to have no objection to being made a point of removal. Of course, one of these Army munition depots brings much business into a community, and a small town might well desire to have one located near it if due regard were paid by the Government to the safety of its people.

I wish to take occasion to thank the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the spirit in which they have handled this application for relief of the people of Baltimore. They have done everything in their power to give us relief; they have gone to every extremity to which they felt that they could properly go in order to assure it to us.

Our conferees have been compelled to accept the compromise which I have mentioned. I have no faith in it. The report to be submitted is not to deal with Curtis Bay or with Raritan especially, but it is to deal with the storage of Army munition throughout the United States. However, I have no choice except to submit to the results that have been reached in the conference. All that I can do is to protest and to remonstrate and to say that I think that it is simply disgraceful that the prayer of our people for security has not been long ago heeded, and that even now, when it is reluctantly heeded, is to be heeded in such a begrudging, limited, and selfish spirit as it is.

Suppose this petition were emanating from the city of Chicago or from the city of Philadelphia or from the city of Cleveland or from the city of San Francisco or from any other city in the land, under those circumstances I could not conceive of myself as being such a brute, so absolutely insensible to all the generous impulses of human nature, as to be unwilling to do everything in my power to bring such hazard as I have described to an end. Not only is there that threat at Curtis Bay to existing business plants and to human life in Baltimore, but necessarily such conditions as those which prevail at Curtis Bay can not but chill the spirit of business enterprise and progress in Baltimore and check the general growth of the city. What company wants to spend thousands or millions of dollars in establishing another great plant at Curtis Bay or within the radius of its dangers if it is to be daily or hourly in peril of being totally destroyed by an explosion?

When the explosion took place last summer—one which happily was not far-reaching in its effect—terrified men, women, and children, fled from their homes in the Curtis Bay locality; and when some of the bolder citizens of Baltimore sought to find out what had caused the casualty, they found themselves practically facing the bayonets of the military authorities who denied them, and properly denied them, admittance to the places of storage at the depot.

All I have to add is to say to Mr. MADDEN that if an explosion should occur at Curtis Bay before any relief shall be given to the people of Baltimore, I commend to his perusal the old story of Cain and Abel, as it is told in the Book of Genesis:

> And the Lord said unto Cain: Where is Abel, thy brother? And he said: I know not; am I my brother's keeper?
>
> And He said: What has thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground.
>
> And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand.
>
> When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.
>
> And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear.
>
> Behold, Thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from Thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass that everyone that findeth me shall slay me.

"Shall slay me," as Mr. MADDEN will have slain many of the good people of our city—men, women, and children—to say nothing of those industrial plants, warehouses, and homes which will have toppled to the ground and been abased in the dust.

Mr. WILLIS obtained the floor.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator. I merely wish to say a very few words on the same subject touched upon by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE].

The condition which the Senator from Maryland has so vividly portrayed as existing in Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, exists, I might say, fourfold in the State of New Jersey. I use the term "fourfold," as that proportion is indicated by the appropriations necessary to remove the explosives. As I recall, the Budget estimated—and the estimate was approved by the President—that a sum of approximately $2,100,000 would be required to remove the very high explosives, including T. N. T., the most dangerous type of high explosive, from the Raritan Arsenal, N. J., to remote points in the country. I think the appropriation necessary to remove similar explosives from Curtis Bay Arsenal is in the neighborhood of $300,000 or $400,000. I do not make that comparison

for any other reason in the world than to emphasize the terrible situation, as we view it, existing in the State of New Jersey.

As the Senator from Maryland has pointed out several times during the discussion, some of the officers of the War Department in their testimony seem to consider the danger remote. At the same time, in the State of New Jersey only a little more than a year ago it was not so remote when the depot at Lake Denmark and at the Picatinny Arsenal, located approximately 2 or 3 miles apart, or portions of them, at least, were destroyed by an explosion and twenty-odd lives were lost, as I recall, and millions of dollars' worth of Government and private property were destroyed.

I recognize, Mr. President, that we must have locations for these explosives. I am sure New Jersey is as patriotic as any other State and that all the States are equally patriotic and are prepared to assume their full share of responsibilities of this unattractive nature. New Jersey has within its borders many powder works, and frequent explosions have occurred. A number of governmental activities of this character were located there during and shortly after the World War. We expected that to happen and we were ready for it. They were all a part of our war contribution, but now to retain this appalling threat, as it were, to public life and property, right in the midst of congested sections, in my judgment, is absolutely indefensible.

Again, from a business standpoint there is no occasion for this. Congress years ago enacted legislation and approved an appropriation to build storage houses for this type of explosive and other inflammable material in sections that were remote from development. At an expense of several hundred thousand dollars one was built in Utah. My information is that it is not used at all, or, if at all, only in a very slight degree; yet the Government has expended the money, and the storage house is there, and explosives stored there would not be a menace to private property, because, from my information, there is not a village within 7 miles of the storage house.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I do not want to lose my rights. I think I have the floor, but I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator from Ohio will permit me to ask a question, what became of the project we had before the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. EDGE. I was just going to refer to that. Also, the Navy have asked for a storage house in a section, as I understand, likewise removed from ordinary municipal development, out in the State of Nevada; and, if I am not mistaken, permissive legislation was passed in the Senate at the last session in order to build such a storage house.

Why should we spend the hundreds of thousands of dollars necessary to build these storage houses if we are still going to keep this explosive material in the midst of sections where development is rapid? The Raritan Arsenal in New Jersey, from which it is sought to remove this material, is located within a couple of miles of the large city of New Brunswick. It is now being hemmed in all around; there is practically a town on every side of the arsenal excepting the river side. To have that arsenal in the midst of that growing population is unfair to the people residing there, and in my judgment it is not good business from the standpoint of the Government.

I want to express my appreciation of the earnest efforts that I know the conferees have made to have the amendment appropriating money for removal, as unanimously adopted by the Senate, retained in the bill. I can not understand at all the logic of the conferees on the part of the House. This reference to a committee, of course, is merely that type of compromise which means little, if anything. However, I want to give our conferees full credit. They have provided, in the amendment which will shortly be read at the desk, that a report shall be made by this board of officers on the location of explosives and where they should be removed not later than March 15, 1928. It is that definite assurance that we will have a report before this session of Congress is apt to adjourn that moves me to accept without further discussion the decision on the part of the conferees.

I give notice now that on March 16, 1928, if the report is not in, I shall demand the report, and that immediately following that report if there is anything in it upon which we can base action—and I am sure no report could be brought to the attention of Congress except one that would recommend the removal of these explosives—I shall ask for an appropriation in some appropriation bill during the present session of Congress that will direct the removal of this menace.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I only desire to take a moment.

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this matter was brought up near the end of last session. I became much interested in it. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate permitted it to come up without objection and go on the celebrated second deficiency bill, which later went down in the tumultuous ending of that session through filibustering.

While this definite action was not proposed originally, yet we inserted these various appropriation items freely in the Senate committee. I think this language, which compels Army and Navy heads to move quickly and report quickly, will enable us to take care of this matter later, perhaps in this Congress.

I wish to say a word to my friend from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE], whom I regard as one of the greatest lovers of justice in this body or in the Nation. While perhaps I may be guilty of using some word that has caused it, I think he is a little severe on our friend the chairman of the House committee, Mr. MADDEN. I will say that while the House conferees objected point-blank to the action of the Senate, Mr. MADDEN interested himself at once to cooperate with us in some way to provide for carrying out the aim of the Senate; in fact, he was almost the author of something that they could do in the House that we could not do on this side under our rules..

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to direct the attention of the Senate very briefly to amendment numbered 21 and to make some brief observations thereon, and then to ask a ques- of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

It will be recalled that when this bill was before the Senate it struck out, after somewhat extended discussion, lines 9 to 19, inclusive, on page 52, those lines containing the provision that authorized the appropriation of $100,000 for the construction of a brick plant at the United States Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.

The conferees have provided, in amendment numbered 21, as follows:

> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, and at the end of the matter so restored, after the numerals "1925," insert the following.

Then follows, verbatim, the language of section 6 of the act of January 7, 1925, that language being as follows:

> That the inmates of the United States Industrial Reformatory shall be employed only in the production and manufacture of supplies for the United States Government, for consumption in United States institutions, and in duties necessary for the construction and maintenance of the institution.

It will be recalled that when this matter was under discussion a few days ago, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] expressed himself as follows—I will read what he said at that time so that there can be no doubt about it. At page 558 of the RECORD he used this language, and I particularly desire the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to this. I had asked him whether he would accept an amendment providing that the brick to be manufactured at that reformatory should be used only in that institution. The Senator from Wyoming then said:

> As to using the bricks at one institution, there may be a good many little buildings that are connected in a way and yet are separate buildings; but, if I can do so in order, I should not object to an amendment that would carry out the very idea that the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee expressed in the House in his debate, near where the Senator is reading, where he was very vehement in his idea that this brick should be for the use of penitentiary buildings only and nothing else.

Subsequently, on the same page, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming very properly read what the chairman of the House committee had said, evidently to enforce the idea that the bricks to be manufactured there were to be used only at that institution. The Senator from Wyoming read the following from the RECORD. I will start with what was said by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LANHAM:

> Mr. LANHAM. Let me ask the gentleman if it is contemplated that the brick to be manufactured in this plant shall be used at this institution?
>
> Mr. MADDEN. Only.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. Only; and not put in competition with outside brick manufacturers?
>
> Mr. MADDEN. That is it. It is a humanitarian proposition.

The question I desire to submit to the able Senator from Wyoming is this: Is it the understanding, then, based upon

that statement, that this provision extends, as the chairman of the House committee said, only to the manufacture of brick for the completion of that institution and for the construction of the necessary buildings of that institution? Is that the understanding of the chairman?

Mr. WARREN. It is not only my understanding, but I fully believe the institution would not be permitted, under this proposed legislation, to do otherwise. I will say to the Senator that I am just as well satisfied as I was when I said at an earlier date that all I wanted done was to confine the manufacture and use of this brick to the one institution where these convicts are incarcerated, not for the purpose of competing with the market in any way, but because, for the good of the morals and the health and general improvement of those convicts, they must be in some way kept at that or some other industry.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in view of the statement the Senator has made, and in view of the fact that this is a great appropriation bill with very many important provisions, I do not feel inclined to oppose its passage, though I should very much have preferred if the Senate provision could have been accepted and this language stricken out. In view, however, of the assurance that comes from the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that it is the understanding that the bricks made here shall be used only in this institution for the purpose of constructing the necessary buildings in this institution, and upon the assurance from the chairman of the House committee which I have just read, I shall not further oppose the passage of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not see at this moment the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] in his seat. I believe he wanted to say a word in relation to the proposed appropriation for the Cape Cod Canal.

A year ago I was in agreement with the Senator in adding five and one-half millions or six millions to the proposed appropriation for purchasing the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness of the canal; but information afterwards reached me, as it reached Members on the House side, that it was too early to accomplish what was wished for in the interest of the canal. Hence, we differed on the floor the other day as to the immediate use of this money. I made a point of order, which was overruled, and the Senator put the matter to the Senate, and I was further overruled. Since then, however, the matter has come up in such a way that I think we are in perfect agreement, because I wish to do just what the Senator wishes to do, and with the information we now have I believe it can be safely and well accomplished, probably before the end of this Congress. It is, however, one of those things that the Government has loaned its credit to, and prepared a contract which is being lived up to, but which is not ready to close, and ultimately it will take more money than we have appropriated. The money already appropriated is not fully used—in fact, very little of it so far—so that I do believe it is wise to wait.

I move to agree to the amendment of the House to amendment of the Senate numbered 32.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I move to recede from amendments numbered 19, 36, and 37. They refer to the same subject, different storehouses and arsenals put over for this examination.

The motion was agreed to.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I report back favorably from the Committee on Appropriations the resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, the office of legislative counsel, and employees paid on vouchers under authority of resolutions, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOLIDAY RECESS

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) providing for a holiday recess, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, 1927, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, January 4, 1928.

REGENT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRATTON in the chair). Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. FESS. From the Committee on the Library I report a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which now exists, be filled by the appointment of John Campbell Merriam, of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMISTICE DAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 25, to declare the 11th day of November, celebrated and known as Armistice Day, a legal public holiday, along the same lines that other days have been declared legal holidays by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BORAH. How many legal holidays have we now?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I do not know, but I know that November 11—armistice day—is not a legal holiday, and all the posts of the American Legion over the country have passed resolutions requesting that it be made such. I will appreciate it if the Senate will pass the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am opposed to our creating any more legal holidays, unless there is a most exceptional occasion for so doing. It seems to me we can properly show our respect for this day without making it a legal holiday. I once heard an eminent scholar say when one of the great powers of Europe fell from a first-class to a fourth-class power, it had finally created 93 holidays.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will let this one go through, I promise that I will not offer any more.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have no objection personally to the joint resolution at this time, but I understand it has not gone to a committee. At the last session we agreed that all joint resolutions and bills should go to committee first, and I hope the Senator from Texas will not ask us to deviate from that rule.

Mr. MAYFIELD. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] had one passed just before I called up this joint resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. That was reported from a committee. The Senator from Texas can get a report on his measure by Monday, and I hope he will agree to that, because I would dislike to see the rule which we adopted violated. If we violate it or waive it in one case, we shall have to do so in others. It will be only two days longer, if the Senator will wait until Monday, and I ask that it may go to the appropriate committee.

Mr. MAYFIELD. If it is to be sent to a committee it is immaterial to me where it is sent, because I do not suppose we shall ever hear of it again.

Mr. BORAH. This is a more important matter than I believe the Senator realizes. Let us take time to consider it.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Do I understand the Senator to object?

Mr. BORAH. It seems so.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Is it so?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the joint resolution will be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MAYFIELD. The Chair said, "If there is no objection." Should not the inquiry be, "Is there objection to its consideration?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made to its consideration.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

INTERNATIONAL RADIOTELEGRAPH CONVENTION

On motion of Mr. BORAH, and by unanimous consent, the injunction of secrecy was removed from the International Radiotelegraph Convention and General and Supplementary Regulations Relating Thereto, transmitted by a message from the President of the United States on December 12, 1927.

DWIGHT WHITNEY MORROW

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by Proctor Hall, published in the New York Times magazine on October 16, 1927, relative to Dwight Whitney Morrow, the American ambassador to Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

MORROW TAKES ON OUR KNOTTIEST JOB—TO HIS MISSION IN MEXICO THE NEW AMBASSADOR BRINGS AN ANALYTICAL MIND AND A GREAT CAPACITY FOR WORK

By Proctor Hall

Dwight Whitney Morrow will soon present his credentials in Mexico City as American ambassador to undertake the solution of the most difficult problem that has confronted a diplomatic representative of the United States in recent years. From a personal standpoint it is a new test in a new field for a man whose career up to this time has been extraordinarily successful. Not only because of the weighty issues involved, but also because of the challenge of the man and the task, the result will be watched with the closest interest.

The selection of Mr. Morrow by President Coolidge was a personal appointment—with a difference. Ordinarily personal appointments are one of the items entered on the debit side. They carry with them the implication that the appointing Executive might well have gone further, beyond the circle of his friends, and found one more fit for the job. They are excused as one of the prices paid in electing any human being to an executive office.

The personal appointment of Mr. Morrow, on the other hand, was a case in which the long friendship of Mr. Coolidge for the lawyer-financier gave the President a lever by which he could lift a man pre-eminently fit from such an entrenched position as a partnership in J. P. Morgan & Co. Here was a personal choice which reached up, not down.

It is altogether probable that no other President except Mr. Coolidge could have persuaded Mr. Morrow to take the ambassadorship. Mr. Morrow has given generously of his time and abilities to public services, and it is known has cherished a wish to devote himself entirely to some task in this field. The circumstance that the President of the United States, his friend of years, was faced in our relations with Mexico with a long-standing problem of enormous importance and intricacy, was the special event which led to Mr. Morrow's retirement from the Morgan partnership. And the problem, too, is one of which he has intimate knowledge.

Mexico City has exhibited the liveliest curiosity concerning the new ambassador. If it will relieve President Calles's suspense, he may as well know that the differences between Mexico and the United States are now to be tackled by a man who will make all previous ambassadors seem as if they had been toying with our diplomatic exchanges. The United States has been represented in Mexico City by men of good caliber, but never by one of Mr. Morrow's ability, energy, and capacity for this particular task. Calles will know very shortly after the new ambassador presents his credentials that a new order has been established.

The Mexican President will find it impossible not to like Mr. Morrow, not to admire him. Mr. Morrow will be patient, diplomatic, pretty careful of Mexican sensibilities and ways of doing things. But the pressure will be constant. Morning, noon, and night the ambassador will be mastering the problem, piecing it together, getting a little forward with the job. Working with Mr. Morrow on a hard task is never recommended as a rest cure or for one who likes short hours.

Mr. Morrow was one of the ranking partners of the house of Morgan. The enormous load of responsibilities and labors can not be equally distributed at 23 Wall Street any more than in other partnerships. Some of the partners, equipped by special abilities, carry more of the burden than others. J. P. Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont, and Mr. Morrow have been the three associated by the financial world with the major operations and policies of the banking firm. Russell C. Leffingwell, also a lawyer, is a newer partner, and Thomas Cochran and George Whitney are supposed to be active chiefly in connection with the Morgan interests in domestic industrial corporations. Mr. Morrow has been one of the wheel horses in the Morgan international banking activities, to which the firm has given an increasingly large proportion of its attention, as well as in its railroad and industrial corporation connections.

The list of directorates from which Mr. Morrow withdraws in leaving the Street is not impressive. Neither, for that matter, is the list of directorates of any other partner. On January 3, 1914, the Morgan firm publicly announced the withdrawal of the members from scores of directorates, such as the New York Central, American Telephone & Telegraph, and others, the statement asserting that "the necessity of attending many board meetings has been so serious a burden upon our time." Mr. Morrow has lately been a director on only six boards—Bankers' Trust Co., Foreign Finance Corporation, General Electric Co., International General Electric Co. (Inc.), National Broadcasting Co. (Inc.), and Palisade Trust & Guarantee Co., Englewood, N. J.

Mr. Morrow withdrew from the Morgan partnership on September 30. His interest in the firm was liquidated; he accepted payment in full for it. The partnership agreement of the Morgan firm contains a paragraph to the effect that the estate of a deceased member must accept without question whatever valuation the firm puts upon the partnership at the time of death. No estimate of what Mr. Morrow received can be made with any authority. But in leaving the house of Morgan, with which he had been since 1914, Mr. Morrow severed more than a mere business association. The relations of the partners are peculiarly personal and close, and men such as Mr. Morgan, Mr. Morrow, and Mr. Lamont feel it so.

Mr. Morrow's desk was in the row of partners on the Broad Street side of the first floor of 23 Wall Street—his was inside the partitioned inclosure with Mr. Morgan's and Mr. Lamont's—and his office was on the second floor on the Wall Street side. A visitor might think that these dark paneled offices with open fireplaces were the libraries in private homes. One partner sits in an armchair at a refectory table, with leaded casements of tall bookcases behind him. On the table the portfolios of papers, tied with ribbons, might be manuscripts instead of files of decoded cables, corporation statements, and contracts.

Mr. Morrow's office was plainer. He never has been greatly interested in appearances—even in his own, for that matter. He is intent only on what is going on in his mind. One had but to interview him there, to listen to him, as he sat on the leather-covered sofa, one leg doubled under him, explain all the details of something about Amherst College, the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, the Interborough Rapid Transit situation, or the wide distribution of foreign bonds among investors, to realize what concentration of mind and labors had gone on in this man's brain in this setting. In many respects Mr. Morrow impressed one as being the most intellectually active man in the financial world.

A man small in height but with head and brow large and very well proportioned; firm, chiseled face; eyes clear and keen—Mr. Morrow is a figure of whom one takes notice. His voice is strong. He talks rapidly, not smoothly, but always explicitly. If a listener restates something not quite correctly, Mr. Morrow is not content to leave it so. He phrases it right. One is convinced after hearing Mr. Morrow expound a situation that here is a man who has mastered every detail thoroughly, put it in order in his mind, and worked out the underlying principles as well. He is an attentive listener so long as the information which he is getting is what he wants and at a pace to satisfy his active mind. He knows how to search out and assemble information.

Mr. Morrow's financial and business experience fit him especially well to grapple with the vexed questions in these fields involved in our Mexican relations—and these questions are many and important. A number of persons, however, will ask whether the able Mr. Morrow is diplomatic in a trying situation.

The answer is that he has accomplished notable things in the many public services he has rendered, and these are proof that Mr. Morrow is successful in manner as well as in results. Perhaps his outstanding public service was his work as adviser to the Allied Maritime Transport Council in London from February to December, 1918. It is a well-shared secret that the difficult work of this war organization in alloting tonnage had not been made easier by the attitude of openly expressed suspicion of other allies on the part of certain American representatives. Mr. Morrow was quick to see the danger in the feelings aroused; he straightened out an ugly situation with tact and dispatch. There was a noticeably better feeling in London for his having been there.

President Calles might well ask his ambassador in London to make a full report on Mr. Morrow's work in this one task. It was for this and for his labors on the Military Board of Allied Supply that he was awarded the distinguished-service medal. There need be no fear in Mexico City that Mr. Morrow does not grasp the human equation in any

situation, or that he is not appreciative of the value of friendly good nature in reaching his goal. His sense of humor is as keen as his insight.

The troubled situation at Amherst College which led to Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn's resignation as president bore heavily on Mr. Morrow's time and patience. He was a trustee of his alma mater. The outside world had the impression that what led up to the final act in that drama was a matter of a few months. Mr. Morrow and the other trustees tried earnestly to save for Amherst students the values of a personal leadership and stimulation which they correctly estimated. For five years the trustees, guided entirely by Mr. Morrow, had tried to work out a solution for a problem which yearly grew more impossible. If Mr. Morrow has not lost the quality of patience which he showed in that case, our diplomatic relations will be fortunate.

Mr. Morrow is not given to the use of ultimatums or force. His power is persuasion by force of fact and argument. The writer remembers long Saturday afternoons spent with Mr. Morrow in 1917, when he was chairman of the Prison Inquiry Commission of New Jersey, the first of his notable public services. Murder and torture had been committed in the prisons and mismanagement was universal. To a newspaper man it seemed necessary that individuals be punished after public trial in order to arouse public opinion in the State to demand a clearing up.

Mr. Morrow was not willing to let the chances of real reform rest, as he saw it, upon the outcome of trials in which proof would not be easy. He was intent upon framing new laws, a new organization, and he counted upon fact and reason to put over what he wanted. He summoned experts to help him. On Saturday afternoons a telephone message from the Knickerbocker County Club frequently would come to remind him of a foursome match he had forgotten while he was working away on prison reform. And generally the street lights were on before he called it a day and bundled up some papers to take home. If any one Morgan partner has had to put the firm cat out on leaving for the night more often than any other, that one probably is Mr. Morrow.

He is a shining example of the truth that a busy man has most time to give to outside demands upon him. The extra tasks which Mr. Morrow has shouldered have not been merely those treasurerships of good causes which can be managed by a secretary. Most stories concerning men like Mr. Morrow are apocryphal, but it is said that Mr. Morgan once remarked to him: "Dwight, I will personally give you $100,000 if you will resign as trustee of Amherst." He did not. He gave a great deal of time to the war-savings campaign, to the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, as a worker on the board and not a mere name to decorate the letterhead. He consolidated the charitable agencies in the town where he lives—Englewood. He never has associated himself with anything as a figurehead. In every movement to which he has lent his name he has been a hard worker, and he has left everything better for concentrating his constructive mind upon it.

President Coolidge named him chairman of the Aircraft Board in 1925 to study the Nation's aeronautical needs, particularly with reference to the Army and Navy. Mr. Morrow's conduct of that inquiry was quick and thorough. He took the froth and fury out of wild charges and proposals which had followed the resignation of General Mitchell, drew information from witnesses expeditiously, and prepared a thorough, well-planned report along sound lines.

It was President Coolidge's long personal friendship which enabled him to call on Mr. Morrow for the time-taking job of the Aircraft Board. They were classmates at Amherst, graduated in 1895. When the students came to vote for the man most likely to succeed in life almost every one voted for Morrow. Coolidge got one vote—Morrow's. The friendship which has existed between these two men since those days has not been an intimate one of frequent contacts; but they have met through the years, and their esteem for one another has strengthened. Mr. Morrow is amusing in describing his conviction that the rise of Mr. Coolidge from selectman to legislator, to governor, to Vice President, and then to President was inevitable, a progress which no earthly force could avert.

Mr. Morrow worked to pay his way through Amherst. His father had been president of Marshall College—no surplus funds in his small budget for college educations for his sons. After Amherst, Dwight Morrow studied law at Columbia, again paying his way by tutoring and other jobs. Upon graduation he obtained a place with Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett. Law firms in those days were far from being worried over what their clerks did with the rest of their $6 a week after meeting the expenses of living. But Morrow attracted attention by the quality and the amount of his work. He was summoned from Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett to 23 Wall Street in 1914.

Mr. Morrow is a scholar, a man of liberal and original mind. In presenting him for the degree of doctor of laws at Princeton, Dean West summed up his life: "It is the story of a quick, deep, and resolute mind, well trained to sound judgment and straight action." To understand the breadth and depth of his mind, one should read, for example, his speech at Chicago on foreign loans, delivered April 23, 1926, in which he declared that there was no warrant in American history for the use of armed forces to collect a debt; and his article in Foreign Affairs on the distribution of foreign government bonds among investors in the United States, together with his series of 10 newspaper articles published in 1919 under the title "The Society of Free Nations," reviewing the attempts to bring about leagues of peace and discussing the plan of the Peace Conference's League of Nations Committee, of which Woodrow Wilson was chairman.

Mexico can take pride in knowing that no man ever before gave up so much to accept any ambassadorship as Mr. Morrow is doing at the call of President Coolidge.

Some news reports at the time of the appointment stated that no other partner in J. P. Morgan & Co. had ever retired. Several have done so, and one went into the sphere of diplomacy. Robert Bacon, who resigned in 1903, later was Secretary of State and ambassador to France. But Mr. Morrow's action really sets a precedent. And the motive behind his action, well-informed friends believe, is his genuine desire to devote his life to public service.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the end of the revenue bill (H. R. 1) as received from the House to-day two parallel reference tables showing where may be found the sections of the old law from which the sections of the bill have been taken and also where the sections of the old law appear in the new bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 19, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 17, 1927

MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

Orestes H. Caldwell, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Radio Commission for a term of five years from February 23, 1927, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Harold A. Lafount, of Utah, to be a member of the Federal Radio Commission for the unexpired term of two years from February 23, 1927, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate vice John F. Dillon.

Sam Pickard, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Radio Commission for the unexpired term of three years from February 23, 1927, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate vice Henry A. Bellows.

Garland S. Ferguson, jr., of North Carolina, to be a Federal trade commissioner for a term of seven years from September 26, 1927, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate vice John F. Nugent.

CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Thomas M. Wilson, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a consular officer with the rank of consul, to be a consular officer with the rank of consul general and also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be second lieutenant

Staff Sergeant Charles Lawrence Driscoll, Medical Department, with rank from December 2, 1927.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Major Sumner McBee Williams, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Walton Goodwin, jr., Cavalry, from December 10, 1927.

To be major

Capt. Winchell Ivan Rasor, Signal Corps, from December 10, 1927.

To be captains

First Lieut. Thomas Reed Holmes, Infantry, from December 6, 1927.

First Lieut. Nicholas Dodge Woodward, Infantry, from December 7, 1927.

First Lieut. Edgar William King, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 7, 1927.

First Lieut. Riley Edward McGarraugh, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 8, 1927.

First Lieut. Allan Preston Bruner, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 8, 1927.

First Lieut. Egbert Frank Bullene, Cavalry, from December 9, 1927.

First Lieut. Mark Gerald Brislawn, Infantry, from December 10, 1927.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. John Wesley Warren, Air Corps, from December 4, 1927.

Second Lieut. Isidore Sass, Signal Corps, from December 6, 1927.

Second Lieut. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen, Field Artillery, from December 7, 1927.

Second Lieut. William Elgie Carraway, Infantry, from December 7, 1927.

Second Lieut. John Mark Pesek, Infantry, from December 8, 1927.

Second Lieut. Herbert Bronson Enderton, Field Artillery, from December 8, 1927.

Second Lieut. John Battle Horton, Field Artillery, from December 8, 1927.

Second Lieut. Joseph Leander Hardin, Field Artillery, from December 9, 1927.

Second Lieut. Carter Bowie Magruder, Field Artillery, from December 9, 1927.

Second Lieut. William Joseph D'Espinosa, Field Artillery, from December 10, 1927.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Reid Shand, Veterinary Corps, from December 11, 1927.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17, 1927

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Walter F. Brown.

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Henry L. Stimson.

THE JUDICIARY

MARSHAL

Martin Brown, western district of Michigan.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John R. Rogers, fifth district of New Jersey.

STATE DEPARTMENT

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE

Robert E. Olds.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Nelson T. Johnson.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Dwight W. Morrow, to Mexico.
Noble Brandon Judah, to Cuba.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL GENERAL

William T. Francis, to Liberia.

CONSULS GENERAL

Coert du Bois.
Cornelius Ferris.
Charles L. Hoover.
Leo J. Keena.
Frank C. Lee.
Irving N. Linnell.

CONSULS

Maurice W. Altaffer.
Russell M. Brooks.
William E. De Courcy.
Charles H. Derry.
Peter H. A. Flood.
George Gregg Fuller.
Anderson Dana Hodgdon.
Alan T. Hurd.
John J. Muccio.
Julian L. Pinkerton.
William W. Schott.
Edward E. Silvers.
Robert Lacy Smyth.
Edwin F. Stanton.
Mason Turner.
Frederik van den Arend.

SECRETARIES

Charles A. Bay.
Willard L. Beaulac.
Robert L. Buell.
John K. Davis.
Durward Grinstead.
Loy W. Henderson.
David McK. Key.
Julius G. Lay.
David B. Macgowan.
Clarence E. Macy.
William J. McCafferty.

VICE CONSULS OF CAREER

Glenn A. Abbey.
George M. Abbott.
George D. Andrews, jr.
Franklin B. Atwood.
La Verne Baldwin.
James C. H. Bonbright.
Sidney H. Browne, jr.
Gordon L. Burke.
Vinton Chapin.
Paul C. Daniels.
Gerald A. Drew.
Fayette J. Flexer.
Landreth M. Harrison.
Knowlton V. Hicks.
Terry S. Hinkle.
Cloyce K. Huston.
Perry N. Jester.
James C. King.
George D. LaMont.
Bruce Lancaster.
Charles A. Page.
J. Randolph Robinson.
Alan S. Rogers.
Albert W. Scott.
Roger Sumner.
John T. Wainwright.
Thomas C. Wasson.
Clifton R. Wharton.
Miss Frances E. Willis.
George H. Winters.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER

Class I

Norman Armour.
Homer M. Byington.
DeWitt C. Poole.

Class II

Ray Atherton.
John K. Caldwell.
Louis G. Dreyfus, jr.
Matthew E. Hanna.
George S. Messersmith.
Stokeley W. Morgan.
Edwin L. Neville.

Class III

Hamilton C. Claiborne.
Felix Cole.
George K. Donald.
J. Klahr Huddle.
Frank C. Lee.
Keith Merrill.
James B. Stewart.

Class IV

Charles R. Cameron.
H. Merle Cochran.
John K. Davis.
Alfred W. Donegan.
Graham H. Kemper.
Leland B. Morris.
Wallace S. Murray.
Lowell C. Pinkerton.
Elbridge D. Rand.
Emil Sauer.
S. Pinkney Tuck.

Class V

Charles H. Albrecht.
Algar E. Carleton.
Monnett B. Davis.
Dudley G. Dwyre.
Jay C. Huston.
Edwin Carl Kemp.
Joseph F. McGurk.
John F. Simmons.
Clarence J. Spiker.
George Wadsworth.
Henry M. Wolcott.

Class VI

Maynard B. Barnes.
Richard F. Boyce.
George L. Brandt.
Harry E. Carlson.
James G. Carter.
Nathaniel P. Davis.
Hooker A. Doolittle.
Hugh S. Fullerton.
Jack Dewey Hickerson.
Robert B. Macatee.
John R. Minter.
Robert D. Murphy.
Orsen N. Nielsen.
H. Earle Russell.
Rudolf E. Schoenfeld.
William H. Taylor.
Henry C. von Struve.
Egmont C. von Tresckow.
Harry L. Walsh.
Bartley F. Yost.

Class VII

Willard L. Beaulac.
Hiram A. Boucher.
Lewis V. Boyle.
Reginald S. Castleman.
Stillman W. Eells.
Augustin W. Ferrin.
Robert Y. Jarvis.
Thomas McEnelly.
J. Lee Murphy.
Earl L. Packer.
Walter S. Reineck.
Leo D. Sturgeon.
Harold S. Tewell.
Frederick L. Thomas.
Harold Shantz.

Class VIII

Maurice W. Altaffer.
Russell M. Brooks.
William E. De Courcy.
Charles H. Derry.
Peter H. A. Flood.
George Gregg Fuller.
Anderson Dana Hodgdon.
Alan T. Hurd.
John J. Muccio.
Julian L. Pinkerton.
William W. Schott.
Edward E. Silvers.
Robert Lacy Smyth.
Edwin F. Stanton.
Mason Turner.
Frederik van den Arend.
H. Dorsey Newson.
Thomas W. Voetter.

Unclassified

Glenn A. Abbey.
George M. Abbott.
George D. Andrews, jr.
Franklin B. Atwood.
La Verne Baldwin.
James C. H. Bonbright.
Sidney H. Browne, jr.
Gordon L. Burke.
Vinton Chapin.
Paul C. Daniels.
Gerald A. Drew.
Fayette J. Flexer.
Landreth M. Harrison.
Knowlton V. Hicks.
Terry S. Hinkle.
Cloyce K. Huston.
Perry N. Jester.
James C. King.
George D. LaMont.
Bruce Lancaster.
Charles A. Page.
J. Randolph Robinson.
Alan S. Rogers.
Albert W. Scott.
Roger Sumner.
John T. Wainwright.
Thomas C. Wasson.
Miss Frances E. Willis.
George H. Winters.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

James E. Stroud, Arvin.
Richard G. Power, Colusa.
Charles E. Wood, Compton.
Chelso A. Maghetti, Davis.
John L. Olson, Decoto.
Walter E. Hyer, Del Mar.
Charles C. Jenkins, El Centro.
George H. Burk, Elk.
James W. Hyatt, Emigrant Gap.
George L. Clare, Guerneville.
Minnie E. Dewar, Hueneme.
Theodore J. Brown, Hynes.
Fred E. Laxdal, Inglewood.
Gyda K. Holmboe, Loma Portal.
Grace D. Perkins, Los Nietos.
Frank Challand, Mission Beach.
Flora Dahl, Mokelumne Hill.
Jacob J. Shroy, Newman.
Fadette T. Gossard, Olive View.
Florence E. Buckner, Pacific Palisades.
Edgar L. Etter, Palos Verdes Estates.
Mary K. Davis, San Carlos.
Josephine Zucca, Selby.
Addie E. Waits, Solana Beach.
Richard L. Mason, South Pasadena.
Granville N. Purington, Trona.
Cinderella L. Phiney, Tustin.
Mathilda Busch, Verdugo City.
Hazel E. Avise, Walnut Creek.
Edith M. Kennedy, Weimar.
Earl D. Cline, Zelzah.

COLORADO

Paul P. Huston, Calhan.
Newell R. Usher, Florence.
Alexander G. Johnson, Fort Lupton.
Lawrence H. Dewey, Fruita.
Lula D. Trimble, Georgetown.
Mary E. Kendall, Kiowa.
James M. Brown, Mancos.
William A. Sawyer, Mount Morrison.
Ellsworth A. Weller, New Castle.
Anna Richards, Ouray.

DELAWARE

John P. Betts, Clarksville.
Lula M. Chambers, Stanton.
Ethel Reynolds, Townsend.

IOWA

Roscoe W. Petersen, Bettendorf.
Herbert B. Arnold, Blakesburg.
Hattie Stanley, Castalia.
Aaron W. Monroe, Clemons.
Mary Chilcote, Conway.
William C. Upham, Fredericksburg.
Alfred E. P. Gillette, Geneva.
Robert D. Adey, Granger.
Frank H. Davis, Ionia.
Martin O. Evans, Joice.
Albert L. Meredith, Lynnville.
William D. Lorensen, McCallsburg.
Libbie L. Lockhart, Packwood.
Eunice M. Bute, Stanhope.
John A. Schmitz, Storm Lake.
Mary F. Park, Tracy.
Bessie M. Rice, Urbana.
Letha Doughten, Woolstock.

LOUISIANA

Regina D. Melanson, Arnaudville.
Mildred M. Gleason, Belcher.
Ella M. Perot, Campti.
Rufus W. Echols, Converse.
Henry S. Adams, Good Pine.
William E. Phillips, Greensburg.
Alvin C. Brunson, Mangham.
Frank Warren, Merryville.
Moise E. Chenevert, Plaucheville.
John T. Boyett, Sarepta.

MARYLAND

Lloyd T. Hayden, Centerville.
Mary W. Tise, Hyattsville.

MISSISSIPPI

Everet M. Chilcoat, Amory.
Scott H. Speck, Blue Springs.
Katie M. Beavers, Boyle.
Bessie Gay, Brooklyn.
Anne D. Powers, Cary.
William D. Myers, Deemer.
Nancy A. Murphey, Doddsville.
Bessie F. Truly, Fayette.
Nathan B. Williams, Fernwood.
Willie M. Windham, Lena.
Daniel F. Hitt, Louin.
Albert S. Russell, Magee.
George F. McLelland, Newton.
Myra P. Varnado, Osyka.
Etoyle S. Countiss, Pittsboro.
Kathleen M. Baker, Scooba.
J. D. Hale, Scott.
Thomas L. Cotten, Summit.
Annie K. Woods, Water Valley.
William A. Miller, Wiggins.

MONTANA

Harly J. Stephenson, Belgrade.
Joseph Keeler, Crow Agency.
George D. Dutro, Dodson.
Henry N. Chambers, Manhattan.
Donald A. Petrie, Martinsdale.
Fred W. Handel, Musselshell.
Selma N. Hauge, Paradise.

NORTH DAKOTA

Rudolph G. W. Anderson, Ambrose.
Anton A. Ficker, Amidon.
Lee Rolle, Brinsmade.
Knut O. Abrahamson, Kathryn.
Alice Stewart, Linton.
Jens B. Dyrud, Maddock.
Rose A. Boardman, Overly.
Bridget A. H. Hennessy, Tolna.

OHIO

Mark E. Miller, Ashtabula.
Will P. McNary, Bannock.
Ambrose B. Wingate, Beach City.
Ralph P. Crane, Bowling Green.
Effie W. Mansfield, Brilliant.
Carl A. Brown, Bucyrus.
Alexander C. McDonald, Coshocton.
Starling F. Trimble, Crestline.
Arthur M. Eidson, Cygnet.
Charles W. Shaffer, Doylestown.
Florence Hilgefort, Fort Loramie.
Guy W. Reuter, Fort Recovery.
James Lewis, Girard.
Fred Brockmeyer, Glendale.
Frank W. Howard, Grafton.
Edward L. Jones, Granville.
Fred B. Reed, Green Springs.
Warren H. Noble, Greenwich.
Jennie Pfeiffer, Grover Hill.
William H. Tracy, Harrison.
Michael Effinger, Lancaster.
Anna J. Pyle, Lansing.
Lincoln A. Slusser, Louisville.
Louis K. Carroll, Manchester.
Charles E. Penquite, Mason.
John McCleery, Masury.

Francis M. Fletcher, McComb.
Harry E. Coil, Mendon.
Pearl C. Brown, Middlefield.
George L. Sayles, Milan.
French C. Stillings, Milford Center.
Dewey H. Beck, Monroeville.
William G. Corne, Newark.
Calvin L. Hartline, Newcomerstown.
Harry M. Day, New Richmond.
Albert S. Nye, New Washington.
Cloyde M. Kieffer, Orrville.
Marshall O. Brooke, Peebles.
Frank B. McCullough, Plain City.
George A. Fisher, Port Clinton.
Clarence R. Seymour, Ravenna.
Olive Toland, Rayland.
Harry W. Hayes, Reynoldsburg.
Fred O. Foster, Seville.
Alva H. Anderson, Shelby.
Harry Oldham, Sidney.
Charles M. Sauder, Smithville.
Elmer E. Weaver, Sugarcreek.
Oral H. Hilborn, Tiro.
Raymond M. Swank, Trotwood.
Ralph L. Stamm, Versailles.
George W. Hassenier, Wapakoneta.
Dora A. Kramer, West Alexandria.
William E. Reed, West Lafayette.
Elva L. Gauch, West Manchester.

OKLAHOMA

Royal F. Hall, Boise City.
Roy M. Muse, Elmore City.
Marshall G. Norvell, Marietta.
Frank W. Fuller, Ringwood.
Otto G. Bound, Ryan.
Marion N. Brumley, Selman.
William A. Vassar, Tryon.
Severee L. Massie, Tyrone.

OREGON

Alice K. Gallier, Bandon.
Elizabeth J. Morgan, Corbett.
Fred C. Matches, Dayton.
Edward C. Michelsen, Kerry.
George W. Johnson, Lakeview.
Thomas R. MacMillan, Lebanon.
Annie O. Johnson, Odell.
Harold R. McIsaac, Parkdale.
Ann B. Heydon, Valsetz.
Walter E. Zumwalt, Wamic.

RHODE ISLAND

James H. Riley, Harrisville.
Lillian G. Hoxie, Shannock.

SOUTH CAROLINA

George B. Patrick, Bowman.
Roy L. Hurst, Chesterfield.
Walter L. Gettys, Clover.
Loka W. Rigby, Moncks Corner.
Elijah Lee, Pacolet.
Robert E. Ragsdale, Pelzer.

TENNESSEE

James G. Jones, Ardmore.
John V. Lady, Blountville.
Pleas P. Campbell, Calderwood.
Bessie J. Clark, Christiana.
Joseph R. Lane, Church Hill.
Weyman I. Dooly, Conasauga.
David H. Hughes, Eagleville.
Lavella Bratschi, Erin.
Jean Brient, Friendsville.
William E. Richardson, jr., Halls.
Nona C. Armstrong, Martel.
Elmer T. Sparks, McKenzie.
Edna Conway, Mosheim.
E. Dan Smith, Mountpleasant.
Mathew M. Huling, Winchester.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate December 17, 1927

POSTMASTER

George T. Taylor to be postmaster at Memphis, Tenn.

SENATE

MONDAY, *December 19, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord; Lord, hear my voice.

Almighty God, who speakest in a thousand voices to the hearts and minds of men, grant to us that we may be taught of Thee, that with understanding hearts we may faithfully perform the duties of this day.

In all our work make us ever mindful of the welfare and the wants of others, knowing that we are in Thy stead.

Save, we beseech Thee, the valiant sons of this Nation imperiled in the great deep, for Thy paths are in the great waters, and even there shall Thy hand lead them. Enfold in Thine arms of love and mercy their loved ones, and by the sacrament of our sorrowing sympathy bring us all to a deeper knowledge and understanding of the mystery of Thine infinite love.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edwards	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.
Barkley	Ferris	King	Sackett
Bayard	Fess	La Follette	Sheppard
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead
Black	Frazier	McLean	Shortridge
Blaine	George	McMaster	Smoot
Blease	Gerry	McNary	Steck
Borah	Gillett	Mayfield	Steiwer
Bratton	Glass	Metcalf	Stephens
Brookhart	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Broussard	Gould	Neely	Thomas
Bruce	Greene	Norbeck	Trammell
Capper	Hale	Nye	Tydings
Caraway	Harrison	Oddie	Tyson
Copeland	Hawes	Overman	Wagner
Couzens	Hayden	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis

Mr. PHIPPS. My colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] is detained on account of illness. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. BRATTON. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] from the Chamber. He is detained by illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is confined to his home on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HOWELL. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ENTOMOLOGY (S. DOC. NO. 29)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State inclosing a recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture that the Congress be requested to adopt a resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite foreign governments to be represented by delegates at the International Congress of Entomology, to be held in the United States in 1928.

It will be noticed that because of the close relationship between entomology and agriculture, the Department of Agriculture is especially interested in the international aspects of this science, which it considers of very great importance to this country. As it would seem, therefore, that the participation of foreign governments in the congress mentioned would be in the public interest, I recommend to Congress the passage of the joint resolution. No appropriation is requested.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 19, 1927.*

CLAIM OF TWO NETHERLANDS SUBJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 30)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report regarding two claims presented by the Government of the Netherlands against the Government of the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by two Netherlands subjects, Arend Kamp and Francis Gort, while the U. S. S. *Canibas* was loading on May 1, 1919, at Rotterdam.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of these claims in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $1,000, $500 of which is to be paid to Mr. Arend Kamp and $500 to be paid to Mr. Francis Gort.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 19, 1927.*

CLAIM OF KNUD G. FLAKNE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to the claim of Knud G. Flakne for the sum of $800, being the value placed by claimant on certain improvements made by him on public lands in the reclaimed Mud Lake bottom, embraced in his homestead entry 014157, Cass Lake series, Minn., which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials signed by 293 citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, on Thursday last I presented a petition from officials of the State of Nevada, and asked that it be referred to the Committee on Claims, which action was taken. I now request that the Committee on Claims may be discharged from the further consideration of the petition and that it may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Claims will be discharged from the further consideration of the petition, and it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GLASS:

A bill (S. 1943) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Henry H. Sibley, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1944) to amend subsection (3) of section 1 of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1945) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 1946) relative to the pay of certain retired warrant officers and enlisted men and warrant officers and enlisted men of the reserve forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, fixed under the terms of the Panama Canal act, as amended; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 1947) granting an increase of pension to Virginia J. Betteys (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 1948) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the amount of their adjusted-service credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1949) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1950) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others;

A bill (S. 1951) for the relief of Louise St. Gez, executrix of Auguste Ferré, deceased, surviving partner of Lapene & Ferré;

A bill (S. 1952) for the relief of E. L. F. Auffurth and others; and

A bill (S. 1953) for the relief of the heirs of Susan A. Nicholas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 1954) allowing and regulating amateur boxing and sparring matches in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1955) for the relief of Lieut. Charles Thomas Wooten, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1956) for the relief of Levi R. Whitted;

A bill (S. 1957) for the relief of Thomas H. Deal; and

A bill (S. 1958) for the relief of William J. Cocke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 1959) to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy jurisdiction over oil and gas leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior on lands in naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 1960) for the relief of John D. McCaffrey; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1961) granting a pension to Frank Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1962) granting a pension to David E. Moody (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1963) granting an increase of pension to Iscah Brady Rawson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 1964) to establish a fish cultural station in the State of Montana as an auxiliary to the Bozeman, Mont., fisheries station; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

A bill (S. 1965) to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 1966) for the establishment of migratory-bird refuges to furnish in perpetuity homes for migratory birds, the establishment of public shooting grounds to preserve the American system of free shooting, the provision of funds for establishing such areas, and the furnishing of adequate protection for migratory birds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1967) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Latta (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1968) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay for the use and occupancy by the Department of Agriculture of the Bieber Building, 1358 B Street SW., Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1969) to promote the development, protection, and utilization of national forest resources, to stabilize the livestock industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Karim Joseph Mery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1971) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the construction of a public building at York, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1972) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Shorey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 1973) authorizing an appropriation for construction and installation of permanent buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 1974) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude G. Abernathe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Marion Miller Knoblock; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1976) for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the second judicial circuit; and

A bill (S. 1977) to provide for the appointment of three additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1978) for the relief of Agfa Raw Film Corporation;

A bill (S. 1979) for the relief of the Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.);

A bill (S. 1980) to reimburse the Mexican Gulf Oil Co. for cost of repairing certain damages as a result of negligent navigation of the U. S. S. *Halsey;* and

A bill (S. 1981) for the relief of the owner of Dry Dock No. 6; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) for the relief of Henry A. Bellows; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

LIMITATION TO TWO PRESIDENTIAL TERMS

Mr. DILL. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 54) limiting the term of President to eight years was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of the Constitution, viz: At the end of paragraph 4 of Article II, add the words: "No person shall serve as President more than eight years."

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a proposed bill for farmers' relief prepared by former Senator Poindexter, together with a prospectus, all of which I ask may be printed as a public document.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I call the Senator's attention to the rule which provides that before any paper shall be printed as a Senate document there must be an estimate of the cost?

Mr. SMOOT. This is within the rule. If the cost is to be over $100, then, of course, there must be an estimate; but this cost will not be anywhere near that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TAX REDUCTION—PERCENTAGE DEPLETION FOR COAL MINES

Mr. WATSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

TAX REDUCTION—ESTATE OR INHERITANCE TAXES

Mr. MAYFIELD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

IMPORTED BROKEN RICE

Mr. RANSDELL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purpose of interpreting the meaning of the tariff act of 1922, with respect to imported broken rice, "broken rice" shall include only the class "Brewers' milled rice" as specified in the united standards for milled rice.

DAISY P. COULBOURN

Mr. SHORTRIDGE (for Mr. DU PONT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Daisy P. Coulbourn, widow of Joseph R. Coulbourn, late an employee of the Senate under the supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. COUZENS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. JOHNSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. NORBECK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 88), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have a rather important resolution in my hand relating to a bill which has recently been before us. I send the resolution to the desk and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Clerk of the House be, and is hereby, authorized and directed in the enrollment of H. R. 5800 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the first deficiency bill, to insert on page 38, in line 9 of the engrossed bill, after the word "attorneys," the following words: "(their heirs or their assignees now of record, as their interest may appear)."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, just a word of explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator state what the resolution is for? Why is it submitted?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was about to state why the passage of this resolution is proposed. It seems that the Comptroller General has raised an objection to the proposed legislation; he does not object to carrying it into effect, but wants to have the provisions so drafted that he can do so.

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended the passage of this resolution. I had a personal interview with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who likewise recommends it. The item provides for the payment of money which is overdue, but in order that it may be paid a slight change is required in its phraseology, which is suggested by the Comptroller General. I present a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in reference to the matter, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 19, 1927.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to your personal call of this date in which we discussed a concurrent resolution with reference to the enrollment of H. R. 5800, in which it is proposed to have inserted after the word "attorneys" in line 16 of page 37 of original print, as reported, the words "their heirs or their assignees, now of record, as their interest may appear," there would seem to be no reason why this amendment should not be incorporated, and there is no objection to the same so far as this office and the department are concerned.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. BURKE, *Commissioner.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming?

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

POLITICS AND MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the New South, in the issue of July, 1927, written by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and entitled "Politics and Muscle Shoals."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND MUSCLE SHOALS—"OUR LOST OPPORTUNITY"

By Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS

Since Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden there has never been discovered an element in nature with so many possibilities of usefulness and pleasure as electricity. All that is needed to give humanity the full enjoyment of this modern giant is to cheapen its production. If stock manipulation can be eliminated and if financial legerdemain and unconscionable profits can be removed, it is the cheapest source of power and light known to man.

But it possesses the peculiar quality that it must be used the instant it is available. The source of supply must be constant so that it can be utilized at any instant. Another peculiarity is that those who use it do so spasmodically.

It follows that a very large amount of the electricity that is generated goes to waste. Our rivers are not constant in their flow and, therefore, for practical purposes, the only electricity that can be counted on is that amount which can be used at any hour of the day and any day in the year.

The power that can be thus utilized is called primary power. The power which the flowing river will produce for only a portion of the time is called secondary power. Secondary power is of but little value. When a water-power development is contemplated the engineers count only on the primary power.

And yet, in most of our streams, there is much more secondary than primary power. For instance, the great dam at Muscle Shoals constructed by the Government is capable of producing in round numbers about 100,000 primary horsepower. Yet there are seasons when for a portion of the year enough water goes over that great dam to make a million horsepower.

If some way can be devised by which this secondary power can be converted into primary power, we have, for all practical purposes, succeeded in making something out of nothing. If we can afford to construct a dam for the purpose of generating 100,000 horsepower, what must be the revolution in cheapening the current if it were possible to convert all the secondary power into primary power?

We would more than treble the output without materially increasing the cost of production, and electricity that had before cost 2 mills per kilowatt-hour to produce would be produced at a small fraction of that cost.

LINKING THE SYSTEMS

No means has been invented by which all of the secondary power can be converted into primary power. However, an approach to that end is not only possible, but is already being put to practical application.

One way of changing secondary to primary power is to build storage dams to hold back the flood waters and release them when the normal flow of the stream is low. This method, while very valuable, is expensive. It often costs as much to build storage dams as it does the generating dam. A more practical way by which this desirable result is brought about is to hook up different generating plants into one great superpower system.

Investigation shows that the high water on one stream does not correspond at times with the high water on another. There may be an oversupply of water on one watershed while the reverse is true on the other side. But if we can combine the secondary power at one dam with the secondary power in another locality where the period of high water comes at a different time, we have thus to a great extent brought about the conversion of secondary power into primary power. Such systems are in utilization in many parts of the world and to a great extent in many sections of the South.

This was demonstrated in 1922 in North Carolina. The flow of the streams had been very materially decreased and a power shortage threatened to stop the street cars, leave a portion of the streets in darkness, and many homes without light.

Directly adjoining this system was a hydroelectric power system in eastern Georgia. This system had enough electricity for its own use, but none to spare. In western Georgia was a similar system, with no surplus electricity. Still west of it came the Alabama Power Co., covering a large portion of the State of Alabama and certain localities in adjoining States, with a system of connected generating plants, both of water and of steam. This company had enough electricity for its own use, but no more.

Northwest of the Alabama Power system was Muscle Shoals. The Government dam had not then been completed, but the great steam plant there, capable of producing 80,000 horsepower, was in running order.

Under the present condition of scientific knowledge electricity can not be economically carried over a wire more than 300 miles. It was impossible, therefore, to generate electricity at this great steam plant and carry it into North Carolina, 800 miles away. But fires were kindled in the great furnaces at Muscle Shoals and power was fed into the west side of the Alabama Power Co.'s system. The Alabama Power Co. was able, from the eastern side of its system, to give to the western Georgia system an amount of power equal to that which it had received from Muscle Shoals. The western Georgia system relayed the current to the eastern part of the State and the plant there passed it along to North Carolina. The catastrophe was averted.

This practice of relaying electricity can be continued indefinitely. The greater the superpower system thus connected the greater the possibilities of human benefit.

It was shown before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate in connection with one of the hearings on Muscle Shoals that the power generated there, if connected with the power generated by the Alabama Power Co. on the Coosa River, would increase the combined output of primary power of the two streams by more than 100,000 horsepower in excess of what could be produced by the two systems if not connected.

MONOPOLY ESSENTIAL

Every city supplied with electricity from a hydroelectric plant uses the current in variant quantities at different hours in the same day. Each city has what is known as the peak load. But this peak load in one city will not correspond in time with the peak load in another city, and if the supplying plants are connected by the simple pushing of a button, thousands of horsepower can be transferred from one locality to another. At the time when Atlanta, Ga., would be short of power Chattanooga, Tenn., might have an oversupply going to waste. Similarly, by the turning of a switch, 100,000 horsepower could be changed from the East, where it was not wanted, to the Middle West, where it was needed.

It follows, therefore, that to get the maximum amount of electricity at the minimum cost it is necessary that all the generating systems should be hooked up together. In other words, to get the full benefits of electricity, it must be controlled and supplied by a monopoly.

Thus far I have said nothing that is in dispute. All that I have said is admitted by all students of the subject. The question then arises: Who shall own and control this monopoly?

A monopoly, privately owned and privately operated, is always obnoxious to a free people. The history of the world shows that human nature is such that men intrusted with the control of a monopoly for private gain naturally bear down with all their power and operate the monopoly for all the traffic will stand. I am not mentioning this in any fault-finding spirit. I am not complaining of the corporations that go into the business for the profit there is in it and who try to get out of it every drop of juice that the lemon contains.

But what about the public? What about those who must pay the bill and those who would like to enjoy the comforts of electricity in their homes? Unless it is cheap the ordinary person can not avail himself of it, and electricity is as necessary in the modern home as running water. I do not believe that a free people will permanently submit to a monopoly that controls a necessity of life. It is not because they have any ill will against those who own the monopoly, but it is because the spirit of independence and freedom that is in every human breast rebels against such control, especially of the natural resources of the country. If we are to permanently remain under the thraldom of a monopoly that controls our necessities, then to a great extent we are slaves.

WHO SHALL CONTROL?

What is the raw material of this monopoly? It is the rivers and the brooks that flow from the mountains to the sea. Is it not true that the people own these natural resources and that they, therefore, have title to the unseen power that exists wherever water flows downhill? Water is a necessary monopoly. The raw material already owned by the people ought to be supplied to the people, and we are confronted with the proposition that this property, thus owned, should all be turned over to private corporations for private gain.

In this particular case, who built the mighty dam on the river at Muscle Shoals? Whose money paid for the giant steam power plant located there? Who built the three towns located in that vicinity? Who macadamized the streets? Who owns all of it, and who toiled in order that that great improvement might be made possible? Certainly not those who would lease this property for a song or who would buy it under untruthful representations as to its value. The river has been harnessed. More than $125,000,000 of taxpayers' money has been expended in the operation. The electricity is being generated,

and yet it seems the people who own it can not get the benefit of the improvement and the investment simply because somebody is afraid that the Government might go into business. Nobody objected when the Government spent its money to harness the property that already belongs to the people, but now, when the proposition is made that this labor-saving improvement should reach the factory and the home without profit to private parties, there goes up a great cry from men who are anxious that the people should not enjoy the comforts and the blessings of their own property unless they pay tribute to the millionaires in Wall Street and elsewhere. For the past several years that this question has been before Congress there has been a continuous fight between those who wanted to save the property of the people for the people and those who wanted to use the property of the people for private gain.

CONTROL OF RATES

In order to save to the people of the South the use of their own property, it was proposed in Congress that the Government should make a complete survey of the Tennessee River and all its tributaries, and that there should be built from time to time, during the next 10 or 15 years, a network of dams for tne improvement of navigation, the control of flood waters, and the development of electricity. It is only by dealing with a system of this kind as a whole that we can get the maximum amount of benefit from the minimum cost.

The Tennessee River flows through the very heart of the South. In its unimproved state it is not navigable. Properly improved, it would help in the control of the flood waters of the Mississippi River, It would give to the South a system of cheap navigation. It would develop a system of electrical distribution the benefits of which would ultimately reach every factory in the South, every home and every municipality between the Potomac and the Gulf, the Mississippi and the Atlantic. It would have been the key to the entire situation.

While there would have been in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 of horsepower developed it would still have been insufficient to supply the region mentioned, but because of its key situation it would have controlled the rates in every city and on every farm in the South.

The control of these generating dams on the Tennessee River by the people would have enabled the Government to prevent any other system in the entire South from charging exorbitant rates to the consumer. They could have interlocked with all the other systems privately owned, and could have said in every case, "Unless your rates are fair we will refuse to give you the benefit of this necessary connection."

NEEDS SOUTH'S SUPPORT

But what happened to this proposition? It lacked only a few votes on one occasion of passing the Senate and, if it had had the united support of the South it would be on the statute books to-day and the time would come when electricity through this great region at 2 cents per kilowatt hour would be a reality.

There is no other great community on the continent better adapted to the application of a great superpower system than the country south of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi. It would mean, in the end, that the coal mines would be added to the system. It would mean that practically every particle of secondary power would be converted into primary power. It would mean a distribution and sale of electrical current equaled nowhere else on the face of the globe, and the South would come into its own.

Not only was there opposition in Congress from many southern representatives, but the business men, the manufacturers, the men of wealth, the governors, the editors and publishers of great southern newspapers, crowded the corridors of committee rooms, raising a hue and cry against any such improvement. All the power of society, of wealth, and of politics and the influence of one of the greatest trusts and monopolies on earth, were used to prevent the people of the South from enjoying this blessing.

The man who was the author of the bill that would have brought about this improvement was denounced all through the South as an enemy to humanity—one who stood in the way of human progress. It was proclaimed on the floor of the Senate that he was a dreamer, an enemy to advancement, a socialist, a bolshevist, and everything else within the category of denunciation. The South itself refused the cup of happiness and contentment that was extended by a friendly hand.

When it was proposed that the Federal Power Commission should not make any additional leases on the Tennessee River and its tributaries until Muscle Shoals was disposed of there came from all over the South an army of her influential citizens, denouncing the bill and asking that this property of the people be turned over to private exploitation. Had the proposition been accepted, the Tennessee River and all its tributaries would, in the first place, have been made completely navigable. That item alone, future generations will realize, would have been of inestimable value.

On behalf of the Power Trust controlled from Wall Street came the representatives of the Southern Manufacturers' Association, the governors of some of the States, some of the Members of the House of Representatives, and some of the Senators, all from the South, all complaining in the same voice and in the same tone with the Power Trust, and through their combined influence the resolution was killed. Many Senators favorable to the proposition threw up their hands in disgust and said, "If the South doesn't want this blessing, why force it on her?"

DAM NO. 3

Thinking men of the South are beginning to wonder now why private parties do not bid for Dam No. 3. This was included in the contemplated Government improvement. Everybody knows that Dam No. 3, standing alone and by itself, would not be a good financial investment, but combined with the scientific development of the Tennessee System it is not only extremely valuable but essential, and for the navigation of the Tennessee River it is absolutely necessary. These power grabbers do not want it, and the South will wait long before private parties, whom many of their representatives love so well, will make a bid upon Dam No. 3, and without Dam No. 3 the proper navigation of the Tennessee River is an impossibility.

But all this, regrettable as it is, is past. Dam No. 2 and other governmental improvements at Muscle Shoals still remain. We can yet save that valuable improvement already owned by the Government with all the machinery already installed. It will not enable the Government to control electric rates over the South as a complete system of development on the Tennessee River would have done, but it is still capable of wielding a wonderful influence. It is still capable of bringing blessings into many southern homes and cheapening the manufacturing establishments. The opportunity that the South had to become the greatest manufacturing portion of our country will never be realized as completely and as fully as it would have been had this great system in the heart of the South been developed and controlled for service rather than for profit. But notwithstanding this, if we still retain Muscle Shoals we can very materially influence the prosperity of all that country.

THE TAXATION SHAM

In the main, there were two objections made against the governmental improvements above outlined. One was that the Government would pay no taxes, and if private capital made the improvement taxes would be levied. The other objection was that if the Government made the improvement and retained the property, it would get into politics. Let me take these objections up in their order.

1. The taxation claim is a myth. In the first place, private parties never will develop some of the power sites on the Tennessee River. I believe Dam No. 3 is an instance. They will pick out only the cream and, as far as they are able to control the Federal Power Commission, they will run each plant independent of any other. If the Government had owned it all and developed it all, it would have been done in a scientific, systematic way, and in the location of any dam reference would have been had to the entire system rather than to the power that might be developed at any particular point. Every scientific engineer knows that this is the only way to get the maximum amount of power for the minimum amount of expense, and it follows that if left to "private initiative," that much-beloved phrase of the Power Trust, there never will be the maximum development that ought to take place—hence the amount of the tax that will actually be paid by private parties is very much overestimated.

But in a broader sense, the owners of private utilities are not taxpayers. They are only tax collectors. They push the burden onto the consumer every time, and the man in the home, the man in the factory, pays every cent of the tax. Not only are they simply tax collectors but they charge an enormous rate for this service. They tax the consumer more for collection purposes than the tax itself amounts to. This statement is borne out by the facts in every public utility proposition from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

A STRIKING CONTRAST

During the year 1924 the city of Los Angeles was supplied with electricity and with water by the municipality. The city of San Francisco, during the same year, was supplied with electricity and with water by private corporations. These cities were practically the same in population. One was downtrodden with the awful "Government in business" proposition. The other was sitting supreme and happy under the management of private initiative. A comparison between the prices which the consumers in these cities paid is wonderfully illuminating. It was shown before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate that during that year the people of San Francisco paid for water and electricity a sum that exceeded the amount paid for water and electricity by the people of Los Angeles by more than the entire tax for municipal purposes in Los Angeles. The people of Los Angeles, in that year alone, saved more than $12,000,000 through the instrumentality of their municipality-owned water and electric plant. While this showing is remarkable, it must be borne in mind that Los Angeles had a very expensive system of water supply. The city brought its water across the mountains for more than 250 miles, while in San Francisco the private companies had no such expense. They supplied the people there with water that was pumped in the immediate vicinity of the city. It must be remembered, also, that Los Angeles was not hooked up with a superpower system. The generation of her electricity is more than double the price that electricity would be throughout the South if a proper superpower system, operated without manipulation and without profit, were installed.

KEEPING OUT OF POLITICS

2. Would Government operation of such a system as I have above outlined get the entire matter into politics? Let me say first that the entire matter is already in politics. It has always been in politics. Every privately owned public utility in the world is actively engaged in politics. The Power Trust mixes into politics in the election of a board of aldermen in the smallest village in the country. It is in politics in the election of every governor. It is in politics in the election of every Member of the House of Representatives and every Senator. It contributes liberally in every presidential campaign. And it never expends a cent but what it expects to get back, and actually does get back with enormous profit on the investment.

In the recent fight over the Boulder Dam bill in the Senate, it is estimated that the Power Trust spent more than $200,000. Telegrams came to many Senators by the hundreds and from States that are 2,000 miles away from the site of Boulder Dam. They came from representatives of the Power Trust in little hamlets in Iowa, in Nebraska, in Kansas, and when these men talk about getting the matter into politics they are only afraid that it will get out of politics. From my study of the question, I believe the only way to take the public utility matter out of politics is to take it over by the Government, either of the Nation, the State, or the municipality.

THE PEOPLE'S MONEY

The bill that was pending in the Senate and which lacked only a few votes of passing had a provision in it which, it was agreed by practically all those who have studied it, would have completely and effectively taken the entire matter out of the domain of the political arena.

What we need, therefore, is to take these matters out of politics. It is a business matter entirely. To take them out of politics we must take them away from those who are themselves in politics clear up to their necks. The Power Trust never sleeps. It has its highly paid attorneys and experts, like an army, covering the entire country. Every municipal body of aldermen, every State legislature, and every Congress, are all importuned by these high-salaried men to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. If they paid their own bills—if they met their own expenses, I would not so bitterly complain. But every cent they spend, every time they deceive or bribe a public official, is all collected from the very men whose property they are wrongfully taking away and whom they are attempting to deceive.

In addition to this army, the Power Trust has employed numberless publicity experts. They are men of great ability and who command the highest of salaries. They write newspaper articles and editorials. They write magazine articles, and they write books based upon false theories and deceptive propaganda. Sometimes directly, but more often indirectly, they control the owners and publishers of magazines and newspapers. They spread their literature, based upon half truths, over the country, through the various news agencies, in order to create a public sentiment in favor of their ownership and operation of the people's property. But again they charge up the enormous expense of their deceptive practices and collect it out of the very people whom they have deceived.

A CANADIAN EXAMPLE

The greatest illustration in the world of a publicly owned and operated superpower system is in existence in the Province of Ontario, Canada. A publicly owned corporation generates and distributes electricity to the municipalities and to many of the farmers of that Province at actual cost. They have been in operation nearly 20 years, and they have shown results that startle the imagination. They have to fight against the same influences that have brought about the defeat of public ownership and distribution of electricity from the Tennessee River.

During the last year more than 80 per cent of the domestic consumers of Ontario paid less than 2 cents per kilowatt-hour for their electricity. More than 80 per cent of the commercial consumers of electricity paid less than 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, and more than 70 per cent of the power users paid less than $25 per horsepower per year. During the last year the domestic consumers of electricity in the United States paid an average of 7½ cents per kilowatt-hour, and during that same time the domestic consumers of electricity in Ontario, Canada, paid 1.85 cents per kilowatt-hour. If the people in our country had paid the same price during the last year for electricity that was charged by the publicly owned system in Ontario, they would have saved on their electric-light bills more than $600,000,000.

I hold in my hand as I write the bill of Mrs. J. Cullom, who lives at 250 Victoria Avenue, Toronto, Canada, for electricity for one month in the year 1922. Mrs. Cullom is the wife of a laboring man. Her home is a modest one of eight rooms, and yet for the month mentioned there was consumed in that home 334 kilowatt-hours of electricity. The amount so consumed is startling to every American citizen. The ordinary house of eight rooms in our country will consume, on an average, about 50, and very seldom more than 60, kilowatt-hours in a month. The amount consumed will, of course, depend upon the electrical appliances in the home, and this in turn, for all ordinary people at least, depends in the main upon the price of the electricity. But Mrs. Cullom had in her home nearly every electrical appliance known to science. She swept the floors by electricity. She cooked all of her meals the year round upon an electric stove. She washed by electricity, she ironed by electricity, she had twice as many electric lights in that eight-room cottage as is usually found in similar cottages in the United States. She heated the water for the kitchen and bath by electricity. In fact, she had in her home what ought to be in the home of every citizen throughout the South. She paid a price that is no more than ought to be paid by every home owner in the South, and no more than would be paid if the natural resources were properly developed and properly managed. Her bill for electricity for that month was $3.55.

This was not only a great convenience but it was a saving of money. If Mrs. Cullom had lived at that time in the city of Washington, the Capital of our Nation, her bill for the same amount of electricity would have been $23.18. If Mrs. Cullom had lived in Birmingham, Ala., she would have had to pay more than $32. If she had lived in Nashville, Tenn., she would have paid in excess of $40 for this same amount of electricity, and if she had lived in some of the towns of Florida she would have paid in the neighborhood of $60—but if she had lived in the States named she would have had the blessed satisfaction of knowing that some private corporation connected with the Electric Trust in Wall Street would have been the recipient of a large share of her contribution. This blessing was denied Mrs. Cullom. It is not denied to the great majority of women who live in the sunny South and who have the benefit of "private initiative."

And it must be remembered that in all the Canadian rates I have given there is an amortization fee. That is, there is included in the prices a fee which in 30 years will pay off the entire invested capital. So that the rates are not only paying interest on the money invested in the development, not only paying for the expense of operation and depreciation, but they are likewise paying a fee that in 30 years will leave them with nothing to pay except the expense of maintenance and operation.

In our country, who ever heard of a private utility company amortizing its capital? Instead of reducing the capital on which consumers are expected to pay interest, the clamor and the practice always is to increase it to the limit and to take advantage of every excuse and every opportunity, either fairly or unfairly, to increase capitalization and thus indirectly increase profits.

CHEAP POWER FOR FARMERS

And the Province of Ontario has not forgotten the farmer. To begin with, it must be admitted that it costs more to get electricity to the farmer than it does to the home in the city. This comes about because of the extra cost of distribution. There may be even less than a dozen farmers to a mile of transmission line, but in the city there are several dozen in every block.

The farmers of Ontario, when they saw what wonderful things were happening in the municipalities in the way of cheap electricity, demanded that they be supplied with this modern element of efficiency, and the Provincial legislature passed a law supplying the system to the farmers. They are getting their electricity at cost—the same as the people of the village and the city. The rural lines are built upon the same theory and the same principle applies to all alike.

The only difference is that the Legislature of Ontario, realizing the additional expense involved in supplying the farmer with electricity and also being anxious, as every legislature in our country is anxious, to relieve the burdens of agriculture, provided by law that for rural lines, owned by farmers, there should be paid out of the treasury one-half of the construction cost of the transmission lines carrying electricity to the farmer organizations. I mention this because some of the propagandists have seized upon this proposition to circulate through the United States the report that the production and distribution of electricity in Canada is subsidized from public funds. At a hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture one of the professors of the State University of Tennessee made this assertion. He made it undoubtedly with perfectly honest intentions, and yet he was entirely mistaken in his assertion.

There is no municipal consumer in Ontario that has ever been relieved by a single penny from public funds. The interest on the bonds and the entire cost of the operation have been paid by those who consume electricity. Not one cent has the taxpayer ever paid outside of the exception that I have mentioned, which goes entirely to the benefit of agriculture and which, in my judgment, is justified in order to relieve agriculture of its extra burdens. The only thing the Province does is to lend its credit in the sale of the bonds that are floated for the installation of the various hydroelectric generating plants and the building of transmission lines. And that brings to mind another advantage that a publicly owned system has over the privately owned system—it can borrow its money for nearly half what the private corporation must pay in the way of interest, and thus the actual expense is very materially lessened.

WHAT FARMS SHOULD BE

I have before me a photograph of the farm home of Mr. B. L. Siple, a Canadian citizen who lives in Ontario. He has 79 acres in his

farm, and at the time I visited him he was milking 17 cows by electricity. He filled his silo by electricity. He ground his feed by electricity. He pumped the water by electricity. Every cow in her stall had a bucket of water within her reach. When she drank the water in the bucket it was automatically filled again. Mr. Siple's barn could be lighted up throughout by the pushing of a button. His house was a beautiful modern cottage, the equal of any in our cities in America. There was running water in the kitchen and in the bathroom. Mrs. Siple cooked the year around on an electric stove. She had an electric fan in the kitchen. She washed her dishes in water that she heated by electricity. The bathroom was supplied with water heated by electricity. She did her washing, ironing, sweeping, all by electricity. In fact, she had practically all of the modern electrical conveniences known to science to-day.

The installation on this farm of this system of electricity had practically saved Mr. Siple the expense of one hired man and it saved his wife the expense of a hired girl. He paid for the entire facilities for the year in which I visited him $115.49. Like the city man, he paid an amortization fee and also included in this bill an item which, in 30 years, will pay off the entire capital stock, including the construction of the transmission lines.

Who is there under our flag that would not like to see this condition applied to the American farmer? If the South were to avail itself of the opportunities that are within its reach the time would soon be here when every toiler in the fields throughout the South would have the same advantage possessed by this farmer brother in the North.

IMPRACTICAL FOR NITRATE

In connection with Muscle Shoals there remains for discussion the question of fertilizer. When the original act providing for the development of Muscle Shoals was passed, there were two provisions contained in it that were mandatory. It was provided that all the improvement made at Government expense at Muscle Shoals should forever be operated by the Government, and that the property should not be sold or leased for operation to private parties. It was likewise provided that in time of peace the power developed on the Tennessee River at the Government dam should be used in the extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere for the purpose of manufacturing fertilizer for agriculture.

Those who are continually harping against Government operation are always calling attention to that part of the original act which says that in time of peace we shall use the power for the manufacture of fertilizer. They never say anything about that provision of the law which says that the property shall never be sold or leased for operation by private parties.

At the time this law was passed, it was believed by practically everybody that by the use of cheap power we would be able to extract nitrogen from the air at a price that would materially reduce the cost of fertilizer to the farmer.

Originally nitrogen was extracted from the atmosphere by what was known as the arc process. It required a great deal of cheap power. Later on, the cyanamid method was discovered, requiring much less power. That was about the condition of the knowledge possessed in America at the time of the breaking out of the World War. It was known that the Germans had invented an improvement over the cyanamid process, known as the Haber process, but the details were not understood by the American scientists at the time of the construction of the plant at Muscle Shoals. The cyanamid process was well understood. Its possibilities were definitely known, and so the Government provided for a large plant at Muscle Shoals, known as nitrate plant No. 2, capable of extracting 40,000 tons of nitrogen from the atmosphere in a year. Our experts thought that there was a fair possibility of their being able to construct a plant that would extract nitrogen from the air by the Haber process, but they were not certain of it, and so it was decided to construct a nitrate plant somewhat experimental in its nature, known as nitrate plant No. 1, which was designed to extract nitrogen from the atmosphere by means of the Haber process. But our scientific advisers were mistaken as to many of the elements included in the Haber process, and so that plant, as far as the machinery was concerned, was a total loss. The building can be used for other purposes. It is modern, well constructed, and supplied with a steam plant of about 5,000 horsepower which is modern in every way.

When the war ended, scientists soon learned what the Germans knew and which they had greatly improved during the war, and it was then possible to construct a plant along more modern lines. From that day to this, scientific men have improved the Haber process. In every improvement made less and less power was used until at the present time it is definitely known that in the construction of up-to-date plants to extract nitrogen from the air, water power will not be used. Instead of locating a nitrate plant in the vicinity of water power, anyone designing such a plant to-day would locate it with a view of getting cheap coal instead of cheap power. With this knowledge no efficient government or private corporation would think of using water power for the purpose of extracting nitrogen from the air. In every case coal is used, because it is more profitable to utilize the by-product of coal than it is to use water power for the comparatively small amount of power that is necessary. Private parties in our own country using nitrogen for commercial purposes have, since the war, constructed a number of comparatively large plants for the extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere, and in no case are they using water power.

Why, therefore, is it that the country has been faced with this wonderful propaganda to deceive the farmers of America by asking them to insist that the Congress shall use Dam No. 2 to get nitrogen from the air? We can use Dam No. 2 and nitrate plant No. 2 and get 40,000 tons of nitrates from the atmosphere every year, but it will be at a cost that, if put into fertilizer, will make it impossible to sell the fertilizer as cheaply as it can be bought to-day upon the market.

There have been two classes that have been instrumental in bringing about this propaganda. One is the political demagogue who wants the farmer's vote and cries aloud that this should be done in the name of American agriculture. The other is a class of people who are either directly or indirectly representatives of the Power Trust. If they can not have the power themselves, they would like to have the Government use it for some unprofitable, unscientific business so as to keep the power out of competition and let them continue their stranglehold which they now have upon the people of the country.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

Under these circumstances, what is the sensible thing to do? All honest citizens who have studied the subject want to cheapen the price of fertilizer. It is important to every consumer of food, and the importance of it is increasing every day in the year. What we want is to develop a system that will cheapen the production of fertilizer, and when that system is developed throw it open to anybody who wants to go into the business. Therefore the cheapening process can very properly be done by the Government itself. It is a proper governmental function, not for the benefit of the farmer alone but for the benefit of all the consumers of our country. The Government has done wonderfully well in this field up to the present time. Since the war improvements made by our own Government officials in the fixed-nitrogen research laboratory have cut the cost of the production of nitrogen practically in half.

It is quite immaterial whether we take the profit from the sale of water power and use it to improve the manufacture of fertilizer or whether we appropriate the money directly from the Treasury for that purpose. In either case it is the use of governmental funds and is entirely justified. It is not at all inappropriate, since we have conceded this great improvement at Muscle Shoals to be dedicated to agriculture in time of peace, that we should use the money we receive for the building of experimental plants for the manufacture of fertilizer; and when the Government builds these plants it ought to do just the same as a private party would do; that is, build a plant that is the most modern and most efficient known. It would be foolish to go back and use a system that is already outlawed and known to be out of date and inefficient.

EXPENSIVE TO SHIP

One of the difficulties with fertilizer is that more than 80 per cent of the contents is simply dirt, used as a mixer, and therefore the freight is one of the big items in the cost. This means that you could not ship fertilizer produced at Muscle Shoals, even if you eliminated the cost entirely, into Missouri or Nebraska and sell it at a reasonable price. The freight alone would make it prohibitive. If by improving the manufacture of fertilizer we can do away with the mixture of worthless material and use the fertilizer in a concentrated form, much of this objection would disappear. There are many other lines besides the reduction of the cost of the nitrate content of fertilizer in which the Government could well experiment with a view of cheapening the process.

None of those who voted against turning Dam No. 2 over to the Power Trust has ever objected to the widest and most liberal program devised to improve and cheapen the cost of fertilizer. In fact, those of us who have thus contended have been the friends of the farmer and have tried, so far in vain, to divide this question into its elemental parts and clear it of the deception and the misunderstanding that many honest people have with reference to it. The delay in experimentation and the cheapening of fertilizer production can be charged directly to those who have foolishly and stubbornly stood in the way of a proper settlement of this Muscle Shoals question. The special interests have been engaged from the very beginning in an untruthful and unfair propaganda to deceive and to fool the American farmer, when, as a matter of fact, they themselves constitute the principal barrier between agriculture and cheap fertilizer.

I believe that the time is not far distant when the American farmer will realize where his interest lies, and when the American consumer will likewise realize that his interest and the interest of the farmer are identical. Let us hope, therefore, that the time will soon come when we can truthfully say to this deceived and misled but honest citizenship, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth will set you free."

ARTICLE ON "PAPER WEIGHTS AND MEMORIES," BY FORMER GOVERNOR HEYWARD, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND AN ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by former Gov. Duncan Clinch Heyward, of South Carolina, and an article from yesterday's Washington Star, and at the same time to present to you a paper weight in the form of a railroad train which was sent to me at my request by President Harrison, of the Southern Railway, to be presented to you.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ARTICLE BY GOVERNOR HEYWARD

I am rich in paper weights which now lie on my desk as I write. That is to say, I have two paper weights which are rich in historic value. One of these weights is very plain and simple, of bottle green glass. For years it was used by Gen. Robert E. Lee, and if it could but speak it would be able to tell many interesting stories. General Lee used it in his tent during the Confederate War to keep the Virginia breezes, blowing over its now famous battle fields, from carrying away his army orders and other papers. After his death the weight was used by his eldest son, Gen. G. W. C. Lee, who, when he retired from the presidency of Washington and Lee University, gave it to me, and on a card wrote its history.

The other paper weight, of gun metal, was kindly sent me only a short time ago by another Virginian, Mr. Fairfax Harrison, president of the Southern Railway. It is a facsimile in miniature of the first engine and train which operated on what at that time—nearly 100 years ago—was the first long railroad line in the world. Though the engine was very small and very crude and the cars likewise, it was the genesis of the great railroad development of the United States. The construction of this railroad and the running of this train was an event in the history of our country second only in importance perhaps to the establishment of the Republic. It should make South Carolinians very proud to remember that every mile of that early railroad lay entirely within the confines of their State, and every dollar with which it was built was subscribed in South Carolina, principally by the city of Charleston.

The Charleston & Hamburg Railroad, as it was first called, began operating a train on Christmas day, 1830, and within three years the entire line of 136 miles from Charleston to Hamburg, on the Savannah River, opposite Augusta, Ga., was completed. It is true that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad had commenced the construction of its road a short time before the South Carolina railroad began to build, but had built only 6 miles. It made such slow progress that when our road was completed to Hamburg only 70 miles of its line from Baltimore was constructed and in operation.

The little engine of my paper weight, named the "Best Friend," which pulled the first train of cars from Line Street in Charleston, had the distinction of being the first practical locomotive built in this country. It was designed by a Charleston man, E. L. Miller, and built at the West Point Foundry in New York City. Not until 18 months later did the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad have a regular locomotive in operation.

I have seen an old picture of the "Best Friend" pulling this first train on the Charleston & Hamburg Railroad and, with one exception, my paper weight is identical with this picture, and that exception is this: The tender of the "Best Friend" on the paper weight is heaped up with cordwood and carries also three barrels of water for the boiler, whereas in the picture a small cannon and three soldiers with high top hats, one waving a United States flag, ride on the tender. This difference first puzzled me, but I have since learned that January 15, 1831, an excursion trip was made from Charleston, carrying passengers. Of course this was a great occasion, and hence the soldiers, the cannon, and the waving flag.

On the return trip the train must have backed into Charleston, for the railroad had only one engine, and if so, it probably made equally as fast time as when it went forward, for that day it had the wind with it. The old picture shows black smoke pouring out of the smokestack, and the direction the smoke takes and also that of the outstretched flag shows that a strong northwesterly wind was blowing. No doubt the picture represents the little train just as it stood at Line Street on that gala day.

It is very interesting to contrast this little engine of nearly a century ago with one of the great locomotives used on our railroads to-day.

In the facsimile of the "Best Friend" the engineer stands on the front of the engine and controls the valve motion of his engine by hand. Both engineer and fireman are exposed to the weather, for the cab had not then come into use. The fireman is shown standing in front of the upright boiler. Besides feeding fuel into the furnace under the boiler, it was evidently his job to control the steam pressure by an old type safety valve which had a long lever, and by moving this back and forth its weight caused variation in steam to any amount at the time required. The engine transmitted its power to the front wheel by inside connecting rods, and these wheels transmitted the power to the rear wheels by connecting rods very similar to those in use on our present-day locomotives. The "Best Friend" was of such construction and steaming capacity that it was necessary to get a full head of steam on the boiler and run the engine until this was exhausted and then get up another head of steam and start out again. The steam capacity of the boiler had therefore to be carefully considered in making up the schedules of the early trains.

The "Best Friend" carried no cowcatcher. Perhaps one was not necessary, for the cattle in the low country those days were small, scrawny, and very agile, and no doubt could outrun the train. Neither did it carry a bell or whistle. The omission of the latter, I am quite sure, was a mistake, and also a great misfortune to the people of Charleston, for I well recall that when the first railroad was built to Walterboro, my old home, every morning a half hour before leaving time the engineer blew a five-minute blast on his whistle, which not only aroused the citizens but woke them with the happy consciousness that at last they had a railroad. Those of us who daily took the train used to consider this blast of the whistle a most considerate attention on the part of the railroad company, for it removed the necessity of our trying to stay awake for hours to keep the alarm clock from going off and waking up the children.

To the foresight, the energy, and the business ability of the leading men of Charleston is due the credit of undertaking the building of the Charleston & Hamburg Railroad. They were the pioneer railroad builders of the world. Even in those early times they had a great vision. They knew that the Almighty had given them the finest harbor between New York and New Orleans, and they realized that to build up their city and State they must have exports as well as imports; that a commerce which was one-sided could not expand. They saw, too, that Charleston was the natural port which the then increasing products of the West should seek, and through which they should be carried to the markets of the world. The building of this railroad heading toward the sunset was the first step they took to make their dream of Charleston, the chief seaport on the South Atlantic, a reality.

The little town of Hamburg was never their ultimate goal. Their conception was a great system of railroads which should connect the trade of the Ohio River with the great valley of the Tennessee, and thence through the Southern States, and its outlet to Europe through the port of Charleston. This vision of the men of Charleston was soon caught by the people of Georgia, and immediately upon the completion of the South Carolina railroad, the Georgia Railroad, from Augusta to Atlanta, was chartered and soon completed. Other connecting lines of railroad still leading westward toward the Ohio were shortly under construction, and the South was leading all other sections of the country in railroad building, until in 1857 the Memphis & Charleston Railroad was completed, and the dream of Charleston seemed to have come true.

From all accounts there must have been great rejoicing in the city of Charleston when they learned that the last spike in this railroad had been driven. I believe that if ever the staid, dignified citizens of that city might have been disposed to follow the shocking suggestion made several years ago by a newly acquired go-getting secretary of their chamber of commerce that "promptly on the stroke of 12 o'clock they should with one accord rush from their offices and homes, and with a "Hip! Hip! Hurrah!" give three cheers for Charleston, it would have been on that eventful day.

But all the cheering and rejoicing was not confined to Charleston; Memphis also cheered and rejoiced, and insisted that the council of Charleston, and as many of its prominent citizens as could come, should journey by rail to Memphis, and that there should be a great joint celebration. They went—the entire council, headed by the mayor, together with 112 of Charleston's most prominent citizens.

The Charlestonians took with them on this occasion 50 members of the old Phoenix fire company and their famous engine, the "Old Betsy." They carried also two hogshead of water from the Atlantic, which with "Old Betsy" figured prominently in the celebration. A most interesting article in the Sunday News of Charleston, written by William G. Mazyck, gives an account of the royal manner in which the people of Tennessee treated the Charlestonians on their arrival. The whole city turned out to extend a welcome. Thousands came from several States. There was cannon firing galore, and the enthusiasm was unbounded.

There was also a great parade in which the Phoenix fire company held the post of honor, and there was a splendid "dress ball." During the day a unique ceremony was held, in which "Old Betsy" played a conspicuous part. In the presence of thousands a command was given, the Charleston firemen got into action, and "Old Betsy" got busy with the hogsheads of water which they had brought. As an account written at the time says: "Soon the pellucid water of the Atlantic rose from our pipe, like a jet from a fountain, high into mid-air, and fell in sparkling drops, a shower of diamonds, into the bosom of the turbid and majestic Mississippi, amid the deafening shouts of the assembled multitude." Then it was that Mayor Douglas, of Memphis, placed a gold ring on the finger of Mayor Miles, of Charleston, and solemnly pronounced, "What this great people hath joined together let nothing put asunder."

The festivities wound up with a most magnificent banquet, which, judging from the menu, "printed on dainty lace-edged paper," must have taken the guests as long to dispose of as it had taken them to make the trip from Charleston. If such a dinner were given in New York these days, it would cost nearly as much as it cost the Memphis & Charleston Railroad to build its line. And the "Best Friend" started it all.

At that time the hopes of Charleston and the South ran high. They were leading in the industrial development of the Nation, but in four years came secession, and their hopes of industrial supremacy vanished amid the smoke of contending armies. The war ending, the South was prostrate. It was conquered territory and was long treated as such. The years of war had brought, among other things, a startling change in the value of its property. When the war commenced the South owned nearly 40 per cent of the entire value of property in the United States, and five years after the war ended they owned scarcely 15 per cent. It is hard for us to realize to-day that in 1860 the South in the value of its property exceeded New England and the Middle States combined.

But the dream of the bold railroad builders of the old South, their far-seeing plans for the expansion of commerce through their ports, was not destroyed but only retarded by the war and is now year by year being realized. Great railroad systems to-day traverse the South's entire territory, and the products of its fields and mines, together with the greatly increasing output of manufactories, find ready transportation to the markets. The railroad over which the "Best Friend" pulled its little train nearly 100 years ago is now a part of the Southern Railway, one of the greatest railroad systems of these times, and one whose every effort from its organization has been to upbuild that section of our common country whose name it has adopted as its own.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., December 18, 1927]

CAPITAL SIDE LIGHTS

With the "triangle purchase bill" coming up for consideration in the House to-morrow, which includes authority to acquire the site of the Southern Railway Building, comes a reminder, through the gift of a paper weight to Vice President Dawes, that the pioneer line of the Southern Railway is approaching its centenary. This paper weight was presented by Fairfax Harrison, president of the Southern Railway, with Senator COLE BLEASE making the speech.

It is a gun-metal facsimile in miniature of the first engine and train that operated on what, at that time, nearly 100 years ago, was the first long railroad line in the world. Though the engine was very small and very crude and the cars likewise, it was the genesis of the great railroad development of the United States. The construction of this railroad and the running of this train was an event in the history of our country second only in importance, perhaps, to the establishment of the Republic.

The Charleston & Hamburg Railroad, as it was first called, began operating a train on Christmas Day, 1830, and within three years the entire line of 136 miles, from Charleston to Hamburg, on the Savannah River, opposite Augusta, Ga., was completed. It is true that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad had commenced the construction of its road a short time before the South Carolina railroad began to build but had built only 6 miles. When the Southern road was completed to Hamburg only 70 miles of its line from Baltimore was constructed and in operation.

The little engine of the paper weight, named the Best Friend, which pulled the first train of cars from Line Street in Charleston, had the distinction of being the first practical locomotive built in this country. It was designed by a Charleston man, E. L. Miller, and built at the West Point Foundry in New York City.

In the facsimile of the Best Friend the engineer stands on the front of the engine and controls the valve motion of his engine by hand. Both engineer and fireman are exposed to the weather, for the cab had not then come into use. The fireman is shown standing in front of the upright boiler. Besides feeding fuel into the furnace under the boiler, it was evidently his job to control the steam pressure by an old-type safety valve which had a long lever, and by moving this back and forth its weight caused variation in steam to any amount at the time required. The engine transmitted its power to the front wheels by inside connecting rods, and these wheels transmitted the power to the rear wheels by connecting rods very similar to those in use on our present-day locomotives. The Best Friend was of such construction and steaming capacity that it was necessary to get a full head of steam on the boiler and run the engine until this was exhausted and then get up another head of steam and start out again. The steam capacity of the boiler had therefore to be carefully considered in making up the schedules of the early trains.

The Best Friend carried no cowcatcher. Perhaps one was not necessary, for the cattle in the low country those days were small, scrawny, and very agile, and no doubt could outrun the train. Neither did it carry a bell or whistle.

ALLEGED MEXICAN PROPAGANDA—PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an open letter by my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], to William R. Hearst, which I send to the desk, be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER FROM SENATOR NORRIS TO WILLIAM R. HEARST

To William Randolph Hearst:

A fair analysis of the recent articles published in the Hearst papers showing an alleged attempt by Mexican officials to bribe United States Senators and editors of various publications, and an analysis of your testimony before the Senate committee, leads to the inevitable conclusion that you are not only unfair and dishonest but that you are entirely without honor.

These articles show, on their face, a constant attempt to draw conclusions not justified from the articles themselves, and to practice deception upon the American people.

It is not necessary to consider any other evidence in order to reach the fair conclusion that in them you are making an attempt not only to besmirch the character of some of our own officials and journalists but that you are trying to excite an animosity and a hatred on the part of our people against the Mexican Government, which, if your articles and alleged official documents were true, would inevitably lead to war between the two countries.

Your attempt to shield yourself from blame by not publishing the names of the four Senators and the editors alleged to be implicated, when properly analyzed, only shows the maliciousness of your attack and adds to the dishonor of your motive. You publish the alleged official documents with the names omitted and, at the same time, state that you stand ready and willing to deliver the original documents to any Senate committee that may be appointed to make an investigation.

You know that the publication of these charges, with the names omitted, must inevitably lead to the appointment of an investigating committee, and that, therefore, the names which you have concealed were bound to be published and that, in fact, the very withholding of the names added to the curiosity and to the interest of an investigation.

WHY THE NAMES WERE OMITTED

You knew, therefore, to begin with, that the action you had taken would bring about the publication of the names and you can not, in ordinary honesty, shield yourself or excuse yourself for the failure to give publicity to the names in the beginning.

Moreover, if these allegations are true, there is no reason why the identity of the individual Senators should be suppressed.

Your testimony shows the reason why you suppressed them. You testified, in part, as follows:

Q. Did you investigate whether money had been actually paid to United States Senators?

A. No, sir; we didn't.

Q. Did you go to the Senators mentioned and ask them?

A. No; we could not without revealing the contents.

Q. Have you any evidence that any Senator received any such money as mentioned here?

A. No. In fact, I do not believe they did receive any money.

Q. Have you ever heard of any evidence to sustain such a charge?

A. No; I do not believe the charge. * * *

Q. Did you consider the liabilities for the libel you might be subjected to?

A. Yes; I guess so.

Q. You had that liability in mind when you did not use the names?

A. Probably.

THE HERALD'S HEADLINE

If you wanted to be perfectly honest with these Senators, why did you not state when the articles were published that you had no evidence that any of these Senators were guilty, and that you did not believe any of the charges against them? You gave no such intimation to the country until you were faced with the question on the witness stand. In fact, on December 9, 1927, when the Hearst papers first published this alleged order giving the money to four United States Senators, there was spread clear across the front page of the Washington Herald this remarkable statement:

"$1,215,000 ORDERED PAID TO FOUR SENATORS BY MEXICO."

You have admitted before the committee that, in your judgment, the Senators were entirely innocent. Why, then, did you permit your papers to publish such misleading and damaging headlines and why were you silent during all the time from December 9 until you appeared on the witness stand on December 15?

PROVES LACK OF CONFIDENCE

The real reason why you pursued this course was to save yourself from a libel suit, and the fact that you took this course shows that

you, yourself, did not have confidence in the genuineness of the documents you were publishing, because, if they were genuine, you ran no risk in their publication. Your admission that in taking this course you had in mind the saving of yourself from damages in a libel suit is an admission that you believed, yourself, that these alleged official documents were forgeries.

You must have known what was common knowledge among the newspaper men of the United States that many alleged official documents from Mexico were being offered for sale to all kinds of organizations and to all sorts of publications.

COMMON AS BOOTLEGGERS

There is not a newspaper man in the city of Washington but has not known for the past year that it was possible to buy forged documents relating to the Mexican Government.

Peddlers of this kind of merchandise were almost as common as bootleggers.

Dealers in this kind of junk were always trying to take advantage of some feeling that existed between different factions in our country and these document dope dealers had a remedy for every condition. They could supply the Ku-Klux Klan with documents showing that the Catholics had arms and munitions hidden in cellars ready to be brought out to exterminate the Protestants. They were likewise able to supply the Catholics with documents showing various activities of the Ku-Klux Klan in gathering together arms and munitions to be carried into Mexico and there used in a contemplated revolution.

HEARTLESS MALICE

To charge you with ignorance of this condition is to ascribe to you a stupidity that would be equaled only by your heartless malice in trying to wreck the good names of officials both in Mexico and in America in order to carry out some scheme of your own.

Your own newspapers about two years ago exposed the fact that our State Department had been offered and had accepted forged Mexican documents. You knew that if your alleged documents were genuine our Department of State would have made a thorough investigation, and that they would not have been rejected by the President of the United States when they were submitted to him, as you say in your testimony they were.

On the 14th day of November, 1927, the Hearst papers, among other things, contained the following reference to the alleged documents:

"The documents which will be published in the American were therefore brought to this country by these officials intimately connected with the Mexican Government and were delivered to the Hearst publications merely because these officials realized that in this manner they would secure the widest publication of the facts contained in these Government files. * * * There is no question of the authenticity of these documents as records of the Government of Mexico."

AN ABSOLUTE FALSEHOOD

You were attempting then to deceive the people of the United States.

This statement, as shown by your own testimony before the committee, is an absolute falsehood.

You knew when this statement was published that instead of these Mexican officials being moved by some patriotic motive of their own, with a desire to get publication for this alleged corruption in the Mexican Government, that they were, in fact, only influenced by cold cash which you were willing to contribute and which you say in your own testimony you did contribute. Instead of the documents being brought to this country by patriotic Mexican officials, they were sold for cash to your agents.

ADMITTED IT TO COMMITTEE

You knew it when this article was published.

You have admitted it on the witness stand. The only object these alleged officials of Mexico had was to make money out of the transaction, and you confess that you paid them between $15,000 and $16,000 for their treachery to their own country.

And when the Hearst papers published, in this same article, that there was no question about the authenticity of these documents, every man connected with your publication, including yourself, knew that the statement was false. You knew that there was a question as to their authenticity, and that if you had pursued the ordinary course that any honest man would take before he blackens the fair names of his fellow men, you would have reached the conclusion that they were absolutely false. And yet, on the 20th day of November, 1927, the Hearst papers published, among other things, the following:

"This documentary proof which the American will continue to publish in consecutive form for some days was obtained from the most secret files of the Mexican Government by officials of that Government. These men were firmly opposed to the Bolshevist policy of their Government and patriotically concerned lest this Russian brand of Bolshevism should eventually destroy their country and wreck the peace and happiness of their people. * * * The revelation of the amazing facts contained in the documents, the Mexican officials hope, might result in ultimate good to their country."

MOVED ONLY BY MONEY

You knew this statement was false when it was published, and its only object could have been to deceive the American people and to try to convince them of the genuineness of the proof which you were offering.

You knew these papers had been brought to this country, not through any patriotic motive, but that they were sold outright for cash to the Hearst papers, and you had at that time contributed the money to make the payment. You knew that these alleged Mexican officials were moved only by the money which you were so willing to contribute.

COULD HAVE QUESTIONED ACCUSED

How easy it would have been for you or one of your numerous hirelings to have ascertained the truth in regard to these documents. In one of them it was alleged, for instance, that Dudley Field Malone, a man known internationally, was the go-between—the cashier, as it were—who received the money from the so-called Mexican traders and delivered it to the four Senators named. How easy it would have been for you or the editor of your New York American to have called Mr. Malone on the telephone. All of your editors knew the high character and standing of Mr. Malone. You could have found out in a few minutes whether this alleged statement regarding him was true, and if he had told you, as he has since testified, that he knew nothing about it, that he had nothing to do with it, you would at once have had positive proof that there was something wrong with these documents, and that no honest man could afford to give it publicity without at least making further investigation.

EXCUSE OBVIOUSLY FALSE

Before you published allegations that would blacken the names of United States Senators your representative in Washington could have called upon these Senators and gotten their version of the affair. If they denied, as they have already testified, that they had any connection whatever with this disgraceful business and knew nothing of it, you would again have had notice that any honest man would welcome that there was something wrong with this document which you purchased. And your excuse, given on the witness stand, that it would have given premature publicity to the transaction, is obviously false. You intended to give it publicity. You admitted on the stand that that was the object you had in view. You say in these articles that that was the object which the Mexican officials had in view when these documents were turned over to you.

ALL FOES OF INTERFERENCE

The ordinary observer will not cease to take notice that the four Senators mentioned were all prominent in the Senate in their opposition to interference by our Government in the affairs of Mexico. It is rather remarkable that it is only this class of Senators whose reputations are attacked. These men were standing as forcefully as they knew how against a policy in Mexico which you were in favor of.

It is likewise peculiar that Calles, the President of Mexico, would spend his hard cash to bribe Senators who were already advocating noninterference—a policy that he himself was anxious to carry out.

MR. CALLES NO IDIOT

We may disagree as to the kind of man Mr. Calles is, but even his enemies have never charged him with being an ignoramus or an idiot. If he were so corrupt and evil-minded as to use Mexican public funds to bribe United States Senators, would it not be reasonable to suppose that his attempt would be made on those Senators who were not already advocating the policy which he, himself, desired to see carried out?

Moreover, what would have been the necessity for his spreading the names of these Senators on the Mexican records? There was no reason why their names should appear there. The order for the payment of the money could just as well have been made without mentioning any names; and yet, if these documents are true, Calles, in his orders, not only mentioned the names and the amounts but the man who should be the go-between for the Senators and the Mexican officials, and he had this all spread upon the official documents of the Mexican Government where every clerk and employee having access to the governmental files would be able to trace the money to its destination—the very thing that he, if you are correct in your charges, was trying to obviate.

THE TELEGRAMS

If you had been moved by an honest motive, you would also have called upon Mr. Elias and given him an opportunity to explain. You would have made an attempt to have gotten from him permission to examine the telegrams, of which some of these documents purport to be copies. There is no doubt but that if you had taken this course he would have done what he did before the committee—given permission for the examination of all telegrams that had passed between him and the President of Mexico.

This would have disclosed what has already, in part, been disclosed before the committee—that no such telegrams passed between the par-

ties, and now, since the representative of the telegraph company has testified, at least as to some of these official telegrams, it has been shown that they did not, in fact, exist and that such telegrams as published in the Hearst papers have, as a matter of fact, never been sent or received.

DECEIT CONTINUES

Even now, ofter this disclosure, the Hearst papers are undertaking to deceive the people of the United States as to what really was done before the committee. I have before me as I dictate, to-day's copy of a Hearst paper, the Washington Herald for Sunday, December 18, 1927. On the second page of that paper, referring to testimony taken before the Reed committee, there appears a headline, in large type, as follows: "Where are the Elias telegrams? We destroyed them."

It is true, if you read the fine print below the headline, you will be able to discover that it is a custom of the telegraph company to destroy telegrams after keeping them for one year, and the representative of the telegraph company has given that as a reason for not producing all of the telegrams called for by the committee. The facts are that all the alleged telegrams published within the year, the agent of the company has shown, were never sent. This is manifestly an attempt on the part of the Hearst papers to deceive the people as to what the real facts were.

The person reading the heading and nothing else will get the idea that Elias, the Mexican representative, was the fellow who destroyed the telegrams, and that they can not be produced because the Mexican officials have destroyed them.

JUST AN INSTANCE

This is only a demonstration of the unfairness—yes; the venom—that has run through all these articles and that is being continued after the truth is beginning to creep out. It shows a malice that can not exist in a heart that is pure or moved by lofty motives.

What is your motive, Mr. Hearst? You have testified before the committee that you have very valuable properties in Mexico. It is almost common knowledge that you were in favor of the overthrow of the present government. You evidently believed that if a revolution could be started it would mean financial benefit for your investments in Mexico. For the sake of making a few paltry dollars you are willing to blacken the character of honest journalists in your own profession. You were willing to cast suspicion upon the loyalty and the integrity of Members of the United States Senate. You were willing to charge that the President of a friendly Republic is a traitor to his country.

You were willing and apparently anxious to do something that would cause our Government to intervene in Mexico.

WILLING TO START A WAR

In other words, for the sake of your financial investments, you were not only willing to ruin the reputation of honest and innocent men but you were willing to plunge our country into war with a friendly neighbor, and thus increase the army of widows and orphans and wounded and crippled soldiers.

Because Members of the United States Senate have not followed the course that you believe they ought to pursue, you were willing to go so far as to ruin their reputations and by falsehoods drive them from public life in disgrace and dishonor. You wanted to show the power of the Hearst papers. You wanted to let it be known that any public official who did not follow your command or your wish would, by such dishonest and disreputable means, be driven from public life. You wanted to put fear into the hearts of men who were seeking public office or who were seeking reelection. You wanted them to know that the Heart papers would relentlessly pursue to the bitter end those public servants who refused to bend the knee to your unreasonable and disreputable demands. You wanted it known that you could put men out of office at your own sweet will, and that to retain office it was necessary to follow you even to the extent of plunging our country into war.

SAME VENOM ALL THE WAY

But what is the use of tracing these articles further? I have given only a few samples. The same venom and the same spirit runs through them from end to end, and if I called attention to all of the inconsistencies and to all of the falsehoods, it would require an article practically as long as your continued story that has been running for many days in your papers.

The record which you have made in this matter is sufficient to place your publications in disrepute in the minds of all honest men, and it demonstrates that the Hearst system of newspapers, spreading like a venomous web to all parts of our country, constitutes the sewer system of American journalism.

GEORGE W. NORRIS.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, as a member of the special committee of the Senate charged with the duty of investigating the statements referred to in the article just read and the documents upon which those statements were based, I feel it my duty to the Senate, to the Senators whose names are embraced in some of those documents, and to the public at large to make a brief statement now.

The special committee has not completed its investigation. Immediately after its appointment it began its work, and it has continued its labors diligently up to the present time. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], is absent from the city; and it is not expected that the hearings will be resumed until the 27th instant.

I have no authority to speak for the committee, and I do not assume to express the opinion of any other member of the committee; but I do believe that the opinion of the committee is unanimous as to certain phases of the investigation, and it is with respect to those phases that I claim the attention of the Senate now.

To wait until after the holiday season has passed, and to leave under a cloud the name and fame of Senators who apparently are just as honorable as any Member of this body, would be an act of injustice to which I do not propose to be a party.

One who serves in public office, especially in a high public position, must anticipate that his acts, both private and public, will be under constant scrutiny; and he should prepare himself to receive with resignation condemnation for dishonorable deeds or for corrupt motives. But one who so conducts himself that he has no fear that a careful inspection of his public life will reveal aught deserving of censure is entitled to have his good name safeguarded, his honor respected; and he who is unwilling to do that, whether a Senator or a private citizen, is a coward unworthy of the name of an American.

The evidence in this case discloses conclusively that neither the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], nor the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], nor the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], nor the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has received one dollar or has been tendered one cent in connection with the purposes referred to in the documents at issue.

All who are concerned in finding the truth concede that these Senators stand uncorrupted and incorruptible. Not only does the testimony show conclusively the fact that I have just stated, but it also discloses that not one of them has ever been approached in any matter in connection with improper considerations respecting Mexican affairs. And as your deputy, your agent, charged with a mission from you, I am proud in this presence to reach out my hand to every one of these four men, to put my arm around each of them, and to say, "I am happy to call you friend."

Hearst's sin is not so much that he inconsiderately published documents involving the names and honor of Senators who were guiltless, but that he fails now through his agencies of publicity to undo in part the wrong that he has done. It takes years to build a reputation that will stand the constant beat of the white light of publicity. One who accomplishes that aim has achieved something worth while, something that is valuable beyond price.

There are sufficient incidents founded in fact to threaten the public confidence in some of the former officers of this Government. Whenever the public believes that the men who serve them are corrupt, that opinion will reflect itself in revolution, in processes of destruction. It is right and proper that they who violate their honor and receive considerations for service, considerations of even a questionable nature, should be exposed and scourged from public life. It is a pity—great God! it is a crying pity—that the great power of the Hearst newspapers has not been employed to the purification of public office where corruption is known to exist. It is a wrong which can not be characterized here that the mighty genius which has amassed millions and acquired control of publicity agencies that reach from limit to limit of this continent should seek to establish its renown by bringing or attempting to bring dishonor upon men who are known to be pure and incorruptible.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am a very humble member of the committee of investigation that is now proceeding in the matter that has just been adverted to. When the resolution was presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] no investigation, so far as I was concerned, was either necessary or appropriate in connection with the gentlemen whose names have been mentioned, who are colleagues of ours. I never have believed, and I never would believe, that there was the slightest justification for any suggestion such as had been made respecting any one of those men, and from the instant that investigation commenced I asserted publicly in the investigation what I say now after the conclusion of the testimony respecting them, that there never was a scintilla of evidence to connect any man of the Senators who were named,

or whose names were deleted in the articles, in any way, shape, form, or manner with any of the matters that were published in the various Hearst newspapers.

Not only that, sir, but these gentlemen were sufficiently known to me that I would have staked myself upon every one of them without any investigation at all. We were asked in the first place by the resolution that was presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania to investigate a single phase of the publications that had appeared. That phase was the one relating to the Senators. So well has that been spoken of by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] that I will not dilate upon it, but by every witness, from every standpoint, it has been demonstrated beyond the peradventure of doubt that there never was the slightest justification, either directly or indirectly, expressedly or impliedly, for suggesting the name of any one of the Senators who ultimately was named in the various documents produced. There never was, in my opinion, the slighest justification for printing any document which, with names deleted or otherwise, might have reflected upon any Senator of the United States.

So much for that. The committee is unanimous in its finding in that regard; but the committee is now going upon another journey. We have finished so far as these Senators are concerned, and we have reached the conclusion that has been depicted so very well, and much better than I could, by the Senator from Arkansas.

We are now proceeding as if we had the full power—for none has challenged it—to determine what these documents are; and speaking for just one member of that committee, Mr. President, I can say that we will go to the end of that investigation; and we will determine, so far as it exists in human power, just what those documents are, whether or not there is any genuineness to them, or whether or not they are forged and spurious; and, as the evidence shall determine ultimately in that regard, there is not a member of the committee but will unhesitatingly state emphatically the conclusion he shall reach.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, as I, too, am a member of the committee of investigation, if I were to remain silent some invidious inference might well be drawn from the fact that I did remain silent.

I have no disposition to reflect upon Mr. Hearst or upon the Hearst press, if for no other reason because this investigation has not been completed. It is important to bear that fact in mind. How far Mr. Hearst was or was not justified in taking these steps that he did to obtain possession of those documents is a matter, it seems to me, that might much more properly and justly be determined at the conclusion of the pending investigation than now.

I will say, however, that, so far as I am concerned, I have always found it extremely difficult to set any limits to the duty of the press to make public anything and everything that affects the reputation of a public man or the standing of his Government. Suffice to say for the present that if I had any reason to believe that in the secret archives of Mexico or any other country in the world there were documents purporting to fix upon me a charge of corruption, I should not simply be content, but I should be delighted were those documents brought to the light of day while I was still living and was still in a position to face a false accusation instead of after I was dead and my lips were mute and I was no longer able to vindicate my good name.

In my judgment, as you will see from what I shall say in a moment, the publication to the world of the facts which have been elicited from witnesses in the pending investigation will have no effect but that of strengthening the high, irreproachable, unassailable reputations for personal integrity and honor enjoyed by the four Members of this body whose names have been used in connection with the case.

It is never agreeable, I hardly need say, for any public man to have his motives or his character impugned in the press or in any other way, but it is always well for us to remember what the late Emperor Joseph of Austria once observed when some friend of his said to him, "I should not care to be an emperor or a king, because I would be in perpetual danger of being assassinated." "My friend," the Emperor replied, "you forget that assassination is a part of the trade of a king." And so assassination of character can be said to be a part of the trade of a United States Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives, or of any other high Federal official.

Saying that much, I wish to add just a word expressive of my general conclusions with respect to the pending investigation, though I had no idea that there would be any occasion for me to do so this morning.

When Edmund Randolph was accused of corrupt conduct in the early history of our country as the result of what, in my judgment, was one of the basest conspiracies ever formed against an American statesman, and was acquitted by the facts, which were soon brought out, Thomas Jefferson, who was by no means partial to him, said, "I am glad that Randolph has been acquitted. All who knew him had already acquitted him."

That we can all say in the present case, for the testimony that has been taken in the pending investigation in relation to the four Senators simply confirms the confidence in which they have always been held by their brother Senators as respects their standing for personal and public integrity. Personally I differ profoundly with each one of them with regard to many public questions of the highest degree of importance. Indeed, in some respects I think that I differ from them almost more widely than I do from any other Member of the Senate. But I fully concur with all my brother Senators in thinking that they are among the most honorable, upright, and irreproachable Members of this body in point of probity and moral rectitude. They are all honorable men, all unassailably honorable men. They all belong to the category of the honest man, who is said, and truly said, to be the noblest work of God.

Though we have not completed our investigation, we have, I believe, prosecuted it far enough to be justified in declaring that there is not the least likelihood that anything whatever will hereafter be developed in it to tarnish to the slightest extent the stainless reputation for integrity which the four Senators have enjoyed. It is entirely too common a thing for the standing of Members of this body to be attacked in one way or another outside of the Senate. One happy result of the pending investigation will, I am sure, be to furnish another proof that the personal and public uprightness of the Members of this body will compare favorably with that of the Members of any other great legislative body.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if I should say nothing my silence might be misconstrued. I did not know what Senators were involved in this investigation until it began. I have been ready for several days to report, and I felt that the committee should report before the holidays its conclusions and findings with reference to the Senators involved.

I am glad that the other members of the committee have made these statements to-day. I heartily concur in what they have said. There has not been produced a single word of evidence tending in the remotest degree to sustain the inferences or charges in the articles which have been printed. I have been satisfied all the time that there was no truth in them. The evidence shows conclusively that there is no truth in them. I felt that these Senators were entitled, not that it might be necessary, but that they were entitled to the judgment of the committee before the holidays, upon the evidence presented, that there is nothing to show them culpable in the slightest degree.

I am glad to join heartily in the encomiums bestowed upon these four Senators to-day, and to say to the Senate and to the country that there is not a single word in all the evidence taken to cast the slightest suspicion upon them or upon any Senator in this body; but, upon the contrary, the proof is clear and positive that none of these Senators has even been approached directly or indirectly in any way, shape, or form for an improper purpose or object.

THE TARIFF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution (S. Res. 52) coming over from a previous day.

Mr. MOSES. May we have the resolution read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. MCMASTER on the 15th inst., as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Senate favors an immediate lowering of tariff schedules, and tariff legislation, embodying lowered schedules, should be considered and enacted during the present session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCMASTER] is not now in the Chamber, but previously this morning he indicated in conversation with me that he intended to ask to have the resolution go over without prejudice. I therefore assume to make that request in his behalf in view of his absence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go over.

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLIC-UTILITY CORPORATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (S. Res. 83), submitted by Mr. WALSH of Montana, on the 17th instant, coming over from a previous day:

Resolved, That a committee of five Members of the Senate be appointed by the President thereof, and be hereby empowered and directed to inquire into and report upon: (1) The growth of the capital assets and capital liabilities of public-utility corporations supplying either electrical energy in the form of power or light, or both, however produced, or gas, natural or artificial, of corporations holding the stocks of such public-utility corporations, and of non-public-utility corporations owned or controlled by or affiliated with such holding companies; (2) the method of issuing, the price realized, or value received, the commissions or bonuses paid or received, and other pertinent facts with respect to the various security issues of all classes of corporations herein named, including the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness thereof, as well as the stocks of the same; (3) the extent to which holding companies or their stockholders control or are financially interested in financial, engineering, construction, and/or management corporations, and the relation, one to the other, of the classes of corporations last named, the holding companies and the public-utility corporations; (4) the services furnished to public-utility corporations by holding companies and/or their associated, affiliated, and/or subsidiary companies, the fees, commissions, bonuses, or other charges made therefor, and the earnings and expenses of such holding companies and their associated, affiliated, and/or subsidiary companies; and (5) the value or detriment to the public of holding companies owning the stock or otherwise controlling such public-utility corporations immediately or remotely, with the extent of such ownership or control, and particularly what legislation, if any, should be enacted by Congress to correct any abuses that may exist in the organization or operation of such holding companies.

The committee is further empowered and directed to inquire and report whether, and to what extent, such corporations or any of the officers thereof or anyone in their behalf or in behalf of any organization of which any such corporation may be a member, through the expenditure of money or through the control of the avenues of publicity have made any, and what effort to influence or control public opinion on account of municipal or public ownership of the means by which power is developed and electrical energy is generated and distributed, or to influence or control elections.

That the said committee is hereby authorized to sit and perform its duties at such times and places as it deems necessary or proper, and to require the attendance of witnesses by subpœnas or otherwise; to require the production of books, papers, and documents; and to employ counsel, experts, and other assistants and stenographers, at a cost not exceeding $1.25 per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses and sign subpœnas for witnesses; and every person duly summoned before said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, who refuses or fails to obey the process of said committee, or appears and refuses to answer questions pertinent to said investigation, shall be punished as prescribed by law. The expenses of said investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers of the committee or subcommittee signed by the chairman and approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the sessions or the recesses of the Senate, and until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, as I indicated on Saturday, I shall object to that procedure. In the first place, it is entirely unusual. I dare say there is some precedent for sending a resolution of this character to two committees, but I can not now recall any. Perhaps some other Member of the Senate can.

In the second place, as I further indicated on Saturday, I see no occasion whatever for proceeding in that manner.

I took occasion, in submitting a resolution in substantially the same form at the last session, to indicate to the Senate at some length my views concerning the necessity for the inquiry. There may be other reasons not adverted to by me. But the Senate has had some six or seven months to acquaint itself with my own belief as therein expressed. If there is any opposition to the investigation which is suggested by the resolution, Senators may express themselves concerning it. I think the investigation ought to be ordered and I think the resolution should be sent without further delay to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. President, it might perhaps be appropriate at this time to remind the Senate of some of the more important and salient facts to which I invited the attention of the Senate in my address on this subject made last spring. There is now capital going into this industry to the amount of nearly one-half billion dollars a year. There are securities being issued by these corporations aggregating nearly three times that sum, or $1,500,000,000. The mergers which are taking place have given rise to widespread concern. As an appendix to my remarks made last spring there was included a table, furnished by the Electrical World, showing the appalling number of mergers and purchases made by the great group of holders of public utilities securities in operating companies. The list for the two years embraces printed pages to the number of something like 30 or 35. Rapidly the operating companies throughout the country are passing into the control of half a dozen great groups through holding companies and other devices. The attention of the country was directed to some of the perils involved in this great movement in a series of articles by Professor Ripley, of Yale, appearing something like a year ago and since published, with additions thereto, in a book by him entitled "Main Street and Wall Street."

Everybody concedes, Mr. President, that there are advantages accruing by this consolidation. Everybody realizes that the needs of the country for further development are growing and constantly increasing, that in a certain way this is a natural growth; but that it is attended by many abuses is conceded upon all hands; and the question arises as to what ought to be done, if anything ought to be done, about the matter. I shall content myself, Mr. President, at this time with simply calling attention to the demand which has come up from the country for the proposed investigation. That it is desirable, if not entirely necessary, is conceded by the industry itself, for which, I think, the Electrical World may be regarded as speaking. It does not object to an investigation; it merely wants an investigation that is not prompted by political motives, conducted by some one who has "a lightning rod" out. Its views concerning the matter are expressed in an editorial, a portion of which I should like to have read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Although Congress will not assemble for three months, the air is already rife with rumors of contemplated legislation of interest to the electrical industry. Muscle Shoals and the Colorado River, it may be taken for granted, will come up for discussion, but whether definite action will follow only a rash prophet will predict. What is most to be feared from Washington this session, however, is the threatened investigation of electric light and power companies, and particularly holding companies, by a senatorial committee headed by Senator WALSH of Montana. Not necessarily because of any shortcomings of the electric light and power industry as a whole, for it has an admirable record, but because of the detrimental effect of the publicity on the security market.

Next year is presidential year, and there are many aspirants with lightning rods down their backs seeking to be struck. To such men publicity is like a spring of water to the parched earth. It is unfortunate that investigations of this kind may be started on whims and that the motives back of them are not always above suspicion; but if an investigation is to come, it might as well come now, when the electric light and power industry can best stand it. The findings may be an agreeable surprise or a heavy shock; yet the industry may make up its mind that the inquiry will not seek to advertise the accomplishments of electric public utilities, but, on the contrary, to distort and magnify blameworthy actions of a few to the detriment of many. Any exposures of wrongdoing will be welcome, for the industry can not purge itself too quickly of those who have not its interests, as well as those of its patrons uppermost. How to do this without hurting others, however, is the great problem. Unfortunately this is not likely to give any congressional committee much concern.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. FESS. A resolution on this subject was introduced at the last session and came to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which I was a member. Because that committee did not have any latitude to go into the matter at all, we thought it would be much better if the resolution could be referred to a committee which does have some right to go into the merits of the proposition. I am rather inclined to look upon the resolution of the Senator from Montana with some favor, recognizing, however, that there is a good deal of contingency involved in it. Such a resolution might do some good, but there might be some danger coming out of that sort of an investigation. I did hesitate, however, to report out the resolution to which I have referred without having an opportunity to give any consideration to it

at all. That was the reason I had hoped that the Senator from Montana might ask to have the resolution referred to some other committee than the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am endeavoring in a feeble way to supplement what I said last spring by now giving the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate some reasons why that course ought to be taken.

Mr. President, the fear expressed by the Electrical World in the article which I have mentioned is commented upon in an editorial appearing in the Times, of Hartford, Conn., which seems to think that the investigation is very desirable. I ask that the editorial may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Times, Hartford, Conn., November 17, 1927]

THE POWER INQUIRY

The interview which Senator THOMAS F. WALSH of Montana gave Correspondent David Lawrence regarding the proposed electric power investigation is illuminating for the light it sheds on the uncertainty which exists as to just what is going on in the power industry. That uncertainty is shared by pretty nearly all who endeavor to arrive at a sound conclusion in their own minds about the desirability or undesirability of the great number of mergers, consolidations, and holding companies.

Mr. WALSH does not charge that millions have been made illegitimately in the flotation of securities. He would like to know. So would a good many observers. He is not certain whether overcapitalization will keep rates up or dividends down, but he believes inquiry is pertinent. He does not play a lone hand in that particular either.

The Senator discussed the proposal that the electric industry does not object to investigation, but does not want to be subject to a "political inquisition." It has been said before that the industry would like to be investigated by experts. Such experts would doubtless have to be found within the industry itself. They would be far more likely to sympathize with the ambitions and undertakings of the industry than to find fault with its ambitious programs. Experts of any other point of view would not be regarded by the industry as sufficiently qualified. The country might as well have an investigation by Senator WALSH, even if the power people were inclined to brand it political, as to go through a farce destined from the outset to be a whitewash.

Those who think about the power matter at all are thinking in the very terms used by Senator WALSH. Connecticut has been experiencing exactly the sort of manipulation which is under discussion. The public utilities commission at this moment is withholding permission for a merger which if granted will enormously increase the capital structure by which the operations of two local companies are financed. It is expected that dividends will be paid on this additional capital, and there is no place to secure the funds for that purpose except out of the pockets of those who are obliged to buy gas and electricity from the companies in question. This is but a single instance. It has been multiplied many times in Connecticut. The concern which has become the power octopus of this State operates in a score or more of Commonwealths. No one who is not on the inside can tell what are the ramifications of its interlocking and relationship with similar corporations equally large or even larger. No one, comparatively speaking, knows whether this is good or bad, or the extent to which it is bad, if bad at all. Sooner or later the public interest will require that it be determined and that the electric power which is being so manipulated shall be used to let a little light in upon the complicated manipulations which are going on.

The kind of an investigation to which the electrical industry—the Insulls, the Mellons, the U. G. I.'s, and the rest—would submit willingly would not be worth the powder to give it motive force. There is an extreme probability that such an inquiry as Senator WALSH would conduct, if empowered to conduct one, would do far more good in making understandable that which now seems so needlessly and even deliberately bewildering than it possibly could do harm. A Senate inquiry is far less to be frightened at than are the manipulations taking place in the power industry.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial printed in a newspaper published in another section of the country, the Kansas City Star, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Tuesday, July 26, 1927]

TO DIG INTO PUBLIC-UTILITY FINANCING

Near the end of the last session of Congress Senator WALSH of Montana introduced a resolution providing for the investigation of power, light, and gas companies, with especial reference to the financing, merging, refinancing, and remerging of these public-utility concerns. A few days ago Mr. WALSH announced he would press for this investigation early in the coming session.

Senator WALSH has not indicated a line of investigation beyond the distribution of electricity and gas and the manner of financing the producing and distributing companies. We know something of the extent to which mergers have gone in these fields, how smaller companies have been absorbed and larger ones made, how the larger companies have been merged into supercompanies, and how holding companies have cornered the supercompanies until the flotations of securities has become a maze too great for the average mind to comprehend. Senator WALSH describes these holding company stocks as "staggering in amount."

To read some of these merger stories one gets the impression that the transactions are quite apart from the business of the service companies, being merely the operations of stock brokers, bankers, and promoters for their own aggrandizement. If this is true, and unquestionably it is true to some extent, then the extraneous profits made from these manipulations come from one of two sources—from the consumers, in excessive rates, or from the public for shares that may be of doubtful value unless the pyramiding process goes on, and it can not go on indefinitely.

When the Government authorizes the consolidation of railroads it does not authorize merger on merger, holding company on holding company; it centralizes the operation of the absorbed system and undertakes to make the operation of the lines more serviceable and less costly. The sole purposes are to gain efficiency and economy and in the end cheaper service. Why should power and light and gas companies have without challenge the license to make the public service primarily a stock-jobbing instrument?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask, now, that there may be read a communication which I received from the Illinois Municipal League, together with a resolution adopted by that organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE,
HEADQUARTERS OFFICE,
Urbana, Ill., November 22, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Illinois Municipal League has just finished its fourteenth annual convention, and among the resolutions passed was resolution No. 7, declaring in favor of your resolution proposing a Federal investigation of public-utility financing (see copy of resolution inclosed).

Inclosed is a copy of our convention program. From it you will note that the league has a total membership of 370 municipalities, with a combined population of over 5,000,000 people, or approximately 70 per cent of the population of the State of Illinois.

I would appreciate receiving at least a few extra copies of your resolution and speech on the investigation of public-utility companies. I note from the newspapers you are planning on introducing such a resolution on December 6. Perhaps it will be better to wait until this resolution and speech are printed, rather than to send us the speech and resolution of last February. There was, however, a lot of useful information in your speech of last February, and we should at least have a few extra copies of these if they are available.

With best wishes for your success in this investigation, I remain,

Cordially yours,

A. D. MCLARTY, *Secretary.*

Resolution of the Illinois Municipal League favoring a Federal investigation of the financial structure of public-utility companies

Be it resolved by the Illinois Municipal League in annual convention assembled at Peoria, Ill., on November 18, 1927, That the Illinois Municipal League favors the resolution of Senator THOMAS J. WALSH of Montana proposing a Federal investigation of the financial structure of public-utility companies, with a view to ascertaining the effect of such structure upon the rates of such utilities. We favor such investigation because we believe many Illinois cities are being faced with ever-increasing rates in spite of the efforts of the Illinois Commerce Commission. We believe that due to Federal constitutional protection, our local and State authorities are helpless to protect our inhabitants against unjust and extortionate rates for these great public necessities, and the League of Cities of Illinois welcomes an investigation of this subject by the Federal Government.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I also ask that there be incorporated in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. E. B. Stahlman, the editor of the Nashville Banner; and I ask that there be read from it only the initial paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NASHVILLE BANNER,
Nashville, Tenn., November 7, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am sending under separate cover several matters bearing upon the power situation in this State and section which I thought might be of interest and use to you. I am very heartily in favor of the investigation into the electrical industry proposed in your resolution, and my paper will earnestly support you in that timely and patriotic service which you will render to the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remainder of the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The remainder of the letter is as follows:

You have rendered the Nation your debtor in the naval reserves oil inquiry; but, important as was that service, it is scarcely comparable to that which your investigation into the power industry opens up. This question is already rapidly coming to the front, and the fight which you will make in behalf of the whole business fabric of the Nation and its political well-being which are directly concerned with the methods of the power magnates will necessarily deepen the public interest in it and the realization of the immense public stake. Let me call your attention in this connection to the editorial headed "The great new issue," which appeared in the Banner of yesterday. You will note in it my earnest indorsement of your course and purposes.

The file of articles bearing upon the recent Appalachian Power Conference held in this State is commended to your careful investigation. That conference, as you will note, was held at Chattanooga. For a long while it was camouflaged as being a spontaneous expression of the people of the South in regard to the development of their water power resources. As a matter of fact, the conference was dominated by the banded power interests of the South. The manifest purpose was to influence Congress and the Federal Power Commission upon the Muscle Shoals question and in behalf of the East Tennessee Development Co.—which is owned upon a 50–50 basis by prominent eastern power capitalists—the development company, as you may recall, being an applicant for permits covering the cream of the power resources of the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

The real selfish nature of this conference was exposed by the Banner in the editorial sent you under the caption, "That Chattanooga power rally." The articles sent to the Banner from its two staff correspondents, which we had on the ground, will show you how the power interests are working in this section. They brought employees and business and political allies from every direction. Owing to the thorough exposure by the Banner of the inner purposes of the so-called conference the resolutions which were adopted just before adjournment did not carry out the initial purpose.

I am sending copy of an address by a member of the Banner editorial staff, who was the only speaker before the Chattanooga conference attacking the program of the power magnates and the validity of the Federal water power act of 1920.

As you will see from other inclosures the Tennessee State Board of Public Utilities has taken action in regard to the conservation of the power resources of the State. I am sending you the orders which the commission has issued in that connection, not because they have an immediate and present bearing upon your inquiry but in order that you may be advised as to the movements in this State touching upon the power question.

I shall endeavor to keep you advised as to developments in this section of possible interest to you.

With assurances of high regard, I am,

Yours very truly,

E. B. STAHLMAN.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that there be likewise incorporated in the RECORD an editorial from this paper, the Nashville Banner; and I ask that there be read only the concluding paragraph indicated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The third issue, which is of far-reaching importance, is: Shall the practice of holding companies, constituting the power companies, in pyramiding unjustified exactions from operating companies, be investigated thoroughly under the resolution which Senator WALSH of Montana will introduce in the coming Congress; and shall necessary legislation be enacted to prevent these evil practices or shall the power combine continue to exact from operating companies unjustified contributions which at last become a part of the cost of electric energy sold to consumers?

The Banner favors the Walsh resolution, to the end that all evil practices may be brought to light and all impositions on the public exposed, and that necessary legislation be enacted to put an end to such evils.

The Tennessean has been significantly silent on this issue up to this hour.

There are, of course, other collateral and subordinate questions which should, and the Banner believes will, be handled by the Tennessee commission efficiently and decided in a manner that will best serve the needs of the people of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the entire editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The entire editorial is as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner of November 20, 1927]

THE THREE ISSUES

There are three distinct issues involved in the development and use of the water-power resources of Tennessee.

The first question is this: Is the Federal Government clothed with constitutional authority to make disposition and to control and regulate the utilization of the water-power resources within the boundaries of Tennessee, or is that authority vested in the State government, subject only to the limited jurisdiction of the Federal Government over navigation under the interstate commerce clause of the Federal Constitution?

This issue became acute when a power conference was held at Chattanooga in December, 1925, at which time the power combine filed application with the Federal Water Power Commission for 11 dam sites on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, including Cove Creek Basin, a water-power site of extraordinary value. A demand was made by those in charge of the affairs of the State and by the Nashville Tennessean, backing the power combine, that the Federal Water Power Commission issue permits to the power company which had applied, awarding these 11 water-power sites, utterly disregarding the rights of the State of Tennessee.

A determined drive was made in an effort to compel immediate action by the Federal Government. Official telegrams were sent to the power commission at Washington. Numerous editorials were published demanding immediate action. Propaganda was industriously circulated, and the whole campaign was conducted on an assumption that the legal right to dispose of the water-power resources of this State was vested in the Federal Government, and that the State, through its sovereignty, had no voice in the matter.

The Banner challenged the authority of the Federal Government to thus dispose of the water-power resources within the boundaries of Tennessee. This paper declared that these rights are vested in the State and not in the Federal Government, and that the State alone had authority to permit their development and use to prescribe the conditions therefor.

The Banner has at all times, before and since that conference, maintained the position that the Federal Government was without constitutional authority to dispose of resources belonging to the States.

The Tennessean, with equal directness and diligence, has constantly insisted that the Federal Government should exercise the authority of disposition of these natural resources belonging to the State.

On October 10 and on November 1 the Tennessee Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, through orders which were thoroughly approved by the attorney general of the State, asserted that the right to control and supervise the development and utilization of the power resources within the boundary of Tennessee belongs to the State and not to the Federal Government.

Since the issuance of those orders, which have attracted nation-wide attention, the Tennessean has been silent on the direct issue involved, although it has published editorials still advocating the cause of the power combine.

The Banner continues to maintain the position which it has constantly defended, and is supporting the railroad and public utilities commission in its assertion of the rights of the State and its declaration of an intention to defend, protect, and enforce those rights.

The next issue is: Shall these valuable power resources be awarded to private interests of any kind—power companies, manufacturing companies, or companies of any kind—without monetary consideration, or shall the State of Tennessee be paid for the use of these natural resources belonging to all the people?

This issue has existed and has been pointed for the past few years. The Banner has never equivocated. It has always maintained and still maintains that private investors should not be permitted to take over these resources belonging to the State and use them without compensating the State therefor. The Tennessean, supporting the position of the power combine, has with equal diligence urged that these resources be awarded the power combine without any money consideration whatever.

The Tennessee commission, in its orders of October 10 and November 1, and the attorney general of the State, have taken the position that the State should be rewarded for these resources by those who are permitted to develop and use them.

The Banner has not changed its position and will not change it. This paper insists that whoever is permitted to develop and use the water-power resources within the boundaries of Tennessee must pay to the State annually the reasonable value thereof.

The Tennessean has at all times insisted that these water-power resources should be turned over to the power combine without any monetary consideration.

The third issue, which is of far-reaching importance, is: Shall the practices of holding companies, constituting the power combine, in pyramiding unjustified exactions from operating companies, be investigated thoroughly under the resolution which Senator WALSH of Montana will introduce in the coming Congress, and shall necessary legislation be enacted to prevent these evil practices, or shall the power combine continue to exact from operating companies unjustified contributions which at last become a part of the cost of electric energy sold to consumers?

The Banner favors the Walsh resolution, to the end that all evil practices may be brought to light and all impositions on the public exposed, and that necessary legislation be enacted to put an end to such evils.

The Tennessean has been significantly silent on this issue up to this hour.

There are, of course, other collateral and subordinate questions which should, and the Banner believes will, be handled by the Tennessee commission efficiently, and decided in a manner that will best serve the needs of the people of Tennessee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, reference was made in the editorial from the Electrical World to the peril to securities issued by these public-utility corporations. In view of that I offer a letter received by me from the president of the National Association of Owners of Railroad Securities. This association is also interested in public-utility securities; and for that reason I offer the letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
OWNERS OF RAILROAD SECURITIES,
New York, N. Y., July 28, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
Helena, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The Security Owners' Association, which I represent as president, has as its members large mutual insurance companies, mutual savings banks, trust funds, colleges and universities, and many individuals who are not owners of securities.

These security owners are very largely interested in public-utility securities, and, of course, it is essential to take the same point of view as you do with respect to the holding-company situation.

I will be out in the West during the week of the 15th of August, and wonder if it is convenient for me to see you at your home or at some other convenient place during the early part of that week.

I was very much interested in the public attitude which you showed in the last Congress concerning the public utility holding company situation, and should very much, indeed, appreciate an interview with you.

With cordial regards, I am
Sincerely yours.

MILTON W. HARRISON, *President.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I now offer for the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Topeka Daily Capital, a paper published by one of our associates, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], entitled "The unregulated power mergers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator ask that it be read?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial will be incorporated in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

THE UNREGULATED POWER MERGERS

Ex-Governor Pinchot of Pennsylvania is issuing circulars to the public pointing out the probabilities of control of superpower by a few giant corporations through mergers of plants purchased at prices in excess of their cost or value, in the furious competition to obtain vantage points. But Governor Pinchot sounds like a "voice crying in the wilderness." A generation has risen up that "knows not Joseph," and not much concern is aroused by the man from whom Theodore Roosevelt obtained his policy, once highly thought of, of conservation of natural resources.

Yet it is true that these utilities extending across State lines are not utilities under regulation. The States lose control as they expand, and Congress has enacted no law for their regulation. Governor Pinchot wants a law.

Senator WALSH of Montana is cooperating with Pinchot, but not yet for any bill for regulation of power companies. At this time he proposes merely a resolution for a survey by Congress to determine the facts. This is being opposed by what is described as one of the most powerful lobbies in recent years at Washington.

As manufacturing industries in the United States are now electrified in excess of any others in the world and in some instances up to 100 per cent, mechanical power provided by several enormous power companies will evidently in the next generation become a greater interest than transportation. Homes also are rapidly becoming electrified, and farms soon will be. This is the greatest present development in the Nation.

In his speech on this subject Senator WALSH this year listed all power mergers for 1925 and 1926, the latter far outnumbering the former. More than a thousand power plants, large and small, were merged into a few immense concerns in 1926.

Senator WALSH raises no objection to this and recognizes consolidation as desirable. What he calls attention to is that the consolidations are going on without regulation. He cites the statements of financial and power magazines that report for last year's mergers alone that while great outlays were made in improvements and development, yet the increased capitalization of the large power units during the year exceeded these outlays and former capitalization of the plants merged by $2,000,000,000.

Earning power, in short, appears to be in the process of being capitalized at will. Once established, such capitalized structures may fix rates also at will, or corresponding with the apparent investment.

State commissions have not got very far in their attempts at regulation of power companies having interstate lines of service. The president of the Hartford Electric Light Co. last year in hearings before the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission after referring to the undoubted economies to be obtained by mergers nevertheless asked:

"But what is the value of economies to the communities, if in order to effect them it has been necessary to capitalize the savings for years to come and in their capitalized form to donate them either to the former stockholders or to the speculative banker who brought the parties together?"

The Walsh resolution rests, in the author's words, on the irresponsible command of the capitalizing process by the power companies. "Not being public utilities," says Senator WALSH, "the securities issued by them are in most States not subject to control by the local regulatory authorities. But being nation-wide, it may be said, in their activities, Congress may very properly inquire into their organization and their operations with a view to determining whether it may, as well as whether it should, attempt any regulation of the business they conduct, having in mind the interest of the consumer on the one hand and of the investor on the other. That some such study ought to be prosecuted with a view to ridding the industry of abuses quite generally acknowledged to exist, is recognized in business circles."

Governor Pinchot reports from an expert investigation paid for by himself that 41 corporations now control 80 per cent of all electrical energy produced in the United States and have a capitalization of $10,200,000,000, or about half the valuation of all the railroads in the United States. Of these 41 great power mergers he finds that 29 are controlled by five men and their associates. Such concentration makes for efficiency in service, but what it does to capitalization and rates is another story.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This editorial refers to a letter addressed to me by ex-Governor Pinchot, of the State of Pennsylvania, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

1615 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: You have announced your intention to reintroduce your resolution for an investigation of concentration in the control of electric power. In the event of its passage, and if you so desire, I am prepared to submit facts which, I believe, furnish definite proof of the existence, ownership, and extent of this concentration, together with material on methods of financing stock inflation, and the exploitation of the electric monopoly.

For more than 20 years far-sighted men have called the attention of the American people to the danger to self-government and economic freedom which lies in the growing concentration of electric power in a few hands without adequate public regulation.

In the message in which as governor I laid the giant power plan for the development and regulation of electric power before the Pennsylvania Legislature three years ago I said on this subject:

"There is already advancing with immense rapidity a consolidation of companies engaged in supplying this universal source of power, which has already far transcended State lines and has, in many respects, reached national proportions. The situation which this consolidation clearly foretells is like one in which every source of steam power in America should be under the control of a single monster corporation. In the face of such a concentration of capital and power the States and the Nation can maintain their industrial freedom and ability to govern themselves only through the medium of effective public regulation.

"Nothing like this gigantic monopoly has ever appeared in the history of the world. Nothing has ever been imagined before that even remotely approaches it in the thoroughgoing, intimate, unceasing control it may exercise over the daily life of every human being within the web of its wires. It is immeasurably the greatest industrial fact of our time. If uncontrolled it will be a plague without previous example. If effectively controlled in the public interest it can be made incomparably the greatest material blessing in human history."

At once the electric interests disputed these statements and have continued to dispute them ever since.

During the past year a study of this question has been carried on under my direction by an expert in whose ability and integrity I have full confidence. His report definitely establishes the truth of what I said. It shows that the coming nation-wide electric monopoly is very much further advanced than the propaganda of the electric interests has permitted the public to surmise. The study is not fully completed, but it has gone far enough to establish these facts:

Forty-one corporations control four-fifths of all the electric energy produced in the United States. Out of the 68,732,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity produced in 1926, these 41 corporations produced 54,713,000,000.

These 41 corporations have a total capitalization of $10,200,000,000. They monopolize all the sources of electric power for four-fifths of our people. Eighty-five million seven hundred thousand Americans must get electricity from these 41 corporations or go without.

Of these 41 corporations 29, or about three-quarters, are already known to be dominated, owned, or controlled by five men or corporations and their associates. These five dominant electrical interests are the General Electric Co. of New York, Doherty of New York, Morgan of New York, Ryan of New York, and Insull of Chicago. It is altogether probable that most, if not all, of the remaining 12 also will be found to be dominated, owned, or controlled in the same way. But if the five major interests do in fact control only the 29 corporations, still their assets are capitalized at six thousand million dollars ($5,990,000,000) and they produced in 1926 more than half of all the electricity used in the United States.

The five controlling interests are allied, but not, so far as we know, actually under any single head. But they are tied together, first, by their common interest in maintaining their present power to collect extortionate rates from their customers. The combined electric lobby now in Washington, which represents them all, is proof enough of that.

Secondly, they are tied together by common ownership in certain companies, by common investment interests, by common directors, and doubtless in many other ways not yet disclosed.

These facts are evidence of the prodigiously rapid growth of a nation-wide electric monopoly, and they justify abundantly such warnings as are quoted above. Their significance to our people, not only economically and industrially but politically also, is almost beyond exaggeration. They have a direct and most important bearing on the overshadowing issue in America, which is the control of government by monopolists for the purposes of monopoly. In this attack on self-government and economic freedom the electric interests form the head of the spear. It is of the most urgent importance that this fact should be understood.

Sincerely yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it will be recalled that some phases of this subject were investigated by the Federal Trade Commission. Their report has been submitted. It is a monumental work, and it will furnish an important basis for the work of this committee. But the investigation contemplated by the resolution is not intended at all to cover the ground traversed by the Federal Trade Commission in its investigation. As will be noted from a reading of the resolution, the inquiry relates particularly to the financing of these transactions, a subject upon which the report of the Federal Trade Commission does not touch.

I merely desire to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that if this investigation shall be ordered by the Senate, and I shall be in any way concerned with it, I shall endeavor to make it constructive rather than critical; I shall endeavor to find out what the facts are, so that the public may know; I shall endeavor to call to the aid of the committee men eminent in economics, who have studied this particular question, as well as the business men who are connected with the industry, and who can speak for it, who can tell of the advantages accruing to the public through this extraordinary movement, and who will be questioned concerning whatever disadvantages there may be attendant upon it; so that if the evils that attend it—and unquestionably there are some—can be averted by legislation, the appropriate legislation may be enacted if it is within the power of the Congress to do so.

I trust this resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and that the pending motion will be defeated.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the vote on this question. I wish only to comment on the widespread interest in this subject, as evidenced by the small attendance in the Chamber during the discussion.

I wish further to state that, inasmuch as I have spent a good deal of my life in writing editorials, I am not affected by either their dogmatic or their didactic character; and as for resolutions passed by various voluntary associations, my wastebasket is daily filled with them, and they leave me cold.

I wish to have this resolution considered by some committee which, in the quiet of the committee room, undisturbed by the dynamic character of the Senator from Montana, may study the merits of the question. The only regret that I have in connection with the present discussion is the implied renunciation by the Senator from Montana of any presidential aspirations on his part, because I am certain his party could go much farther and fare much worse.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope that the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] will not prevail. If there is any subject which commands the attention of Congress and the country, it is the alarming acceleration which has taken place in the development of a structure for the purchase and control of the public utility and power enterprises of this country.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana well stated in a very able address delivered during the last session of Congress the urgent reason for the prosecution of a thoroughgoing investigation. Since that time developments have taken place in the power industry which add weight to the arguments made by him at that time.

There should not be a serious question as to the investigation contemplated by the resolution. If there is to be a question raised, the place for the discussion and the argument is the open floor of the United States Senate and not the quiet of the committee room, so subtly recommended by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, we are all aware of the fact that these enormously powerful organizations represented in the public-utility and power business of this country have established here at Washington a lobby through which they propose to prevent the passage of this resolution and other legislation which may come up during this session of Congress affecting the power industry. I for one want to see this discussion and this argument conducted on the floor of the United States Senate and not behind the closed doors of a committee. It is well enough for Senators to suggest that we may move to discharge the committee should its deliberations in the quiet of the committee room take overlong, but that does not bring the direct issue before the Senate. Upon this important issue I believe it is the duty of every Senator to register his vote on the direct question of authorizing this investigation and thus discharge our obligation to the people of this country with regard to this vital problem.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] will not prevail. I am a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but I wish to say that I feel quite sure that if this resolution shall be sent to that committee we would never have an investigation of this problem during this session of Congress. I want it distinctly understood that every man who is voting on this resolution, and who votes to send it to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, is voting against any investigation, as it will undoubtedly be too late to proceed with such an investigation by the time the Interstate Commerce Committee is able to report the resolution. That the subject does need an investigation, and that there is a demand for it, notwithstanding what the Senator from New Hampshire has said, seems to me to be quite evident.

Some years ago in my home State I was called upon to look into a situation which prevailed there, and I found this condition of affairs: One concern had gone out and purchased all of the small power companies in that State, and they had paid something like $33,000,000 for them. They immediately incorporated into a company, and sold bonds to the extent of $33,000,000. Then they sold common stock to the extent of $47,000,000 and preferred stock to the extent of $10,000,000. In other words, they injected into that company something like $57,000,000 of what you might call watered stock. When they came to tax the property, it was found that it was taxed for $33,000,000, but when we went across the aisle to find upon what basis they were charging the people for power, we found the valuation then to be something around $90,000,000.

This is a subject which affects every housewife in this country and every manufacturer in this country who uses electrical power, and I think it is high time that it should be in-

vestigated. I think this resolution should not be sent to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but should be sent to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. As I said at the beginning, to send it to the Committee on Interstate Commerce will mean delay, and probably such delay as will make it impossible for the investigation to be carried on.

Why should the matter be taken up and discussed before the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to decide whether or not there should be an investigation? Every man here on this floor either knows that it should be investigated, or he knows that it should not be investigated, and he knows that if it is sent to the Interstate Commerce Committee we will not get a particle more information than each and everyone of us has right here in this body at this time.

I sincerely trust that the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire will not prevail.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I did not expect to take any part whatever in this debate. As the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I certainly have no personal desire that this proposition should be sent to that committee for investigation, but I am somewhat surprised that my good friend from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who himself is a member of the committee, should reflect either upon the honor of the committee or its ability to do its work. I feel quite sure that if the resolution shall be sent to that committee it will be given as prompt attention as the other business of the committee will warrant.

I mean by that that the one thing which is uppermost in the minds of the members of that committee at this time is railroad consolidation. We have had that up for several years; it has been the subject of debate and discussion not only before that committee but throughout the country, and the President is asking that legislation shall be passed. Hearings have been had before our committee time and again, as we all know, and it is a question upon which we can very speedily act and doubtless will do so. Therefore there is nothing in the way of speedy consideration of this resolution.

I think the resolution should go to some committee in order that the limits of authority of the Senate itself to investigate a question of this character should be defined. I am told that there are over 5,000 public-utility corporations in the United States, and that some 4,500 to 4,600 of them do business wholly intrastate, within a town or within a city, with no communication whatever over State lines.

I am wondering whether or not my friend the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who is a very able lawyer, believes that we can investigate into everything concerning any one or all of those public utilities operating wholly within a State, and if not, should not the language of this resolution be limited to those doing an interstate business? I do not think we have any authority to investigate at all except under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. FESS. That is the important feature which is disturbing me. If it comes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which I am a member, we have not any authority to make any sort of suggestion in the way of amending the resolution.

Mr. WATSON. I have no desire to have the resolution go to the calendar, which course it would take at 2 o'clock, and I suggest that we vote upon the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion, since the Senator from Indiana has mentioned the point, that the resolution would not go to the calendar, because there is no unfinished business.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. That is a very happy state of affairs.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Indiana had in a way addressed a question to me.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I beg to say that this question has a double interstate aspect. In the first place, it is not at all true that these companies operate entirely within a single State, even the operating companies. The amount of electrical energy now transmitted from one State to another in the aggregate is very great. It constitutes, however, only about 5 per cent of the total amount generated. As a rule the energy is consumed within the State in which it is generated. But in the case not only of electrical energy, but of gas, the commodity is very often transferred from one State to another, and the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that in that event neither the State of its origin nor the State of its consumption has any power whatever of regulation.

Mr. WATSON. That is quite true. I am familiar with that decision. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose that in the town in which I live, Rushville, Ind., there be an electric-light company unconnected with any other company which transmits energy over State lines; would the Senator claim that we have the authority to investigate the entire financing of that particular company?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not concede it at all; in fact, I assert the contrary. I do not concede at all that the power of the Senate to investigate a subject is controlled by the question of its power to legislate upon that particular subject. The Senate may very properly institute an inquiry not only to determine whether it is wise to legislate upon a particular subject but also as to whether it has the power to legislate upon that particular subject. Before it can determine that matter it becomes necessary to know just exactly what the facts are.

The fact about the matter, Mr. President, is that these operating companies, single, independent operating companies, are controlled from centers often far beyond the borders of the States in which those operating companies are located, so that really it becomes an interstate problem; and whether it falls within the domain of interstate commerce or not is a question upon which I do not care at the present time to express any opinion. Indeed, I have none formed. I desire to institute an inquiry to find out whether it is possible for the Congress of the United States to legislate so that these abuses may be corrected or whether we are helpless in the matter.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. A fair corollary to what the Senator from Montana has said with reference to his view of the power of the Senate in matters of investigation is that the Senate could proceed with an investigation for the purpose of satisfying the curiosity of any Senator who could persuade a majority of the Senate to his point of view.

With reference to the Senator's last statement, as to the core of the purpose for which he is pressing here, he can bring that immediately and concretely before the Senate any time that he introduces a bill to carry out and effect the purpose which he states he has in mind.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I want to correct an impression which the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee seems to have, namely, that I wanted to reflect upon the Interstate Commerce Committee. He is entirely in error. My thought about the matter was simply that the Interstate Commerce Committee has before it, or will have before it, radio legislation and possibly investigations into the radio situation. It also has legislation pertaining to the railroads of the country, and I am quite sure that that legislation is going to take a great deal of the time, if not all of the time, of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It seemed to me just a ridiculous waste of time on the part of the Senate to send this matter to the Interstate Commerce Committee and ask them to decide as to whether or not some other committee should investigate it. I would not reflect upon the Interstate Commerce Committee, nor would I reflect upon the chairman of that committee. I think he would do the best he could to get the hearings just as quickly as possible. But under the circumstances it would be, it seems to me, almost an impossibility.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in partial reply to one of the observations made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], may I invite his attention to the fact that in many of the so-called intrastate utility companies or organizations or corporations the stocks or bonds are held by corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and more and more the corporations which heretofore operated solely within a State are being absorbed by corporations engaged in interstate commerce or their stocks and bonds are being acquired, if not in toto, at least partially, so that the conduct of their affairs is determined not by local persons, unless they are named as directors by corporations engaged in interstate commerce, but by the larger unit or organization which has its habitat perhaps in one of the great cities of the Union.

It does seem to me that we ought to pass the resolution because of the well-known situation in regard to public utilities, and particularly power corporations, in the United States. If it does go to a committee, it seems to me that it should go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

If legislation is required, I believe it will be legislation supplemental to the Clayton Act or the Sherman antitrust law, and obviously any legislation dealing with the important question of trusts or combinations in restraint of trade would emanate from the Committee on the Judiciary. If there is any disposition—though I hope there will not be—to refer the resolution to a committee, I shall ask for a vote upon its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary rather than to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Utah is along the line of the interest that I have in the resolution. A similar resolution was presented at the last session and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] made a very elaborate address, graphically illustrated by charts on the wall of the Chamber. It was of interest to all of us, and I think he made a strong case. The resolution came to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which is purely a formal committee and has no right whatever in the way of going into the merits of a proposal, but simply to put into operation the machinery after the policy has been established either by the Senate or by another committee.

I would hesitate to vote upon a measure where we could not go into the merits of it, but which involved so much. I am not particular whether it goes to the Judiciary Committee or to the Interstate Commerce Committee or any other committee which has power to go into the merits of it. It does not matter at all. I would vote for it to go to either committee. I happen to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, but I am also a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I hope that it will not go to the latter committee for the reason that it involves so much, and we have absolutely no authority in that committee to inquire into anything except to vote "yes" or "no." In order to cure that weakness in that committee——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The requirement that the resolution shall go to the Committee to Audit and Control is statutory. Congress has enacted a law to the effect that it must go to that committee. Will the Senator from Ohio give us his view as to what that statute means?

Mr. FESS. Where there is any money to be drawn out of the contingent fund of the Senate the resolution comes to our committee, but the proper procedure would be that the policy of the subject should not be considered in our committee. The last two paragraphs of the Senator's resolution would be appropriate to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. That is the usual procedure. But there is the major portion of the resolution which is the establishment of a policy involving millions upon millions of dollars, upon which we can not express even an opinion.

It has been suggested by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that when any resolution involving a policy of this sort is offered, it ought to go to the committee which has jurisdiction of the policy.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Senator has not answered my question. I want to know what his view is concerning what duty devolves upon the Committee to Audit and Control when such a resolution goes to it.

Mr. FESS. The duty is to vote "yes" or "no."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; but upon what consideration?

Mr. FESS. No consideration at all. We can not go into that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say, the law says that it must go to that committee, and that committee does not inquire into the thing at all, but simply votes "yes" or "no."

Mr. FESS. That is upon a matter where expenditures are required and which can not be voted in any other way except by this committee. The question of expenditure does not enter into my idea at all here. I am ready to vote on that at any time. The question here is the policy in reference to concentration and control, and it seems to me that ought not to go to a committee which has absolutely no authority to go into any question of merit. If it would come from the Committee on the Judiciary or the Interstate Commerce Committee recommending such a policy, then the expenditure feature of the resolution would come to our Committee to Audit and Control, and we are ready to vote on that at any time.

I recognize that there is a desire to expedite the matter, and knowing that our committee could not spend any time on it, but it would have to vote either "yes" or "no," there would be less time wasted if it came to our committee; but what can a member of a committee of this body do when he sits upon a question of this kind, voting blindly, without any authority to investigate? Would he be justified in voting to report it out? On the other hand, it is easy for the committee to vote such a resolution down, but that would not be quite fair. Then the Senate would move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution and bring it at once to the floor of the Senate. The regular way would be to refer this resolution to some committee that has the power to go into its merits. Then if an expenditure is required, it should be sent to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. By following such a course there could be no jeopardy anywhere, so far as I can see.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio permit a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. KING. As I understand the position of the Senator, it is if the resolution shall be referred to one of the standing committees, and that committee reports favorably upon it, and the resolution is then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the latter committee have no alternative but must report the resolution back favorably?

Mr. FESS. No; it may report back favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. KING. The Senator thinks, then, that the Committee to Audit and Control would have the opportunity to reverse the action of the other committee which reported to the Senate favorably?

Mr. FESS. It is quite evident if a committee which has the power to go into the merits, as would the Judiciary Committee, should report back favorably that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate would not hesitate at all in giving authority for the expenditure of the money.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator this question: Suppose the Committee on the Judiciary—I mention that committee because the Senator from Ohio named it—upon full investigation should report out this resolution favorably and it should then be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; does the Senator believe that his committee would have the right to negative the action of the Committee on the Judiciary which had investigated the resolution fully and had reported it favorably?

Mr. FESS. I presume the committee has the right to do whatever it sees fit to do, and then the Senate may correct any error it may make; but it seems to me I would be perfectly justified in saying that if another committee had made such a report the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate would indorse it by voting out the resolution at once.

Mr. KING. My opinion, if it is worth anything to the Senator—and it may not be—is that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate would have a mere perfunctory duty to perform, and it would be its duty immediately to report the resolution back to the Senate.

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me, that is the difficulty with our committee all the time; it has a mere perfunctory duty to perform.

Mr. KING. I think there is a good deal of truth in what the Senator states; and I should like to ask him another question.

If this resolution or any other resolution should be referred to one of the standing committees and upon investigation such committee should report it back favorably and the resolution should then go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and the duty of the latter committee would then be merely to report back favorably—if that premise be correct—then if the Senate decides to refer the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate against the motion to refer it to a standing committee, is not the result just the same as if it had gone to the standing committee, for the reason that the Senate has expressed itself in favor of the resolution and in favor of the Committee on Contingent Expenses of the Senate reporting it back favorably?

Mr. FESS. That is what I am trying to express, and I hope that the practice of the Senate will be that whenever a matter comes up involving a controversial question it will not be submitted to our committee, which has no latitude at all, but will go to a standing committee; then let that committee determine what shall be done, and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate will then perform its perfunctory duty.

Mr. KING. I have had occasion heretofore to refer to what I deem to be a rather paradoxical or incongruous situa-

tion with respect to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I think that the Senate either ought to approve of a resolution before it goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate or that a standing committee of the Senate ought to approve it.

Mr. FESS. That is my idea.

Mr. KING. So that the work of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate would be one of bookkeeping rather than of investigation.

Mr. FESS. That is my idea very well stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edwards	Keyes	Sackett
Barkley	Ferris	King	Sheppard
Bayard	Fess	La Follette	Shipstead
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Shortridge
Black	Frazier	McLean	Simmons
Blaine	Gerry	McMaster	Smoot
Blease	Gillett	McNary	Steck
Borah	Glass	Mayfield	Steiwer
Bratton	Goff	Metcalf	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Thomas
Broussard	Greene	Neely	Tydings
Bruce	Hale	Norbeck	Tyson
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Wagner
Copeland	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hayden	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Heflin	Phipps	Warren
Dale	Howell	Pine	Watson
Deneen	Johnson	Pittman	Wheeler
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Willis
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to refer the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MOSES and Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], who is absent on account of illness. Being unable to obtain a transfer of that pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). For to-day and to-morrow I have a pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN]. As he is not present, I am not at liberty to vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I have a telegram from him, in which he says that he desires to be paired in favor of referring the Walsh resolution to the Interstate Commerce Committee. As that is the way I intend to vote, I feel free to vote, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOWELL. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained at home by illness.

Mr. BAYARD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. He is not present, but I am informed that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote on this question, and vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]; and

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING].

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—40

Bayard	Goff	Metcalf	Simmons
Bingham	Gould	Moses	Smoot
Broussard	Greene	Oddie	Steck
Dale	Hale	Overman	Steiwer
Deneen	Hawes	Phipps	Thomas
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Tydings
Edwards	Keyes	Ransdell	Tyson
Fess	McLean	Robinson, Ind.	Warren
Gillett	McNary	Sackett	Watson
Glass	Mayfield	Shortridge	Willis

NAYS—36

Ashurst	Blaine	Bratton	Capper
Barkley	Blease	Brookhart	Copeland
Black	Borah	Bruce	Couzens
Dill	Howell	McMaster	Shipstead
Ferris	Johnson	Neely	Swanson
Frazier	Kendrick	Norbeck	Wagner
Gerry	King	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Hayden	La Follette	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Heflin	McKellar	Sheppard	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—18

Caraway	Gooding	Reed, Mo.	Stephens
Curtis	Harris	Reed, Pa.	Trammell
du Pont	Harrison	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Fletcher	Jones, N. Mex.	Schall	
George	Norris	Smith	

So the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) authorizing a correction in the enrollment of House bill 5800, the first deficiency appropriation bill, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The concurrent resolution which has just come from the House is the same as one which the Senate passed a short time ago. I also understand that it is quite important that it should be passed to-day, so that the clerks may begin the enrollment of the bill. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is not here at this moment, and I am sure would like to have it passed at once, I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed in the enrollment of H. R. 5800 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the first deficiency bill, to insert, on page 38, in line 9 of the engrossed bill, after the word "attorneys," the following words: "(their heirs or their assignees now of record, as their interest may appear)."

G. TOM TAYLOR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 80.

Mr. MOSES. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 80, submitted by Mr. McKELLAR on the 17th instant, as follows:

Whereas in 1921 an examination was held by the Civil Service Commission at Memphis, Tenn., for postmaster at that place; and

Whereas G. Tom Taylor, then claiming to be a resident of Memphis, made application and took the examination, but the Civil Service Commission declined to certify him as one of the eligibles; and

Whereas in 1925 another civil-service examination was held in Memphis for postmaster in that place, and the said G. Tom Taylor again became an applicant and again was refused a place on the list of three eligibles; and

Whereas no appointment was made for about a year after said 1925 examination, because apparently it was not desired by the political powers that any one of the three eligibles should be appointed postmaster; and

Whereas the political powers finally induced Mr. Bugg, the third man on the list of eligibles, to withdraw his name; and

Whereas the Civil Service Commission again refused to certify the said G. Tom Taylor, but did have a reexamination made into his application and qualifications; and

Whereas the report of the examiners in 1921, in 1925, and in 1926 all showed that the character and reputation of said G. Tom Taylor unfitted him for postmaster at Memphis, and held he was not qualified for postmaster by reason of not possessing the proper character and fitness; and

Whereas, notwithstanding these facts and findings of its own examiners, the Civil Service Commission on or about the 1st of June, 1927, placed the said G. Tom Taylor on the list of eligibles by a majority vote; and

Whereas the said G. Tom Taylor was at once appointed acting postmaster and took charge of the office; and

Whereas his name was sent in to the Senate for confirmation early in December, 1927; and

Whereas opposition appearing to the confirmation of G. Tom Taylor his nomination has been withdrawn; and

Whereas the said G. Tom Taylor has been continued an acting postmaster at Memphis, notwithstanding his lack of qualifications and fitness as required by the civil service laws: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, authorized, ordered, and directed to send for persons and papers and report at the earliest possible day its findings on the following questions:

First. What were the facts as ascertained by the Civil Service Commission as to the character and qualifications and fitness of the said G. Tom Taylor to be postmaster in Memphis?

Second. What reasons actuated the Civil Service Commission in disregarding the findings of its own examiners and in certifying the said G. Tom Taylor as eligible for postmaster at Memphis, notwithstanding his lack of qualifications and fitness as found by the examiners?

Third. That the said committee is authorized to report any other pertinent facts concerning the eligibility of the said G. Tom Taylor for postmaster or as to the action of the Civil Service Commission, or any member thereof, in certifying the said G. Tom Taylor as eligible for postmaster at Memphis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, there are some recitals in the whereases about which I am not at all certain and upon which I would not want the Senate to go on record immediately. Therefore I will ask the Senator to let the resolution go over until I have had time to make some inquiries and confer with him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to have that done. I will say to the Senator that we can take it up to-morrow.

Mr. MOSES. I will make every effort to get the information between now and to-morrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; we will let it go over, then. Will there be any other session of the Senate before the holidays?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then we will take it up on Wednesday.

Mr. MOSES. Very well.

REPORTS OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call up the order offered on a previous day for the printing of the annual reports of the public utilities of the District of Columbia in accordance with the practice heretofore followed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I objected to that order the other day. I have no objection to it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the order.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the annual reports of the following-named public utility companies in the District of Columbia, for the year ending December 31, 1926, heretofore transmitted to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document:

Capital Traction Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington Gas Light Co., Georgetown Gas Light Co., Washington Railway & Electric Co., City and Suburban Railway of Washington, Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co., and Washington Interurban Railroad Co.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, December 21, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1927

MEMBER OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John Jacob Esch, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a term of seven years, expiring December 31, 1934.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1927

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL GENERAL TO ETHIOPIA

Addison E. Southard, of Kentucky.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, CLASS I

William Dawson.
Claude I. Dawson.

MEMBERS FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Claude M. Henry.
Edward T. Franks.

MEMBER UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Mrs. Bessie Parker Brueggeman.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION

Arthur J. Tyrer.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE

John L. Crone and Harry Layfield to be supervising inspectors.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Eugene Landers to be examiner in chief.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

William C. Coleman to be United States district judge, district of Maryland.

Edward J. Moinet to be United States district judge, eastern district of Michigan.

Frederick H. Bryant to be United States district judge, northern district of New York.

Frank J. Coleman to be United States district judge, southern district of New York.

FIRST JUDGE, CIRCUIT COURT, FIRST CIRCUIT OF HAWAII

Alva Edgar Steadman to be first judge, circuit court, first circuit of Hawaii.

COAST GUARD

Frederick C. Billard to be commandant.
Quincy B. Newman to be commander (engineering).
Robert B. Adams to be engineer in chief (for four years).

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

AIDES

George William Lovesee.	John Malcolm Baker, jr.
Lawrence Pinkerton Sowles.	Edwin Caleb Baum.

JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

Francis Bartholomew Quinn.	George Riley Shelton.
Bennett Green Jones.	Ira Taylor Sanders.
Ector Brooks Latham, jr.	Charles Roland Bush, jr.
John Bowie, jr.	Edward Robert McCarthy.

HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

Augustus Peter Ratti.
Cornelius Daniel Meaney.

COAST GUARD

LIEUTENANTS

Carl H. Hilton.	Emette B. Smith.
Joseph S. Rosenthal.	Frank D. Higbee.
Frank M. Meals.	Ben C. Wilcox.
John W. Kelliher.	

ENSIGNS

Clarence F. Edge.	Alexander L. Ford.
William T. Schellhous.	Stephen H. Evans.
Harold S. Maude.	John A. Glynn.
Donald E. McKay.	John E. Fairbank.
Vernon E. Day.	Joseph A. Kerrins.
Leslie B. Tollaksen.	William W. Scott.
John L. Steinmetz.	Eward H. Thiele.
Stanley C. Linholm.	Reginald H. French.
Fred P. Vetterick.	John W. Ryssy.
George M. Phannemiller.	John J. Purcell.
George F. Hicks.	Richard L. Burke.

California C. McMillan to be commander (engineering).
Albert C. Norman to be captain (engineering).
Theodore G. Lewton to be captain (engineering).
Herbert F. Walsh to be ensign (temporary).
George W. David to be commander (engineering).
Joseph E. Stika to be lieutenant commander.
Ray W. Dierlan to be lieutenant (temporary).
Frank H. Nelson to be lieutenant (temporary).
Kenneth L. Young to be lieutenant (temporary).
Paul E. Purdy to be lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary).

Louis A. Round, jr., to be ensign (temporary).
William H. Shea to be commander.
Arthur G. Morrill to be lieutenant (junior grade).
Nathaniel S. Fulford, jr., to be ensign.
Richard L. Horne to be ensign.
Clinton P. Kendall to be lieutenant commander (engineering).
Rutherford B. Lank, jr., to be constructor.
Dale R. Simonson to be constructor.
Harold S. Berdine to be lieutenant (junior grade).
Eugene Blake, jr., to be captain.
Chester H. Jones to be commander.
Harry C. Howe to be lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary).
Donald D. Hesler to be ensign (temporary).
Charles H. Bartlett to be ensign (temporary).
Robert S. Jackson to be ensign (temporary).
Philip H. Scott to be captain.
William F. Towle to be commander.
Frederick G. Eastman to be ensign (temporary).
Charles L. Duke to be lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary).
Kenneth S. Davis to be ensign (temporary).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

To be general officers

Edward Lawrence Logan to be major general, reserve, Massachusetts National Guard.

Morris Benham Payne to be major general, reserve, Connecticut National Guard.

Elmore Farrington Austin to be brigadier general, reserve, New York National Guard.

Erland Frederick Fish to be brigadier general, reserve, Massachusetts National Guard.

Irving Andrews Fish to be brigadier general, reserve, Wisconsin National Guard.

Dudley Jackson Hard to be brigadier general, reserve, Ohio National Guard.

Erle Davis Luce to be brigadier general, reserve, Minnesota National Guard.

William Swan McLean, jr., to be brigadier general, reserve, Pennsylvania National Guard.

George Francis O'Connell to be brigadier general, reserve, Wisconsin National Guard.

Allison Owen to be brigadier general, reserve, Louisiana National Guard.

John James Phelan to be brigadier general, reserve, New York National Guard.

Albert Lyman Cox to be a brigadier general, reserve.

George Edmund de Schweinitz to be brigadier general, Auxiliary Reserve.

William Barclay Parsons to be brigadier general, Auxiliary Reserve.

Henry Lewis Stimson to be brigadier general, Auxiliary Reserve.

Clinton Goodloe Edgar to be brigadier general, Signal Corps Reserve.

REGULAR ARMY

To be general officers

Thomas Quinton Donaldson to be major general.
Henry Davis Todd, jr., to be major general.
Abraham Grant Lott to be brigadier general, Cavalry.
Charles Roscoe Howland to be brigadier general, Infantry.
Fred Thaddeus Austin to be Chief of Field Artillery.
George Sabin Gibbs to be Chief Signal Officer.
Edmund Pepperell Easterbrook to be Chief of Chaplains.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be major generals

Richmond Pearson Davis.
Edwin Branch Winans.
Joseph Dugald Leitch.

To be brigadier generals

George Columbus Barnhardt.
Meriwether Lewis Walker.
George Hairston Jamerson.
Henry James Hatch.
Ralph Henry Van Deman.
James Haynes Reeves.
Walter Cowen Short.
Frank Sherwood Cocheu.
Otho Bane Rosenbaum.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lutz Wahl to be The Adjutant General.
Charles Higbee Bridges to be Assistant The Adjutant General.

INSPECTOR GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

William Cannon Rivers to be Inspector General.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

William Edward Horton to be assistant to the Quartermaster General.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Samuel Hof to be assistant to the Chief of Ordnance.

AIR CORPS

James Edmond Fechét to be Chief of the Air Corps.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

To be second lieutenants

Hans William Holmer.
Harold Albert Kurstedt.
Edward Grow Daly.
Donald Chamberlin Hawkins.
Theodore Addison Weyher.
Robert Hammiell Naylor.
Paul Dunn Charles Berrigan.
Henry Gordon Douglas.
Joseph Winston Cox, jr.
George Townsend Derby.
Max Sherred Johnson.
Lee Bird Washbourne.
John Robert Crume, jr.
Charles Albert Harrington.
Charles H. McNutt.
Herman Walter Schull, jr.
Garrison Holt Davidson.
William Henderson Minter.

SIGNAL CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Elmer Blair Garland.
Alvin Louis Pachynski.
Fred Wallace Kunesh.
James Wilson Green, jr.
William Perry Pence.
Charles Brundy Brown.
James Wilson.
George Lucien Richon.
Julius Theodore Flock.

CAVALRY

To be second lieutenants

John Leonard Hines, jr.
Loren Davis Pegg.
Woodbury Megrew Burgess.
Manuel José Asensio.
Alexander Macomb Miller, jr.
William Hamilton Hunter.
Thomas John Hall Trapnell.
Raymond Wiley Curtis.
Edward Pont Mechling.
Robert Graham Lowe.
Charles Pennoyer Bixel.
Howard Auguste Kelly Perrilliat.
Thomas Frank Trapolino.
Henri Anthony Luebbermann.
Francis Scoon Gardner.
Leander LaChance Doan.
Theodore Kalakuka.
Henry Magruder Zeller, jr.

FIELD ARTILLERY

To be second lieutenants

George Woodburne McGregor, jr.
Cecil Winfield Land.
Frederic Joseph Brown.
Maurice Francis Daly.
Gerald Francis Lillard.
Francis Cecil Foster.
Laurence Sherman Kuter.
Fox Brandreth Conner.
Thomas Morgan Watlington, jr.
Reynolds Condon.
Edward Gilbert Farrand.
Mason Fred Stober.
Benjamin Whitehouse.
Thomas Kessler McManus.
Charles Richard Hutchison.
Stanley Burton Bonner.
John Milton Burdge, jr.
Bertram Arthur Holtzworth.
Frederick Andrew Granholm.
Daniel Phipps Miller.
Samuel James Simonton.
Alex Norwood Williams, jr.
Jeremiah Paul Holland.
John Mills Sterling.
Mark Kincaid Lewis, jr.
James Francis Collins.
Herbert Bryant Kirkpatrick.
Harold James Coyle.
Forester Hampton Sinclair.
Harold Stanley Isaacson.
Willis Webb Whelchel.
Arthur Edwin Solem.
Charlie Wesner.
Meredith Donald Masters.
Lewis Hinchman Ham.
Milton Merrill Towner.
Robert Curtis White.
Joseph Ganahl, jr.
John Marion Moore.
Stuart Wood.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Julian Montgomery West.
Frederick Everett Day.
Edwin William Chamberlain.
Harry Oliver Paxson.
Henry Joseph Hoeffer.
George Fenton Peirce.
Parmer Wiley Edwards.
William Lewis McNamee.
John Raymond Lovell.
Everett Charles Dunham.
James Douglas Curtis.
Joseph Coleman Timberlake.
Olaf Helgesen Kyster.
Orrin Leigh Grover.
Harry Forrest Townsend.
Virgil Miles Kimm.
Aloysius Joseph Lepping.
Lawrence Edward Shaw.
Matthew Kemp Deichelmann.
Nathan Alton McLamb.
Frank Thomas Ostenberg.
John Kochevar.
Joy Thomas Wrean.
John Joseph Holst.
Guy Ernest Thrams.
Arthur Roth.
John Thomas Hopper.

INFANTRY

To be second lieutenants

Robert Kirby Perrine.
Francis Elliot Howard.
Kenneth Earl Thiebaud.
Willard Burton Carlock.
George McCoy, jr.
George Edward Martin.
Robert Griffith Turner.
Edward James Francis Glavin.
Joseph Howard Gilbreth.
Horace Alvord Quinn.
Lee Roy Williams.
Edward Davis McLaughlin.
James Virgil Thompson.
Paul Edwin Schewe.
Walter Morris Johnson.
Albert Harvey Dickerson.
Orville Melvin Hewitt.
Arthur Layton Cobb.
William Jordan Verbeck.
Fay Roscoe Upthegrove.
William Jefferson Glasgow, jr.
Charles Bertody Stone, 3d.
George Esnip, 2d.
Ruby Elderidge Hunter.
Ernest Godfrey Schmidt.
Ernest Benjamin Gray.
Douglas Campbell.
William Joseph Phelan.
Carl Sherman Graybeal.
David Morgan Hackman.
Ralph Wise Zwicker.
Woodson Finch Hocker.
James Albemarle Harron.
William Edgar Thomas.
Cyril Edward Williams.
Arthur Milner Burghduff, jr.
Joseph Woitkievicz Vincent.
Robert Martin Wohlforth.
Vachel Davis Whatley, jr.
George Edward Levings.
Harry Ellery McKinney.
Carl Elliott Lundquist.
Antulio Segarra.
Bernard Cecil Rose.
Guy Stanley Meloy, jr.
George Van Horn Moseley, jr.
Roy William Axup.
John Walker Kirby.
Forrest Anthony Hornisher.
Raymond Earle Bell.
Dudley George Strickler.
Dana Powers McGown.
Charles Boal Ewing.
Felix Alex Todd, jr.
Barney Avant Daughtry.
John Ogden Kilgore.
Philip DeWitt Ginder.
Ralph Edwin Doty.
Howell Hopson Jordan.
Robert Frederick Sink.
Elmer Matthew Webb, jr.
John Prame Kaylor.
Christian Gotthard Nelson.
Martin Joseph Morin.
Gilbert McKee Allen, jr.
Calvin Louis Whittle.
George Emericus Bender.
Jack Henry Griffith.
Robert Campbell Aloe.
Montgomery McKee.
David Stuart Loughborough.
Nelson Irving Fooks.
Malcolm Frederick Bauer.
Lawton Butler.
Marion Huggins.
Frederick Funston, jr.
Martin Moses.
Robert John West, jr.
Edgar Daniel Stark.
David Drew Hedekin.
James William Smyly, jr.
Raymund Gregory Stanton.
Neil Bosworth Harding.
Jesse Floyd Dressler.
Willis Small Matthews.
Robert Lewis Easton.
Henry Malone Bailey.
Fred Leroy Thorpe.
William Rapier Francis Bleakney.

AIR CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Earl Clinton Robbins.
Andrew Joseph Kerwin Malone.
Russell Keillor.
Charles Clifford Coppin, jr.
Mark Darrow Stephen Steensen.
Ernest Harold Lawson.
John Edward Bodle.
William Harold Doolittle.
Russell Scott.
Burton Murdock Hovey, jr.
Richard Eastman Cobb.
Alexander Everett Cabana.
Dale Davis Fisher.
Henry Weisbrod Dorr.
Irvin Alberta Woodring.
Carlisle Iverson Ferris.
Elwood Richard Quesada.
Willard Roland Wolfinbarger
James Arthur Ellison.
Hoyt Leroy Prindle.
James Franklin Walsh.
George Richard Geer.
Forrest Lynne Neville.
Donald Wright Benner.
John Quincy Adams.
Harry John Flatequal.
Herman Franklin Woolard.
Lawrence Henry Douthit.
George Robert Acheson.
Harry Prime Bissell.
Keith Roscoe.
Frank Hamlet Robinson.
Waldine Winston Messmore.
Herbert Melvin Newstrom.
Allen Ralph Springer.
Franklin Calhoun Wolfe.
Ford Larimore Fair.
Ivan Maurice Palmer.
Harold Frederick Brown.
Joseph Gerard Hopkins.

Harold Henry Hunt to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Joseph Lawrence Dark to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Henry Rosser Angell to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Frank Keith Park to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Paul Leamon Woodruff to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Walter William Gross to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Joseph George Felber to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Otto Clyde George to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Harold Arthur Wheaton to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
John H. Jones to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Gilbert Lorenzo Tefft to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Vera H. Wiseman to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Morris Miller Bauer to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Rex Ivar Heinlein, jr., to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Frank Alfred Lightfoot to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
John Richmond Pitman, jr., to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
George Selman to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Earl Clarence Bergquist to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Richard Chase to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Albert Neil Hickey to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Ronald Irving Pride to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Royce Alison Drake to be second lieutenant, Cavalry.
Paul Alfred Disney to be second lieutenant, Cavalry.
Leo William Desrosiers to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Gordon Philip Saville to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Charles Bernard Overacker, jr., to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
George Henry Macnair to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
William Barwig Blaufuss to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Louis Howard Foote to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Donald Carl Snyder.
Rawley Ernest Chambers.
Stanton Knowlton Livingston
Thomas Fort Bridges.
Fletcher Emory Ammons.
Lester Maris Dyke.
William Berry Wilson.
Henry Bennett Lavery.
Harold LeRoy Stewart.
Arthur John Redland.
William Foster Burdick.
James Bathurst Smith, jr.
William Lenoir Wilson.
Carlton Duncan Goodiel.
Frank Wilburn Messer.
William Mahlon James.
August Wesley Spittler.
Robert Francis Bradish.
Jacob Charles Harshbarger.
Horace Page Marvin.
Kenneth Gilbert Smith.
Ralph Matthews Sloan.
Leonard Dudley Heaton.
William Hubert Seale.
Marion Whitmell Ransone.
William Riney Craig.
Thomas William Ellsworth Christmas.
Edward Herman Theis.
Harold Willard Glattly.
James Pope Gill, jr.
Francis Elbert Council.
John Presly Bachman.
John Buist Chester.
George Barnard Moore, jr.
John Winchester Rich.
Thomas Brown Murphy.
Huston J. Bantom.
Hervey Burson Porter.

DENTAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Kenneth Pearce Fulton.
Harold George Ott.
Leland Stanford Mabry.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Charles Stunkard Greer.
John Lloyd Owens.

PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

Bienvenido Mobo Alba to be second lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER AND PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER

Adjutant General's Department

William White Dick to be captain, Infantry.
William Elbridge Chickering to be captain, Infantry.
Perry Cole Ragan to be captain, Infantry.

Judge Advocate General's Department

Lee Stephen Tillotson to be major, Infantry.
Joel Franklin Watson to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Quartermaster Corps

Thomas Waples Barnard to be captain, Infantry.
Irwin Samuel Dierking to be captain, Infantry.
James Courtney Browne to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Robert Brice Johnston to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Finance Department

Horatio Grant Coykendall to be captain, Infantry.
Arthur James Perry to be captain, Infantry.
Lemuel Edwin Edwards to be first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps.
John Fidelis Connell to be first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps.

Corps of Engineers

Warren Nourse Underwood to be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Herbert William Ehrgott to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Ordnance Department

Frank Fenton Reed to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Garland Thomas Rowland to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Harold Mark Reedall to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Signal Corps

Hamner Huston to be major, Infantry.
Gordon Cogswell Irwin to be captain, Infantry.
Mark Rhoads to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Percival Adams Wakeman to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
William Holmes Wenstrom to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Cavalry

Thomas Grafton Hanson, jr., to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
John O'Day Murtaugh to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Prentice Edward Yeomans to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.

Field Artillery

Edward White Wildrick to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Albert Charles Stanford to be captain, Signal Corps.
Ernest Thomas Hayes to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Roswell Boyle Hart to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Esher Claflin Burkart to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Wilbur Ray Pierce to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
William Augustus Davis Thomas to be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
James Robert Lindsay, jr., to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Thomas Clagett Wood to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Arthur Bliss to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
John Llewellyn Lewis to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Donald Dunford to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Julian Henry Baumann to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
William Murlin Creasy, jr., to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
John Prichard Woodbridge to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Gregg Miller Lindsay to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.

Coast Artillery Corps

Willard Karle Richards to be major, Ordnance Department.
Albert Dewitt Chipman to be captain, Cavalry.
Russell Thomas George to be captain, Cavalry.
Jesse Knox Freeman to be captain, Infantry.
Auston Monroe Wilson, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
John Mitchell England to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Frederick Cruger Pyne to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
John Frederic Powell to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
William Frederick Niethamer to be second lieutenant, Infantry.
Holger Nelson Toftoy to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Charles Winchell McGeehan to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Henry Lee Hughes to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Paul August Jaccard to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.
Paul Burnham Nelson to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.

Infantry

David Lamme Stone to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
John Southworth Upham to be lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
Joseph James O'Hare to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Josiah Ross to be second lieutenant, Air Corps.

Air Corps

Randolph Piersol Williams to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.
Ralph Francis Stearley to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Charles Dawson McAllister to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
James Milliken Bevans to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Donald Fowler Fritch to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Herbert William Anderson to be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery.
George Hinkle Steel to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery.
William Ewing Baker to be second lieutenant, Infantry.

BY PROMOTION

Harris Pendleton, jr., to be colonel, Infantry.
Howard Gilman Davids to be colonel, Infantry.
Ernest Van Dyke Murphy to be colonel, Infantry.
Hilden Olin to be colonel, Finance Department.
Albert Watson Foreman to be colonel, Infantry.
Perrin Lindsey Smith to be colonel, Finance Department.
Harry Lawrence Cooper to be colonel, Infantry.
William Stanley Sinclair to be colonel, Infantry.
Charles Louis Willard to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
Arthur Pitt Watts to be colonel, Infantry.
William Arthur Carleton to be colonel, Infantry.
Lochlin Washington Caffey to be colonel, Infantry.
William Saunders Faulkner to be colonel, Infantry.
Ernest H. Agnew to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
Robert Oakes Ragsdale to be colonel, Infantry.
Austin Allen Parker to be colonel, Infantry.
Fred Van Schaick Chamberlin to be colonel, Infantry.
Aubrey Lippincott to be colonel, Cavalry.
Robert Christian Humber to be colonel, Infantry.
George Luther Hicks to be colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
Parker Hitt to be colonel, Infantry.
Dennis Patrick Quinlan to be colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department.
Kyle Rucker to be colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department.
Lynn Sawyer Edwards to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
Hugh Kirkpatrick Taylor to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Henry Noble to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
Douglas McCaskey to be colonel, Cavalry.
Freeborn Page Holcomb to be colonel, Finance Department.
Clenard McLaughlin to be colonel, Infantry.
Edward Beall Mitchell to be colonel, Infantry.
James Henry Como to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
Harol Dever Coburn to be colonel, Infantry.
Allen James Greer to be colonel, Field Artillery.
Robert Whitfield to be colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
James Andrew Mars to be lieutenant colonel, Air Corps.
Robert Morgan Lyon to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
William Mechling Colvin to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
Benjamin Edwards Gray to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Elvid Hunt to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Dorsey Read Rodney to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
Alexander Mortimer Milton to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
Campbell Blackshear Hodges to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Jacob Winfield Scott Wuest to be lieutenant colonel, Air Corps.
Max Bruce Garber to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Corbit Strickland Hoffman to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Stephen Wilson Winfree to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
Arthur Emmett Ahrends to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Charles Franklin Severson to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Harry Surgisson Grier to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Charles Beatty Moore to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Clark Lynn to be lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
Cornelius Stockmar Bendel to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Ben Frazer Ristine to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Albert Gilmor to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
Stuart Ainslee Howard to be lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
John Francis Franklin to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Roland Wallace Boughton to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Irving Monroe Madison to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Ellery Farmer to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Everett Newton Bowman to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Homer Neill Preston to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Edward Aloysius Brown to be lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
William Franklin Harrell to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
George Edgar Nelson to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.
Jesse Duncan Elliott to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Edward Himmelwright Tarbutton to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
Carroll Borden Hodges to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Daniel Murray Cheston, jr., to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
James Madison Churchill to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Luther Rice James to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Andrew Davis Chaffin to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Frederick Wegener Boschen to be lieutenant colonel, Finance Department.
Louis Farrell to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Charles Otto Schudt to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
Emmett Addis to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
Harry Lazelle King to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
William Franklin Robinson, jr., to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
John James Burleigh to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Arthur Gerald Hixson to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
Augustine Aloysius Hofmann to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
James Blyth to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Edwin Gunner to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Resolve Potter Palmer to be lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department.
Edward Eugene McCammon to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Paul Calkins Potter to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Albert Thurston Rich to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
David Perry Wood to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.
Charles Bean Amory, jr., to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
William Earl Chambers to be major, Infantry.
Joseph Merit Tully to be major, Cavalry.
James deBarth Walbach to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Warner William Carr to be major, Infantry.
Hugh Mitchell, to be major, Signal Corps.
Robert LeGrow Walsh to be major, Air Corps.
Richard Mar Levy to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Thomas Lyle Martin to be major, Infantry.
Geoffrey Prescott Baldwin to be major, Infantry.
Kenneth Macomb Halpine to be major, Infantry.
George Sidney Andrew to be major, Cavalry.
Roland Paget Shugg to be major, Field Artillery.
Ellicott Hewes Freeland to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Spencer Albert Townsend to be major, Cavalry.
Richard Clark Birmingham to be major, Infantry.
Felix Rossiter McLean to be major, Infantry.
James Cornelius Ruddell to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Thomas Green Peyton to be major, Cavalry.
Joseph Hamilton Grant to be major, Infantry.
Arthur Monroe Ellis to be major, Infantry.
Maurice Levi Miller to be major, Infantry.
Junius Henry Houghton to be major, Air Corps.
Abram Vorhees Rinearson, jr., to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Benjamin Anthony Yancey to be major, Infantry.
William George Patterson to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Douglas Jenkins Page to be major, Field Artillery.
James Nephew Caperton to be major, Cavalry.
Charles Compton Smith to be major, Cavalry.
Harrison Herman to be major, Cavalry.
Frank Clark Scofield to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
George Joseph Newgarden, jr., to be major, Infantry.
John David Miley to be major, Infantry.
John Forest Goodman to be major, Infantry.
Ferdinand Francis Gallagher to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Barrington Lockhart Flanigen to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert Kenneth Whitson to be major, Infantry.
Otto Frederick Lange to be major, Infantry.
Harlan Leslie Mumma to be major, Infantry.
Alexander Mathias Weyand to be major, Infantry.
Walter David Mangan to be major, Field Artillery.
Henry Parker Blanks to be major, Infantry.
Carl Archibald Bishop to be major, Infantry.
Ansel Griggs Wineman to be major, Field Artillery.
James Ellis Slack to be major, Cavalry.
Marvin Randolph Baer to be major, Infantry.
Marvin Conrad Heyser to be major, Field Artillery.
Harold Preston Kayser to be major, Infantry.
Basil Dennis Spalding to be major, Infantry.
Sidney Guthrie Brady to be major, Field Artillery.
Robert Sherman Barr to be major, Ordnance Department.
Joseph Herzer to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
George Lea Febiger to be major, Infantry.
George A. Pollin to be major, Field Artillery.
Claud Edward Stadtman to be major, Infantry.
Erwin Cobia West Davis to be major, Field Artillery.
Clarence Ralph Huebner to be major, Infantry.
Frederick McCabe to be major, Infantry.
Irving Howard Engleman to be major, Infantry.
William M. Cravens to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Frederick Joseph de Rohan to be major, Infantry.
Frederick Schoenfeld to be major, Quartermaster Corps.
William McCaskey Chapman to be captain, Infantry.
Norman McNeill to be captain, Infantry.
Glen Henry Anderson to be captain, Infantry.
Bryant Edward Moore to be captain, Infantry.
Leo Vincent Warner to be captain, Field Artillery.
Alston Deas to be captain, Infantry.
Henry William Bobrink to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Onslow Sherburne Rolfe to be captain, Infantry.
Henry Perkins Gantt to be captain, Field Artillery.
Jesse Brooke Matlack to be captain, Field Artillery.
Parry Weaver Lewis to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Edward Wrenne Timberlake to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Wallace Jenna to be captain, Infantry.
William Richard Fleming to be captain, Infantry.
Francis Porter Simpson to be captain, Infantry.
Arthur Paul Thayer to be major, Cavalry.
Emile George De Coen to be major, Field Artillery.
John Boone Martin to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
Paul Joseph McDonnell to be major, Infantry.
Eustis Leland Poland to be major, Infantry.
Paul Hathaway to be major, Infantry.
Hardin Cleveland Sweeney to be major, Infantry.
Eugene Manuel Landrum to be major, Adjutant General's Department.
Frank Glenister Ringland to be major, Cavalry.
John Barber Harper to be major, Finance Department.
Edwin Charles Mead to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Fenton Lee to be major, Infantry.
George Worthen Teachout to be major, Infantry.
Harry Cooper Barnes, jr., to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert John Hoffman to be captain, Infantry.
Clare Wallace Woodward to be captain, Infantry.
John Stevenson Mallory to be captain, Field Artillery.
Frederick Dent Sharp to be captain, Field Artillery.
William Sydney Barrett to be captain, Chemical Warfare Service.
Paul Ryan Goode to be captain, Infantry.
Harry Niles Rising to be captain, Ordnance Department.
Henry Cornelius Demuth to be captain, Field Artillery.
Lowell Meeker Riley to be captain, Field Artillery.
Emil Krause to be captain, Infantry.
Robert Lynn Bacon to be captain, Infantry.
Jacob House Edwin to be captain, Air Corps.
Charles Purvis Arthur to be captain, Infantry.
James Jackson Hea to be captain, Infantry.
Carlisle Britannia Wilson to be captain, Infantry.
Harold Lewis Milan to be captain, Infantry.
Horace Harding to be captain, Field Artillery.
Fred Ernest Davis to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
George Darryll Gamble to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Edmund Graham West to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Joseph Idus Lambert to be captain, Cavalry.
Clarence Nelson Iry to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Joseph Worth Timmons, jr., to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Hugh Whitt to be captain, Finance Department.
Charles Frederick Wilson to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Ray Aloysious Dunn to be captain, Air Corps.
Irwin Wilson Guth to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Crawford McMann Kellogg to be captain, Chemical Warfare Service.
William Frank Johnson to be captain, Infantry.
Frank Dennison Wheeler to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Herbert Allen Gardner to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Albert Lobitz to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Simon Jacobson to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Edward William Lachmiller to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Talmage Phillips to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
John Paul Tillman to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
George Wilbur McEntire to be captain, Air Corps.
John Newport Greene to be captain, Cavalry.
Charles Harrison Brammell to be captain, Field Artillery.
Frank Arthur Mertz to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Asa Jeremiah Etheridge to be captain, Air Corps.
Earl Spiker Schofield to be captain, Air Corps.
Henry James Conner to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Arthur Emel Simonin to be captain, Air Corps.
Frank O'Driscoll Hunter to be captain, Air Corps.
Harold Huston George to be captain, Air Corps.
Alden Harry Waitt to be captain, Chemical Warfare Service.
Sterling Clifton Robertson to be captain, Infantry.
Charles Walton Cameron to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Arthur Edwin Danielson to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Paul Lindsay Beard to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Joseph Lawrence Aman to be captain, Ordnance Department.
Walter Jay Reed to be captain, Air Corps.
St. Clair Streett to be captain, Air Corps.
Ranald Trevor Adams to be captain, Field Artillery.
Andrew Jackson Nichols to be captain, Infantry.
Archie Donald Cameron to be captain, Infantry.
John Conrad Christophel to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Roger Shaw McCullough to be captain, Air Corps.
Frank Morrell to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Peter Shemonsky to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
William Hunt Roach to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Carl Bierwirth Searing to be captain, Infantry.

Robert Lake Miller to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Ralph Eli Fleischer to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Robert Oliver White to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
William Foelsing to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Charles William Dietz to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Walter Lane Shearman to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Roy Marsh McCutchen to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Aubrey Hoodenpyl Bond to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Hubert Walter Collins to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Frank Bowman Hastie to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Bennett Hart Bowley, jr., to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Robert Dorrance Ingalls to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Walter Lyman Medding to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Albert Carl Lieber, jr., to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
George Jacob Nold to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Samuel Howes Baker to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Elisha Kenneth Henson to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
John Isham Moore to be captain, Air Corps.
Lloyd Milton Garner to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Vance Lawton Richmond to be captain, Infantry.
Earle Trask Louck to be captain, Infantry.
Harris Markham Findlay to be captain, Field Artillery.
Russell Crayden Winchester to be captain, Cavalry.
George Hunter Passmore to be captain, Infantry.
James Stevenson Rodwell to be captain, Cavalry.
George Orenthus Allen Daughtry to be captain, Cavalry.
Kirk Broaddus to be captain, Cavalry.
Newton Gale Bush to be captain, Infantry.
Paolo Hoffoss Sperati to be captain, Infantry.
LeRoy Welling Nichols to be captain, Infantry.
Charles Martin Chamberlain, jr., to be captain, Infantry.
LeRoy Allen Whittaker to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Harry Barnes Sepulveda to be captain, Infantry.
Samuel Charles Skemp to be captain, Air Corps.
John Robert Hubbard to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Robert Gale Breene to be captain, Air Corps.
George Abe Woody to be captain, Ordnance Department.
Thomas Kenneth Vincent to be captain, Ordnance Department.
Samuel Littler Metcalf to be captain, Infantry.
Geoffrey Maurice O'Connell to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Frank Wilbur Halsey to be captain, Infantry.
Kirby Green to be captain, Infantry.
Myron Joseph Conway to be captain, Infantry.
Hollis Benjamin Hoyt to be captain, Infantry.
Arthur Foster Gilmore to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
John August Otto to be captain, Infantry.
Joseph Burton Sweet to be captain, Infantry.
William Quinntillus Jeffords, jr., to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Garland Cuzorte Black to be captain, Signal Corps.
George Anthony Patrick to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Joseph Andral Nichols to be captain, Infantry.
Leon Lightner Kotzebue to be captain, Infantry.
Walter Christian Thee to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.
George Work Marvin to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Charles Joseph Barrett, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Otto Spaulding Tinkel to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Maxwell Davenport Taylor to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Henry James Woodbury to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Louis Jacob Rumaggi to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Edmund Clayton Lynch to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Francis Jennings Wilson to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Alfred August Kessler, jr., to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Paschal Neilson Strong, jr., to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Lawrence Coy Leonard to be first lieutenant, Ordnance Department.
Mervin Eugene Gross to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Robert Wayne Raynsford to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.
LeRoy Judson Stewart to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Edward Shelley Gibson to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
John Francis Uncles to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Giles Richard Carpenter to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
David James Crawford to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
William Field Sadtler to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Earl Foster Thompson to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Charles Newsom Branham to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Francis Borgia Kane to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Stevens Lawton to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Albert Svihra to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Slator Marcellus Miller to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Granger Anderson to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Alfred Eugene Kastner to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Edwin Paul Crandell to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Mark McClure to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Myron Leedy to be first lieutenant, Ordnance Department.
Alba Carlton Spalding to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert Landon Taylor to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery Corps.
Stephen Cecil Lombard to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery Corps.
Howard Gillespie Davidson to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Fred James Woods to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Kenneth Francis Pughe to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Robert Smith McClenaghan to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Francis Xavier Mulvihill to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Charles Hancock Reed to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Walter Russell Hensey, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Orval Ray Cook to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Perry McCoy Smith to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
James Wrathall Spry to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Gordon Sherman Armes to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Frederick William Hein to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Raymond Balliet Bosserman to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Charles Rufus Smith to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Harold Alfred Meyer to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Robert Earle Blair to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Harold Thomas Molloy to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
James Dunne O'Connell to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Gilman Clifford Mudgett to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Leonard Edwin Stephens to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Numa Augustin Watson to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Wesley Woodworth Yale to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Robert Wilkins Douglass, jr., to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Oscar Louis Beal to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Oliver Wendell Hughes to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Robert Vincent Murphy to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Aloysius Eugene O'Flaherty, jr., to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Melville Fuller Grant to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
James Edward Rees to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
James Robinson Pierce to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Lemuel Mathewson to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
George Harold Carmouche to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Thomas Varon Webb to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
George Edward Mitchell, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
William Henry Schildroth to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
George Arthur Taylor to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Alfred Lawrence Price to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Frank Llewellyn Beadle to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Gilbert Hayden to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.
Francis Eugene Cothran to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Thomas Herbert Maddocks to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.
Charles Perry Holweger to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
David Marion Fowler to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Edward Arthur Kleinman to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Blackshear Morrison Bryan, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
John Lawson Ballantyne to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Hilbert Milton Wittkop to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Donald Quitman Harris to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
John Percy Kennedy, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Townsend Griffiss to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
William Andrew Wedemeyer to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Edwin Carlo Greiner to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Philip Howard Raymond to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Oliver Perry Newman to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Roscoe Gorea MacDonald to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
John Hughes Stodter to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Thomas Edward Lewis to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Stewart Tiffany Vincent to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Paul Henry Mahoney to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
James Clyde Fry to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Austin Folger Gilmartin to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Elbert Kelly to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Orestes Cleveland to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
James Harrison Dickie to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Charles Llewellyn Gorman to be first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps.
Joseph Perry Catte to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Albert Carroll Morgan to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Perley Bernard Sancomb to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
John LaValle Graves to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Herbert William Kruger to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
William Earl Watters to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Leo Henry Dawson to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Milton John Smith to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Carl Budd Wahle to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Leonard Loyd Hilliard to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Lester Vocke to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
James Fish, 3d, to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
John Leon Dicks to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Lester Mavity Rouch to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
John Owen Colonna to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Herman William Fairbrother to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Grover Cleveland Kinney to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Thomas Edward Meyer to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Thomas Jefferson Randolph to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Harry Edwin Magnuson to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
LaRoy Sanders Graham to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Francis Lavelle Ready to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
David Hottenstein to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
George John Kelley to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Ray Brooks Floyd to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Ray Eugene Marshall to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
George Cabell Carrington to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Harland Fremont Burgess to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Karl Clifford Frank to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Clyde Anderson Burcham to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Walter Raymond Miller to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Randall James Hogan to be first lieutenant, Ordnance Department.
Robert Nicholas Young to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
James Frederick Phillips to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Douglas Valentine Johnson to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Frederick Williams Watrous to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Charles Elford Smith to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Raymond Edward Culbertson to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Maynard Harper Carter to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
LeGrande Albert Diller to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Robert Parker Hollis to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Isaac Davis White to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Louis Edward Roemer to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Max Hesner Gooler to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Joseph Howard Harper to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Emerald Foster Sloan to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Newton Farragut McCurdey to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
John Julius Dubbelde, jr., to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Joe Ford Simmons to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.
Clarence Turner Hulett to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Daniel Powell Poteet to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Ord Gariche Chrisman to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Gerson Kirkland Heiss to be first lieutenant, Ordnance Department.
Ransom George Amlong to be first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps.
Paul Lawrence Martin to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Walter Howard DeLange to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Robert Kelsey Haskell to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Ralph Adel Snavely to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Claude Armenius Thorp to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.
Rowland Reid Street to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
John Marquiss Whistler to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
James Howard Leusley to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
William Henry Drummond to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Viking Torsten Ohrbom to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Glen Trice Lampton to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Howard Miller Fey to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Robert Boyd Williams to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.
Francis Rarick Johnson to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Glenn Hunter Palmer to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.
Royal Bertrand Lord to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Kenner Fisher Hertford to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Steven Livesay Conner to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Miles Reber to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Charles West Stewart, jr., to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
William Francis Merwin Longwell to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
John Rutherford Noyes to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Lyle Rosenberg to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
William Randolph Winslow to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
William Newton Leaf to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
David Morris Dunne, jr., to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Frank McAdams Albrecht to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Theodore Morrison Clarence Osborne to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Ralph Arnold Tudor to be first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.
Robert Farnsworth Hallock to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Stuart Alfred Beckley to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Harold David Kehm to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Philippine Scouts

Rafael Larrosa Garcia to be major, Philippine Scouts.

REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Jay Ralph Shook.
Henry Halcolm Rutherford.
Ernest Lewis Ruffner.
Patrick Henry McAndrew.
George Macy Ekwurzel.
Carroll Deforest Buck.
John Howard Allen.
Robert Urie Patterson.
Roger Brooke.
Wallace De Witt.
Matthew Augustus DeLaney.
Paul Stacy Halloran.
Kent Nelson.
Peter Conover Field.
Herbert Goss Shaw.
Louis Brechemin, jr.
Clement Colfax Whitcomb.
Cosam Julian Bartlett.
Reuben Boyd Miller.
James Frank Hall.
Raymond Franklin Metcalfe.
Perry Lee Boyer.
James Matthew Phalen.

To be lieutenant colonels

Guy Victor Rukke.
Henry Church Pillsbury.
Edgar King.
Ray Woodman Bryan.
William Hadley Richardson.
William Kay Bartlett.

To be captains

Otis Blaine Schreuder.
Edward John Kallus.
Arthur David Hawkins.
Howland Allan Gibson.
Paul Ashland Brickey.
Berna Thomas Bowers.
Leon Lloyd Gardner.
Prentice Lauri Moore.
John Paul Russell.
John Morris Hargreaves.
Don Longfellow.
Ray Hamilton Skaggs.
William Frank DeWitt.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

James Melvin Epperly.
James Harvey Pence.
Everitte Favor Arnold.
Marvin Edward Kennebeck.
Hugh David Phillips.
Walter Edwin Chase.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Jules Henry Uri.

To be majors

Jacob Edward Behney.
William Henry Houston.
Clell Bricker Perkins.
Horace Samuel Eakins.
Isaac Owen Gladish.
Jesse Daniel Derrick.
Jean Rossman Underwood.
Raymond Alexander Kelser.
Clifford Caswell Whitney.
Christian William Greenlee.
Harold Edward Egan.

To be captain

Frank Marion Lee.

To be first lieutenants

Herbert Morris Cox.
Laurence Robert Bower.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captains

Thomas Grimsley Hester.
John Dennis Foley.

CHAPLAINS

William Richard Arnold.
Alexander Daniel Sutherland.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Charles F. Hughes, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy.

Capt. William D. Leahy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy.

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS

Edward H. Campbell.
Walter S. Crosley.
Frank B. Upham.
Ridley McLean.
David F. Sellers.
Joseph M. Reeves.
Frank H. Brumby.
Harris Laning.
Henry V. Butler.
James J. Raby.
William H. Standley.

TO BE CAPTAINS

John S. Abbott.
Nathan W. Post.
Roscoe F. Dillen.
Herbert H. Michael.
Allen B. Reed.
Christopher R. P. Rodgers.
Lewis Coxe.
Cleon W. Mauldin.
Isaac C. Johnson, jr.
David W. Bagley.
Fred H. Poteet.
Geórge M. Baum.
Richard P. McCullough.
Max M. Frucht.
Charles S. Joyce.
Ormond L. Cox.
Royal E. Ingersoll.
Herbert F. Leary.
Chester W. Nimitz.
Reuben B. Coffey.
Joseph V. Ogan.
Albert T. Church.
John N. Ferguson.
Arthur C. Stott.
William S. McClintic.
Byron McCandless.
Roscoe C. MacFall.
Edmund S. Root.
Arthur B. Cook.
George C. Pegram.

TO BE COMMANDERS

Edmund S. R. Brandt.
James D. Maloney.
Alan G. Kirk.
Granville B. Hoey.
Francis W. Scanland.
Joel W. Bunkley.
Max B. DeMott.
Ernest J. Blankenship.
Harold C. Train.
Wallace L. Lind.
Lee P. Johnson.
Monroe Kelly.
Marion C. Robertson.
Leo L. Lindley.
Edward C. Raguet.
Charles C. Davis.
Robert R. Paunack.
Frank D. Manock.
Williams C. Wickham.
Freeland A. Daubin.
Hugh V. McCabe.
Claude S. Gillette.
William C. Faus.
Thomas E. Van Metre.
John H. S. Dessez.
Stuart S. Brown.
Comfort B. Platt.
Sherman S. Kennedy.
Chauncey A. Lucas.
Charles H. Morrison.
Paul H. Rice.
Robert G. Coman.
Holbrook Gibson.
Charles E. Reordan.
Howard H. J. Benson.
Hugo W. Koehler.
George N. Reeves, jr.
Virgil J. Dixon.
James B. Glennon.
Franklin Van Valkenburgh.
Vance D. Chapline.
Frank A. Braisted.
Raleigh C. Williams.
Thalbert N. Alford.
Eugene M. Woodson.
Wilbur J. Carver.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Carroll W. Hamill.
Lyman K. Swenson.
Thorvald A. Solberg.
Edward P. Sauer.
John H. Carson.
Robert B. Carney.
Arthur W. Radford.
William D. Thomas.
George F. Martin.
Bernard F. Jenkins.
Boyd R. Alexander.
Edwin S. Earnhardt.
John E. Williams.
Jesse L. Kenworthy, jr.
Webster M. Thompson.
Albert E. Schrader.
Louis R. Vail.
Paul S. Goen.
Harry V. Baugh.
Dennis L. Ryan.
Andrew D. Mayer.
Charles G. Halpine.
Charles T. Joy.
Walter W. Webb.
Nelson N. Gates.
Henry L. Phelps.
Arnold H. Bateman.
John E. Reinburg.
John A. Terhune.
Charles J. Wheeler.
Theodore T. Patterson.
George P. Brewster.
Samuel P. Ginder.
Henry B. Broadfoot.
Adolph J. Merkt.
Van H. Ragsdale.
John Wilkes.
Robert J. Walker.
Robert B. Twining.
Homer L. Grosskopf.
William P. Bacon.
Wilbur W. Feineman.
Bruce P. Flood.
Oscar W. Erickson.
Fred D. Kirtland.
James M. Steele.
Arthur D. Burhans.
Thomas D. Warner.
Paul W. Rutledge.
T. DeWitt Carr.
Charles P. Cecil.
Calvin T. Durgin.
Humbert W. Ziroli.
James A. Scott.
William E. Miller.
George F. Chapline.
William J. Forrestel.
John S. Roberts.
John D. Price.
James B. Ryan.
Sidney W. Kirtland.
Richard E. Webb.
Edwin F. Cochrane.
Thomas V. Cooper.
Roy K. Jones.
Martin B. Stonestreet.
Heman J. Redfield.
Lowell Cooper.
Andrew C. McFall.
Herbert S. Jones.
Herbert J. Grassie.
Isaiah Parker.
James K. Davis.
George D. Price.
Cassin Young.
Carlyle Craig.
Knefler McGinnis.
James P. Compton.
Fred W. Connor.
Dallas Wait.
John E. Ostrander, jr.
Linton Herndon.
Houston L. Maples.
Randall E. Dees.
Colin Campbell.
Paul W. F. Huschke.
Frank G. Fahrion.
Albert G. Noble.
Ingolf N. Kiland.
Frank H. Dean.
Edward A. Mitchell.
Harold S. Klein.
Alexander D. Douglas.
Lawrence Wainwright.
Donald B. Duncan.
Earle E. Muschlitz.
Robert B. Dashiell.
John O'D. Richmond.
Simon P. Fullinwider, jr.
William P. O. Clarke.
George T. Howard.
Andrew G. Shepard.
Lisle F. Small.
Nicholas Vytlacil.
Robert G. Tobin.
Theodore M. Waldschmidt.
Carl F. Holden.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Rowland D. Hill, jr.
Amariah B. Cartwright.
William J. Medusky.
Glenn F. DeGrave.
Frederick H. Ottaway.
William G. Buch.
Herbert V. Perron.
John E. Pixton.
Ralph B. Hunt.
William B. Jackson, jr.
Kinloch N. Gardner.
Harry A. Guthrie.
William S. G. Davis.
Sydney S. Bunting.
Arnold E. True.
Grover B. H. Hall.
Linfield L. Hunt.
Sterling T. Cloughley.
Wayne A. McDowell.
William B. McHugh.
Rodger W. Simpson.
Frederick D. Kime.
Roy M. Signer.
Harry A. Brandenburger.
Rufus G. Thayer.
John G. Burrow.
William F. Ramsey.
Donald R. Tallman.
Eugene P. Sherman.
Benjamin L. Hailey.
Gerald D. Linke.
Malcolm E. Selby.
William F. Fitzgerald, jr.
Thomas J. Kelly.
Bruce Settle.
James C. Pollock.
John J. Curley.
Harold W. Eaton.
Harold E. McCarthy.
Morton C. Hutchinson, jr.
Paul E. Roswall.
William W. Juvenal.
Wilson D. Leggett, jr.
Delamer L. Jones.
William G. Lalor.
William W. Cone.
Elmon B. Guernsey.
John P. Womble, jr.
Bryan C. Harper.
Ralph O. Myers.
Samuel W. Du Bois.
Paul E. Howard.
George S. Young.
Thomas F. Darden, jr.
Ralph R. Stogsdall, jr.
Alexander S. Edward.
Paul J. Register.
Joseph C. Hubbard.
DeLong Mills.
Forrest H. Wells.
William L. Drybread.
Dashiell L. Madeire.
Silas B. Moore.
Nicholas B. Van Bergen.
Joe E. Rucker.
George D. Martin.

Boynton L. Braun.
Everett E. Pettee.
Walter S. Dufton.
Carl H. Sanders.
Paul E. Howell.
Fort H. Callahan.
Herbert W. Taylor, jr.
Carl S. Drischler.
Charles F. M. S. Quinby.
Walter R. Jones.
Parke G. Young.
Elmer A. Tarbutton.
William G. Fewel.
John H. Willis.
Byron H. Hanlon.
Carl H. Bushnell.
William E. Makosky.
Laurence A. Abercrombie.
Harry L. Bixby.
Irving D. Wiltsie.
Elwood D. Poole.
Frank R. Talbot.
Joseph C. Cronin.
Wyatt Craig.
Keith R. Belch.
William G. Forbes.
Walfrid Myquist.
Rogers S. Ransehousen.
George D. Lyon.
Herbert A. Tellman.
Charles O. Glisson.
Everard M. Heim.
Edmund Kirby-Smith, jr.
James S. Freeman.
George C. Miller.
Stephen B. Cooke.
William V. Hamilton.
George H. Lyttle.
Dewey G. Porter.
Wakeman B. Thorp.
Charles W. Gray, jr.
Charles W. Roland.
George C. Crawford.
Robert W. Berry.
Lorenzo S. Sabin, jr.
William S. Price.
Joseph A. Connolly.
August J. Detzer, jr.
William R. Cooke, jr.
Donald T. Giles.
Charles H. Judson.
Donald F. Smith.
Charles F. Macklin, jr.
Campbell D. Emory.
Ralston B. Vanzant.
Jasper T. Acuff.
Francis J. Firth.
Hugh Peters.
Arthur H. McCollum.
Lawrence E. Divoll.
Lawrence C. Grannis.
John F. Madden.
Bernard J. Skahill.
Louis G. McGlone.
Melville E. Eaton.
Edmund C. Mahoney.
Angus M. Cohan.
Geoffrey E. Sage.
Harold A. Carlisle.
Delwyn Hyatt.
Herman Barter.
Clarence E. Aldrich.
Charles F. Greber.
George L. Russell.
John S. Crenshaw.
Lawrence F. Connolly.
Walter B. Pendleton.
Leo B. Farrell.
Charles J. Marshall.

Walter S. Keller.
William C. Gray.
Peter M. Money.
Frederick I. Entwistle.
Walter F. Weidner.
Burtnett K. Culver.
Lamar M. Wise.
John J. Lenhart.
Clinton A. Misson.
John A. Upshur.
Thomas L. Lewis.
Justin H. Dickins.
Thomas A. Parfitt.
William D. Johnson, jr.
Joseph R. Barbaro.
John W. Rice.
Walter G. Schindler.
William A. Griswold.
Howard N. Coulter.
George G. Herring, jr.
Edward P. Moore.
Morris J. Westfall.
Donald L. Erwin.
Marion C. Thompson.
Elmer P. Abernethy.
Edward C. Ewen.
Eugene B. Oliver.
John E. Rezner.
Ernest H. Webb.
Ward C. Gilbert.
Edward I. McQuiston.
Frederick S. Steinbauer.
Robert E. Canty.
Thomas M. Dell, jr.
Casper H. Hicks.
Julius A. McNamar.
Joel Newsom.
Apollo Soucek.
Ralph E. Hanson.
Thomas Lee McCann.
Willard R. Gaines.
Leslie K. Pollard.
Charles R. Lamdin.
Charles S. Alexander.
Horace L. De Rivera.
Philip G. Nichols.
Alex M. Loker.
Robert E. Jasperson.
Walter J. Lee.
Daniel A. Frost.
James V. Carney.
Joseph M. Began.
Wiley N. Hand.
William D. Hoover.
Edwin M. Crouch.
John M. Campbell, jr.
Oral R. Swigart.
Walter P. Ramsey, jr.
Buell F. Brandt.
Lester R. Reiter.
Robert G. Willis.
Harold A. Houser.
Leo J. McGowan.
Julius L. Thompson.
John P. Heath.
Francis J. Bridget.
Robert F. Hickey.
Theodore R. Wirth.
James A. Roberts, jr.
James H. McWilliams.
Charles R. Brown.
Lowden Jessup, jr.
Myron E. Thomas.
Jennings Courts.
John M. Hoskins.
Joseph P. Rockwell.
Lionel L. Rowe.
Floyd F. Ferris.

TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Carlisle H. Thompson.
Farrington, L. Barr.
Frederick Moosbrugger.
Samuel P. Comly, jr.
Matthew L. Kelly.

Irvin T. Duke.
Truman J. Hedding.
Chester C. Wood.
Clarence E. Ekstrom.
William G. Fisher.

John A. Hayes.
Edmund A. Cunningham.
Rufus E. Rose, jr.
Orville F. Gregor.
Lee R. Herring.
Charles W. Wilkins.
Eugene C. Rook.
Robert L. Campbell, jr.
Claude B. Reese.
William N. Mansfield.
George C. Towner.
William A. Hickey.
Ralph E. Wilson.
Louis W. Nuesse.
Thomas H. Dyer.
Merle A. Sawyer.
Leo A. Bachman.
William M. Cole.
William F. Simmons.
Clifford A. Fines.
Edward W. Rawlins.
James W. Smith.
Elmer E. Yeomans.
Edward F. Crowe.
Elmer E. Berthold.
William G. Michelet.
Francis J. Grandfield.
Wallace M. Beakley.
Hallsted L. Hopping.
Maurice M. Bradley.
Joseph H. Garvin.
Lester K. Rice.
Stephen G. Barchet.
William P. Tammany.
Shirley Y. Cutler.
William C. France.
Rae E. Arison.
Bob O. Mathews.
Ephraim R. McLean, jr.
Walter V. R. Vieweg.
Richard F. Stout.
Willford M. Hyman.
Bernard L. Austin.
Joseph M. P. Wright.
Albert Handly.
Norman W. Ellis.
John T. Shannon.
Joseph E. Wolowsky.
James R. Pahl.
Paul K. Bryant.
William J. Longfellow.
George W. Patterson, jr.
Donald B. Bennett.
Joseph A. Callaghan.
James D. Lovejoy.
Howard L. Collins.
James S. Laidlaw.
Adrian M. Hurst.
John W. C. Brand.
William V. Davis, jr.
John N. Opie, 3d.
Ezra M. Ellis.
Aurelius B. Vosseller.
William J. Mitchell.
John R. Ruhsenberger.
John F. Addoms.
Gordon M. Stoddard.
Harold H. Tiemroth.
Marcel E. A. Gouin.
Emory W. Stephens.
Donald F. McLean.
Howell C. Fish.
Alfred J. Bolton.
John M. Kennaday.
Philip M. Boltz.
Thomas H. Templeton.
Edwin R. Wilkinson.
Roger E. Perry.
Sumner K. MacLean.
William D. Brown.
Paul Graf.
Warren D. Wilkin.
Forrest R. Bunker.
Virginius R. Roane.
William B. Bailey.
Henry C. Daniel.

Sherman E. Burroughs, jr.
Jere D. Hyde.
Joseph P. Thew.
John P. Cromwell.
Daniel J. McCallum.
Herrmann G. Page.
Forrest Close.
Herbert R. Ballinger.
Frank W. MacDonald.
Hammond J. Dugan.
Herman Sall.
Charles A. Legg.
Herbert K. Gates.
Solomon F. Oden.
Thomas J. Kirkland, jr.
Myron S. Teller.
Tillman T. Dantzler.
Robert O. Minter.
Crutchfield Adair.
Bertrand D. Quinn.
Stephen R. Bedford.
George W. Evans, jr.
John D. Hayes.
Max Schreiner.
Harold P. Smith.
Arthur W. Bass.
Wayne N. Gamet.
Everett W. Abdill.
Paul L. F. Weaver.
Willis E. Cleaves.
Theodore J. Shultz.
Edwin T. Layton.
Roger D. Phillips.
Thomas A. Turner, jr.
Robert C. Sutliff.
Adolph H. Oswald.
Frederick R. Furth.
Robert L. Swart.
Frank C. Layne.
Eugene C. Burchett.
George W. Stott.
Thomas A. Huckins.
George A. Sinclair.
Dale Harris.
Kenneth Earl.
James B. Ricketts.
John A. Marsh.
LeRoi B. Blaylock.
Samuel E. Latimer.
Harold B. Miller.
Austen V. Magly.
Robert G. Lockhart.
Thomas C. Ragan.
Preston V. Mercer.
Robert Goldthwaite.
Jose M. Cabanillas.
Carl E. Cullen.
Audley L. Warburton.
Colby G. Rucker.
Jack B. Williams.
James R. Dancy.
Robert S. Carr.
Warren W. Harvey.
Harold R. Demarest.
Francis M. Hook.
William W. Weeden, jr.
Samuel M. Bailey.
Elton C. Parker.
Roy D. Williams.
Ethelbert Watts.
Lawrence J. McPeake.
William H. Duvall.
Howell Armor.
John C. Harris.
Minor C. Heine.
Donald J. Ramsey.
Henry E. Richter.
Frank E. Deam.
Richard J. Bourke, jr.
Leon W. Johnson.
Charles H. Callaway.
Howard V. Hopkins.
Herbert P. Sheldon.
Neill Phillips.
Harry Burris.
Richard C. Webb, jr.

Walter M. Graesser.
Joseph S. Lillard.
Arthur D. Barnes.
John A. Holbrook.
William B. Thompson.
Richard S. Moss.
William R. McCaleb.
Archibald G. W. McFadden.
Joseph I. Taylor, jr.
Harrison B. Southworth.
George C. Montgomery.
Joseph F. Johnson.
Thomas E. Fraser.
Thomas S. Cameron.
Russell J. Bellerby.
Charles W. Oexle.
Edwin J. Taylor, jr.
Dewey H. Collins.
Wallis F. Petersen.
Frank H. Ball.
William A. Evans, jr.
George M. Brydon, jr.
Frank R. Davis.
Charles E. McDonald.
William S. Hays.
Max C. Storms.
Richard F. Johnson, jr.
Charles B. Cross, jr.
Dennis L. Francis.
John S. Holtzclaw.
Henry W. Goodall.
Louis B. Edwards.
Charles A. Ferriter.
Harry B. Temple.
William L. Erdmann.
Clyde J. Nesser.
Wilfred E. Lankenau.
John M. Sweeney.
John C. Waldron.
Frederick J. Ilsemann.
Arthur M. Townsend.
Raymond R. Waller.
George Edmund Peterson.
Richard S. Baron.
Cameron M. Winslow, jr.
Elijah W. Irish.
Burton L. Doggett.
Ralph T. McDaniel.
Charles C. McDonald.
Robert E. Sayre.
Arnold R. Kline.
William V. Deutermann.
Leslie H. Hawkinson.
Lloyd H. Thomas.
Edgar T. Neale.
Ted C. Marshall.
Ira H. Nunn.
Louis Roedel.
Erskine A. Seay.
Joseph W. Fowler.
John K. Hyatt.
John H. Morrill.
James H. McIntosh.
Elliott W. Shanklin.
Albert N. Perkins.
Hugh B. McLean.
John E. Spahn.
Chester E. Carroll.
Rufus C. Young, jr.
Louis H. Gwinn.
Edgar L. Witmer.
John B. Rooney.
Frederick J. Bell.
Hampton M. Ericsson.
Harrell W. Hall.
Brainerd N. Bock.
Lewis E. Coley.
John C. Daniel.
Joseph J. Woodward.
Joseph W. Adams, jr.
Henry T. Read.
Robert S. Bertschy.
Thomas J. Ball.
Hugh J. Martin.
George C. King.
Clarence L. Winecoff.
Charles J. Stuart.
Joseph A. Farrell, jr.
Arthur B. Leverett.
Stockton B. Colt, jr.
Bernard T. Zelenka.
Bromfield B. Nichol.
Walter C. Dey.
Eugene T. Seaward.
John T. Warren.
Joshua C. Shively.
Fitzhugh L. Rhea.
Francis H. Gardner.
John F. Cooke.
James C. Landstreet.
Edward F. Gallagher.
Joseph M. Worthington.
Ralph V. Baldwin.
Elliott M. Moore.
Arthur B. Dickie.
Sidney King.
Robley W. Clark.
Burnice L. Rutt.
Charles L. Lee.
Robert H. G. Johnson.
George Edward Peterson.
Noble W. Abrahams.
Robert W. Larson.
William A. Kanakanui.
Arthur C. Wood.
Theodoric C. Linthicum.
James F. McDonough.
Ralph E. Mills.

TO BE ENSIGNS

Ferol D. Overfelt.
Philip W. Snyder.
Walter H. Albach.
Robert A. Hinners.
Allan L. Dunning.
Herbert J. Pfingstag.
John W. Bays.
Herbert M. Neuhaus.
Herbert C. Zitzewitz.
Robert D. Conrad.
Joseph F. Jelley, jr.
Thomas L. Davey.
Lawrence R. Daspit.
Samuel H. Crittenden, jr.
Kenneth A. Knowles.
Richard Wagner.
Paul D. Miles.
Leonard S. Mewhinney.
Warner R. Edsall.
Clifford S. Cooper.
William P. Chilton.
William M. Nation.
William H. Organ.
William T. McGarry.
Selman S. Bowling.
Earl B. Patterson.
Cornelius S. Seabring.
Edwin R. Van Sickle.
William C. Bryson.
Wallace B. Mechling.
Henry H. Caldwell.
Ernest W. Lamons.
Cecil T. Caufield.
Joseph R. Hamley.
Joseph S. Detwiler.
Charles M. Tooke.
Melvyn H. McCoy.
James H. Hogg.
Paul H. Ramsey.
Henry T. Koonce.
George W. Anderson, jr.
Warren F. Graf.
John E. Faigle.
Albert B. Scoles.
David W. Tolson.
Jack S. Holtwick, jr.
Harold F. Traua.
Eliot Olsen.
Wesley H. Randig.
John C. Bernet.
John W. Slayden.
Welton D. Rowley.
Shirley S. Miller.
Francis C. Manville.
Allen M. Zollars.
James V. Rigby.
James E. Cohn.
Jacob C. Schwab.
Richard H. Phillips.
Joseph N. Murphy.
John C. Broach.
Leroy V. Honsinger.
Charles M. Heberton.
Archibald D. Hunter.
David B. Overfield.
Charles E. Clutts.
Hunt V. Martin.
Alan B. Sutherland, jr.
Harold S. Harnly.
Ralph Hickox.
Arthur E. Loeser.
William H. Leahy.
Robert H. Rice.
James A. Lucier.
Van Leo Wanselow.
Bloomfield M. Cornell.
Harlan M. Thorpe.
James F. Benson.
John B. Smyth.
Charles C. Pyne.
Carl F. Stillman.
Benjamin E. Moore, jr.
Leonard C. Chamberlin.
Delbert F. Williamson.
George B. Tuggle.
Harold L. Tallman.
James A. Haley, jr.
Thomas J. Hamilton.
Henry B. Stanley.
Frederick L. Litty, jr.
Halle C. Allan, jr.
Frederic A. Berry, jr.
Theodore C. Fauntz.
Loren A. Morris.
Earl K. Swearingen.
Carl J. Pfingstag.
Harry J. Ward.
David B. Young.
Roger F. Scott.
Frederick Funke, jr.
Herbert F. Eckberg.
William C. Specht.
Frederic F. Agens.
Carl W. Flesher.
James A. Jordan.
John W. White.
Miles H. Hubbard.
George L. Heath.
John C. Zahm.
Harry R. Horney.
Robert C. Winters.
Daniel T. Eddy.
Charles D. Griffin.
Rawson Bennett, 2d.
Sylvius Gazze.
Thomas L. Mayo.
Howard W. Taylor.
Eldon C. Mayer.
James J. McKinstry.
Harold M. Briggs.
Perry K. Jeanes.
Seymour A. Johnson.
Carl R. Midtlyng.
Wellington A. Hammond.
Lester J. Geiger.
Hubert G. Wall.
Martin P. Hottel.
Fritz Gleim, jr.
Andrew H. Bergeson.
Raymond J. Moore.
Jere H. Stofflet.
Robert C. Brixner.
Otis C. Gregg.
Christian H. Duborg.
James R. McCormick.
Lannie Conn.
Paul W. Card.
Clifford L. Wickman.
Jack F. Bowling, jr.
William R. Sands, jr.
William E. Ferrall.
Martin J. Lawrence.
Samuel G. Mitchell.
Jack Maginnis.
Edward H. Eckelmeyer, jr.
Edward M. Condra, jr.
Brooke Schumm.
Carroll F. Johnson.
John W. Malley.
Jack H. Lewis.
Richard W. Smith.
George K. Fraser.
Carl L. Steiner.
Hilfort C. Owen.
Kenton E. Price.
Arthur S. Born.
Allen Smith.
Thomas B. Klakring.
William Loveland.
Alexander M. Kowalzyk, jr.
John L. Ewing, jr.
Timothy F. Donohue.
James M. Roberts.
Alden D. Schwarz.
James G. Holloway, jr.
Jesse Blackwell.
Vernon Dortch.
Robert S. Quackenbush, jr.
Edmund T. Napier, jr.
Walter H. Price.
Marin R. Stone.
Daniel J. Weintraub.
George B. Gilbertson.
Robert L. Densford.
Leland R. Lampman.
Jack P. Monroe.
Herbert L. Hoerner.
Edward K. Shanahan.
Noble W. Lowrie.
Charles P. Hill, jr.
Lee W. Parke.
Harry F. Bauer.
John F. Henkel.
Harry E. Day.
Argyll E. Buckley.
Gill M. Richardson.
Joseph T. Hazen.
Leon J. Barbot.
Charles B. Beasley.
John T. Corwin.
Clayton R. Dudley.
Edward N. Teall, jr.
Joseph W. Kern.
Richard D. Zern.
John L. De Tar.
John A. Edwards.
Leonard W. Bailey.
Robert B. Alderman.
Myron T. Evans.
Thomas L. Greene.
Charles J. Zondorak.
William L. Knickerbocker.
James A. Prichard.
Tyrrell D. Jacobs.
James L. Shank.
Emmanuel T. Goyette.
George B. Coale.
John F. Hines, jr.
Howard W. Gordon, jr.
Paul R. Drouilhet.
Peter K. Wells.
Eugene E. Davis.
Creed C. Burlingame.
Robert H. Speck.
Arthur K. Ehle.
Henry R. Dozier.

James W. Blanchard.
William Y. C. Humes, jr.
Philip C. Olin.
Arthur C. W. Baskin.
George L. Hansen.
Richard B. Levin.
Frank Turner.
Ulysses S. G. Sharp, jr.
Robert A. Johnson.
Eugene E. Lindsey.
Philip A. Tague, jr.
Roy Scott.
Leo W. Nilon.
Robie E. Palmer.
Wayne T. Stukey.
George M. B. Smith.
Monro M. Riker.
James S. Willis.
Louis P. Fairlamb.
Abram H. Afong, jr.
Robert Brodie, jr.
Frederic S. Habecker.
Robert F. Martin.
Wm. T. Romizer.
Farar B. C. Martin.
Randolph B. Boyer.
John T. Dimon.
Paul L. High.
Gregory A. Ladd.
Hysell P. Cooper.
Philip S. Griffith.
Howell J. Dyson.
John W. Schmidt.
Robert M. Barnes.
Harold T. Deutermann.
Harold P. Richards.
Charles L. Melson.
Edwin W. Herron.
Thomas O. Oberrender, jr.
Harold A. Henry.
Wendell G. Osborn.
Arnold W. McKechnie.
Howard C. Adams.
Ross R. Kellerman.
Harold M. Zemmer.
Paul S. Depew.
Robert I. F. Fravel.
Hugh A. R. Keiran.
Theodore O. Dahl.
Liles W. Creighton.
David C. White.
Harry R. England.
Lawrence M. Jensen.
Gerald R. Dyson.
Joe W. Boulware.
Emmett J. Sullivan.
Charles K. Bergin.
Robert E. Dixon.
Richard C. Collins.
Edward S. Addison.
George G. Mead.
George D. Sullivan.
John C. Woelfel.
Willard A. Saunders.
Blinn Van Mater.
Loring O. Shook.
Theodore S. Dukeshire.
Tom C. King.
George D. Dickey.
Wm. F. Royall.
Thomas B. Neblett.
Newlin Neuhauser.
Thomas M. Dykers.
Lewis J. Sheaffer.
Arthur G. Bruner.
Floyd C. Camp.
William H. Ashford, jr.
Mitchell D. Matthews.
Clarence E. Coffin, jr.
Frank Bruner.
Frederick C. Marggraff, jr.
Eugene B. McKinney.
Thomas J. Flynn.
Harold R. Sheehan.
Alfred R. Truslow, jr.
Selden G. Hooper.
Walter C. Winn.
William C. Jennings.
Frank T. Corbin.
Milton A. Nation.
John M. Madison.
John Eldridge, jr.
Edmund E. Garcia.
Harry H. McIlhenny.
Albert R. Heckey.
Edwin B. Robinson.
James W. Lucas, jr.
Lucius H. Chappell, jr.
John E. Fitzgibbon.
Levi J. Knight, jr.
Joseph J. Carey.
Wayne R. Loud.
Louis T. Malone.
John R. Waterman.
Eugene F. McDaniel.
Louis H. Hunte.
Courtney Shands.
Monroe B. Duffill.
George Knuepfer.
Stanley E. Judson.
Herbert D. Riley.
Charles K. Hewins.
Jules F. Schumacher.
Gordon S. Ashley.
Chesley M. Hardison.
Morton S. Cressy, jr.
Thomas H. Massie.
David J. Walsh.
Leonard B. Southerland.
Theodore G. Schirmeyer.
Frank Virden.
William R. D. Nickelson, jr.
Myron W. Graybill.
Emile R. Winterhaler.
Francis S. Kirk.
Robert J. Foley.
Ernest Blake.
William H. Cuzner.
Harry L. Hicks.
David B. Coleman.
Henry J. Armstrong, jr.
Maurice E. Goudge.
Charles L. Freeman.
Peery L. Stinson.
Frank M. Hammitt.
William S. Harris.
Carl M. Dalton.
Edward P. Hagan.
Robert T. Symes.
Claren E. Duke.
William H. Potts.
William H. Brockman, jr.
Edward D. Lindell.
Roland F. Pryce.
Henry T. Jarrell.
Eugene L. Lugibihl.
Edwin K. Ponvert.
Robert V. Hull.
Adoniram J. Hill.
Dick R. Downer.
Edward J. Drew.
Robert K. Brown.
Francis W. McCann.
Arthur D. Marks.
Julian D. Greer.
Albert E. Fitzwilliam.
Nathaniel T. Roberts.
Ernest J. Sabol.
Marshall L. Smith.
William R. Caruthers.
Joseph B. Danhoff.
Joe Taylor.
Joseph A. Corwin.
Spalding Trafton, jr.
Cyrus T. Clendening.
Renwick S. Calderhead.
Philip H. Ross.
Lee F. Keys.
John G. McClaughry.
Philip B. Tankard.
Bosquet N. Wev.
William R. Ignatius.
Howard A. Yeager.
James W. Hager.
Arthur H. Taylor.
Charles J. Skelly.
William E. Kaitner.
Bernard M. Gates.
Howard E. Purdy.
George A. Lewis.
Leonidas W. Pancoast.
Doyle G. Donaho.
Alan R. Montgomery.
William A. Deam.
Alvin Robinson.
William E. Balfrey.
Harry J. Hardwick.
Malen Durski.
Harry M. Denty.
Joshua W. Cooper.
Francis E. Cromwell.
Michael P. Russillo.
John Bailey.
Granville A. Moore.
Gus B. Lofberg, jr.
Clinton S. Rounds.
Robert B. Morgan, jr.
Joseph B. Maher.
Robert N. Downes.
Edward P. Southwick.
Richard E. Fenton.
Gordon S. Everett.
Veryl F. Frye.
John C. Atkeson.
Byron C. Gwinn.
Elmer G. Cooper.
James J. McRoberts.
John E. Clark.
Marion M. Byrd.
Ray A. Mitchell.
Harry D. Hale.
Harry R. Hummer, jr.
Jack O. Wheat.
Oddle W. Anderson.
William A. Sutherland, jr.
Thomas C. Green.
John O. R. Coll.
John S. Thach.
Francis R. Jones.
Henry M. Marshall.
John A. Milburn.
Lester B. Mye.
Joseph A. Flynn.
Milton T. Dayton.
Julius F. Way.
James K. Averill.
Curtis A. Myers.
Albert B. Mayfield, jr.
George A. Lange.
Albert J. Devany.
Clarence E. Cortner.
Glenn W. Legwen, jr.
William O. Burch, jr.
Glynn R. Donaho.
Oscar W. Pate, jr.
Alston Ramsay.
Reamor E. De La Barre.
Paul D. Gross.
Oscar H. Dodson.
Raymond L. Harrell.
George L. Jones, jr.
John T. Brown, jr.
James P. Walker.
Edward R. Johnson.
Theodore R. Stansbury.
John W. Chittenden.
Henry F. Gorski.
Charles J. Starkus.
Charles E. Harrison.
Paul F. Johnston.
Robert A. Allen.
Andrew B. Buttrey.
Arthur F. Anders.
Ethan W. Allen.
Donald C. Burt.
Francis C. B. McCune.
Sam Pickering.
John S. Tracy.
George B. H. Stallings.
William D. Irvin.
Roscoe D. Hughes.
Fred J. Leatherman.
Gardner K. Grout, 2d.
Daniel W. Latimore.
Charles W. Parker.
Alex McL. Patterson.
Clarence E. Boyd.
David W. Shafer.
Patrick Henry, jr.
Claude L. Weigle.
Gordon L. Caswell.
Robert E. Braddy, jr.
William W. Outerbridge.
Charles J. Hardesty, jr.
Elmer C. Powell.
William M. Gullett.
John H. Cross.
Richard P. Wilkinson, jr.
Richard E. Myers.
Wilton S. Heald.
Jimmie R. Simpson.
Robert S. Ford.
John J. Branson.
Walton B. Hinds.
Calvin E. Wakeman.
George W. Willcox.
Joseph D. McKinney.
Joseph R. Rubins.
Herbert T. Tortorich.
Frank D. Giambattista.
Thurston B. Clark.
Samuel H. Griffin, jr.
Albert S. Carter.
Winston I. Quattlebaum.
John William Murphy.
Elmer O. Davis.
William S. Maxwell.

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS

William Seaman.
James S. Woodward.
Samuel S. Rodman.
John B. Mears.
Thomas W. Raison.
Curtis B. Munger.
Ausey H. Robnett.
James M. Minter.
Edward U. Reed.
Reynolds Hayden.

TO BE MEDICAL INSPECTORS

Sankey Bacon.
George A. Riker.
Harry E. Jenkins.
John F. Riordan.
Walter C. Espach.

TO BE SURGEONS

George D. Thompson.
Albert G. Wenzell.
Norman Roberts.
Edward L. McDermott.
Wendell P. Blake.
Roger D. Mackey.
Paul P. Maher.
Carl J. Robertson.
Warren E. Bradbury.
Eustace H. Prescott.
Lea B. Sartin.
Maurice S. Mathis.
James B. Moloney.
Charles P. Archambeault.

William W. Hall.
Herbet L. Barbour.
Rex H. White.
Jesse W. Smith.
Francis P. Gardner.
James E. Andrews.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Caldwell J. Stuart.
Herbert L. Pugh.
Bruce M. Summers.
Oliver A. Smith.
Edward P. Kunkel.
Peter C. Supan.
Edward M. Harris, jr.
Walter L. Bach.
Herman Seal.
Winfred P. Dana.
Robert M. Gillett.
George F. Cooper.
John M. Bachulus.
Harry D. Templeton.
Charlie H. Allman.
William E. Pinner.
Dwight J. Wharton.
Oliver R. Nees.
Harvey E. Robins.
Carl D. Middlestadt.
Charles H. Bitner.
Charles C. Yanquell.
Joseph I. Porter.
Henry M. Weber.
John R. Smith.
Thomas F. Cooper.
George C. Thomas.
Leonard L. Wilson.
Thomas H. Hayes.
Everett H. Dickinson.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Carl H. McMillan.
James H. Wall.
William A. DeMonbreun.
George H. Fondé, jr.
Clarence C. Myers.
Irwin L. Norman.
Charles S. Paddock.
Irby B. Ballenger.
Emmett D. Hightower.
William H. Algie.
Harold G. Young.
Wendell H. Musselman.
Hubert H. Carroll.
Ernest D. Davis, jr.
Harry H. Haight.
Courtney G. Clegg.
William J. Hogue.
Leslie K. MacClatchie.
David J. Cracovaner.
Joseph E. Evans.
Paul E. RePass.
Jesse W. Miller.
John L. Enyart.
John H. Korb.
Leland J. Belding.
Claude R. Ball.
Robert S. Simpson.
Norman A. Ross.
Cecil C. Welch.
Julian Love.
Roy R. Kracke.
Carl K. Youngkin.
Adolph P. von Hungen.
William E. Carskadon.
Germain J. Cotta.
Rupert H. Draeger.
Douglas T. Prehn.
Charles E. Fitzgerald.
Charles J. Cooney.
Frederick C. Meyers.
Oscar W. Thoeny.
Robert C. Luckey.
James T. Parker.
Herbert C. Walker.
Joseph G. Schnebly.
Cly H. Hatcher.
Jay F. Miller.
Gordon B. Tayloe.
John B. Clark.
Henry C. Wass.
Dirk M. te Groen.
Ransome O. Jackson.
Clyde L. Bozarth.
Jesse G. Wright.
Charles W. Shilling.
Farra L. Read.
Clark W. Virtue.
Charles W. Stelle.
Bernhardt I. Wulff.
Fred H. Hartshorn.
Albert J. Kelley.
Thomas J. Carter.
Henry T. Cox.
Marion J. Eaton.
William E. Walsh.
DeCoy Marchand.
Otto W. Wickstrom.
John P. Wood.
Clifford W. Moore.
John F. Moore.
Joseph S. Green.

TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS

Ernest W. Lacy.
Lucien C. Williams.
Paul G. White.
John J. Haas.
Howard C. Wickham.
Edward B. Howell.
Adolphus R. Gleitsman.
Clarence E. Garcia.
Francis G. Ulen.
Daniel A. Doherty.
Allen H. Hetler.
Francis J. Long.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Joseph Connolly.
Francis R. Hittinger.
Robert R. Crees.
Jesse W. Miller, jr.
Ralph B. Putnam.
Frank A. Richison.
Alfred R. Harris.
Virgil H. Traxler.
Wadsworth C. C. Trojakowski.
George H. Rice.
Sidney P. Vail.
Theodore DeW. Allan.
Francis W. Lepeska.
Otto V. Rogstad.
Otis A. Peterson.
Leon M. Billings.
John M. Thompson.

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Frank K. Sullivan.
Arthur Siegel.
Hector J. A. MacInnis.
Alfred Dinsmore.
Edward H. Delaney.
Louis D. Mitchell, jr.
James L. Frisby.
Robert P. Irons.
Edwin D. Foulk.
Edward O. Andersen.

TO BE PAY DIRECTORS

John D. Robnett.
Felix R. Holt.
Chester G. Mayo.
James F. Kutz.
Walter D. Sharp.
William G. Neill.
Roland W. Schumann.
Dallas B. Wainwright, jr.
George P. Shamer.
Frank Baldwin.
David G. McRitchie.
William H. Wilterdink.
John F. O'Mara.
Manning H. Philbrick.
Edward R. Wilson.
Everett G. Morsell.

TO BE PAY INSPECTORS

Thomas J. Bright.
Robert K. Van Mater.
Major C. Shirley.
Harold C. Gwynne.
Chauncey R. Murray.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS

William E. Tripp.
Nicholas J. Halpine.

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS

Frederic W. Hesser.
Kenneth R. Miller.
J. D. Parks.
Frederick L. Hetter.
Charles G. DeKay.
Donald B. Hilton.
Roland W. Rickertts.
Calvin B. White.
Louie L. Lindenmayer.

TO BE NAVAL CONSTRUCTORS

Roy W. Ryden.
Waldo P. Druley.
Joseph W. Paige.
James E. J. Kiernan.
James R. Allen.
Leslie C. Stevens.
William R. Nichols.
Richard McK. Rush.
Paul W. Hains.
Thomas P. Wynkoop.

TO BE ASSISTANT NAVAL CONSTRUCTORS

Armand M. Morgan.
Edward W. Clexton.
Wendell E. Kraft.
Robert S. Hatcher.
Edward V. Dockweiler.
John J. Scheibeler.

TO BE CIVIL ENGINEERS

Frank T. Chambers.
Clinton D. Thurber.

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS

William L. Richards.
Richard P. Carlson.
Walter T. Eckberg.
Wallace B. Short.
Harold MacT. Sylvester.

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Hubert George.
Russell L. Kaetzel.
Ivan E. Pitman.
David L. Ullman.
Robert H. Merryman.
George W. Meyer.

TO BE CHIEF GUNNERS

Francis J. Kaiss.
Arthur S. Fenton.
Antonio G. Aquatero.

TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Merion E. Hair.
Albert J. Petrasek.

TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

William H. Frost.
George W. Almour.

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

Anthony Iannucci.
Edward J. Sherry.
Meares B. Cartmell.
Virgil D. Duke.
Raymond G. Shively.
Harry F. Meachen.
Clarence J. P. Buckey.
Irvin J. Heckman.

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Cecil O. Hamrick.
William D. Wilkinson.
Elmer Stephenson.
James H. Parish.
Charles E. Coleman.
Charles C. Hiles.
Benn A. Fairchild.
Garret Boer.
Robert Nelson.
Leroy Alexander.
Harold R. Darling.
Ted B. Daly.
Raymond Ciesluk.
William D. Burroughs.
Irvin L. Ludlan.

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS

Ralph W. Plummer.
Robert G. Heiner.
Spencer L. Higgins.

TO BE MEDICAL INSPECTORS

Edwin L. Jones.
William H. Short.
Gordon D. Hale.
Lawrence M. Schmidt.
Chandler W. Smith.
Edward V. Valz.
Harry R. Hermesch.
Alexander B. Hayward.
Reginald B. Henry.
Walter A. Bloedorn.
George R. W. French.

TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frederick A. L. Dartsch.
Douglas T. Day, jr.
Richard G. Ganahl.
Henry C. Doan.

TO BE SURGEONS

Warwick T. Brown.
Max Silverman.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Robert K. Y. Dusinberre.
Lloyd R. Newhouser.
John R. Lynas.
Carl M. Dumbauld.

Frederic McK. Ingersoll to be passed assistant dental surgeon.
Charles A. Nicholson, 2d, to be naval constructor.
Charles H. Cushman to be naval constructor.
Henry F. Mulloy to be lieutenant (junior grade).
Joseph H. Lawson to be lieutenant commander.
Thomas C. Ritchie to be lieutenant (junior grade).

RETIRED LIST

Capt. Reginald R. Belknap to be a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE COLONELS

Presley M. Rixey, jr.
Theodore E. Backstrom.
William H. Pritchett.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Frederick A. Barker.
William T. Hoadley.
Emile P. Moses.
Harold F. Wirgman.

TO BE MAJORS

John B. Sebree.
Louis E. Fagan.
Allen H. Turnage.
Louis M. Bourne, jr.
Matthew H. Kingman.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Edward A. Fellowes.
Andrew L. W. Gordon.
Leland S. Swindler.
Howard N. Stent.
Donald Spicer.
Ford O. Rogers.
Walter G. Farrell.
William L. Harding jr.
John B. Neill, jr.
Ralph R. Robinson.
Walter E. Bilisoly.
John K. Martenstein.
Hamilton M. H. Fleming.
Frederick E. Stack.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Raymond P. Rutledge.
Samuel S. Jack.
Henry R. Paige.
Guy DeW. Chappell.
Joseph W. Earnshaw.
Walter L. J. Bayler.
Marion L. Dawson, jr.
Harold G. Newhart.
Frank M. June.
George H. Potter.
Earl S. Piper.
Robert A. Olson.
Francis M. McAlister.
Jack P. Juhan.
Harold D. Hansen.
Jesse S. Cook, jr.
Miles S. Newton.
Archie E. O'Neil.
Allen C. Koonce.
Alan Shapley.
Jefferson G. Dreyspring.
David F. O'Neill.
John C. Munn.
Jaime Sabater.
Richard P. Ross, jr.
Elmer G. Marks.
Mercade A. Cramer.
Roger T. Carleson.
John S. Letcher.
Frank H. Wirsig.
Frank G. Dailey.
William R. Williams.
Robert B. Luckey.

TO BE CHIEF MARINE GUNNER

James W. Lattin.

TO BE CHIEF QUARTERMASTER CLERKS

John Strong.
Holmes J. Smith.
Harry S. Young.

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERK

John W. Lytle.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Leonard D. Redfield, Benson.
Luther Cadwell, Holbrook.

ARKANSAS

Mary Brown, Alpena Pass.
Roy W. Stevens, Ashdown.
Bing Moody, Bald Knob.
Thomas T. West, Beebe.
Milton R. Stimson, Brinkley.
Kay S. Rolley, Crawfordville.
Redford G. Miles, Des Arc.
Edith M. Cook, De Valls Bluff.
Robert M. Deason, El Dorado.
Garland S. Russell, Green Forest.
William J. Rumsey, Hardy.
Oliver A. Hill, Hartford.
Charles L. Jones, Junction City.
George H. C. Palmer, McGehee.
Harry L. Shambarger, Mulberry.
Thomas A. Hunt, Murfreesboro.
Paul Smith, Nettleton.
Ned P. Atkin, Parkdale.
Frank Weldin, Piggott.
James H. Ward, Quitman.
Edwin S. Thompson, Springdale.
Nona E. Robertson, Thornton.
Stella I. Winn, Winslow.

CONNECTICUT

John W. Cook, Beacon Falls.
Henry G. Linsley, Branford.
Carl W. Brage, Darien.
Leontine M. Root, East Berlin.
Sarah L. Ruic, Farmington.
W. Burton Allen, Litchfield.
Ernest F. Brown, Manchester.
Courtland C. Potter, Mystic.
Walter E. Brown, Naugatuck.
William P. Leete, North Haven.
Cyrus I. Byington, Norwalk.
Casper K. Bailey, Norwich.
Fred R. Alford, Oakville.
William C. Bushnell, Plantsville.
William P. Stone, Salisbury.
Nelson E. Welch, Somers.
Walter B. Palmer, Sound Beach.
John P. McGrath, Southington.
Harry Muir, Thomaston.
William C. Saunders, Waterford.
John V. Abbott, Watertown.
Adele P. Brush, West Cornwall.

GEORGIA

Richard G. Mansfield, Bluffton.
Roxie B. Goza, Chamblee.
Alma Bustle, Coolidge.
Rufus H. Johnson, Hogansville.
James P. Pirkle, Hoschton.
Cicero F. Duffee, Jonesboro.
Charles R. Jones, Rossville.
Clarence G. Hardigree, Watkinsville.
Roger E. Fulcher, Waynesboro.

INDIANA

Neil D. McCallum, Batesville.
Helen P. Roetzel, Boonville.
William P. Hays, Burns City.
Lola E. Lippard, Clermont.
William Teutemacher, Dyer.
Charles G. Covert, Evansville.
Luther K. Abel, Fairland.
George F. Freeman, Franklin.
Clyde W. Ward, Gas City.
Olin M. Bagby, Greenwood.
Ruth I. Trapp, Grovertown.
Robert H. Bryson, Indianapolis.
John G. Martin, Lynn.
John A. Jones, Marion.
Lucille MaCurdy, Monon.
William H. Wright, Montezuma.
Charles E. Ballance, Oaktown.
Winbern H. Dillon, Pittsboro.
Charles O. Harper, Somerville.
Charles L. Grishaw, Tipton.

IOWA

Edward J. Kooreman, Alton.
Lucian C. Tilden, Ames.
Arthur L. Remley, Anamosa.
Eddy L. Newton, Anita.
Howard C. Walter, Arnolds Park.
Allen A. Mickelsen, Battle Creek.
Walter H. Herzog, Baxter.
George L. Beeler, Bellevue.
Elda Bendigkeit, Bennett.
John C. Erton, Blairsburg.
Lloyd Lock, Castana.
Sue G. Cross, Chelsea.

Omar H. Brooks, Cleghorn.
William M. Crosier, Coggon.
Orlean P. Riordan, Correctionville.
Frank M. Williams, Council Bluffs.
Ressie E. Scheib, Delmar.
Adam F. Deadrick, Dike.
Ralph R. Ray, Doon.
Howard C. Snyder, Earlville.
Arthur W. Moore, Eldon.
Madge Fell, Fremont.
William Molloy, Galva.
William L. McLaughlin, Glidden.
Marion G. McCreight, Greenfield.
Howard L. Nickerson, Grundy Center.
John C. Foster, Hedrick.
Alphonso T. Joder, Hudson.
Charles C. Shrader, Iowa City.
Charles W. Woodward, Kellogg.
Dora M. Schenken, Keystone.
Emma A. Gibbs, Klemme.
Maurice L. Curtis, Knoxville.
Edwin E. Starr, Lake Park.
Edward Thaves, Lakota.
James J. Pruitt, Larchwood.
Andrew F. Bittle, Lisbon.
Lambert H. Meier, Lowden.
Irven L. Donner, Malvern.
Gus E. Holmberg, Manning.
Hope C. Niemann, Marcus.
Harland J. Maurer, Mechanicsville.
Claude I. Patterson, Mediapolis.
William E. Males, Milo.
Anna A. Meek, Minburn.
George Guyan, Monticello.
Charles S. Rogers, Mount Pleasant.
William S. McKee, Muscatine.
Rose M. Ward, Neola.
Herbert E. Hadley, Nevada.
James M. Crawford, New London.
Roy H. Bailey, Newton.
Alexander J. Irwin, New Virginia.
Lanah A. Lawler, North English.
Carl A. Wissler, Oakdale.
Christopher C. Morris, Oakland.
John B. Balkeman, Orange City.
Joseph E. Crissinger, Oxford.
Louis F. Bousquet, Pella.
Maude E. Barkley, Pierson.
Edward Oldis, Preston.
Jo G. Milligan, Pulaski.
John S. Baxter, Red Oak.
Lloyd R. Hughes, Sac City.
Lucille Brouillette, Salix.
Walter E. Witten, Sloan.
Edward R. Bender, Spencer.
George W. Sisler, Stanwood.
John D. Herriott, Stuart.
Dwight C. Kessler, University Park.
Tabitha Yelsma, Ute.
Lennie L. Hoffman, Vail.
Layton E. Brown, Victor.
Clarence A. Knaack, Walcott.
Jessie E. D. Palmer, Walnut.
James A. Smiley, Winfield.

KANSAS

Frederick H. Dodd, Altoona.
William P. Ham, Atchison.
Ella M. Greason, Atwood.
Ernest E. Shannon, Barnes.
John G. Hyde, Beloit.
Jessie M. Arbogast, Belpre.
Horace C. Lathrap, Blue Rapids.
Arthur B. Fowler, Brookville.
James R. Galyon, Burden.
Linnihan M. Kelleher, Burlingame.
Claude W. Simpson, Cawker City.
Martin W. Sanderson, Cedar Vale.
Charles S. Nation, Chanute.
William C. Coates, Clyde.
Orville G. Hannum, Corning.
Elwood M. Jones, Council Grove.
Edward L. Kier, Courtland.
Harvey E. Yenser, Delphos.
Alfred N. Parrish, Dunlap.
Harry A. Osborn, Emporia.
Carl E. Meyer, Enterprise.
William L. Oliver, Erie.
Rebecca C. Minneman, Fairview.
Hiram L. Hyde, Geneseo.
Charles S. Goodrich, Goff.
Edward M. Brown, Greensburg.
Bessie M. Achenback, Hardtner.
Luella Meredith, Hill City.
Ferdinand Scharping, Hillsboro.
William T. Beck, Holton.
Alvey P. Spessard, Junction City.
Kirby L. Griffith, Kanopolis.
Elmer E. Brewster, Leavenworth.
Joseph C. Wolf, Macksville.
John O. Rodgers, Mankato.
Eben Carlsson, McPherson.
John B. Schwab, Morrowville.
Josiah Foltz, Newton.
Herman F. Kiesow, Osage City.
William M. McDannald, Peru.
Leslie Fitts, Reading.
Albert E. Kerns, St. Marys.
Ralph G. Johnson, Seneca.
Guy E. Woodhouse, jr., Sharon Springs.
Chester A. Freeman, Tonganoxie.
Viola E. Stauffer, Valley Center.
Orliff F. Falls, Valley Falls.
Carroll B. Kelley, Wakeeney.
Mary O. Detwiler, Wamego.
Charles E. Painter, Waverly.
Claude J. Wood, Wetmore.
William L. Holmes, White City.
Althea C. Curry, Winchester.
John F. Allen, Yates Center.
Zella M. Swope, Zenda.

KENTUCKY

James S. Trosper, Allais.
Andrew J. Boatwright, Beech Creek.
George D. Montfort, Campbellsburg.
Troy Arnett, Dunham.
Catherine E. Ransdell, Eminence.
Amos G. Bryant, Fleming.
Claude P. Freeman, Fulton.
Lula Hall, Gilbertsville.
George L. Jarboe, Glen Dean.
Mildred Ramage, Hickman.
Mary L. Easum, Jeffersontown.
Mike Staley, Lackey.
Mary O. Manby, La Grange.
Lillie M. Jackson, Lebanon.
York Hatfield, McVeigh.
Carl A. Reis, Mogg.
Willie M. Quillen, Neon.
Fred L. Sears, Nicholasville.
Ella M. Geddes, Pippapass.
Chester A. Combs, Vicco.
Byrd Wicker, Wayland.

MAINE

Everett E. Sinnett, Bailey Island.
William F. Holden, Bangor.
Everett E. Brown, Brooks.
Fred A. Pitts, Damariscotta.
Everett M. Vannah, East Boothbay.
Eugene L. Jewell, Fairfield.
Harry B. Brown, Farmington.
John E. Sargent, Fryeburg.
Stephen H. Ward, Kennebunk Port.
George D. Vose, Kingfield.
Charles E. Perry, Kittery Point.
Walter B. Stone, Lovell.
Mary G. Kennison, Madison.
Albert C. Bradbury, Newport.
Bernice E. Morse, North Jay.
Edith B. Holden, Oakfield.
Homer M. Orr, Old Town.
Louise R. Harding, Orono.
Alice C. Havener, Searsport.
Earle R. Clifford, South Paris.
Ernest C. Butterfield, Springfield.
George W. Tracy, Stockholm.
George H. Hopkins, Stockton Springs.

MICHIGAN

Jennie McMinn, Bessemer.

MISSOURI

James E. Roark, Anderson.
Thomas J. Bryant, Anglum.
William L. Shipp, Centerview.
Frank W. Dunn, Chaffee.
Walter B. Ashbaugh, Clarkton.
Alice I. Dixon, Creighton.
John J. Kennon, Doniphan.
Merton M. Meador, Exeter.
Florence E. Gilbert, Fillmore.
Robert G. Teague, Frankford.
Henry W. Schupp, Freemont.
Charles N. Williamson, Gentry.
Estella D. Seaton, Lathrop.
Virginia Young, Osage City.
John E. Bauer, Osborn.
Edwin G. Karstedt, Rosebud.
Alfred O. Lowman, Smithville.
Wyatt B. Little, Steele.
James R. Simmons, Stotts City.
Wallace Frederick, Stoutsville.
Annie N. Johnson, Winston.

MONTANA

Asa E. Armstrong, Browning.
Alfred Briscoe, Cascade.
Isaac L. Brooks, Culbertson.
William S. Carlson, Ekalaka.
Cass E. Parker, Fromberg.
Otto M. Christinson, Glasgow.
John R. Lloyd, Great Falls.
James R. Minugh, Harlem.
Frederick B. Gillette, Hinsdale.
Queenie B. Lyndes, Hysham.
Harry Kennedy, Rosebud.
William L. Marsh, Roy.
Jennie Bywaters, Sandcoulee.
Army B. Cowee, Wibaux.

NEBRASKA

William H. Bogard, Avoca.
Robert Pease, Beatrice.
Hazel Babbitt, Belgrade.
W. Ross Pedley, Bertrand.
Mary L. Simmons, Bloomfield.
Dolph L. Houser, Campbell.
Arthur C. Smith, Carleton.
Gus Johnson, Ceresco.
Ethel Talcott, Crofton.
Henry L. Balser, Dixon.
Harvey E. Poole, Dunning.
Fred C. Beach, Eagle.
Sanford E. Ralsten, Geneva.
Earl D. Willard, Genoa.
Albert L. Hepp, Greeley.
Lynn F. Cunningham, Gurley.
Herschel L. Anderson, Havelock.
Herman L. Boyes, Hebron.
Elmer W. Couch, Henry.
Robert E. Templin, Hoskins.
Frank J. Prucha, Howell.
Merle A. Brady, Kimball.
Herman H. Schroer, Lawrence.
Otto C. Smith, Lyman.
Emory S. Clements, Lyons.
Howard W. Botsford, Meadow Grove.
Helmuth A. J. Paul, Millard.
Ingebert J. Thomsen, Minden.
Edward L. Barker, Pender.
Edwin S. Garber, Red Cloud.
John C. Oaks, Seward.
Roy Hauke, Shelton.
Clyde H. Hodges, Superior.
Claude A. MacDonald, Sutton.
Catherine Honey, Uehling.
Augusta Robb, Union.
Zenas E. Decker, Wauneta.
William Berridge, Wausa.
Harry H. Jordan, Wilcox.
Lawrence A. Kibbee, Winnebago.

NEVADA

Philomena Borrego, Austin.
Isaac L. Stone, McGill.
Fred L. Littell, Yerington.

NEW JERSEY

Abram R. Bates, Allentown.
Frank T. Buchanan, Bordentown.
Reuben Coyte, Coytesville.
Emma Heus, Demarest.
George Oberle, Edgewater.
Harry W. Bellis, Flemington.
Howard N. Parker, Gibbsboro.
James C. Norris, Hightstown.
Frank Pierson, Lawrenceville.
Renview L. Hull, Lebanon.
Elvord G. Chamberlin, Montclair.
William A. Sweeney, Red Bank.
George Schultz, Waldwick.
William H. Albright, Woodbury.
John A. Smith, Wrightstown.
Dorothy M. Cliver, Yardville.

NEW YORK

Bessie P. Slater, Attica.
Henry W. Ware, Batavia.
Irving Barrett, Bedford Hills.
Charles J. Amsden, Bolivar.
Etta Merritt, Brewerton.
Elizabeth H. Oschmann, Broad Channel.
James T. McLain, Center Moriches.
William S. Keene, Cold Spring Harbor.
Edna Frisbee, Conewango Valley.
William J. Snyder, Conifer.
Carrie J. Johnson, De Kalb Junction.
William W. Baldwin, Downsville.
Sadie M. Henderson, Garnerville.
Richard B. Coriell, Glasco.
Harris Kass, Greenfield.
James E. Colgan, Hamden.
Rosa H. Warner, Hampton Bays.
Frank E. Vail, Howells.
Charles F. Fowler, Iona Island.
John J. Cole, Jamesport.
Lois B. Gridley, Macedon.
William T. Finn, Madison.
Emsley V. Pepper, Middle Granville.
Walter J. Burke, Mineville.
Henry W. Koster, Narrowsburg.
Maud E. Butterfield, New Berlin.
Ruby C. Williams, New Lebanon.
John J. Lynch, Oscawana.
Phelps Smith, Paul Smiths.
J. Edward Uline, Ransomville.
George W. Harris, Richmondville.
Harlow G. VanNamee, Richville.
Clarence P. Varian, Scarsdale.
Otto F. Schuler, Snyder.
Alfred A. Clairmonte, South Fallsburg.
Bert P. Wood, Springfield Center.
William L. Bouchard, Surmount.
William H. Topps, Syossett.
Harold G. Haines, Urlton.
Vernon Vaughn, Water Mill.
Grace A. Harrington, West Point.

NORTH DAKOTA

Irwin E. Walton, Bantry.
Evan S. Brown, Buffalo.
James Taylor, Cando.
Oscar J. Haner, Douglas.
Nellie Ribb, Donnybrook.
Earl M. Sauness, Enderlin.
Louis Hansen, Esmond.
Hugh H. Parsons, Fessenden.
Otto Gackle, Fredonia.
Vern A. Tallackson, Grafton.
William D. Sinclair, Hannaford.
Duncan McLean, Hannah.
Walter P. Osborne, Hunter.
Ole H. Larson, Killdeer.
Elizabeth Graham, Knox.
Simon M. Ronning, Kramer.
Catherine Lynch, Lakota.
Nelson M. Chamberlain, Page.
John C. Black, Plaza.
Lottie A. Lund, Powers Lake.
Albert F. Harris, Reeder.
Albert M. Marchand, Rolla.
Ralph H. McKean, Sanborn.

John P. Breslin, Sanish.
Carl L. George, Sarles.
Seth E. Garland, Tioga.
Chase E. Mulinex, Tolley.
Charles S. Laidlaw, Wales.
Albert J. Drake, Westhope.
Robert M. Mares, Wheatland.
Frank Heglund, White Earth.
Axel G. C. Strom, Williston.
Arnold Lien, Wyndmere.
Norbert J. Joyce, Zap.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Truman C. Knott, Bristol.
John Schafer, Delmont.
Myrta M. Lund, Erwin.
Earl J. Meredith, Groton.
Clyde H. Cotton, Hitchcock.
George A. De Walt, McLaughlin.
Gustavus M. Finotti, Missionhill.
Henry Swindler, Mitchell.
Catherine M. Kuehl, Mound City.
Eugene M. Coffield, Oelrichs.
Richard Whalen, Pine Ridge.
Robert H. McCullagh, Sanator.

TEXAS

Lindsey C. Payton, Abilene.
Roberta G. Sterrett, Albany.
Mack M. Pittman, Annona.
Ernest E. Cornelius, Athens.
Joel A. Reese, Ballinger.
Frederick W. Guffy, Belton.
Vina Johnson, Bertram.
Harvey L. Pettit, Bloomburg.
Harry N. Cook, Brady.
Claude F. Riley, Canton.
Josie D. Jackson, Center Point.
Alfred A. Thomas, Chandler.
John W. Triplitt, Cisco.
Etta Varley, Collinsville.
Wellington T. Cutler, Crockett.
Chess W. Barr, Cross Plains.
Robert H. Fenton, Denton.
Wilson I. Lawler, Deport.
Charles H. Cmajdalka, Fayetteville.
Charles W. Silliman, Ganado.
James P. Hewitt, Giddings.
Virgil G. Pritchett, Gladewater.
Emma J. Cleveland, Grand Prairie.
William I. Rodgers, Gunter.
Eva Currie, Happy.
James M. Everett, Hedley.
Mamie B. Mustaine, Honey Grove.
Maude L. Tucker, Idalou.
Charles F. Adams, Jacksonville.
Helen M. Peel, Jourdanton.
David W. Thompson, Keltys.
Charles E. Smith, Kerens.
Annie D. Barker, Kilgore.
Nicholas C. Nail, Krum.
Helen C. Wallace, Kyle.
James D. Dyer, Lamesa.
James E. Cooke, Mart.
August C. Koepsel, Mathis.
Harvey J. McKinzie, Midlothian.
Wenzel K. Richter, Moulton.
Henry A. Williamson, Nacogdoches.
Hattie M. Culpepper, Palmer.
Jasper W. Blount, Quinlan.
Arthur N. Brown, jr., Richland.
Elmer I. Wade, Rockdale.
Gayle T. Snedecor, Rosenberg.
Kelsey R. Dort, Saint Jo.
Riley M. Foster, Saratoga.
Nelson L. Yates, Stratford.
James I. Dunn, Tioga.
Ralph D. Gilbert, Trinity.
Vera Butler, Troup.
Roscoe K. Garver, Van Alstyne.
William G. McClain, Waxahachie.
Alphonso S. Butler, Winona.

UTAH

Peter Allan, Blanding.
Henry H. Lunt, Cedar City.
James C. Hill, Elsinore.
Will C. Barton, Garfield.
Alta A. Dayton, Magna.
Henry C. Jacobs, Mount Pleasant.
George G. Rosevear, Park City.
Mary Cooper, Pleasant Grove.

WISCONSIN

Jerry J. Jerabek, Algoma.
Mae Wittmann, Arpin.
Jules G. Pierre, Brussels.
Theresa J. Keyes, Cobb.
Effie Banna, Ogdensburg.
Peter D. Harris, Oneida.
Mildred Werner, Pittsville.
Alma Colt, Poy Sippi.
Walter F. Dietlen, Sheldon.
LeRoy H. Ardern, Springbrook.
Merton J. Dickinson, Tipler.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, *December 19, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of holiness, Thy love has brought to the gates of our lives the footsteps of One who is the sovereign expression of man's utmost need and man's utmost hope. Do Thou move in advance of us and direct the way. Come and give our work its charm, our association its blessing, and to the whole day its joy. Brace our souls with certainties, and may they not be furrowed by doubts. Be Thou the invisible bridge that unites us in our dreams and aspirations with man wherever he is found. In the name of the Son of Man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 16, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House be, and is hereby, authorized and directed in the enrollment of H. R. 5800 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the first deficiency bill, to insert on page 38 in line 9 of the engrossed bill, after the word "attorneys," the following words: "(their heirs or their assignees now of record, as their interest may appear)."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an explanation of this resolution.

The matter of $85,000 for attorneys' fees is carried in the deficiency bill in the usual language, as we supposed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman do this under a motion such as he has submitted?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a bill which has been passed by the House and has been passed by the Senate.

Mr. MADDEN. This will have to go to the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. And the conference report has been agreed to by the House, and the gentleman is now proposing to insert something additional by a resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. This is done frequently.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it still before the Senate or has it been enrolled?

Mr. MADDEN. It has passed the Senate, but is not yet enrolled; and, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior, whose department this transaction affects, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs have both sent a letter to Senator WARREN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, saying this is all right. The Comptroller General says this ought to be done, and we are complying with the Comptroller General's request.

Really, I think it is all right the way it is, but the Comptroller General thinks otherwise.

I ask for a vote.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1090) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in the State of Tennessee, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

The message also announced that the Senate concurred in the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, 1927, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, January 4, 1928.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes;

That the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to said bill; and

That the Senate receded from its amendments numbered 19, 36, and 37 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Concurrent Resolution 3

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Clerk of the House be, and is hereby, authorized and directed in the enrollment of H. R. 5800 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the first deficiency bill, to insert on page 38, in line 9 of the engrossed bill, after the word "attorneys," the following words: "(their heirs or their assignees now of record, as their interest may appear)."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were presented by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had on December 14, 1927, approved and signed a bill of the following title:

H. R. 3190. An act authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 1090. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIEUT. COMMANDER WILLIAM FRANKLIN CALLAWAY

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the House may well halt public business for a moment to express a word of sympathy in the great submarine disaster which has recently occurred off the coast of Massachusetts, when forty-odd splendid men went down, when the submarine *S–4* was struck by a Coast Guard vessel, which sent it to the bottom of the sea.

The sympathy of everybody goes out to the men who are in this vessel, most of them gone. Six men who were in the engine room are now said to be alive, and every effort is being made to reach them and render whatever relief can be given. Everybody in this country is watching for news, and all news is being given out by the naval authorities through the Bureau of Navigation, so that all parents and others may know about them.

Our sympathy goes out to each and every one of them, and my excuse for rising this morning is to refer particularly to one man, Lieut. Commander William Franklin Callaway, a man of high character and of great service—an inspection officer who had gone there to inspect this vessel and was confined there with the other officers in the room where the officers are located, and which, perhaps, was flooded. While six men in the engine room are now said to be alive, the probabilities are that the officers are not alive.

Lieut. Commander William Franklin Callaway came from my home town. His family were my next-door neighbors. I know intimately all his relatives. He was appointed to Annapolis 20 years ago by my distinguished predecessor, David De Armond, and after graduation served continuously in the naval service, 10 years in the submarine service. His record is notable.

I shall ask permission in this connection to print with what I say a notice of him contained in the Washington Star, a similar article having appeared in the Washington Post and practically all the other papers, including the Missouri papers.

Intimately I knew him. His father was twice sheriff of my home county of Henry. His grandfather was also sheriff of the same county, both prominent in public life and my close personal friends. His uncle, Frank Callaway, read law in my office, and was afterwards prominent as an educator. One of Lieutenant Callaway's brothers was my stenographer and secretary, and is now in the Philippines. Recently I appointed the younger brother of Lieutenant Commander Callaway to Annapolis, and I felt it was not inappropriate for me to rise on this occasion and ask permission to say a word about these men who have given up their lives and are now confined at the bottom of the sea in this submarine, and to especially say a few words about this splendid naval officer, William Franklin Callaway.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print with my remarks this splendid notice of Lieutenant Commander Callaway contained in the Star of Sunday morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Lieut. Commander William Franklin Callaway, 201 Shepherd Street, Chevy Chase, Md., submarine expert for the board of inspection and survey of the Navy Department.

Lieut. Graham Newell Fitch (junior grade), 2400 Twentieth Street, who attended the Force School and the Central High School here.

Walter Bishop, naval radio operator, whose wife's home is given in Navy Department records at 1228 Pennsylvania Avenue SE.

Charles A. Ford, 1016 Montana Avenue NE., civilian, chief draftsman for the board of inspection and survey.

FAMILIES ARE NOTIFIED

The families of Lieutenant Commander Callaway, Lieutenant Fitch, and Mr. Ford were notified early last night of the accident and told that every possible effort was being made to rescue the men. At the same time they were informed that little hope was being held by the department for the safe recovery of those on board the submarine. Mrs. Bishop could not be located.

"We are mobilizing every aid to raise the submarine as quickly as possible," said Secretary Wilbur, "but this will depend on diving conditions and the buoyancy of the submarine."

Pointing out that the submarine weighs 900 tons and that the lifting buoy will lift about 600 tons, Mr. Wilbur said that Capt. E. J. King, who supervised the raising of the *S–51*, will go by airplane to-morrow morning from New York to the scene of the disaster.

"The submarine was apparently operating on its regular standardization tests," said Secretary Wilbur. "The area for this is located purposely so as not to be in the ordinary steamship lanes. Conditions there are ideal for this work, as there is deep water and it is close to shore. If this submarine was struck by a destroyer going 18 knots there is probably very little hope that anyone survived; but we will endeavor to learn at the earliest possible moment by sending divers down to communicate, if possible.

LIST MAY NOT BE CORRECT

Accompanying Secretary Wilbur when he arrived at the department soon after 10 o'clock was Capt. W. R. Sexton, head of the Material Department of Naval Operations. Officers of the Navy Department, as soon as they heard of the disaster, began checking up on the list of officers and crew.

It was explained that the list as finally made public might not be correct as to detail, as it was not entirely up to date. It was explained also that some of the men supposed to be on the submarine when she went down might not have been aboard, while others not mentioned in the list might have gone aboard at the last minute.

Lieutenant Commander Callaway has rounded out two years' service with the Navy Department in Washington, and in the next few months expected orders detailing him for sea duty. During his residence in Washington, the first in his naval career, he has been attached to the

board of inspection and survey as a submarine authority, and in such capacity made frequent trials and test runs on new, modified, and overhauled naval craft. He left Washington Monday, expecting to return home a few days before Christmas.

Born in Clinton, Mo., November 7, 1889, Lieutenant Commander Callaway was appointed to the Naval Academy from that State in 1907, and upon graduation was assigned to submarine duty. In 1917 he served aboard submarines and continued in this duty until the close of the World War. Later he commanded the submarine *R–19*.

WIFE COLLAPSES

In 1921 he was sent as an inspector of machinery to the Bausch Sulzer Co., of St. Louis, and the following year went to the Asiatic Fleet in command of Submarine Division No. 12.

Lieutenant Commander Callaway's next of kin are his wife, who was in a state of collapse last night; a 6-year-old son, William F. Callaway, jr.; his father, Jerry Callaway, of Clinton, Md.; and a brother, Peyton, who is a midshipman at the Naval Academy.

THE MAGNETO

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing an article of my own on the magneto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Speaker in presenting Colonel Lindbergh to the House of Representatives Saturday, December 10, made a very happy remark in characterizing Colonel Lindbergh as "America's most attractive citizen." I could not but feel, as everyone else, a genuine delight in this unselfish partner in "We," as he received the ovation and congressional medal he so richly deserved.

Up in the thirty-fourth congressional district some of my boyhood friends are investing in airplanes to develop their flying ability and have a sort of dress rehearsal for the "flying age" before they set forth on the "great adventure."

I take a peculiar pride in the fact that up in the beloved hills of my native county is an American institution with an invested capital of approximately half a million dollars, to make available for the United States at this time and in its times of maximum emergency, of a vitally important part of the aeronautical engine; namely, the magneto for ignition. This company is an American concern, producing American products, financed by American capital, directed by Americans, and employing 95 per cent American workers.

I realize what great interest you all have in aviation and I want you to have first-hand facts and impressions as received by me when "Bill" Southworth and I inspected this plant, for it will prove interesting to you who have to keep in touch with our progress in aviation.

Of all the accessories, each one a specialty in itself, which contributes its share to the operation of the aircraft engine, there is none in my opinion more interesting or deserving of more attention than the ignition. Practically every make and type of aircraft engine is equipped with magnetos for ignition, which by virtue of their compactness, simplicity, and efficiency are greatly preferred to the ignition system which obtains its primary energy from a storage battery.

Basically, the magneto in most general use as ignition for the aircraft engine consists of a four-pole magnet which is rotated between pole shoes by the engine drive. The immediate result is the generation of magnetism of flux which passes backward and forward through the laminated core of the coil. About this core is wound a number of turns of comparatively heavy wire. Wrapped about this is the condenser, and next in turn comes the secondary winding which is made up of nearly 2 miles of insulated wire having a thickness equivalent to that of a man's hair. A contact-breaker lever, working against a cam, interrupts the flow of primary current generated by the rotation of the magnet and the accurately timed intervals of this interruption and the consequent building up and dying down of the primary current creates a spark of approximately 18,000 volts. This high-tension voltage, which is the final product of the magneto, is distributed to each spark plug of the cylinders of the engine at the required time, thus producing a spark which is the ignition.

Late in 1922, the Bureau of Aeronautics of the United States Navy, in collaboration with the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, carried on a series of exhaustive tests with aircraft magnetos, which were at that time imported. The factory producing this magneto was located in Soleure, Switzerland, and the American company was acting as its agent. Actual operations of these magnetos on dynamometer tests and a series of flight tests conducted by the Bureau of Aeronautics over considerable periods proved without question that this magneto was far superior to any other in existence for the vitally important work of supplying dependable and accurately timed sparks to the aircraft engine. Our own ignition manufacturers in general were fully cognizant of the problems required to be solved to provide satisfactory ignition, but nothing of any consequence has been done to improve ignition devices or to keep step with the development of the aircraft engine.

As a result of the thorough tests conducted by the Navy, and realizing that some drastic steps must be taken to improve the ignition situation, the Bureau of Aeronautics negotiated a contract whereby it was arranged that to meet immediate needs 250 magnetos made up of 9 and 12 cylinder types should be imported at once from Switzerland, modified, given further thorough test, inspected, and delivered to the Bureau of Aeronautics. It is of importance and considerable interest to note that this contract was contingent upon the company's agreement to a clause therein which specified that a factory for the purpose of manufacturing magnetos must be established in the United States, thus making available to the Navy this highly important and vitally necessary machine as soon as possible.

One can well realize the great value to naval and military aeronautics that would accrue from the establishment of a domestic source of supply of highly satisfactory ignition devices for their aircraft power plants. Within three months after the date of the contract, the first magnetos were delivered to the Navy, and their satisfactory performance further justified this farsighted move on the part of the Navy.

An American company was formed and immediately made arrangements for the acquisition of suitable property and equipment for manufacturing and satisfactory arrangements with the Swiss company as to patents and manufacturing rights were consummated. The town of Sidney, Delaware County, N. Y., was selected as being an ideal place from the standpoint of transportation facilities and availability of skilled labor. This town, with a population of about 2,800, is situated in the Unadilla Valley at the junction of the Delaware & Hudson and New York, Ontario & Western Railroads. It is about 200 miles northwest of New York City on a direct line between Binghamton and Albany. With the cooperation of the Chamber of Commerce of Sidney, a recently vacated automobile factory was obtained and altered to suit the requirements.

The administration of the company is by Americans and the stock is owned by an American corporation of New York City. There has been invested well in excess of a half million dollars in the business, and more than 90 per cent of the employees are Americans. Mr. Laurence R. Wilder, president; Mr. T. Z. Fagan, in charge of sales; Mr. Herman Hanni, who had been prominent in the organization of the Swiss factory, in charge of manufacture; and Mr. G. E. Steiner, in charge of accountancy, formed the nucleus of this organization. At the time of writing Mr. Walter Spengler is chief engineer; Mr. Albert Egli, production manager; and Mr. C. P. DeWitt, purchasing agent.

Activities were started January 1, 1925, at the Sidney plant with eight employees. The actual manufacture of American-built magnetos commenced February 8, 1926. Up to the present time the company has produced in the Sidney factory close to 2,500 nine and twelve cylinder aircraft magnetos, and has on its pay roll 175 employees. The total floor space is approximately 85,000 square feet, nearly all of which is at present occupied.

This company is manufacturing and delivering aircraft magnetos for use on the Wasp and Hornet engines; for use on the Whirlwind, Cyclone, Typhoon, and Tornado engines; for use on the 3A–1500 and 3A–2500 engines; for use on the D–12 engines, and to the Army Air Corps and Navy Bureau of Aeronautics for spares and replacements. In addition, this company is supplying aircraft magnetos of various types to about eight other American aeronautical engine manufacturers.

One of the materials which is used in the construction of this magneto and which contributes so much to its success is the fine quality of dielectric, which is part of the distributor mechanism. This is a vulcanized gum, specially prepared and molded under a secret process by a Swiss concern. The company has been working intensively in an effort to obtain in the United States a material equal to it in all respects. To date its efforts have not met with success, although it is felt that recent tests of domestic material are very encouraging. The production of American-built coils is well under way, and the aircraft magneto, type V–AG12–D being produced at the Sidney factory is American built throughout with the exception of the above-mentioned dielectric parts for the distributor. With the availability of domestic material for this, the aircraft magneto will be a 100 per cent American product.

I was distinctly impressed during my visit to the factory with the splendid spirit which prevails throughout the plant. Each man and woman, from the floor sweeper to the department heads, seems thoroughly aware of the responsibility which is theirs in producing this vitally important part of the aircraft engine. Further was I impressed by the meticulous care taken in handling the various delicate and finely wrought parts which go to make up the magneto. The machine tools, jigs, fixtures, and other equipment are of the best and most up-to-date and are designed for accuracy and moderate production.

The majority of modern aircraft engines are of the 9-cylinder type, and 9-cylinder magnetos, together with the 12-cylinder type, are the ones being produced at the Sidney plant. Magnetos for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, and 18 cylinder engines can be supplied by this company, and some of these special types are imported and modified to meet American aircraft-engine requirements at the factory in Sidney.

Nothing but aircraft ignition is manufactured at the factory in Sidney, it being considered by that company that the importance of this part of the engine justifies a high degree of specialization. This may in part account for their marked success. Unprecedented performance is being obtained with them, and somewhat in support of this it was pointed out that Lindbergh, Chamberlain, Byrd, Acosta, Smith and Bronte, Maitland and Hegenberger, Goebel and Jensen had used them as ignition equipment for their Wright whirlwind engines.

The thoroughness of the tests given the magneto before its delivery was greatly surprising to me. Each magneto is operated in groups on long test benches, delivering its spark to open gaps. The test period is between 75 and 100 hours at a speed of 2,000 revolutions per minute. At the conclusion of this test the magneto is disassembled, inspected, reassembled, and placed on test again at high speeds up to 4,500 revolutions per minute. It is then ready for final inspection, where it is carefully checked for dimensions, appearance, and so forth, and where it is assured that the magneto conforms to the particular specifications of the Army, Navy, or engine manufacturer for whom it is destined.

Considerable development work is going on constantly. Improvements and new details of design are being worked in as fast as it is possible to do so and provide sufficient time for their testing. The necessity for smaller, lighter magnetos is well appreciated and understood by the engineers, and there is ever an effort on their part to accomplish these results. Every indication points to a continuance of the superb workmanship and utmost care in manufacturing that has contributed to much of the splendid reputation of these aircraft magnetos.

A particularly interesting development that I saw was the vertical double aircraft magneto, which is a mechanism of real beauty and truly a masterpiece in fine machine work. Briefly, it consists of pole shoes, upon the ends of which are mounted two coils. Upon the end of the rotating magnet is mounted a four-lobe cam which actuates two braker mechanisms, the functioning of which produces eight synchronous or staggered sparks per revolution of the magneto. This magneto only weighs 12½ pounds and with its two distributors, which weigh 1.5 pounds each, this ignition device will mean a considerable saving in weight and space over the two-individual-magneto installation.

Mr. Fagan, who showed me about the factory, stressed particularly the great importance of the very considerable experience that the company has had in supplying aircraft engine magnetos. There were constantly being pointed out to me changes and modifications, all meaning improvements that have been incorporated as a result of the engineer's close cooperation and contact with the engine manufacturer and operating units of the Army and Navy. The Naval Aircraft Factory and the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy and Wright Field of the Army have worked with the company to the fullest possible extent, and a most thorough understanding between these departments and the company has made possible most gratifying results. "As a matter of fact, both these branches of Government aeronautical activity are almost indispensable in the assistance they render to the manufacturer of accessories," said Mr. Fagan.

Rear Admiral William A. Moffett, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, has stated in one of his annual reports that "No engine is better than its accessories." I am, as a result of my visit to the plant, very sure that this places a real responsibility on them, of which they are fully aware and able to fulfill.

Aside from the manufacture of the magneto to conform with various specifications and requirements of the engine manufacturer for military, naval, and commercial use, there are many problems confronting the engineers, such as radio interference, which is caused by the high-tension spark of the magneto, exceedingly high altitude requirements, and so forth. Much is being done with these problems by the company, and gratifying results are being obtained.

Practically every aircraft engine built in this country to-day is equipped with these aircraft magnetos, and in very nearly every case there are two of them per engine. Even considering this factor of safety, the complete failure of one magneto will appreciably lessen the power of the engine. This company's viewpoint in this regard is to consider that the engine is actually equipped with only one magneto, the failure of which would, of course, immediately cause the engine to stop.

The whole organization is extremely proud of its success in having overcome the many discouraging obstacles in the path of producing in America this magneto. And justly so, for it is distinctly a better magneto than the previously imported Swiss type. This claim for superiority is entirely warranted as a result of exhaustive comparative tests carried out on a Navy project by the naval aircraft factory at Philadelphia on magnetos from the two sources and from actual performance in service.

HENRY CLAY VAN VOORHIS

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to announce the death of Henry Clay Van Voorhis, of Zanesville, Ohio, who for 12 years represented the district I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Mr. Van Voorhis died December 12, 1927. For three quarters of a century he lived in the county where he was born, one of our most honored and distinguished citizens. He was graduated from Denison University and was a student at the Cincinnati Law School. He was a capable lawyer, but left that profession to become a Member of the Congress of the United States, being elected in 1892 to the Fifty-third Congress and served in the five succeeding Congresses, and then voluntarily retired. During his service in the House he was a member of the powerful Committee on Appropriations.

That was in the days of Uncle Joe Cannon. They were friends, and Mr. Cannon frequently stopped in Zanesville in his journey from the National Capital to his home to greet his friend, Mr. Van Voorhis. His political allegiance was to the Republican Party and at least twice he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention. Both before and after he came to Congress he was president of the Old Citizens National Bank, one of the most reliable financial institutions in Ohio.

Mr. Van Voorhis was a commanding figure, congenial, true to his friends, and gifted with a strong personality. He was a good lawyer, a splendid citizen, a very capable statesman. He served his day and generation well, and it is indeed with sorrow that I announce the passing of this distinguished and patriotic American.

COLONEL LINDBERGH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1927.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take pleasure in informing you that the department has received a telegram, dated December 15, 1927, from the American ambassador at Mexico City containing the following message for you from Colonel Lindbergh.

"I am deeply grateful for your message and for the action of the House of Representatives."

I am, my dear Mr. LONGWORTH, sincerely yours,

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

The Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
House of Representatives.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT CLEARWATER, MINN.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the Consent Calendar.

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 193) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved March 4, 1925, to be built by the State of Minnesota and the counties

of Sherburne and Wright across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, in the county of Wright, in the State of Minnesota, are hereby extended to March 4, 1927, and March 4, 1929, respectively.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The following committee amendments were read:

Line 4, after the word "by," insert the word "the."

Strike out all of line 9 and insert the following in lieu thereof: "one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof."

Amend the title so as to read:

"To extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT WOLF POINT, MONT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 444) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, is it the purpose of the committee to adopt some policy in regard to these bridge bills? As gentlemen know, there is no character of bills that come before the House that receive less attention than do these bridge bills.

Mr. DENISON. I am not prepared to admit that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I mean consideration by the House and not by the action of the committee. Very often we find very valuable rights are being given away to private individuals or corporations when, as a matter of fact, it has been demonstrated that the best policy for the community as well as for the Government was that the bridge be constructed and operated by the Government or some agency—like the tunnel between New York and New Jersey, which is operated with great success.

Can the gentleman from Illinois inform us what policy the committee will adopt so that we may rely entirely on the committee and not have to examine every bridge bill before us?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked a pertinent question, and I will answer it the best I can. The policy of the committee is to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge by the State government or a political subdivision thereof whenever the State or municipality asks for it. We prefer to give the franchise to the government or a political subdivision, or to some government agency, like the highway commission; but if they do not ask for it, and if there is public sentiment in favor of the construction of the bridge, and private individuals ask for authority to construct and build the bridge, the policy of our committee is to grant it. But every bill contains a reservation of the right in favor of the public to take it over at any time, after a limited number of years, and operate it as a free bridge.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And every private bill contains that proviso?

Mr. DENISON. Every one contains that provision.

We never report a bill granting a franchise to private persons or corporations to build a toll bridge that does not contain a provision giving the State or county or municipality in which the bridge is located the right to recapture the bridge upon terms that fully protect the interests of the public.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of the House briefly to the situation we are getting into on the bridge question. Under the Federal aid law there is a provision that Federal aid can not be given to toll roads, and under the construction placed upon that law the Federal aid is not given to roads which approach a toll bridge. Congress at the last session passed a large number of bridge bids, and I think a larger number of them were private toll bridges.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. In a moment. There is no adequate provision in the law to regulate the price of the toll or to in any manner have charge of the transportation over these bridges, except the privilege that has been given by Congress to permit the corporation or individual to construct the bridge. The Federal Government is providing for a great road system throughout the country. Every State in the Union is at work now building a Federal system of roads, and may we not find the entire Federal road system tied up by a system of toll bridges, whereby the entire public must contribute to private persons in order to travel over the public roads. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to insert in the RECORD at this point the fact that this particular bridge now under consideration is not a toll bridge.

Mr. DOWELL. I am referring only to the proposition that we have before us, because a large number of toll bridges are to come before us at this session.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Is there any intention on the part of the committee of which the gentleman is chairman to bring in any legislation that will enable the Government to condemn these toll bridges that are mulcting the people out of millions of dollars.

Mr. DOWELL. That is the point I want to arrive at. The bridge proposition is not before the Committee on Roads. There is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill respecting this matter, and some legislation should be presented and adopted by this Congress. There is, as I understand it, a small provision at the end of these bridge bills, which in a manner provides that the bridges may be recaptured, but it is not a complete piece of legislation, and before this Congress passes another bridge bill it should pass legislation whereby the public may under certain conditions restore these bridges to the use of the public free.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman says that there may be danger that we will lose control, or that Congress will lose control, over the right to construct certain toll bridges.

Mr. DOWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman realize that under the 50–50 proposition in respect to road construction, as the matter is carried on in the city of Washington, Congress has absolutely lost control of Federal-aid roads carrying interstate commerce?

Mr. DOWELL. Every bridge built anywhere over a navigable stream has to have the approval of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is true, and that will continue.

Mr. DOWELL. What I insist on is that before we go further in bridge construction we should pass comprehensive legislation for the protection of the public in the future that the public may use this Federal-aid system throughout the entire country without a contribution to private interests.

Mr. SNELL. What is the gentleman's suggestion along that line?

Mr. DOWELL. There is a bill before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now which provides for the construction of bridges, with the provision that they may be recaptured for the benefit of the public under certain conditions.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. We ought to quit passing these toll-bridge bills, and we ought to follow the law we passed and provide that every bridge that connects a through highway built partly with Federal aid, especially from one State into another, must be a free bridge, and thus encourage States to appropriate money to match Federal aid, so that free bridges may be built with Government and State funds along with the through highway, as the bridge is just as much a part of the highway as any other segment of it.

Mr. SNELL. And how long would it take to get a private bridge bill through here providing that the Federal Government pay for these things? There is not the slightest possibility of doing such a thing.

Mr. BLANTON. It is just as easy to provide many millions for free bridges as it is for the other portion of the highways.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no one suggesting that the Government build these bridges.

Mr. SNELL. That is what the gentleman from Texas suggested.

Mr. BLANTON. Only in cooperation with the States; I propose for the Government to match dollars with the States to build free bridges, just as it is now doing to build the rest of the highway.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no objection to the building of bridges providing there is provision that the public may, under certain conditions secure ownership and control of them.

Mr. BURTNESS. To what bill does the gentleman refer?

Mr. DOWELL. I refer to the bill of the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURTNESS. I want to say that I appreciate, of course, very much the gentleman's support of the bill. I think it is very meritorious legislation. I have already requested our committee to hold hearings on the bill shortly after the holidays to consider all the propositions involved. I hope Members generally will become interested in it. On the other hand, I think it is also fair to say that the bridge bills during the last session of Congress, at least, have adopted provisions much along the line of the general bill I have introduced. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] a year ago made an extended speech on the floor of the House showing just what the policy of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is. Every bill authorizing the construction of a toll bridge by private capital passed during the last session, at least, and I think the same was true in the session preceding, gave to the public—that is, to adjoining counties, municipalities, or other public agencies—the right to buy the bridge on what we may term a reduced measure of damages.

There is another factor which I think has been overlooked by the gentleman from Iowa, namely, that any person may object to the amount of toll charged by the private bridge corporation if deemed unreasonable, and that the Secretary of War has power to pass on the tolls, which power has possibly been used but little.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman knows that is not a practical proposition at all.

Mr. BURTNESS. Because of the fact the proposition can, in my opinion, be improved, proposals touching this subject are included in the general bill to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. DOWELL. My position is to get the best road system possible.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. Is it the policy of the committee to report favorably, so far as restrictions are concerned, as many bills over the same stream as are asked for, say, 2 or 3 miles apart, when there is no heavy traffic? Is it the policy of the committee to do that?

Mr. DENISON. The policy of Congress has been to grant any municipality a franchise to construct a bridge. It is very unwise to grant a monopoly, but if the people want bridges across a stream, Congress has no objection to their having them. That is decided by local conditions. Local conditions affect it.

Mr. BEGG. Now, may I ask the gentleman—I know in three specific cases where there is not—I have forgotten, but the figures will bear me out—where there is just enough traffic to produce a return of perhaps 5 per cent on the construction of a bridge, yet there are bridges from 2, 3, or 5 miles up or down. The promoters finance it in New York, and it is not the promoters who hold the bag, but it is the innocent purchasers of the securities; and I think Congress could well afford to make an investigation as to the restrictions, I call them, or what they are, on which they are granted. That is one of the things which I think the committee ought to consider. If it is a case of permitting a bridge across any stream where there is a reasonable excuse for it, I do not care. In one case they can go to New York and make a clean-up.

Mr. DENISON. Is not that true in regard to all other investments?

Mr. BEGG. No; I do not think it is true in regard to all other investments.

Mr. DOWELL. I think we have a proposition here that is vital to the American people.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There are a number of these toll bridges which connect important highways, highways upon which the Government and the States have expended a large amount of money. Now, why should they not be highway bridges paid for by the Government and States jointly, open free to the public? I think they ought to be. I think we ought to take steps now to encourage States to join the Government in matching dollars and building free bridges. Yet you are going to make this a toll bridge.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; that is what I want to keep clear of, that the bridge now before the House for consideration is to be constructed on the Federal system by the State of Montana.

Mr. BLANTON. Open and without tolls?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I am for it.

Mr. DOWELL. I am not discussing the bill now before the House, but I am calling attention to the situation which has arisen.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to have these bridges built and pay toll on them rather than have no bridge at all?

Mr. DOWELL. This is the situation: The Government and the various States are investing millions and millions of dollars in the construction of good roads all over the United States, and if Congress is going to permit private persons to hold key positions to build bridges without enacting comprehensive and adequate legislation for the recapture of those bridges to the public use, our people may be compelled to pay tribute to individuals by way of bridge tolls for many years to come.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DOWELL. I want to complete my statement. I have in mind a system of road construction in the United States for the future along the lines laid out under the Federal-aid program, and I want the public to be amply protected in the use of these highways. When these private bridges have been built the public should have the opportunity under comprehensive legislation to purchase them at a fair and reasonable price to the builders.

This matter should be called to the attention of Members of Congress, because over a very large system of Federal-aid highway construction in the United States every effort should be made to keep them out of the hands of a few men after the system has been constructed. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, just a few words in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL]. I made an address in the House last year on this subject which the gentleman from Iowa evidently has not done me the honor to read. We adopted a policy, after a couple of years' study by the committee of the Senate and the committee of the House, governing the granting of franchises to build bridges over the navigable waters of this country, and the policy is included in every bill granting the right to construct a bridge. That policy has been agreed on after a great deal of study. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] did not ask for a hearing and did not ask permission to present any views on that subject, although he had that opportunity and he has that opportunity now. Our committee will be glad to hear him at any time concerning the proper franchise to be given for the construction of bridges.

The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his statement of the law. Congress has delegated to the Chief of Engineers and to the Secretary of War the right to regulate tolls over every toll bridge in the United States, and whenever any party has constructed a toll bridge and any citizen thinks the rate is too high, all he has to do is to write to the Secretary of War and file a protest; and every one who wants to be present at the investigation can present himself and express his views; and if the Secretary of War, after making the investigation, finds that the tolls are unreasonable or too high, he can order them reduced; and what he says is the law. There can not be any appeal from it unless, of course, his orders should amount to confiscation.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Has the gentleman had any experience in regard to changing railroad rates under that condition?

Mr. DENISON. Well, that question is just as impertinent as some of the other statements made by the gentleman from Iowa. We have laws by which those things are governed. When the gentleman says there is no regulation of tolls he is mistaken. Anybody can object to the rate of tolls, and if the tolls are found unreasonable they will be reduced.

We have worked out a plan, and it is embodied in every bill passed granting a franchise for a toll bridge. It is a fair plan to the public. By it we save to the public the right to take over any privately owned toll bridge whenever the public wants to do so, and we limit the amount of damages or compensation to be paid when the public takes over the bridge. We do not

let them charge for good will or going value or earning power. All the public has to pay for is the actual value of the physical structure. That is quite a concession to the public, and that applies to every toll bridge constructed since the adoption of the policy.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. CARSS. Does this provision apply to the bridges built heretofore?

Mr. DENISON. No. This policy that we are acting upon now applies only to bridges built after the adoption of the policy. Of course, we can not pass a retroactive law. All private toll bridges constructed under acts of Congress in the past two years have been constructed under that policy, and the rights of the public are fully preserved in the recapture clause.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DENISON. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand the gentleman to say there is a law which prescribes that the Federal Government may regulate tolls over bridges?

Mr. DENISON. Certainly; all bridges in the United States constructed over navigable streams since 1906 can be regulated by the Chief of Engineers or the Secretary of War.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A bridge running over a river dividing two States?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; that has been the law since March 23, 1906.

Mr. BURTNESS. A bridge across any navigable stream.

Mr. DENISON. Yes. The Secretary of War can regulate the tolls on any toll bridge in the United States which is constructed over a navigable waterway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My reason for asking that question is rather an inquiry as to the power of the Federal Government to make such a rule and regulation.

Mr. DENISON. It is a rather sweeping power.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I understand it, the Federal Government only gives its consent to such structures upon the ground that there may be no obstruction to navigation and consequently commerce, and has questionable power to make authorizations.

Mr. DENISON. In 1906 Congress conferred that power upon the Secretary of War, and it is not a dead letter. The Secretary of War exercises that power every now and then, and he has done so quite frequently.

Now, I would like to have gentlemen remember this: The Federal road act provides that no part of the funds appropriated under its provisions shall be expended upon a road where tolls are charged. Of course, the intention of Congress was to prevent the expenditure of Federal funds on a toll road, one of the old-fashioned toll turnpikes; but the section of the act, where definitions are provided, defines "bridge" as being a part of a highway, so that the comptroller in construing the act has held that Federal-aid funds can not be expended on a road that approaches not only a toll bridge but a toll ferry. There are hundreds of ferries in this country, and, of course, they are all toll ferries; and the ruling of the comptroller applies to Federal-aid roads that approach a ferry. He says Federal funds can not be expended on that part of the road which approaches a ferry; that is, upon that part of the road which extends back to a point where the road could be used independently of the bridge or ferry. When that ruling of the comptroller was made, of course, it proved to be more or less embarrassing to the Bureau of Roads, and I filed a bill in the last Congress to correct that situation. However, I have never been able to get the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] to permit us to go before his committee to present the reasons for the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The law mentioned by the gentleman contemplates that on arterial highways constructed partly with Federal aid the bridges and ferries must be free. Why should not they be free? The bridge or ferry is just as much a part of the highway as is any other segment of it. If the law and General McCarl's ruling could be enforced, it would be a great thing for the people, for it would induce the States to match dollar for dollar with the Federal Government and build free bridges to replace the toll bridges and ferries, that now interrupt and hold up interstate motor traffic along through highways. But the law is not wholly obeyed, because aid has been granted on highways with both toll bridges and ferries, and such highways have been constructed almost to abutments that lead both to toll bridges and toll ferries.

Mr. DENISON. That has not been done since the comptroller's ruling?

Mr. BLANTON. It has been done all the time, and I know of a number instances in which it has been done—the highway stopping some 100 yards or more from the approaches.

Mr. DENISON. I will have to say that I think the gentleman from Texas is wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. I have any number of such cases in my mind and can cite them to the gentleman. I have been over some of such highways this past summer.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the consent of Congress have to be given for the construction of bridges over a navigable stream that is wholly within a State?

Mr. DENISON. Consent of Congress is necessary unless the navigable portion of the stream is entirely within the borders of one State; then consent can be obtained from the State legislature. Since the comptroller has made the ruling to which I have referred—and it is rather technical, and I myself think it is foreign to the original intention of Congress—he has refused to approve vouchers issued by the Bureau of Roads for the expenditures of Federal funds on roads leading up to toll bridges or ferries, and therefore, the Bureau of Roads is not expending money on approaches either to ferries or to toll bridges. Now, that situation ought to be corrected by Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. If they construct a bridge they should not charge tolls but it should be open.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman from Texas ought to know that Congress can not compel the construction of free bridges.

Mr. BLANTON. But we can provide for it.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. I understand the attitude of the Government to be just what the gentleman has stated it to be, but the gentleman from Iowa stated a moment ago there was no intention on the part of the Government to construct these bridges. Now, if there is no intention on the part of the Government to construct them and private capital must construct them, is there any way in the world we can make the States construct them?

Mr. DENISON. There is no way, of course.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that Congress refuse permission for the building of bridges on interstate and intrastate highways is untenable. There are numerous points in practically every State of the Union where arterial highways approach from both sides of impassable streams and there terminate to the profit of inadequate ferries and to the expense and inconvenience of the traveling public. The Federal Government should either supply bridges at these key points or it should authorize private enterprise to supply them. It would be nothing short of absurd for the Government to refuse to build these bridges and at the same time refuse to permit anyone else to build them.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] calls attention to the law forbidding Federal aid on highways connecting with toll bridges. But the same law also forbids Federal aid to roads connecting with toll ferries. It is apparent, therefore, that the building of toll bridges by local enterprise where State and Federal funds are not available in no wise prejudices the situation so far as Federal aid is concerned, for the reason that these crossings are without exception already served by ferries charging exorbitant tolls.

So far as the safeguarding of the rights of the public is concerned, it is only necessary to consult any of the bridge bills passed in the latter part of the last session of Congress to note that the standardized form which is now required in all bridge bills, and for the drafting of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is entitled to the thanks of the Congress and the country, amply cares for the interests of both the Government and the public. Every bridge bill passed since this form was adopted contains provisions under which the State or any adjoining political subdivision may at any time take over the bridge and acquire title at actual cost of construction, such cost to be fixed by the Secretary of War, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to draft a law more effective and more drastic

in its protection of the rights of the traveling public and of the Government than the form now in use.

Contrary to the suggested policy of restriction in the building of bridges, Congress should authorize a bridge at every ferrying point on every Federal-aid highway in the United States. We need these bridges, and we need them now. We must have them in order to perfect our highway system and to provide for complete cooperation with our railroads and our deep-waterway system now in process of construction.

It is to be hoped that this session of Congress will break all records in the authorization of the construction of these missing links in the greatest highway system in the world.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for beginning and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont., as authorized by the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or Roosevelt County, or McCone County, in the State of Montana, or either or several of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont., approved January 15, 1927, be, and the same are hereby, extended one year and three years, respectively, from January 15, 1928.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "beginning" and insert the word "commencing" in lieu thereof.

In line 4, strike out the word "a" and insert the word "the" in lieu thereof.

In line 5, after the words "by the act," insert the words "of Congress."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "January 15, 1928," and insert in lieu thereof "the date of approval hereof."

On page 2, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVITT: On page 2, line 7, after the word "hereof," insert: "*Provided*, That the construction of the bridge authorized by the said act of Congress may be in township 27 north, range 47 east, or township 27 north, range 48 east, Montana meridian."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows:

To extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE RIVER AT EL PASO, TEX.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5582) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street in the city of El Paso crosses the Rio Grande, in the county of El Paso, State of Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved May 19, 1926, to be built across the Rio Grande at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street in the city of El Paso crosses the Rio Grande in the county of El Paso, State of Texas, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS POTOMAC RIVER AT DAHLGREN, VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5628) to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by the act of Congress approved May 5, 1926, to be built across the Potomac River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation from a point in the vicinity of Dahlgren, in the northeastern end of King George County, in the State of Virginia, to a point south of Popes Creek, in the county of Charles, in the State of Maryland, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER AT FULTON, ARK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5642) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Red River at Fulton, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for beginning and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by the act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark., approved February 4, 1926, are hereby extended one year and three years, respectively, from the date of the approval hereof.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 3, strike out the word "beginning" and insert in lieu thereof the word "commencing."

After the end of section 1 add the following:

"SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS TENNESSEE RIVER ON LINDEN-LEXINGTON ROAD, TENN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6053) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved May 7, 1926, to be built across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BETWEEN WRIGHTSVILLE AND COLUMBIA, PA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6479) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River between

the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved May 7, 1926, to be built across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved January 26, 1925, across the Columbia River, at or near Kettle Falls, Wash., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENT TO NATURALIZATION LAWS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 349) to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I think there should be an amendment on page 3, line 2; the article "a" should be "any."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. It does not seem to me to be necessary.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do gentlemen think the effect of this is that he may appear before the examiner who is nearest the witness?

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. That was the intent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Very well, then; I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the third paragraph of the second subdivision of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"As to each period of residence at any place in the county or District of Columbia where the petitioner resides at the time of filing his petition there shall be included in the petition the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each has personally known the petitioner to have been a resident at such place for such period, and that the petitioner is and during all such period has been a person of good moral character."

(b) The fourth subdivision of section 4 of such act of June 29, 1906, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Fourth. It shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting any alien to citizenship (1) that immediately preceding the date of his petition the alien has resided continuously within the United States for at least five years and within the county or the District of Columbia where the petitioner resided at the time of filing his petition for at least six months, (2) that he has resided continuously within the United States from the date of his petition up to the time of his admission to citizenship, and (3) that during all the periods referred to in this subdivision he has behaved as a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. At the hearing of the petition residence in the county or District of Columbia where the petitioner resides at the time of filing his petition, and the other qualifications required by this subdivision during such residence, shall be proved only by the oral testimony of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States. If the petitioner has resided in two or more places in such county or District of Columbia, and for this reason two witnesses can not be procured to testify as to all such residence, it may be proved by the oral testimony of two such witnesses for each such place of residence. At the hearing residence within the United States, but outside the county, and the other qualifications required by this subdivision during such residence shall be proved either by depositions made before a naturalization examiner or by the oral testimony of at least two such witnesses for each place of residence."

(c) Section 10 of such act of June 29, 1906, as amended, and section 2170 of the Revised Statutes are repealed.

(d) The Secretary of Labor shall make such changes in the forms prescribed by section 27 of such act of June 29, 1906, as are necessary to make them conform to the provisions of this act.

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 11 and 12 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Fourth. No alien shall be admitted to citizenship unless (1)."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the word "that."

Page 2, line 19, strike out the word "that."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "county," insert "or District of Columbia."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Senate Joint Resolution 48, providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of a class other than Members of Congress be laid before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 48

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which now exists be filled by the appointment of Charles Evans Hughes, of New York.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate Joint Resolution 49, providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents to the Smithsonian Institution of class other than that of Members of Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 49

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which now exists, be filled by the appointment of John Campbell Merriam, of the District of Columbia.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SOLDIERS' HOME AT LOS ANGELES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 164) to authorize appropriations for construction at the Pacific Branch Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I see here is an appropriation of $250,000. Will the gentleman from Michigan explain that?

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, there was a fire at the soldiers' home in Los Angeles and burned the mess hall. It was after Congress adjourned, and, at the suggestion of the Director of the Budget, when I was in the West I went to see it. The old soldiers are being messed in four different places. There are 1,300 of them to be fed, and a good many times it takes three messes. Some of the men have to go two or three hundred feet across one of the principal streets of Los Angeles. There are

men being turned away from the soldier's home every day because they are unable to feed all the men who apply. In addition to that there are 265 men who feed at Sawtelle but who have to sleep out. The places that are now used for mess halls should be used to house the old soldiers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made out a good case, and I withdraw my objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $250,000 to be expended for the construction and installment at the Pacific Branch, Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., of one general mess building, with bakery and equipment and such utilities and appurtenances thereto as in the judgment of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers may be necessary.

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 4, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$200,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had concurred in the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed in the enrollment of H. R. 5800 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the first deficiency bill, to insert on page 38, in line 9 of the engrossed bill, after the word "attorneys," the following words: "(their heirs or their assignees now of record, as their interest may appear)."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled House joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR—AMENDING STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1397) amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the gentleman knew the purpose of the bill he would not object. In the first place, it simply amends existing law by doing away with an amendment which was placed in the law on November 17, 1921. That amendment extended the time of the period of limitation and was intended to apply only to war frauds from three years to six years. Let me read the amendment of 1921:

Amendment of November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. 220), now found in section 582 of title 18 of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, is as follows: "*Provided, however*, That in offenses involving the defrauding or attempts to defraud the United States or any agency thereof, whether by conspiracy or not, and in any manner, and now indictable under any existing statutes, the period of limitation shall be six years. This section shall apply to acts, offenses, or transactions where the existing statute of limitation had not yet fully run on November 17, 1921; but the proviso shall not apply to acts, offenses, or transactions which on that day were already barred by the provisions of existing laws."

The period of six years in reference to war cases has now passed. The war frauds are cleaned up by this time. The purpose of this is very clear. One witness in a case which is coming up for trial in the District of Columbia before long refuses to testify, on the ground that he may incriminate himself, and in order to take that immunity from him and compel him to testify, this amendment is necessary.

Mr. SCHAFER. If what the gentleman says is correct, that the six years has run in all of those cases, has it not also run against this witness in the Teapot Dome case? Here is what I have been considering, and, perhaps, the gentleman can clear it up: During the last session of Congress I made several speeches and put into the RECORD clear and convincing evidence, obtained at considerable expense, showing conclusively that there was a conspiracy on the part of Government officials and others to loot the alien property. I have not had opportunity to have that investigating resolution adopted, and I believe that a new Congress after election may look at that resolution with a favorable light. I do not want to approve of any legislation that will permit those crooks to go without being brought to trial.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As I understand it, these cases were committed before 1920?

Mr. SCHAFER. Oh, no; some of them in 1924.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If those people defrauded the Government, they would come within the six-year period.

Mr. SCHAFER. But with this bill they would only have three years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is true. I do not believe alien property cases come within the scope of the 1921 amendment. Does the gentleman want to assume the responsibility of extending immunity to a recalcitrant witness who will not testify in one of the most important cases which the Government is going to try?

Mr. SCHAFER. Oh, in order to get one witness I do not like to let a dozen or a hundred crooks go who robbed the Government through the alien property.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If anyone has defrauded the Government in cases arising out of the war, if he has not already been indicted, there is not much chance of indicting him now.

Mr. SCHAFER. Why is there not, if there was a conspiracy in 1924 and 1925?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, we tried a case in New York City only a few weeks ago, I think it was in September or October. It was a clear-cut case where the Government was defrauded of three or four hundred thousand dollars, and yet the jury would not convict because so much time had elapsed.

Mr. SCHAFER. I believe that if these cases to which I refer were brought before a jury the jury would convict, and I will assume the responsibility. I am not going to permit a lot of crooks to have the statute of limitations run in their favor in order to get just one man. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am afraid the gentleman is doing more damage in one direction than he realizes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

BATTLE OF PERRYVILLE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 48) to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $5,000 be, and is hereby, authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of erecting a tablet or marker on the grounds of the Battle of Perryville, near Perryville, in Boyle County, Ky., in honor of the Federal soldiers who took part in that battle, and many of whom are now buried therein, said tablet or marker to be erected in a suitable location, having reference to the monument erected by the State of Kentucky to the Confederate dead that also lie buried therein. Said sum to be despensed by the Secretary of War, after he shall have approved the plans for said tablet or marker.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept, free of cost to the Government, a tract of land containing 4 acres, with the roadway 25 feet wide running from the east side of said tract to the Perryville turnpike, and upon presentation of good and perfect title to said tract of land the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish thereon a national cemetery.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "dispensed," on page 2, line 10, be corrected.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMMISSIONERS IN COURT OF CLAIMS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was H. J. Res. 82, to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (February 24, 1925, ch. 301, par. 1, 43 Stat. 964; United States Code, p. 899, sec. 269), providing for commissioners in the Court of Claims, their appointment, powers, and procedure, be, and the same are hereby, continued in full force and effect for the term of five years from the date of the approval of this joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

HOUSE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, at the close of the last Congress the House passed a resolution directing the interim Committee on Accounts to make a survey of the employees and services of the House for the purpose of making any corrections, equalizing salaries, and abolishing useless positions. This committee has labored during the summer and fall and has presented here a report. We worked without any desire to favor anybody, but simply to carry out the desires and wishes of the House. Now, for the purpose, perhaps, of making our work intelligible to Members of the House, so that they will know what we have done, I am making this statement. We have no pride of authorship, no desire to separate anybody from his position, but we appreciate that the desire of the House is to have the House organization work efficiently and economically.

We abolished 22 positions. Only 2 of them might be called major positions.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I have only 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. Does the gentleman propose to call up this resolution?

Mr. MACGREGOR. That will be determined later. I am making a statement under unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRNS. I want to suggest to the gentleman that a resolution of this importance ought not to be called up until after allowing opportunity for Members to look into it and understand it. I hope the gentleman will let it go over until after the holidays.

Mr. MACGREGOR. There seems to be a misunderstanding of some Members of the House as to what we are trying to do.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. You are taking my time——

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is taking the time of the House. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I may not be able to explain it in the time allotted to me.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman could get 15 minutes additional if he wished it. This bill of the gentleman's is too important a matter to take up to-day under suspension of rules. This proposition will take from the House post office two needed employees over there. The gentleman's report says that there are three forwarding clerks, and I happen to know there are only two. There is a mistake in that respect.

The House Postmaster has given the best service in that office that has ever been given Members of Congress since I have been here. Now, I do not think the House is going to vote to cripple the splendid service given by this office. I am as strong for economy as anyone, but I am for sane economy.

Mr. MACGREGOR. It is no baby of mine, it is the House's. In the office of the Clerk we abolish three clerks of $2,020 each. We find no necessity for the expense. Over in the House Office Building is a library which probably most Members of the House did not know anything about. There are three employees connected with that library. We propose to abolish the House end library and keep the reference room adjacent to the floor of the House and appoint a librarian to take care of that. In the Doorkeeper's office we investigated the folding room and made inquiry, and there are five clerks keeping records in the folding room. We considered that number too many, so we have taken out the office of the superintendent of the folding room and placed it in charge of the very efficient foreman of the folding room. There are 31 folders in the House Office Building. We have reduced the number to 25 and taken 1 of the folders who is now carried on the roll as a folder, and who acts as a bookkeeper, and created for him the position of bookkeeper.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Allow me to present this. In the document room there are nine assistants in that work, and we have taken out one assistant and given the remainder part of the compensation. In the office of the Sergeant at Arms we have abolished the office of Deputy Sergeant at Arms, whose sole duty is to put the mace up and down.

We have also abolished a pair clerk and a messenger. There is a Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of the pairs and there is a pair clerk and messenger, and also a pair clerk and messenger among the minority employees, so that there are four employees to take care of pairs, which appeals to us as being entirely too many. So we have taken off one on the Republican side and one on the Democratic side. We have abolished the position of stenographer and typewriter in the Sergeant at Arms' office, for which he has no use.

In the postmaster's office we have taken off, as the gentleman from Texas says, two messengers. We were informed by the postmaster, as I remember the testimony, that there were three persons engaged in forwarding mail, and we could not see why there should be so many persons engaged in forwarding mail, and thought that one person could handle it, so that we have cut off two.

In the list of special minority employees we have abolished the position held by the late Joel Grayson, because that position can not be filled and there is now no Joel Grayson. There was only one Joel Grayson and there is nobody to take his place.

We have also abolished the position of clerk to the majority leader. At the present time the clerk to the majority is acting with the Clerk of the House, and the work of clerk to the majority leader is being done by Mrs. Donnelly, who was originally appointed under a special resolution, she having formerly been clerk to Mr. Mann. We have taken off the assistant pair clerk on the minority side and we have abolished the clerk and janitor of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, because that committee has been abolished. We have abolished 22 positions and created 6, the positions created being clerk to the Doorkeeper, assistant clerk to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the janitor to the Commtitee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and janitor to the Committee on Education.

Mr. BLANTON. Right there will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the use of having all these colored janitors sitting out in the hall in front of the doors of offices in the Capitol and House Office Building? The gentleman by his bill proposes to increase their salaries to $190 each per month. I have been here 11 years. I have never found any use for it. What is the use of continuing that archaic, expensive custom that ought to have been done away with long ago?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman is probably right, but you can not do all this in one swallow. Most all of these janitors are really messengers.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but they sit out in the hall and do nothing.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The report says that the library in the House Office Building is seldom used.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Right there, where did you get the report? I have not been able to get it. I sent out for it, and they said they were all gone.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am one of the Members who are compelled to use the library.

Mr. MACGREGOR. It would not be any great effort for you to walk over to the Library of Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But we find quicker service in the House Office Building. I have to consult books there.

Mr. MACGREGOR. That can very readily be handled under the Library of Congress, and there is no use in having five people over in this moribund library here with nothing to do.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am interested in that. When we send over there for books, they ought to send them over.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I omitted to say that in the office of the Doorkeeper we have 17 laborers who are supposed to be janitors. We also have 8 cloakroom men who are supposed to be janitors. There has been an entire lack of discipline in regard to the janitor force, and for the purpose of efficiency we have reduced the number of laborers in that class to 12, and placed them under the direction of the chief janitor, under rules and regulations to be provided by the Committee on Accounts, which will enforce discipline. Five of these 17 we find to be old employees who have been here for a long period of years, running up as high as 50 years, and we have placed them on what might be called a retired list.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an inquiry there?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. What has the committee done with this large number of clerks who for nine months previous to the meeting of Congress on the first Monday of December were carried on the pay roll as clerks to committees when no such committees existed, since they were not elected by Congress? Do you keep up that practice and carry clerks for four months or nine months during the recess between terms of Congress? Do you keep them on the pay roll acting as clerks or janitors to some Members?

Mr. MACGREGOR. That is a custom that has continued for a number of years. They used to be appointed as session clerks, but in recent years they have been provided for as annual clerks.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman tell us of any service that has been rendered by these clerks during the nine months when Congress was not in existence?

Mr. BLANTON. They mail out Republican campaign speeches.

Mr. SNELL. All sorts of inquiries come there during vacation from Members of Congress, and they are kept there to attend to that kind of work.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. As the gentleman intimates, there should be a few of those clerks to committees, but that might be arranged for at the end of a Congress. But here there are all those clerks to committees which go out of existence at the end of a session.

Mr. SNELL. I speak from my own observation.

Mr. LEAVITT. I can speak for the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HUDSPETH. How much do you expect to save by this resolution?

Mr. MACGREGOR. We expected to save $50,000; but now it is down to $10,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Where do you apply that saving?

Mr. MACGREGOR. We increase the compensation in the case of 22 employees in the Clerk's office and 35 in the Doorkeeper's office, 1 in the Sergeant at Arms' office, 3 in the Postmaster's office, 7 special and minority employees, 41 committee clerks, 12 assistant committee clerks, and 32 janitors or messengers. We have increased the compensation of 153 employees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman here presenting a report from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. MACGREGOR. We are presenting the report of the interim Committee on Accounts, which was authorized under the resolution adopted on March 3, at the close of the last session.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Will there be any opportunity to amend this resolution, or is it the intention to bring it up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The purpose was to bring it up under suspension of the rules.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not attempt to do that to-day, for under suspension the bill could not be amended in any particular, and unless it is amended it should not pass. I regret to oppose any bill proposed by our good friend from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR], for we all on both sides of the aisle like him, and we would rather be with him than against him; but his bill does great injustice to both the post office and the document room, and must be changed.

Mr. CANNON. What is the number of the resolution appointing the interim Committee on Accounts?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I think 453.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. This resolution has only become available in the last hour or so. I just saw a copy of it myself a moment ago, and I have been told by several Members it has not been available before and had not been printed. Does not the gentleman believe that the consideration of a resolution covering so many employees ought to be deferred until Members can look into it? I hope the gentleman will not undertake to press it to-day.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I am not pressing it now. I am simply trying to explain it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I simply want to ask why a member of the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman from Missouri, has to ask the chairman of the Committee on Accounts a question about this resolution?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Because the gentleman from Missouri does not understand the situation. This was the interim Committee on Accounts, which exists from the time one Congress dies until the commencement of another.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Then the gentleman from Missouri was not a member of the interim committee?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No; he was not.

Mr. GALLIVAN. That is a good answer. May I ask the gentleman one more question?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Is it not a fact that this resolution was not available until two hours ago?

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is not available now.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I understand the resolution is not available to all Members even now.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of answering the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is not the desire of the committee, against the wishes of the House, to bring this matter up to-day or before the holidays, but the object was that the House should not be successfully lobbied between now and the time it does come up. That is the reason we tried to bring it up to-day. There was no attempt on the part of the committee to accomplish a reform. That was not the idea. There was no attempt on the part of the committee to consider economy. That was not the idea. The purpose of this bill is to increase efficiency, improve morale, and accord justice to the employees of the House. There is not a single Member who will be deprived of one single convenience, comfort, or necessity under the provisions of this bill. That is the whole proposition, and the chairman of the committee is trying to explain to you that although the bill seems to carry a lot of discharges that in reality it only carries 16 discharges. In addition to that, salaries which almost every Member of this House has been importuning the Committee on Accounts to increase have been increased in the lower brackets and justice has been done to a lot of hard-working employees of this House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman states that he proposes to move to suspend the rules. Is he presenting this as a report of the committee for consideration by the House, or is this merely preliminary to asking unanimous consent to move to suspend the rules?

Mr. MACGREGOR. This is a unanimous-consent request to explain the report and the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. The matter is not then before the House?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No; except as a matter of explanation; that is all.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman tell us who comprised this interim committee?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman's colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL]——

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have not the slightest doubt of that when I see this kind of a bill.

Mr. MACGREGOR (continuing). The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] and myself.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Is it the gentleman's contention that this is a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No; I am not presenting it as a privileged report. I am simply giving information under unanimous consent.

Mr. SINNOTT. Then the gentleman does not expect to present it as a privileged report?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I do not claim that it is privileged.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I find the bill comes from the Committee on Accounts and not from any interim committee.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Which bill?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am asking this as a parliamentary inquiry. I do not expect the gentleman who is trying to answer me to be Speaker of the House for quite a while. I am submitting the parliamentary inquiry, Is this a report from an interim committee or from the Committee on Accounts? The gentleman who has the floor says it is a report from the interim committee.

Mr. MACGREGOR. It is.

Mr. GALLIVAN. But House Resolution 59 says, "From the Committee on Accounts."

Mr. MACGREGOR. The resolution is introduced by myself. It has been referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Then it is not a report of an interim committee?

Mr. MACGREGOR. What—the resolution?

Mr. GALLIVAN. The resolution now before us.

Mr. MACGREGOR. No; it does not have to be.

Mr. GALLIVAN. May I ask if the Committee on Accounts has reported the resolution?

Mr. MACGREGOR. It has not.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. It is very clear that the matter the gentleman is discussing ought not to be voted upon to-day, and I think the membership can count confidently upon its not being considered to-day. It does seem to me, however, that it is well the gentleman should explain his resolution, and for the purpose of explanation I think, perhaps, if the gentleman were not interrupted he would be able to do it better, if he be not constantly interrupted. As it is not going to be considered to-day, I hope the membership will allow the gentleman in the remaining part of his time to explain his proposition, because if it can stand on its merits we wish to adopt it in due time, and if it can not then we can drop it.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I do not yield now. I hope the gentleman will let me get through my remarks.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to ask the floor leader a question, if I may. I simply want to know what will be the parliamentary situation. Is this bill to go to the Committee on Accounts and be considered by that committee or is it to be considered by the House?

Mr. TILSON. I understand the resolution has been referred to the Committee on Accounts, but to-day it is being discussed and explained. Nothing is to be done about it now, however. No motion has been made and none can be made unless the Speaker recognizes the gentleman to suspend the rules, which is the only way it can be brought up now.

Mr. DOWELL. That answers my question.

Mr. MACGREGOR. When interrupted I was at the point in the bill with respect to committee clerks.

There are 44 committees of the House. We have increased the compensation of the clerks of all the committees except four—the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Accounts, the Committee on Claims, and the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

We have placed the committees in classes according to the way in which, in our humble judgment, they ought to be arranged. We have placed them in six classes, the Appropriations Committee, of course, occupying No. 1, and the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, No. 2, and so on down the line.

We have increased the compensation of the clerks of these three committees from $3,300 to $3,600.

In the next line we have raised them from $2,880 to $3,000; 11 we have raised from $2,360 to $2,500; and 10 from $2,360 to $2,400.

There are 22 committees having assistant clerks and we have raised 10 of them. Most of them we considered had sufficient compensation for assistant clerks. The general raise has been for those getting $1,520. whom we have raised to $1,650.

We have sought to follow out the wishes of the House. We have done this, as I have said, without consideration for any person or whom it was hitting; but simply to make this House function in the way we think you want it to function. We have given you the result of our work and trust it will meet finally with your approval. I do not myself want to cram anything down the throats of the Members. I want them to use their calm, cool, and dispassionate judgment and act only according to the dictates of their consciences, and not because they are besieged by a lot of those who are personally interested.

SECTION 1044 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (S. 1387) amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (c. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220), the gentleman from Wisconsin, who objected, having withdrawn his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220), be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 1044. No person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense, not capital, except as provided in section 1046, unless the indictment is found, or the information is instituted, within three years next after such offense shall have been committed: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall apply to any offense for which an indictment has been heretofore found or an information instituted, or to any proceedings under any such indictment or information."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HOUSE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, service on a committee to abolish useless offices, to adjust duties and compenastions is never pleasant and seldom appreciated.

At the end of the last session the Speaker appointed two gentlemen of the majority and me to undertake this service. I will say for the other two members of the committee that they have served laboriously and sincerely. Our object was not economy so much as efficiency and equality. I will say, individually, that at no time did I consider the saving of any money where the convenience or comfort or the reasonable usefulness of any Member of the House would be impaired.

The main trouble now is a lack of responsive coordination on the part of the employees of the House, a lack of direction and control. For instance, one would think that the chief janitor had something to do with the janitors; but he has not.

One would reasonably suppose that a stenographer to the clerk was stenographer to the Clerk, but he is not; he is clerk over in the stationery room.

We have some barbers who can not barber, and a Member would run the risk of having his throat, rather than his whiskers, cut if he allowed him to shave him. [Laughter.] The reason why they are barbers on the pay roll is because they served as bodyguard to some Member in the Civil War. They have been here, some of them, for more than 40 years.

Personally I am not in favor of turning these old men out, and so we have provided a sort of place to take care of them; but they ought not to be barbers.

It was our purpose to get a more responsive service. Wherever there is a perfectly useless employee I say without hesitancy that we recommend the abolition of that office.

Take, for instance, the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, whose duty is merely to put up that mace and take it down, for which he receives around $2,800 a year, and who at the last session of Congress left for home before we adjourned and was not here to take it down and came near leaving us in session all summer. [Laughter.]

In all good faith I see no reason for continuing the office when there is the Sergeant at Arms to take down the mace.

Now, there is a minority employee whom we have recommended to be dismissed, and he happens to be one of my good personal friends among the minority employees. But there is no service for him to perform. That is Mr. Overstreet, a splendid gentleman and one of the two pair clerks for the minority. You also have two on the majority side, and so we recommend the dismissal of one on the majority and one on the minority side simply because there is no real work for them to do.

I want you gentlemen on the Democratic side to realize that to show the good faith of the gentleman on the majority side we Democrats get the best of it. It merely so happens; there was no politics in our report. An employee on the majority side is superintendent of the folding room, performing no service, at least none that can not be performed by the foreman of the folding room, whose salary is increased and who happens to be a Democrat.

Now, I know that the two Republicans would not have recommended that this position be abolished if the position had not been absolutely useless.

So far as the statement of the gentleman from Texas about the condition of the post office is concerned, why, of course, I would not interfere with the proper functioning of that office. We had an inspector from the Post Office Department go all through it. We introduced on the stand all individuals, gentlemen interested over there, to find out what these gentlemen were doing. They have three men over there doing one man's work, and we disposed of two of them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What disposition was made of the barbers?

Mr. GILBERT. We put the barbers under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts. Somebody has to perform those duties, and I happen to occupy a place on that unenviable committee, but there is where it belongs.

Now, I have no prejudice in this matter at all. It is an unpleasant task. The House gave to the committee an unpleasant task and they have conscientiously performed it. It is back to you to say whether or not the House was indulging in a mere gesture.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Certainly.

Mr. MAPES. On page 6 of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, the last paragraph places the laborers appointed by the Doorkeeper under the jurisdiction of the committee through the chief janitor "and such other attendants as may be appointed upon the roll of the Doorkeeper." What employees did the committee intend to embrace by the language "such other attendants"? Is it intended by that language to place all the appointees upon the roll of the Doorkeeper under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. MACGREGOR. There are two on the roll of the Clerk who are in the bathroom and we desire they should go on the roll of the Doorkeeper.

Mr. MAPES. And this language, "such other attendants," applies only to the two bathroom attendants?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. GILBERT. It is impossible, of course, to make any adjustment that will be satisfactory to every Member.

I say frankly that this recommendation of ours is not exactly as I would have it. There are some here that I think, under our resolution, are paid too much and some too little; but you can not meet the mind of every Member on those matters. On the whole, a great improvement will be made in service. a more equitable pay provided, and a saving of $17,000 a year effected if the report be adopted. It is as good as three conscientious, hard-working Members can make it. Without throwing ourselves any encomium, I believe any other report by any other Members would be found to contain as many objectionable features as this probably contains.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am for sane economy as much as anyone in this House, but while this Committee on Accounts is seeking to save $10,000, or even as the gentleman first supposed, $50,000, if they had put in the same time on some of the main bureaus or independent offices of this Government, and used the same energy, they could have saved not $10,000 or $50,000, but $50,000,000, and with careful work they could save two or three hundred million dollars a year instead of this paltry little sum proposed by them at the expense of good service. We want service in our post office, and we are getting the very best that is possible. We have one of the finest fellows there as Postmaster in the House Office Building that you could find anywhere in the United States. He is giving the service. Oh, he is a Republican and I am a Democrat, but he gives everybody good service, Democrat and Republican alike; and he ought to have every single facility given him that he needs for good service. Yet our committee is proposing to take two of his needed employees away from him.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

Mr. UNDERHILL. No; yield now.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will yield now to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The Postmaster is all the gentleman says he is. He has three forwarding clerks, one his wife and one his son.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. If the floor leader of this House [Mr. TILSON] will ring up the Postmaster, he will find out that he has but two forwarding clerks, and only two, and has never had more than two. The gentleman from Massachusetts is mistaken about that.

Mr. UNDERHILL. He gave us that information himself.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not care where the gentleman got the information. I know a little something about his personnel, for I have investigated it myself, as I have carefully investigated all employees of this Government, and he has only two, and if the gentleman is wrong in his contention in that respect he may be wrong with respect to all the balance of his bill which he is seeking to bring up under suspension of the rules. [Applause.] I want economy as much as anybody, but I want sane economy. I sincerely hope that if the gentleman does bring this resolution up under suspension of the rules, in which case we would not have a chance to amend it, that the House will vote it down, and make the committee bring in its bill here under the rules so that the membership of the House may not be forced to put their stamp of approval, but may amend it as they see fit. This is too early in the session of Congress for such bills to come up under suspension of the rules. There is plenty of time in the closing hours two years from now for rules to be suspended and bills passed in that manner. We ought not to permit this bill to come up here under suspension of the rules, and I do not think the Speaker of this House will permit it, although this committee has great influence from a party organization standpoint.

What was the purpose of this original resolution to begin with, when first proposed in the Sixty-ninth Congress? It was to do justice to the House employees, and to all of them. It was to grant a proper raise to all of them in salary, which they have not had in 20 years. We have had our salaries raised and others have had their salaries raised, but the employees of this House have not had a raise in 20 years, except the war bonus of $240 to those getting under $2,000. That was the purpose of the original resolution, and yet that purpose has been thwarted, because in this proposed bill in no particular has there been a proper raise in the salaries of the House employees. Oh, some $20 has been granted here and there to a few favorites, such as the colored janitors who sit in front of office doors all day and do nothing, who by this bill are to draw $190 per month, but I am talking about the rank and file of them.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I think the gentleman ought to withdraw that statement about favorites. We have had no favorites in this matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why has the gentleman not raised all of them instead of just a few? [Applause.]

Mr. MACGREGOR. Because we have taken those that we thought ought to have raises.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman has shown favoritism.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman can not say that.

Mr. BLANTON. Whenever you raise some and forget to raise the others, I think that favoritism is shown. [Applause.]

Mr. MACGREGOR. That is a bad construction of the gentleman's mind.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I hope that this resolution will not be called up to-day under suspension. If it is called up, we must gather enough strength to kill it; and then we can later amend it properly under the rules. I will procure from Postmaster Collier the facts about his office and attach same hereto.

THE REAL FACTS ABOUT POSTMASTER COLLIER'S OFFICE

MY DEAR POSTMASTER COLLIER: In debate on the floor a few minutes ago it was stated by members of the Committee on Accounts that you now have three forwarding clerks, and that your son also is employed. I announced that you had only two forwarding clerks. I would appreciate your answering the following questions, to wit:

First. Have you two or three forwarding clerks?

Second. I have been under the impression that your son, Wilson F. Collier, is attending a law university at night and needs to work during the day, and that through the kindness of my colleagues, Congressman GRIEST and Congressman MCLAUGHLIN, who are on the patronage committee, they placed your son on temporary employment, and that he has been doing the heavy work on the outside, handling the heavy mail and heavy boxes on the loading platform. Please advise me whether my above impression about your son is correct or not.

Third. Please advise me whether taking the two employees away from you, as is proposed, would cripple your needed force and hamper you in giving the splendid service we are all now receiving?

Your friend,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

POST OFFICE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1927.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I answer your questions just received, as follows, to wit:

First. I have only two forwarding clerks and have never had more than two.

Second. Your impression about my son as stated is true and correct.

Third. Yes; absolutely.

Very truly yours,

FRANK W. COLLIER.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to inject myself into this debate, because it is not the time to discuss the merits or demerits of the resolution; but I can not let the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] go unchallenged, although I believe that most of the Members do not take much stock in it. However, there was some applause when he suggested favoritism was shown by this committee, that we had raised the salaries of some and not others. We have raised all of the low-paid employees. We have raised all of the hard-worked employees. We have tried to get rid of a few loafers. These are the facts. As far as the post office is concerned, we did as we did in every other department.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. No. We called the head of the department in before us, and he gave us a list of those he had on his pay roll.

We found in this schedule there were three persons, two men and one woman, designated as forwarding clerks. We asked the postmaster how long they were employed as forwarding clerks.

He said one during the session, and during vacation he kept three. We asked why, and he said because they had to forward the Members' mail. We said, "What do you do with the other employees during the interim?" And he said, "They have their vacation." When we asked how long these vacations extended, he said that the time was divided up among the employees, and each man in the employ of the post office got, I think, a little over four months.

Now, we never asked a person what his politics were; we never asked who appointed him; whose particular pet he was. We just went through this thing in a businesslike way. There was no desire on the part of the committee—in spite of what the gentleman from Texas said—to play favorites or to bring about economy. That was not the idea; but because of favoritism, because of loafing, because of inefficiency, the morale of employees was destroyed and service was neglected.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. And those who were performing good work would ask why this one, a particular pet, was doing nothing. The law you passed that said that a certain employee should be assigned to certain duties and be on the pay roll for that purpose was being violated and said employee was hiding in some cubby-hole in the Capitol. There was no favoritism shown in any way, shape, or manner. We tried to give you something scientific, something honest, and something just. I desire to say that if you will study this you will not find a single, solitary personal consideration in it; and if you will be as square and honest as the committee was, you will recommend and indorse it yourself.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. As far as the figures are concerned, we did not increase the salaries of those earning $4,000, $5,000, and $6,000. We have increased those which were below $1,200, a pittance of $1,000 or less a year, the thoughtless Government paying its employees less than a living wage, less than an existence wage, so we raised every one of those up to a point where, at least, they could have sufficient income for maintenance of life if not life's luxuries.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. No; I will not yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I know, but not very willingly.

Mr. BLLANTON. But I did yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. There is something I want to impress upon the minds of Members for a particular reason. Every man who has lost his job has some friend in the House. Everyone who has been removed—there are 22; but there are six other places which we created. Such employee is going to try to hold his job, and you are going to be solicited and importuned in his behalf. It is not a cheerful or enviable position for one to be in. I know it, and it is pretty hard to turn men down. If you are going to be square about it, you have to treat all alike, and ask yourselves, Is the service necessary, or is it just a job for some favorite?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

APPOINTMENT ON A COMMITTEE

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 61

Resolved, That O. J. KVALE, Representative from the State of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House on the Territories.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING THE RECESS

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by Mr. CURRY, chairman of the Committee on the Territories, to ask permission of the House that the Committee on the Territories may sit during the recess of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. It is only during the Christmas recess. As I understand, it is not a general request.

Mr. DOWELL. It is only during the Christmas holidays.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes on the matter under discussion.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to opening up this matter again. I am sorry the gentleman from Missouri could not get in. We have already wasted an hour in discussing a matter that is not coming up to-day, so for the protection of the other Members I must object to any further discussion of this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. I object.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 278) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to suspend the rules and pass House bill No. 278.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not a day when the Speaker is authorized to recognize gentlemen to move to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair disagrees with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I will withdraw that statement. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 278) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of $250,000,000, in addition to the amount authorized in section 3 hereof, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, but under this authorization and from appropriations (exclusive of appropriations made for 'remodeling and enlarging public buildings'), heretofore made for the acquisition of sites for, or the construction, enlarging, remodeling, or extension of, public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, not more than $35,000,000 in the aggregate shall be expended annually (except that any part of the balance of such sum of $35,000,000 remaining unexpended at the end of any year may be expended in any subsequent year without reference to this limitation): *Provided*, That such amount as is necessary, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the total amount authorized to be expended under the provisions of this act, shall be available for projects in the District of Columbia, and not more than $10,000,000 thereof shall be expended annually (except that any part of the balance of such sum of $10,000,000 remaining unexpended at the end of any year may be expended in any subsequent year without reference to this limitation): *Provided*, That at least one-fifth of the expenditures outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1927 shall be for the buildings heretofore authorized, and at least one-fifth of the expenditures for the fiscal year 1928 and at least one-fifth of the expenditures for the fiscal year 1929 shall be for a like purpose, unless a less amount shall be necessary to complete all of such buildings: *Provided further*, That expenditures outside the District of Columbia under the provisions of this section shall not exceed the sum of $5,000,000 annually in any one of the States, Territories, or possessions of the United States."

(b) The last paragraph of such section 5 is amended by striking out "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANHAM. I am the ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and favor this legislation. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY] is also a member of the committee. He is opposed to the legislation. By reason of his opposition to the legislation would he not thereby have a prior right to demand a second?

The SPEAKER. In certain cases he would. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the bill has never been before the House except under suspension of the rules, and the fact that the Members are not acquainted with the provisions of it, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi suggests the absence of a quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. BUSBY. Temporarily, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and thirty-two Members are present—a quorum. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is a similar bill at the desk to come up, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be taken on this bill be limited to 40 minutes on a side. In view of that, I do not propose to ask for a second on the second bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes to a side. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 40 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi 40 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is a bill which has for its purpose an increase of $100,000,000 in the authorization for the construction of public buildings in the country at large. The companion bill, upon which it is understood the gentleman from Mississippi will not demand a second, is a bill with reference to the District of Columbia, authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the property commonly known as the triangle property, located between the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue and the north side of Maryland Avenue. In the last session of Congress these two bills were combined and passed this body by more than a two-thirds vote, but failed of consideration in the other body of the Congress. Consequently they come before us again at this time for action.

This particular bill now under consideration, making an increase of $100,000,000 in the authorization for the country at large, is important by reason of the fact that it increases the annual appropriation from $25,000,000 a year to $35,000,000 a year. If enacted, the building projects which will be submitted to us under the existing law at this session of Congress will be predicated upon $35,000,000 as an annual expenditure instead of $25,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much will be the expenditure outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. LANHAM. All of this additional appropriation is to be spent outside of the District of Columbia. The sum of $10,000,000 will be added to the annual amount already authorized to be expended outside of the District of Columbia. There will be, then, $20,000,000 annually for new construction in the country at large, $5,000,000 for the country at large with reference to those projects which were authorized in 1913 and never completed, and $10,000,000 for construction in the District of Columbia; in other words, $25,000,000 for the country at large and $10,000,000 for the District.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Covering a period of how many years, I will ask my colleague?

Mr. LANHAM. It covers a period of several years under the existing law, but the amount for the country will get larger as the District projects are taken up.

If I may continue for a few minutes, I think I may anticipate a good many of your questions and be able to make a more connected statement. We have had practically no construction in this country by the Federal Government for many years. There is great need for it. There is scriptural authority for the saying that "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." Of course, the people of the Nation, anxious for the public buildings which are so much needed, have long cherished a hope they have felt to be reasonable, but their projects have been deferred and the obligation is upon us to see that they are deferred no longer than is absolutely necessary.

We decided the matter of policy in a former Congress. I was opposed to the change of policy, and labored as hard and as earnestly as I could in my opposition to the adoption of the policy which now exists, but that policy was ratified by the Congress by an overwhelming vote, and it stands now as our policy. Any effort to abolish it at this time, it seems to me, would simply tend to continue the static condition that we now have in Federal building construction.

What is the object of this bill? It is to accelerate the construction by increasing the amount of money which may be used in the country at large. Under its provisions a greater number of buildings may be built the first year, and we shall be enabled to get more rapidly the erection of the many buildings that are required in this country. I hope the limit of the authorization for annual appropriations may be extended as soon as we can determine whether or not those in the Federal Government who have in charge the construction of buildings can use a larger amount.

I confess that the $100,000,000 additional provided for in this bill will not give us all the money which is needed for Federal construction in this country, but it is, gentlemen, a step in the right direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEAVITT). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When this legislation was up last year there were assurances made by Mr. Wetmore, of the Treasury Department, Governor Bartlett, in the Post Office Department, by the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLIOTT], and the distinguished gentleman, as ranking minority member [Mr. LANHAM], to certain Congressmen with respect to a certain building program. May we rely on those assurances concerning this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to my colleague that any assurance I am able to give I hope any man can rely upon at any time. Under the existing policy of the law I have to rely, like everyone else, upon those who are in charge of the construction.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of us are relying on those selfsame promises. The assurance I have had from the four authorities mentioned that buildings would be constructed at Sweetwater and Coleman, Tex., on sites there which the Government has owned for years causes me to support this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I understand this is a five-year program, is it not?

Mr. LANHAM. It is at present. It may require an extension or it may be, by efficiency of operation, that we can increase the annual appropriations and do the work faster and be able to complete the entire building program necessary for the country within five years. I hope we may.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Can those vested with authority to enter into contracts for construction contract in advance of one year?

Mr. LANHAM. There is a provision in this bill which is before the House that the amounts not used in any one year may be available in the following year, carrying over the appropriations, so that they will really have the effect of being continuing appropriations.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. But they could not contract for four and five years in advance.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not think they can contract far in advance for construction which is not covered by the appropriations made.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. For that year?

Mr. LANHAM. As I have indicated, the unexpended balance of an annual appropriation may be carried over and made available in the following fiscal year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Relative to promises, my colleague is on the Public Buildings Committee, and he has watched the procedure. Have they not proceeded so far in pretty much of a businesslike manner. I did not get in under the wire myself, I will state to my colleague; but have they not proceeded in a businesslike way?

Mr. LANHAM. I think they have. Here is the situation, gentlemen: There are more buildings necessary in this country than money will be provided for even with the passage of the bill which is now before us, but the passage of this bill is a step in the direction of making available enough money to take care of all these projects, and I am hoping that in the next session of Congress, and perhaps even in this session of Congress, we may take another step in that same direction. If we do not begin the necessary construction, we shall remain in a static state, with no buildings whatever. The people are clamoring for them. With them it is largely tweedledum and tweedledee as to any academic discussion we may have here with reference to policy, that matter having now been settled and determined. It is my purpose to try to accelerate the building of the necessary Federal structures all over this country and to stimulate those in charge of the actual construction to do as much in any one year as they can. We can likely tell from this initial year whether or not it would be wise from a practical standpoint to increase the annual amount of appropriations hereafter. I hope we may, and that we may get to all of these projects in which we are interested as rapidly as possible. However, gentlemen, we ought to start getting to them, and that is what is now proposed.

Mr. ESLICK. Is it not true that the present appropriation of $100,000,000, added to the original $100,000,000, will take care of only 178 places already having Federal buildings and 58 additional buildings, and that by taking that number, 236, from 2,317 places it leaves 2,081 places in the United States that have a postal revenue of from $10,000 to $900,000 yearly not provided for in this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. That may be true. I will not dispute the gentleman's figures, because I do not have the figures before me. But this bill starts Federal construction in this country in some places, at least, and it is conceded that it is needed in the cases cited. It may not start it at your place or my place, and there will be many places that will still need it. But let us start with our program, build all we can, and see how much those in charge can expend efficiently in any year. If it be shown they can expend more, let us increase the authorization and get all of this needed work done as rapidly as possible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does not the passage of this bill mean this: That the amount expended for public buildings in the country in each year will be doubled, whereas it would be only half that amount if we do not pass it?

Mr. LANHAM. That is practically so. I am hoping, gentlemen, that by the next session of Congress, when we get some of these public buildings started, we can see our way clear to increase the annual authorization so that we may get all of this Federal construction done just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. COX. Considering the policy we have adopted, does not the hope of the country of ever getting public buildings depend on consideration being first given to those that present an emergency?

Mr. LANHAM. I think so; and, gentlemen, to state by way of opposition that much of this money will be placed in large cities which already have Federal buildings is beside the mark.

There are some cities under contemplation which have grown since they have had a Federal building from 25,000 population to 150,000 or 200,000 population, and certainly they must be more urgent cases, although they have an inadequate Federal building, than some town of 2,000 or 3,000 people where rented quarters may be occupied, temporarily, at least, without very serious inconvenience.

Our rent bill is mounting annually. For this very rental we can construct many buildings. Let us go ahead with the project and the program and get as many built as we possibly can, and increase the authorization as rapidly as we may in order that we may catch up with the requirements.

While I am on the floor, let me say one further word with reference to the companion bill to this one—the so-called triangle bill.

I think there is little, if any, opposition in this House to that bill. The Federal Government to-day has many of its departments in rented quarters, isolated here, there, and yonder.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. And the great purpose of this companion bill is to carry out the L'Enfant plan and place in this triangle Federal departmental buildings like the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Labor, to get them out of rented quarters and to give us a civic center of our own buildings where we may obviate the payment of rent, where we may transact the public business with greater dispatch, and where we may have some architectural harmony and conformity among the structures and make this the great Capital that it should be.

Let me say that these buildings—the Commerce Department, the Justice Department, and the Labor Department—are not intrinsically mere District of Columbia buildings. They are buildings in which all the people of this country are interested. [Applause.]

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I come before you to talk again on the public buildings bill as a matter of principle. I want to say to you in the beginning that if the estimates that are before you, which are contained in the documents from the Treasury and Post Office Departments, are correct, I am taken care of to the extent of having one building designated to come out of the first $100,000,000, regardless of what becomes of you who are not designated.

But this does not satisfy me, because when I go into the history of the public-building programs of this country I find that the policy which we are now trying to adopt, the policy which prevailed in this country for almost 100 years, never did work and never did get results. It did not work then and it will not work now.

I take some passages from the speech of one of our colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], in which he discusses somewhat the history of the public-building programs of the country. The gentleman tells us that until 1853 public building was done under the supervision of the President and under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and that during that time, a period of 64 years, there was a total of 23 post offices built and a total of all buildings, including quarantine and immigration stations of 56 places, and this was all that was done in the 64 years.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not true that was due to the fact Congress had not appropriated the necessary money for the building of the different buildings?

Mr. BUSBY. I presume that is true.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And the fault was with Congress rather than with the method employed?

Mr. BUSBY. I am not advised on that, and I would not accept that theory of it, because seeing how slowly we have traveled during the six years I have been in Congress trying to get a building program on foot and being opposed by the administration, I would naturally come to the conclusion it was not because Congress was not willing to provide funds but because the administration could defer the building as it is doing now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will my friend yield?

Mr. BUSBY. I yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As I understand it, the gentleman proposes under his bill that every Congressman have one building in his district; is that the gentleman's proposal?

Mr. BUSBY. I will answer that in this way——

Mr. HUDSPETH. If I have my friend's position correct, does the gentleman really expect to get such a bill through this Congress now or at any time in the future?

Mr. BUSBY. Not if we keep on in the way we are going now, taking "hopes deferred." We are very much like another expression from Pope—"hope springs eternal in the human breast; man never is but to be blessed"—and to you who, like my colleague and friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who has been made a couple of promises and who says he is still relying on those promises.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that there are places over the United States where it is imperative that public buildings be built.

Mr. BUSBY. Oh, certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Then how are we going to get them built except through a bill of this character. Does the gentleman think there is any possibility of getting a measure through like the one the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes, I do; if we will stiffen up like men and like true representatives of the people and say what we are going to do. Then there would be a chance and not otherwise [applause], because if you dillydally around here with an administration averse to the program, we will never get it in this way or in any other way, and I can prove this to you by the spokesmen from the departments who appeared at the hearing.

If you will now let me proceed for just a few moments I think I will come to the specific point we have before us, which is this particular bill.

I filed minority views on this question, and I venture to say not one Member out of twenty has had time to read this report, because it has been printed only a day or so.

In this document, Report No. 11, I point out the fact that it was provided by the act of May 25, 1926, that a survey of the needs of the country for public buildings be made by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General. This survey was made and was presented to the House as Document No. 651, second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, and was dated January 15, 1927. The report (p. 2) recites that it is presented as a—

> preliminary report showing the minimum public-building needs of the country at the present time.

It also states (p. 3):

> It should be noted that the growth of the Postal and other services is so rapid that additional needs will develop during the period of the present building program to an extent which will greatly enlarge the figures presented in this report. The Postal Service doubles in about 10 years, and it is therefore obvious that with the present limitation of expenditures provided in the act there would be no possibility of the building program catching up with the public-building requirements of the country.

A summary of the things covered by this report (p. 3) discloses that notwithstanding the law only authorizes the expenditure of $115,000,000 for the country at large, estimates of buildings have been made totaling an expenditure of $199,128,000, as follows:

One hundred and seventy-nine cities that now have Federal buildings are to receive $167,850,500; 58 cities estimated for new buildings—most of which are required by section 3 in the act of May 25, 1926, providing for two buildings for each State—$8,477,500; marine hospitals and quarantine stations, $12,000,000; immigration stations, $1,100,000; and other buildings under the Treasury Department where no postal facilities are furnished, $9,700,000; making the total of $199,128,000 for which definite estimates have been made under the law that authorized an expenditure of only $115,000,000.

It is readily seen that the estimates submitted exceed by $84,128,000 the amount authorized to be expended.

The report referred to—Document 651—in the third division states that there are 799 cities where the postal receipts range from $20,000 per annum to more than $900,000 per annum "where no public buildings have ever been erected," and which cities are not estimated for in the proposed expenditures of $199,128,000, nor is it contemplated that they are to be considered in the seven-year building program being advocated by the administration. In addition to these 799 cities with postal receipts of from $20,000 to $900,000 per annum that are not to be cared for during the six to seven years covered by the proposed building program, there are 1,512 cities with postal receipts of from $10,000 to $20,000 per annum at the present time for which no estimates have been made and which are certainly not to be cared for in any contemplated building program. It is estimated that these 2,311 cities would require an expenditure of approximately $170,420,000 to supply them with appropriate Federal buildings; $199,128,000 covering the places estimated for, added to $170,420,000 to supply the needs of the places not estimated for, would make a total of $369,548,000 required for the public-building needs of the country at large.

In the estimates totaling $199,128,000 it is proposed to construct during the period of from six to seven years buildings in 58 cities that have never had Federal buildings. At the maximum amount of $35,000,000 that it is ultimately proposed shall be expended per annum for Federal buildings under House bill 278, known as the Reed bill, how long at that rate will it take the country to get relief from the great congestion in its mail quarters? I ask this question to disclose the utter impracticability of the methods we are proceeding on to attempt to furnish the country with the buildings it must have if it is to carry on the service of handling the mails and business through the mails for the people.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. I will.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is it not a fact that there are 166 places owned by the Government in which there is no proper building?

Mr. BUSBY. That is true; many places have sites where it is not proposed to erect buildings on them, but they divert the funds to other centers where there are great needs; and there is great need, there can be no question about that.

Now, this document submitted by the Treasury Department in which places are estimated for totals $199,128,000. Suppose we pass the present bill. The money in it can not be reached before four years if we come to the maximum of $35,000,000. So I say there is no immediate need for further authorization, because we have authorizations for four years in advance.

Now, there is one helpful feature, and it is the only one in the bill, where we raise the limit of the annual amount to be spent from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000. But if we further entangle ourselves in following up these vague illusions of getting buildings under the present building policy, if we further authorize public buildings which can not be reached under five years, in years to come when we find that it is really impractical and impossible to proceed with this policy we will find it more difficult to extricate ourselves from the predicament. That is why I am against this bill as useless procedure.

If we are to pursue the "lump-sum" policy, we should pass a bill raising the limit of the annual expenditure from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000. That would not hurt anything, and before we expended the money authorized we could tell what kind of results we are going to get from the Treasury Department, for it would not then be hampered by unreasonable limitations.

Now, continuing the history of the public buildings, in 1902 the first "pork barrel bill," so-called, was passed by Congress because the Congress realized that they could not get results by depending on the departments; that favoritism of all sorts and kinds with promises and none of them kept was the rule and policy of the departments in following up legislation of this "lump-sum" class. I think I can demonstrate that by the official documents before I finish.

In 1902 Congress passed an omnibus building bill. It passed omnibus building bills each Congress until 1913, and practically all our public buildings were built during that period. That is about the only way we could get a public building; that is, by naming the places and amounts for buildings.

After 1913 we had no public building bill because of the war, and for 14 years we have gone along with practically no building. Our mails have increased something like 700 per cent in volume and our needs have increased accordingly. In many cities the Post Office Department is compelled to rent old store houses, and accommodations of that class, and that is where our mail is cared for and mail service rendered.

I am for taking care of this proposition in a straightforward manner. I think our country is financially able to build all the buildings which the United States needs in which to house and carry on its own business. Buildings totaling $199,000,000 are estimated for in document No. 651. The department estimates that it will take $170,000,000 to take care of the 2,311 places not mentioned in this estimate and not proposed to be cared for in this program. That will make $370,000,000 outside of the

District of Columbia, and that is the present minimum needs of the country for public buildings.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I understand an appropriation of $25,000,000 is authorized to buy land for the so-called triangle.

Mr. BUSBY. That will come up in a few minutes from now. It is proposed to pass that bill to-day.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. But there will be no debate on it?

Mr. BUSBY. That is true.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Has any testimony been brought before the committee as to the aggregate assessed value of that triangle land?

Mr. BUSBY. Practically no testimony at all has been submitted to the committee regarding the triangle.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will yield, let me say that I have heard the statement made by those in authority that the assessed value of the property is a little in excess of $17,000,000 and that a part of that property which has been acquired recently for other purposes was acquired on condemnation proceedings at an advance of only 12 per cent over the assessed valuation of the property.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. BUSBY. That information is outside talk; that was not brought before the committee in a straightforward business way. The Public Building Committee reported that bill without any hearings at this Congress, and with practically no information in the way of hearings at the last Congress.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am wondering why the committee should favor an appropriation of $25,000,000 without the taking of some testimony.

Mr. BUSBY. I can not understand that. I am wondering why they do not open the proposition up and bring it before the House without bringing it up under suspension of the rules, which prevents an opportunity to offer amendments or to say a word about an amendment; but I have gotten no answer to that as yet.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I understand that the figures given out as the assessed valuation is the assessed valuation as it had been raised during the last year, and that the assessed valuation previous to last year was a little in excess of $13,000,000.

Mr. BUSBY. I thank the gentleman for the information. There are some items proposed for the District of Columbia. I am not opposed to that. The sum of those items is $50,000,000, contained in the act of May 25, 1926. There is $14,750,000 for the Memorial Bridge, and $25,000,000 that we propose to appropriate with which to buy the triangle. There is $5,500,000 that we appropriated recently to buy the land between the Capitol and the Union Station. There is $1,250,000 which we are spending for a site for the Supreme Court Building, and we propose to erect a building on that at an expense of $5,000,000. There is $20,000,000 expenditure for school buildings, and about one-third of that, or $7,000,000, is paid by the United States. That makes a total of $116,500,000 that we are spending in the District of Columbia. There is no limitation placed on any part of that expenditure, except on the $50,000,000 and the five-year school program, which shall extend over a period of five years. I am not complaining about that; but I do think that if we are so liberal locally we ought to recognize some of the obligations to the folks in our respective districts and care some for them. In mentioning these things I have not mentioned the arboretum or the Botanic Gardens, or the bathing beaches for the white and colored people, or the Center Market site and building, or the purchase of park grounds, all of which entail an expenditure of several million dollars more, and I venture to say that $125,000,000 will be spent in the District of Columbia while we are pinching the rest of the country because we are afraid to spend a little money for these things which have developed in your territory and mine.

The cry raised against a building bill that mentions items and limits the amounts of those items, is that it is a pork-barrel bill. I want to refute that proposition and show that there has never been a pork-barrel building bill in this country. There are 1,129 first-class post offices in the United States; 670 of those offices are located in Federal buildings and 459 first-class post offices have never had a Federal building. There are 3,419 second-class post offices in the United States, and only 515 of those offices are located in Federal buildings; 2,904 of them have never had a building erected for them. There are more than 11,103 third-class post offices in the United States and only 10 of them are located in Federal buildings. This, to my mind, refutes the cry that the country has gone to the bad because Congress has passed "another pork-barrel bill." It can not remain a pork-barrel bill, if so when it was passed, because our country is growing. Our cities are growing cities, and it is only good business to go into the heart of a growing city and select a block or half a block on which later to erect a Federal building. Our Government would save money in that way and be acting wisely as good business men should act. I know and you know a number of instances where a site was bought from 25 to 40 years ago which is worth more now than the amount that it would require to construct a modern post-office building to serve the city which has in most instances tripled in population since that time. I am in favor of the development of rivers and harbors; but if you have a river and spend so much on it this year, that river will remain the same size, and there might be such a thing as a "pork-barrel" proposition with reference to rivers and harbors, but not with reference to post-office buildings in cities.

RENTS PAID BY GOVERNMENT IN MILLIONS

Another important thing to take into consideration in determining the extent of a building program the country should undertake is the question of the millions of dollars being paid in rent by the Government for quarters in which to house its mail and other activities.

Mr. Garrard B. Winston, Undersecretary of the Treasury, stated in the hearings on H. R. 11791 of January 22, 1924 (p. 41), that—

> We are paying this year about $23,000,000 of rent outside the District of Columbia, and about $1,135,000 within the District.

Since that time it is very evident that the rent bill of the Government has tremendously increased, because in the last annual report of the Postmaster General, in speaking of the increase in rents on renewed leases for postal activities, he says, after mentioning a number of instances where quarters had been re-leased during the year (p. 13):

> This was an increase of 74.6 per cent over the expiring leases, 27.9 per cent of which increase was due to additional space required and 46.7 per cent to a higher rate paid per square foot.

It is evident that if we go along a few more years without adequately taking in hand the building needs for housing governmental activities, the Government's rent bill will be from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 per annum. When the Government is able to borrow money at 4 per cent and less, it seems to me that we are playing the part of a very poor business man to continue year after year with the present business policy while the mail service to the people is crippled from one end of the country to the other because of lack of sufficient quarters.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is it not a fact that this committee under its first allocation made two-thirds of the allocations to the sites secured in 1913, and to buildings that were not completed at that time, on account of war conditions, and where there were not sufficient funds? Did not the committee first look after those sites?

Mr. BUSBY. The act of May 25, 1926, provided that $15,000,000 of the $115,000,000 authorized for the country should be used to place buildings where the act of 1913 had authorized them. They were to be built within three years. That would have allowed $5,000,000 a year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And most of the appropriation was taken up in that way.

Mr. BUSBY. Yes; $4,219,700 out of the $19,878,700 for all purposes, and that was because an amendment was tacked onto our former bill in the Senate, requiring them to do that. I do not think those places would have been given consideration if they had been left open.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Was that bill ever passed in the other body?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes; it is section 3 of the act of May 25, 1926.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BUSBY. I yield myself 10 minutes more.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. I will.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Am I correct in the belief that under this bill contracts may be entered into for the amount up to the limit of the bill within any time? I am speaking with reference to this expenditure the limit of which is $35,000,000 a year.

Mr. BUSBY. Section 4 of the act of May 25, 1926, provides—

> that unless specifically provided for in the act making appropriations for public buildings, which provision is hereby authorized, no

contract for the construction, enlarging, remodeling, or extension of any building or for the purchase of land authorized by this act shall be entered into until moneys in the Treasury shall be made available for the payment of all obligations arising out of such contract, and unless the said act making appropriations for public buildings shall otherwise specifically provide, as hereinafter authorized, appropriations shall be made, and expended by the Secretary of the Treasury, in accordance with the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ELLIOTT. They can not enter into a contract for any building until the appropriation is made for that specific building.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Within the limit of $35,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is merely an authorization to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUSBY. Now, further in regard to the question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] a while ago, as to how to get needed buildings. You will find, as Congress found in 1902, we will not get any results from this slipshod method by sending a blanket authorization down to the supervising architect, because he is still supervised by outside architects who have no responsibility to this body. As a result, we will get nothing for the country at large, and then we will come to the conclusion that if we are to get results we will have to stand up like men and quit taking vague promises. We will do as every straightforward business man would do in buying or building a house for his business activities. You say this will be administered fairly. But take the proposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH]. It seems to me wherever we find developed cities that have postal receipts of some $10,000 a year and up, and, mind you, there are some cities that have more than $500,000, $600,000, or $800,000, and some almost a million dollars in postal receipts annually, but where we have more than $10,000 postal receipts a year a prudent Government would look out and purchase a suitable site in that city on which to construct a Federal building, and when the receipts reached, say, $20,000 or $25,000 provide by law that the Government then in a straightforward business way will go ahead and construct a suitable building to house its activities. We can work out some plan along that line. Further to provide where there are cities having no Federal building having postal receipts of $10,000 or more in each of the congressional districts, give some recognition to those congressional districts, because the whole country pays the tax, and the whole country pays for the building.

Now, as to the other proposition that this will be fairly administered. With all due deference to our genial chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT], I know that Rushville, Ind., is entitled to a Federal building. Under the terms laid down you would term it a "pork-barrel" city; but I do not believe that. That is not my construction of the matter given. Now, in Report 651, last session of Congress, occur these words, speaking of Rushville. It says:

> The city should also have fair consideration for a Federal building in view of the services rendered the country by Representative ELLIOTT, the author of the public buildings bill.

Now, that is the reason given in the official report for giving Rushville, Ind., a post-office building, and yet they told us, and continue to tell us, that there is no pork in this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Not now.

Mr. ELLIOTT. But the gentleman is making an attack on me. There is just as much reason for giving a building to my town as there is for giving one to the gentleman's town.

Mr. BUSBY. I will defend your city, not on the ground that it is a pork-barrel proposition, but on its merits. I think the gentleman from Indiana should have defended it on the same ground, instead of letting them stick a thing like this in that report.

We find the very first estimate made to Congress contains an item, coming down through the President and through the Budget Committee, for Rushville, Ind.: "For the acquisition of a site and commencing the construction, $40,000," under an estimate totaling $115,000.

Now, Rushville is not one of those growing cities such as we find out farther in the West. In the year 1880 it had 2,515 population. In 1890 it had 3,475; in 1900 it had 4,541; in 1910 it had 4,925; and in 1920 it had 5,498 population. What I am showing you is that this thing does not work out just as the gentleman said it did. The committee chairman's city is included in the very first appropriation submitted. When it came up for consideration on the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] said—he was chairman of that subcommittee—that he was surprised at the amount they were asking for the site. He says:

> If the people of Rushville appreciate the erection of that public building, I do not believe they would want a site costing $30,000. It is out of all proportion to the building.

He says further:

> Your post-office inspectors have made an outlandish proposition for $40,000 at Price, Utah, and $30,000 for Rushville, Ind., and that has been tentatively approved for action.

He suggests that there be some limit fixed.

Gentlemen, do you think you should let some departmental clerk or some honest man who is doing the best he can down in the department attend to your business rather than that you should take the work in hand yourself? Would you tell your people when you get back home, "I did not know what to do, and we turned the work over to the Treasury Department"? Consideration has been shown to me in this matter, but no promise is going to stop me from advocating on the floor of this House what I believe to be justice to myself and justice to my people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves one minute.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I do not know that I need five minutes, but I ought to take it if I do. I may say, when called upon to speak, that the reason for this bill is the fact that there may be better facilities afforded to the different sections of the country and the existing authorizations for public buildings allowed.

You may recall, of course, that the last bill provided for an expenditure of $165,000,000, and that $15,000,000 of that was to increase the limit of cost of buildings that were authorized in 1913 and which could not be built because of the increased cost of building; that $50,000,000 of that was allotted to buildings in the District of Columbia, and $100,000,000 for buildings in the rest of the country. But there was a provision also that there could be expended for all purposes only $25,000,000 a year; that you could expend only $5,000,000 in one State, and that each State must have at least two buildings before you could expend more than $5,000,000.

We have reached the limit of expenditure in a given year, and we have only scratched the surface of the needs of the country. It is because of this that we have given some consideration to the problem, which was occasioned by the failure of the deficiency bill last year, due to the fact that the Senate had too much to do and was unable to pass that deficiency bill before the day of adjournment came. We have lost at least a year in the building program, and so in the deficiency bill just passed we carried $8,000,000. That $8,000,000, added to what we already had and what we expended during this year, brings us up to the limit beyond which we are not allowed to go before the 1st of July. We are carrying all in the regular bill, which becomes effective on the 1st of July, that will be allowed under the old act for 1929, although this is only 1927 it is the fiscal year 1928, and so within the $25,000,000 limit which the country is allowed to spend we find ourselves unable to meet the obligations that are pressing on every hand for new buildings; and that failure to meet the obligations which the exigency of the case imposes upon us is the justification for passing the pending bill.

The pending bill adds $100,000,000 more to the $165,000,000 already provided. It enlarges upon the amount that may be expended in a given year; it enables us to approach the problem with greater certainty of being able to take care of the urgent cases; it enables us to meet more promptly the demands of the various communities of the country; and it insures to the Members of the House and the Senate earlier consideration of the questions which they have been urging and which have been urged upon them for years.

In my own case, for example, I have been trying to get a building for Chicago since 1908.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman assure us that the revenue bill, which we passed the other day, will provide enough money to carry out this program?

Mr. MADDEN. I voted against the revenue bill because I wanted to vote in advance to save money enough to do the things that are urgently needed. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of Iowa. May it not be necessary for the President to veto either this bill or the revenue bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, I am not the President, but I voted in advance to veto it. All of this $100,000,000 will not be expended in one year. It will take three, four, or five years to spend it all, and it will not be as great a burden upon the tax-paying public as it might seem to be on its face, but it will be an insurance to the various sections of the country that their cases will not be unjustifiably delayed. That is about what it will be.

I do not know what limit of expenditure per annum is proposed in the two bills.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Thirty-five million dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. But if it should be $35,000,000 or $40,000,000, that would, of course, meet the pressing needs and it might be that out of that I may be able to find a way to secure a building for Chicago, for which I got the first appropriation in 1908 and we are still waiting. However, I am not selfish on that point. I want the country taken care of in all its parts. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, while our Government is one of the youngest, it is still one of the richest nations of the world; yet at the same time it is a tenant government. Our Government is paying more than $25,000,000 per annum as rentals on buildings in which to conduct the Government's business. The buildings in which private business is conducted are owned by corporations and individuals. I am one of those who believe that the business of the Government, wherever that business is of sufficient importance, should be conducted in buildings owned by the Government. A public building in any town or city will stimulate a patriotic pride in the people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that the interest on the investment and the upkeep of Federal buildings in the average small city is more than they are paying in the way of rentals?

Mr. ALMON. That may be true, but that does not change my idea about the propriety of the Government owning the buildings in which to conduct the Government's business. At the same time I am one of those who believe that the 500 Members of the Congress of the United States are better qualified to determine where these buildings should be constructed than any two Cabinet officers or any two bureaus in the city of Washington. It was the policy of the Congress of the United States for some 60 years to provide funds for the construction of the public buildings through and by means of what is commonly known as an omnibus public buildings bill, meaning that the Members of the Congress should determine where they should be built. I was one of those who tried from 1913 until 1926 to secure the passage of another omnibus public buildings bill.

We passed one through the House and another was reported by the committee to the House, when the question came up in 1926 a fight was made by those who favored an omnibus bill, and those who favored the policy which was adopted in May, 1926, through and by means of what is known as the Elliott buildings bill. I opposed and voted against that bill. It authorized sites for buildings to be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury and Postmaster General instead of Congress. However, it is now the law and is the only way to buildings. I am going to vote for the pending bill because I realize that if there is to be any further building provided in this country in the near future it will have to be done through the policy recommended by this administration and adopted by Congress in May, 1926. I do not know whether it is going to be a success or not, but I know the administration can not succeed in its building program that has been laid out unless Congress provides the necessary funds. I believe we should provide another $100,000,000 at this time so that it will be known that funds will be available to meet the building program. At the time the Elliott bill was enacted I said if you are going to start out on this kind of a building program you should authorize the appropriation of a sufficient amount. I said then that $150,000,000 would not be a drop in the bucket, and now instead of making this $100,000,000 we ought to make it at least $200,000,000, if you are going to make a real success of the program and put buildings where they are greatly needed. This administration is responsible for the conduct of this law. Do not give them an opportunity to say that the reason this plan or this policy has failed was because Congress would not appropriate the money with which to carry it out and make a success of it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Is there a Federal building at Muscle Shoals?

Mr. ALMON. No; there is not a building at Muscle Shoals. Sheffield, situated about in the center of the Muscle Shoals district, has been selected as one of the two places in Alabama where buildings are first to be constructed. There is very great need for a building at that place, and I sincerely hope that it will be taken care of in the next year's building program. There are other places in my district in great need of public buildings, and I expect to get them later. To pass this bill, and others to follow, is the way and only way to get them. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH].

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: O gentlemen of the House, we hear a great deal of talk about this bill being a measure solely for one section—the North and East—and also some Members on my side want to go back to the "old pork-barrel" method. Well, these gentlemen just as well face the issue and look it in the face squarely. This House is not going back to the "pork-barrel" method of selecting one Federal building in every congressional district in the United States. I take it there are many districts in the United States similarly situated as is the district which I try to represent here, and I am for this measure. My district must have some relief, and I am going to try to get it. When I came to Congress eight years ago the population of the district I am trying to represent was about 211,000. At the present time, as estimated by various chambers of commerce, telephone directories, and other agencies and so forth, it is claimed to be about 500,000. In one or two counties out there when I first ran, the largest town they had was a prairie-dog town. To-day, within a year or two, there are towns out there that have sprung up, on account of the oil development, almost overnight. Those people must have adequate postal facilities and buildings. For instance, the town of McKamey a year or so ago was a big prairie-dog town, but to-day, I am informed, has over 10,000 people. Other oil towns like Big Lake, Rankin, Best, Wink, Pyote, and many others I could mention of equal importance.

We need some Federal buildings, because we have this same situation in about 14 of the counties out there where, as I said the other day, when you strike a pick into the ground you get oil. Six of the largest oil fields of the South were recently developed in my district, including one of the richest oil fields in the United States where they are getting gushers of 10,000 barrels daily at as shallow as 1,000 feet, the Yates oil field. The town of Iroan has sprung up there. We must have a post office, a postmaster, and the Government must rent a building.

I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY], who is opposing this measure, that I tried through the old method—the one he advocates now—when I first came here, and while this district was developing, to get some public buildings established. Some of the older Members advised me as follows: "CLAUDE, introduce bills designating your places." Well, I introduced a bill to establish one, I think, in almost every county or town in my district having a population of over 2,000. I do not know of anybody who surpassed my speed limit in that respect except my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Judge BLANTON. He had one almost proposed in every precinct in his district, as I showed you here one day. [Laughter.] Of course, I am speaking somewhat facetiously as to Judge BLANTON'S bills, but he introduced quite a flock. I think he opposed this bill the last time, while I voted for it. He has got a building at Sweetwater. Well, I am glad of it. I trust every colleague of mine who needs a building will get one—especially the Texas delegation. Some say the way to get you a building designated is to fight this bill. Well, I do not believe this, as I said to my colleague and friend, FRITZ LANHAM to-day, and he agreed with me. The building committee—Mr. Schuneman, Governor Bartlett, Mr. Martin, and the architect, Mr. Wetmore—I believe are trying to handle this matter in a business way and use business methods—they have a big

problem, but I believe they will work it out fairly and squarely. They impress me as being fair men.

Mr. BUSBY. If the gentleman will permit, I want to correct him. The gentleman [Mr. BLANTON] did not oppose the bill. He simply opposed the proposition until he had promises for two places.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Oh, I think the gentleman from Mississippi is mistaken in this latter statement. I am not sure as to Mr. BLANTON'S vote. There was no record vote. But my recollection is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] rose against that bill when it came up under a suspension of the rules. I may be in error; but at any rate, I heard him say at one time before the bill came up he was opposed to this character of legislation. He may have changed his mind when it came up. I have been in favor of such a bill, because when you have a district like mine developing out there so rapidly with towns that had developed even before the oil boom—such as Colorado, Big Springs, Marfa, Alpine, Henville, Marlin, Pecos, Fort Stockton, and many more—which is not only the greatest livestock growing district but one that produces more wool, more oil, mohair, more cattle, more sheep, goats, and, I would say, if my friend over here from Marlin, TOM CONNALLY, were not present, probably more cotton; but we produce a great deal of cotton out there, TOM, you saw it when you went out there with the Texas Press Association last summer. You take a district like that, which has grown in eight years from 211,000 population to 500,000, if some figures sent me are correct, where they are handling the mail on the sidewalks, in the alleys, even out on the street; yes, in poorly heated and worse ventilated places. It is the duty of our Government to provide adequate, safe buildings for post offices; then, gentlemen, certainly we need some Federal buildings and lots of them—I have mentioned a number of towns where post-office buildings are needed—in my home town, El Paso, we must have a new immigration station and a new Federal office building, and if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY] can tell me under his method how in the name of the shining sun I can get a building except on paper, I would like to hear it. Here is the majority over here [indicating], the Republicans. This is the only character of legislation they say they will vote for, and they are responsible for legislation here. I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi whether, after the 4th of March, a year from next March, when the Donkey moves into the White House—and if I read the signs of the political horizon correctly, he is going to move in for four years at least—and the Elephant moves out, will my friend still be opposed to a bill of this character? If I read the signs aright, that is what is going to happen. Just what the "Burro's" name is I do not know, but "Brer" Elephant will surely have to vacate and make way for the Donkey and Democracy's triumphant entry. Will the gentleman still be against this measure?

Mr. BUSBY. Does the gentleman mean for me to answer the question? If so, I would like to have him give me an opportunity to answer.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Would the gentleman be opposed to this measure under a Democratic administration? I want to say to him that I am firmly convinced that inside of a little over a year your party and mine will handle it.

Mr. BUSBY. I am opposed to the proposition under anybody's administration, because it is wrong in principle and not recognized——

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is the gentleman serious about that? If we had a Democratic President and a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury and a Democratic Postmaster General, would the gentleman stand on this floor and fight our own party and say our party is not competent to administer this fund, as he is now saying of the present majority party? [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSBY. I have said so. If the gentleman will stop long enough for me to answer, I will say yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Ah, I can stop. I am not a "self-starter," but a "self-stopper." The gentleman seems to be a "self-starter" when this bill comes up, but unable to apply the emergency. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida, if he wishes to ask me a question. He so indicated a few minutes ago.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. The same condition that obtains in the district of the gentleman from Texas obtains all over Florida. May I ask how in the world we will ever get buildings unless we appropriate for them?

Mr. HUDSPETH. You can not get them in any other way except by the terms of this bill, I will say to my good friend from Florida, and we are appropriating for them under this bill. You do not want to get them simply on paper, as the gentleman from Mississippi proposes; you and I want them in our towns and cities where urgently needed. My friend from Yazoo City, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY], can go around talking about getting buildings in every congressional district whether needed or not—give all the boys a piece of pie—but he might just as well attempt to stop the last overflow of the great Mississippi River with a toothpick. Do you not know you can not get them in that way, Brother BUSBY?

Mr. BUSBY. I am not from Yazoo City.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Well, the gentleman is from another good place in the great State of Mississippi. Yazoo is all right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Might I suggest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] that probably the phenomenal growth in population in his district is due largely to the hustling Congressman from that district.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No, my friend; no; the great increase in population is due to the greatest people that inhabit this earth, the finest, most fertile soil, and the most genial climate, and in spite of that Congressman you so kindly referred to. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the picture of the growth in population so vividly drawn by the gentleman from Texas, while, perhaps, not quite so exaggerated in some parts of the country, is nevertheless quite uniformly true.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It was not an exaggeration, but a true picture that I was drawing.

Mr. REED of New York. I know that, but as to the rest of the country I say that it might be quite as pronounced as in the gentleman's district; but it is a fact, as practically every Member on the floor knows, that cities have been making a very rapid growth all over this country for a period of years.

We had long, exhaustive hearings before our committee and the conditions prevailing in most of the cities of the country were described as deplorable. It was developed at these hearings that there are towns where important mail matter has to be stored in temporary buildings that are unsafe, and in some cases stored in tents. At other places valuable mail is exposed to the rain because they are unable to cover large shipments of parcel post.

The country is interested in having some relief. When we passed the bill appropriating $165,000,000, $50,000,000 of which was to be used in the District of Columbia and $15,000,000 to be used to carry out contracts authorized in 1913 that could not be completed within the limit of cost, it meant in the final analysis that the country at large under this program of an expenditure of $25,000,000 a year would only get $10,000,000 a year. This was a matter of bitter disappointment to every community where there was congestion in the postal business. I have no ax to grind. I had none when I introduced this bill for an extra $100,000,000.

Now, let us analyze this House bill 278 and see what it does. It just doubles the building program. I doubt very much if we were to authorize an appropriation for more than $100,000,000 at this time whether the organization of the Government could handle the money expeditiously and wisely until an organization had been built up to carry out a larger program. Under this program they tell us they can spend $35,000,000 efficiently and economically. Now, it means for the first three years the country at large will get an expenditure of $20,000,000. At the end of three years the country at large will get $25,000,000, and at the end of five years the country at large will get an expenditure of $35,000,000 a year.

I believe that is going to meet many urgent needs of the country. I agree with the other speaker that as soon as the organization has been built up so that the money can be expended wisely to meet the situation, that this Congress in its wisdom will give that organization more money to meet other emergency cases where the postal receipts are even less than $20,000 a year.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will this take care of all the buildings that are said to be necessary in the survey?

Mr. REED of New York. I can not state that, but it will go as far as the money will go, and we will be $100,000,000 better off than we would if we did not pass this bill.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. What would be the condition if you added to this bill another $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 authorization?

Mr. REED of New York. As I stated, the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department were carefully questioned on this phase of the situation. You know that since 1913 we have had no building program to amount to anything. The war came on and everything was disrupted. But the Government has no organization that could take care of any more money wisely than we are appropriating in this bill. As I say, if the situation develops, and they have an organization that warrants it, we can appropriate more money. I insert an analysis of H. R. 278:

ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC BUILDING BILLS

Act of May 25, 1926		*H. R. 1534 (Reed bill)*	
Authorization	$165,000,000	Further authorization	$100,000,000
Extension limit of cost	15,000,000		
Sites and buildings, District of Columbia	50,000,000		
Country outside of District of Columbia	100,000,000	Increase to	200,000,000
LIMITATIONS		LIMITATIONS	
Annual expenditure	25,000,000	Increase to	35,000,000
Annually in District of Columbia	10,000,000		
1927, 1928, and 1929, per annum, outside of District of Columbia, buildings authorized in prior acts	5,000,000		
New projects outside	10,000,000	Makes available	20,000,000
After third year, for new projects outside of District of Columbia	15,000,000	After third year, for new projects outside of District of Columbia	25,000,000
After fifth year, for new projects outside of District of Columbia	25,000,000	After fifth year, for new projects outside of District of Columbia	35,000,000
This act contemplates a survey of the public building needs of the country and provides that the $100,000,000 authorized for public buildings outside the District of Columbia shall be allocated to the different States, where buildings are found to be necessary, in such manner as to distribute same fairly on the basis of area, population, and postal receipts.		Unexpended balance of $35,000,000 may be expended in any subsequent year. This bill liberalizes program without changing policy of the act of May 25, 1926.	

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, they say that there is no other way to get a public building except to vote for this bill and turn it over to the department to build the building. Well, gentlemen, if you will vote down this proposition, which is under suspension of the rules, and give me an opportunity to substitute the bill that I hold in my hand, I will send you all back to your offices happy, and you will be glad the bill came up. [Laughter.]

How can the department down here know where to put a public building better than I do in my own district? They talk about the needs of the country. I want to tell my good friend from Chicago that I have down in my district a town—Seminole City—that in one month collected more freight than the Rock Island collected in Chicago, and yet it does not even get honorable mention. From this city the Rock Island collected $7,000,000 in freight in six months. The postal money orders in that town amounted to $849,957.10. They sold $46,158 worth of stamps and registered 16,000 letters. They received 18,000 registered letters and 10,000 to 15,000 letters daily. And yet that town will have no more chance of getting a public building in this bill than the proverbial grasshopper has in a turkey pen. [Laughter.]

Now, I am not going to chide you, but, as my good friend from Texas says, there may be a change in the administration next year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Oh, there will be; no question about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Well, if it does come I will be here fighting this legislation just the same, because I am not willing to vote to abrogate the powers of Congress and put it in the hands of a bureau. As far as my experience has gone, the Democratic bureaus do not respect Congress any more than the Republican bureaus. [Laughter and applause.]

You turn this over to the bureau and the administration shifts and then you gentlemen will be here with me fighting this proposal, because you will not get any more out of a Democratic administration than you get out of the Republican administration. That is what is going to happen.

Now, let us deal in this matter with common sense. We all know down deep in our hearts that you have shifted the responsibility when you take it off your own shoulders to say where the money shall go.

You have a lot of promises on paper, but it takes the cold coin of Uncle Sam to build houses, and Congress can say where that coin is to go just as well as the department can, and you know it, and you will be standing here five years waiting for these buildings to be erected. If you vote this down and let me put this bill in, you can go home this evening happy, because you will have gotten something for your districts and rendered the country a real service by saving $100,000,000. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHALMERS].

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this bill when it was up for consideration during the last session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. At that time I said that I was an optimist, that I believed in men and their promises, that God was in His heaven, and all is right with the world.

My friends, I am going to be frank with you. If Toledo, Ohio, does not get an adequate Federal building out of this $100,000,000 for the country at large my optimism and belief in men will get an awful jolt, because I have had a definite promise from the joint committee that if the Reed bill became a law Toledo would get its Federal building. This is as it should be.

I represent one of the most urgent projects in the United States. I call your attention to the fact that the present building is utterly and hopelessly inadequate to the Federal requirements in our city. The building was built in the early eighties. It was completed and opened in 1888. You will please note that in 1880 the city of Toledo had a population of 50,137 people. In 1890 the population was 81,434. To-day greater Toledo has more than 350,000 inhabitants. This will show an increase in population since the present Federal building was conceived of a city of 300,000.

The ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Judge LANHAM, of Texas, has well said:

> There are some cities under contemplation which have grown since they have had a Federal building from 25,000 population to 150,000 or 200,000 population, and certainly they must be more urgent cases, although they have an inadequate Federal building, than some towns of 200,000 or 300,000 people where rented quarters may be occupied temporarily, at least, without very serious inconvenience.

This describes the Toledo situation exactly.

The postal needs in Toledo are not pressing, but those of the Government generally, especially of the Internal Revenue Bureau and of the United States district court, are very urgent. When the present Federal building was built in Toledo a grand-jury room was provided in the attic, a room about 20 feet square, with one dormer window about 6 feet above the floor. There were no near-by toilet facilities. At that time only men served on the jury. Now, under the law, we have mixed juries of men and women. There is no jury room for either petit or grand juries. When the court room is not in use for trial purposes petit juries occupy the crowded library, thus excluding its use for library purposes. At times the grand jury occupies the court room. This is not always possible, and when impossible the grand jury goes to one of the three rooms in the district attorney's office, on another floor, a very cramped and inconvenient situation.

At times there are three petit juries in action at the same time—one in the library, one in the judge's private chambers, and one hearing a case in the court room. There is no witness room. Witnesses when not permitted to sit in the court room occupy benches in the corridor. There is no room for court commissioners. Sometimes their hearings are held in the marshal's office, a room 20 feet square, with a counter running across the middle of it. Prisoners, bondsmen, and witnesses elbow each other; and the improprieties which the contacts give rise to, both in commissioners' hearings and in trials, are frequent and grave.

Judge John M. Killits has been district judge of the Toledo district for the past 18 years. He is one of the most efficient, conscientious, and learned judges in the United States. In a letter which I received from him recently Judge Killits says:

> That the building was poorly constructed in the first place; its walls have settled and cracked. The location is so noisy from the street clatter that frequently windows must be closed in the summer when court is in session. Since I have occupied this position the work of this division has so grown that it now exceeds that of more than half

the districts of the country. In 1910 there was 1 deputy marshal, 2 deputy clerks, and 1 assistant district attorney with a stenographer, taking care of the court's work. Now there are 5 deputy marshals, 5 deputy clerks, 2 assistant district attorneys, and 2 stenographers. This greatly increased force is cramped into quarters which were barely adequate in 1910. Sanitary and toilet accommodations are nothing less than abominable.

My colleagues, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a statement was made on the floor a few moments ago that no hearings had been conducted on this bill or on the triangle bill which is to follow it. I can not let that go unchallenged. The fact is that in the last session of Congress both of these propositions were given exhaustive hearings, the triangle bill passed the Senate and came to the House, and we added to it the Reed bill which is before you to-day and brought it over here, and the two bills combined in one passed this House by an overwhelming vote. I think only 26 Members voted against it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Can the gentleman give us information as to what the hearings showed the assessed value of the land was in the triangle district?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The only thing that I know of in the hearings was $17,000,000. That is my recollection.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. On what basis is property assessed in Washington—on the cash value?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman knows as much as I do about that. It was assessed at that sum for the purpose of taxation in the District.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is that assessment at cash value?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is something you can not tell about, in any place, under any law that I have ever had any experience with. Where they are supposed to assess at full value, they may do it and they may not.

On May 25, 1926, we passed what was known as the public buildings bill. That bill provided that $100,000,000 should be available in construction work throughout the country; that $50,000,000 should be available for construction in the District of Columbia and $15,000,000 more to be added to a fund for the purpose of constructing buildings which were authorized in the act of 1913, and previous acts, for the purpose of increasing the limits of cost so that those buildings could be erected and that program worked out. Under the terms of the original bill $25,000,000 was all that was available in any one year; $10,000,000 of this had to go to the District of Columbia, $10,000,000 outside, and $5,000,000 each year to carry out this program of 1913, so that that left only $10,000,000 available under that act to go to the country. That act was also case-hardened; in other words, that if any portion of that $25,000,000 was not used in that year or in any one year it could not be carried over into the next year. There was also a provision in that act that directed the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General to make a survey of the country and report back to Congress what they found in regard to needs for public buildings throughout the United States. They came back here with a report showing that it was necessary to spend not only $100,000,000 but nearly $200,000,000 to take care of those buildings outside the District. So that caused us to bring out this bill, and we were satisfied that the condition of business affairs of the country had gotten to a point that it would stand for an additional appropriation each year, and we put in this bill an authorization for $35,000,000 instead of $25,000,000, this additional $10,000,000 all to go to the country. In addition, we limbered up the law in this respect, that if this year they will only use $30,000,000 of this appropriation, or less, the amount that was not used could be carried into next year and become available then.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will.

Mr. BURTNESS. I desire to ask a question in reference to the construction of the present law. The gentleman will recall the last proviso put in paragraph 4 of the bill passed last year was to the effect that estimates should be made for two buildings in each State provided cities with receipts of $10,000 or $20,000 each did not have buildings. I understand that at first the department construed that to mean there should be two besides the buildings provided for in section 3 of the act. But before the report came out dated January, 1927, they construed the law to this effect, that any building included in section 3 would be counted as one of the two buildings. Now, what does the chairman say in reference to that point?

Mr. ELLIOTT. My construction is this: Section 3 provided for constructing the buildings of 1913 and previous acts, and has nothing to do with that provision providing for two buildings in each State, and regardless of how many buildings the State has under section 3 of the act it does not relieve the Government from building the two buildings.

Mr. BURTNESS. In other words, estimates should be made for two buildings regardless of the number of buildings carried in section 3.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand it we have authorized $165,000,000 heretofore. This bill will add another $100,000,000, making $265,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now, as I understand it, $367,548,000 will care for all the buildings that are eligible under the law?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am sorry my time has expired.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that two-thirds having voted in favor thereof——

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 275, noes 27.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

ACQUIREMENT OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire economically and at an early date adequate sites for suitable accommodations in the District of Columbia for the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government not under any executive department, and suitable grounds, parking, and approaches thereto, the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, is hereby amended so as to authorize and direct him to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, all the lands obtainable with the funds that may be appropriated, including buildings and other structures, included within the triangle bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue and B Street, extending from Fifteenth Street to Sixth Street NW., and reservations A, B, C, and D, except property owned by the United States or the District of Columbia, as such lands appear in the records of the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the amounts authorized in said act of May 25, 1926, and without regard to the limitations contained in the first paragraph of section 5 of such act, the sum of $25,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. The buildings constructed under said act approved May 25, 1926, when completed and ready for occupancy shall be turned over to the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks for care, maintenance, and protection, including the furnishing of heat, gas, and electricity therein, together with all machinery, tools, equipments, and supplies to be used in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there a second demanded? If not, the question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be printed, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on the Library:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Eighth Annual Report of Perry's Victory Memorial Commission for the year ended December 1, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ENTOMOLOGY (S. DOC. NO. 29)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State inclosing a recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture that the Congress be requested to adopt a resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite foreign governments to be represented by delegates at the International Congress of Entomology, to be held in the United States in 1928.

It will be noticed that because of the close relationship between entomology and agriculture the Department of Agriculture is especially interested in the international aspects of this science, which it considers of very great importance to this country. As it would seem, therefore, that the participation of foreign governments in the congress mentioned would be in the public interest, I recommend to Congress the passage of the joint resolution. No appropriation is requested.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—FRENCH STEAMSHIP "MADELEINE" (S. DOC. NO. 24)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of France against the Government of the United States on account of the losses sustained by the owner of the French steamship *Madeleine* as the result of a collision between it and the U. S. S. *Kerwood*, which at the time of the collision was being operated by the War Department, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1927.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—JOHN ADOLF ET AL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report concerning the claims against the United States presented by the German Government on behalf of the heirs or representatives of the German nationals, John Adolf, Hermann Pegel, Franz Lipfert, Albert Wittenburg, Kahl Behr, and Hans Dechantsreiter, for various amounts aggregating $461.59, which have been covered into the general fund of the Treasury Department as required by the statutes relating to the disposition of effects and unpaid wages of deceased seamen on American vessels, it appearing that each of the German nationals referred to lost his life while in the status of seaman in the American merchant marine. The report requests that the Congress be asked to authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay these claims.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of these claims in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress authorize an appropriation of the sum of $461.59.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—SUN JUI-CHIN

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, respecting a claim against the United States, presented by the Chinese Government for compensation arising out of an assault in China on Mr. Sun Jui-chin on June 11, 1923, by a private in the Marine Corps, a member of the legation guard, with a request that the recommendation of the Secretary of State, as indicated therein, be adopted, and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay the indemnity.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress, as an act of grace, and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in a sum equivalent to $500 Mexican.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—WILLIAM WISEMAN

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in regard to the services in behalf of the United States of William Wiseman, British vice consul at Salina Cruz, Mexico, during the period from April 12, 1914, to December 13, 1917, when, with the permission of the British Government and at the request of this Government, he had charge of the American consulate at Salina Cruz and of American interests in the district surrounding that place. The conclusion reached by the Secretary of State has my approval, and I recommend that the Congress authorize an appropriation of $9,200 to be paid to Mr. Wiseman in recognition of the services which he so generously rendered.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PORTO RICO (H. DOC. NO. 121)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 12 of the act of Congress of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the twenty-seventh annual report of the Governor of Porto Rico, including the reports of the heads of the several departments of the government of Porto Rico and that of the auditor, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

I recommend that the report of the Governor of Porto Rico, without appendices, be printed as a congressional document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—SAMUEL RICHARDSON

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of a claim against the United States presented by the British Government for the death on November 1, 1921, at Consuelo, Dominican Republic, of Samuel Richardson, a British subject, as a result of a bullet wound inflicted presumably by a member or members of the United States Marine Corps, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to me on April 3, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated April 5, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 92, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

Concurring in the recommendation made by the Secretary of State, that in order to effect a settlement of this claim the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $1,000, I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress, in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—AREND KAMP AND FRANCIS GORT (S. DOC. NO. 30)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report regarding two claims presented by the Government of the Netherlands against the Government of the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by two Netherlands subjects, Arend Kamp and Francis Gort, while the U. S. S. *Canibas* was loading on May 1, 1919, at Rotterdam.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of these claims in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States in the

premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $1,000, $500 of which is to be paid to Mr. Arend Kamp and $500 to be paid to Mr. Francis Gort.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—RELATIVES OF EDWIN TUCKER (S. DOC. NO. 20)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, concerning a claim against the United States, presented by the Government of Great Britain for compensation to the relatives of Edwin Tucker, a British subject who was killed by an United States Army ambulance in Colon, Panama, on or about December 6, 1924. The report requests that the recommendation as indicated therein be adopted and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to compensate the claimants in this case.

I recommend that in order to effect a settlement of the claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation of $2,500.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1927.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AYRES, by unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HOCH), was granted leave of absence, for one day, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is one more bill which it is intended to urge for passage before the holiday recess, and that is the bill known as the alien property bill, which heretofore has been under consideration in the House. There remains 1 hour and 20 minutes for general debate on that bill. It is hoped that if the Members will keep a quorum of the Committee of the Whole we may be able to finish the general debate on the bill to-day. The remaining consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule we may finish to-morrow, provided there is a quorum present at all times, so that no time is lost in the consideration to-morrow. But it is absolutely necessary that a quorum should remain here until that bill is passed. The day will be held in reserve in case it is not finished to-morrow; but if it is finished to-morrow, it is hoped that Wednesday's session will be but a formal session. I hope the Members will give us their presence as much as possible until that bill is out of the way, a quorum being absolutely necessary until the bill is passed.

SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7201, the alien property bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7201.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Pending that motion, I would like to know how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. One hour and 20 minutes remain, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER]. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7201, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7201, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope this bill may pass and that quickly and without any amendment. There is a very large number of conflicting claims between the Governments of the United States and of Germany, and there are potent reasons why a settlement should be promptly made. The background for this measure shows very careful attention given by the Committee on Ways and Means and also contemporaneously and at an earlier date by the Mixed Claims Commission. If I am any judge of popular opinion, the overwhelming sentiment both in the United States and Germany is in favor of the settlement proposed in the bill, notwithstanding the fact that it is not altogether satisfactory and is the result of compromise.

In the first place, we ought to maintain the most friendly relations with the present Government of Germany. Between that Government and the one against which we declared war in 1917 there is a startling contrast. The express language of our declaration was a declaration of war against the Government of Germany, an organization which for militaristic spirit and a desire for imperialism surpassed any country of our time, but the present Government of Germany is one which is taking a leading part for the peace of the world. They have learned their lesson, we may say, and the dominant forces in that country now look forward to an era of peace with all nations.

There are three special reasons why we should think favorably of this settlement. In the first place, the claims of other governments against Germany were taken up by ex parte commissions. The amount of the claims was very greatly exaggerated. One hundred and thirty-two billion marks was the first claim or the equivalent of about $30,000,000,000. In contrast, the claims of American nationals were adjudicated by an international commission. The next reason is the fairness and the unusual confidence of the German people in the Government of the United States. They agreed that the arbiter on the Mixed Claims Commission, according to the treaty of August, 1922, should be one of our own nationals. That is almost unprecedented. Justice Day was first chosen and then Judge Parker. Again, should the present provisions for payment fail, the German Government continues to be responsible for the amounts of the findings on these awards.

There are several objections made to this settlement which do not trouble me. The first is that possibly the Germans may obtain the amounts due to them at an earlier date than the American claimants. Is there any valid objection to this? In the first place, we should be generous. In the next place, we have a vast amount of their property from which liquidation can be accomplished and claims can be paid. The gentleman from Tennessee the other day deprecated the long delay in coming to any arrangements for payment by Germany. I am not troubled by that either. It was not until the latter part of 1922 that we began to settle our claims for loans to the Allies. We were technically at war with Germany until July, 1921. Germany was prostrate. There were bread lines in all her cities, and thus there was every reason why we should be considerate. Another objection is that the limit of the amount to be paid for ships which we took over, for the radio station, and for patents is fixed at $100,000,000. It is maintained that this a large figure. But bear in mind that is an unusual provision. In arbitrations the ordinary rule is not to fix any limit and this is for our benefit rather than otherwise. Again the objection is made that insurance companies are to receive the amounts due to them, some $35,000,000. On this question let me say that the universal rule of law is that an insurance company is subrogated to the claims of the assured. That is true in private transactions and it is true in international law.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The point of those who oppose the bill upon that ground is not that the insurance companies would not have the right of subrogation against the Government of Germany but, as I understand this bill, the taxpayers of the United States will pay in part at least those claims and then will perhaps in the future be reimbursed by the Government of Germany. But suppose the German Government falls down on its payments, what then?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is mistaken in that. We would not pay a dollar on those claims.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Then where is the money to come from?

Mr. BURTON. My time is limited and I can not yield further. If any other rule were adopted, if the payments by the insurance companies were final, and there were no grounds of claim against the country which, by submarines or other methods, destroyed our ships, it would be an encouragement in the future to resort to ruthless methods, it would be an encouragement to destroy, because it would be known that the country guilty of the destruction would escape liability. That universal principle, as I said, pertains not only to private wrongdoers but also to governments. There have been some half dozen cases in which arbitrations have been held to which the United States has been a party, and the insurance companies have been indemnified out of the awards against foreign countries. The French indemnity of 1831 was the first, and there have been some seven in all involving countries in the Old World and in the New. Among them I might mention the London commission of 1853; the Van Ness convention with Spain in 1834; the Danish indemnity, 1830; the Peruvian indemnity, 1841; the Chinese indemnity, 1858; and the British Claims Commission, under article 12 of the treaty of Washington, 1871.

Another point in favor of these claims is that there were separate awards made to each insurance company, and it is the universal principle in such cases, supported by the statute of 1896, that the Government holds the amounts that are paid as trustee for the claimants. The statute to which I have referred is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., * * * Trust funds: Hereafter all moneys received by the Secretary of State from foreign governments and other sources, in trust for citizens of the United States or others, shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury.

The Secretary of State shall determine the amounts due claimants, respectively, from each of such trust funds, and certify the same to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, upon the presentation of the certificates of the Secretary of State, pay the amounts so found to be due.

Each of the trust funds covered into the Treasury as aforesaid is hereby appropriated for the payment to the ascertained beneficiaries thereof of the certificates herein provided for. * * * (Feb. 27, 1896. Supp. Rev. Stat., vol. 2, 1892–1901, p. 449.)

On this point I will read briefly from a decision made by Judge Parker, umpire of the Mixed Claims Commission:

But where a demand is made on behalf of a designated national, and an award and payment is made on that specific demand, the fund so paid is not a national fund in the sense that the title vests in the nation receiving it entirely free from any obligation to account to the private claimant, on whose behalf the claim was asserted and paid and who is the real owner thereof. Broad and misleading statements susceptible of this construction are found in cases where lump-sum awards and payments have been made to the demanding nation covering numerous claims put forward by it and where the tribunal making the award did not undertake to adjudicate each claim or to allocate any specified amount to any designated claim. It is not believed that any case can be cited in which an award has been made by an international tribunal in favor of the demanding nation on behalf of its designated national in which the nation receiving payment of such award has, in the absence of fraud, or mistake, hesitated to account to the national designated, or those claiming under him, for the full amount of the award received. So far as the United States is concerned, it would seem that the Congress has treated funds paid the nation in satisfaction of specific claims as held "in trust for citizens of the United States or others."

It is true that in the settlement of the *Alabama* claims the amounts were not paid to insurance companies, but there was a very vital difference. Individual claims were not presented, and the award of $15,500,000 was made to the Government of the United States. This situation differs so radically that different principles should prevail. Before the Mixed Claims Commission there was a specific award made to each of the insurance companies. The "Old Roman," as we called him in Ohio, Mr. Thurman, a man who was never very partial to the capitalistic elements of the country, very strongly asserted in the discussion of the *Alabama* award that the insurance companies should have been paid out of the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. BURTON. I would like to have an additional minute.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BURTON. In conclusion, I wish to say that this case has been very thoroughly considered. There has been an agreement between the representatives of all classes of claimants, and it is not only just but expedient that we permit the agreement to be carried out. It has a bearing upon all arbitrations. If we seek here to interfere with the findings that were made, we discourage arbitrations in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition for one minute in order to answer the inquiry propounded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] as to where this money is to come from.

The only money that is to be appropriated in this matter is for the purpose of paying for the ships, the radio stations, and so forth. We have to pay for these anyway, whether we pass the bill or not, because it was agreed between Secretary Kellogg and those making the arrangements with reference to reparations, that if we confiscated these ships, this would be taken out of the reparations payments. Therefore if we do not pay them under the bill, we will pay them in that way.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, I was not addressing my inquiry at all to the payment for the ships.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no other appropriation made.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. One moment. If the insurance companies are to be paid for losses for which they have already collected large premiums, from what fund are they to be paid?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman will find that on page 24 of the report. Twenty per cent of German property to be temporarily retained, $40,000,000; German share of unallocated interest fund, $25,000,000; mixed claims receipts—2¼ per cent to September 1, 1928, $23,000,000; one-half of the appropriation for ships and radio stations, $25,000,000. There is a total available for the payment of all the American claims, not simply the insurance claims, of $113,000,000.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I understand that; but a part of this fund that will be paid to the insurance companies is a part of the general fund that will be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States; is not that correct?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is only out of that part that is appropriated for the payment of the ships and the radio stations.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And also to the payment of the insurance company claims and general claims of American claimants.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; there is no appropriation made for that.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Well, we will discuss that when we get to that section of the bill. I think I can then make my position perfectly clear.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I want to add on another point that we do not take any of the German property in the sense of appropriating or confiscating it. There are to be certificates issued for it, and in due time the certificates are to be taken up and paid.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the financial settlements to be made as a result of the Great War must of their nature be most complex. The Dawes reparation, the debt settlements, and all negotiations between our late enemies and our allies in the very nature of things must be difficult and intricate. No scheme can be devised which will be satisfactory and fair alike to all interested parties. It is not to be expected that any bill having to do with the subjects covered by the present bill will be accepted by all without some protest. It would seem, however, that House Resolution 7201 comes as near to it as humanly possible, and it is therefore to be hoped that this measure, the result of painstaking study by our officials, drafted with care and reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, will receive so nearly a unanimous vote in this body as to convince the people of the world that it embodies the best judgment of Congress on the subject.

It is not my purpose to argue the merits of this bill or to point out its defects, if any there are, but rather to join with others in an effort to explain just what the bill will accomplish and the methods that will be employed. I start with only one premise, namely, that the exercise of the power vested in Congress by a Supreme Court decision which legalizes confiscation of property of former alien enemies is repugnant to the thoughts of the people of this country. Time and again President Wilson reiterated the fact that we entered the war from absolutely unselfish motives, and to-day this House has the opportunity to demonstrate the truth of his statement, which was undoubtedly approved by the citizens of this country.

So much time has elapsed since the establishment of peace in 1921 that the inference might be drawn that this country either contemplates confiscation of alien enemy property or

desires to profit unduly by further delay in its return. This erroneous impression must not be allowed to prevail in foreign countries. Further postponement of legislation will only add to the complications and materially increase the interest account.

There are three major propositions combined in this one bill and I wish to deal with each one very briefly and separately:

First. The return of property of German nationals seized under the trading with the enemy act and now held by the Alien Property Custodian.

Second. The settlement of claims of German nationals against the United States for ships, patents, and a radio station taken over and used by this Government.

Third. The settlement of claims of American citizens against the German Government.

These are the three major propositions dealt with in the bill, but combined with them is the method of procuring funds, as well as their equitable apportionment for the above-mentioned purposes. All these points are so completely set forth in the report accompanying this bill that it hardly seems necessary to refer to them in detail. Assuming, however, that some slight explanation and a brief résumé of these subjects may be of value to the Members of the House, I will endeavor to present them in as simple language as possible.

The statement that it is impossible to describe simply a complex and intricate matter applies as well to this subject as to taxation.

The intention of the Government not to confiscate but to return the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian has been plainly shown by the passage of the so-called Winslow bill, whereby all accounts of $10,000 or under have been paid. This of itself both established a precedent and showed the disposition of Congress toward this seized property. There is no more logic in settling accounts of $10,000 and under than there is in paying those of over $10,000, provided both classes of claims have the same merit. By paying those of less than $10,000, more than one-half of the amounts originally in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian have been returned. If these claims are just and equitable, of course, there can not be an arbitrary line set at $10,000. It is just as right and fair to pay the larger claims as it is the smaller ones. This bill calls for the payment of 80 per cent of the remaining property held by the Alien Property Custodian. It is not intended to confiscate the remaining 20 per cent, but to say to the holders of those claims that they must wait for final settlement until other financial arrangements are completed. This method of settlement was also agreed upon and acceptable to Germany. Germany is rapidly recovering from its worst financial condition as a bankrupt nation. This method, while criticized sometimes by our own people, I think it is important to say was agreed to by the representatives of Germany. Rather than wait until these payments can be made by Germany, we are taking other means of relieving our own citizens. Alien property rightfully belongs to its alien owners or their legal heirs. Likewise, American citizens are entitled to similar treatment by Germany. This is the reason why full payment will not immediately be made under this bill. We certainly owe to our citizens as just and fair treatment as we are disposed to accord to our late enemies.

The claims of American citizens have been passed upon by the Mixed Claims Commission established under an agreement dated August 10, 1922, composed of an American, a German, and Judge Parker as umpire. While these claims are similar to those of the nationals of other countries against Germany, it is necessary to have a definite form of settlement owing to the fact that Great Britain established, as it were, a clearing house for its nationals, offsetting their claims against the claims of German nationals. This method is not one that this country would be apt to approve.

While the Mixed Claims Commission is authorized to pass upon the merits of the claims and fix the amounts due, it has no authority in any way to designate or arrange the form of payment. This is a matter entirely within the hands of Congress, and it is with that problem that we are faced at the present time.

There is a third class of claims known as the claims of German nationals against the United States. As has been frequently stated, these cover ships, patents, and a radio station taken over and used by the United States. These claims have not as yet been adjudicated or passed upon. This bill sets up the machinery for such approval.

While this bill does not name the arbiter, no one is being considered for the position except the man who has made such a success as umpire of the Mixed Claims Commission. The interests of both countries will be safe in his hands and justice will be done to all concerned.

CLAIMS ON ACCOUNT OF SHIPS, RADIO STATION, AND PATENTS

Acting under the authority given him by Congress the President of the United States seized ships belonging to German nationals, a radio station, and certain patents.

In accordance with the joint resolution under which the ships were seized the value of the ships was appraised by a naval board of survey. This board reported an aggregate value of all the ships of approximately $33,000,000.

The appraisal was purely an ex parte proceeding. It seemed to your committee that the shipowners should have an opportunity to present their side of the case. The shipowners have claimed an aggregate value of approximately $300,000,000. The bill proposes that an arbiter will determine, after an opportunity to be heard has been given the owners, the just compensation which should be paid by the United States for the ships, the radio station, and the patents. It is impossible to predict, of course, what the aggregate final determinations will be. I would suppose that the values will probably be somewhat in excess of the values determined by the naval board of survey. Under the agreement entered into the aggregate amount which the United States will ultimately be called upon to pay can not exceed $100,000,000.

Inasmuch as the lowest estimate, including interest to January 1, 1928, is approximately $50,000,000, the bill provides for the immediate appropriation of this amount. If the arbiter determines an amount in excess of $50,000,000, his reports will be transmitted to Congress for additional appropriation.

Under the agreement the owners of the ships, the radio station, and the patents will receive, as soon as the proceedings of the arbiter will permit, the immediate payment of 50 per cent of their awards and the ultimate payment of the remainder.

The above outlines the three main problems dealt with in the bill. There are, however, two or three additional points to which I would like to refer briefly.

AWARDS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

During the consideration of the legislation by the committee and on the floor of the House, it has frequently been asked: Why should the payment to the United States of the amount of its awards be postponed?

In the first place, the United States has no lien against any property as security for the payment of its claims. Secondly, the Government of the United States is expected to endure. It should not be concerned with a postponement of payment, even if that postponement is for a relatively long period of time, so long as it will receive payment eventually. And lastly, it must be borne in mind that all the negotiations were conducted by the United States Government. If, as a result of those negotiations, we are receiving an insufficient sum to make proper payments on all the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, it seems to me that the United States Government should accept the responsibility and, under the circumstances, should be willing to give a priority to its citizens.

INSURANCE AWARDS

There has been considerable interest displayed in the payment of awards of insurance companies. It seems to me that the actual consideration should be laid before the House.

Awards of the Mixed Claims Commission are absolutely final and binding, so far as they evidence a direct financial responsibility of Germany for the payment of the amounts awarded. I have heard no one assert that Germany should not pay, at least eventually, all the amounts properly due from her.

It has been contended that the payment of the insurance-company awards should be postponed. As a matter of fact that is, for all practical purposes, exactly what the bill does. The insurance-company awards, at least in so far as they amount to any material sum of money, are in excess of $100,000. Many of them greatly exceed this amount. Under the bill, the final payment of all these awards will not take place within 22 years.

The testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means shows conclusively that the insurance companies who have received awards did not profit by their war-risk insurance. In fact some of them even lost money. Although the rates were advanced appreciably because of the additional risks, it was stated before the committee that their rates were, as a practical proposition, fixed by the rates established by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, which was in competition with the private insurance companies.

Furthermore, there is a complete answer to the contention. Twenty-four million three hundred thousand dollars' worth of claims of the United States are based upon the right of subrogation under the insurance policies written by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance—exactly the same kind of claims held by the insurance companies. In addition, I think we are safe in

saying that this entire amount represents profit to the United States on its war-risk insurance business.

The balance of the awards of the United States, $17,715,000, represents claims on account of damages to vessels owned by the United States and operated by the Shipping Board or the United States Railroad Administration.

Section 5 of the bill provides for the establishment of a special fund to be made up of four items, as follows:

First. Twenty per cent of amounts now held by the Alien Property Custodian.

Second. The unallocated interest fund, approximately $25,000,000.

Third. Fifty million dollars appropriation for the payment of ship claims.

Fourth. All receipts in respect of claims against Germany by reason of awards of Mixed Claims Commission.

In this brief résumé of the purposes of this bill I have avoided all references to the terms of treaties which must underlie any form of agreement or settlement. These have been explained to you by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER]. They are also included in the report accompanying the bill. I preferred to make my statement in as simple and plain form as possible, without legal complications or phraseology.

No one claims that the form of settlement proposed by this bill is perfect. On the other hand, it is the best proposition which those who have the matter in hand can offer, due to the many complexities. It would seem to me that those not approving it should offer constructive suggestions of changes rather than destructive criticism.

The bill should become law promptly for the best interests of all claimants and the Government.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is apparent to all that this bill under discussion will pass this branch of the Congress, but in spite of this certainty I wish to hold it long enough to mark it with the earnest protest of at least one Member of the House. The bill partakes both of a national and international character and should be discussed in the light of international practices and domestic law. I am opposing the bill chiefly because it incorporates the idea of confiscation, which is repugnant to the sentiment of the country, as expressed in our fundamental law and the law of nations. This country at its very inception committed itself in the first treaty that it ever made, which was with France, to the doctrine of nonconfiscation of alien private property as a result of war. The other great powers had for many hundreds of years been departing from the old doctrine of confiscation that was greatly extended under the rule of the Roman Empire and had done much toward the refinement and humanizing of international law. In 1785 we entered into a treaty with Prussia whereby provision was made for the protection of life and property and the peaceful pursuit of trade of the subjects and citizens of both countries in time of war. This treaty was renewed in 1799 and again in 1828.

The statement has been made on the floor in debate that it was not made with Germany, therefore leaving the House to assume that we were not bound thereby so far as Germany was concerned. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that both Germany and the United States have always regarded the treaty as applying to the whole German Empire. In a correspondence between the Secretary of State and the German minister in 1871 the treaty was considered as extending to the whole of Germany. This recognition was again given in the treaty in 1884, when our Government protested discriminatory rates threatened by German railways. It was again recognized in a decision rendered by our Supreme Court in the case of Disconto Gesellschaft *v.* Umbright (208 U. S. 570), in which Mr. Justice Day said:

> This treaty is printed as one of the treaties in force in compilation of 1904, page 643, and has undoubtedly been recognized by the two governments as still in force since the formation of the German Empire.

Similar rulings were made in later decisions rendered by the same court. There is further authority for the contention that the treaty was in force with the whole of the German Empire found in a general order issued by the greatest living soldier, General Pershing, to the American Expeditionary Forces in France, July 1, 1918. The order, among other things, contained the following:

> By the treaty of Berlin, 1799, still in force, the United States of America and the King of Prussia solemnly pledged themselves to the world and to each other * * * the obligations of this treaty will be scrupulously observed unless and until substantially violated by Germany, in which case further orders will be published from these headquarters.

So we may conclude that the argument that the treaty was not with the whole of Germany can not prevail. It is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that the Prussian treaty was in force and binding upon the contracting parties until August 25, 1921, when the treaty of Berlin was made.

Under the trading with the enemy act of October 6, 1917, creating the office of Alien Property Custodian and later amendments thereto, all property in the country belonging to aliens was seized. While I contend that this was in violation of our commitments under the Berlin treaty, yet it was an authorized exercise of the war powers of the Government. However, a study of the debates in both the House and the Senate had upon this bill will disclose the fact that no contention was made that the property of the alien should be or was to be confiscated.

In other words, the purpose of the bill was to sequester all such property; that is, take control of it and put it beyond the possibility of being used by the enemy in the waging of war against us. Some time before we entered the war the Secretary of State, with presidential sanction, stated in substance that in case of war with Germany that the property of the Germans located in this country would be protected, and that there would be no confiscation. President Wilson in his proclamation of April 6, 1917, declared—

> All alien enemies are enjoined to preserve the peace toward the United States * * *. And so long as they shall conduct themselves according to law, they shall be undisturbed in the peaceful pursuit of their lives and occupations and be accorded the consideration due to all peaceful and law-abiding persons, except so far as restriction may be necessary for their own protection and for the safety of the United States.

Again in later messages to the Congress he reannounced this same policy to be followed by the Government.

In his letter to Pope Benedict XV, he said:

> The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German Government, but they desire no reprisal upon the German people, who have suffered all things in this war that they did not choose.

To now pass legislation that embodies the idea of confiscation would be to overturn our national policy, to violate our treaty obligations, do violence to our domestic law, and shock world confidence. We must in the treatment that we give the subject of the bill be mindful of treaties existing at the time of our entrance into the war.

Mr. HOOPER. Is not the gentleman from Georgia confounding seizure of German property with confiscation of German property?

Mr. COX. I shall come to that question in a moment and undertake to answer the gentleman.

Some Members, as I understand, are under the impression that this 20 per cent of the alien property and the unallocated interest is in fact held by the Government as security for the payment of the claims of our nationals against the German Government. This is not quite accurate, for as I interpret the bill, this fund made up in large part with the property of the alien is appropriated to the payment of the claims of our nationals against the German Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly, the 20 per cent is taken now, but provision is made for its repayment. It is held as security.

Mr. COX. Not as security. Let me direct the gentleman's attention to the report of the Senate Committee considering this bill at the last session of Congress. I read you from the report:

> The House bill provided for the return of 80 per cent of the property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian and the temporary retention of the remaining 20 per cent and its application to the payment of the claims of American citizens.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Exactly, "temporary retention."

Mr. COX. Yes; but applied to the payment of claims against the German Government. Now, while these two questions, that is, the return of alien property and the payment of our nationals are somewhat related, they are not so much so that treatment must be given at one and the same time. We owe one duty to the alien enemy and another to our nationals. We owe it to the enemy to return his property without regard to the question of the payment of our nationals. This property represents invest-

ments made here upon the invitation of the Government. Aliens came here and spent a lifetime in the accumulation of a large part of this property in question. It represents their savings. To all intents and purposes, they were citizens of this country. They simply had failed to become naturalized. Shall the property of such be taken and be used for the payment of the claims of our nationals which, in many instances, represents the loss of profits on transactions had in time of war and nothing more? Such a procedure, to my mind, is indefensible. The treaty of Berlin contained the following stipulation:

All property of the Imperial German Government, or its successor or successors, and of all German nationals, which was, on April 6, 1917, in or has since that date come into the possession or under control of, or has been the subject of a demand by the United States of America, or of any of its officers, agents, or employees, from any source or by any agency whatever * * * shall be retained by the United States of America and no disposition thereof made, except as shall have been heretofore or specifically hereafter shall be provided by law until such time as the Imperial German Government * * * shall have made suitable provision for the satisfaction of all claims against said governments, respectively.

When we made the London agreement, adopting the Dawes plan, we made, I respectfully contend, "suitable provision" for the payment of our nationals, as provided for in the treaty of Berlin. What other provisions for the payment of our nationals have we the right to demand? In other words, is it our right to disregard the provisions of the London agreement and demand of Germany that she make other and further agreements by way of "suitable provision"?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. But who must define the term "suitable"?

While I agree with a large part of the gentleman's argument, that the German alien property is held as a trust fund, I can not go any further, because the treaty of Berlin puts it on the Congress of the United States to determine the definition of the word "suitable."

Mr. COX. Yes; but entering into the London agreement and accepting allocations under the Paris agreement subsequently made, we committed our nationals, who were, of course, compelled to act through the Government to an arrangement whereby claims were to be paid, and of course this arrangement deferred the time of payment to such extent as to mean no payment at all in a large sense, not in the lifetime of many of the claimants.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If there was any acceptance by Congress at all, it was not evidenced by any action thereon.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman mean with reference to the treaty of Berlin?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The treaty of Berlin was ratified, but I am talking about the 2½ per cent awarded out of the reparations. We took that as that was all the Allies would let Germany pay us. They would not let Germany pay us any more.

Mr. COX. Yes; but in the arrangements made our nationals were represented by our Government, and the Government accepted it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman, for the benefit of some of us who are not as familiar with the terms of the treaties as apparently the gentleman is, tell us exactly what provision was made under the Dawes plan by the German Government to pay the claims of American citizens against the German Government?

Mr. COX. I must not permit myself to be drawn away from the main discussion by answering questions which, so far as the purpose of my discussion is concerned, is without relevancy.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In the simplest terms, what was the provision made by the Dawes plan for the payment of American claims against the German Government?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Two and a quarter per cent, $10,700,000 a year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman state before he gets through how he would dispose of the German and the American claims?

Mr. COX. I will with pleasure. Anything less than the complete return of the alien private property would, in my judgment, discredit the country. Pardon me here. I want to refer to another provision of the bill. That is, that clause that is intended to vest the power in the Alien Property Custodian to make further and additional seizures. It is almost unbelievable that such a suggestion would be made here 10 years after the end of the war. Why permit further seizures and further outrages perpetrated against the peaceable alien, amounting in a large part to a confiscation of his property?

The argument is offered that the reason for this provision is to enable the custodian to treat all property alike. With reference to the claims of our nationals, I concede that the Government owes them the duty to exert all of its powers, permitted under the law, to see that their claims are paid. Frankly, I am prepared to support a measure under which this Government would be authorized to make settlement of these claims, at least in large part and upon a reasonable basis.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think I fully understand the gentleman from Georgia. Does he mean that he would pay German claims in full and our Government should make appropriation to pay the American claims?

Mr. COX. I would pay the German nationals. I would restore all the German property.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And make appropriation to pay the American claims?

Mr. COX. Yes, in part and under certain conditions.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Upon what grounds would the gentleman base the suggestion in having the Government of the United States assume the obligation of the German Government for the destruction of its property?

Mr. COX. That is a question the answer to which almost destroys the argument. This is my answer, however. The arrangements made between the United States and Germany whereby the claims of our nationals were to be paid, amounted to such a sacrifice of the interest of claimants that it would appear that there is justification for the Government assuming some responsibility. At any rate, the assurance is given by the proponents of this bill that nobody will lose anything, that the alien will receive all of his property with interest, and our national collect his full claim. If this is so certain as is contended, then would it not be better that the Congress return the property belonging to the alien, pay our own nationals and subrogate itself to the rights of its nationals whose have been or may be adjudicated by the Mixed Claims Commission? In other words, the Government can better finance these claims than individuals. This whole bill, so far as future payments are concerned, to both the alien and our national, is put upon the certainty of Germany meeting her obligations under the Dawes plan.

If Germany fails to pay, then the alien fails to receive the balance due and claimants against Germany would likewise suffer. That is, this happens so far as provision made by this bill is concerned. If the statement of policy of the bill is to be taken as binding upon the Congress, then this Government substitutes its liability for that of Germany, because of the assurance here given that the alien will receive his property and our claimants the satisfaction of their demands.

Mr. BOWLING. Is it not contrary to our treaty with Germany to hold the German property as hostage or security whereby our nationals may secure what is coming to them? Is that lawful?

Mr. COX. I think it is in violation of the treaty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understand the gentleman, he thinks it not only in violation of the terms of the treaty but a transgression of public morality.

Mr. COX. Yes; I agree with the gentleman.

In the last Congress there was introduced what was known as the Mills bill. It was killed off by the indictment drawn against it by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who denounced it as a "colossal steal." The reason for this was that it provided that the United States should settle the claim of its nationals against Germany, subrogating itself to the rights of the claimant, making collections according to the terms of the Dawes plan. In this connection I want to say that this bill embodies those same principles, because if the statement of policy is held as binding upon the Congress then there is a substitution of the liabilities of this Government for Germany so far as the payment of the claims of our nationals against Germany are concerned. The bill further authorizes an appropriation of $50,000,000. One half is to go to the payment of claims for ships that were seized by the Government, the other half into this fund out of which our nationals are to be paid, and this represents, to the extent that it goes, the payment on the part of this Government of claims that its nationals hold against the German Government.

My colleagues, this bill should not pass for many reasons that are convincing to me. It is confiscatory in principle and in fact.

It violates our solemn treaties and domestic law. It is a positive injustice to those who trusted us in casting their lot in our midst, many loyal supporters of the Government, and citizens to every intent and purpose, the only trouble being they had not become naturalized. It appropriates their property to the satisfaction of claims of great interests, whose claims represent the loss of profits on transactions carried on during the war. The bill interferes with the rights of contract because of the limitations fixed upon payment. It injures world confidence in the permanency of our laws and in the binding force of our international engagements, thereby endangering our trade and commerce, the extension and improvement of which is necessary to the future prosperity of the country. It is a measure which is not reflective of the public will, because, as I believe, a well-advised public would not support a measure that brings reflection upon the Government and injures its standing in the family of nations. It is a poor compromise and a credit to no one. I take the position that it should not pass. I have no hopes of its being defeated nor of anything that I have said influencing results, but I am persuaded that if you should approach consideration of the bill with an open mind and free of the war spirit that affects your judgment that you would denounce the measure as a wicked proposal to do injustice to innocent people, to reverse a sound policy of government, the observance of which has meant so much to the advancement of the Republic as a great and just world power. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, a great Democratic statesman for whom, in spite of my rather intense Republicanism, I have always had a very high admiration, once said in a grave crisis, "It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us." I would be happy to vote for such a bill as has been suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. I did favor, and I might say I would still favor, the Mills bill. I would like to return all of the German property immediately, and I would like to make provision for the immediate payment of the claims of American nationals. I would go even as far as the gentleman from Georgia in voting an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury to make that complete settlement possible. If the gentleman thinks it can be done, let him test it by a motion to recommit this bill. It is impossible. Everybody knows it is. Not being able to get all I want, but still being convinced that our Government and our people should take as immediate steps as possible to clear up this situation, I am willing to vote for the best compromise legislation that has yet been proposed. The gentleman says the bill implies confiscation. I do not think so. It does mean the complete return of alien property ultimately and a substantial doing of justice to all parties concerned. The gentleman said that 20 per cent of German property is being confiscated. It is not. It is being put in this special deposit fund temporarily, as are other assets, in order that payment may immediately be made of the most pressing claims, both of Germans and of Americans. It is merely temporarily withheld, but even interest is paid upon it and will be paid upon it until all of the 20 per cent has ultimately been returned. There is only one item upon which interest will not be paid and that is upon the unallocated interest, and to pay interest upon that would be to pay compound interest.

The gentleman said the London agreement did make a suitable arrangement for the payment of American claims. Who is to determine whether that was a suitable arrangement? The provision was put in for the benefit of the United States, and why should not the United States itself, through its Congress, determine when a suitable arrangement has been made? I do not think this bill is in violation of the treaty of Berlin or of the London agreement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There has never been any claim of that kind on the part of the Germans.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman [Mr. Cox] asks what will be done if Germany fails to make payment under the provisions of the Dawes agreement. We might speculate, of course, as to the future; but we have a treaty with Germany; we have an arrangement with Germany, and we are making commitments of our own in this very legislation. If we can not presume that these arrangements will be carried out in good faith we might as well stop all attempts at any legislation of any kind. That is purely speculation. We have as much right to say that with the present spirit of Germany and with the present control of the politics of Germany there is no question that the payments provided for under the Dawes arrangement will be made by the German Government.

I want to call attention to a very peculiar situation here with reference to these two funds or these two sets of claims on the part of Germany on the one side and America on the other.

The total amount of German property held by the Alien Property Custodian on October 31 last amounted in value to $245,000,000 in round numbers. The total claims of the United States of America and its nationals against Germany on January 1, 1928, will amount to $247,000,000 and some odd hundred thousand—$245,000,000 on the one side and $247,000,000 on the other.

This bill is framed so that by the use of the special-deposit fund and by the payment of the reparations under the Dawes agreement, while it may take a term of years, ultimately both of these obligations—our obligation for the German property held by the Alien Property Custodian and the obligations of Germany to the Americans and to the United States Government—will be paid off and offset one against the other.

There remains only the fund of $50,000,000. The gentleman from Georgia spoke of a fund of $100,000,000. There is no such fund. There will be a fund of $50,000,000——

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If I did, I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. COX. I said there was an appropriation of $50,000,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There will be an appropriation of $50,000,000. I think that the gentleman said, "One-half of the appropriation will go to pay claims of German nationals and one-half will go to the special-deposit fund." The fact is that the whole of the $50,000,000 will go into the special-deposit fund. It will be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury for the payment of just claims against the United States of the owners of the ships, the radio station at Sayville, N. J., and the patents which were seized by the United States during the war.

Mr. COX. Is not $25,000,000 used for the payment of the German claims?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Twenty-five million dollars will go into this deposit fund in 1928 and another $25,000,000 will go into the deposit fund later, in 1929. The whole $50,000,000 will go into this deposit fund, but the whole fund, including the resources from every angle, will be used to pay German claims as well as American claims. This appropriation is only temporarily being placed in this deposit fund for that purpose, but will ultimately be used to pay German claims on ships, radio station, and patents.

We do not know how much will be needed for that purpose. I have heard the argument that a limitation of $100,000,000 is too high. I do not know whether, ultimately, it will be too high or not. Some 10 or 11 years ago there was a valuation of $33,000,000, as I remember it, placed upon the ships alone by a Navy board; but if we are going to make settlements in full, if we are going to follow the same lines we have followed throughout in these settlements and pay interest on deferred payments, we may find the ultimate claims will be a great deal more than $33,000,000 or $50,000,000; but the amount that ultimately shall be paid will be determined by an arbiter appointed by the President of the United States, and I say there never was a more liberal offer by any government in the world in the settlement of an international dispute or of international claims than that which was made by Germany in this case when she voluntarily gave to the President of the United States sole authority, without any action on her part, to appoint the arbiter who shall determine what sums shall be paid to German nationals for the acquisition of these ships and for the radio station and the patents.

I am not going into any long, detailed discussion of the plan which is involved here. It is rather involved; it is rather intricate and complex; but your committee, which has considered this matter, went over it thoroughly and reached, I think, the unanimous conclusion that this is the only practical manner in which this matter can now be adjusted. And there is the further argument that the parties involved have agreed to it. The German claimants have agreed to it, American nationals having claims against Germany have agreed to it, and it requires only the sanction and the consent of the Congress of the United States.

It is rather odd, Mr. Chairman, that the debate upon this bill began in 1926 upon the same date as in 1927, the 16th day of December. On the 18th of December last we passed the bill in the House by a vote of 281 to 66. There is no substantial difference between this bill and the bill that was then passed. Let us again ring in the yuletide by the passage of a bill which will make for friendliness, for peace and good will between nations which but a short decade ago were at arm's length in the throes of war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa has six minutes remaining and the gentleman from Mississippi two minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I can not say much in six minutes, so I will allow the gentleman from Mississippi to control the remainder of the time.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN].

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the bill only because I fear I may have been misunderstood in my attitude toward it by what I said the other day in criticism of the claims of private insurance companies. I still feel that there is a criticism that might be made of it, but I did not mean to imply that I was not in favor of the bill. I am in favor of it and will vote for it. Last year I voted for it, and I shall vote for it again when an opportunity is presented.

It is not an ideal bill. Perhaps an ideal bill can not be expected under the circumstances, with all the conflicting elements and conflicting interests. I think the Ways and Means Committee deserve commendation and gratitude for presenting to the House a bill which we can with a clear conscience vote for. It does not pay back 100 per cent to the German nationals, which I think we should have done five years ago. I think also that it is unfortunate that property interests are given preference over the interest of human life.

I was very much interested in the statement made by that distinguished statesman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], when he said that we ought to pay the claims of the insurance companies in order to establish the principle that property should be paid for when destruction is made on the high seas.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Death claims are to be paid for.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am glad the bill provides that death claims shall be paid, but there are certain personal claims that are not paid for at all; only those are paid for where dependents are left behind. Human life is not regarded as valuable as property. I wish by the same token that we might appraise human life as valuable as we do property in this bill.

I should like to see the claims of the United States Government put on a par with the claims of the insurance companies, but they are not. I should like to see the bill amended and the change making the American Government claims on a par with the private insurance companies. But I shall vote for the bill because it is nine-tenths of the whole and because I realize that it is the only thing that can be had. Justice delayed is justice denied.

About $500,000,000 is involved in the settling of war claims under this bill. Approximately half of this huge amount will be paid to German citizens whose property was seized during the World War. The other half will be paid over to American citizens whose property was either seized or destroyed by the German Government, and for which no restitution has been made. Uncle Sam appears both as a creditor and as a debtor; as a creditor he will be paid for losses resulting from destruction of ships, and so forth; as a debtor Uncle Sam will compensate German interests for the ships, patents, and radio plants seized by our Government.

But there is involved not only half a billion dollars but a great principle of international law. It has always been the honorable and traditional policy of our Government not to confiscate property of private citizens even of our enemy. Our great statesmen from Alexander Hamilton to the present time have declared confiscation to be repugnant to our sense of justice and public morals.

On the other hand, our Government can not and should not allow our own citizens to suffer loss of property or damages due for loss of life. Fortunately a compromise has been affected in this bill by which the interests of both parties are mutually conserved. It is not a perfect bill, but the best compromise measure that has been submitted to Congress since the problem has been up for solution.

Justice delayed is often justice denied. Our citizens and German citizens have waited 10 long years for the settlement and payment of their adjudicated claims. I shall gladly vote for this bill because it is a solution of one of the most complicated problems resulting from the World War.

It is true the interested parties will not be paid in full at once. The German citizens will receive 80 per cent immediately, 20 per cent of their property being withheld as security and also to make possible the payment of American claimants at once, in part at least. The American claimants will be paid about 60 per cent immediately, and up to 80 per cent before the Germans recover their unpaid balance. Then both parties share equally thereafter as the fund accumulates for this purpose.

Our Federal Treasury will not be called on to pay out one cent, except as it pays for the ships, patents, and radio equipment it seized and used for its own purposes. Even if no settlement were made as provided for in this bill, our Government would directly or indirectly pay for this seized property.

The half billion dollars will be paid out first from funds now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, seized from and belonging originally to the German citizens; next from interest which has accumulated on this seized property; and then from the annual payments to be made, or already made, by the German Government as part of the reparations due us from Germany and stipulated in agreements already made.

It will probably take 25 years to clean up this settlement in full. Uncle Sam is the most deferred creditor. Under this bill the Federal Treasury will be the last to be paid off. Individuals, both American and German, will get most of their claims paid within 5 years, and in full in about 15 years.

It is not a perfect but at least is a practical and a just settlement.

I like especially that feature of the bill which calls for full and immediate payments of all claims for personal injury and loss of life, and all property claims under $100,000. The large property claims are made to wait. I don't like the idea of paying off large insurance claims of companies which profited during the war before our own Government is paid off.

For 10 years the American and German claimants have been waiting for the return of their property and settlement of their claims. Because I believe a graver injustice would be done in further delay, I am for the passage of the bill and for the early settlement of these claims. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a statement made before the committee with respect to this bill by ex-Senator R. L. Owen.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I am inserting a statement prepared by former Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, with reference to the Alien Property Custodian bill now under consideration:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT L. OWEN WITH REGARD TO THE RETURN OF ALIEN PROPERTY AND SETTLEMENT OF AMERICAN CLAIMS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Gentlemen of the committee, in considering the return of German alien property and the settlement of American claims, your attention is respectfully invited, first, to the interests of the United States and the importance of its fixed policies with regard to the safety of private property.

OUR DOMESTIC INTERESTS

During the last century international law had developed a policy of giving complete protection to private property in the event of war, and practically all of the civilized nations respected this policy of protecting private property. The United States for a hundred and fifty years has maintained this policy firmly without a single departure. In 1802 it paid Great Britain approximately $3,000,000 to settle claims arising from confiscatory acts of individual States during the preceding war. The reason for this policy was as stated by Jefferson, Hamilton, and others responsible for the Constitution of the United States—that is, that when individuals confided themselves and their property to the hospitality and protection of our Government; when they loyally subjected themselves to our laws; when they paid taxes and created values by their industry and intelligence, there arose an implied contact between such individuals and the Government that they were entitled to protection, even if the foreign government of which they might be subject, should engage the United States in war.

Obviously, such individuals were innocent of making war, and the making of war by our Government could not be justly held to break the social compact, implied or actual, between them and our Government. Our Government, therefore, by the Constitution does pledge protection of their property against confiscation by numerous provisions. In consequence of this policy long pursued, the United States became a haven to which men might repair confiding in the safety of their private property invested in the United States. As an obvious result, hundreds of millions of dollars came to America and were invested in America, and the United States became of increasing industrial, commercial, and financial importance. Huge sums of money were borrowed from abroad and invested in the United States, by which our railroad system was built up and many industries were transplanted from abroad to the United States as a place both of profit and safety.

If we should now confiscate the German alien property and hold these individuals responsible for the alleged wrongdoing of the old German Imperial Government, or of the present democratic German Republic, we should be serving notice on all the world that the ancient and honor-

able standards set in the United States for the safety of private property could no longer be relied on.

Obviously this would be a very serious reason to prevent in future the free flow of capital for investment in the United States from abroad and would thus interfere with the greater future prosperity which America might otherwise attain. It would be against our present domestic financial interest.

Moreover, it would be against the honor and good repute of the United States abroad, because such an act, in violating our executive and legislative promises, would lower in the estimate of the world the good name of the United States Government, which has the opportunity now of setting a standard of high principle throughout the world. This is peculiarly the case because by the treaty of Versailles private property of aliens was in effect confiscated by Great Britain, by France, by Italy, by Belgium. These Governments have injured their own standing by this disregard and violation of the rights of private property, a fatal principle which led, perhaps, to the extreme disregard of private property by the communists and bolshevik throughout Europe. Is is to the national interest of America to stand strenuously against the Bolshevik doctrine or any doctrine which disregards the rights of private property upon which civilization itself is based. For that reason the domestic policy of the United States should stand steadily for the safeguarding of private property and complete protection to the owners of the German alien property now held by the United States Government, as well as for the protection of the American claimants whose property has been put in jeopardy by war and who now seek the protection of their own Government in the measures which your honorable committee is considering.

OUR FOREIGN INTERESTS

It is of equal importance to the United States in relation to our foreign affairs that we should treat private property as a sacred right.

The United States during the last 10 years has had an enormous development in its industrial, commercial, and financial life, and the present known outstanding investments of the United States and its nationals abroad exceed $20,000,000,000.

If we treat the right of private property lightly or inconsiderately we thereby set a false precedent which may be infinitely injurious to the United States. If we confiscate private property invested in the United States in disregard of our own Constitution and legislative pledges, we should not be surprised if other nations should avail themselves of such an evil precedent to confiscate the private property of our citizens and bring on international complications of dangerous consequences. The great friction which has taken place between our Government and other governments where American property has been put in jeopardy on a serious scale will readily occur to your honorable committee. The German alien property, amounting possibly with its reductions to $200,000,000, is only one-hundredth part of the American investments abroad.

Our foreign economic interests, therefore, require that we should not put in jeopardy such interests by establishing a bad precedent. We should not be influenced by those nations who have in the stress and excitement at the ending of the great war violated this principle. It is clearly evident that their present financial embarrassment and difficulty of getting credits on a favorable basis are partly due to the sense of insecurity which has been brought about by this unwise policy. Their grave blunder in disregarding their own previous better policies is a warning to us and not an example.

Therefore, in considering the question of the German alien property and the settlement of American claims, our own national, domestic, and economic interest should be well considered as of the greatest importance in guiding our action in regard to such settlements.

America has now the opportunity to maintain and set precedents of far-reaching consequences to the great future of the United States and to the world itself. We feel justified, therefore, in submitting to your honorable committee the further consideration which justifies your committee in recommending to Congress the complete settlement of these questions.

THE HONOR AND DIGNITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Separate and apart from all economic considerations is the honor and dignity of the United States. The devotion of the American people to their Government is due to the fact that they entertain a profound respect and love for the Government of the United States, because they know that that Government is incapable of conscious wrong, that they are justified in entertaining the deepest sentiment of honor and respect for that Government, that the Government fulfills every just obligation, that its dignity and its honor are kept immaculate by the representatives of the American people. And nothing could make amends to have this faith of the people weakened in any degree by an act of Congress or by an omission to act by Congress, which would show that the Congress of the United States was in any way indifferent to the legislative and executive pledges and commitments of this Government. So that our honor and our dignity alike require the most scrupulous consideration in disposing of this important question.

We therefore feel every confidence in submitting the following observations with regard to the questions before your committee:

First. The question of the return of the German alien property.

GERMAN ALIEN PROPERTY RETURN

We submit that the German alien property owners should have relief at the present session of Congress.

For nine years they have been deprived of their property. Even if Congress acts now it will take from one to two more years to make the settlements. Their need has been and is known to be serious.

It is conceded that as private individuals, trusting their large investments entirely to the protection and the justice of the United States, they were not responsible for the World War, which was ruinous to them.

TREATY PROVISIONS

They came under the mutual protection of the Government of the United States and of the former Imperial Government of Germany, under the special treaty provisions of the United States and Prussia of 1799, article 23, as renewed by article 12 of the treaty of 1828, and of the principles declared by the United States in the Jay treaty of 1794, article 10.

The treaty between the United States and Prussia of 1799 provided as follows:

"ART. 23. If war should arise between the two contracting parties, the merchants of either country then residing in the other shall be allowed to remain nine months to collect their debts and settle their affairs; and may depart freely, carrying off all their effects without molestation or hindrance; and all women and children, scholars of every faculty, cultivators of the earth, artisans, manufacturers, and fishermen, unarmed and inhabiting unfortified towns, villages, or places, and in general all others whose occupations are for the common subsistence and benefit of mankind, shall be allowed to continue their respective employments and shall not be molested in their persons, nor shall their houses or goods be burnt or otherwise destroyed, nor their fields wasted by the armed force of the enemy into whose power by the events of war they may happen to fall; but if anything is necessary to be taken from them for the use of such armed force, the same shall be paid for at a reasonable price.

"And it is declared that neither the pretense that war dissolves all treaties, nor any other whatever, shall be considered as annulling or suspending this and the next preceding article; but on the contrary, that the state of war is precisely that for which they are provided, and during which they are to be as sacredly observed as the most acknowledged articles in the law of nature and nations."

This article was renewed by article 12 of the treaty of 1828, in force when the property was taken over. (See vol. 2, Malloy Treaties and Conventions, p. 1494.)

Article 10 of the Jay treaty of 1794 provided:

"Neither the debts due from individuals of one nation to individuals of the other, nor shares, nor moneys, which they have in the public funds, or in the public or private banks, shall ever in any event of war or national differences be sequestrated or confiscated, it being unjust and impolitic that debts and engagements contracted and made by individuals, having confidence in each other and in their respective governments, should ever be destroyed or impaired by national authority on account of national differences and discontents."

The United States Government in pursuance of this just policy under the treaty of January 8, 1802, paid Great Britain some $3,000,000 to make good acts of confiscation against British subjects practiced by some of the States in the Revolutionary War.

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

They came under the special protection of the Constitution of the United States, which having taken every precaution to secure the protection of private property, declares as a fundamental principle:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures."

It expressly declares that this right "shall not be violated."

It declares that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. It makes no provision for taking private property for private use, even with compensation.

Amendment 5 especially declares:

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The word person, as used in this amendment, is not confined to a citizen, but covers any person of foreign allegiance domiciled in America or doing business in America.

The Constitution provides adequate means of protecting property rights against private as well as public trespass.

The Constitution makes the principle of holding private property inviolably binding on the 48 States, and says:

"Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The Constitution forbids any State to pass any bill of attainder or law impairing the obligation of a contract.

These constitutional provisions were based on the principles enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and were based upon fundamental justice, sound morals, and wise international policy.

The authors of the Constitution held that when the Government admits foreigners, or invites them to bring property into the country, to pay taxes, to obey and uphold the law, the Government thereby tacitly pledges protection and security to such tax-paying foreigners. That such aliens subject to the civil and criminal law in war as well as in peace, by their loyal obedience to the law, are entitled to protection. That the seizure of their property, therefore, and its confiscation, would not only violate the implied contract of hospitable residence, but would violate every rule of justice and equity.

In his Camillus Letter 18, Alexander Hamilton said:

"No power of language at my command can express the abhorrence I feel at the idea of violating the property of individuals, which, in an authorized intercourse in time of peace, has been confided to the faith of our Government and laws on account of controversy between nation and nation. In my view every moral and every political sense unite to consign it to execration."

Alexander Hamilton, in 1794, discussing the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, urging the doctrine of the protection of private property, said:

"Moreover, the property of the foreigner within our country may be regarded as having paid a valuable consideration for its protection and exemption from forfeiture; that which is brought in commonly enriches the revenue by a duty of entry. All that is within our territory, whether acquired there or brought there, is liable to contributions to the Treasury in common with other similar property. Does there not result an obligation to protect that which contributes to the expense of its protection? Will justice sanction, upon the breaking out of a war, the confiscation of a property which, during peace, serves to augment the resources and nourish the prosperity of a State? * * * Reason, left to its own rights, would answer all these questions in one way and severely condemn the molestation on account of a national contest, as well of the property as of the person of a foreigner found in our country, under the license and guaranty of the laws of previous amity."

It was under this policy that the United States paid Great Britain some $3,000,000 to make good certain acts of confiscation against British subjects practiced by some of the States in the Revolutionary War.

The United States Supreme Court has held, through John Marshall, Chief Justice (U. S. v. Percheman, 7 Peters 51), that while in waging war the United States has, as one of its war powers, the right to confiscate, still—

"The modern usage of nations, which has become a law, would be violated; that the sense of justice and of right, which is acknowledged and felt by the whole civilized world, would be outraged if private property should be generally confiscated and private rights annulled."

The United States never has, even in war, in a hundred and fifty years confiscated alien private property.

CONFISCATION WOULD VIOLATE EXECUTIVE PLEDGES

When this country was threatened with the renewal of the submarine warfare, and war was contemplated, and the probable consequences, and alien property owners began to withdraw deposits from America, the President of the United States on February 18, 1917, through the Department of State, made the following official declaration:

"The Government of the United States will under no circumstances take advantage of a state of war to take possession of property to which, under international understanding and recognized law of the alien, gives it no just claim or title. It will scrupulously respect all private rights alike of its own citizens and subjects of foreign States."

The President of the United States said on April 2, 1917:

"We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. * * * We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when these rights have been made as secure as the faith and freedom of the United States can make them."

The President on April 6, 1917, pledged the protection of all enemy aliens and said they would be "accorded the consideration due to all peaceful and law-abiding persons, except so far as restrictions may be necessary for their own protection and for the safety of the United States."

The President, replying to Pope Benedict, said, referring to the Germans in Europe, that the American people "desire no reprisal upon the German people, who have themselves suffered all things in this war which they did not choose."

In his message to Congress December 4, 1917, he said:

"No nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done * * * wrong."

The President said on April 6, 1918:

"We ourselves propose no injustice, no aggressions. We are ready whenever the final reckoning is made to be just with the German people."

CONFISCATION WOULD VIOLATE LEGISLATIVE PLEDGES—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The trading with the enemy act, approved October 6, 1917, shows on its face, by its context, by the manner of its presentation to Congress, by the testimony before the committees, by the reports of the committees of Congress, by the debates in Congress, that it had no intention whatever to confiscate alien property or to dishonor the pledges made by the President of the United States and by the Secretary of State immediately preceding the presentation of this bill to Congress.

The act was intended as a war measure to control trade and communication between citizens of the United States and citizens of Germany to prevent alien property being used to the disadvantage of the United States during the war, to give complete security to alien property, and to safely return it after the war or to make a just settlement, as promised by the President.

This act was drawn under the direction of the President of the United States and passed at the request of his administration for the above purpose. It was elaborately explained to Congress by Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State; Hon. William C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce; Hon. Charles Warren, Assistant Attorney General; Dr. Edward E. Prenty, Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, under whose direction the act was drawn, before the committee May 29, 1917, page 13, that the bill was intended for the protection of alien property. Secretary Redfield, speaking for Mr. Lansing, in his presence said:

"The creation of an Alien Property Custodian is a novelty and is in line with that same effort toward equity which impels us to indicate an earnest desire to show to the people with whom, unfortunately, we are engaged in war, that here is the opposite of confiscation and here is the opposite of requisition."

Mr. Lansing said that the act "will put it in the hands of the Government to protect the property and it will avoid any lawless acts against it."

Mr. Warren said: "It is merely a temporary taking over of an enemy property; its conservation is in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian."

Both the Senate committee report and the House committee report (H. Rept. 685, 65th Cong., and S. Rept. 113, 65th Cong.) expressly declare the same principles and that the act did not contemplate confiscation.

The debates in Congress demonstrated the same purpose exclusively.

Mr. MONTAGUE said the act of taking over the property was done "to conserve the interests of America in this great struggle, and at the same time its final and honest payment to the creditors is made more secure."

Mr. De Walt said: "This property is not confiscated at all." He also said that the bill was not in violation of The Hague convention of 1907, which expressly provides for the protection of private property on land, and said: "It was in conformity with that idea that the proclamation of the President as early as last June was made, reaffirming the doctrine that private property should not be confiscated and that the provisions of this bill were made as they are."

Upon the suggestion of Mr. Stafford that Congress might, after the war, neglect to act, that it would have the effect of confiscation, Mr. Snook said: "Does the gentleman think that Congress will assume that position? Has the gentleman so little confidence in the Congress of the United States as to think it will not act fairly and justly with those men?"

COURT DECISIONS

The courts decided against confiscation in Pennsylvania Supreme Court (266 Pa. St. 189) and said: "The trading with the enemy act is not for confiscation of property; it is rather for its preservation. While, if the President so directs, the money or property of an alien enemy may be taken by the Government for its own purposes, the owner does not part absolutely with it if, after the end of the war, his claim to it shall be settled as Congress shall direct." This decision was confirmed by the United States Supreme Court.

In the Forty-sixth New York Supreme Court Reports, page 175, the court says: "In the exercise of its plenary power in this matter, Congress might have provided for the confiscation of enemy property, but it did not do so. The act on its face is plainly not confiscatory."

The decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States v. Chemical Foundation does not negative this sound doctrine. The issue of the Chemical Foundation case was whether title passes to the Chemical Foundation by sale of the patents by the Alien Property Custodian to that corporation. The court held that as a matter of law that the sale during the war of said property was valid, but this does not mean confiscation even in time of war, because the promise of the President of the United States and of the Congress of the United States to make

just settlement after the war sufficiently cover the case and left an open forum for the settlement of any claim for damage arising. No individual instance had occurred under which the Alien Property Custodian should have disregarded the rights of an alien property owner that would change the purpose of the executive and legislative branches of the Government to which we have referred above.

Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State, in an address at Philadelphia, November 23, 1923, said: "A confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interest of particular individuals but at the foundations of international intercourse, for it is only on the basis of security of property, validly possessed under the laws existing at the time of its acquisition, that the conduct of activities in helpful cooperation is possible, * * * rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another state, a state is under an international obligation appropriately to recognize, it is the policy of the United States to support these fundamental principles."

THE LANGUAGE OF THE ACT

The language of the act shows the act was intended as a war measure only to control trade and communication between citizens of the United States and citizens and residents of Germany, and to prevent alien property being used to the disadvantage of the United States during the war, to give security to alien property and safely return it after the war or settle damage done.

The Alien Property Custodian, section 6, was empowered to receive all money and property belonging to a nonresident enemy.

German citizens in the United States holding property were not molested in person or property unless, as in a few negligible cases, by presidential proclamation they were declared enemies.

The Alien Property Custodian was to receive the property, "to hold, administer, and account for the same under the general direction of the President, and as provided in this act." But the President was expressly pledged not to confiscate but to protect the property and faithfully account for it when the war is over.

The alien property owners residing in Germany left their properties in the United States under the pledge of a German-American treaty, under the constitutional protection of the United States, under the unbroken policy of 150 years, under the protection of The Hague Convention of 1907, and the international obligation of the United States, under the executive pledges of the Secretary of State and of the President of the United States, and were perfectly justified in doing so. To confiscate the property now or to continue to retain it with the effect of confiscation would clearly dishonor the pledges made by the Chief Executive of the United States, and the obligations of the Congress itself.

The Alien Property Custodian was "vested with all of the powers of a common law trustee in respect of all property other than money," and "under such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe, may manage such property and do any act or things in respect thereof," necessary to prevent waste. "To protect such property to the end that the interests of the United States in such property and right of such person as may ultimately become entitled thereto or to the proceeds thereof, may be preserved and safeguarded." This language is entirely inconsistent with the confiscation of the property.

Section 12 declares: "After the end of the war any claim of any enemy or of an ally of an enemy to any money or other property received and held by the Alien Property Custodian, or deposited in the United States Treasury, shall be settled as Congress shall direct." This language was discussed in Congress and its meaning explained to be that an honest accounting should be made to the owner and the return of the property or its value after the war was ended.

Section 16 imposed a penalty for willful violation of the provisions of the act that "any property, funds, security, or other articles or documents, or any vessel," etc., "concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States."

This language is entirely inconsistent with the idea that the property was intended to be confiscated by the United States except for a willful violation of the act itself. At a later date, March 28, 1918, the President of the United States was authorized to acquire the title of the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment facilities on the Hudson River, now owned by the North German Line Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Line Terminal & Navigation Co., two corporations of the State of New Jersey, if he shall deem it necessary for the national security and defense: *Provided*, That if such property can not be procured by purchase, then the President of the United States is authorized and empowered to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof. If such property shall be taken over, as aforesaid, the United States shall make such compensation therefor, to be determined by the President. Upon the taking over of said property by the President, as aforesaid, a title to all such property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States.

But the President was fully committed by his own proclamation and by the policy of the Government not to confiscate, but to account for such property uprightly. A plan for such adjustment is now being considered by your honorable committee, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, representing the President of the United States. The language of this latter amendment shows there was no intent to confiscate.

On March 28, 1918, the act was further amended to give the custodian under the President the power to dispose of such properties, by sale or otherwise, "in like manner as though he were absolute owner thereof." This amendment was necessary to enable the custodian, as trustee, to convey a title free from doubt to protect the property itself. It often became necessary to dispose of assets which otherwise might be perishable, but there was no negation whatever of the duties of the trustee to continue to act faithfully as a trustee, nor was there any modification of the pledge by Congress, after the end of the war, to make a just settlement, as promised by the President.

It was under this act, as amended, that the chemical patents relating to explosives, gases, medicines, etc., were sold to the Chemical Foundation before the end of the war. The Chemical Foundation was not organized for profit but for public fiduciary purposes, to make available to the chemical industries of the United States the important patents necessary for war-making purposes and for purposes of defense. The Supreme Court held at the October term, 1926, that there was no conspiracy or fraud in such sale and that a good title passed regardless of the consideration paid. The reasoning is clear, and there is nothing inconsistent with the trading with the enemy act in this decision for the very sound reason that the owners of the patents were provided a remedy in the law itself, and because the executive and legislative branches of the Government were pledged to a just settlement when the war was over, and no injustice is done under these circumstances. Only in the event that a fair and just settlement were refused could a complaint of injustice be made.

The Alien Property Custodian has advised the return of the property.

THE CAUSES OF THE DELAY IN RETURNING GERMAN ALIEN PROPERTY

The treaty of Versailles, officially terminating the war, went into effect January 10, 1920. It was submitted to the Senate of the United States and subjected to a prolonged discussion which finally terminated at the close of the Wilson administration in a refusal to accept it.

The new administration of the Sixty-seventh Congress came into power March 4, 1921. On July 2, 1921, the Knox-Porter resolution was passed declaring the war at an end and declaring that the United States and its nationals were entitled to all rights accruing under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or under the treaty of Versailles, or as to one of the principal allied and associated powers.

It further provided (sec. 5): "All property of the Imperial German Government or its successor or successors, and of German nationals which was on April 6, 1917, in, or has since that date come into, the possession or under control of, or has been the subject of a demand by the United States of America, or of any of its officers, agents, or employees from any source, or by any agency whatever * * * shall be retained by the United States of America, and no disposition thereof made except as shall have been heretofore, or specifically hereafter shall be provided by law, until such time as the Imperial German Government * * * or their successor or successors, shall have respectively made suitable provision for the satisfaction of all claims against said Government of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America and who have suffered through the acts of the Imperial German Government or its agents * * * since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of shares of stock in German * * * American or other corporations, or in consequence of hostilities or of any operations or war or otherwise," etc.

The Knox-Porter resolution also demanded the "most-favored-nation" treatment; and confirmation to the United States by Germany of "all fines, forfeitures, penalties, and seizures imposed or made by the United States of America during the war, whether in respect to the property of the Imperial German Government or German nationals" * * * "and shall have waived any and all pecuniary claims against the United States of America."

Retaining the German alien property except and until provided by law was already the United States statute law under the trading with the enemy act and Germany being required to agree to it was merely a method of requiring Germany to agree to existing law until Germany made "suitable provision" which Germany was anxious to do.

The obvious intention of the Knox-Porter resolution was not to confiscate German property but to retain it until the German Government had complied with the demands made.

The German Government did comply to the extreme limit of its capacity by the treaty of Berlin. (Hearings, Part III, pp. 17–24.)

THE BERLIN TREATY

On the 25th of August, 1921, the plenipotentiaries of the German Commonwealth and of the United States entered into a treaty of peace, reciting the armistice, the treaty of Versailles of June 28, 1919, and the Knox-Porter resolution of July 2, 1921, as follows:

"Being desirous of restoring the friendly relations existing between the two nations prior to the outbreak of war"—

Article I. "Germany undertakes to accord to the United States and the United States shall have and enjoy all the rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages specified in the aforesaid joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of July 2, 1921, including all the rights and advantages stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the treaty of Versailles, which the United States shall fully enjoy, notwithstanding the fact that such treaty has not been ratified by the United States."

At the time of the Berlin treaty, August 25, 1921, the German Government was under the military, financial, and commercial control of the allied and associated powers. The treaty of Versailles had been enforced by a famine blockade, and the threat of an immediate resumption of war if the Government of the German Commonwealth refused to submit to the treaty of Versailles as dictated.

The President of the United States in October, 1918, had demanded the abdication of the German Imperial Government, William II and his dynasty, against which the Government of the United States had waged war. William II and the Hohenzollern dynasty abdicated prior to the armistice of November 11, and on November 9, 1918, a revolution took place in Germany to establish such a government as that demanded by the President of the United States, and desired by an overwhelming majority of the German people.

Frederick Ebert, leader of the German social democracy, on November 10, assumed the chairmanship of the council of people's commissioners. The hereditary rulers and other German kings, princes, and notables, followed the action of William II. They all stipulated abdication or acquiesced in their deposition. The military masters of Germany were overthrown. The United States had accomplished its declared purpose in waging the war.

On November 30, regulations for an election were framed to elect representatives to a constitutional convention. These regulations established the principles of universal, direct, secret, and equal suffrage for all German men and women of 20 years of age or more on the date of election. Proportional representation was established. The election was held January 19, 1919, and a provisional government was established February 10, 1919. The convention was composed of 423 delegates from 38 districts, elected by proportional representation.

Social Democrats	163
The Center (Catholic)	90
German Democratic (progressive)	75
German National People's Party (conservative)	42
German People's Party	22
Independent Social Democrats (radical)	22

The monarchist element was thus demonstrated by proportional selection to have been practically eliminated by this vote of the German people. The constitution of the German Commonwealth was adopted on July 31, 1919, and became effective by executive order August 11, 1919. A new cabinet had been organized by Gustavus Bauer. (See Constitution of the German Commonwealth by Monroe and Holcomb, Harvard University, published by the World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston.)

Under this treaty seeking to "restore friendly relations" with the German people shall we confiscate any part of the private property of the citizens of Germany and now in time of peace violate our executive and legislative pledges to them on the theory it will profit us in money to do so?

THE GERMAN LAW OF EXPROPRIATION

The term "reich" now means "commonwealth" or "republic," representing a national union of states.

Section 1, article 1, declares as follows: "The German Commonwealth is a republic. Political authority is derived from the people."

Article 7 provides, among other things, for jurisdiction in conjunction with the States of—

"12. The law of expropriation." (Confiscation is not recognized.)

Article 153 recites: "The right of private property is guaranteed by the constitution. Its nature and limits are defined by law. Expropriation may be proceeded with only for the benefit of the community and by due process of law. There shall be just compensation in so far as is not otherwise provided by national law. If there is a dispute over the amount of the compensation there shall be a right of appeal to the ordinary courts in so far as not otherwise provided by national law."

Article 178 declares as follows:

"The constitution of the German Empire of April 16, 1871, and the law of February 10, 1919, relating to the provision of government of the commonwealth are repealed.

"The other laws and regulations of the empire remain in force in so far as they do not conflict with this constitution. The provisions of the treaty of peace signed on June 28, 1919, at Versailles, are not affected by the constitution."

The other laws and regulations of the empire remaining in force provide that the expropriation of private property is a matter of state law under which a private property owner may have his property appropriated for public purposes upon just compensation, with a right of hearing in the state court. In this manner the rights of private property of a German citizen is protected under the German state law. The German Government in agreeing to the Berlin treaty that the German Government accords to the United States the right to retain all private property of German citizens in the United States until suitable provision was made by the German Government for the satisfaction of all claims against that Government would have had no option even if confiscation of vested private property had been contemplated. But that Government had no reason to believe, it is respectfully submitted, that when the German Government did everything in its power to make suitable provision that then the United States would resort to confiscation of the private property of the German nationals under American protection if the American claims were not fully and immediately liquidated on a cash basis.

The German Government therefore had no constitutional right to authorize the confiscation of the property of German nationals under the Weimar constitution.

It is perfectly obvious that the German Government had no intention of authorizing the confiscation. It merely surrendered to the requirement of the Government of the United States and accorded to the United States the right, which Congress had already taken, to retain the property of German nationals until the German Government made suitable provision for the satisfaction of the demands of American claimants.

But even if the German Republic had had the right to confiscate, and if the treaty of Versailles had authorized confiscation, even if the German Government had intended to authorize confiscation, the German Republic is not competent to modify the Constitution of the United States nor to modify the social compact of the United States with private persons holding property in the United States, nor to modify nor interfere with the contract relation arising from the executive and legislative pledges of the United States to protect the private property of individuals who are under the safeguard of our laws.

The United States has persistently refused to recognize the existing Government of Russia for many years on the ground that the Russian Government had systematically violated the sacred principle of the rights of private property and was undertaking to spread this pernicious doctrine elsewhere. The United States can not afford itself to violate this principle.

Hon. A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, in his public letter of April 19, 1926, in discussing the question of Germany's action in attempting to make suitable provision for the satisfaction of American claims, as provided under the Knox-Porter resolution and the Berlin treaty, said:

"A creditors' committee investigated Germany's economic capacity and found that 2,500,000,000 gold marks ($625,000,000) per annum was Germany's entire capacity to meet her treaty obligations. * * * German creditors accepted their committee's recommendation as embodied in the Dawes plan, and by the Paris agreement divided the total annuity among the creditors. The United States signed the Paris agreement and thereby accepted the Dawes plan. By the Paris agreement the annuity for the payment of the American mixed claim was fixed at 45,000,000 gold marks ($11,000,000)."

The German Republic therefore has made suitable provision for the satisfaction of the American claims, unless it is held that where Germany has paid to the utmost of her capacity such provision is still not "suitable." Such an interpretation of the Berlin treaty is unreasonable. The purpose of the Knox-Porter resolution was to put pressure to bear on Germany and compel Germany to do her utmost to pay these claims. Germany has done her utmost and her utmost has been fixed by the entente allies and accepted by the United States. If this be not "suitable provision," the term is a mockery.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Congress of the United States under the trading with the enemy act has released all of the property held by many of the persons whose property was held by the Alien Property Custodian, even where such persons have had their property taken over lawfully under said act by the Alien Property Custodian. The property of all persons, German alien property owners, who by the operation of the Versailles treaty had become citizens of other newly erected nations, or had become citizens of other governments under the treaty of Versailles, such as the German citizens who now are residents of Schleswig-Holstein, or of Alsace and Lorraine, or who became citizens of Belgium when Eupen and Malmedy were attached to Belgium; or of German citizens who became citizens of Czechoslovakia, or became citizens of Poland, as in Danzig and the Danzig Corridor, and in other portions of eastern Germany attached to Poland; or who now are citizens of Yugoslavia, showing that Congress had no intention to confiscate this property and had actually released all of the holdings belonging to thousands of former German citizens who came within certain categories.

Moreover, the House of Representatives passed the Winslow bill on February 23, 1923, by a vote of 300 to 11, directing the return of all German alien property to German owners up to an amount of $10,000,

showing that with regard to such persons Congress did not intend to confiscate their property but ordered it returned.

It is incredible that Congress intended to confiscate the property remaining after such action of Congress in ordering the full return to innumerable individuals as above set forth. The reason for retaining any portion of the property was obviously in the interest and for the benefit of the American claimants whose advocates naturally desired to have these claims settled before the claims of all the German nationals had been finally disposed of. It was in deference to their wishes that a portion of the property was still retained and, due to a parliamentary compromise, which enabled a partial settlement to be made at that time with the smaller owners.

THE AMERICAN CLAIMS AGAINST THE GERMAN REPUBLIC

The question arises, What course should Congress take in regard to the American claims against the German Republic?

During the last session of Congress the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. A. W. Mellon, with the approval of the President of the United States (hearings), proposed that the United States should finance the American claims and be reimbursed such advances by Germany out of 100,000,000 gold marks payable annually, using $30,000,000 of accumulated interest which had been obtained on German alien property funds, but not allocated. The use of this interest was agreed to by the representatives of the German owners of the alien property, so that by this settlement the American claimants would not be compelled to wait for a period so long as to be destructive of their rights, and so that the return of the German alien property might be immediately made without the objection of those who feel that the German alien property should be retained until the American claims were liquidated.

The objection was made that to use the credits of the Treasury of the United States to liquidate the American claims would be unjust to the Treasury because in the event that the German Government should default in making the payments pledged by the German Government to the United States it would inflict a possible loss on the Treasury which would be against the interest of the taxpayers of the United States.

The matter was somewhat strongly put by saying it was equivalent to Treasury money paying German debts. These objections deserve a careful consideration.

The amount of the indebtedness of the German Republic to the United States on account of the Army of occupation costs is $250,000,000, without interest. The amount which would be due to the American claimants and the United States, less the amounts available, would be approximately $200,000,000, making a total of $450,000,000, less credits and cross-entries of $100,000,000 or more, to be liquidated by the payment of $23,820,000 (100,000,000 gold marks) per annum.

The Treasury can obtain this money due to liquidate the American claims for approximately 3¼ per cent. The United States is committed not to charge interest on the Army occupation cost, so that the liquidation under the plan of paying the United States 100,000,000 gold marks per annum would liquidate the fund within a reasonable time, unless Germany defaulted.

There is no probability of Germany defaulting this debt, which is peculiarly a debt of honor which the German Government fully recognizes, and Germany is otherwise obligated to pay these debts even if the Dawes plan were modified. The debt due to the United States by Germany under such an arrangement would amount to a little over 30 cents per capita per annum of the German population for the annual payment of $23,800,000 per annum. Germany is one of the most thoroughly organized industrial communities in the world.

But the objection still lies against the use of the Treasury fund for payment of American claims—if Germany should default—and it is therefore necessary to inquire further whether or not the financing of the American claims by the Treasury is or is not justified, in view of a possible risk.

Primarily the obligation to pay the American claims rests upon Germany, the German Republic, and is freely acknowledged. But in the contingency of German default we have a right to inquire whether the United States is not obligated as a matter of law, as a matter of sound policy, as a matter of good conscience, to protect the American claims in such event.

THE UNITED STATES IS OBLIGATED TO PROTECT THE AMERICAN CLAIMS

In times of peace a citizen who pays his taxes and supports the law is entitled to the protection in his life and property by his government, and the United States is charged with the duty of meeting the expense of protecting the life and property of the citizen through the processes provided, and private property can not be taken without just compensation. If he is assaulted, the Government of the United States goes to the expense of prosecuting those who are guilty of the assault.

But in times of war the citizen must do more than pay his taxes—he must offer his life itself for the protection of his government. He must pay extraordinary taxes; he must be prepared to subordinate every private interest for the public safety, and a reciprocal obligation arises in times of war with the government. The government should protect the citizen to the extent of its power against any injury by the operation of the government itself.

The government in time of war declares war for the purpose of protecting the larger interests of all of the people, and if in protecting all of the people by war a citizen is subjected to an extraordinary loss due to this act of the government in declaring war, or due to the policies laid down by the government during the war, the losses should not be allowed to fall disproportionately upon the citizens, but should be apportioned upon all of the people in whose interest war or the policies of war were declared.

An American citizen who suffered a great loss in Germany as a result of the declaration of war, or on the sea because of war policies adopted by the Government, is entitled to look to his Government for redress if the German Government, which is primarily responsible, should default in the liquidation of such claim.

The American claimants have a primary claim against Germany but a secondary claim against the United States. If Germany defaults, it is the duty of the American Government to protect its citizens, nevertheless.

This is the exact principle recognized by France in rebuilding the devastated regions—France paid the cost of repairing and rebuilding the destroyed property and looks to Germany to repay; why should the United States be less considerate of its citizens or less just and fair to its own people who have suffered?

The American citizens having property in Germany are under the mutual protection of the German Government and of the American Government by international treaty between Germany and the United States, and also under The Hague convention, which pledges the citizen safety of private property in war, and if Germany defaults in this obligation, the citizens who relied upon the mutual obligations of Germany and the United States to safeguard their property have a right to look to the United States Government for payment.

THE UNITED STATES AS TRUSTEE

The United States was chargeable with the duty as the representative and trustee of its citizens to see to it that its citizens were protected in their private property rights as against the German Imperial Government and its successor, the German Republic. A private citizen can not safeguard himself against a foreign government; he must rely upon his own government to protect him, and the responsibility of his own government to protect him is perfectly manifest. The United States recognizes this obligation in passing the Knox-Porter resolution and the Berlin treaty, and in the international agreement, establishing the Mixed Arbitral Commission, and in its negotiations obtaining 45,000,000 gold marks with which to liquidate the obligations of the German Republic to the American claimants.

But the United States is not only responsible for the discharge of this duty but for the discharge of the duty in a competent manner. The United States Government may not by negligence imperil its own citizens' rights without responsibility.

It is a notorious fact that when Germany had quick assets available to pay the Army occupation costs, and the American claimants in 1918, 1919, 1920, etc., the United States, by its negligence, failed to collect the amount even of the Army occupation costs from the Reparation Commission established by the allied and associated powers. Was not this a grave negligence of the Government of the United States of which the American claimants would be the victims unless now the American Government assumes the responsibility of the loss, if any, from a future possible German default?

The United States, when Germany had quick assets, made no demand on Germany for payments to protect the American claimants, which was its bounden duty to do. Since, therefore, the United States by its negligence has put the American claimants in danger of the possibility of loss in the event that the German Republic might default, the United States, chargeable with the duty of protecting its own citizens against its own negligence in this matter, should take the risk, if any there be, of German default.

THE PARIS AGREEMENT

The United States having by its negligence failed to secure the assets necessary to meet the Army occupation costs, and the amounts due the American claimants, went to Paris January 24, 1925, when the Dawes plan was adopted, six years after the armistice, and demanded a participation at that belated date and obtained from the allied powers the agreement that the United States should have 55,000,000 gold marks as first lien for the protection of the Army occupation costs, and, second, 45,000,000 marks out of the Dawes reparation fund, after certain primary charges had been made, including the 55,000,000 gold marks. In other words, the United States, acting as representative of the American claimants, obtained a first lien for itself and a second lien for the benefit of the cestui que trust—the American claimants.

It should be clear that the United States as trustee, according to the principles, practices, and underlying reasons of the law of equity, should not take advantage of the American claimants in this manner by giving itself preferential treatment. Moreover, the United States obtained the 100,000,000 gold marks on the ground, as stated by its representative in Paris, that the United States had no other means available for meeting these charges. It was perfectly clear that under the Con-

stitution of the United States the executive and legislative pledges of the United States that the German alien property could not be confiscated and used as a means of meeting the Army occupation costs or pay the American claimants. Having on this ground obtained the 100,000,000 gold marks under the Dawes plan, the United States, in effect, confessed that the American claimants had no security in the alien property in the hands of the United States. This implied confession that the alien property was not a security leaves the Government all the more responsible.

If the Government attempted to confiscate the German alien property, it would lose the right to retain the 100,000,000 gold marks per annum, which it got allowed at Paris on the representation that the alien property was not available.

For this reason, since the United States can not plead the right to confiscate the German alien property as a means of meeting the American claims, the United States, as a matter of common fairness, should recognize its duty to give the American claimants the position of preferred creditors against the 100,000,000 gold marks, finance them, and take the possible risk, if any, of having Germany default.

This policy is a wise policy from a national standpoint, because it is of grave importance that the citizens of the United States should be able to rely upon their Government to protect them in the event of war against the consequences of governmental acts or governmental policies. The strength of the Government of the United States is based upon the devotion of its citizens and the attachment of the citizens to the Government must depend upon the Government giving full protection to the citizen in his just rights.

For these reasons the United States should, as a matter of right, as a matter of good conscience, as a matter of sound policy, take the risk, if any, of Germany defaulting. The actions of the Government of the United States in protecting its citizens against the contingencies of war are shown by many instances during the war where the Government organized special instrumentalities for the protection of the citizen against the extraordinary demands of war, such as the War Finance Board, where the Government used its credits on a huge scale to protect the citizens against the injuries which war otherwise would have inflicted; where the Government, for instance, used its own credit to the extent of $200,000,000 to finance loans through the farm-loan banks to the farmers of the Nation. The Government is now spending $500,000,000 per annum for the protection and restoration of citizens injured by war (through the Veterans' Bureau). It set up machinery for personal insurance during the war for citizens who enlisted under the colors; it provided pensions for them. It set up marine insurance for the protection of its citizens when the American insurance companies were unable or unwilling to bear the risk of marine insurance.

It is of great importance that the policy laid down in the Berlin treaty of restoring friendly relations between the German people and the American people should be carried out by liquidating all of these unsettled claims of German nationals and of American nationals.

The settlement of these claims would release a very large volume of frozen credits, which would immediately flow into the channels of industry, of commerce, of finance. A very large part of these funds would be invested in American cotton, cottonseed oil, petroleum and its by-products, in metals, agricultural products, manufactured products, and the United States would be the beneficiary of increased revenue, of increased commerce passing through our ports, and from internal revenue.

The premises considered, we respectfully submit that a sound national policy justifies the immediate return of the German alien property and the liquidation of the American claims.

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "settlement of war claims act of 1928."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7201, the alien property bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ST. LOUIS & O'FALLON RAILWAY CASE DECISION

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago there was handed down by a statutory United States court in the eighth circuit in a decision in the so-called O'Fallon case wherein there was considered the so-called recapture provision of the transportation act. The decision is a very important one. It will have a good deal of effect upon future determination of valuation proceedings under the recapture provision, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a copy of the opinion as rendered by the judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Reserving the right to object, anyone who wants a copy of the O'Fallon case can obtain it.

Mr. NEWTON. At the price of $15.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, no.

Mr. NEWTON. That is what the clerk advised me at the time.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. A certified copy, of course, but when printed it will be available.

Mr. MAPES. Has the gentleman considered having it printed as a House document?

Mr. NEWTON. I have not.

Mr. MAPES. Would it not be well to consider it?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If it is printed in this way, it will be printed in very fine type so that nobody will read it. If the gentleman wants it to be read, it should be put in readable form.

Mr. NEWTON. I have a copy of the opinion myself, and my thought was that Members might be interested in reading it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If it is printed at all, we would like to have it in readable form. If it is printed in the RECORD it will be in such fine print that no one cares to read it. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request and proceed in a different way to secure what he desires.

Mr. NEWTON. I will do that.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the colloquy occurring, I ask unanimous consent to have the opinion referred to in my remarks printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Reserving the right to object, how much space will it occupy?

Mr. NEWTON. I have not any idea.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. It ought to be limited to five or six copies. I do not object, but it ought to be limited to five or six copies, as that is about as many as will read it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Minnesota tell me just the character of the O'Fallon decision? Is that the one that the Supreme Court held that the reproduction cost——

Mr. NEWTON. Oh, no; it is not the Supreme Court of the United States at all. It is a statutory court composed of two circuit judges and the district judge sitting on an appeal.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In a court of appeals?

Mr. NEWTON. No; not in a court of appeals, but on the appeal from the Interstate Commerce Commission valuation of the recapture provision in the case of a small railroad in the city of St. Louis. It is the first time that that particular statute has come up for a judicial review.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And the court, as I remember, affirms the reasoning of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. NEWTON. The court did not affirm the reasoning, but it did affirm the findings and valuation of the commission.

Mr. HOCH. Two of the judges were of opinion that it was not necessary to pass upon the commission's method of valuation in determining the cases before it. The third judge held that it was necessary, and he not only upheld the order of the commission, but the commission's valuation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL AND THE USE OF INDIANA LIMESTONE

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks on the public buildings bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, to-day H. R. 278, the public buildings bill, passed the House by more than a two-thirds majority, without a record vote, and under suspension of the rules, and I take this opportunity of expressing myself in favor of the building program. While the district I have the honor to represent does not receive a Federal building under this bill, yet I am in favor of a building program; and in order that a building program for the construction of Federal buildings may go forward I voted for the bill. I am in favor of a building program for the reason that the Government and the country at large are sorely in need of many Federal buildings. I hope this building program will be carried on as rapidly as

possible, and I hope that those charged with the duty of the location of these buildings will locate them in accordance with the greatest needs of the country.

And in connection with the building program I want to call the attention of my colleagues, and those charged with the duty of constructing these buildings, to the Indiana limestone, the Nation's building stone. Indiana limestone, or Bedford limestone, as it is commonly called, is produced near Bedford, Lawrence County, Ind. Practically all of this building stone is located in two counties in the State of Indiana—Lawrence County, in the district I represent, and Monroe County, in the district represented by my colleague, Mr. GREENWOOD. This stone is truly the Nation's building stone because there is no other material that finds so wide a field of usage from the finest structures to those purely utilitarian in character. In fact, there is no other quarry deposit in the world furnishing a material that is so universally used. Few people realize that from these two counties in southern Indiana about 35 per cent of all the building stone used throughout the entire United States is quarried, and that these two counties supply about 65 per cent of all the finished building stone used by the entire country.

It is safe to say that there is no other building stone in the world that can equal this product of southern Indiana for beauty and general utility, and that there has been no other quarry opened anywhere in the world, from the time of the building of King Solomon's temple down to the present time, that has supplied a stone that has been so generally useful for building purposes, a stone which possesses to such a marked degree the combination of beauty, permanence, and fine weathering properties. There is no other stone that is so easily worked, and so low in cost, that is at the same time as durable and strong.

It is on the basis of genuine structural merit and moderate cost that enables this product of southern Indiana to be so widely distributed and so extensively used. About 30,000 carloads of this stone are shipped from these two counties annually, amounting to over 11,000,000 cubic feet. The Government has already used this fine stone in many of its buildings because it could obtain no better material, and the use of this Indiana product is always in line with the demand for proper economy in Government expenditures. There are over 50 mills, or cutting planes, of the Indiana limestone district. About one-third of the product of these quarries is cut and finished at these mills. The remainder of this product is shipped out in the rough state to cutting planes and stoneyards in all parts of the country. It is therefore a national industry and every cutstone yard in the United States is a producer of finished Indiana limestone for building purposes. The building industry, in fact, has come to depend upon the Indiana product as one of the basic materials of construction, and its importance to the construction industry as a whole is well known to those who are familiar with this great industry. This industry employs many laborers, many skilled laborers, and it is one of the greatest and most helpful industries in the State of Indiana.

Some of the more important Government buildings constructed of Indiana limestone, the Nation's building stone, are: Treasury Department Annex, War Risk Insurance Building, Department of Interior Building, Bureau of Printing and Engraving, Medical Science Building, United States Chamber of Commerce Building.

Six State capitols: Georgia, Kentucky, Indiana, Nebraska, Mississippi, and Oklahoma.

United States assay office, New York, and eight Federal reserve banks: Boston, New York, Richmond, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Dallas.

Numerous post offices and Federal buildings, including those at Ithaca, N. Y.; Huntington, W. Va.; Indianapolis and Kokomo, Ind.; Cadillac, Mich.; Decatur, Ill.; Columbia, S. C.; Oklahoma City and Muskogee, Okla.; El Paso, Amarilla, and Paris, Tex.; Santa Barbara, Calif.

Courthouses and city halls too numerous to mention, including such fine buildings as those at Albany and Plattsburg, N. Y.; Memphis, Tenn.; Kenton and Eaton, Ohio; Shreveport, La.; Newton, N. C.; Tremont, Nebr.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Tulsa, Okla.

State office buildings and memorials, such as those at Harrisburg, Pa.; Springfield and St. Louis, Mo.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and Nashville, Tenn.

Large Scottish Rite and other Masonic temples at Washington, D. C.; Springfield, Mass.; Nashville, Tenn.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Detroit, Mich.; St. Louis, Mo.; Topeka, Kans.; Omaha, Nebr.; Little Rock, Ark.; Oklahoma City and Guthrie, Okla.

I have called attention to only a few of the buildings in various parts of the country constructed of Indiana limestone for the purpose of showing that this stone has already been recognized as a national building stone, and I take pleasure in recommending for the use of the construction of Federal buildings the Indiana limestone.

FARMERS' FINANCE CORPORATION MEASURE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on farm-relief legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to call attention to my bill (H. R. 77) to create the Farmers' Finance Corporation with authority to make loans through the banks to the farmers, provided the producers planting 75 per cent of the particular commodity sign contracts with each other, with the bank, and with the corporation authorizing and empowering a commodity council to control production so as to probably not produce a surplus and also to control marketing so as to secure a reasonable and fair price.

A council selected from the friends of the farmer would be authorized for each commodity. The duties of the farmers, the council, the banks, and the corporation are made definite and clear in the bill.

The individual farmer gets the loan, if he desires it. He pays no bonus, commission, fees, taxes, or equalization cost. He pays only a low rate of interest in the event he avails himself of the loan privilege and the interest he pays is set aside as a surplus for him and his fellow farmers.

The individual farmer could borrow the average amount for which his commodity has sold since January 1, 1917, and therefore his price would be stabilized at the average. The loan would enable him to hold his own cotton or other commodity for a fair price. In order to protect the corporation, the bank, his fellow farmers, and himself he agrees to make such fair curtailment of his acreage as is made by all other planters of the particular commodity and as will help him get a reasonable price for his carry-over and also for his new production.

The producers of each commodity would only be bound by their own expressed consent, and then only those who so contract. By this plan the Congress would simply offer to the farmers a plan something on the order of the 50–50 plan now offered the States in highway construction and other matters. The Federal Government would offer to help the farmers become absolutely free to manage their own products and, as never before, to name and fix a fair and reasonable price for the sale of their own commodities.

The Federal Government would only ask as a consideration for this new freedom of the farmers their pledge that they would deal squarely with each other and with the Government's corporation and do that which is best for them and all concerned in the matter of production and marketing. We would be offering to help the farmers provided they would help themselves.

The bill would give the farmers a chance to become masters of their own fortunes and, in my humble judgment, is a more satisfactory farm-relief measure than heretofore written.

The farmers would handle their own commodities and get their full value with no unnecessary profit to middlemen or absorbed by expensive marketing machinery. The farmer and his fellows would receive for their commodities the highest possible reasonable price from the manufacturers and exporters and would get all of the price, without deductions for fees, commissions, or other so-called marketing expenses.

The farmer's friends, not his enemies, would control his destinies and there would be no dangerous bureaucratic control of his rights. There would be only absolutely necessary governmental agencies, with well-defined duties and powers.

The bill is not in the interest of any organization, corporation, or any man or set of men other than the farmer, is drawn with his sole and only interest in view, and yet is not unfair or unjust to anyone.

The bill has a complete referendum and recall, and would not go into effect unless the producers of 75 per cent of a particular commodity so elected, and would not remain of force unless satisfactory to at least 75 per cent of such producers.

In my humble judgment, the bill provides a complete solution of the overproduction problem, meets every reasonable objection to other farm relief bills, and without equalization fees, expensive machinery, or red tape puts the farmer on an absolute parity with those engaged in other industries or enterprises. It helps the farmer directly, not indirectly, makes clear his every right, raises no mooted questions or difficult issues, makes him the master of his own problems, and assures him the prosperity to which he is so justly entitled.

The overproduction problem is the most serious of all, and all efforts to control production by arbitrary law, sales taxes, equalization fees, or low prices to the producer are objectionable and ofttimes very obnoxious. Let us work out a plan to let the farmers solve this problem by mutual contracts of their own rather than by law or force. If this plan will solve the overproduction problem, it must be admitted that it is a most effective scheme.

Some say that the farmers will not sign the contracts provided for in the bill, and therefore there will be no adequate control of production. Of course, if the farmers do not agree to the terms of the bill, then it will not go into effect. It is my humble judgment, however, that there is so much merit in the bill that the farmers of the country will approve its terms and do their part in bringing the provisions of the bill into full force and effect in their behalf.

Let us do our part. Knowing the farmers as I do, I feel confident that they will do theirs. I know it has been said that the farmers will not get together or act in concert. In their behalf, I deny the charge.

They will organize if we make organization worth while for them. They organized the greatest nation on earth long before the days of the big factories, railroads, big cities, and big commercial and industrial organizations.

It is hard, though, for the farmers to organize efficiently while they are being plundered and slaughtered like a covey of baited doves, from every side and by almost everybody. Let us given them legislation not as a mere jesture to get their vote in the next election, nor as a bait to get them partially together that they may be the more easily exploited and slaughtered by their enemies, but that they may work together of their own accord in their own behalf, free from outside interference, with the same governmental assistance given other peoples and industries, winning for themselves and their children a new freedom of equality and establishing once and forever their own independence in their own affairs.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN Q. TILSON

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address made by me on October 14 last in the city of York, Pa., on the occasion of the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the meeting of the Continental Congress in York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I here insert an address delivered by me October 14, 1927, on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the meeting of the Continental Congress at York, Pa.

The address is as follows:

CELEBRATION OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEETING OF THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS AT YORK, PA.

CONNECTICUT IN THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS AT YORK

My presence here is due to two influences—first, the earnest invitation of my good friend Doctor MENGES, the distinguished Representative in Congress from this district, and, second, my appointment under a concurrent resolution as a member of a committee of Congress to represent the Congress of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the meeting of the Continental Congress at York.

It was suggested by the committee in charge of the historical program that as a Representative of the State of Connecticut in Congress it would be appropriate for me to tell something of the part my own State played in the important work done during the momentous session of the Continental Congress held here. Before proceeding, however, to make particular reference to the part played by any one State it is necessary to outline very briefly the general situation at that crisis of our national life so that each part may be the better fitted into the whole picture.

When the Continental Congress met at York on September 30, 1777, only a little more than a year had passed since the Liberty Bell had rung out the glad news that a new nation had been born to take its place along with the other free and independent nations of the world. With high hopes the brave but still feeble youngster had embarked upon the perilous sea of national life, but the voyage thus far had not been a very prosperous one. The clouds were particularly dark and gloomy at this time. General Washington had been defeated at the Brandywine and the road opened for General Howe to march into Philadelphia. It was necessary that the Congress remove to another place. Lancaster was at first chosen, but even in those days the principle of safety first prevailed and York was substituted, so that "the Susquehanna should flow between Congress and the enemy." I am glad to have this opportunity to visit this historic city of refuge and look it over, for in case Congress should again be chased out of its customary meeting place your beautiful city of to-day would be most inviting.

In the autumn of 1777 a critical and very trying period had been reached in our national history, so that the conduct of the Continental Congress at this juncture became a matter of the most serious moment. Samuel Adams voiced the general feeling when he said: "Our affairs are said to be desperate, but we are not without hope and not without courage. The eyes of the people of this country are upon us here, and the tone of their feeling is regulated by ours." Such was the spirit in which the session of Congress held here began its labors. The deeds performed were in accord with this spirit and the fact that the military situation was, indeed, well-nigh desperate makes all the more illustrious those deeds that were prompted by honor and courage, rather than by self-interest and cowardice. You will recall that it was while Congress sat here that the Conway cabal was brought out into the open which had for its purpose the supplanting of Washington in command of the Army; and it was here that Congress, after some doubt and scheming, wisely determined to remain true to that great figure in our national history.

In the period of deepest gloom during the sitting of the Congress here two notable events transpired that greatly encouraged those in charge of and responsible for the destinies of the new Republic. The first was the defeat of Burgoyne at Saratoga. Creasy gives this as one of the 15 decisive battles of the world. Without attempting to decide the much-disputed question as to whether it is entitled to be so ranked, it can be said with certainty that it was the most critical battle of the war. Burgoyne's campaign was well conceived. Its purpose was to open up the line of Lake Champlain and the Hudson River, thus driving a wedge through the heart of the distraught country and thereby connecting with the British force already in possession of New York City and vicinity. Had Burgoyne won at Saratoga the result would have been to effectively separate the entire New England group of States from the other States, thus rendering cooperation impossible. It was a notable victory for the American troops and added much to the repute of General Gates as an army commander. The glory of his achievement, however, has been somewhat dimmed by the unfortunate connection of his name with the attempt to supplant Washington as Commander in Chief of the American forces.

The second of the great events of the period to cheer patriot hearts was the open alliance with France which brought to our country in the time of its greatest need Rochambeau and De Grasse with an army and a navy from France.

The two notable events mentioned stand out like mountain peaks in the period of the York session, but they do not obscure the long list of noteworthy actions of a practical character on the part of Congress, all necessary for the maintenance of an armed force in the field. It was most necessary of all that the several States should act together and not separately, and so it came to pass that here in York were formulated and adopted the Articles of Confederation that served the purpose of holding the country together for the time being. It has become the fashion to belittle the value of the Articles of Confederation, because they did not create a government of sufficient strength to withstand all the decentralizing influences of a postwar period. Let those who are disposed to minimize the wisdom and utility of the articles reflect that it was 1777 and not 1787 that saw their genesis. An attempt then to agree upon a constitution like that adopted in 1787 would have meant the complete disruption of the newly formed Union. Weak as the Articles of Confederation were as the framework of a self-sustaining government in times of peace—and they have been characterized, somewhat accurately, to be sure, as "a rope of sand"—nevertheless they served as a possible basis of unity for the newly formed group of Colonies now trying to function as a nation under the stress of war. The articles were probably as strong a binding force as would have been accepted at the time, and having served a most important purpose at a most critical stage, they should be reverently regarded as constituting one of the most important documents in our history.

The all-absorbing business throughout the session of Congress held here was carrying on the war. Washington's army at Valley Forge was in a deplorable condition. Finances were at a low ebb. In order to get either men or money it was necessary for the States to cooperate with Congress, and to secure anything like uniform cooperation was an almost impossible undertaking. The States were jealous of each other and much disposed each to let the other States do it. So throughout the session we find one appeal after another for all sorts of things necessary for the conduct of the war. Some States nearer the scenes of military activities realized more fully the situation and responded with greater alacrity than others; but it was an uphill fight the young Nation was making and against great odds.

It is with pardonable pride, I hope, that I here record Connecticut as one of the States that responded nobly to the requests coming to the governor either directly or through the delegation in Congress. Our very able and industrious State librarian at Hartford, Mr. George S. Goddard, has prepared for my use a digest of all the matters to which the attention of Gov. Jonathan Trumbull was called during the period covered by the session at York, either by the direction of Congress or by the Connecticut Delegates, and it is a pleasure to note the very satisfactory response in almost every case. For instance, a

letter from General Washington, dated October 21, 1777, urges the States to fill up their depleted battalions, and calls attention to the fact that the only States reporting having even recruiting officers appointed are Connecticut and New Jersey.

After the surrender of Burgoyne, Congress placed under the supervision of Governor Clinton, of New York, the defenses of the Hudson, and directed him to call on the militia of Connecticut and Massachusetts for aid.

Connecticut is called upon by Congress in a number of instances to aid in transporting and storing salt, clothing, and other necessary articles for the Army—in all instances responding favorably.

The measures taken by Connecticut for providing public stores are formally approved by a resolution of Congress, as is also the appointment as commissary of one Henry Champion, who seems to have been an early Connecticut edition of Herbert Hoover as food administrator.

In the light of present conditions in Connecticut as regards its iron industry and forests, two other formal resolutions of the Congress while at York are of special interest. On October 30, 1777, a resolution requests Connecticut to have the workmen at the Salisbury furnace cast mortars for Continental Army use under the instruction of General Knox, while on December 4, 1777, Connecticut is asked, along with New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and New York, to preserve pine timber suitable for masts. No doubt Connecticut then complied fully with those requests, but would now find difficulty in complying with either.

The introduction of the record of service of Connecticut men in the War of the Revolution, compiled by the Connecticut adjutant general's office, thus sums up the contribution by Connecticut to the military forces of the Revolution:

"A total of 30,000 men may be considered as a reasonable estimate of men from Connecticut engaged in the military service. Of this number some 10,000 represent continental soldiers—men who enlisted for long terms and served in the field outside of the State under Washington's immediate command. A complete record would embrace several thousand additional names, especially of the militia. From expressions used by Governor Trumbull in his correspondence and other sources, it is apparent that, barring a small loyalist element in the western part of the State, nearly every able-bodied man in Connecticut rendered, or was enrolled as notified and prepared to render, some kind of service during the Revolutionary War. The exposed situation of the State, with entire coast subject to incursions and ravages by the enemy and her proximity to the several fields of operations in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New York, required her to be in a constant state of preparation. On this account, and because of the size of her population, then relatively large, she was regarded as one of the four strong States supporting the cause, ranking in capacity next after Massachusetts, Virginia, and Pennsylvania."

Connecticut also served well the cause of the Revolution during the dark period of the York session through the men sent as Delegates to represent the State in the Continental Congress. One serious mistake made by the States sending Delegates to the Congress then and which, by the way, is still often made by constituencies in sending Representatives to Congress, was in making frequent changes in their delegations. Before one Delegate had served long enough to fully understand his task it too often happened that the lure of the bench or some other more attractive State position would draw him away. Connecticut was no exception to this rule. Each State was asked to keep three Delegates in attendance, and yet in the short space of nine months during which the Congress sat in York it was necessary for Connecticut to send seven different men in order to keep filled a delegation of three Members.

In spite of all the adverse conditions surrounding it the personnel of the Continental Congress usually ranked high in ability. A number of those who had signed the Declaration of Independence and some of those who were later to help frame the Constitution were Delegates from time to time. Of the seven Connecticut Delegates who served in Congress during any part of the session at York, four had signed the Declaration of Independence—Williams, Huntington, Wolcott, and Sherman—and one, Roger Sherman, signed all four of the great papers of the forming of the Nation—the Association of 1774, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Federal Constitution.

The seven men who represented Connecticut, with their respective periods of service, are as follows:

Eliphalet Dyer from October, 1777, to April, 1778.
Richard Law from October, 1777, to February, 1778.
William Williams from October, 1777, to February, 1778.
Samuel Huntington from February, 1778, to June, 1778.
Oliver Wolcott from February, 1778, to June, 1778.
Roger Sherman from April, 1778, to June, 1778.
Titus Hosmer from June 23, 1778.

Of these seven Connecticut Delegates who attended the session at York, five were college graduates—Dyer, Law, Wolcott, and Hosmer being Yale men and Williams a graduate of Harvard. All but Wolcott had legal training either as attorneys in practice or on the bench. Williams does not seem to have practiced, but was a judge of the county court. Wolcott studied medicine with his brother, Dr. Alexander Wolcott, and Williams studied theology. Dyer received a degree of doctor of laws from Yale in 1787. All of the delegates had had experience in State (or colonial) legislative and judicial bodies for years. With the exception of Sherman, and possibly Hosmer, the Delegates came from families of influence, whose members were accustomed to public office. The Wolcotts, Huntingtons, and Dyers were prominent in government circles. Richard Law was the son of Governor Jonathan Law. The exception, Roger Sherman, however, proved one of Connecticut's greatest statesmen in spite of the handicap of being a self-made man.

The seven sons of Connecticut to whom I have referred served their country worthily, some of them conspicuously, here and elsewhere, thereby bringing credit to the State they represented and making for themselves honored names to be handed down to posterity.

There remains to me now but a word further, and that is on behalf of the House of Representatives at Washington to congratulate you, the good people of York, upon the enterprise and courage you have displayed in promoting and carrying through so successfully this very notable celebration. You have accomplished something preeminently worth while in thus recalling to the minds of people everywhere the events of a crucial period in our national history that has not received the attention its importance deserves.

Here ends what I have to say on this historic occasion, but as I have made reference to seven worthy men of honored memory in my own State it will not be deemed inappropriate if I here add as an appendix to my remarks a very brief biographical sketch of each of them, the data for which were furnished by the State librarian at Hartford.

Eliphalet Dyer was born in Windham, September 14, 1721. Graduated at Yale, 1740. Studied law in Windham, admitted to the bar, 1746. His real entry into public life was in connection with the project for establishing a colony in the valley of the Susquehanna. He was an original member of the Susquehanna company. In August, 1763, he went as an agent for the Susquehanna company to England to obtain confirmation from the crown of the company's title to the Wyoming Valley. He was not successful in this, but his ability as an advocate, or at least his reputation, is shown in that he was appointed a special agent for the colony to conduct the Mohegan Indian case. He declined this appointment. He was a member of the Stamp Act Congress, September, 1765, judge of the superior court; delegate to the First Continental Congress and active in the governor's council and on the committee of safety. Died in his 86th year, May 13, 1807. His services as an earnest, prudent patriot were highly valued.

Richard Law was born in Milford, March 7, 1732/3, son of Governor Jonathan Law. Graduated at Yale, 1751. Studied law with Jared Ingersol. Admitted to the bar, 1755. He began his public service as a representative to the general assembly in October, 1765, and during his career he filled offices in the assembly, was on the New London County bench and on the superior court bench. He was appointed to the Continental Congress in 1774 and 1776 but did not attend until 1778. In 1786 he was made chief judge of the superior court and later became district judge of Connecticut under the Federal Constitution. He was mayor of New London in 1784. He assisted Roger Sherman in revising the Connecticut statutes. Died January 26, 1806. It has been said of him that "as an advocate his style was pure and correct but not copious and flowing. He was distinguished more as a learned lawyer, a close logician, a fair special pleader, than as an eloquent orator. His talents were better adapted to a court than a jury."

William Williams was born in Lebanon, April 28, 1731. His father and grandfather were ministers. Graduated at Harvard, 1751. Studied theology. During the French and Indian War he went on a military expedition to Lake George in 1755. He returned much dissatisfied with the British commanders and their attitude toward the Colonials. His political life began when at the age of 25 he was made town clerk, an office he held 45 years. He represented Lebanon in the general assembly and was in that body, either in the lower or upper house, practically all of his life. The records of the council of safety are in his handwriting. In fact, the amount of manuscript in the Connecticut archives bearing either his name or in his writing, is stupendous. He was judge of the Windham county court, signer of the Declaration of Independence, and member of the Connecticut convention for the ratification of the Federal Constitution.

The aim of Mr. Williams in his political career was said to have been "to merit the title of an honest politician." He had the unlimited confidence of his fellow citizens in private life as well. He married Mary, the daughter of Governor Trumbull. Nearly all of his personal fortune was spent in the war. He kept his house open at all times to soldiers, entertaining during the winter of 1781 the officers of a regiment stationed in his town.

It is stated that Benjamin Huntington remarked to Colonel Williams, "I am in no danger of being hung, for I have neither signed the Declaration nor written anything against the British Government." "Then, sir," replied Williams, "you deserve to be hung for not having done your duty."

Samuel Huntington was born in Windham, July 3, 1731, of a respectable family which immigrated to this country at an early period. Huntington was financially unable to get a college training, but studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1758. His practice became exten-

sive and his reputation firmly established. He was a Delegate to Congress 1776–1781; signer of the Declaration of Independence, and President of Congress 1779–1781. After his resignation from Congress he was in the council of the State. He was chief justice of the superior court and governor of the State. His manner was reticent and retiring, his shyness being often mistaken for pride. As a judge he was dignified in deportment, courteous to the bar, and much respected by those with whom he came in contact. His decisions were impartial and his attitude firm. By some he has been ranked next to Governor Trumbull for popularity in that period of the State's history.

Oliver Wolcott was born in East Windsor, November 20, 1726. Graduated at Yale, 1747. He was a descendant of a public-spirited family, his father being Gov. Roger Wolcott. After an experience as captain of a company in defense of the northern frontiers against the French, he studied medicine with his brother, Dr. Alexander Wolcott, and began its practice in Goshen. His activities soon became political. He was sheriff of Litchfield County when it was first organized; representative in the general assembly and member of the governor's council, 1771–1786. He was a Delegate to the Continental Congress and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was particularly active in the raising of militia during the Revolution. His residence in what was then one of Connecticut's frontier towns gave him opportunity to assist in the defense of the Hudson and in raising men for the frequent alarms. He was a brigadier general of the State and was in command of regiments sent to New York in 1776 and in the Saratoga campaign in September and October of 1777. His time was divided between civil and military public service. In 1793 Yale gave him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. He died at Litchfield December 1, 1797, aged 71.

President Dwight says: "Wolcott was remarkably distinguished for intrepidity, firmness, incorruptible integrity, strong, bold conceptions, and a peculiar decision of character. At the same time his sensibility was quick and exquisite. The sight or even the narration of a mean, dishonest, or an ungenerous action appeared to give him a chill and changed his countenance."

Roger Sherman was born at Newton, Mass., April 19, 1721. He removed to New Milford, Conn., in 1743. His father was a farmer and not wealthy, so that it was necessary for Roger Sherman to acquire his education through his own efforts. He worked as a shoemaker until after he was 22 years of age. Connecticut has not only a learned blacksmith in Elihu Burritt but a distinguished shoemaker in Sherman in her hall of fame. Before Sherman was 33 years of age he had been admitted to the bar, had occupied various civil offices of the colony, had been member of both houses of the assembly, and judge of the court of common pleas. He was actively in favor of Connecticut's claim to the Susquehanna title. He was a Delegate to Continental Congress and the one man to sign all four great papers of the forming of the Nation—the Association of 1774, the Articles of Confederation, the Declaration of Independence, and the Federal Constitution. He died at New Haven July 23, 1793.

Although he lacked the graces of polished society, his influence and statesmanlike qualities won recognition. We read that he "showed the highest qualities of a statesman in knowing how to compromise and when to be firm," and that he possessed "a remarkable sagacity in judging not only what measures were best for a community, but what the people were willing to bear. His influence over men was greatly strengthened by his strong sense of justice."

Patrick Henry ranked him with the greatest statesmen of his time and acquaintance. Gen. Winfield Scott placed him as fourth in importance of the chief actors in the revolutionary period and formation of a new government.

Thomas Jefferson spoke of him as a "man who never said a foolish thing."

Titus Hosmer was born at Watertown, Conn., 1736; graduated at Yale, 1757. He began the practice of law in 1760. His attendance at the York session of Congress was confined to the latter part of June, and therefore his name does not hold the place of prominence of the other delegates. He was speaker of the lower house of the State assembly, was made judge of the maritime court in 1780, and was considered influential in creating sentiment for vigorous measures against Great Britain. Noah Webster regarded him, with William Samuel Johnson and Oliver Ellsworth, as one of the three greatest sons of Connecticut, but upon what grounds this claim is to be maintained the great lexicographer does not make entirely clear.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 20, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, December 20, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(9 a. m.)

Interior Department appropriation bill.

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

To promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce (H. R. 5641).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

241. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Edgartown Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

242. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of St. Augustine Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

243. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Guyandotte River, with a view of preventing the said river from further encroaching upon the public streets of and private property in the village of Barboursville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

244. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Key West Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

245. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of St. Cloud Canal, Fla., connecting the lake at St. Cloud with the lake at Kissimmee; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

246. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Darien Harbor and Rifle Cut, Ga.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

247. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Thunderbolt Harbor, Ga.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

248. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of New River Inlet, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

249. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Wekiva River, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

250. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Horn Harbor, Va. (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

251. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingent expenses, War Department," during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

252. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 802. A bill to correct the military record of Curtis P. Wise; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 871. A bill for the relief of William Earhart; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of George Adams; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FURLOW: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2272. A bill for the relief of William Morin; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Lucius Bell; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of George H. Gilbert; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3041. A bill for the relief of Alfred St. Dennis; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3049. A bill for the relief of Alexander Ashbaugh; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3192. A bill for the relief of John Costigan; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Alvin H. Tinker; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3993. A bill for the relief of Adam B. Ackerman, alias B. Aunkerman; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4027. A bill for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5255. A bill for the relief of Jacob F. Webb; without amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Anthony Schwartzenberger; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6364. A bill for the relief of Edward Tigh; without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6579. A bill for the relief of James W. Kingon; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3497) granting an increase of pension to Marcel H. Poirier; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Abe Cohen; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5292) for the relief of Mattie Holcomb; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6169) for the relief of John H. Grout; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6782) for the relief of George F. Newhart, Clyde Hahn, and David McCormick; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6896) for the relief of the Alaska Products Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 7044) granting an increase of pension to Banner Chandley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 7900) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7901) to regulate the liability of the parties for accidents occurring at grade crossings on steam, electric, and other railways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLING: A bill (H. R. 7902) granting the consent of Congress to the State highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River, near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERNATHY: A bill (H. R. 7903) to authorize the erection at Clinton, Sampson County, N. C., of a monument in commemoration of William Rufus King, former Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CARSS: A bill (H. R. 7904) to transfer to the city of Duluth, Minn., the old Federal Building, together with the site thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7905) to enforce the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7906) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 7907) to prevent deceit and unfair prices that result from the unrevealed presence of substitutes for virgin wool in woven or knitted fabrics purporting to contain wool and in garments or articles of apparel made therefrom manufactured in any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 7908) to authorize the granting of leave to ex-service men and women to attend the annual convention of the United Spanish War Veterans and auxiliary in Habana, Cuba, in 1928; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PEAVEY: a bill (H. R. 7909) to authorize the maintenance and renewal of a timber frame trestle in place of a fixed span at the Wisconsin end of the steel bridge of the Duluth & Superior Bridge Co. over the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7910) amending the act approved April 30, 1926, entitled "An act amending the act entitled 'An act providing for the comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital,'" approved June 6, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7911) to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7912) to exclude from the mails certain newspapers containing matter printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 7913) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Elk River on the Athens-Florence road between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7914) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Whitesburg Ferry on Huntsville-Lacey Springs road, between Madison and Morgan Counties, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7915) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near the Scottsboro, on the Scottsboro-Fort Payne road, in Jackson County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7916) granting the consent of Congress to the Madison Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7917) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to their widows and their dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7918) to amend the World War veterans' act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7919) to provide that funds appropriated for the care and relief of Indians of Wisconsin under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 7920) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a dairy and livestock experiment station at or near Mayfield, Ky.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7921) granting the consent of Congress to A. Robbins, of Hickman, Ky., his heirs, and legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 7922) to amend section 601 of the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 7923) providing that funds appropriated for the care and relief of Indians of California under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7924) to prohibit the training of any person after his twenty-fourth birthday in the citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 7925) authorizing the maintenance of a bridge over the Monongahela River, between the borough of Glassport and the city of Clairton, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 7926) to place a retired officer of the Army on the retired list as a major general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 7927) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission of the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Atchafalaya River, at Melville, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7928) to authorize the President to classify certain positions under the civil service act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 7929) to give military status and discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps, organized by the War Department under authority of the President of the United States for service during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 7930) to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 7931) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the equalization of promotion of the officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy with officers of the line," approved June 10, 1926, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 7932) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7933) to fix salaries of certain judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7934) to amend section 300 of the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7935) to amend Title III of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 7936) to create the United States board of alienists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 7937) to authorize mapping agencies of the Government to assist in preparation of military maps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7938) to regulate sales by utilities in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7939) to authorize settlement of damages to persons and property by Army aircraft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7940) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 7941) amendatory of the act of March 26, 1908 (35 Stat. L. p. 48), as amended by the act of December 11, 1919 (41 Stat. L. p. 366); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7942) authorizing an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the purchase of cottonseed, kafir seed, milo maize seed, and seed grain to be supplied to farmers in the pest-stricken areas of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7943) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, approved July 3, 1926; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7944) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 7945) providing for a mine-rescue station and equipment at Fort Smith, Ark.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 7946) to repeal an act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of the homestead laws to certain lands in the Yellowstone Forest Reserve," approved March 15, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 7947) for the relief of officers and enlisted men of the United States military forces who served in Porto Rico from May 26, 1900, to April 23, 1904; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 7948) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7949) to amend section 4826, Revised Statutes, as amended by act of June 7, 1924, Forty-third Statutes at Large, page 519 (Title 24, sec. 131, Code of U. S. Laws), by extending the privileges of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to disabled nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 7950) to promote the development, protection, and utilization of grazing resources on public lands, to stabilize the range stock-raising industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 7951) to amend subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, relating to degree-conferring institutions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7952) to extend the benefits of the Hatch Act, the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 7953) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in the amendment thereof; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended, to include poultry within their provisions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) requesting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the differences between the football teams of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) authorizing the Postmaster General to make a just and equitable compensation for the past use in the Postal Service of a certain invention and device for the post marking of mail packages and for the more permanent cancellation of postage stamps during the time the said device was in use by the Post Office Department, not exceeding or going beyond the life of the letters patent thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a memorial monument to the pioneers of the Nation in Washington City, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) entitling all employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia to pay for Saturday, December 24, the same as any other holiday; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 119) authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory and at the grave of the Indian chief, William Weatherford, known as the "Red Eagle"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KIESS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) providing for the appointment of a joint committee of Congress to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in American Samoa; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLOOM: Resolution (H. Res. 60) to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 62) that the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $1,140 per annum to cloakroom man No. 4 of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That this rate of compensation shall be effective only so long as the position is held by present incumbent; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 63) to provide an equality in the rules for the playing of football games between the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting the installation of turbine engines at the Coolidge Dam for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power, assuring a cheap electrical power for the agricultural and mining interests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, urging the enactment of Federal legislation regulating the interstate shipment of revolvers, machine guns, and other deadly weapons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 7954) for the relief of R. B. Fulford; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7955) for the relief of Charles Thomas Wooten; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 7956) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Sumpter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7957) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sarah Taggart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 7958) for the relief of Agfa Raw Film Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7959) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the extension by the Commissioner of Patents of the patent granted to Frederick G. Ransford and Perter Low as assignees of Marcus P. Norton, No. 25036, August 9, 1859; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 7960) for the relief of Bernard Eberhart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7961) granting an increase of pension to Abbie S. Jewett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7962) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. O'Mara; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7963) granting a pension to Bridget McAvoy Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7964) granting a pension to Mary Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) granting a pension to Marie Dehmel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7966) granting a pension to Eugene N. Hoyt, alias William Naylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7967) granting a pension to Olivia Marie Kindleberger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7968) granting a pension to Matilda Lovey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7969) granting a pension to Helen C. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7970) for the relief of F. A. Brady (Inc.); to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7971) for the relief of John Leo Bruckner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7972) for the relief of Nicholas Andrew Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7973) for the relief of Charles A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7974) for the relief of Clarence F. Birkett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7975) for the relief of Annie M. Eopolucci; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7976) for the relief of Mrs. Moore L. Henry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7977) for the relief of the Karnani Steamship Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7978) for the relief of William Mackin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7979) for the relief of Bessie Greene; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7980) for the relief of Louis Miller; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7981) for the relief of Max Rauch; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7982) for the relief of the heirs of the late Frank J. Simmons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7983) for the relief of Morris Spirt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7984) for the relief of George F. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7985) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob J. Udelson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7986) for the relief of Jerome J. Wingers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 7987) for the relief of W. H. Fisher; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7988) granting a pension to Mrs. Isaac D. Caldwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7989) granting an increase of pension to William Leslie Hull; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7990) granting an increase of pension to Murray R. Marshall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7991) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Rodgers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7992) for the relief of Sally Mattie Macready, widow of Edward Daniel Macready; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARSS: A bill (H. R. 7993) granting a pension to Mary A. Hubbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 7994) granting an increase of pension to Maria Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7995) granting an increase of pension to Huldah E. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7996) granting an increase of pension to Please Waits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7997) granting an increase of pension to H. E. Waits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7998) granting an increase of pension to George Waits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7999) granting a pension to John D. Waits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 8000) granting a pension to Hattie Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8001) conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the steamship *City of Beaumont* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 8002) granting a pension to Emma S. Stokes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 8003) authorizing preliminary examination and survey of St. Petersburg, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8004) granting an increase of pension to Edith Quick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 8005) granting a pension to Emily Asbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8006) granting a pension to Virginia Canterbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8007) for the relief of the Ansted National Bank, Ansted, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8008) granting a pension to Martha Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8009) granting a pension to James Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8010) granting a pension to Emily J. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 8011) granting a pension to Minnie Starner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 8012) granting an increase of pension to Helen A. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8013) granting a pension to M. F. Loyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8014) granting a pension to Vashti Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8015) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Chronister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8016) granting an increase of pension to Ada M. Standish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8017) granting an increase of pension to Mae E. Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8018) granting an increase of pension to Massey C. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8019) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda J. Mayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8020) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8021) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8022) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8023) granting an increase of pension to John R. Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8024) granting an increase of pension to Frances H. McGee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8025) granting an increase of pension to H. B. Guyton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8026) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Etheredg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 8027) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Zimmerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 8028) to provide a preliminary survey of Lumber River and Little Pee Dee River in South Carolina with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8029) to provide a preliminary survey of Lynchs River in South Carolina with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8030) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Fulton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 8031) for the relief of Higgins Lumber Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8032) granting an increase of pension to Abbie R. Raymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8033) granting a pension to Zorado B. Merrill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 8034) for the relief of Carteret Street Methodist Episcopal Church South, Beaufort, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8035) for the relief of Charles Clarence Schilling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8036) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8037) granting a pension to George W. Mudd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8038) granting a pension to Mary Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8039) granting an increase of pension to Addie E. Foreman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 8040) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Nason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8041) granting a pension to Alexander McWhirter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8042) granting a pension to Marion Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8043) granting a pension to Pearl Bouchie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Lynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 8045) granting a pension to Annie Broderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 8046) granting a pension to Lucy E. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8047) authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Green River and Barren River, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 8048) granting a pension to Margaret L. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 8049) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 8050) granting a pension to Lois Fordice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 8051) granting a pension to Euphemia Trine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: (H. R. 8052) granting a pension to William Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 8053) granting a pension to Anna Marie Higgs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 8054) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Teague; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 8055) granting a pension to Mary E. Tigue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8056) granting a pension to Sophia H. Groszka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8057) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 8058) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Ruby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8059) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kauffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8060) granting an increase of pension to Magdalene Inglebirt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8061) granting an increase of pension to Annie Malehorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8062) granting a pension to John J. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8063) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Callahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8064) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hetzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8065) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Ring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8066) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8067) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Gear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8068) granting a pension to Robert Baxendale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 8069) granting an increase of pension to Adaline B. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 8070) to provide a survey of the Petit Jean River with a view to the control of floods therein; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 8071) for the relief of Glen D. Tolman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8072) for the relief of Peder Anderson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8073) granting a pension to James Hopkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 8074) for the relief of certain seamen who are judgment creditors of the Black Star Line (Inc.) for wages earned; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8075) granting a pension to Martha J. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 8076) granting a pension to Andrew J. Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8077) granting an increase of pension to James M. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8078) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Dibble; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 8079) for the relief of Henrietta Seymour, widow of Joseph H. Seymour, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8080) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8081) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to bestow a gold medal of honor, of

such design as he may approve, upon Chief Boatswain Thomas A. Ross, of the United States Coast Guard Station, Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 8082) granting an increase of pension to Lena Stuckey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 8083) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Geyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 8084) for the relief of Fukumatsu Hayashi; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8085) granting a pension to Jennie Abernathy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8086) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Kimball; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8087) granting an increase of pension to Belle P. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8088) granting a pension to Elvira Van Dyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8089) granting a pension to Mrs. Rudolph Seiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8090) granting a pension to Zachariah T. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 8091) granting an increase of pension to Clara Comer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8092) for the relief of Randolph Sias; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8093) for the relief of John Rooks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8094) granting a pension to Josephine Canfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 8095) for the relief of William McCormack; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8096) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Asabelle Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 8097) for the relief of Gilliam Grissom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8098) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 8099) granting a pension to Frances H. Cosby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 8100) granting an increase of pension to Eunice R. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 8101) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fritchman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8102) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8103) granting an increase of pension to Lucy McDonnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) admitting Johannes Tielle, a citizen of Holland, to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GIBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a duplicate congressional medal of honor for the widow of Lieut. Col. William J. Sperry; to the Committee of Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

267. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

268. By Mr. BERGER: Memorial of the Wisconsin Master Plumbers' Association, recommending that information being collected by the General Federation of Women's Clubs concerning the equipment of American homes be by authorization of law by the Census Bureau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

269. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of citizens against House bill 78, the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

270. Also, petition of citizens against House bill 78, the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

271. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition of the citizens of Binghamton and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

272. Also, petition from the citizens of Binghamton and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

273. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of certain residents of Beloit, Rock County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

274. Also, petition of certain residents of Beloit, Rock County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

275. By Mr. DRIVER: Petition signed by citizens of Jonesboro, Ark., protesting against the passage of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

276. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petitions protesting against compulsory Sunday closing law, citizens of Susanville, Calif.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

277. By Mr. GARBER: Letter of William Wallace Brauer, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., in support of the alien property bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. Also, resolution of Oklahoma Pecan Growers' Association, petitioning development of the pecan industry at an adequately financed experimental and research station at some suitable location in the Southwestern States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

279. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Cameron County, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

280. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of C. S. Grant and 47 other residents of Eaton Rapids, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

281. Also, petition of Ed. Kellogg and 114 other residents of Calhoun County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

282. Also, petition of H. O. Talbott and 131 residents of Charlotte, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

283. Also, petition of C. A. Miner and 14 other residents of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

284. Also, petition of Clinton B. Waller and 119 other residents of Charlotte, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

285. Also, a petition of Will L. Bush and 186 residents of Charlotte, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

286. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by R. D. Bordwell and 124 others residing in the third congressional district of Nebraska, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

287. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Mrs. S. M. Tew and numerous other persons residing in Birmingham, Ala., in opposition to House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

288. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition protesting against the enactment of a compulsory Sunday observance law by citizens of the sixth congressional district of Michigan; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

289. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of residents of Midland, Tex., protesting against Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

290. By Mr. KADING: Petition of 53 citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., protesting against Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

291. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of citizens of Portsmouth, Ohio, against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

292. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of several residents of Alexandria, Minn., against Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

293. Also, petition of several residents of Douglas County, Minn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

294. By Mr. KIESS: Petition from citizens of Clinton, Potter, and Tioga Counties, Pa., opposing compulsory Sunday laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

295. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., protesting against the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

296. Also, petition of Omro, Wis., protesting against the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

297. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Bertha H. Leach, Mary Mayall, Agnes J. Mayall, Edward M. Carpenter, and 135 other citizens of Fall River, Mass., protesting against enactment of compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

298. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Alto, N. Mex., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

299. Also, petition of Joe Quesenberry Post No. 10, American Legion, Las Cruces, protesting against Veterans' Bureau Regulation No. 177; protesting against any repeal of World War veterans' act in connection with the $50 monthly award to arrested-tubercular patients; protesting against contemplated legislation making hospitalization compulsory; protesting against General Order No. 59E; protesting against transfer of Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital to the control of the Army; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

300. By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: Petition of Louise Harris and 52 others, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

301. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, favoring the resolutions of Representative Theodore Burton to prevent shipment of munitions of war to an agressor nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

302. By Mr. SMITH: Resolution by the executive committee, department of Idaho, the American Legion, favoring legislation providing for the transfer of title of the land and buildings in the Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho, from the War Department to the United States Veterans' Bureau and the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

303. Also, petition of citizens of Filer, Idaho, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

304. By Mr. SOMERS of New York: Petition of the Congregation Shaare Torah of Flatbush, Brooklyn, protesting against the outrages perpetrated against Jews in Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

305. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mrs. A. M. Morris and 152 citizens of Cobb County, Ga., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

306. By Mr. SOMERS of New York: Petition of 700 citizens of Brooklyn, against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

307. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by 541 adults of the State of Washington protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

308. Also, petition signed by A. G. Steinert and others, of College Place, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

309. Also, petition signed by Frank McKay and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

310. Also, petition signed by John R. Fleming and others, of Buena, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

311. Also, petition signed by E. C. Reiber and others, of Granger, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

312. Also, petition signed by Charles Trefz and others, of College Place, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

313. Also, petition signed by C. W. Chamberlain and others, of Colfax, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

314. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Delta, Swanton, and Liberty Center, Ohio, protesting against the passage of a compulsory Sunday observance law or any other national religious legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

315. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petitions of various citizens of Arkansas, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

316. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions of the Central Council, Irish County Clubs of Massachusetts, adopted at a meeting held Sunday evening, December 11, 1927, at Hibernian Building, protesting against the provisions of the so-called national origins act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

317. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of 17 residents of Edmore, Mich., opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

318. Also, petition of 27 residents of Cedar Lake, Mich., opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

319. Also, petition of 223 residents of the county of Saginaw, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

320. Also, petition of 240 residents of Ionia, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

321. Also, petition of 11 residents of Elwell, Mich., opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

322. Also, petition of 38 residents of Vestaburg, Mich., opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

323. Also, petition of 111 residents of Gratiot County, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

324. Also, petition of 462 residents of the county of Saginaw protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

325. Also, petition of 106 residents of Eureka, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

326. By Mr. WINTER: Resolution of Chamber of Commerce, Powell, Wyo., protesting against further restriction on Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, *December 20, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Do Thou give us Thine open ear, Lord God of Hosts, and we would unbar the doors of our hearts. Let Thy Spirit be the bond of fellowship and may He speak within the circle of our souls. Amid the forces of life we despair of anything like personal independence and mastery. Yet while they often bear us to the very edge of doom, inspire us and hold us with the heroic accent of unquenchable faith. O God, a tragedy has torn the Nation's heart and holds it in a freezing blight. Oh, the cheerless, defiant waters; the charts can not help the vessel that is fast upon their jagged floor. But come Thou to the dear loved ones, who are dazed and speechless in the curtains of their grief. The men, our heroic brothers, the stalwarts of the waves, who in the face of peril never wore a lowering brow in the face of danger, give them great peace and resignation as they pass through the tortures of their transition. At the eternal daydawn, robed in the splendor of a fadeless morning, may their jubilant anchors be cast in the stormless harbor of heaven above. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 19, 1927, they presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 92. A joint resolution authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of

American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7201, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7201, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Has the Clerk read section 2 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Clerk has read just the first section.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I am opposed to this bill, Mr. Chairman, on two grounds. In the first place, it authorizes the arbiter that is set up under the provisions of the bill to make an award of as much as $100,000,000 for certain ships and a radio station which were seized after the declaration of war against the Imperial German Government under an act of Congress. In this act of Congress we provided that when these ships and the radio station were seized the value of them should be appraised by an authority set up in the law. This appraisement has been made, and is less than $35,000,000, and yet the Ways and Means Committee brings before us a bill which affirmatively authorizes the arbiter to find an award of as high as $100,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think that if we make ourselves judge and jury by picking out the arbiter ourselves that we have gone about far enough? The only solitary thing we give the Germans is a chance to be heard; simply that and nothing else.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will discuss that viewpoint a little bit. If the Ways and Means Committee wanted to place in the bill a limitation of authority on the part of the decision of the arbiter, why did the committee not place a limitation of $35,000,000 or even $50,000,000, which would have exceeded the value that has already been put upon these ships by the authority which Congress itself fixed in the original law, and which would have made ample allowance for a difference of opinion as to the value of these ships?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why have any arbiter at all, then? Why not simply appropriate for the ships and say, "We will only pay $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 for them." The result would be, however, under the plan which the gentleman suggests, we would have to pay for the ships out of the reparations fund based upon the reasonable value of them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Let me answer one question at a time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. What the Ways and Means Committee has really done is under the guise of a limitation; they have issued an invitation to the arbiter to find a value of as high as $100,000,000, and the whole bill is bottomed upon that theory.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My understanding is that the naval board fixed a value of $33,000,000 upon the ships alone about 11 years ago. They fixed no value upon the radio station at Sayville or upon the patents, which are also included in the items to be acted upon by the arbiter.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, yes; but the gentleman knows that the patents and the radio station will be a very small item as compared with the award for the ships.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, no; they will be considerable factors, and then we have the question of interest since that time, of course.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. On this point of value let me read from a brief which has been submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. A. W. Lafferty, a former Member of this House and now a practicing lawyer in the city of New York. He says on page 20 of his brief:

> For your information and that of your committee in drafting proposed legislation, we note the following as a general basis of agreement between the American and German interests which we, respectively, represent:
>
> 1. Twenty per cent of the alien property fund to be temporarily retained * * *.
>
> 2. Fifty per cent of awards for payment of German ships, radio stations, patents, etc., to be likewise temporarily retained and applied to American claims as soon as it become available.
>
> Doctor Kisselbach, who signed the foregoing agreement—

That is, the agreement I have just read—

> asking that it be made the basis of last year's bill, which it was, testified before the Senate committee (hearings, p. 181) that he represents 100 per cent of the German shipowners.
>
> Therefore the German shipowners themselves are proposing to Congress that if Congress will appropriate up to $100,000,000 for their ships (appraised by authority of Congress at less than $35,000,000) they will—very graciously, of course—permit Congress to use $50,000,000 of that appropriation temporarily to pay American claims.
>
> Beware of Greeks bearing gifts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Now, we had a colloquy yesterday in which the gentleman from Iowa said that those of us who took the position that none of the money paid to these insurance companies that are to be subrogated—none of it should come out of the pockets of the taxpayers. He said we were in error as to our position. Members who were bold enough to make an assertion of that kind were more or less ridiculed on the floor of the House. Now, the gentleman's own report, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] shows that exactly what we said is true, and I am going to read the report and Members can judge for themselves.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The money goes into the pot.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will show the way it goes into the pot. Page 15 shows how the fund is to be made up. First, 20 per cent of the Alien Property Custodian funds goes into it, as was set out in the agreement that I have just read. That is No. 1. Now, No. 2 is the unallocated interest fund. No. 3 is the amount of the appropriation for the payment of ship claims. That is $50,000,000, and that is out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Here is where Doctor Kisselbach made a concession in order to get the permissive authority for the arbiter to award up to $100,000,000. Fifty per cent is made available only for payment of the ship claims, and the other 50 per cent is made available for what? Just what we said—for payment of general claims, including the payment to insurance companies who subrogate themselves to the rights of the claimants who suffered losses.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say simply this: The right of subrogation is a right which is recognized in both domestic and international law, and under this right the insurance companies would have the right to press claims against the Imperial German Government and its successor, the Republic of Germany, for losses which they paid to clients whose property they insured. I certainly would not object to the payments of these claims being made by the German Government, but I certainly do object to setting up a special fund, as is done in this bill, and part of which comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers, out of which to pay them.

Mr. BECK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Prior to my election to this body I was counsel for a large group of American claimants directly interested in this legislation. For that reason I rise in fairness to state the facts to the House and to ask permission not to take part in the discussion and be excused from voting.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In pursuance of established American doctrine, it is hereby declared that the claims of nationals of the United States against Germany, as determined by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, shall be settled by the ultimate payment in full by Germany; that all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian as security for the payment of such claims of

nationals of the United States against Germany shall ultimately be returned, together with the accrued interest and other earnings thereon; that the claims of German nationals against the United States for reasonable compensation for certain of their ships, radio stations, and patents taken or used by the United States shall be adjudicated and the amounts determined to be due shall ultimately be paid in full.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "custodian," strike out the balance of line 8 and all of line 9.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out these words beginning on page 2, line 8, after the word "custodian," "as security for the payment of such claims of nationals of the United States against Germany." I take the position, and I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] agrees with me——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is rather a different amendment than the gentleman spoke to me about. I do not know that there is any objection to it as it stands now. It will not alter or affect the paragraph, in my judgment.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Under the Berlin treaty the language was that the property should be held until suitable provision was made for its return. The German people do not like this language. It is not true and it does not affect the legislation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think it makes any difference whether it is in or out.

Mr. OLDFIELD. All right; I understand the gentleman from Iowa accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAINEY moves, on page 2, line 1, to strike out all of lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, this section which contains our declaration of policy adds absolutely nothing to this bill. The Senate committee a year ago struck it out and reported the bill with this section out. I move now to strike it out. If it should be incorporated into the law, it might rise up in the future to plague future Congresses.

In the first place, we have no such established American doctrine as is stated in this declaration of policy. In the second place, this absolutely pledges us to pay all the claims of German nationals against the United States on account of their ships, radio stations, and patents, every dollar of them with interest up to the time when they are ultimately paid. The country has been subjected to a large amount of propaganda to the effect that it is our doctrine to return enemy property. We never have returned enemy property. We are going to do it now. I expect to vote for this bill. I think it ought to be returned, but that has not been our policy, and as the years pass and these matters develop, that may not be our policy in the future. This alleged policy is usually referred back to our treaty of 1799 with Prussia, now regarded as a bilateral treaty, and now regarded as void and of no effect by our State Department, as I have already shown in the hearings, in which I incorporated a letter from the Secretary of State. This treaty expired by its own terms in 1810, and we renewed it again in 1820 and it stood until the World War. By that treaty we only agreed with Prussia that the property of alien enemies residing in the other country during the period of the war outside of fortified cities should be returned. That is as far as that treaty went, and we have already done that since the war.

We have returned the property of all alien German enemies residing in the United States during the war, and all these other treaties, and all these other declarations of policy are based on our old treaties with Prussia, which contained only this. We never have returned property of alien enemies residing out of this country, no country in the world ever did, and Germany has not returned our property that she in effect confiscated during the war. We did not have much property there, of course, except bonds held and deposits in her banks, and a few plants. Plants were taken over if they were steel plants or dye plants, and the testimony of one of the witnesses before the committee, and the only testimony we have is that his plant was wrecked during the war and was not returned to him in any condition other than the wrecked condition in which the Germans left it.

These reparation payments are not going to last forever. They reach their peak next year. They have been made so far out of money that we have loaned to Germany. We have loaned her $600,000,000 and the other nations have loaned her $300,000,000. Her balance of trade is against her. Therefore, she has been paying us out of the moneys that she has borrowed from us, and she has been paying the other nations out of the money that she has borrowed from us.

I commend to Members of the House a recent book written by George P. Auld, which made its appearance from the press of Doubleday, Page & Co. just a few days ago. George P. Auld was accountant general of the old Reparation Commission, and he was a member of the Dawes committee of experts. He is qualified to speak on this subject if anybody is. He sets out in his book and clearly shows that these reparation payments, if they continue at the peak, which is to be reached next year, are to end absolutely in 25 years, and those 25 years will be up in 1949. I might read just one clause from this book:

It is, therefore, clear that through the adoption of the Dawes plan by the governments concerned, an annuity of $625,000,000 plus or minus a prosperity adjustment was guaranteed to run for 25 years.

And no longer than that, except that for 15 years after the expiration of the 25-year period Germany may still continue to pay the amount obtained from railroads and from industrial bonds, which amounts to $240,000,000 a year, and that can continue for 15 years longer. But if we get no larger proportion of that than we are now getting out of the reparations now being paid, we will not get very much money during the 15 years that continues to run. This settlement with Germany by the Reparation Commission, effected by all of the nations, out of which they have graciously given us 2¼ per cent, is subjected to amendment as the years pass. It may be increased if Germany is prosperous. It may be diminished if she is not. We all know what the situation is now. Even the payments due us we have difficulty in transferring, and when this bill was reported a year ago there was $6,000,000 due, according to testimony, that we could not get over here, and which had been there for a number of days; but if she can not pay $625,000,000 a year—and a majority of the experts who have considered the question do not think she can pay that much—then she can have it scaled down, and we will get less. But even assuming that she is going to keep it up, it will be 25 years from September 1, 1928, before the $10,700,000 annuity payments per year reimburse us for the amount that we are now expending. Therefore, in view of these facts, and in view of the doubtful future, and in harmony with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Chemical Foundation case, I think we ought not to declare this to be our policy when it is not our policy at all. We did not return any property that we seized during the Civil War. Those claiming that property are required to prove loyalty, and whenever they do that it has been returned or accounted for. We have gone further than that already with enemy aliens living within the country, and I do not think we ought to bind another generation, because it will be that long before this is settled.

And we ought not now to make this charge upon our Treasury and to further commit ourselves upon the theory that the German Government will last for the next 80 years without reorganization and upon the theory they are going to continue these Dawes payments indefinitely when we know they will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. RAINEY. No; I do not.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to strike out the section is pending.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has been seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. COX. I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas said he was opposed to the amendment, and he asks the floor in opposition.

Mr. RAYBURN. I would rather the gentleman from Georgia would proceed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. I support it because the bill is not reflective in this statement of policy. Unless it be the intent of the bill to make the United States a guarantor for Germany in the satisfaction of the claims of our nationals against Germany the section should be stricken out. That is what I construe this language to mean—

That all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian shall ultimately be returned.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has made fair criticism of the bill, and I agree with him in part. I take the position that the whole structure of the bill is put upon the certainty that Germany will meet its obligations assumed under the Dawes plan. This declaration of policy simply means, if the bill passes in its original form, that it will sail under false colors, as the whole body of the bill violates this declaration of policy set out in this section.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. When the Winslow bill was in the House it will be remembered that we returned property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian up to $10,000. At that time I offered an amendment to return all the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, and during that debate I said that the indefinite holding of property is confiscation. I tried to point out at that time in the minority report which my colleagues and I filed that if America had any policy at all upon this question—and I contended then and now it has a historic policy in reference to the matter contained in the bill that the gentleman from Illinois seeks to strike out—it was that from the days of Hamilton and Jefferson and Marshall down to now every man who had a reputation that extended beyond the community in which he lived and had spoken and written upon this question said, that long before that time that all civilized nations had looked upon the question of confiscating private property for the satisfaction of a public obligation with obloquy. That has been our policy. Every writer upon international law in America from that time to now who has been recognized as an authority has taken the position that the most savage doctrine ever announced by any people anywhere was that private property should be taken for the satisfaction of a public obligation. The gentleman from Illinois says he is going to vote for this bill. I am not one of those who, if I am going to vote for a bill, am going to place myself in the position of saying I do not agree with its fundamental principles and then turn round and vote for the bill.

Why do we have this bill before us to-day? It is because we do not expect or intend to commit the Government of the United States to the savage doctrine of confiscation of alien property. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] refers to the seizure of cotton in the South by the North during the Civil War. That is one instance that he points out when the United States has not observed its ancient and its fundamental policy upon this question, and I believe that every fair-minded man in the world to-day, both North and South, believes that the United States Government to-day owes and has since the seizure of that cotton owed in honesty that debt to the people of the South. [Applause.] The only time when the United States Government has announced or pursued any other doctrine except the doctrine that alien property should not be seized and held and confiscated is that one instance. In the language of John Marshall, when he spoke upon this question more than 100 years ago, that doctrine of confiscation of private property had been looked upon with obloquy amongst all of the civilized nations for generations, he denouncing it to be "the most savage doctrine that could obtain between civilized countries."

If this bill means anything, it means that the United States Government is going to live up to that great doctrine and resume its stand upon that high plane. If the American Government had never by congressional action announced that as a policy to the world, this greatest and most powerful Nation upon the earth to-day should be the leader and step out and announce the policy as the permanent and continuous policy of this Government.

I hope, therefore, that we shall not by the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] strike from this bill this declaration of policy, which could have only one effect upon the thought of the world, and that is that we do not indorse the policy as laid down in this paragraph. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST GERMANY

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of State shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, established in pursuance of the agreement of August 10, 1922, between the United States and Germany (referred to in this act as the "Mixed Claims Commission").

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay an amount equal to the principal of each award so certified, plus the interest thereon, at the rate fixed in the award, accruing before January 1, 1928.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay annually (as nearly as may be) simple interest, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, upon the amounts payable under subsection (b) and remaining unpaid, beginning January 1, 1928, until paid.

(d) The payments authorized by subsection (b) or (c) shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, but only out of the special deposit account created by section 5, within the limitations hereinafter prescribed, and in the order of priority provided in subsection (c) of section 5.

(e) There shall be deducted from the amount of each payment, as reimbursement for the expenses incurred by the United States in respect thereof, an amount equal to one-half of 1 per cent thereof. The amount so deducted shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. In computing the amounts payable under subsection (c) of section 5 the fact that such deduction is required to be made from the payment when computed or that such deduction has been made from prior payments shall be disregarded.

(f) The amounts awarded to the United States in respect of claims of the United States shall not be payable under this section.

(g) No payment shall be made under this section unless application therefor is made, within two years after the date of the enactment of this act, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Payment shall be made only to the person on behalf of whom the award was made, except that—

(1) If such person is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if the payment is not over $500 it may be made to the persons found by the Secretary of the Treasury to be entitled thereto without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law in respect of the administration of estates;

(2) In the case of a partnership, association, or corporation, the existence of which has been terminated, payment shall be made, except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), to the person found by the Secretary of the Treasury to be entitled thereto;

(3) If a receiver or trustee for the person on behalf of whom the award was made has been duly appointed by a court in the United States and has not been discharged prior to the date of payment, payment shall be made to the receiver or trustee or in accordance with the order of the court; and

(4) In the case of an assignment of an award, or an assignment (prior to the making of the award) of the claim in respect of which the award was made, by a receiver or trustee for any such person, duly appointed by a court in the United States, such payment shall be made to the assignee.

(h) Nothing in this section shall be construed as the assumption of a liability by the United States for the payment of the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, nor shall any payment under this section be construed as the satisfaction, in whole or in part, of any of such awards, or as extinguishing or diminishing the liability of Germany for the satisfaction in full of such awards, but shall be considered only as an advance by the United States until all the payments from Germany in satisfaction of the awards have been received. Upon any payment under this section of an amount in respect of an award, the rights in respect of the award and of the claim in respect of which the award was made shall be held to have been assigned pro tanto to the United States, to be enforced by and on behalf of the United States against Germany, in the same manner and to the same extent as such rights would be enforced on behalf of the American national.

(i) Any person who makes application for payment under this section shall be held to have consented to all the provisions of this act.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINEY: At the end of line 24, page 2, strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "except that no award shall be certified if the rights of the person or corporation on behalf of whom such award was made were acquired by subrogation of the rights of a beneficiary under a policy or a contract of insurance."

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an attempt on my part to prevent these insurance companies writing marine insurance during the period of the World War from being reimbursed for losses they did not sustain. Some of these claims are very large; five of them on this list I have here run from $2,000,000 to $7,000,000.

The claims of 40 or 50 of these insurance companies were allowed by the Mixed Claims Commission as claims against Germany. This is the only opportunity we shall ever have to prevent their payment at this time. My information is, with

reference to the French spoliation claims, that that portion of those claims which were allowed 100 years ago and which yet remain unpaid consists largely of insurance claims just like this. Before we entered the World War we had less than 40 companies engaged in writing marine insurance. The number was greatly augmented after 1914, but when we entered the war we had only 40. The number quickly rose to 100, and now the number again has been reduced to less than 40. I do not know how much these insurance companies made, but I know that they did not lose anything. Mr. Mills, of New York, a member of the committee, in presenting this matter on the floor a year ago—he is now Undersecretary of the Treasury—said this on this floor:

Frankly, I do not know whether these insurance companies made a profit or not.

Now, if he feels that way about it, the chances are that they made a profit. He would not say they did not, and he was supporting this bill.

I expect to vote for this bill, but I want to make it as good as I can before I vote for it. I want to do just as much as I can for my conscience in these matters. I am, unlike the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], concerned in making this bill as good as I can before I am compelled to vote for it. I believe in the doctrine of returning confiscated property. The doctrine is now being established for the first time in the world, notwithstanding we have most untactfully declared that it has always been our policy. I tried to strike that out of the bill, but the committee would not do it.

Now, there are 45 insurance companies, according to the evidence, that collected in premiums, from August 1, 1914, to July 2, 1921, $248,000,000; and their losses, according to the evidence as near as it can be ascertained, in spite of the fact that they tried to cover it up as much as they could, after salvage and after reinsurance, amounted to only $169,000,000. Our Government went into the insurance business during the war, and our policy was to write insurance upon such ships as were to be exposed in such dangerous seas that the possible loss was too great to be assumed by private companies. We took the worst of these losses, and we collected $40,000,000, and our losses were less than $25,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more? This is the last amendment I am going to offer, except perhaps pro forma amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. These insurance rates varied, depending upon the zone to which the merchant vessels proposed to sail. Before the war these same insurance companies charged for marine insurance less than 1 per cent.

During the war they charged less than 2 per cent, but after we entered the war their rates rose until they charged sometimes as much as 30 per cent and sometimes more than that. They never made as much money as they did during the war, and they did not lose one cent. Under the bill we are considering now they will get, each one of them, $100,000 on every one of these claims and we have already paid $10,000 on all claims. By this declaration of policy, which we have retained in this bill, and which has absolutely no place in it, hereafter we agree we are going to pay them in full in some way for something they never have lost. The effect of striking this out of the bill will be simply to postpone the claims of these insurance companies until all of these other claims which we are now providing for are paid, and it will take 25 years for that; it will take more than that, as a matter of fact, because these reparation payments will stop, according to Mr. Auld in his book, in 1949, but upon the theory that they are going to last until 1953 we are adopting the provisions of this bill. Therefore, under the most favorable conditions for Germany, if there is no adjustment downward of the amount of the reparations she is expected to pay, there will be a period of four years, from 1949 to 1953, during which we will not get one cent on account of these reparations, unless the Reparation Commission and the nations interested therein—and the Reparation Commission is functioning under the League of Nations and the Versailles treaty—agree to give us 2¼ per cent of $240,000,000 for the 15 years following 1949, which amount will be absolutely negligible.

This does not destroy these claims; it simply postpones the time when these insurance companies, which have not suffered a dollar of loss, can present their claims and in some way get the money from Germany if they can.

I do not want to have these insurance companies paid the claims which have been allowed against Germany by the Mixed Claims Commission on the technical doctrine of subrogation only. The United States ought not to pay them. Let them wait and get this out of Germany if they can.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not true that these insurance companies, according to the hearings, have already reaped very large profits from the business they have done, and therefore have sustained no losses?

Mr. RAINEY. That is the point I am trying to make in this argument and that is the gist of my entire argument. They have not lost a dollar but have made profits such as they never made before in all their history, and now under the technical doctrine of subrogation we are going to reimburse them for the losses they have paid. The real losers on account of the sinking of these ships are the men who paid the 30 and 40 per cent insurance premiums. The Americans who paid them these insurance premiums on ships and on cargoes presented their claims to the Mixed Claims Commission, but that commission disallowed them and none of them are carried here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am opposed to the amendment offered by my friend from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] and I hope it will not prevail.

Gentlemen, we are called upon to decide a practical question.

In the first place, by the treaty of Berlin, in 1922, the Mixed Claims Commission was established. That commission was made up of one German citizen, one American citizen, and an umpire, Judge Parker, of Texas, another American citizen. Judge Parker testified before the committee, and he is an outstanding citizen of Texas. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] told the committee there was no better or more upright and able citizen of the State of Texas than Judge Parker. He told us this: He said that every large claim, and especially every insurance claim, that came before the commission and the umpire was thrasheed out just like a lawsuit. Both sides were heard.

If he thought a claim was a just claim he recommended an award; if he thought it was an unjust claim he recommended that it be disallowed; or if he thought the claim was too much he recommended that it be cut down.

Gentlemen, how can we go back of the Mixed Claims Commission? It is absolutely impossible for the House of Representatives or for the Senate of the United States to investigate individually all of these thousands of claims.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And failure to carry out the recommendations of this Mixed Claims Commission would simply be a repudiation of the treaty?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Absolutely; we would be repudiating the treaty. In addition to that, the German Government and the German people pay these claims. It is not like the ship claims and the claims for the radio station and patents. They agreed to pay them, and if the Mixed Claims Commission says they agreed to pay them and they are just it is impossible for us to go behind the action of that commission. If you want to kill this sort of legislation you will cut this provision out of the bill, but I hope you will not do so.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. The only question the Mixed Claims Commission considered was the legal question of subrogation, and the only thing they had before them was reinsurance and salvage, which would cut down these apparent losses—is not that true?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Judge Parker said they made a thorough examination and had a real trial in his office with respect to all of these various claims, insurance, and everything else.

Mr. RAINEY. Under the technical doctrine of subrogation.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I believe he said that.

Mr. RAINEY. Judge Parker did not say these companies ever lost these amounts.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Now, my friends, we are up against this situation: We could have returned the German property in 1923 if the Republican side had voted like we voted, but the American claimants felt they had rights, and there are thousands upon thousands of them and probably 99 per cent of them were absolutely just and ought to be paid by somebody. However, they prevented the passage of legislation which

would have returned it all. You will remember that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] offered the amendment and practically as a unit we on this side voted to return all the property to its German owners.

There are two things I am very much interested in. One is getting rid of this question and the other is getting this two or three hundred million dollars out of the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. I do not think anything else is good policy. This ought to have been settled 8 or 10 years ago.

If we amend the bill in important particulars like this, it will be another 8 or 10 years before the matter is settled. The German people do not want this to happen and, of course, the American claimants do not want it to happen, and we ought not to want it to happen. Therefore I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe if you set back the insurance claims as proposed by the amendment, you have got to set back a certain amount of the German alien property to secure the insurance claims, and therefore instead of forwarding this great settlement, you are putting off the settlement for a term of 15 or 20 years.

Any amendment that does not contribute to a settlement, I oppose. I have here before me the brief of the United States Government, appearing on behalf of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and on behalf of the insurance companies of America, arguing for the allowance of the insurance company claims before the Mixed Claims Commission. I intend to summarize this brief and insert it in the RECORD under permission to extend my remarks.

The first proposition I believe in is this: The insurance companies are the financial right arm of the American merchant marine. There is not a shipowner that will cast a rope from a pier until the hull of his ship is insured. There is not a cargo shipper that will load a cargo into a ship until the cargo is insured. All of the American business men want the headache of the risk to be transferred to the insurance company. Under the policies written during the period of the war, both with the Federal Government and with the insurance companies, the insurance companies were subrogated to the rights of the insured to recover whatever they could from whatever source was available.

I believe this doctrine should be upheld. It has been upheld in every international arbitration that has ever occurred. It is the civil law of every State in the Union. It is the civil law of the Federal courts. There have been decisions from the beginning of this Government down to the present day upholding it in the common practice between the merchants, the insurance companies, the railroads, and so forth, throughout our land. It has never been contested. No legislature has sought to repeal it.

If we do not sustain the doctrine upon which the Mixed Claims Commission acted, a doctrine which runs foursquare with all of the domestic law and policy of our States and of our Nation, we have the burden of proof upon us to show why we depart from it.

I never heard of a defense to an insurance claim in a State court where the defendant could write into his answer that the insurance company made money and therefore is not liable for the damage called for under the policy. I have never heard of this defense. No lawyer in this House has ever used it in a court of law. I say to you now that if the insurance companies are not making money, they are worse than a plague of smallpox to the business men of the Nation.

The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee shows that these companies broke dead even on their ocean war-risk insurance. When you find an insurance company that is in a state of collapse, mark you, every business man that relies upon it is in danger of ruin.

I have in my pocket a telegram from the counsel to the State superintendent of insurance of New York asking me to present as far as I can an argument on behalf of the payment of the insurance claim. He has under liquidation or in the hands of a receiver three or four great New York companies at this moment, and they have awards payable under this bill. He called my attention the other day to the fact that the overwriting of war risks was a contributing cause to the collapse of these companies.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Their present plight can not be attributed to war business, can it?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I have the information from him and I will put the telegram in the RECORD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 19, 1927.*

Hon. FRANK OLIVER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Represent State superintendent of insurance in liquidation of Liberty Marine Insurance Co., New York National Insurance Co., and North Atlantic Insurance Co., who have awards rendered in their favor by Mixed Claims Commission for losses paid on hulls and cargoes. These companies are in liquidation for benefit of American creditors who are dependent on these awards for payment of their claims. The awards of Mixed Claims Commission were rendered by an international court of highest standing, whose decisions are by treaty binding on our Government. Further, no basic difference between claims of insurance companies and those of large corporations, who are self-insurers. Many other moral and legal arguments exist against any suggestion of discrimination. I make this appeal for American creditors who are vitally interested in result of liquidation of foregoing companies. Your kind efforts in their behalf will be widely appreciated.

VINCENT L. LEIBELL.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is my impression they did a very prosperous business during the war, and then following the war business slackened off. I am not talking about the particular companies which the gentleman has in mind, but insurance companies in general.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. The insurance companies in general, according to the evidence, showed they broke about dead even on the premiums and the losses paid, plus the expenses of the insurance companies. That is the evidence in the hearings.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then this would all be velvet?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. This would be their velvet, as you call it, but I deem it their payment for their rights under their contracts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But I think they ought to take the last place in priority.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Why should Germany, who caused the payment of these high rates that gentlemen complain of, get away scot-free when a contract is presented by which the insurance company is subrogated to the rights of the insured, and proof is put in showing payment of loss?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But I would put them at the foot of the list.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] made a magnificent argument, showing that if we allow a nation to plead that simply because the insurance companies made money, therefore that nation had the right to destroy all the ships possible and not pay a nickel for them, then we are announcing a very strange and at the same time most dangerous international doctrine.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. For an easy question. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Does the gentleman think, however, that the United States Government should come in and in any sense assume any of these liabilities of the German Government? That is what is done under this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is not done under this bill.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. That is denied by gentlemen who have prepared the bill. I think when the Government of the United States holds money for the payment of the ships, radio station, and patents, which should have been paid long ago, that payment by the Government from such a fund is not a payment by the Treasury of the United States out of money belonging to the taxpayer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is money belonging to the Germans.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And the Germans have consented that it may be so applied and it is not the taxpayer's money at all.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Not at all; a trust is impressed upon it for the benefit of the shipowners and the owners of the radio station and patents, and no matter what disposition the Government of the United States makes of it, it does not seem to me to be of any concern to the taxpayer as long as they fulfill the trust obligations imposed upon it.

However, I intend, as I said, to summarize this brief and to put in the argument made by the counsel for the Government of the United States demanding the right of subrogation for the Government itself, which went into the insurance business, and

showing in this brief that the Government of the United States was coinsurer with the private insurance companies and that allowances were made, on the sinking of the same ship, to both the Government and the private insurance companies on the same basis.

They stand on a parity. I shall present a brief analysis of the *Alabama* claims and the awards. Gentlemen here have used the argument that the principles of that case should be followed in this settlement. The American counsel presented an analysis of the *Alabama* claims and the awards to the Mixed Claims Commission, which shows conclusively that the action of the Congress of 1882, which legislated on the subject of the *Alabama* claims, was based on a political and not a judicial principle.

Gentlemen here have contended that if an insurance company shows a net profit on its business during the war that it should be deprived of its recovery against a foreign nation which caused it to pay out losses to its policyholders. It is argued that as far as insurance companies are concerned a test of the condition of their treasuries should be taken in determining their rights under their contracts.

If they have lost money their contracts should be allowed to stand in a court of justice. If they made money their contracts should be considered null and void. A litigant must take a pauper's oath before his suit will be considered by the court. Fallacious and unsound as this argument is, the gentlemen who advance it intend that as far as this bill is concerned it shall apply only to insurance companies and not to the other claimants who will recover under the terms of the bill. The Standard Oil Co. receives an award. Why not find out first if it made or lost money during the war. The Singer Manufacturing Co., the International Harvester Co., the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, and hundreds of other large corporations will recover their claims when this bill passes. Yet no one asks that their profit or loss sheets be taken into consideration in determining their entitlement to recover. The awards they received by the judgment of the Mixed Claims Commission are accepted as final. They should be accepted as final. We agreed to abide by them. The decisions of the commission were based upon the accepted rules of international law. We can not refuse to honor their decisions without defying the accepted rules of international law.

The United States Government established the War Risk Insurance Bureau during the war. It took from the insurance companies a group of its most expert underwriters. These men wrote the Government policies, collected the premiums, and paid out the losses just as they had been accustomed to do when conducting a private business. The Government of the United States paid out losses of about $26,000,000. It collected premiums of about $46,000,000. It made on its war-risk insurance about $20,000,000. It has been awarded by the Mixed Claims Commission every dollar of the losses paid out. The Government stands to gain $46,000,000 by its war-insurance business.

Under leave to print I submit a summary of the brief submitted by counsel for the United States Government on behalf of the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

[Before the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, organized under the agreement of August 10, 1922, between the United States and Germany]

United States of America *v.* Germany, No. 8.

United States of America on behalf of the Bennettt Trading Co. (Inc.); United States Veterans' Bureau; Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Co.; Insurance Co. of North America; and the Automobile Insurance Co. of Hartford, claimants, *v.* Germany, No. 94.

United States of America, and the United States of America on behalf of the National Fire & Marine Insurance Co., claimants, *v.* Germany, No. 208.

BRIEF ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

In these cases the United States presents:

A claim against Germany to recover the sum of $250,000 paid to the Texas Steamship Co. on May 16, 1917, by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Treasury Department of the United States, following the destruction of the company's steamship *Illinois* by a German submarine on March 18, 1917.

The claim of the Bennett Trading Co. (Inc.), owner of the bark *Christiane*, the United States Veterans' Bureau, the Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Co., Insurance Co. of North America, and the Automobile Insurance Co. of Hartford, to recover from Germany the sum of $127,220.72, with interest, on account of the sinking of the bark *Christiane* on August 7, 1917, by a German submarine.

The claim of the United States of America, and the United States of America on behalf of the National Fire & Marine Insurance Co., against Germany to recover, with interest, the sum of $49,776.76 paid to the Equitable Trust Co. on July 20, 1917, by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Treasury Department of the United States, and the further sum of $2,500 paid to the Foreign & Domestic Transportation Co. on May 7, 1917, by the National Fire & Marine Insurance Co., following the destruction of the American schooner *Edwin R. Hunt* by a German submarine on April 7, 1917.

* * * * * * *

PART V

THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBROGATION IN CASE OF INSURANCE PAID ON PROPERTY LOSSES IS THOROUGHLY ESTABLISHED IN AMERICAN, ENGLISH, FRENCH, AND GERMAN LAW

* * * * * * *

In short, a doctrine of subrogation is that one who has been compelled to pay an obligation which ought to have been paid by another is entitled to exercise all the remedies which the creditor possessed against that other, and to be indemnified from the fund out of which should have been made the payment which he has made. As above stated, it is a mode which equity adopts, and its purpose is to compel the ultimate discharge of a debt by him who, in equity and good conscience, ought to pay it, and to relieve him whom none but the creditor could ask to pay. (For a discussion of the subject see Sheldon on Subrogation, 2d ed., pp. 1, 2, 3, and 15.)

In treating of the question of subrogation, Winter, in his work on Marine Insurance, page 339, says:

"The right of subrogation: No consideration of the subject of marine losses would be complete without making some reference to the right of subrogation. While the underwriter may be liable under the policy of insurance for the loss incurred, it does not necessarily follow that he alone is responsible for the injury suffered. In many cases there arises, because of the accident causing the loss, a liability on the part of some third party to respond for under their policies of insurance. It would be manifestly unfair, however, for the underwriters to respond for the loss for the owner to retain his right of action against the owners of the offending vessel. Accordingly, in order that the equities may be reserved upon the payment of loss by the underwriters, they are by law vested with the benefits accruing from the right of action which has arisen in favor of the assured. This is known as the right of subrogation. Through this right the underwriter is clothed with all the benefits arising from claims against third parties which have arisen since the date of the casualty, and the assured is obligated to lend his name and good offices in the collection of such claims. The expense of collection, legal and otherwise, will, of course, be assumed by the underwriters in proportion to the interest which they have in the claim. If the settlement under a policy covering the entire interest has been for a total loss, the underwriter is entitled to the benefit of the right of action in full; if, on the other hand, the loss is but partial or the property is not fully insured, the underwriter will be subrogated only to the extent that the assured has been indemnified. The right of subrogation arises at the moment of payment."

The mission and purpose of subrogation are lucidly explained as follows by Joyce in his work on The Law of Insurance (2d ed., vol. 5, pp. 5879, 5880):

"The doctrine of subrogation in insurance does not primarily arise from, nor is it dependent upon, any of the terms of the contract, although in many cases policies now provide for the subrogation of the insurer to the rights of the insured. We have already seen that marine and fire insurance is a contract of indemnity, and it is for the purpose of carrying out this principle that the doctrine of subrogation has been adopted. In other words, in the absence of this doctrine the insured might often recover more than a full indemnity, and to prevent such result the courts have adopted the rule that the insured shall be entitled to only one full indemnity for the injury sustained, and from this the doctrine of subrogation has arisen. As a general rule, therefore, if the insurer pays to the insured the amount of the loss, the former will be entitled to be subrogated to all rights which may exist in behalf of the insured against third parties who may be liable to the insured in any way for the loss * * *."

* * * * * * *

"* * * It may also be stated," continues Joyce, "that from the very nature of the contract of insurance, as a contract of indemnity, the insurer, when he has paid to the assured the amount of the indemnity agreed upon between them, is entitled, by way of salvage, to the benefit of anything that may be received, either from the remnants of the goods, or from damages paid by the third persons for the same loss." (Joyce on Insurance, vol. 5, p. 5880.)

* * * * * * *

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Supreme Court of the United States, in a great number of cases, has recognized and affirmed and reaffirmed the equitable principle of

subrogation inuring to an insurance company upon its having indemnified a property owner for a loss sustained at the hands of a tortfeasor. A leading case by the Supreme Court on this subject, that of Comegys *v.* Vasse (1 Peters, 193), is treated of elsewhere in this brief.

A very lucid definition of the doctrine of subrogation is made by Mr. Justice Strong, of the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Hall *v.* Nashville & Chattanooga Railroad Co., reported in Eightieth United States, 367, as follows:

"It is too well settled by the authorities to admit of question that, as between a common carrier of goods and an underwriter upon them, the liability to the owner for their loss or destruction is primarily upon the carrier, while the liability of the insurer is only secondary. The contract of the carrier may not be first in order of time, but it is first and principal in ultimate liability. In respect to the ownership of the goods, and the risk incident thereto, the owner and the insurer are considered but one person, having together the beneficial right to the indemnity due from the carrier for a breach of his contract or for nonperformance of his legal duty. Standing thus, as the insurer does, practically in the position of a surety, stipulating that the goods shall not be lost or injured in consequence of the peril insured against, whenever he has indemnified the owner for the loss, he is entitled to all the means of indemnity which the satisfied owner held against the party primarily liable. His right rests upon familiar principles of equity. It is the doctrine of subrogation, dependent not at all upon privity of contract, but worked out through the right of the creditor or owner. Hence it has often been ruled that an insurer who has paid a loss may use the name of the assured in an action to obtain redress from the carrier whose failure of duty caused the loss.

"From the very nature of the contract of insurance as a contract of indemnity, the insurer, when he has paid to the assured the amount of the indemnity agreed on between them, is entitled, by way of salvage, to the benefit of anything that may be received, either from the remnants of the goods or from damages paid by third persons for the same loss. (Phoenix Insurance Co. *v.* Erie & W. Transportation Co., 117 U. S. 312.)

"Payment to the owner by the insurer does not bar the right against another party originally liable for the loss, but the owner, by recovering payment from the underwriters, becomes trustee for them and by necessary implication makes an equitable assignment to them of his right to recover in his name. (U. S. *v.* American Tobacco Co., 166 U. S. 468.)

"The right of the insurer to recover from the carrier for the loss of goods is not contingent upon the loss having been total, or upon its having been followed by an abandonment, but rests upon the ground that his contract is in the nature of a contract of indemnity and that he is therefore entitled, upon paying a sum for which others are primarily liable to the assured, to be proportionally subrogated to his right of action against them. (Hall *v.* Nashville & C. R. Co., 13 Wall. 367.)

"As between a common carrier of goods and an underwriter upon them, the liability of the owner for their loss is primarily upon the carrier, while the liability of the insurer is only secondary. (Wager *v.* Providence Insurance Co., 150 U. S. 99.)

"An insurance company which has paid losses by fire to the shippers is subrogated to their claims for such losses against the owner of the vessel. (Garrison *v.* Memphis Insurance Co., 19 How. 312.)"

* * * * * * *

SUBROGATION A PART OF GERMAN CIVIL LAW

The following excerpts from German civil law show that the principle of subrogation is firmly intrenched in Germany, where it is known that the law of insurance has attained a high degree of development:

"Creditor's right of subrogation in respect of debtor's claims for indemnity: If the circumstances or event by which the debtor's performance has been rendered impossible is one entitling him to partial or total indemnity from another (e. g., from an insurance company, which has taken the risk of such circumstances or event, or from a wrongdoer who is liable for the damage caused thereby), the creditor is entitled, in satisfaction pro tanto of his claim for compensation, to an assignment of the claim for indemnity, or to the delivery or payment of any object or sum of money received by the debtor in respect of such claim. (German Civil Code 281; German Civil Law, by E. J. Schuster. p. 169.)

"Right of subrogation: A person who compensates another for the loss of a thing or a right is entitled to the assignment of the claims which the person receiving compensation has against any third party, in respect of the thing or right for which compensation has been given. (German Civil Code, 255.)

"Illustration: A bailee who compensates the owner of the bailed goods wrongfully taken out of the bailee's custody may ask for an assignment of the owner's right to recover the goods from their unlawful possessor.

* * * * * * *

THE ALABAMA CLAIMS

It therefore becomes pertinent to give the precise history in connection with the treatment of claims of underwriters in the distribution of the *Alabama* award. This history reveals that Congress was faced with a distinct political situation. There was a comparatively small fund available out of which to pay claims. This fund of $15,500,000 had been covered into the Treasury of the United States. Congress was about to create a local commission or court for the distribution of the fund. The Government of the United States in this proceeding, instead of pressing claims against a foreign government, was now defending the Treasury against its own citizens. There was a small army of claimants against this fund. A few of these claimants were underwriters who had in a legal way, through indemnification, been substituted to the rights of action of American citizens who suffered losses of ships and cargoes during the Civil War at the hands of the Confederacy. The underwriters were few in number and were corporations. The so-called war premium men were thousands in number. It was manifestly the view of Congress that the fund was insufficient to pay both classes of claimants. After stormy debates, Congress enacted a law the purpose of which was to break down the equitable and time-honored principle of subrogation in property insurance and to set aside the legal rights acquired by insurance companies by way of assignment following indemnification by them of the original owners who had suffered property losses.

* * * * * * *

CONGRESS AND THE ALABAMA CLAIMS ARBITRATION

Under the *Alabama* claims arbitration, provided by the treaty of Washington May 8, 1871, between the United States and Great Britain, a fund of $15,500,000 was awarded to the Government of the United States in satisfaction of its claims against Great Britain for unneutral conduct toward the Government of the United States on the part of Great Britain during the Civil War as constituted in the depredations of the Confederate cruisers built and equipped by Great Britain and in some cases manned by British subjects.

In this case the contracting parties were two friendly States, and after the arbitration commission had awarded $15,500,000 as a lump sum the fund was distributed strictly through American agencies. These agencies were two courts known as the first and second courts, and which were provided for by acts of Congress. The first court made awards amounting to $9,315,753 for direct losses to claimants occasioned by the inculpated cruisers; that is, the cruisers whose possession in the hands of the Confederacy was traceable to the action of British subjects. A second court was created, which paid in full claims arising through acts of exculpated cruisers; that is, cruisers not having had any connection with British subjects in the case of their origin or equipment. In this class claims amounting to $3,346,016.32 were paid in full, the payments including interest and principal. The commission, following the instructions of Congress laid down in the act creating the court, disallowed all insurance company claims, except in cases where the sum of the company's losses in respect to the war risk assumed by it exceeded the sum of the premium and their gain in respect to such risk. The court held that such a course was regulated under section 12 of the act of Congress of 1882 creating the second court. The effect of this holding was practically to cut out and bar insurance company claims, and assignees of insurance companies were likewise and for the same reason barred. The war-risk premium men, however, were paid in part, the fund remaining being prorated among the holders of some 3,662 judgments, amounting in principal and interest to $16,312,994.53. (Moore's Int. Arbitrations, vol. V, pp. 4654–4664.)

The action of the majority in Congress in barring insurance claims was severely criticized during a debate on the subject on the floor in both Houses, particularly in the Senate. Senator Thurman, for instance, in discussing the action of Congress in barring insurance companies unless they had lost money, said:

"* * * I never can vote for any bill that does that great injustice, as I believe; and I do say now, and say it in all solemnity, that in my humble judgment there was never so deleterious an example set by any government in the world as is set by the provision in this bill, that insurance companies shall recover upon their claims if they have not made profit, but shall not recover if they have made profit. Stripped of its verbiage, stripped of its disguise, tearing away the sophistry of it, it amounts to this, that the Congress of the United States says to the people of the United States a man shall recover upon his claim, not according to the validity of his claim, but according to the length or brevity of his purse. If he is already rich enough, no matter how legal or valid his claim shall be, the court shall turn him away from its doors and say, 'You have enough already'; but if he has been unfortunate in business or improvident in business or in rash and unprincipled speculations, or has taken hazards that no prudent person would take. * * * You agree to pay the owner in the one case and you refuse to pay the man who paid him for his losses under a contract for insurance in the other. This principle is entirely

familiar in our Congress; it is beyond contradiction or the possibility of contradiction that the man who insures another upon a lawful voyage and then, upon the occasion of loss, has paid the other the amount of his insurance stands directly in his shoes with all the rights, legal and equitable, which his insured had at the time of the loss. There is no gainsaying these propositions, but here for the first time the attempt is made to stamp the contract of insurance as illegal, as impolitic, as not to be favored by the law.

"Mr. President, the contract is directly the reverse. The contract of insurance is legal and is in every respect to be encouraged and to be protected by law. Such contracts ever have been protected by law; and if the Government of the United States, with a view of diverting or perverting this fund from the plain course which an execution of their trust would lead them to make, it follows they do this at the cost of the law as set forth by their own highest tribunals, and I fear they will do it at the cost of the respect of every respectable nation of the world. I would not desire to see my Government stand in that attitude * * *. This is an attempt to escape from principles of law, we will ascertain, and which are now denied for the first time in the history of our legislature."

* * * * * * *

It is seen from the above quotation that in the view of certain Members of Congress that body could do justice to claimants, but a constituted court of the land could not. An examination of the acts of Congress of June 23, 1874, and June 5, 1882, establishing, respectively, the first and second "Court of commissioners of Alabama claims," reveals that Congress handled the situation in the only way in which it could have been handled so as to disallow the claims of American underwriters. Congress passed two laws which, as shown above, set aside the legal and equitable principle of subrogation and likewise rights obtained under implied, or even express, assignments to underwriters. The majority report shows that Congress was afraid for these underwriters' claims to go before a duly constituted court, and instead set up two courts of its own and provided in the instrument erecting these courts that claims of underwriters should be disallowed unless the sum total of their operations throughout the war showed a net loss.

This test of the right of an underwriter to make claim for sums paid out by him by way of indemnification, when analyzed, is found to be without legal basis and, according to Senator Thurman, founded on sophistry.

In order to show the utter legal fallacy of the rule or test put to underwriters by Congress in connection with the *Alabama* award it is only necessary to recite a few suppositious cases.

Suppose a large oil company during the recent war ran a fleet of tankers. The business of the company was to sell oil and to make a profit thereon, if possible. The price obtaining for oil during the war, it must be admitted, was influenced by the existence of the war, increased cost of labor, increased freight rates, and risks and perils incident to the existence of the war. The company was in all probability charging war-time prices because of the war. One of these tankers is sunk by a German submarine. Can it be argued for one moment that before the oil company could appear before this commission as a claimant with respect to the tanker it lost it must be shown to the satisfaction of the commission that the company suffered a net loss with respect to the operations of its other tankers during the war?

An American importer runs a large store in New York with branches in Chicago and elsewhere. War conditions affect the prices charged by him as in the case of the oil company. A shipment of goods en route from Europe to New York is lost in the sinking of a ship destroyed by a German submarine. Must this importer, before he could recover upon the shipment of goods lost by him, show to the commission that he suffered a net loss upon the other importations handled by him and which were not sunk?

A Texas lumber company is engaged in cutting cypress in southeast Texas and southwest Louisiana. A shipment of lumber to a European port is lost on a vessel sunk by a German submarine. If the business of the lumber company on shipments which were not sunk showed a net profit, would the lumber company be barred from pressing a claim against Germany before this commission?

A Gloucester fisherman, from that famous old port in Massachusetts, owned a fleet of fishing vessels during the recent war. One of them, laden with swordfish, was sunk by a German submarine in the Atlantic raid of June, 1918. Before the Gloucester fisherman can appear as a claimant before this commission, must he show that the sum total of his operations during the war with respect of his other fishing vessels showed a net loss?

A still more striking illustration would be furnished in the following: Realizing that extreme speed in a vessel would probably render it immune from submarine attack, and that on account of war conditions good money could be made in getting goods to Europe, a group of New York business men form a corporation and buy two fast liners, which they convert into cargo carriers for the express purpose of making money out of the war. One of these boats, despite its great speed, is sunk by a German submarine. Before the American owners of the sunken ship could appear before this commission as claimants, must they show that the operations of the other vessel during the war showed a net loss?

Instances and illustrations in line with the above might be multiplied. It is believed these few are sufficient to illustrate the sophistry contained in the position of Congress in legislating underwriters out of their claims and the legal and equitable rights which the law had conferred upon them.

The insurance companies were engaged in the business of selling, of marketing, insurance. The merchants referred to above were engaged in selling commodities. Each was a business. Each concern was operating during the war with a view to making whatever profit it could legitimately make out of the war and war-time conditions. Yet is there any instance on record either in this or any other country where the rule which Congress built up to eliminate underwriters' claims has been invoked against any other business in order to shut off the claim of a country's national?

* * * * * * *

PAYMENT OF FRENCH SPOLIATION AWARDS BY CONGRESS

Under the act of March 3, 1891, to pay the findings of the Court of Claims for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, Congress tacked on a proviso that in all cases where the original sufferers were adjudicated bankrupts the awards should be made on behalf of the next of kin instead of to the assignees in bankruptcy, and that the awards in cases of individual claimants should not be paid until the Court of Claims should certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the personal representatives on whose behalf the award was made represented the next of kin and the courts which granted the administrations, respectively, should have certified that the legal representatives had given adequate security for the legal disbursement of the awards. (26 Stat. L. 908.)

The act of March 3, 1899, contained the same proviso in connection with the payment of French spoliation claims (30 Stat. L. 1191); likewise the act of May 27, 1902 (32 Stat. L. 218).

The act of May 27, 1902, contained a further proviso to this effect: "*Provided, however,* That any French spoliation claim appropriated for in this act shall not be paid if held by assignment or owned by any insurance company * * *." (32 Stat. L. 233.)

It will be noted that this provision did not undertake to deduct from the claim any insurance that might have been collected by the original owner of the property in question, and that apparently it was entirely possible for a claimant to have been indemnified twice, once by an insurance company and once by the Government of the United States.

The act of February 24, 1905, making further appropriations on account of French spoliations, contained both the proviso as to the next of kin of original sufferers who had been adjudicated bankrupts and a proviso that any French spoliation claim appropriated for in the act should not be paid if held by an assignment or owned by any insurance company. (33 Stat. L. 780, 800.)

* * * * * * *

PART VIII

GERMAN CONTENTION THAT PRINCIPLE OF SUBROGATION IS NOT APPLICABLE TO WAR-RISK INSURANCE IS NOT BORNE OUT BY ANY LAW OR PRECEDENT—ON THE CONTRARY NUMEROUS CASES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW SHOW RULE TO BE OTHERWISE

* * * * * * *

The positions of the learned agent and counsel as set forth above, are as novel as they are difficult to substantiate. International law books, particularly works on international arbitrations, which are essentially and necessarily the fullest and most complete expositions of the rules of international law obtaining in the mutual adjustment of the relations and affairs of nations with each other, reveal numerous instances in which the principle of subrogation was applied to insurance placed on war risks.

A war broke out between Spain and Great Britain in the year 1796. On the 20th of April, 1802, President Jefferson called to the attention of the House of Representatives a communication to that body and report of Mr. Madison, as Secretary of State, containing information regarding French spoliations of American property since October 1, 1796. These spoliations were grouped into six classes as follows:

1. Vessels taken at sea and brought into Spanish ports by the French.
2. Vessels similarly treated by the Spaniards.
3. Vessels seized in Spanish territory and either condemned there or sent to French ports by the French.
4. Vessels seized or condemned by the Spaniards in Spanish ports.
5. Cargoes belonging to citizens of the United States seized or embargoed by the Spaniards on American vessels.
6. Cargoes belonging to citizens of the United States seized by the Spaniards on foreign vessels other than American.

By far the greatest number of complaints fell within the first and third classes, comprising captures and condemnations by the French.

An early and leading case in which the Supreme Court of the United States confirmed the right of an underwriter to recover on a policy

written upon a war risk is that of Cornelius Comegys and Andrew Pettit, plaintiffs in error, *v.* Ambrose Vasse, defendant in error, reported in First Peters, 191. Previous to the year 1802, Vasse was an underwriter on various vessels and cargoes, the property of citizens of the United States, which were captured and carried into the ports of Spain and her dependencies; he paid the losses arising therefrom prior to the year 1802 and an assignment was made thereof to Vasse by the owners. Vasse became embarrassed in his affairs and his creditors proceeded against him as a bankrupt. An assignment was accordingly made to one Jacob Shoemaker, and Comegys and Pettit proceeded to take upon themselves the duties of assignees. Vasse obtained a discharge in bankruptcy in 1802. In the year 1824 the sum of $8,846.14 was received by Comegys and Pettit from the Treasurer of the United States, the sum being the amount awarded by the commissioners sitting at Washington under the treaty with Spain on February 22, 1819, on account of the captures and losses growing out of the war of 1796 between Great Britain and Spain. A controversy arose between Vasse and the assignees, Comegys and Pettit, as to who was entitled to the proceeds of the award of the commissioners.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Justice Story wrote:

"We do not think that, upon an examination of the doctrines of insurance, there is any difficulty in this part of the case. It does not appear on the record whether there was in this instance any formal instrument of abandonment or not, nor is it material, for the law gives to the act of abandonment, when accepted, all the effects which the most accurately drawn assignment would accomplish. By the act of abandonment the insured renounces and yields up to the underwriter all his right, title, and claims to what may be saved, and leaves it to him to make the most of it for his own benefit. The underwriter then stands in the place of the insured and becomes legally entitled to all that can be rescued from destruction."

The opinion of Mr. Justice Story in the case of Comegys *v.* Pettit and Vasse is regarded as a classic on the question of abandonment and subrogation resulting from losses suffered at sea in time of war, and this case is justly regarded as a leading one on these subjects. In deciding the case, Mr. Justice Story held that the duty of the American commissioners was to look for the original claim for damages and injuries against Spain itself and that it was wholly immaterial for this purpose upon whom it may in the intermediate time have devolved or who was the legal as properly distinguished from the equitable owner, provided he was an American citizen; that if the claim was to be allowed as against Spain, the present ownership of it, whether in assignees or personal representatives or bona fide purchasers, was not necessary to be ascertained in order to exercise their functions in the fullest manner.

* * * * * * *

If any doubt existed as to the right of the insurance company to the remedies which might thereafter become open to him, and that the insurer is not limited to rights which might be in his mind, or which might only exist at the time insurance was placed, the following further language of Mr. Justice Story in the case of Comegys *v.* Pettit and Vasse would seem to be conclusive:

"Mr. Marshall and Mr. Park manifestly contemplate the case as establishing the principle that any indemnity, however arising, is a trust for the underwriters after they have paid the loss. (Park on Ins. ch. 8, p. 229; Mar. on Ins. B. 1, ch. 14, s. 4.)

"The case of Gracie *v.* The New York Insurance Co. (8 Johns. R. 237) recognizes the same principle in its full extent. That was a case of abandonment after a capture, and where there had been a final condemnation, not only by the courts in France but an express confirmation of the condemnation by the sovereign himself. One question was whether the jury were at liberty to deduct from the total loss the value of the spes recuperandi. The court held they were not. Mr. Chief Justice Kent in delivering the opinion of the court, said:

"'If France should, at any future period, agree to and actually make compensation for the capture and condemnation in question, the Government of the United States, to whom the compensation would, in the first instance, be payable, become trustee for the party having the equitable title to the reimbursement; and this would clearly be the defendants (the underwriters) if they should pay the amount, etc.' The case of Watson *v.* The Insurance Co. of North America (1 Binn. R. 47) proceeds upon the same principles. It admits that the spes recuperandi passes by an abandonment to the underwriter; and the question there was, whether its value, when not abandoned, was to be deducted from the total loss. We consider it, then, clear, upon authority, that the right to the compensation in this case was in its nature assignable, and passed by abandonment to Vasse; and, upon principle, we should arrive at the same conclusion. The right to indemnity for an unjust capture, whether against the captors or the sovereign; whether remediable in his own courts, or by his own extraordinary interposition and grants upon private petition, or upon public negotiation, is a right attached to the ownership of the property itself, and passes by cession to the use of the ultimate sufferer. If so assignable to Vasse, it was equally in its own nature capable of assignment to others; and the only remaining inquiry would be whether it had so passed by assignment from him.

Mr. Justice Story, in the course of his opinion, cited various instances of insurance placed upon war risks and in which it has been affirmed that the principle of subrogation obtained. The paragraph last above quoted shows that an underwriter in asserting rights obtained by him through subrogation may invoke those obtained either in his own courts or through public negotiations between sovereign governments.

By the above holding American underwriters are clearly entitled to invoke not only whatever remedies might be available to them in municipal law but rights which have since become available by treaty or other diplomatic negotiation.

The Government of the United States had numerous claims submitted against it under the twelfth article of the treaty of May 8, 1871, between the United States and Great Britain, these claims being predicated in each and every instance upon war risks. In all of these cases—and there were many of them—the principle of subrogation was recognized, and insurance companies were following the practice of international arbitrations, which, like that of admiralty and equity courts, is to permit insurance companies to come in and claim in their own right. In the case of the *Sir William Peel*, before the Washington arbitration, one Edwin Gerard appeared as claimant for himself and certain insurance underwriters. This British vessel had been captured by an American man-of-war on September 11, 1863, while lying at anchor at the mouth of the Rio Grande River. A considerable portion of the argument in the case was directed to the point as to whether the vessel was in delicto when captured, the Government of the United States taking this position and contending, therefore, that insurance companies would have no greater rights than the owners of the vessel, and that if the owners had no right to recovery, neither did the underwriters. In this case insurance companies had made certain assignments of their rights. In further defending, however, the Government of the United States admitted that by abandonment and acceptance of the same, and payment as for total loss, entire right to any and all the proceeds of the vessel passed from the owners of the ship and cargo to the insurers, irrespective of the legality of the contract of the insured, the contract being a voluntary one by the act of the parties. The United States further contended, however, that the undertaking of the insurance companies was to indemnify British subjects for losses resulting from an illegal act—that is, a violation by the British of rights of the United States in blockading the South. The commission, in deciding the cases, held that the capture of the vessel within the neutral waters of Mexico was a violation of law, that the assignment by the insurance company was a valid one, "and that the contracts of insurance were also valid and entitled to recognition and protection under international law." (Vol. 6, Papers Relating to the Treaty of Washington, pp. 100–110, Hale Report.)

Here was a further instance in which the right of subrogation was recognized in case of war risk.

In the case of the steamship *Circassian*, a British vessel captured by a United States cruiser on May 4, 1862, off the coast of Cuba, insurance companies and underwriters claimed £52,636, with interest, the value of the cargo insured by them, which was abandoned by the owners, and on which the underwriters paid the insurance as a total loss. The British Government urged on behalf of the insurance companies that—

"* * * those claims were the legitimate subject of reclamation before this commission, as well in respect of those portions of the insured cargo originally owned by French merchants as of those owned by British subjects; that upon abandonment and payment the title of the underwriters became absolute to all interest of the insured in the property and to all right of reclamation in respect of the same, and that such title related back to the date of insurance."

The Government of the United States in this case took the position that the cargo in question had been British owned and that the insurers had acquired title or right to claim from them. On this point the United States urged:

"* * * That the abandonment by the insured to the insurers after capture, the acceptance of such abandonment by the insurers, and payment as for a total loss simply operated as a transfer to the insurers of the rights of the assured in respect of the capture; and that the insurers stood merely as subrogated to the rights of the owners at the time of the capture and as their equitable assignees. That such transfer by operation of law gave to the insurers as equitable assignees no better standing before the commission than they would have in case of a claim for any other injuries to the persons or property of individuals not subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, but who had assigned their claim against the United States for such injuries to a British subject."

The commission made an award on behalf of the insurance companies and included in the award the proceeds of the cargo which belonged to French merchants as well as the portion which belonged to British subjects. (Hale report, Papers Relating to Treaty of Washington, vol. 6, pp. 141–148.)

In the case of the British bark *Springbok*, which was captured by an American cruiser east of Nassau, one John Riley appeared before the Washington arbitration and claimed, as manager of the London A1 Insurance Association, the A1 Guarantee Insurance Association, and the Colonial A1 Insurance Association, insurers of the vessel, and who had, on abandonment by the owners, paid as for a total loss.

The commission unanimously allowed the claims of the insurance companies for reimbursement of the amounts paid by them for the losses on the vessel. (Hale report, Papers Relating to Treaty of Washington, vol. 6, Washington Arbitrations, pp. 117–123.)

On the 14th of September, 1807, Denmark, suddenly forced by Great Britain from the position of neutrality from which Napoleon had already prepared to drive her, issued instructions to her privateers to bring in not only all British vessels but all vessels which there was ground to suspect of not being neutral. In the latter part of 1809 American merchants began to complain of the seizure of their vessels by Danish privateers. Between April and October, 1809, upward of 50 American vessels were seized and carried into Danish ports, and 21 on the list were condemned. The whole number of American vessels captured in 1809–10 was 160, of which 42 were condemned.

By a convention of March 28, 1830, the Government of Denmark agreed to pay 650,000 Spanish milled dollars "on account of the citizens of the United States who have preferred claims relating to the seizure, detention, condemnation, or confiscation of their vessels, cargoes, or property whatsoever by the public and private armed ships or by the tribunals of Denmark, or in the States subject to the Danish scepter." An American court of commissioners appointed by the President to distribute this fund made awards amounting to $2,154,425 and allowed insurance claims. (Moore's International Arbitrations, vol. 5, pp. 4549–4573.) Under the treaty of July 4, 1831, with France, the latter country agreed to pay the United States the sum of 25,000,000 francs for French spoliations against American commerce, which grew out of the famous Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon during the progress of the Napoleonic wars. The commission which distributed this indemnity allowed payment for vessels lost, for freight, lost cargoes, insurance premiums, and wages of crews, and insurance companies were permitted to appear as claimants. (Moore's International Arbitrations, vol. 5, pp. 4460–4485.)

Under the Van Ness convention between the United States and Spain of February 17, 1834, the commissioners appointed to determine the claims against Spain allowed insurers to recover the sums which had actually been paid by them, except in cases especially adjusted between the parties where the intention of the parties entering into the contract was allowed to be carried out. These claims grew out of Spanish spoliations on American commerce in consequence of the war between Spain and her American colonies. (Moore's International Arbitrations, vol. 5, pp. 4533–4547.)

The claims of underwriters to reimbursement for insurance paid on the cargo of a vessel owned by Stephen B. Howe, which had been seized by the Government of Peru, were allowed under the terms of the convention of March 17, 1841, in connection with which Peru undertook to satisfy the United States on account of seizures, captures, sequestrations, and confiscations of American vessels and their cargoes at sea or in Peruvian ports. (Moore's International Arbitrations, vol. 5, pp. 4591–4607.)

It is shown from the foregoing that, contrary to the German contention, it has been the practice among nations to recognize the application of the equitable doctrine of subrogation in cases where insurance was taken upon war risks, and that in each and every instance the insurance company, in the final analysis, was permitted to revoke whatever rights were made finally available to it by its own Government through negotiations or otherwise; that these rights were builded upon and made possible the realization of whatever rights the insurance companies may originally have attained from the assured by reason of the payment of the losses and the subrogation of the insurance company thereby to the rights of the insured.

Numerous other instances might be cited, but it is believed that these are sufficient to show the inaccuracy of the German position, and the learned German agent and counsel are called upon to produce any authorities or precedents showing that the principle of subrogation may not be invoked in cases of war-risk insurance.

Germany appears in this record asking that the United States and its nationals shall receive through international law less than would be accorded them under American, English, French, or German law.

PART IX

GERMANY, AS TORT-FEASOR, BOUND TO MAKE INDEMNIFICATION FOR LOSSES CAUSED BY HER, CAN NOT INVOKE, WITH A VIEW TO DIMINISHING OR DISCHARGING THIS LIABILITY, THE BENEFITS OF INSURANCE PAID FOR BY OTHERS

On page 12 of the German "Observation on the *Lusitania* rules," the following significant passage occurs:

"* * * It thus follows that in the case of reparation losses which may be charged to Germany's account under the treaties and agreements between the German and United States Governments, no individual American citizen or corporation should, in principle, be regarded as entitled to claim damages for loss of goods if the loss has been fully covered by insurance."

Germany by the above has plainly taken the position that the owner of property lost during the recent war at the hands of Germany can not nevertheless prefer a claim or maintain an action against Germany if the owner theretofore has collected insurance on the property from another. The relation of Germany in these proceedings is that of a tort-feasor, a wrongdoer who is and must be held liable for war losses caused by her. The analogy in fact is complete, and Germany, as tort-feasor, appears in the present record undertaking to reap the benefits of insurance taken out by another, paid for by another, and for which Germany was in no way responsible except by creating the condition which necessitated the taking out of insurance.

* * * * * * * *

"The fact that the insured has recovered payment for the loss from the insurer will not prevent the former from recovering from the person or persons by whose negligence the loss was occasioned, and the payment by the insurer will not be in mitigation of the damages sustained." (Joyce on Insurance, vol. 5, p. 5914.)

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, under the treaty between Germany and the United States, Germany accepted liability for losses sustained by the sinking of ships and by the destruction of cargoes. The insurance companies, by operation of law, under legal principles recognized in every jurisdiction and in every system of law, became subrogated to the rights of the insured. The only question here is whether Germany shall pay the full amount of the losses sustained by the sinking of the ships and by the destruction of the cargoes.

These insurance companies are all American nationals. Wherever an American insurance company had reinsured in a foreign company the amount of damage covered by such reinsurance was deducted from the amount paid to the American insurance company. So these awards are all for the benefit of American nationals.

Some one has said that the insurance companies made profits out of their business during the war. The United States Government was in the insurance business during the war. The United States Government insured ships under the war risk insurance act, and upon that business conducted by the United States there was a profit of $17,000,000 over and above all losses.

And still, notwithstanding that profit of $17,000,000, the Mixed Claims Commission made awards in favor of the United States of $24,000,000, thereby subrogating the United States for losses sustained by those who were insured by the United States under the war risk insurance act. So we are in the position that the United States Government has made a profit of $17,000,000 over and above the $24,000,000 for which the awards have been made by the Mixed Claims Commission, and still we are to collect these awards of $24,000,000 from Germany.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The bill provides that the United States Government shall not receive any pay out of this fund.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It does not. The United States Government ultimately will be paid under this bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am talking about the fund set up in the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman means the special deposit fund, yes, in a way, because the special deposit fund is created principally for the purpose of taking care of small claims—first the return of 80 per cent of Germany property, and secondly for taking care of the claims of American nationals for death and personal-injury losses, paying claims of American nationals amounting to less than $100,000 and paying $100,000 upon the larger claims. Of course, it would be folly to urge that the United States Government upon its claim of $24,000,000 should get payment of $100,000. We might put that in if we wanted to, but it would seem almost picayunish.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. At the same time, the United States Government is receiving $13,000,000 annually on its debt against Germany.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; it is constantly receiving $13,000,000 a year, and also $10,700,000 a year through the Reparations Commission. In terms of German currency we are receiving 55,000,000 gold marks annually in payment of the cost of the Army of occupation and 45,000,000 gold marks for the payment of 2¼ per cent out of the allotment of the Reparation Commission. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, under extension of remarks I wish simply to add that the so-called "special deposit fund" will continue until all German property has been returned to its owners and all claims of the United States and its nationals, including the Government of the United States, have been fully paid. This fund will be created in and be disbursed by the Treasury Department of the United States. The assets in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian will be distributed to their owners to the extent of 80 per cent, and the balance of 20 per cent and other nondistributed assets will be deposited in the Treasury to become a part of the special deposit fund, out of which the Treasury Department will eventually return this balance of 20 per cent to its German owners in accordance with the plan outlined in the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after the figures "1928," insert the following: "*Provided*, That no claim shall be allowed or paid under the provisions of this act in behalf of any insurance company or any insurer, either in its own right or as assignee in the right of a person or party insured, unless such claimant shall show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that during the period within which such losses arose the sum of such losses in respect to such company's or insurer's war risks exceeded the sum of its premiums or other gains upon or in respect to such war risks, and in the case of any such allowance the same shall not be greater than such excess of loss."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have followed in this amendment the exact language of the stipulation that was made more than a half century ago in reference to the *Alabama* claims. In other words, in settling the *Alabama* claims it was provided that the insurance companies should be paid only what they could show their actual losses to be; that is, their excess losses over their excess premiums during the war. They were permitted to make their normal profits on their normal business, and if their excess losses due to the war period exceeded their excess premiums they were allowed the amount of that excess. It seems to me that would be fair. Those claims were almost a deadly parallel to these. They who seek equity should do equity.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. In a moment. I want first to make my statement. In the cases at bar the insurance companies collected, according to the evidence, all the way from 1 or 2 per cent up, and in some instances 30 to 40 per cent excess premiums. After the war came on it was found that the dangers of the war, so far as they were concerned, were not anything as great as they had anticipated, and they all made money, some of them a great deal of money. There is not any indication that any of them lost any money, but if they did lose, this amendment I have offered would permit them to recoup those losses. They collected these excess premiums. I do not blame them for that. It was their right to protect themselves.

The technical argument of subrogation is made. It would carry much weight if there had been great losses and if we were not underwriting any portion of it. But the American Government is appropriating $50,000,000, at least, to be used temporarily in connection with these claims, so that the taxpayer, in the event the reparation payments are not continued, may be forced to pay a portion of it.

The argument is made that the Germans—as if that justified any course of dealing—are paying this, and that they agreed to it. Of course they agreed to it. If you put a pistol to a man's head he will agree to anything, and if you have circumstances thrown around him in such shape that he can not do other than agree to what those who hold the whip hand are in a position to dictate, of course he will agree to it. It is not a question of whether Germany agreed to it; it is a question of whether it is right; and I do not believe that insurance companies that collected these excess premiums by virtue of the war and who made money should be allowed to collect this excess amount, and in view of the circumstances I do not think they should want to.

If it could go back to the people who paid the premiums, that would be a different thing—just as when we refund the excise taxes, we do not give them back unless it is shown that the people who receive them are paying them back to the person who paid them in the first place.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman intend that the Government of the United States shall surrender its award of $24,000,000 for profits which it had made?

Mr. JONES. That is altogether a different question.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, no; the Government was in the insurance business.

Mr. JONES. I do not agree to that feature of the bill, if it is in here, but whether it is or not, two wrongs do not make a right, and if an insurance company has collected tremendous premiums and made great profits, whether our people are paying those profits or a helpless people are paying them, it is not right to allow them to collect a lot of other money that they did not earn.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is no provision at all in this bill making provision that the Government shall be paid its claim. On the contrary there is provision that expressly says that the amounts awarded the United States in respect to claims of the United States shall not be payable under this.

Mr. JONES. That was my understanding of it, but whether it does or not makes no difference. I understand even according to the gentleman's own construction that it will be paid only in the event that these reparations are paid, which is entirely different from saying that they shall be paid 100 per cent after collecting these tremendous premiums and making a lot of money. Of course, they are not to be paid 100 per cent first thing, right off the reel, but they will as soon as the matter gets into working order. They are among the first to be paid.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Only to the extent of $100,000 in the first place.

Mr. JONES. But that will take care of a good part of it, and then finally the remainder will be paid; as soon as the death and other claims are taken care of those will be settled.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will look in the hearings he can get the amounts of the insurance awards, and they are in very large amounts. They are paid up to $100,000 first.

Mr. JONES. That is all the greater reason why we should not take money out of the Treasury and pay them. If these claims run over a hundred thousand dollars each, evidently they collected many hundreds of thousands of dollars in premiums, because the witness, as shown by the hearings, who presented the argument in behalf of the insurance companies said that their losses were not as great as they had anticipated, and they could have reduced the rates if they had known the full facts.

I have no objection to any of these fair claims being paid, and I think the property should be returned. I think if an insurance company lost anything, not getting sufficient to pay its war losses, it should be compensated. But here we are trying to settle a great many complicated and troublesome claims and issues. Everyone should be fair. They should be paid, if at all, out of reparations and not in any circumstances out of direct appropriations.

Here is the provision that was put in in reference to the insurance companies in the *Alabama* case, which is a parallel claim. I can not recognize the distinction that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] drew, although I always listen with great interest to anything that he has to say.

Here is the provision:

No claim shall be admissible or allowed by said court by or on or in behalf of any insurance company or insurer, either in its or his own right, or as assignee, or otherwise, in the right of a person or party insured as aforesaid, unless such claimant shall show to the satisfaction of said court that during the late rebellion the sum of its or his losses, in respect to its or his war risks, exceeded the sum of its or his premiums or other gains upon or in respect to such war risks; and in case of any such allowance the same shall not be greater than such excess of loss.

That is the exact principle we applied to the British insurance companies.

Mr. RAINEY. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to state to the gentleman his amendment is better than mine, and as soon as I get the floor I will withdraw my amendment and accept his substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in two minutes I can not correct all the careless statements made by the gentleman from Illinois, who spoke about the insurance companies getting $10,000, and the gentleman from Texas, about their being paid at once by the provisions of the bill, but there are two reasons,

either one of which is sufficient to cause Members of the House to vote against this amendment. In the first place, it violates the solemn promise of our treaty we entered into. It is agreed both on the part of the United States and on the part of Germany that these claims should be referred to the mixed commission, and we would abide by the awards. Now, some gentlemen urge that we repudiate a treaty we solemnly entered into in order to put off the insurance claims a little further.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have only two minutes. There is another reason why this amendment should be defeated. The gentleman would not accomplish anything if he succeeded in his amendment. Under the Berlin treaty 2¼ per cent of the reparations is being paid regularly to our Government, and part must be applied to the payment of the insurance claims. Nothing will be accomplished by the amendment, and I insist it ought to be voted down.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment and accept the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. RAINEY) there were—ayes 33, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this section and all amendments thereto have been closed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not mean on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All amendments to the section have been closed on motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS OF GERMAN NATIONALS AGAINST UNITED STATES

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be a German claims arbiter (hereinafter referred to as the "arbiter"), who shall be appointed by the President, at a salary to be fixed by the President not in excess of $15,000 a year; or any officer or agent of the United States may be designated by the President as arbiter. Any officer or agent so designated shall receive as arbiter, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a salary to be fixed by the President in an amount, if any, which when added to any other salary will make his total salary from the United States not in excess of $15,000 a year.

(b) It shall be the duty of the arbiter, within the limitations hereinafter prescribed, to hear the claims of any German national (as hereinafter defined), and to determine the fair compensation to be paid by the United States, in respect of—

(1) Any merchant vessel (including any equipment, appurtenances, and property contained therein), title to which was taken by or on behalf of the United States under the authority of the joint resolution of May 12, 1917 (40 Stats. 75). Such compensation shall be the fair value, as nearly as may be determined, of such vessel to the owner immediately prior to the time exclusive possession was taken under the authority of such joint resolution, and in its condition at such time, taking into consideration the fact that such owner could not use or permit the use of such vessel, or charter or sell or otherwise dispose of such vessel for use or delivery, prior to the termination of the war, and that the war was not terminated until July 2, 1921, except that there shall be deducted from such value any consideration paid for such vessel by the United States.

(2) Any radio station (including any equipment, appurtenances, and property contained therein) which was sold to the United States by or under the direction of the Alien Property Custodian under authority of the trading with the enemy act, or any amendment thereto. Such compensation shall be the fair value, as nearly as may be determined, which such radio station would have had on July 2, 1921, if returned to the owner on such date in the same condition as on the date on which it was seized by or on behalf of the United States, or on which it was conveyed or delivered to, or seized by, the Alien Property Custodian, whichever date is earlier, except that there shall be deducted from such value any consideration paid for such radio station by the United States.

(3) Any patent (or any right therein or claim thereto, and including an application therefor and any patent issued pursuant to any such application) which was licensed, assigned, or sold by the Alien Property Custodian to the United States. Such compensation shall be the amount as nearly as may be determined, which would have been paid if such patent, right, claim, or application had been licensed, assigned, or sold to the United States by a citizen of the United States, except that there shall be deducted from such amount any consideration paid therefor by the United States (other than consideration which is returned to the United States under section 27 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended).

(4) The use by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by any patent (including an application therefor and any patent issued pursuant to any such application) which was conveyed, transferred, or assigned to, or seized by, the Alien Property Custodian, but not including any use during any period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, or on or after the date on which such patent was licensed, assigned, or sold by the Alien Property Custodian, in determining such compensation, any defense, general or special, available to a defendant in an action for infringement or in any suit in equity for relief against an alleged infringement, shall be available to the United States.

(c) The proceedings of the arbiter shall be conducted in accordance with such rules of procedure as he may prescribe. The arbiter, or any referee designated by him, is authorized to administer oaths, to hold hearings at such places within or without the United States as the arbiter deems necessary, and to contract for the reporting of such hearings. Any witness appearing for the United States before the arbiter or any such referee at any place within or without the United States may be paid the same fees and mileage as witnesses in courts of the United States. Such payments shall be made out of any funds in the special deposit account hereinafter provided for, and may be made in advance.

(d) The arbiter may, from time to time, and shall, upon the determination by him of the fair compensation in respect of all such vessels, radio stations, and patents, make a tentative award to each claimant of the fair compensation to be paid in respect of his claim, including simple interest, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, on the amount of such compensation from July 2, 1921, to January 1, 1928.

(e) The total amount to be awarded under this section shall not exceed $100,000,000, minus the sum of (1) the expenditures in carrying out the provisions of this section (including a reasonable estimate for such expenditures to be incurred prior to the expiration of the term of office of the arbiter), and (2) the aggregate consideration paid by the United States in respect of the acquisition of such vessels and radio stations, and the use, license, assignment, and sale of such patents (other than consideration which is returned to the United States under section 27 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended).

(f) If the aggregate amount of the tentative awards exceeds the amount which may be awarded under subsection (e), the arbiter shall reduce pro rata the amount of each tentative award. The arbiter shall enter an award of the amount to be paid such claimant, and thereupon shall certify such awards to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay the amount of the awards certified under subsection (f).

(h) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay annually (as nearly as may be) simple interest, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, upon the amount of any such award remaining unpaid, beginning January 1, 1928, until paid.

(i) The payments authorized by subsection (g), (h), or (s) shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, but only out of the special deposit account created by section 5, within the limitations hereinafter prescribed, and in the order of priority provided in subsections (c) and (d) of section 5.

(j) The Secretary of the Treasury shall not pay any amount in respect of any award made in respect of any claim by or on behalf of the German Government or any member of the former ruling family, but the amount of any such award shall be credited upon the final payment due the United States from the German Government for the purpose of satisfying the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission.

(k) No payment shall be made under this section unless application therefor is made, within two years after the date the award is certified, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Payment of any amount in respect of any award may be made, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, in money of the United States or in lawful German money, and shall be made only to the person on behalf of whom the award was made, except that—

(1) If such person is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if the payment is not over $500 it may be made to the persons found by the Secretary of the Treasury to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law in respect of the administration of estates;

(2) In the case of a partnership, association, or corporation the existence of which has been terminated, payment shall be made, except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), to the person who, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, is entitled thereto;

(3) If a receiver or trustee for the person on behalf of whom the award was made has been duly appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction and has not been discharged prior to the date of payment, pay-

ment shall be made to the receiver or trustee or in accordance with the order of the court; and

(4) In the case of an assignment of an award, or of an assignment (prior to the making of the award) of the claim in respect of which such award was made, by a receiver or trustee for any such person, duly appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction, payment shall be made to the assignee.

(l) The head of any executive department, independent establishment or agency in the executive branch of Government, including the Alien Property Custodian and the Comptroller General, shall, upon request of the arbiter, furnish such records, documents, papers, correspondence, and information in the possession of such department or independent establishment as may assist the arbiter, furnish him statements and assistance of the same character as is described in section 188 of the Revised Statutes, and may temporarily detail any officers or employees of such department or independent establishment to assist the arbiter, or to act as a referee, in carrying out the provisions of this section. The Attorney General shall assign such officers and employees of the Department of Justice as may be necessary to represent the United States in the proceedings under this section.

(m) The arbiter, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to (1) appoint and fix the salaries of such officers, referees, and employees, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations or to the classification act of 1923, and (2) make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, law books, periodicals, books of reference, and printing and binding), as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this section and within the funds available therefor. Any officer or employee detailed or assigned under subsection (l) shall be entitled to receive (notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary) such additional compensation as the arbiter, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe. The arbiter and officers and employees appointed, detailed, or assigned shall be entitled to receive their necessary traveling expenses and actual expenses incurred for subsistence (without regard to any limitations imposed by law) while away from the District of Columbia on business required by this section.

(n) On the date on which the awards are certified to the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (f), the terms of office of the arbiter, and of the officers and employees appointed by the arbiter, shall expire, and the books, papers, records, correspondence, property, and equipment of the office shall be transferred to the Department of the Treasury.

(o) No award or tentative award shall be made by the arbiter in respect of any claim if (1) such claim is filed after the expiration of four months from the date on which the arbiter takes office, or (2) any judgment or decree awarding compensation or damages in respect thereof has been rendered against the United States, and if such judgment or decree has become final (whether before or after the enactment of this act), or (3) any suit or proceeding against the United States, or any agency thereof, is commenced or is pending in respect thereof and is not dismissed upon motion of the person by or on behalf of whom it was commenced, made before the expiration of six months from the date on which the arbiter takes office and before any judgment or decree awarding compensation or damages becomes final.

(p) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, the sum of $50,000,000, and, after the date on which the awards of the arbiter are certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, such additional amounts as, when added to the amounts previously appropriated, will be equivalent to the aggregate amount of such awards plus the amounts necessary for the expenditures authorized by subsections (c) and (m) of this section, except that the aggregate of such appropriations shall not exceed $100,000,000.

(q) The provisions of this section shall constitute the exclusive method for the presentation and payment of claims arising out of any of the acts by or on behalf of the United States for which this section provides a remedy. Any person who files any claim or makes application for any payment under this section shall be held to have consented to all the provisions of this act.

(r) If the aggregate amount to be awarded in respect of any vessel, radio station, or patent is awarded in respect of two or more claims, such amounts shall be apportioned among such claims by the arbiter as he determines to be just and equitable and as the interests of the claimants may appear.

(s) The Secretary of the Treasury, upon the certification of any of the tentative awards made under subsection (d) and the recommendation of the arbiter, may make such pro rata payments in respect of such tentative awards as he deems advisable, but the aggregate of such payments shall not exceed $25,000,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, line 22, after the word "exceed," strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000,000."

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this action—covered by my amendment—was taken by the Senate Committee on Finance after this bill went over to the Senate during the last Congress. It simply reduces the authorization for the payment of ships, radio stations, and patents from the maximum of $100,000,000 to $50,000,000. I wish to remind Members of the fact that there seems to have been no distinction made by the committee or any distinction in debate between ships and other alien property, whereas there is a distinction in fact and under international law and practice and under the treaties. Now, the German nationals in their claims rely upon the treaties of 1799 and 1828 between Germany and the United States. As has been explained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], and as stated by Secretary of State Kellogg, these treaties are no longer in force and effect. Even when they were in force and effect they had no application whatever to ships, as the terms of the treaties themselves specifically show. We are under no obligation, either legally or morally, to pay the German shipowners anything whatever for these ships which we seized in time of war. We are under no obligation, according to the old treaty between Germany and this country, and we are under no such obligation under any provision of subsequent treaty or the present treaty. We are under no obligation, according to international law or practice, because the ships of an enemy seized by a combatant in warfare have never been returned or paid for. Competent authorities on international law and custom have stated before the committees, and it is stated generally, that there is no instance in which this has been done by this country or by any other country. And our allies are making no pretense of paying for German ships which they seized.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Or any other property.

Mr. DAVIS. I know. They are under no obligation to do so. And no nation ever has paid for a ship seized in warfare. It is not construed as confiscation. They are prizes of war. That is true whether they are seized on the high seas or in a harbor or anywhere else. This has likewise been the universal custom on the part of the United States and all other nations with respect to all other property of either an enemy nation or the nationals of an enemy nation so seized, unless such property was specifically protected by treaty between the combatant nations.

However, perhaps the political exigencies have not heretofore been so great.

There is not any question about it, and I presume nobody will dispute that it has been the undisputed international law and custom throughout all the tide of time.

We are under no obligation to pay for any of these ships under our own law, or under the acts and proclamations under which we seized them, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in the noted Chemical Foundation case, held that expressly with respect to patents, the court declaring in part as follows:

> There is no support for a construction that would restrain the force of the broad language used. Congress was untrammeled and free to authorize the seizure, use, or appropriation of such properties without any compensation to the owners. There is no constitutional prohibition against confiscation of enemy properties. And the act makes no provision for compensation. The former enemy owners have no claim against the patents or the proceeds derived from the sales.

Patents, if anything, stand upon higher equitable ground than do ships, because under the treaties of 1799 and 1828, which were abrogated by the treaty of 1921, it was provided that German nationals residing in this country should be protected in their persons and their goods and homes and lands.

In view of the fact that the administration and so many Members, even from the South, are disposed to be so considerate of our late enemies, and so generous in donating to them such large sums collected from the American taxpayers, I wish to remind them of what the practice and conduct of this Government has been toward its own nationals. As is well known, during the War between the States, the Union Armies throughout the South seized, used, and destroyed immense amounts of property of every description belonging to the citizens; they frequently tore down churches and other buildings in order to use the lumber for building barracks; the Federal officers frequently purchased or seized stock, grain, meat, and various other properties, giving the citizens receipts therefor or orders on the Government for payment thereof. None of those receipts or orders have ever been redeemed, or any of the purchased, seized, or destroyed property paid for by this Government, unless and until the owner had commenced action and obtained judgment in the United States Court of Claims, one of the prereq-

uisites to a recovery being that the claimant must prove that he was loyal to the Union during the said war. There are still thousands of such claims which could be proven even according to that test, but many years ago this Congress enacted a law which has since prevented such claimants from asserting their claims in the Court of Claims or elsewhere, and this Congress will not even entertain a bill for the payment of any such claims. As to the owners of such property who were not loyal to the Union during the War between the States, and who were consequently classed as enemies, they have never had a day in court, and not one of them has ever been paid for his property so seized, purchased, or destroyed, notwithstanding the fact that after that unfortunate war was concluded they demonstrated their unalloyed loyalty to this Government in every conceivable manner. And yet many of the Representatives of those very people and their descendents are eagerly advocating the donation to our late German enemies of several times the value of their property which was seized by this Government during the World War, including ships which have never heretofore in all history been regarded or treated as otherwise than prizes of war.

I would paraphrase the old adage that "Charity should begin at home" into "Justice should begin at home."

However, I am aware of the fact that it has become the confirmed practice in this country to be generous to aliens, to be more generous to aliens than to our own nationals, and I shall not undertake at this time to change the policy of this Government in that respect. But I do say this: That if we are to pay for these ships, not because of any legal or moral obligation, but merely as a matter of grace—and that is what it amounts to—we should at least protect this Government against paying more than the value of those ships. This bill as it now stands will authorize the payment of much more than the value of those ships that were seized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, let us look for a moment to the value of these German ship for which we propose to authorize a payment of $100,000,000. You may rest assured that they will be paid whatever is allowed. You know how those things go. The committee in its report upon this question correctly states that the Naval Board of Survey, appointed under the provisions of the seizure act, made a survey of those ships and estimated their value at the time of seizure to be about $33,000,000. And then against that this report states the former German owners brought suit in the Court of Claims against the United States and alleged that their ships were worth $250,000,000.

The report is about as accurate in that respect as it is in other respects, because they only alleged that the ships were worth $230,000,000. But the lawyers in the House know that allegations in complaints as to amounts which they claim they are entitled to recover are not entitled to much consideration, and that is particularly true when a plaintiff is kicked out of court, as was the case with these plaintiffs in the Court of Claims.

Now, the only other evidence on the value of these ships furnished to us by the committee is a statement made by the chairman of the committee that it was shown that the United States had sold 44 of these ships, as he said, for $14,000,000; and that is a mistake. This statement of the chairman was based solely on the fact that the attorney for these former German shipowners presented to the committee a statement of 44 ships which he claimed had been sold by the Shipping Board for $14,976,520.

The fact of the business is that the major portion of these ships were sold upon long time with a cash payment, ranging all the way from nothing to not exceeding 25 per cent, and were turned back on the Government because the purchasers were irresponsible and could not meet their payments. That was true with respect to all of the more valuable ships, as I could show from the record if I had time to do so. So that is no evidence at all.

The fact of the business is this: That the survey and appraisal by this naval board, which was very carefully and specifically made, was done by men fully capable of performing that service.

On this subject the report of the Senate Committee on Finance, submitted by the chairman, Senator SMOOT, declared:

> The methods employed by the board were proper and the appraisals seem to have been fairly made. The bill as reported to the Senate consequently eliminates the provisions of the House bill for a new appraisal and provides for the payment for the ships upon the basis of the appraisals made by the Navy Board of Surveys.

The Navy board made exhaustive, detailed, and voluminous reports, and they reached the conclusion that those ships were worth only $33,000,000 at the time of their seizure, and that sum included some ships that belonged to the Government of Germany, and it included some ships that belonged to the nationals of other countries.

The average age of these ships at the time of seizure was about 15 years. Many of them were 30 or 40 years old and had been previously put out of service, but pulled out because of the war demands for tonnage; and all experts will tell you that the useful life of a ship is only 20 years. In other words, after operation for 20 years it becomes so expensive to keep operating it and make necessary repairs that it does not pay, and if you want to operate a ship for a longer period than that you must go to the expense of reconditioning it, putting in new machinery, and so forth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of the committee for five minutes more. This is an important matter and I should like to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. In addition to the age and general condition of these ships, I want to call your attention to the fact that with respect to nearly all of them the German crews had practiced sabotage; in other words, they had destroyed the machinery and put the ships out of commission.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Under the terms we pay for them only in the condition they were in.

Mr. DAVIS. That is what I am talking about. They were in bad shape. This survey was very liberal; I say it was exceedingly liberal. The Navy board did not reduce the physical value of the ships by reason of the fact that they were wholly unavailable and useless to the German owners at least until after the treaty of peace was signed four years later, even if we had not seized them. On that point your committee called before them Mr. Neagle, from the Navy Department, to give them information and advice, and here is what he said about the appraisal:

> Mr. MAPES. This bill, as you know, instructs the arbiter to take into consideration in fixing the value the fact that the owners "could not use or permit the use of such vessel or charter or sell or otherwise dispose of such vessel for use or delivery prior to the termination of the war, and that the war was not terminated until July 2, 1921." Did this board consider that in arriving at its valuation?
>
> Mr. NEAGLE. No; I am convinced that the board did not. I do not see how it could, because the vessels when they were seized came entirely to the Government—that is, the title came to the United States—and when the war ended, on July 2, 1921, the vessels were just as unavailable at that time to a German national as they were at any time during the war; and any agreement that he might have made, as suggested in the bill, for delivery of the vessel after the war would have been impossible, because the Government still had it just as completely. So that would have been of no value at all.
>
> Mr. MAPES. Have you anything upon which to base a judgment as to the difference in valuation that there would be between what the board valued these ships at and what the arbiter, using this standard, would value them at?
>
> Mr. NEAGLE. I do not see how the arbiter could very well arrive at a reasonably good determination of that, because of the time that has passed since the occurrence and the unavailability of the vessels. The board saw the vessels themselves, and were able to get an impression that could not be obtained at this time. So I do not think that a determination of the value at this time would be very valuable.
>
> Mr. MAPES. Would it be your judgment, then, that it would be as well, perhaps, to take the valuation fixed by the board as to provide for this way of fixing a valuation on them?
>
> Mr. NEAGLE. I believe that would be the only practical and reasonable thing to do.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. MILLS. And, of course, whatever value these ships had to the German owners was such value as might be derived from their right to sell these vessels for delivery after the war.
>
> Mr. NEAGLE. Well, if it is based on that, I am afraid the Germans would come out with a very small chance.

And so they would. In January, 1920, the International Mercantile Marine Corporation submitted to the Shipping Board a bid of $27,400,000 for the cream of all of these German seized

ships, including the *Leviathan*, *George Washington*, *America*, *Republic*, and all of the ships they thought were worth purchasing. They proposed to pay for the ships in 16 years' time and agreed to operate them under the American flag. John Barton Payne was then chairman of the Shipping Board. He felt it was a good proposition and that it ought to be accepted, but there was one member of the board who felt differently. Finally they sought the views of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has jurisdiction over shipping matters for the House.

They appeared before our committee in executive session and each of them stated his position and his contention, one that we should accept the bid and the other that we should not sell the ships. After hearing the statements our committee, regardless of party, as I recall, were unanimously of the opinion, and so advised Chairman Payne, that they should accept the offer. That was true in the light of the condition of those ships, their age, and all that sort of business, although at that time, in January, 1920, as you know, shipping and ocean freight rates were at their peak, and all ships that were able to traverse the seas were in use. Before the Shipping Board could consummate the sale, William R. Hearst filed a bill enjoining the sale. The Shipping Board won the suit in the Supreme Court of the District. Hearst appealed and the Shipping Board won the suit on appeal, but by that time the slump in shipping had come and the company that had proposed to buy these ships did not want them, and there has never been a time since that those ships could be sold for one-third of what we could have sold them for at that time; and they could have been sold for as much at that time, and even more, than they could at the time the ships were seized.

The treaty of peace between Germany and the United States of America was signed August 22, 1921. This would have been the first time the ships would have been available to the German owners if they had been permitted to remain interned in our harbors and had never been seized as enemy ships by our Government and it had then been desired to permit the Germans to repair and replace the ship machinery, which they had willfully destroyed, and to withdraw the ships. At least a year before the signing of this peace treaty there had come the greatest world slump in shipping in all history; there was such a decrease in commerce that thousands of ships all over the world became surplus and were laid up; it was impossible to sell ships at any price. As suggested by Mr. Neagle, the market value of these ships at that time was practically nothing.

In their bid for these ships in 1920 the International Mercantile Marine Corporation, after calling attention to the extreme age of the vessels and their generally bad condition, stated that reconditioning and repairing of the ships would probably entail "an expenditure of from forty to fifty millions of dollars; that the cost of repairs in a number of instances will exceed the original cost of the steamers, which when repaired will still be vessels of advanced age; and that the combined amount of the bids and of the expenditures required for repairs, rehabilitation, renewal of equipment, and outfits will closely approximate the present cost of new construction."

As a matter of fact, after the war the Shipping Board expended over $30,000,000 in reconditioning only a small number of these former German ships before they were fit for commercial usage. Practically all of such ships which were thus reconditioned and have since been sold were sold for much less than the cost of reconditioning; in some cases the ships being sold for a small percentage of the cost of reconditioning. For example, $2,405,920 was spent on the *City of Los Angeles*—the former German name being *Gr. Kurfurst*—and she was subsequently sold for only $100,000. This ship was appraised for $606,350 by the Navy board. The records show many other cases just as illuminating. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the House or to delay the vote, but I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. I will freely admit that the gentleman from Tennessee was right when he said—and I think every member of the committee who has spoken has admitted—that we could have taken these ships and could have confiscated them just the same as we could have confiscated every dollar's worth of property of any other German national which the Alien Property Custodian now holds, but the United States, as I take it, does not believe in that policy, enunciated some 2,500 years ago when the vandal chief, after capturing Rome and demanding so many pounds in gold for his removal, put his sword on the scales when the gold was being weighed out and said, upon remonstrances being made, "Woe to the vanquished." That is not the policy our Government is going to proceed on.

They talk about these ships being prizes of war. That is true; but they are not prizes of war like going out upon the high seas and wresting them from another nation. These ships came into our ports when we were at peace with Germany and when we were a neutral nation. They came here and they were dismantled. At that time they were in such condition that they could not get away even had we applied the 24 hour law, which the laws of nations give to vessels to get away from an unfriendly port after they had entered a port that had theretofore been friendly. After they entered our ports and were dismantled it would have been absolutely impossible for these vessels to have gotten away.

Now, as to the cost of these vessels and as to whether they are worth $100,000,000 or not. I said the other day that I believed $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 would be the amount which the arbiter would fix. We hope, trust, and believe the amount will not exceed $50,000,000. What is the value to be placed on these ships? The value to be placed on them, as the gentleman from Tennessee read to you a few moments ago, is what they were worth when they came into our ports minus what they would be worth to Germany after the war was over, which, as Mr. Neagle stated, would make them worth very little. To proceed on the theory that we might be appropriating more than the value of the ships would be to say we have no confidence in the arbiter. In fact, my friends, the whole argument against this bill is based on a lack of confidence in Germany's meeting its obligations and a lack of confidence that we are going to have an arbiter who is a fair man. I take it—and I will always take it—that when the President of the United States looks over this country for the purpose of appointing a man who, in his judgment, will fulfill his public duty that he will finally appoint a man who is going to be faithful and one who will honestly perform the duty imposed upon him; if it appears the ships are only worth $40,000,000, he will so find. I am not going to say in advance that the arbiter who is going to be appointed is one who will be swayed by improper influences and one who will make the assessed valuation of these ships very largely in excess of what they are worth.

Then let us remember another thing. The gentleman talks about the fact that the cream of the ships were only worth a certain amount. What is he going to say about those vessels we used during the war? Of course, many of them were dismantled, but we did use them, and we used them at a time, my friends, when a ship was worth ten times as much to us as it is now.

We did not have the great merchant marine which was necessary in order to transport all our supplies and our men across the seas. This was a time when we asked every owner of a private ship or a private yacht to come to our assistance; and let us take into consideration now the fact that these vessels which came into our port when it was friendly, and which were taken and used by us, were worth a great deal to the United States during the war. If $100,000,000 is too much, if the arbiter is honest, we will get back all that is not expended.

I hope, my friends, the amendment of my good friend from Tennessee does not pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS) there were—ayes 30, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I make this pro forma motion in order to ask a question and have a reply incorporated in the RECORD.

I want to know of the chairman of the committee if this bill contains a provision which will clarify the situation which was raised by the so-called Sturchler decision which the New York courts handed down about a year ago. This decision was that upon death or transfer of the title of property that those who acquired the property subsequent to its seizure are not entitled to either the income or the principal.

In the case which I have in mind a former leader of the Boston Symphony Orchestra of over a generation ago, who had left our shores but had all of his money invested in securities in this country, found himself in destitute circumstances. Finally the Alien Property Custodian rendered a decision which allowed him to receive his income, which he enjoyed for about a year. He then died and for some little time after that the income from his estate was paid to his widow, who was then 80 years of age and had the care of an invalid daughter. Suddenly these payments ceased without notice. She waited

some two or three months and then wrote to the Alien Property Custodian, and he wrote her back, as follows:

We are in receipt of your favor of the 26th bearing inquiry as to income accruing to the estate of Wilhelm Gericke, and regret to advise you that subsequent to our 1925–26 remittance an opinion has been rendered, known as the Sturchler decision, which prohibits returns being made to claimants who acquired title to property subsequent to seizure.

As the principal, Wilhelm Gericke, died October 27, 1925, the case of heirs falls within the Sturchler decision, and it will be impossible for us to make returns in this case pending the final determination of this decision.

I communicated with the Alien Property Custodian's office and asked him if in the meantime Mrs. Gericke and her daughter should starve to death, and he said the court took no cognizance of that.

I want to ask the chairman of the committee if this case and others like it are covered by this bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will have to say to the gentleman that I have not examined the decision to which he refers and do not know just exactly on what the decision is based; but I assume the decision was based on the trading with the enemy act, which, of course, would be amended by this bill. But even under the trading with the enemy act, offhand, I doubt whether the decision would stand; but in any event we have three provisions here with reference to assignees, one on page 28, subsection (d), one on page 29, subsection (g), both giving rights to the legal representatives of a deceased person—this was a case where the party was deceased, was it not?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. These provisions, I think, would take care of the situation. Then we have a further provision on page 34 with reference to assignees and funds in trust. I think these provisions will care for the situation which the gentleman mentions.

Mr. UNDERHILL. And pending the passage of this bill the chairman holds that under the trading with the enemy act it was not the intention of the committee or of the Congress that any such interpretation should be placed upon that act.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Offhand I do not think the trading with the enemy act authorized the decision which was made, but I may be wrong about that. I have not seen the decision myself.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It would be hard to assume that Congress passed legislation which recognized the right of an original owner and cut off legal heirs, devisees, and assigns.

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is the position I held, but the court held differently.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENT

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created in the Treasury a special deposit account, into which shall be deposited all funds hereinafter specified and from which shall be disbursed all payments authorized by section 3 or 4, including the expenditures authorized under subsections (c) and (m) of section 4 and subsection (e) of this section.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to deposit in the special deposit account—

(1) All sums invested or transferred by the Alien Property Custodian, under the provisions of section 25 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended;

(2) The amounts appropriated under the authority of section 4;

(3) All money (including the proceeds of any property, rights, or benefits which may be sold or otherwise disposed of, upon such terms as he may prescribe) received, whether before or after the enactment of this act, by the United States in respect of claims of the United States against Germany on account of the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the funds in the special deposit account, subject to the provisions of subsection (d), and in the following order of priority—

(1) To make the payments of expenses of administration authorized by subsections (c) and (m) of section 4 or subsection (e) of this section;

(2) To make so much of each payment (in respect of an award of the Mixed Claims Commission authorized by subsection (b) of section 3, as is attributable to an award on account of death or personal injury, together with interest thereon as provided in subsection (c) of section 3;

(3) To make each payment (in respect of an award of the Mixed Claims Commission) authorized by subsection (b) of section 3, if the amount thereof is not payable under paragraph (2) of this subsection and does not exceed $100,000, and to pay interest thereon as provided in subsection (c) of section 3;

(4) To pay the amount of $100,000 in respect of each payment authorized by subsection (b) of section 3, if the amount of such authorized payment is in excess of $100,000 and is not payable in full under paragraph (2) of this subsection. No person shall be paid under this paragraph and paragraph (3) an amount in excess of $100,000 (exclusive of interest beginning January 1, 1928), irrespective of the number of awards made on behalf of such person;

(5) To make additional payments (in respect of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission) authorized by subsection (b) of section 3, in such amounts as will make the aggregate payments (authorized by such subsection) under this paragraph and paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection equal to 80 per cent of the aggregate amount of all payments authorized by subsection (b) of section 3. Payments under this paragraph shall be prorated on the basis of the amount of the respective payments authorized by subsection (b) of section 3 and remaining unpaid;

(6) To pay amounts determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be payable in respect of the tentative awards of the arbiter, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (s) of section 4;

(7) To pay to German nationals such amounts as will make the aggregate payments equal to 50 per cent of the amounts awarded under section 4. Payments authorized by this paragraph or paragraph (6) may, to the extent of funds available under the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, be made whether or not the payments under paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, of this subsection have been completed;

(8) To pay accrued interest upon the participating certificates evidencing the amounts invested by the Alien Property Custodian under subsection (a) of section 25 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended;

(9) To pay the accrued interest payable under subsection (c) of section 3 and subsection (h) of section 4;

(10) To make such payments as are necessary (A) to repay the amounts invested by the Alien Property Custodian under subsection (a) of section 25 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, (B) to pay amounts equal to the difference between the aggregate payments (in respect of claims of German nationals) authorized by subsections (g) and (h) of section 4, and the amounts previously paid in respect thereof, and (C) to pay amounts equal to the difference between the aggregate payments (in respect of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission) authorized by subsections (b) and (c) of section 3, and the amounts previously paid in respect thereof. If funds available are not sufficient to make the total payments authorized by this paragraph, the amount of payments made from time to time shall be apportioned among the payments authorized under clauses (A), (B), and (C) according to the aggregate amount remaining unpaid under each clause;

(11) To make such payments as are necessary to repay the amount invested by the Alien Property Custodian under subsection (b) of section 25 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended; but the amount payable under this paragraph shall not exceed the aggregate amount allocated to the trusts described in subsection (c) of section 26 of such act;

(12) To pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the amount of the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission to the United States, on its own behalf, on account of claims of the United States against Germany; and

(13) To pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts any funds remaining in the special deposit account after the payments authorized by paragraphs (1) to (12) have been completed.

(d) Fifty per cent of the amounts appropriated under the authority of section 4 shall be available for payments under paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (c) of this section and shall be available only for such payments until such time as the payments authorized by such paragraphs have been completed.

(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, from funds in the special deposit account, such amounts, not in excess of $25,000 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment of the expenses in carrying out the provisions of this section and sections 25 and 26 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, including personal services at the seat of government.

(f) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest and reinvest from time to time in bonds, notes, or certificates of indebtedness of the United States any of the funds in the special deposit account, and to deposit to the credit of such account the interest or other earnings thereon.

(g) There shall be deducted from the amounts first payable under this section to any American national in respect of any debt the amount, if any, paid by the Alien Property Custodian in respect of such debt which was not credited by the Mixed Claims Commission in making its award.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say to my colleagues that I do not ex-

pect to contribute anything to the argument either for or against the bill. My main purpose in rising is to undertake to secure a little information from some member of the committee who can give it to me to clarify some uncertainty that has arisen with reference to the question of the amount of security in sight to guarantee, or reasonably assure, the payment of the amount that will be awarded to our nationals by the Mixed Claims Commission and the ultimate method of collection of these sums.

As I understand it—and if I am not correct I will thank the chairman to correct me—the Mixed Claims Commission is not a creature of Congress. It is a diplomatic forum set up between the representatives of Germany and the United States to attempt to adjust outside of Congress the amounts and conditions of settlement of these disputed items.

The report of the committee shows, at least it is estimated, that the aggregate of the amount which will ultimately be due American nationals as fixed by the Mixed Claims Commission will amount approximately to $186,000,000. It is also in the report that the amount to be reserved for ultimate payment of these claims is not, as a matter of fact, in sum sufficient to guarantee the payment of this amount.

In other words, the payment of at least a part of these claims is based on certain contingencies to arise in the future. For instance, you are depending on a certain amount annually, to be collected under the reparations agreement from the German Government, to be applied to the payment of the claims of the American nationals.

It was suggested in argument by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] that, although it may not be entirely probable, it is at least entirely possible that in the course of a few years there may be some substantial breach in these relations—I do not mean a breach of good feeling but some financial change, because Germany is contending for it.

So there is a contingency by which all amounts due the American nationals are not assured by the terms of the bill.

I want to say further that there are a number of claims pending before the Mixed Claims Commission amounting in the aggregate to thirty or forty million dollars. My information is that some of these claims are based on sabotage claimed by American nationals during the period of our neutrality, and before we declared war against Germany for the wanton and ruthless destruction of American property. It is assumed, of course, before the Mixed Claims Commission gets through that it will adjudicate all the claims now pending before it.

I want to ask the chairman of the committee if there is anything in the convention establishing it that makes it sure that the Mixed Claims Commission will function until all claims have been adjudicated and whether or not there is any limit of time for the functioning of that commission?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no limit of time. The Mixed Claims Commission will continue to function until they are through adjusting claims, which will not be very long.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That brings up another thing that is in my mind. If we are to adopt the policy of this bill—and in the main I agree with its terms—I think we ought to endeavor, if humanly possible, to safeguard every possible contingency that may arise with reference to these conditions, that the time may not come in the future when we will have a repetition of the *Alabama* claims, the French spoliation claims, and other claims which will hang like a cloud over the Congress of the United States generation after generation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And the very fact, as stated in the report of this committee and the answers to the interrogatories I submitted to the chairman of the committee, demonstrate that such a situation will be possible.

Now, my thought was—I do not propose to offer any amendment, for I realize it is too late now, with the temper of the House and the general situation of this bill, to hope to amend it in any substantial degree, but this is only the beginning of the passage of this bill, for the other body must act on it, too—it seems to me that there should be some consideration of what I have suggested with reference to the certainty of security of the ultimate payment of every just claim—that it ought to be fixed by the terms of this bill and not left to conjecture. I hope that the Senate will so amend the bill as to provide not only that the claims commission may be requested to continue their work until all claims are adjusted, but to fix expeditious and certain methods of collection for American claimants. If I had my way about it, I would reserve more than 20 per cent of the amount of German property that we hold in order to assure that those conditions will be carried out; but I do indulge the hope that in view of the fact that there are a number of claims of large amounts still unadjusted, in view of the fact, as I believe, that these bills will be paid in the order of their filing with the Treasury Department, that we do not in the ultimate passage of this bill leave this question open in any particular for future Congresses to help to determine.

An expression was used here—a poker term—about a jack pot. With my very limited knowledge of that game, I say that when the final show-down comes on this whole propostion I do not want the American nationals to have to shove the "stack" over to the German people, when, as a matter of fact, America and the American nationals hold the best hand. That is exactly what I have in mind in offering these suggestions.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Does the gentleman from Alabama contend that he does not know what a jack pot is?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, no; I know what a jack pot is.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has inquired with reference to the final allowances of these claims by the Mixed Claims Commission. The committee did not deem it advisable to put an express time limit on the claims commission, but the committee did consider that the claims commission ought to get through in six months at the very least, and perhaps before that time.

With reference to the absolute guaranty of these claims, which have been allowed in favor of Americans, I say frankly to the gentleman that it is not in the bill. There is no absolute certainty that they will be paid in accordance with the terms of the bill, because part of it is dependent upon the payment by the Germans of the reparation allowance. But there is this. The gentleman would want to hold out more of the German property, while the gentleman from Georgia objects because we are keeping out so much. We have to strike a medium somewhere between. I think the House would be very much opposed to paying the Germans in full, as advocated by the gentleman from Georgia, and then leaving the American claimants to collect their claims as best they could, or making an appropriation out of the Treasury for their payment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of this declaration of policy contained in section 2, I ask this question: In the event that ultimately the structure of your payments should collapse, and the American nationals should not be paid, does the gentleman not regard this declaration of policy which we have just adopted as an absolute commitment in principle that if that contingency arises and they do not collect out of Germany, then the Government of the United States is an insurer of the payment of these claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, that is taken care of in another part of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. But whether or not it is written in the bill, is it not the square thing for the American Government to pay these claims in that event. If I should be a Member of Congress when such a contingency arises, I know that I would vote for it. I intend to vote for this bill, but we have a fund in hand now, and if you turn this fund back, then I hope to stay here long enough so that if these American claimants are not paid I can vote to pay those claims. We have got to treat our people right.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But we are not proposing to turn this all over to the Germans.

Mr. BUTLER. But you are reserving only 20 per cent.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And the unallocated interest, which amounts to nearly 40 per cent.

Mr. BUTLER. But we have this thing in hand now, and we ought to keep it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then, we are reserving part of the ship money, which belongs to the Germans and not to the American taxpayer as some one suggested. We expect to reserve a part of that, and all together we think we have the matter fixed so that everyone will receive their money. In all events we have it fixed so that the American claimants on account of death losses will get their money at once, and that the Germans and the Americans will get the greater part of their claims paid, and then we will have done something with this great mass of money which we have in our hands and have done nothing with for so long.

Mr. BUTLER. But it is desirable to keep enough back so that the American claimants will be secure.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. This bill comes from the Committee on Ways and Means, but it is a bureau bill just the same. It has the Ogden Mills earmarks upon it, just the same, and I can not go as far as our big-hearted friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] who says that he is voting for the bill merely because he has confidence in the committee.

Whenever a trustee takes charge of property for a cestui que trust he charges the trust estate up with all expenses of handling the trust. That is the general proposition sanctioned by law in our courts, which is followed everywhere; yet in this case we are forcing the innocent American taxpayers to pay all of the enormous expense of handling this alien property.

Mr. BUTLER. But if we turn this thing back, are we not morally responsible to make good?

Mr. BLANTON. But we have made the American taxpayers pay all of the expenses of handling it, and my friend knows how many scandals have been connected with the handling of this property during lo, these many years. I am not willing to charge the American taxpayers up with all these expenses, plus the graft scandals that have been connected with this Alien Property Custodian's office, and I am one here who is going to vote against this bill.

I am in accord with the general proposition of restoring to others that which is their just due, but I am in accord with only part of this bill. I am in accord with a number of the principles enunciated by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], but I am not in accord with charging the American taxpayers with all of the extravagance and waste and everything else that has gone with the handling of this property for the German aliens.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. We ought to have charged the German aliens, the wrongs of whose country forced us to take this property in charge, with the expenses of handling their trust property, if you please. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the charges are true, which I am not granting——

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman denying there has been scandal?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman denying that there has been waste and extravagance?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know whether there has been or not.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman denying it has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then the gentleman is not yielding?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield. I was trying to find out where the gentleman stood.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am trying to find out where the gentleman from Texas stands.

Mr. BLANTON. It is mighty easy always to find out where the gentleman from Texas stands. I announce my position on every bill that comes up in the House, both on the floor and by my vote.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Texas is claiming there has been some extravagance in the management of this money and he would charge it to Germany. Is that the gentleman's theory?

Mr. BLANTON. If the Alien Property Custodian has been extravagant, it ought not to be charged against innocent American taxpayers but ought to be charged against the property that he handled. He has been handling it for the German aliens. It has been a favor to them to take charge of the property and a favor to them to turn it back, because all other countries of the world confiscate it, and if there has been expense and extravagance it ought to come out of their pockets and not out of the pockets of the American taxpayer.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Do I understand the gentleman that because there has been some waste and extravagance in the keeping of this property for 10 years instead of returning it to its owners the gentleman would hold it indefinitely so that there might be more waste?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I would have turned it back years ago, but I would like to charge up all the waste and extravagance and the expense of handling it and turning it back to the estate of these aliens. That is as far as I would go. I would not make our innocent American taxpayers suffer for the wrongs of others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETURN TO GERMAN NATIONALS OF PROPERTY HELD BY ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

SEC. 9. Subsection (b) of section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended by striking out the punctuation at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or" and inserting after paragraph (11) the following new paragraphs:

"(12) A partnership, association, or other unincorporated body of individuals, or a corporation, and was entirely owned at such time by subjects or citizens of nations, states, or free cities other than Austria or Hungary or Austria-Hungary and is so owned at the time of the return of its money or other property hereunder, and has filed the written consent provided for in subsection (m); or

"(13) A partnership, association, or other unincorporated body of individuals, having its principal place of business within any country other than Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, or a corporation organized or incorporated within any country other than Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, and that more than 50 per cent of the interest or voting power in any such partnership, association, other unincorporated body of individuals, or corporation, was at such time, and is at the time of the return of any money or other property, vested in citizens or subjects of nations, states, or free cities other than Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, and that the written consent provided for in subsection (m) has been filed; or

"(14) An individual who at such time was a citizen or subject of Germany or who, at the time of the return of any money or other property, is a citizen or subject of Germany or is not a citizen or subject of any nation, state, or free city, and that the written consent provided for in subsection (m) has been filed; or

"(15) The Austro-Hungarian Bank, except that the money or other property thereof shall be returned only to the liquidators thereof, and only if such liquidators give a bond, in a penal sum and with sureties satisfactory to the President or to the court, as the case may be, conditioned that they will redeliver to the Alien Property Custodian all such money or other property distributable to the Government of Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary; or

"(16) An individual who at the time of the return of such money or other property is not a citizen or subject of Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, and that the written consent provided for in subsection (m) has been filed, and that no suit or proceeding against the United States or any agency thereof is pending in respect of such return, and that such individual has filed a written waiver renouncing on behalf of himself, his heirs, successors, and assigns any claim based upon the fact that at the time of such return he was in fact entitled to such return under any other provision of this act."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 4, beginning with the word "that," strike out through the word "and," in line 10.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I understand this is entirely agreeable to the gentlemen on the other side. It is merely a perfecting amendment in view of the fact that Austria-Hungary matters will subsequently be taken up, and it strikes out what is not at all necessary now, and this is a complicated provision, anyway.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is an old adage that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. It was never better illustrated than a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Texas took the floor and criticized certain features of the bill and asserted that the American taxpayers' money was being spent extravagantly and wastefully. I think that is substantially the remark he made. I agree with him; we should save the money of the American taxpayers. We should not be wasteful and extravagant with it, and it is therefore for that reason that I desire to call attention to the extravagance and waste of the taxpayers' money by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Under an abuse of the leave-to-print privilege which is extended to Members, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated February 14, 1927, 87 pages of closely printed material, practically all of which had been previously printed either in the RECORD or in committee hearings. It affected a case which had been closed and which was of no interest to the taxpayers of the country or to any citizen of this Union.

I was astonished when that RECORD came to my home and I realized the abuse that had been perpetrated upon the taxpayers in the form of waste and extravagance by the gentle-

man from Texas. I took pains to inquire as to the amount of the expenditure that had been caused to the American taxpayers by the extravagance and waste of the gentleman from Texas, and I found that that extension, covering a third of that large print of the RECORD, cost the American taxpayers in extravagance and waste the enormous sum of $4,670.16.

Therefore I say that a man who lives in a glass house ought to be more careful how he throws stones, because they may come back to break his own house.

Further than that, I want to venture the statement that if the gentleman from Texas had been paying his own bills, rather than calling upon the Treasury of the United States and taking it from the taxpayers' money, that document would never have been printed. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad I got under one gentleman's skin.

The gentleman from Massachusetts refers to my report on Frederick A. Fenning, one of the bellwethers of the gentleman's party, who by his own President was placed in authority here in Washington as a commissioner of the Government; a man who for 25 years had robbed the veterans of the country, the veterans of the Civil War, out in St. Elizabeths; the veterans of the Spanish-American War out in St. Elizabeths; and the poor shell-shocked veterans of the World War, 900 of whom had been incarcerated in St. Elizabeths without law and without reason.

Oh, I was after the gentleman's bellwether when I went after Mr. Fenning, and I leave it to my colleagues here to say if for four months I did not work 18 hours a day, night and day, before I was able to bring enough evidence before our committees to dislodge that man who had been robbing the soldiers. I was working without stint. I worked when it meant the loss of health. I spent several thousand dollars all together out of my own pocket before I got through with it; and if you will write to your Public Printer he will tell you that I have paid to the Government Printing Office over $11,000 in cash for reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to send out. To my constituents, to let them know? No. I did not need to send reprints to them. They know my record here.

I have sent reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD into every State of this Union, to thinking minds, to try to remedy existing conditions here; and because I called attention to the waste and extravagance and the graft that had been in this Alien Property Custodian's Office—one of the gentleman's Republican offices, if you please, and I was getting under the Republican's hide, if you please—he could not stand it, and he had to get up here and engage in personal abuse of me. I leave it to my colleagues that the printing of that report stands as a valuable permanent record here of the infamy of a man who would rob soldiers.

Among the many cases I cited in such report there was a poor woman in Connecticut who gave three sons to the war. Two were left in France; one came back shell shocked. He was placed in St. Elizabeths on the motion of the gentleman's protégé, Mr. Fenning. He was confined there as of unsound mind; he was robbed there. His $11,000 estate was taken over, and Mr. Fenning, having put him there as a crazy man, after handling his estate several years, went into court and got an order to let that poor fellow of unsound mind make a will disinheriting his own mother, upon the allegation of Mr. Fenning that the mother was not a moral character. I brought some of the best people in Connecticut here, who testified before the Judiciary Committee that the poor woman, after giving her three sons to the war, was forced to take in washing to make a living, and that she was a splendid, moral woman. She had been robbed of her son and of his estate by the man concerning whose case I filed the report for the information of my colleagues. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not want that put in the RECORD. He strains at an expenditure he estimates at $4,000, and yet he pays no attention to the waste of $400,000,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) Subsection (d) of section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Whenever a person, deceased, would have been entitled, if living, to the return of his money or other property hereunder, then his legal representative may proceed for the return of such money or other property as provided in subsection (a) hereof, and such money or other property may be returned to such legal representative without requiring the appointment of an administrator, or an ancillary administrator, by a court in the United States, or to any such ancillary administrator for distribution directly to the persons entitled thereto: *Provided, However,* That the President or the court, as the case may be, before granting such relief shall impose such conditions by way of security or otherwise, as the President or the court, respectively, shall deem sufficient to insure that such legal representative, administrator, or ancillary administrator will redeliver to the Alien Property Custodian such portion of the money or other property so received by him as shall be distributable to any person not eligible as a claimant under subsection (a), (b), or (n) hereof."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: "nor shall a debt be allowed under this section unless notice of the claim has been filed, or application therefor has been made, prior to the date of the enactment of the settlement of war claims act of 1928."

(c) Subsection (g) of section 9 of the trading with the enemy act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The legal representative of a person, deceased, whose money or other property has been conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian or seized by him hereunder and held by him or by the Treasurer of the United States, may (if not entitled to proceed under subsection (d) of this section) proceed under subsection (a) for the recovery of any interest, right, or title in any such money or other property which has, by reason of the death of such person, become the interest, right, or title of a citizen of the United States, unless such citizenship was acquired through naturalization proceedings in which the declaration of intention was filed after November 11, 1918, or has become, prior to the enactment of the settlement of war claims act of 1928, the interest, right, or title of a person eligible as a claimant under subsection (a), (b), or (n) of this section. Such legal representative shall give a bond, in a penal sum and with sureties satisfactory to the President or the court, as the case may be, conditioned that he will redeliver to the Alien Property Custodian all such money or other property not distributed to such citizen or person so eligible, or, if deceased, to his heirs or legal representatives."

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members of the House, when Rome was mistress of the world and her nation the mightiest of its time it was the custom of every Roman citizen to carry upon his standard the three Latin words "Civis Romanus sum," "I am a Roman citizen," and woe indeed to that nation or to that race that would dare to desecrate the rights and privileges of Roman citizenship. Ancient Rome has fallen into the ashes of time. To-day the mightiest Nation of the world is America. In the hearts of every one of us there pulsates the paraphrase of the Roman sentiment "Civis Americanus sum," "I am an American citizen," which is the greatest heritage that can be bequeathed to us and which we in turn can hand down to the generations that are to be.

In this historic Hall, the great House of Representatives, is at the present time being enacted a great American drama. Ten years ago we declared war against the Imperial German Government, that symbolized autocracy, tyrannical monarchy, and imperialism. Arrayed against it were the forces of democracy, with liberty and freedom of opportunity. Democracy triumphed.

To-day we behold the magnanimous spirit of our beloved American Nation extending its hand of good fellowship to its great sister Republic of Germany.

The bitterness of war, hatred, and rancor has now disappeared and in its stead we find the great humanitarian heart and soul of America, desirous of doing justice to the nationals of Germany and the nationals of America who suffered untold hardships in the loss of life, limb, and property when they were caught in the whirlpool of war.

Through this bill that is being sponsored by the two great political parties, the Republican and the Democratic Parties, we are going to do justice to those whose cries for help have been unanswered during the last 10 years, during which time they have suffered from the confiscation of their properties and the destruction of life that is so near and dear to them.

It is a great privilege, indeed, for me to pay the tribute of my regard to that genial, generous, kind-hearted leader of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. GREEN of Iowa] for sponsoring this measure, in which he has been so ably assisted by that eloquent and venerable statesman from Ohio, Congressman

BURTON, reinforced by that militant, aggressive, and versatile legislator, Mr. CHINDBLOM, of Illinois. While from the great Democratic Party, to which I have the honor to belong, have been heard the earnest, sincere, and enlightened words of Congressman OLDFIELD, of Arkansas, in cooperation with the fiery sentiments expressed by my confrère, Mr. COLLIER, of Mississippi, as well as the scholarly opinion of Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas. Here we find the symbolization of true Americanism, as Republicans and Democrats have united and cooperated together to put through this bill to vindicate to the world that America entered this war not for conquest but for humanitarian ideals that would make the world safe for democracy. [Applause.]

Through the passage of this alien property bill we are not assisting the Imperial Government of Germany, but we are coming to the rescue of Germany that has given to the world such eminent names as Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Lessing, Kant, Schopenhauer, Erlich, Hahnemann, Wassermann, Koch, Einstein, Wagner, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Holbein, and Karl Marx, men whose names are famous in the rôles of science, art, literature, philosophy, medicine, economics, music, and painting. To the nation that has produced such wonderful scholars America is proud to welcome them in the forefront of the civilized nations of the world. [Applause.]

Another reason for my voting for this alien property bill, which provides for the settlement of claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the legitimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian and for an equitable apportionment among all claimants of funds due to them, is the fact that the Republic of Germany has treated its racial minorities with the most magnanimous, humane, tender, and sympathetic consideration. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues in the House, I hereby serve notice upon the membership of this historic body that when the claims of Hungary and Rumania shall come before this House I shall raise my voice in mighty protest not to grant to these nations any consideration from this great Republic of ours, because of the outrageous treatment that Rumania and Hungary are according its racial minorities, and shall arraign Hungary and Rumania before the bar of the public opinion and the conscience of our country as nations that are outlaws in the family of humanity and unworthy of any consideration, because of the inhuman and barbarous treatment they have accorded to the Jewish citizens of those nations.

In this the twentieth century of civilization the time has come when we Americans, liberty loving as we are, shall raise our voices, through the membership of this House, that religious intolerance and religious bigotry practiced through pogroms, massacres, and persecutions must cease. In the name of the people of the United States and in behalf of the fourteenth congressional district of New York, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, I demand that the Hungarian and Rumanian Governments grant equal political protection to all of its subjects under its jurisdiction and, above all, at once stop the barbarous and cruel treatment of innocent Jewish citizens and protect their life and property, in accordance with the covenants of existing treaties between the Kingdoms of Hungary and Rumania and the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks a resolution I have received from the Jewish Veterans of the Wars of the Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution adopted by national executive committee of the Jewish Veterans of Wars of the Republic at a special meeting held on December 18, 1927, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City

Whereas our good comrade, Hon. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH, has presented in the first session of the Seventieth Congress a resolution (H. J. Res. 91) calling upon President Calvin Coolidge to intercede in the name of humanity against the outrageous treatment of Rumanian minorities, and failing in that to bring about the abrogation of the treaties between the Empire of Rumania and the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the historical policy of the United States enunciated by that great American Secretary of State, John Hay, resulted in our abrogation of all treaty relations with the Russian Empire because of the barbarous brutalities under the régime of the late Czar: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the national executive committee of the Jewish Veterans of Wars of the Republic, whose muster rolls embrace the American sailors and soldiers of the Jewish faith who served under the colors of the Nation during the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, the Boxer uprising in China, and the World War, in special meeting assembled this 18th day of December, 1927, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, do most heartily commend our good comrade, Doctor SIROVICH, for his efforts to further the cause of humanity, and do therefore call upon him to make similar representations on behalf of the Hungarian minorities, who are to-day the victims of the same atrocious, barbarous, and inhuman treatment under the Hungarian Government; and be it further

Resolved, That we request our distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, to proceed immediately to collect the Rumanian and Hungarian debts to this country, which are now due or past due, and that we withdraw all credits from these barbaric countries until by their actions they prove themselves worthy of intercourse with civilized peoples; and therefore be it also

Resolved, That we send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senate of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. Section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(m) No money or other property shall be returned under paragraph (12), (13), (14), or (16) of subsection (b) or under subsection (n) unless the person entitled thereto files a written consent to a postponement of the return of an amount equal to 20 per cent of the aggregate value of such money or other property (at the time, as nearly as may be, of the return), as determined by the Alien Property Custodian, and the investment of such amount in accordance with the provisions of section 25. Such amount shall be deducted from the money to be returned to such person, so far as possible, and the balance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the sale (in accordance with the provisions of section 12) of so much of the property as may be necessary, unless such person pays the balance to the Alien Property Custodian, except that no property shall be so sold prior to the expiration of six years from the date of the enactment of the settlement of war claims act of 1928 without the consent of the person entitled thereto. The amounts so deducted shall be returned to the persons entitled thereto as provided in subsection (e) of section 25.

"(n) In the case of property consisting of stock or other interest in any corporation, association, company, or trust, or bonded, or other indebtedness thereof, evidenced by certificates of stock or by bonds or by other certificates of interest therein or indebtedness thereof, or consisting of dividends or interest or other accruals thereon, where the right, title, and interest in the property (but not the actual certificate or bond or other certificate of interest or indebtedness) was conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian, or seized by him, if the President determines that the owner thereof or of any interest therein has acquired such ownership by assignment, transfer, or sale of such certificate or bond or other certificate of interest or indebtedness (it being the intent of this subsection that such assignment, transfer, or sale shall not be deemed invalid hereunder by reason of such conveyance, transfer, assignment, delivery, or payment to the Alien Property Custodian or seizure by him) and that the written consent provided in subsection (m) has been filed, then the President may make in respect of such property an order of the same character, upon the same conditions, and with the same effect as in cases provided for in subsection (b), including the benefits of subsection (c).

"(o) The provisions of paragraph (12), (13), or (14) of subsection (b), or of subsection (m) or (n) of this section, and (except to the extent therein provided) the provisions of paragraph (16) of subsection (b), shall not be construed as diminishing or extinguishing any right under any other provision of this act in force immediately prior to the enactment of the settlement of war claims act of 1928.

"(p) If a person whose money or other property was conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian or seized by him hereunder, dies (or, in the case of a corporation, association, or partnership, if its existence has terminated) the Alien Property Custodian shall transfer the money or other property in the trust to trusts in the names of the persons (including the German Government and members of the former ruling family) who have succeeded to the claim or interest of such person; and the provisions of subsection (a) of this section relating to the collection of a debt (by order of the President or of a court) out of money or other property held by the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States shall be applicable to the debts of such successor and any such

debt may be collected out of the money or other property in any of such trusts if not returnable under subsection (a) or (g) of this section."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EATON: On page 32, line 9, after the figures "25" and before the period, insert the following: "or until all damages suffered and all expenditures made or incurred by any purchaser from the Alien Property Custodian in defending or establishing title to the property so purchased shall have been paid to such purchaser out of the proceeds of the sale of such property. The amount of such damage suffered and all expenditures made or incurred by such purchaser shall be determined by the arbiter upon evidence submitted to him and under such rules and regulations as the said arbiter shall prescribe."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have not taken any of your time in any discussion of this bill, but I now bring to your attention a matter of vital importance to many of our American taxpayers and business men. While I do not wish to interfere with the wave of sweetness and good will which is rolling over this august assemblage at the present time, I still feel we owe something to the American taxpayer, and I present to you a concrete illustration, which is better than any speech I can make, setting forth what I mean.

Before the war and for years since a great German institution has been conducting an industrial and financial business in Germany. Before the war they had a branch in this country, which did a great business here and throughout the world. The name of that firm is the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft. They actually did business under that name.

When the war came on their German business outside of Germany was shut down and the American branch carried it on. They did an enormous business in and with this country, with the Allies, and with others. Then we went into the war and their property in this country was seized and handed over to the Alien Property Custodian. He advertised for buyers; bids were made, and on September 12, 1918, an American company known as the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co., of Pennsylvania, purchased this property, its good will, its name, its patents, and its rights for $1,312,000 in cash. Then they started to do business, and as soon as the armistice was signed they were blocked at every point in this country and throughout the world by the original Koppel Co. in Germany.

Take one illustration: The American Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. sold $15,000 worth of car equipment in Mexico. Immediately the original German company appeared on the scene and got an injunction against them for using the name of Koppel in Mexico. The American company went through all the courts of that country and received a unanimous decision from the Mexican Supreme Court in their favor. That lawsuit cost them $20,000. Meanwhile, the company to whom they had agreed to deliver the goods sued them because they had not delivered the goods, so at the present time this American Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. has had to pay out over $50,000 to defend a right for which it paid $1,312,000 in cash.

The American Koppel Car & Industrial Equipment Co. received from the Alien Property Custodian in Washington, under date of February 19, 1921, a statement setting forth that they had bought the name, paid for it, and were entitled to the use of it. I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks this letter, which is not very long.

So I ask consideration of this amendment on the part of the House. Let us not forget that we are still in America, and that our American people still have some rights; and let us see to it that our vote here on this amendment will establish the right of giving to these people who have spent their good money in good faith for these properties some protection without being robbed continuously in the courts of the world.

This is the whole story. The American company has no recourse here. They can not enter suit in this country because the original Koppel company is in Germany and has no property here. So I ask you to consider my amendment as proper and necessary and fair, and I hope the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee will give heed to this request for relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting this short letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1921.*

KOPPEL INDUSTRIAL CAR & EQUIPMENT CO.,
Koppel, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: On September 12, 1918, the Alien Property Custodian sold to the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co., at public auction for $1,312,000, the property of Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengeselischaft, registered under the laws of Pennsylvania as a foreign corporation, and its subsidiaries, including the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co.

The deed and bill of sale is dated December 24, 1918, and conveyed inter alia all and singular the property, real and personal, tangible and intangible rights, claims, titles, interests, effects, and assets of every kind and description whatsoever of the said Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft and all incidents and appurtenances thereto, including the business as a going concern and the good will possessed, held, and enjoyed by, in the name of, or for, or on behalf of the companies whose properties were sold, and each of them.

The deed also conveyed "any and all registered trade-marks, trade names, and the like * * * belonging to, owned, possessed, held, used or enjoyed by, in the name of, or for, or on behalf of, the said companies and concerns, and each and all of them."

By your letter of February 17, 1921, to me it has been called to my attention that proceedings have been brought against the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. by the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft, or its agents, interfering with or to restrain in certain foreign countries, including Mexico and the Argentine Republic, your use of the word "Koppel," not only as your trade name or trade-mark, but as part of your trade name or trade-mark.

As requested in your letter of the 17th instant, I wish to assure you—

(1) That it is the judgment of the Alien Property Custodian that the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co., under its deed of conveyance from the Alien Property Custodian, acquired the right to use in foreign countries the trade name and trade-mark "Koppel" and any other trade-marks, registered and/or unregistered, used by the American business of the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft and the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co., an American subsidiary of the German company, in the same way and to the same extent as had been or was enjoyed by the American business of the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft and by the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co., an American subsidiary of the German company, as evidenced by shipments made by either of them from the United States to foreign countries prior to the war between the United States and Germany.

(2) That it is the judgment of the Alien Property Custodian that the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft should be required, before any of the proceeds of the sale of its property by the Alien Property Custodian are returned to it or to any one in its behalf.

(3) To acknowledge, in writing, to the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. and the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co. their right to use in foreign countries the trade name and trade-mark "Koppel" and other trade-marks and trade names, registered and/or unregistered, of the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft to the same extent as was enjoyed by the American business of the Germany company and by the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co. at the time they were sold to the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. by the Alien Property Custodian, as evidenced by shipments made by the American business of the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft and by the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co. from the United States to foreign countries prior to the war between the United States and Germany, and to this end to execute and deliver to the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. such instruments properly legalized and in such form as for this purpose may be required by the laws of the various foreign countries.

(b) To reimburse the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. its reasonable expenses expended protecting its rights and in defending in foreign countries suits and proceedings brought or instituted against it and/or the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co. in foreign countries by the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft to restrain and/or prevent and/or interfering with the use and enjoyment by the Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Co. and/or the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co. of the trade-marks and trade names used and enjoyed by the American business of the Orenstein & Koppel-Arthur Koppel Aktiengesellschaft and the Pennsylvania Car & Manufacturing Co. prior to the war between the United States and Germany.

I have executed this letter in duplicate and have attached one copy to the trust file in this case. I may further add that I have discussed this matter with Attorney General Palmer, formerly Alien Property Custodian when this sale was made, and he is in accord and indorses these findings.

Yours truly,

(Signed) FRANCIS P. GARVAN,
Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would not make this point of order if I thought this claim was meritorious. People sometimes buy lawsuits. These people got just exactly what they contracted for, and they got into some trouble as a result of it. We gave the matter careful consideration in the committee.

I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not germane to the bill in any respect. This is a bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States and the ultimate return of German property. In short, it is a bill for the payment of American claims and of German claims which are specially provided for in the bill. The amendment is for the payment of some damages by the Alien Property Custodian, which are claimed to have been suffered by some parties after they came in possession of some property sold by the Alien Property Custodian. I think the amendment is not germane to anything in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel competent to discuss a point of order against the distinguished judge and lawyer from Iowa, Mr. GREEN. I do not know whether this amendment is germane, but I know one thing—it is not German; it is American. [Laughter.] Whether we are going to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel remains for this House to decide. What I want is to see these American people who spent their good money and bought a thing in good faith, guaranteed by the custodian, get a square deal, and I hope the gentleman will not be so meticulous in his objections as to make it impossible to extend relief even to American citizens at this time of good will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I regret I shall have to insist on my point of order. These gentlemen bought at a small price very valuable property and came off well enough.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The amendment, it seems to the Chair, attempts to bring into consideration an entirely new subject. The amendment covers the rights of purchasers. The bill has to do with the rights of German claimants or American claimants only, whose property has been damaged or seized. It seems to the Chair the amendment comes within the rule relating to germaneness, which provides that an amendment should not embrace a subject foreign to the bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. LUCE. I move to strike out the last word in order to inquire of the chairman or some other member of the committee in regard to paragraph (m) on page 32, and to ask if this paragraph contemplates a contingency under which some or all of 20 per cent will not eventually be returned to the German nationals. Is the postponement of the payment of 20 per cent made in contemplation of such a contingency?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; the expectation is it will all be returned.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman speaks of an expectation——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We think it is a fairly reasonable certainty that it will be returned.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The reason for the retention of the 20 per cent is to make possible the scheme of payment involved here; or to be precise, in order to create the special deposit fund out of which the smaller claims may be immediately paid.

Mr. LUCE. That I had gathered from reading the report and from the debate.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This particular paragraph is placed in here to put all German claimants upon a parity so that all of them will contribute the 20 per cent to the special deposit fund and all will be subject to the postponement of the 20 per cent.

Mr. LUCE. I still find myself unable to be in position to explain to my constituents why 20 per cent is retained, and I would return to my original question. Is there in contemplation any contingency under which the whole 20 per cent will not ultimately be returned?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There is not.

Mr. LUCE. Then why do you retain it, if there is no such contingency in sight?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In order to provide an immediate fund out of which the smaller claimants, both German nationals and American nationals, may be paid at once. The larger claims of both German and American nationals will ultimately be paid as well, but their payment will be deferred in order to make possible the application of payments under the Dawes plan into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LUCE. Has the committee any computation indicating how long it is likely to be before that 20 per cent may be returned?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. At the end of the report there is a computation of 25 years for the payment of all claims, both German and American.

Mr. LUCE. Then it is possible this 20 per cent may be held for 25 years?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A small portion of it.

Mr. LUCE. Does the committee think it of importance to carry the more trifling amounts of this sort over that period?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The payment of all of these claims depends on the creation of the special deposit fund. You can not make fish of some and fowl of others.

Mr. LUCE. How am I going to be able to explain to my constituents when I get back home why we are holding back any of this money, why we take it back from these claimants, instead of taking it out of the Treasury as an advance?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will make the same reply as I did to the gentleman from Georgia. I myself would prefer to have all German property returned immediately, but it can not be done. You can not pass that kind of a bill. I invited the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] to offer a motion to recommit and test the temper of the House. We are satisfied that it can not be done, and so are the parties in interest here, nearly all of whom have consented to this arrangement.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. The trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"SEC. 26. (a) The Alien Property Custodian shall allocate among the various trusts the funds in the 'unallocated interest fund' (as defined in section 28). Such allocation shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be based upon the average rate of earnings (determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) on the total amounts deposited under section 12.

"(b) The Alien Property Custodian, when the allocation has been made, is authorized and directed to pay to persons entitled, in accordance with a final decision of a court of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or of an opinion of the Attorney General, to the distribution of any portion of such unallocated interest fund, the amount allocated to his trust.

"(c) In the case of persons entitled, under paragraph (12), (13), (14), or (16) of subsection (b) of section 9, to such return, and in the case of persons who would be entitled to such return thereunder if all such money or property had not been returned under paragraph (9) or (10) of such subsection, and in the case of persons entitled to such return under subsection (n) of section 9, an amount equal to the aggregate amount allocated to their trusts shall be credited against the sum of $25,000,000 invested in participating certificates under paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 25. If the aggregate amount so allocated is in excess of $25,000,000, an amount equal to the excess shall be invested in the same manner. Upon the repayment of any of the amounts so invested, under the provisions of section 5 of the settlement of war claims act of 1928, the amount so repaid shall be distributed pro rata among such persons, notwithstanding any receipts or releases given by them.

"(d) In the case of any other enemy or ally of enemy entitled to such return, the Alien Property Custodian shall deposit the amount allocated to his trust in the Treasury in the name of such person until otherwise directed by Congress.

"(e) The payment provided for in subsection (a), the investment provided for in subsection (c), and the deposit provided for in subsection (d), shall be made out of the unallocated interest fund.

"SEC. 27. The Alien Property Custodian is authorized and directed to return to the United States any consideration paid to him by the United States under any license, assignment, or sale by the Alien Property Custodian to the United States of any patent (or any right therein or claim thereto, and including an application therefor and any patent issued pursuant to any such application).

"SEC. 28. As used in this act, the term 'unallocated interest fund' means the sum of (1) the earnings and profits accumulated prior to March 4, 1923, and attributable to investments and reinvestments under

section 12 by the Secretary of the Treasury, plus (2) the earnings and profits accumulated on or after March 4, 1923, in respect of the earnings and profits referred to in clause (1) of this section.

"SEC. 29. (a) Where the Alien Property Custodian has made demand or requirement for the conveyance, transfer, assignment, delivery, or payment to him of any money or other property of any enemy or ally of enemy (whether or not suit or proceeding for the enforcement thereof has been begun and whether or not any judgment or decree in respect thereof has been made or entered) and where the whole or any part of such money or other property would, if conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to him, be returnable under paragraph (12), (13), (14), or (16) of subsection (b) of section 9, the Alien Property Custodian may, in his discretion, and on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, waive such demand or requirement, or accept in full satisfaction of such demand, requirement, judgment, or decree, a less amount than that demanded or required by him.

"(b) The Alien Property Custodian shall not make any such waiver or compromise unless, after compliance with the terms and conditions thereof, he or the Treasurer of the United States will hold (in respect of such enemy or ally of enemy) for investment as provided in section 25 an amount equal to 20 per cent of the sum of (1) the value of the money or other property held by the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States at the time of such waiver or compromise, plus (2) the value of the money or other property to which the Alien Property Custodian would be entitled under such demand or requirement if the waiver or compromise had not been made."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, line 6, after the period, insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 14. SEC. 22. No person shall be entitled to the return of any property or money under any provisions of this act, or any amendment of this act, who is a fugitive from justice of the United States or any State or Territory thereof or the District of Columbia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent the return under the provisions of this bill of any money or property to Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, who is a fugitive from justice and a notorious draft evader.

I am authorized to state that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think that the amendment is necessary, but I see no objection to it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that while many Members of the House do not think that the amendment is necessary, yet it has been deemed necessary to incorporate in this bill in subparagraph (o) to section 12 a provision preserving the rights of the Government and of individual claimants under existing laws notwithstanding the provisions of this bill.

The trading with the enemy act, section 22, as amended by the Winslow Act in 1923, prohibited the delivery under the provisions of this act of property or the return of property to those who are fugitives from justice. This bill creates additional classes who are entitled to the return of their property, but there is no specific inhibition in the bill against the return of such property to those who may be fugitives from justice.

If the amendment is necessary, we ought not to have any opposition to it. If it is of doubtful necessity, then it ought to be adopted, for surely no Member of this House desires to vote for the return of several hundred thousand dollars of property to this notorious draft dodger.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's same amendment was adopted last year and put in the bill, was it not?

Mr. RAINEY. No. I offered the amendment but it was not adopted, the contention being that the trading with the enemy act covered it.

Mr. BLANTON. It was then admitted here by the committee to be sound, even though it was not adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETURN OF INCOME

SEC. 14. Section 23 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) In the case of any person entitled to the return of money or other property under the provisions of paragraph (12), (13), (14), or (16) of subsection (b) of section 9, the amount of net income, dividends, interest, annuities, or other earnings accrued and collected after March 4, 1923, and prior to the date of the enactment of the settlement of war claims act of 1928, which has not been paid under subsection (a) of this section by reason of the $10,000 limitation therein, shall be returnable to such persons under and subject to the conditions of such paragraph (12), (13), (14), or (16); and any net income, dividend, interest, annuity, or other earnings accruing and collected on and after the date of the settlement of war claims act of 1928 shall be paid to such persons under subsection (a) of this section without regard to such $10,000 limitation."

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures in line 26. What is the purpose of this section?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I am about to offer an amendment striking out practically all of this section, and I think that my explanation of that amendment will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. NEWTON. Very well.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETURN OF INCOME

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 38, line 9, beginning with the word "by," strike out through line 26 and insert in lieu thereof the following, to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The Alien Property Custodian is directed to pay to the person entitled thereto, from and after the time this section takes effect, the net income, dividend, interest, annuity, or other earnings, accruing and collected thereafter, on any property or money held in trust for such person by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States for the account of the Alien Property Custodian, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, which is agreed to by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], is to remove from the 80 per cent provision all of the income that may hereafter be received on the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. In other words, from the time of the passage of this bill, if it is passed, the Alien Property Custodian will turn over all of the net income, dividends, interest, or other annuity on the property in his hands. At present it has been subject to the $10,000 limitation. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] that that is the way that figure came in in the paragraph as it stood, and under the other provisions of the bill it would be subject to the 80 per cent limitation.

Mr. NEWTON. And this restores it to about where it was a year ago when the bill went over to the Senate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think that is correct.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does that mean that we are going to continue the office of Alien Property Custodian in that department indefinitely?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; we will get rid of all this property eventually.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But I refer to the custodian and the bureau.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It has to be continued until this property has been turned over, but that should not be long.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCOME TAX

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 38, after line 26, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 15. Section 24 of the trading with the enemy act is amended by inserting '(a)' after the section number and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(b) In the case of income, war profits, excess profits, or estate taxes imposed by any act of Congress, the amount thereof shall be computed in the same manner as though the money or other property had not been seized by or paid to the Alien Property Custodian, and shall be paid, as far as practicable, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.'"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply to clear up a doubt and protect the Government in the matter of taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We are approaching the end of this bill. In fact, we

have completed the bill, except the definition section, and at this time I rise to put into the RECORD a brief statement of the unfortunate circumstances due to the inexcusable bungling of this administration and of the last administration which has made necessary this bill, with its unfortunate provisions.

In 1918 the war ended with the armistice. In 1919, 25 nations participated in the treaty of Versailles, including the United States and China. Every one of those nations signed the treaty of Versailles. It was not ratified by two of them. The United States and China did not ratify that treaty.

In 1921 under the Harding administration, anxious to obtain all the benefits for the United States of the treaty of Versailles without assuming any of its obligations, we entered into the treaty of Berlin, and the treaty of Berlin is not worth the paper it is written on. We are finding that out now. In 1922, although we had already entered into the treaty of Berlin, Mr. Hughes, then Secretary of State, delivered his address in New Haven, Conn., in which he said, among other things:

> We are not seeking reparations. We are, indeed, asking for the reimbursement of the costs of our army of occupation. Others have been paid and we have not been paid, but we are not seeking general reparations. We are bearing our own burdens, and through our loans a large part of Europe's burden in addition. No demands of ours stand in the way of the reparations question.

Then afterward, when the old commission on reparations was functioning, from this administration came the suggestion of the appointment of a committee of experts, known afterward as the Dawes committee. We did not realize until then the situation in which we found ourselves. We could not get a dollar under our treaty of Berlin with Germany. The other nations in signing up the treaty of Versailles, 23 of them altogether, had obtained by that treaty and through the Reparations Commission a first mortgage on all the revenues of the German Government, and the second mortgage that we got under the treaty of Berlin was not worth the paper it was written on. Then followed the unfortunate speech of Mr. Hughes in New Haven in 1922.

In 1925, even this administration blundering along as it did during the year following its accession to power through the elections of 1920, commenced to realize that we had to get something out of the Reparations Commission. Bear in mind the Reparation Commission was appointed as a result of the treaty of Versailles, which we would not sign.

The Reparation Commission is also in fact a subsidiary of the League of Nations, with which we pretend to have nothing whatever to do. We say we are avoiding entangling alliances. But, however, in our public policies we are encouraging and indorsing loans to nations until we have now loaned them, I do not know how many billions of dollars, but a tremendous amount, until we are making entangling alliances absolutely inevitable. But in 1925 after the blistering exchange of notes between Mr. Hughes and Mr. Chamberlain, embraced in the Senate document which I think is not now a secret document, although it was a year ago, in which Mr. Chamberlain called attention to his New Haven speech, we were permitted humbly and with bended knees to crawl into the conference at London of the Reparation Commission and they threw us this pittance of 2¼ per cent reparation under which they expect to commence collecting next year $625,000,000 a year. In the interval which elapsed between the armistice and the treaty of Versailles and the London conference—six years—the other nations which entered into the reparation arrangements succeeded in collecting from Germany revenues amounting to $1,280,000,000. We did not get a cent of that amount. We are now accepting Germany's promise to pay $13,000,000 on the amount each year, and so far for a year she has been able to pay it, and then we are expecting $10,700,000 a year from the Reparations Commission, a creation under the Versailles treaty and really subsidiary of the League of Nations. This is the blundering arrangement into which we have been forced by this administration and the last administration which makes it necessary for those of us who want now to return this German property to vote for this bill as it is.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. In a moment. We lost $170,0000,000 of interest alone on account of the blundering of these two administrations in the matter of reparation payments alone, and we have endangered the entire amount we may expect to obtain from Germany these next 25 years. The amount we are expecting to be paid under this bill will not be paid in 25 years if she keeps up these payments. That is the situation in which we find ourselves and which makes it necessary for Democrats on this side of the House who regret the bad things in this bill to vote for it. We are helping you get out of the blunders you have been making during the last two administrations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish, first, to ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may have leave to correct section numbers and references thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> On page 39, lines 11 to 12, strike out the words "partnership, association, or corporation" and insert in lieu thereof "partnership or association."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have not risen to discuss this amendment, which is simply a perfecting amendment to which, I think, no one has any objection nor have I any desire to discuss the diplomatic history of the last 10 years which has been referred to by the gentleman from Illinois. It is true that possibly we could have obtained better terms from Germany if we had cared to plunge this Nation into the struggles and conflicts which now harass Europe. We have kept out of that, and I am glad we have, and in the long run we will be better off, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Illinois says.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield in that connection, all in the world we would have had to do was to have kept in touch with the Reparations Commission in collecting these debts and we would have kept entirely aloof from the political side of the question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is in error. We had removed our Army from Europe. We had no opportunity to compel anything in the way of reparations, whereas the other nations were still holding Germany under their control. They had their feet on the neck of the German nation, and they could control these reparations absolutely. The only way we could have an award other than what the Allies were willing to grant us with reference to these reparations was by sending an army over there to fight for it. We did not do it, and it is well we did not.

But I did not want to discuss that matter. I only wanted to express my thanks to the Members of the House for the cooperation they have given on the bill in making such rapid progress we have had to-day.

This bill marks a distinct step in the course of nations. Alone and solitary among all the victors in the great struggle of the war, we are willing to turn back the property that came into our hands. No other nation has offered to pay back even so much as a penny of the property they seized. We alone have taken our stand upon this high principle, which we expect to enforce and will continue to uphold. [Applause.]

Now, there are some who would like to pay the Germans at once for all their property taken. I sympathize with them to some extent in that theory, but this would make necessary an appropriation out of the American Treasury for the purpose of paying the American claims. A bill of that kind can not be passed through this House and can not be got through the Senate. A bill that makes the German claims superior to the American claims has no chance of passage; neither could we get through a bill that puts the American claims superior to the German claims. All we have done in this bill is to put all of them on an equality, as nearly as possible. Under this bill we pay 80 per cent of the German claims and almost that amount of the American claims. The claims that received our special attention were the claims of people who are suffering and in want, and we believed that they should be paid at once. As a result the larger claims are deferred, but those are all of companies that can spare the money for the time being. They will get interest on their claims and they are all desirous that this bill be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Before the gentleman proceeds in his general remarks I would like to ask him what is the effect of his amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The effect of the amendment is simply to include "partnership or association."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Or corporations?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; corporations. It is simply a perfecting amendment.

Mr. Chairman, among the claimants on both sides are people who are actually praying that this bill be passed. We have held this money for nearly 10 years. It still lies in the Treasury. If action is longer delayed it may be years more before action is taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Out of what funds is the interest on the unpaid accounts to be drawn?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is drawn from various funds. As shown by the report, part of it is from payments on the reparation funds.

Mr. MADDEN. Are there means by which the interest is earned?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There are some funds out of which the interest on these claims will be paid.

Mr. MADDEN. What funds? I was not here during all the debate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The fund was created, first, by taking 20 per cent of the value of the German property; and, second, the unallocated interest; and, third, $25,000,000 of German money, appropriated for payments on the ships, patents, and radio stations, and the money received on reparation payments. Altogether this amounts to $113,000,000. Of course the German property is only temporarily retained.

We make no appropriations except to pay for the ships, radio stations, and patents. The American taxpayer is out nothing except for the past debts of the Government. The bill is fair and just as between the American claimants on one side and the German claimants on the other, and should pass by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds, had directed him to report the same back to the House with certain amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 223, noes 26.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. GREEN of Iowa, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 5800. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 21, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, December 21, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(9 a. m.)

Interior Department appropriation bill.

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Rear Admiral Magruder.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5658. A bill allowing the rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army, to the medical officer assigned to duty as personal physician to the President; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 280. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5547. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, or its assigns, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Missouri and Kansas; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6041. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Allegheny River; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6045. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to replace and repair a bridge across the Mahoning River at South Avenue, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5500. A bill to establish a national military park at the battle field of Fort Donelson, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6990. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at Pacific Branch, Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. QUIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7007. A bill prescribing the Army ration; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. J. Res. 93. A joint resolution for the appointment of Paul E. Divine, of Tennessee, as member of the Board of Managers of the National

Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 519. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Ritcherdson; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Michael Patrick Sullivan; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of James K. P. Welch; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of James C. Simmons, alias James C. Whitlock; with amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2422. A bill to correct the military record of Jordan Kidwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2526. A bill for the relief of William Perkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of J. W. La Bare; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2649. A bill authorizing the President to reappoint John P. Pence, formerly an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army, an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3145. A bill for the relief of Willis B. Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3315. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Black, alias Angus Black; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of John M. Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of George Caldwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3730. A bill for the relief of Rebecca R. Sevier; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5065. A bill for the relief of James M. Winston; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5224. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6431. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Easterly; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6432. A bill for the relief of James E. Moyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6389. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pelfrey; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Alexander Boynton; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6832) granting a pension to Creed F. Casteel; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8104) for the organization and regulation of cooperative, nonprofit life benefit associations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 8105) to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors, United States Military Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8106) granting the consent of Congress to F. C. Barnhill, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8107) granting the consent of Congress to Frank M. Burruss, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 8108) amending section 118 of the Judicial Code, as amended, being section 213 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 8109) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument on the site of the battle between Nez Perces Indians under Chief Joseph and the command of Nelson A. Miles; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8110) withdrawing from entry the northwest quarter section 12, township 30 north, range 19 east, Montana meridian; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8111) to provide for an inventory of the water resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8112) to limit the period for which an officer appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate may hold over after his term shall have expired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 8113) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women," approved September 22, 1922; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8114) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Sparks, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8115) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Ruth, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8116) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Lovelock, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8117) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Elko, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8118) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Gardnerville, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8119) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal Building at Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Yerington, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8121) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Ely, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8122) to authorize the remodeling of the building occupied by the United States mint and assay office at Carson City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8123) to amend the pension laws with reference to the terms of service of persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8124) to establish and reopen the United States land office at Elko, Nev.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BERGER: A bill (H. R. 8125) to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the transportation therein of persons employed as private detectives, private police, or private guards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 8126) to repeal the last proviso of section 7 of "An act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska," approved February 26, 1917; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 8127) to provide for the transfer to the Department of the Interior of the public works functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 8128) to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 8129) to amend an act of Congress approved March 4, 1927 (Public No. 795, 69th Cong.), to provide for appointment as warrant officers of the Regular Army of such persons as would have been eligible therefor but for the interruption of their status, caused by military service rendered by them as commissioned officers during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 8130) authorizing the creation of game refuges on the Ouachita National Forest in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 8131) to establish the Federal alcoholic liquor board in the Department of Agriculture to aid in putting the agricultural industry on sound commercial basis by providing incentives to crop diversification and a market for surplus farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 8132) authorizing the appropriation of $2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Medicine Lodge, Kans., to commemorate the holding of the Indian peace council, at which treaties were made with the Plains Indians in October, 1867; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8133) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLEY: A bill (H. R. 8134) to promote temperance in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8135) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 8136) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8137) to promote temperance in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 8138) to promote temperance in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8139) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8140) for the erection of public building at Winnsboro, Wood County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 8141) authorizing additional employees for the Federal Power Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 8142) authorizing the transportation of all miscellaneous refuse collected in the District of Columbia to the workhouse or reformatory tract near Occoquan, Va., and its disposition at that place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 8143) to provide adequate compensation and treatment for veterans having a tubercular disease; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8144) to amend the national prohibition act to permit the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, or exportation of beverages which are not in fact intoxicating as determined in accordance with the laws of the respective States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8145) to amend Title III of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8146) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a hard-surfaced road across Fort Sill (Okla.) Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 8147) to provide for the retirement of Army officers after 35 years' service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8148) to provide for the transfer from the active list of the Army of promotion-list colonels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8149) to combine the limited and unlimited retired lists of the Army into one list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8150) to provide for a system of examinations for promotion of officers of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8151) to define the promotion-list officers of the Army and to prescribe the method of their promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8152) to provide for the selection and appointment of chiefs and assistant chiefs of branches of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8153) to prescribe the compensation of officers of the Army who are separated from the active list because of their classification in class B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8154) to provide for the final classification of officers of the Army who are placed in class B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8155) to provide for a general personnel board for the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8156) to provide for voluntary transfer from the active list of the Army of promotion-list officers appointed on or before July 1, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8157) to authorize the President to fix the percentages of enlisted men of the Army in the sixth and seventh grades, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8158) to provide for retirement of officers of the Army who have had 40 years' service or are 60 years old, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8159) to remove restrictions regarding freedom of retired Army officers to accept employment or civil office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8160) to provide for the transfer from the promotion list of the Army a sufficient number of officers to make the total separations for each year equal to 4 per cent of the whole number of the promotion-list officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 13) requiring scientific study of values and relative values by the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SEGER: Resolution (H. Res. 64) directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to the House of Representatives information concerning the disasters happened to underseas crafts of the United States Navy since 1918; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolution (H. Res. 65) for the appointment of a special committee, composed of seven Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker, to inquire into the construction of submarines, their number and condition, with particular reference to the installation of safety devices and facilities for the raising and salvage of submarines in case of disaster; also to investigate the sinking of the United States submarine *S–51* and the United States submarine *S–4*, and the advisability of constructing for the United States Navy suitable salvage vessels such as are in use in foreign navies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 66) requesting the Secretary of the Department of the Navy to make certain recommendations to the Congress with reference to the desirability of securing and allocating to strategic points equipment to meet emergencies which may arise in connection with the activity of underwater craft; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, praying enactment of legislation for the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the late World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8161) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kille; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 8162) to authorize the appointment of Roger Williams Autry as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8163) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 8164) granting an increase of pension to Maria Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8165) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 8166) granting a pension to Frank P. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8167) granting a pension to Frank H. Winter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8168) granting a pension to Thomas Regan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 8169) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8170) granting an increase of pension to California Thickston Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8171) granting a pension to Fanny Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) for the relief of Daniel D. Swick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 8174) for the relief of Philo Allcott, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 8175) for the relief of William J. McKenna; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8176) granting an increase of pension to Hortense J. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8177) granting an increase of pension to Malissa F. Stayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 8178) to provide for an examination and survey of Blackwater Creek, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) granting an increase of pension to Fanny L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8180) for the relief of May L. Marshall; administratrix of the estate of Jerry A. Litchfield, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8181) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States to William Rosenberg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 8182) granting a pension to Emma G. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8183) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Dawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 8184) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 8185) for the relief of the Great Western Power Co. of San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 8186) granting a pension to Sadie A. Foss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Leavitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8188) for the relief of Gilpin Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 8189) granting an increase of pension to Melissa E. Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8190) for the relief of John G. Cassidy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 8191) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8192) granting a pension to Elsie Ann Tyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8193) granting a pension to Emma Fahnle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 8194) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Lida Loten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Ruth J. Sorrells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) granting a pension to David Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) granting a pension to Margaret Wohlgemuth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) for the relief of Esther M. Roebken; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) for the relief of Mary L. Roebken; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8202), granting a pension to Jacob Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 8203) granting a pension to Jennie Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8204) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8205) granting a pension to Benjamin Bothwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8206) granting a pension to John Maley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8207) granting a pension to Elizabeth Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8208) for the relief of Lamirah F. Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8209) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) granting an increase of pension to Annie Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8211) granting a pension to Margaret Drummond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8212) for the relief of Andrew J. Irwin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 8213) for the relief of David I. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8214) granting a pension to Mary W. D. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8215) granting a pension to Catherine A. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8216) to confer authority on the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to permit J. L. Sink, a bankrupt, to file his application for discharge and to authorize and empower the judge of said court to hear and determine the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8218) for the relief of James Higdon; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

327. Petition of Philadelphia Advisory Council, United Spanish War Veterans, protesting condition of lack of enforcement, as in intent by law, and petitioning favorable legislation to secure veteran preference in Government service to the men and women of the various wars; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

328. By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of citizens of Waushara County, Wis., opposing House bill 78, and against all compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

329. Also, petition of citizens of Marathon County, Wis., opposing House bill 78, and against all compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

330. Also, petition of citizens of Marathon County, Wis., opposing House bill 78, and against all compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

331. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of J. W. Beach and other citizens of Hildebran, N. C., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill, and more particularly the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

332. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the California Wool Growers' Association, praying for an increased appropriation for

predatory animal control work in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

333. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Russell, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for the observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

334. Also, petition of sundry residents of West Middlesex, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of legislation providing for the compulsory observance of Sunday, etc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

335. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation by citizens of Clinton, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

336. Also, petition of citizens of Clinton, Mo., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

337. Also, petition protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation by citizens of Kingsville, Mo., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

338. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 73 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of Sunday compulsory observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

339. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 988 citizens of the Northwest; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

340. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Central Council, Irish County Clubs of Massachusetts, Joseph P. Mohan, president, Hibernian Building, Boston, Mass., protesting against the national origins clause in the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

341. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Cameron County, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

342. Also, petition of citizens of Santa Maria, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

343. Also, petition of citizens of Weslaco, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

344. By Mr. HOGG: Petition of the Quest Club, composed of business executives and professional men of the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., asking Congress to proceed without delay to consider and adopt ways and means to provide flood prevention along the Mississippi River Valley; to the Committee on Foreign Commerce.

345. By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: Petition of the Gyro Club, of the city of Rochester, N. Y., to provide adequate and proper housing for its officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

346. By Mr. JENKINS: Two petitions signed by adult citizens of Jackson County, Ohio, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

347. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of citizens of approximately 25 counties of southeast Texas, urging that the Bureau of Entomology of the United States Department of Agriculture be provided with sufficient funds to control and eradicate the sugar-cane borer and sugar-cane beetle, and that Congress make an immediate appropriation to meet the emergency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

348. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 475 residents of Van Buren County, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

349. Also, petition of 272 residents of Otsego, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

350. Also, petition of 97 residents of Buchanan, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

351. Also, petition of 49 residents of Moorepark, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

352. Also, petition of 77 residents of Plainwell, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

353. Also, petition of 67 residents of Douglas, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

354. Also, petition of J. F. Babcock and 138 other residents of Mendon, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

355. Also, petition of Mrs. Agnes Crawford and 11 other residents of Benton Harbor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

356. Also, petition of 66 residents of Niles, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

357. Also, petition of William Heims and 92 other residents of Buchanan, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

358. Also, petition of G. W. Sowler and 643 other residents of Allegan County, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

359. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the location of a municipal airport in the Jamaica Bay district of the city of New York, where the city already owns sufficient acreage for such purpose and can quickly develop an airport of proper size at a minimum of expense; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

360. By Mr. KORELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

361. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., protesting against the passage of so-called Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

362. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and Washtenaw Counties, Mich., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

363. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill, signed by 111 citizens of Jameson, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

364. Also, petition protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill, signed by citizens of Cameron, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

365. By Mr. MOREHEAD: Petition of residents of Weeping Water, in the State of Nebraska, protesting against House bill 78 or any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

366. By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition signed by Rev. H. W. Peake, of Madison, Wis., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

367. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the location of a municipal airport in the Jamaica Bay district, in the city of New York; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

368. By Mr. STEELE: Petition of 616 citizens of Atlanta and Fulton Counties, Ga., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

369. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Fort Jennings, Ohio, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

370. By Mr. WINTER: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, from residents of Sheridan, Lovell, Dubois, Passaic, Wyoming, and Quietus, Mont.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, *December 21, 1927*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

O Father of mercies and God of all comfort our only help in time of need: Who spakest unto Thy children in the olden time saying, "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire thou shall not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee."

Look with pity, we humbly beseech Thee, upon the sorrows of all Thy children and especially the family, loved ones, and friends of him whom Thou hast tenderly called to Thy side. Grant that his life, so fruitful here, may unfold itself in Thy sight and find sweet employment in the spacious fields of eternity.

And now Lord support us all the day long of this troublous life until the shadows lengthen, and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. Then in Thy mercy grant us a safe lodging, a holy rest and peace at the last. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220);

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 48. An act to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes;

H. R. 164. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at the Pacific Branch, Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 193. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 278. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926;

H. R. 349. An act to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 444. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.;

H. R. 483. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings;

H. R. 5582. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street in the city of El Paso crosses the Rio Grande, in the county of El Paso, State of Texas;

H. R. 5628. An act to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River;

H. R. 5642. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Red River at Fulton, Ark.;

H. R. 6053. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.;

H. R. 6479. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.;

H. R. 6657. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.;

H. R. 7201. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds; and

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220);

H. R. 5800. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

DEATH OF SENATOR ANDRIEUS A. JONES

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to advise the Members of this body that my colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico departed this life last night.

In the passage of Senator JONES the people of his State, and my State, have lost a citizen who has been respected, trusted, admired, and loved through the years. The Government as a whole has lost a valuable citizen, and this body has been deprived of a distinguished, painstaking, and faithful Member. I give notice that at some future time I shall ask that a day be set aside for appropriate services in his memory.

Mr. President, with this feeling I propose the following resolutions, which I ask may be read and adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 89) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, late a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed under the second resolution as the committee Mr. BRATTON, Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. KING, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ODDIE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHORTRIDGE, and Mr. JONES of Washington.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution and ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) adjourned, the adjournment being, under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, until Wednesday, January 4, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, *December 21, 1927*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are now in the foreglow of a skylight overhead. The ancient message is to be glorified, and the old earth is to receive the fulfillment of its dreams. We therefore praise Thee. We shall soon hear the melody bursting forth from the union of heaven and earth saying, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth good will and peace toward men." May the richest blessing of the advent bring cheer and happiness to all our homes. Fill all our firesides with health and gladness like the glow of a sympathetic sunlight. Oh, especially remember the separated loved ones. Lord God of nations, bless our native land. May Thine altars be set up in high places; may Thy banners of righteousness, justice, and truth be unfurled in our skies, and may hate die down like the voice of an angry sea. Oh, let the high standards of charity and brotherly love prevail to the remotest sections of our fair land. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 89

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, late a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take orders for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolution the Vice President appointed Mr. BRATTON, Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. KING, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ODDIE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHORTRIDGE, and Mr. JONES of Washington members of the committee to superintend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes, and following that I ask unanimous consent that the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines, Mr. GUEVARA, may address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes, following which unanimous consent is asked for the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAY OF FEDERAL AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 117) which I send to the desk.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may we have the resolution reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia who come within the provisions of the Executive order making Saturday, December 24, 1927, a holiday shall be entitled to pay for said holiday the same as on other days.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to extend such holiday provisions under unanimous consent, and I object. It is a matter that ought to come up in the regular way.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; but I am going to object. This ought to go to the committee and be considered there.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It has already been considered by a committee and reported upon.

Mr. BLANTON. It ought to be considered by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. We ought to have a chance to look into the matter and see how far-reaching it is.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Let me explain the situation. Under existing law, whenever a holiday is declared by the President, most Government employees receive pay as for any other day; and as to 94 per cent of the employees in the District, embracing about 60,000, they are already covered by existing law. The only ones not covered by law are the employees in the Washington Navy Yard, numbering 3,488, and employees in the Naval Observatory, of whom there are 18. Everybody will be paid for Saturday except those in the navy yard and in the Naval Observatory.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the other 500,000 employees of the United States Government scattered all over the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. They are not covered by the President's proclamation.

Mr. BLANTON. They are not covered?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. They are not covered by the proclamation.

Mr. BLANTON. Why are they not entitled to the same consideration as the ones which the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. They are covered by existing law with respect to holidays that may be declared by the President.

Mr. BLANTON. But the President has forgotten them in his proclamation here in behalf of certain ones who actually live in the District of Columbia. I am thinking of all of them. We must treat them all alike.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It seems to me that in all fairness the people in the navy yard and the Naval Observatory ought to be put on exactly the same plane as other District and Federal employees.

Mr. BLANTON. Whenever the President can treat the ones scattered all over the United States on the same basis I shall not object; but until then I object, Mr. Speaker.

LEGISLATION AND 1928

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks made by me on the occasion of a banquet to the Republican National Committee recently held in this city.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I here extend in the RECORD a brief address delivered at a banquet tendered the Republican National Committee in this city on December 6, 1927.

The Republican National Committee has met in Washington at this time to fix the time and place for holding the next national convention of our party. The six months from now until the convention meets will doubtless be an important period in our history. The course national affairs will take for many years to come will probably depend in a considerable measure upon what occurs during this time. While legislation is only one element in our political life, it is always an important one, and never more so than now. Therefore, the work of Congress during these months will be observed with considerable interest throughout the country.

It is easy to exaggerate the probable political effect of any particular legislation. Those seeking legislation for individual, class, or sectional benefit are always ready to magnify the effect that such legislation will have at the polls, and urge it ostensibly for political reasons. Here lies one of the dangers always present, and especially so immediately preceding a presidential election. The attempt, however, to capture the votes of special groups or classes by legislation unduly favoring them is, in my judgment, unsound from a political as well as governmental viewpoint. There are those who would have Congress in the capacity of a glorified Santa Claus on the eve of an election handing out something specially labeled to a sufficient number of voters to win the election. Leaving aside for the moment the question of the merits of such legislation, I do not believe that elections are to be won in that way. Such a course is more likely to lose an election, if by these legislative acts the great mass of the people, who are not specially benefited, but who must in the end pay the bills, come to the conclusion that the party responsible for such legislation is not to be further trusted. There should be a sounder basis for legislation than simply a trap to catch votes.

There are sufficient real legislative problems of a national character to be wrestled with during the next six months to absorb the entire attention of Congress. The never-ending duty of exercising the closest scrutiny of governmental appropriations and new authorizations of

expenditure is always present with us. We can not dodge this responsibility if we would. We would not dodge it if we could. Our party record on this score is excellent, and must be kept so.

Having done our full duty in keeping within proper bounds governmental expenditures, we come logically to the reduction of taxes. It is inevitable that there should be irreconcilable differences as to where the reduction should take place. A fair spirit of compromise, made effective by the final word of a majority, is the only means of adjusting such differences. As to the aggregate amount of tax reduction, there should be little room for difference of opinion and none whatever as to the principle to be observed in arriving at the proper figure. There should be no reduction below the margin of safety for the requirements of the Treasury. A threatened deficit there would do much harm, while a real substantial deficiency in the revenues would be a serious disaster. A somewhat large proportion of our present revenue is derived from the net income of taxpayers. A very slight recession in business would seriously curtail incomes and the revenue derived from that source. The question of determining the amount of the reduction is not a matter capable of exact calculation, and therefore all the greater care should be exercised, realizing that it is not difficult to make further reductions later if warranted, while in case of a deficit it is both difficult and unpopular to impose new taxes to make up the deficit.

There are many other real and serious problems with which Congress must deal at the present session. One of these—and I refer to what has come to be called farm relief—has had much consideration, but by reason of the inherent difficulty and complexity of the problem no accepted solution has yet been found. As to the particular troubles affecting agriculture, which are very real ones, having failed to agree upon a remedy calculated to effect a complete cure when administered as a single dose, I for one hope that at least a measure of relief may be found by applying proper treatment to individual phases of the trouble as they may develop, rather than wait longer for a single complete and permanent remedy.

Another problem which has existed for some time but has not heretofore received the consideration its importance demands has been thrust into the foreground by recent great and overwhelming disasters. I refer, of course, to the subject of flood control. This is a problem of the first magnitude with wide ramifications and with difficulties and complexities all its own, but it must be met, considered, and put on its way toward solution.

Neither of the problems to which I have just referred is a strictly party problem, except in the sense that our party is in power and therefore must accept the responsibility and see to it that our best efforts are put forth in the direction of a wise solution.

There are many other problems, not attracting so much public attention perhaps, but important, and should receive the same kind of attention. One of these, the question of reapportionment, is a truly national matter demanding early action. Too long has this constitutional duty been deferred. It also is not a party question, but I am glad to be able to state that a very large majority of our party in the House of Representatives have tried to secure action that would assure reapportionment when the 1930 census is taken. Our plan is to fix now the number of the membership of the House for the succeeding decade and direct the Secretary of Commerce as a purely ministerial act to ascertain the number of such Representatives to which each State is entitled as shown by the decennial census taken in 1930. No one can deny the fairness of this method, and it has the additional virtue of fixing the size of the House before the census is taken of removing the cause of controversy between States that gain or lose in their membership, no one knowing in advance which State will gain or lose.

More important, in my judgment, than any particular act of legislation is our attitude as a party toward the principles involved in the solution of governmental problems. It has been the proud record of the Republican Party throughout its years of honored history that it stands for sound orderly progress. There are always those so completely satisfied with things as they are that they are unwilling to change at all, regardless of changed or changing conditions. On the other hand, there are those who seem to think change and progress synonymous terms, and therefore insist upon motion, regardless of its direction. These do not seem to realize that of four cardinal directions in which one may travel only one is forward, one is backward, and the other two may be best described in the language of the street as "side stepping."

Throughout its 70 years of existence the Republican Party when in power—and it has been in power about three quarters of the time—has met and grappled successfully with the many great and perplexing problems that have arisen during these momentous years. It has not hesitated in moving forward with alacrity, but has always used the lamp of experience as a guide. Its march forward has been safe because it has been orderly. Disregarding none of the lessons learned from the experiences of the past, it has turned them to account in facing new and untried situations, and it has done this so successfully that it has merited and received the continued and almost continuous approbation of the American people.

The historical as well as the present attitude of our party has been to follow as nearly as possible the motto of the rugged old pioneer who said: "First know that you are right, and then go ahead." Or, if higher authority is wanted, the spirit of it may be found in Holy Writ in that wholesome advice to "prove all things, but hold fast that which is good." It is in this spirit that we may expect to accomplish much in facing new problems as they arise and solving them without sacrificing the sound principles upon which our institutions and our lasting prosperity have been founded. It is not necessary to sacrifice these principles that have been tested by time and experience. Ours is not the party of the opportunist or of the reckless experimenter, but it is the party that can and does do things worth while.

As I see it the election of 1928 is now won as the situation stands to-day. It could be easily thrown away. It only remains, however, for the party to so continue the conduct of affairs as to retain the confidence of the people it now has in order to make certain the result that all of those here present so much desire.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting some remarks of my own made before the Committee on Appropriations yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations, I am glad to have this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of a most worthy cause, namely, Platt National Park, which is located at Sulphur, Okla. You know the history of the act of Congress that created this park, and at this time I wish to again call the attention of this committee to the usefulness of the park, the great service it renders to the people of the United States, and its need of greater appropriations for further improvements. But few of you gentlemen have had opportunity to visit this park, and I wish you could all visit it some time in the summer when the tourist season is on.

A record of visitors is kept at Bromide Springs, where they are checked by the keeper. The National Park Service previous to 1926 divided this number by four and estimated that as a fair average of visitors, and gave as the reason for this reduction that some people visited these springs more than once. While that is true, it is also true that thousands of visitors to Platt National Park are never checked, as they do not visit Bromide Springs. Many of them go there for the other water, for the hot sulphur baths, and for pleasure, and find all this without visiting Bromide Springs. I believe the number given in the report of the superintendent fairly represents the figures of visitors. In 1926 the National Park Service reduced the figures of the superintendent by one-half as a fair average of visitors.

The reports of the superintendent of Platt National Park shows the number of visitors and campers for the past nine years, as follows:

	Visitors	Campers
1919	107,918	689
1920	173,310	2,981
1921	216,022	10,526
1922	246,998	23,170
1923	470,841	74,589
1924	539,495	95,272
1925	573,522	43,823
1926	248,569	45,796
1927	294,954	51,584

Here I wish to attach a statement from the National Park Service as to the number of visitors in our national parks for the year 1927, as follows:

OCTOBER 28, 1927.

The number of visitors to the national parks and monuments during the travel year ended September 30 reached a total of 2,797,840, according to a statement issued by the Department of the Interior to-day. These figures exceed by 482,935 the high mark of 2,314,905 reached last year.

The division of this travel between the different parks and monuments, with 1926 figures for comparison, is given in the following lists:

Name of park	1926	1927
Hot Springs (Ark.)	[1] 260,000	[1] 181,523
Yellowstone (Wyo.)	187,807	200,825
Sequoia (Calif.)	89,404	100,684
Yosemite (Calif.)	274,209	490,430
General Grant (Calif.)	50,597	47,996
Mount Rainier (Wash.)	161,796	200,051
Crater Lake (Oreg.)	89,019	82,354
Platt (Okla.)	[1] 124,284	[2] 294,954

[1] Estimated.
[2] Actual park visitors; many miners and prospectors passed through park.

Name of park	1926	1927
Wind Cave (S. Dak.)	85,466	81,023
Sullys Hill (N. Dak.)	19,921	22,632
Mesa Verde (Colo.)	11,356	11,915
Glacier (Mont.)	37,325	41,745
Rocky Mountain (Colo.)	[1] 225,027	[1] 229,862
Hawaii (Territory of Hawaii)	[1] 35,000	37,551
Lassen Volcanic (Calif.)	18,739	20,089
Mount McKinley (Alaska)	[2] 533	[2] 651
Grand Canyon (Ariz.)	140,252	162,356
Lafayette (Me.)	101,256	123,699
Zion (Utah)	21,964	24,303
Total	1,930,865	2,354,643

[1] Estimated.
[2] Actual park visitors; many miners and prospectors passed through park.

This report shows that for this year but one park in the United States had more visitors than Platt National Park. These figures show that the visitors have increased in this park from 107,918 in 1919 to 294,954 in 1927. In the year 1925 there was a decrease in the number of visitors, as there was in all our other parks.

The reports show the number of private automobiles entering the park, as follows:

1922	30,000
1923	50,000
1924	57,400
1925	60,000
1926	45,796
1927	75,000

In 1925 more automobiles entered Platt National Park than any of our other parks, and in 1926 the number was excelled only by two other parks.

The report of the Director of National Parks gives the number of visitors that entered Platt National Park in 1926 at 124,284, and the above statement shows the number for 1927 to be 294,954, which is an excellent increase, showing the popular favor of this park with the people of the country.

The National Park Service states that, while the superintendent of the park reports that 875,000 motorists used the park in 1927, so many of these were local repeaters that 294,954 was a fair estimate of the park travel. As stated before, thousands of people visit the park and are never recorded, as they do not visit Bromide Springs, where they are checked, and I believe the director places too large a reduction in his estimate. The superintendent also reports 250,000 private automobiles as entering the park in 1927, but the National Park Service reduces this figure to 75,000, and states that many of these were local cars making numerous entries. The same is true with respect to these cars—many of them are never counted. Yet with this reduction there is only one park with more automobiles entering it than Platt National Park.

I ask permission to insert here a question and answer concerning our national parks, taken from the Washington Star, November 8, 1927:

"Q. Which national park has the most visitors?—A. In 1927 Yosemite Valley topped the list with 490,430 visitors. Platt Park, Okla., was second, with 294,954; Rocky Mountain Park, Colo., third, with 229,862; Yellowstone Park, Wyo., fourth, with 200,825; and Mount Rainier Park, Wash., fifth, with 200,051."

Gentlemen of the committee, I have been familiar with this park for many years, before Oklahoma was admitted to statehood. Long before I can remember, this has been a favorite place for people afflicted with bodily ailments and in bad health. This is one of the greatest and most favored health resorts in the land. In its more than 30 mineral springs there is water of all kinds—sulphur, bromide, medicine, and pure water—all gushing from springs near each other. The reports of noted chemists show that these waters contain medicinal properties of great restorative value to the human body. All forms of nervousness, sleeplessness, and digestive ailments will usually yield to the properties of the bromide water, while the hot sulphur baths are almost a sure cure for rheumatism. I mention this to the committee, in addition to the natural scenery in the park and surrounding country, to call the attention of the committee to the importance of the park.

Adjacent to this park is Oklahoma's great, well-equipped, and efficiently managed sanitarium and hospital for the treatment and care of our soldiers who were in the World War. The State has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the erection and upkeep of this institution. It was placed at Sulphur, near this park, after being selected by a committee of competent physicians for the reason of the health-giving properties of the water there and the healthful surroundings. At this place is also located the Oklahoma School for the Deaf with many beautiful buildings. In addition to this, Sulphur is a beautiful little city with a fine, Christian, law-abiding citizenship.

It is not so large as some other parks, but great in accomplishments, which, I think, should always be taken into consideration in making appropriations for our parks. If you will visit this park in the summer at the height of the tourist season you will meet people there from almost every State in the Union. This park is of great importance to people who are seeking better health and can not afford to go to the more costly parks. While, perhaps, most of the visitors are people with modest means, as living conditions are most excellent and reasonable, you will find them there from all classes, and people of wealth enjoy the healthful waters and the hospitality of the people the same as the thousands of other visitors. Excellent camping grounds are provided without charge to visitors and they can bathe in the water and drink as much as they like. There the visitor will find first-class hotel service and excellent restaurants and boarding houses at moderate cost.

Gentlemen of the committee, the National Park Service can not carry out its program properly without adequate appropriations, and these should be provided by Congress. I favor this program and the continued improving of our national parks, where our citizens can go when they wish, and especially am I in favor of the proper upkeep of those parks where people visit in search of health and where they will likely find it.

Many improvements are needed at Platt National Park, such as additional bridges across the creeks that enter the park, road improvement, extension of sewer and water lines, more comfort stations, tree planting, fencing around the park, additional improvements at the leading springs, drilling of additional wells, dams across the principal creek, improved camping grounds, the construction of a new, modern dwelling and office building for the superintendent and employees.

There should also be appropriations for more help and equipment in the park. With an adequate appropriation Platt National Park will increase its usefulness to the people of the United States, needed repairs and improvements will be made, and its popularity increased. I know the appropriations would be made if you gentlemen would only visit this park during this summer.

Gentlemen of the committee, I greatly appreciate your courtesy in giving me this hearing, and I hope that I have presented the needs of this park in a way that increased appropriations will be granted.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution to present for the appointment of five members to the Committee on Patents to fill places which were overlooked by the majority committee on committees when making the original assignments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 67

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Patents, to wit: Nicholas J. Sinnott, Oregon; Frank L. Bowman, West Virginia; Elbert S. Brigham, Vermont; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; J. Mitchell Chase, Pennsylvania, to rank with the other majority members of said committee in the following order: Albert H. Vestal (chairman), Indiana; Randolph Perkins, New Jersey; Clarence J. McLeod, Michigan; Godfrey G. Goodwin, Minnesota; Florian Lampert, Wisconsin; Nicholas J. Sinnott, Oregon; F. D. Letts, Iowa; Frank L. Bowman, West Virginia; Elbert S. Brigham, Vermont; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Harry L. Englebright, California; Robert G. Bushong, Pennsylvania; J. Mitchell Chase, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE PROPOSED NEW FEDERAL BUILDING AT PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on House Resolution 278, passed the other day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House passed H. R. 278, a bill authorizing appropriations for needed public buildings. It is a worthy measure. I am prompted to say this because I have observed that all the available statistics show that the Government is sorely in need of new buildings here in Washington and in practically every section of the country. The sum which H. R. 278 authorizes to be appropriated for constructing new buildings will enable the Government very materially to meet this pressing need. For this reason I supported and urged the passage of H. R. 278. Moreover, I believe that the measure offers some hope for relief to my particular district, which parenthetically, I may say, has for a long time been suffering on account of the lack of efficient housing facilities to accommodate the various governmental activities that are now attempting to function in the city of Portland. In fact, I have been influenced quite as much by this last reason as by the general consideration into supporting and now commending the passage of H. R. 278. However, it is for the purpose of

discussing the apportionment to be made for my district under the provisions of this legislation, rather than the merits of the measure itself, that I am taking advantage of the courtesy accorded me by the House to make a few remarks.

At the outset I earnestly invite your attention, and particularly the attention of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, to the item of $1,500,000 recommended by the Treasury Department in the Budget "for the acquisition of a site and construction of a Federal building at Portland, Oreg.," for the reason that the amount included in this recommendation is not only inadequate for the construction of a building of appropriate size, but neither a fair nor a just apportionment of the $250,000,000 appropriation authorized by H. R. 278 to the people of Portland and the city's immediate environs. That this assertion is true will readily appear if the House will but grant its indulgence while I briefly review the history of the acquisition, use, and present condition of the old building which the new one is intended to replace.

The site upon which the present Federal building is located was purchased in the year 1869 for the sum of $15,000. Later a building was erected upon it at a cost of $341,500. The same was occupied about the year 1877. The cost has been more than returned to the Government in the way of savings on rent and various uses to which the building has been put from time to time during the past 49 years. In fact, the annual depreciation charges aggregate an amount much in excess of the sum originally appropriated for the construction of the old building and subsequently expended for its alteration and repair. The estimated market value of the site at this date, by conservative appraisements, is something over the sum of $1,750,000. Incidentally, this is the minimum amount for which the Treasury Department has stipulated in its recommendation in the Budget that the site shall be sold. Accordingly, if the program outlined by the Treasury Department is followed by the committee, without allowing an increase in this particular appropriation, the Government will actually withdraw from the city of Portland and its environs the sum of $235,000, more than it plans to expend in a new site and building. In calling your attention to the amount of this credit I do not wish to be understood as contending that the mere fact that there will be such a large disparity between the estimated cost of the new building as projected, and the market value of the site of the old one, without any additional showing, would be sufficient to establish the fact that the sum recommended by the Treasury Department for the new building to be built in my district is not adequate. On the contrary, I know that such an argument would not appeal to either the Members of this House or the members of the Appropriations Committee, but what I do say and feel justified in claiming in regard to the matter is this: That when a community like the city of Portland has had the spirit, enterprise, and tremendous energy to build itself up so that a Government investment in its real estate has been made to advance from the small sum of $15,000 to something over the sum of $1,750,000 in less than 50 years, that fair treatment demands and a square deal dictates that no part of such increase in value should be withdrawn from the city without a strong showing that there is no longer a reasonable necessity for its remaining invested there; that this contingency has not arisen with respect to the Government's business in the city of Portland I now propose to show by calling your attention to some pertinent and related figures, which I believe demonstrate beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt that there is an immediate and urgent need for a new Federal building at Portland to-day of a size and style that will cost not less than $2,000,000 to construct.

After half a century the present building is old, run down, and outgrown. It is poorly adapted and hardly suited to the increased demands that are now being made upon it. Built when the population of the city of Portland was only approximately 25,000 it is now attempting to serve the needs of a community of, roughly speaking, 354,680 inhabitants. In this same connection I call your attention to the fact that the city's percentage of growth in population has been greatly accelerated in the past six or seven years. Also, that there are many signs which strongly indicate that it will not be long, if the present rate of increase continues, and there is every reason to suppose that it will, before Portland will have a population of over 600,000 inhabitants and a metropolitan area containing probably a million people if the increase in the area shall continue to be commensurate with that which occurs within the city. I mention growth in area to you for the purpose of emphasizing the fact, apparently overlooked by the Treasury Department, that there is an ever-present likelihood that the city's boundaries may be extended to include a part or possibly all of its metropolitan area. If this were to be done to-day, say to a radius of 15 miles, Portland would have a population of approximately half a million people. Such extensions, if made, will naturally place additional strains on the capacity of either the old or the new building. It is a contingency that must be considered and anticipated in connection with any plans for a new Federal building at Portland.

As additional evidence of the rapidity of Portland's growth during the last few years, I wish to offer for your consideration a comparison of figures, which I have compiled from various official sources.

In 1916 the postal receipts of Portland were $1,201,262. In 1926 they aggregated $3,900,887, an increase of over 150 per cent in 10 years. The figures for 1927 have not been made available as yet by the Post Office Department.

Over 105,997 building permits were issued by the city between 1920 and 1927. Their aggregate value showed an increase of over 231.2 per cent in building during this period and an increase in the value of residence building of over 356.5 per cent. During the seven years immediately preceding 1927 the public-school enrollment increased 24.8 per cent and the school-age census showed an increase of 27.3 per cent.

Any record of the city's growth within the last few years would not be complete without some mention of its industrial development. Before commenting on this in detail, however, let me direct your attention for a moment to one or two important factors which have contributed to Portland's development.

Portland is situated at the confluence of the Willamette and the Columbia Rivers. It is in the very heart of the world's richest agricultural sections. It possesses a geographical position that is steadily attracting manufacturers who are obliged to give consideration to the question of transportation costs in connection with the operation of their business. It is a natural gateway of outlet for the export wealth of that vast tributary area, so named, the Inland Empire, likewise sometimes called the Columbia River Basin. Incidentally, these are items that should be of vital importance to the Federal Government in selecting sites for new buildings.

The territory served by the port of Portland contains roughly 250,000 square miles and has a population that is conservatively estimated as 4,281,816 people. The products from this great hinterland come down to the city over the only water-grade route through the mountains of the Pacific coast. Portland is the great central market and seaport of the Pacific Northwest. Freight moves to it from all points of the Columbia River Basin. As this empire of natural resources is developed, so will all the products of mines and forest and farms grow into a steadily increasing volume of traffic for exports through the city as its gateway. In recognition of the obviously lower costs of operation of rail lines hauling freight by water grade, correspondingly favorable rail rates have been obtained for Portland and their justification maintained by various decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Portland is the greatest originating seaport in the world. In 1926 its record of water-borne commerce showed that 3,148,211 tons of domestic freight were handled, an increase of 134.4 per cent over the figures for 1920. One million eight hundred sixteen thousand five hundred and thirty-seven tons of foreign freight were handled over the same period, an increase of 256.9 per cent. Fifty-three steamship lines are now giving regular service from the port. A few years ago there were less than a half dozen. Rail transportation has shown a corresponding increase and expansion.

You may have wondered why I called the port of Portland the greatest originating seaport in the world. Let me explain my statement. I mean by greatest originating port that Portland originates more of the products that it transports than any other port. To be specific, one-third of the total standing timber of the United States is in the State of Oregon to-day, of which Portland is the outstanding center. Sixteen per cent of all the grain in the United States is produced in the Northwest, of which over 58 per cent is shipped out by boat via the port of Portland. Pulpwood, wool, mohair, flax, fruits, and vegetables are other products produced in large quantities for many basic industries. The agricultural production of the Columbia country, of which Portland is a great central market and seaport, amounted to $544,821,000 in 1926.

Between 1919 and 1926 bank clearings increased from $1,652,950,830.27 to $2,103,840,193.06, a record of growth that has not been surpassed or equaled by any other city in the Northwest. Pay rolls were increased in 1927 by upward of $1,659,700.

Portland is the first city of the United States in manufacture and export of lumber, first in export of wheat, second in export of apples, and fourth in flour. It is the first primary wool-

export port and the second largest wool market. It leads the Pacific coast as livestock market, in the manufacture of woolen textiles, flour, automatic stokers, automatic motive hoists, locomotives, pulp, and paper. It is the first in the Pacific Northwest in total foreign-commerce tonnage and its leading jobbing center.

Having sketched a very hasty outline for you of the tremendous territory served by Portland, the great natural resources that it possesses, the satisfactory progress that it is making in the way of development, and its exceedingly live condition during the past few years as compared with earlier periods, for the purpose of bringing to your attention the very large population which the city is destined to have in the next decade or two, I will now confine myself strictly to an analysis of the recommendations of the Treasury Department in regard to the size and style of the new Federal building proposed for Portland. But first let me say that the number of Federal employees in Portland has grown during the past 10 years from 641 to 2,691, or over 400 per cent. Federal disbursements have expanded in the same period from $2,913,185 to $11,035,825. Federal housing facilities, on the other hand, have not kept a pace of the growth of governmental business. It has increased less than 100 per cent and much of the estimated expansion is space leased from private property owners.

It is my understanding that the estimated cost of the new building as recommended by the Treasury Department contemplates a building seven stories high, with a basement, to be faced with stone and of an office-type construction. Five hundred thousand dollars of the total sum recommended for appropriation is expected to be used for purchasing a new site, leaving only the sum of $1,000,000 to be used for actual building purposes. Naturally the design of the building will have to conform to the dimensions and contour of the building site when it shall have been selected. This is a matter that may require considerable reckoning.

The old building, which the new one is intended to replace, contains, roughly, 27,136 square feet of office space. Into this area is crowded at the present time the Federal court, judges' chambers, clerks' offices, including bankruptcy and citizenship divisions, the offices of the Federal attorney, bureau of investigation, Department of Justice, central post-office station, and the United States marshal's office. The projected building, it is estimated, will contain approximately 67,751 square feet, or, roughly, two and one-half times the space that was deemed necessary to supply the housing demands that existed 50 years ago in the city's history, notwithstanding the fact that the city's population and Federal business has, as stated, not merely doubled but multiplied. Furthermore, in addition to the governmental activities that are now being housed in the old building, it is planned that the projected building will contain space for the Navy Department, Agricultural Department, Commerce Department, War Department, War Veterans' Bureau, and Shipping Board, which are collectively paying annual rents to private owners of $22,235.

The information that I have received from the Treasury Department is that in a general way the increased space in the projected building will be allocated to the various governmental agencies functioning in Portland about as follows: Six thousand two hundred and twenty square feet for the main postal substation, this is approximately a 65 per cent increase over the space that is now being used. Fifteen thousand seven hundred and seventy-three square feet for the Federal court rooms, clerk of the court, judges chambers, district attorney's quarters, bureau of investigation of the Department of Justice, and the United States marshal's office. This is an increase of approximately 140 per cent over the space that is now being used. Fifteen thousand six hundred and seventy-five square feet will be used by the activities that are now paying the rental aggregating the sum of $22,235 per annum. According to the department's original figures and the ones that were evidently used by it in computing the proposed apportionment as recommended in the Budget, the space required by these various last-named agencies is greater than that which will be provided in the projected building. There is absolutely no room for additional activities. The natural growth of those expected to be housed in the new building does not appear to have been anticipated.

Before passing from the proposed allocation of space in the projected building I would like to explain the source of the figures that I have cited. Immediately after the Budget appeared, I called at the Treasury Department and made a request for details concerning the proposed building and for such information as might be available showing how its size had been determined and its probable cost estimated. In compliance with my request, I was given a typewritten statement which I ask leave to place in the RECORD and from which I will now quote:

> Bill H. R. 17355 provides for a limit of cost of $1,200,000. The estimate this year is increased to $1,500,000 owing to the demand for 26,732 additional square feet by several of the activities to be housed in the new building. * * * The courthouse building contains approximately 27,136 square feet and the projected building is estimated to contain 67,751 square feet, or nearly two and one-half times that now available.

I quote this excerpt to you because I have observed in a letter that the Treasury Department addressed to the Appropriations Committee, under date of December 30, 1927, a statement that there is but 22,430 square feet of office space in the old building and that the new building when erected will contain 74,346 square feet of office space; also the following statement:

> The above area of 74,346 square feet of office space would require a building having a gross area of approximately 109,300 square feet, and it is contemplated to provide a seven-story-and-basement, stone-faced, office-type building having a ground area of 18,000 square feet. It is estimated that such a building at Portland would cost approximately $1,150,000, and making an allowance of, say, $350,000 for a site, the estimated total cost of $1,500,000 is arrived at.

I do not know which set of figures, if either, that the department has supplied in connection with the proposed building is correct, but aside from their disagreement I believe that certain deductions can be reasonably and safely drawn from the information supplied by the Treasury Department.

The first paper from which I quoted shows very clearly that the department either overlooked existing demands or had a new demand made upon it for 26,732 additional square feet within a year's time. In other words, it either did not figure correctly or anticipated incorrectly.

I do not know how the difference between the 67,751 square feet, evidently used as the basis of computing the proposed apportionment at the time the Budget was prepared, and the 74,366 square feet appearing in the department's letter to the committee can be explained. This statement also applies to the inconsistency in the figures regarding the space in the old building.

The construction estimate of $1,150,000 in this same letter shows that the figure of $1,000,000 for the building recommended in the Budget was too low by at least $150,000. Has the Treasury Department definite information that it can secure a site that will be centrally located in Portland for $350,000? The stipulated sale price of the old site does not suggest that it has. On the contrary, it leads one to the conclusion that the sum of $1,750,000 will be required for another equally desirable site, or $875,000 if only one-half the present ground is required.

Two hundred and fifty million dollars! A huge sum! If divided amongst the States according to number—Oregon's share would be upward of $5,000,000. If returns from custom receipts, income taxes, internal revenue, and miscellaneous receipts were to be considered it would be even more. The recommendation of the Treasury Department excludes Portland from anything but a nominal participation. Reduced to its essence, all that the recommendation proposes is a couple of book entries developing an unfavorable balance against the city. Surely it does not require argument to expose the lack of equity concealed in such an unfair proposal.

According to the conservative estimates of those persons who are best acquainted with the district's needs, the city of Portland and its environs need a new Federal building right now, containing not less than 155,000 square feet of floor space, if the present requirements and reasonable future growth of Government's business in the next 10 years is to be properly anticipated and met.

Again an examination of the allocation of Government business in the Pacific Northwest at the present moment will show that at least 75 per cent of the district Federal headquarters are now located in two cities in the State of Washington and only 25 per cent of the same type of headquarters are established in Portland and Oregon. Why is this? I will give you the answer. When the city has struggled in the past to accommodate various district headquarters, it has been pointed out time and time again that space was available in the two Washington cities free, or for practically nothing, and that the same was not available in Portland, and therefore the headquarters had to go to one or the other of the northern cities. In many cases important offices were removed from the city solely on this kind of a space argument. Manifestly, it is not a fair course to tie such activities as have been removed by this kind of an argument forever into the two Washington cities by using the present allocation as a basis of space requirements in future buildings.

Summarizing the remarks that I have made on this subject, I repeat, Portland having made nearly all the values that are needed for a commodious Federal building; Portland having before it beyond any possible doubt a tremendous development; Portland being situated in the commercial and economic center of the Pacific Northwest and therefore able to serve the majority of the people and the preponderating portion of land area of the Pacific Northwest at a less cost and in less time; and Portland and Oregon having been wrongfully deprived in the past of the proper percentage of district Federal headquarters, that its appeal to Congress and to the members of the Committee on Appropriations at this time and in this connection for a substantial Federal building, a building covering at least 100 by 200 feet of ground space and from 10 to 12 stories high, in order to take care of present requirements, reasonable future growth, and the proper share of the district headquarters that should have been given to Oregon, should not go unheeded or unanswered.

Since the figures appearing in the Budget were made public the Portland Chamber of Commerce, the principal civic organization of my district, through its directors has adopted a resolution which it has requested the Oregon delegation to present to you, the tenor of which is that it is to the best interest of Portland, Oregon, and the Government that the new Federal building to be erected at Portland shall have a ground-floor space of at least 100 by 200 feet and be of not less than 12 stories in height.

This resolution, I might add, is accompanied by a number of charts and a very comprehensive survey, which substantiate the claims of the city and Oregon for fair and adequate recognition in the way of an apportionment of the authorized appropriation for Federal buildings under H. R. 278. This data also includes a recommendation that the Government should sell the north half of the present old post-office block, facing Morrison, Fifth, and Sixth Streets, and retain title to the south half, facing Yamhill, between Fifth and Sixth Streets, and to erect the new Federal building on the half so retained. In support of this recommendation it is argued that if the proposed procedure is followed real-estate men estimate that the north half of the block will bring more than $1,000,000, possibly $1,250,000. This would make a substantial sum available without purchasing a new site. The erection of a new building upon the south half would place it where its location will be most satisfactory for both the post-office substation uses and offices and court room uses. The time involved in getting started upon construction work would be reduced to the minimum and probably the largest amount of net funds made available from the Government property.

While I personally am not prepared to urge the construction of the new building upon any particular site or in any special location, it strikes me that this recommendation is worthy of the earnest consideration of the Appropriations Committee. The proceeds of such a sale, together with something less than the figures specified in the Budget, would create a fund of approximately $2,000,000 for a building alone, and that would put up a very excellent structure if a building of the monumental type is not to be selected. In brief, the Government would be able to get substantially the same results in providing space that is now attained by private interest in erecting a first-class modern office building.

In conclusion I wish to say that I feel sure from the spirit of fairness which has uniformly characterized the actions of the Appropriations Committee in dealing with matters of this kind in the past that its members will be impressed not only with the lack of fairness and injustice that will result from depriving the people of Portland and its environs of the excess between the market value of the present site and the estimated cost of the projected building, but also with the strong equity, increased efficiency, and greater public economy that will accrue to the Government by changing the figures recommended by the Treasury Department so as to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Portland of the size and dimensions recommended by the Portland Chamber of Commerce to cost not less than $2,000,000, and that it will so report, and that the House in its turn will pass a bill directing that a sum of not less than $2,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated by H. R. 278 be apportioned to the city of Portland for the construction of a new Federal building.

THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the triangle public building bill, passed the other day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I supported both omnibus public buildings bills at the last session, one of which became a law, and the other, though it passed the House, failed of passage in the Senate because of the filibuster there at the session's close. The last-named bill, as H. R. 278, was reintroduced at the present session and on December 19, 1927, passed the House and is now before the Senate. At this session I have again supported this measure and voted for it.

The need for new public buildings, not only in Washington but throughout the entire country, is so urgent that the additional authorization of $100,000,000 carried in H. R. 278 should be made at the earliest possible moment. This sum will be expended in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 6559, which became a law at the last session. It has been so long since we have had a public buildings program and the increased business of the country has been so great that we can not afford to neglect the vital needs involved.

I merely wish to reemphasize my earnest support of these authorization measures. In the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill for 1929, shortly to be reported, actual appropriations will be included for a number of major public building projects duly recommended and considered, most of which were carried in the special public buildings appropriation bill which passed the House at the last session, but which, like the $100,000,000 authorization bill already mentioned, failed of passage in the Senate because of the filibuster there.

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to an article that appeared in a Washington newspaper yesterday morning, and other papers throughout the country, in reference to the appointment of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, Col. Henry Stimson. The article in part reads as follows:

> The oligarchy, acting on orders from its boss—Senator Manuel Quezon—has called a meeting in Manila of his political followers at which they intend to draw up a plan for a European system of government. This they intend to offer the new Governor General upon his arrival in February. They are telling the people that Quezon has the assurance that such a program will be acceptable to President Coolidge and Stimson.
>
> If the President and Stimson nail this lie, the oligarchy will then refuse to "cooperate" with the new Governor General. They will give as their excuse the false charge that the home Government has broken faith.

Now, gentlemen, I am in a position to say, because I had spoken with Mr. Quezon before he left Washington, that there is no justification for the statements in this article. It is manifestly unfair to create an atmosphere so unfavorable to any new governor. I do not believe I am violating any confidence when I state that Mr. Quezon told me that the selection and appointment of Colonel Stimson was as favorable as could be expected under existing conditions, and he personally appeared before the Senate committee and indorsed the appointment of Colonel Stimson. Senator Quezon stated that he believes there will be the utmost harmony with the newly appointed governor, and that he and his party would cooperate in every way with the new governor.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The newspapers have stated that Mr. Quezon commended to the President himself the appointment of Mr. Stimson. I was with Mr. Quezon and heard him talk before he left here, and he did not indicate any such attitude as the article attributes to him. All that he said was quite to the contrary.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; and he appeared before the Senate committee and indorsed the selection.

Mr. HERSEY. What newspaper did the gentleman from New York quote from?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Washington Herald.

Mr. HERSEY. Did it give the name of the reporter or interviewer?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It was the Universal Service in the Herald.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from the Philippine Islands is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GUEVARA. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it is very encouraging to learn that conditions in the Philippines are improving. The noble efforts made to attain such a situation are beginning to have the expected results. A new Governor General was appointed and the Filipino people are confident and hopeful that harmony and cooperation will mark the initial step for the economic and political progress of the country. It is to be regretted, however, that while the general

conditions of the Philippines are steadily advancing toward cooperation and harmony, stories in the daily papers of this country tending to impair the best of wishes of both Americans and Filipinos are being published. To those who are familiar with the conditions in the Philippines these stories would not do any harm; but for those who follow and learn the course of event through the newspapers, they are certainly poisonous.

The appointment of the new Governor General for the Philippine Islands was heartily indorsed by the Filipino people through their constitutional representatives, and after the appointment was confirmed by the Senate of the United States there was a general rejoicing on the part of all.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that under present conditions the appointment of Mr. Henry L. Stimson as Governor General of the Philippines will inaugurate a new era of cooperation and harmony. We sincerely hope that a mutual and friendly understanding between the American and Filipino peoples will develop, and in my belief Governor Stimson will be afforded with the most cordial cooperation, so essential for the promotion of the best interests of both countries.

Mr. Stimson is well versed with the affairs of the Philippines, and it is but just to hope that his administration will be above the intrigues so common and frequent in all communities. [Applause.]

Mr. GUEVARA asked for and received unanimous consent to include in his remarks the following telegram to Governor Stimson:

DECEMBER 17, 1927.

Gov. H. L. STIMSON,
32 Liberty Street, New York City:

Once more I heartily congratulate you for the confirmation of your appointment by Senate to-day. Your nomination and confirmation for the governorship of Philippines inaugurates a new era for the islands government and people. I am deeply hopeful that the happiness and prosperity of the Filipino people will be attained during your administration. I have all reasons to expect that Filipinos and Americans in the islands will not deny you their assistance and cooperation for the success of your administration, which will issue to the promotion of the welfare of the inhabitants therein. Permit me also to express the belief that your presence in the islands as its chief executive will restore confidence and faith in the United States, and that mutual and friendly understanding between Americans and Filipinos will be achieved. Please accept my sincere wishes for the success of your administration.

PEDRO GUEVARA,
Philippine Resident Commissioner.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUEVARA. Yes.

Mr. CHALMERS. I wish to say that I, too, talked with President Quezon just before he left Washington for his return trip to the Philippine Islands. He said to me that the appointment of Colonel Stimson as Governor General of the Philippine Islands was very acceptable to the Filipino people. Mr. Quezon, as you know, is president of the Philippine Senate.

I spent three weeks in the Philippine Islands this year. I visited some of the Provinces outside of Manila, and I can say from personal observation and investigation that Mr. Quezon represents the best sentiment in the Philippine Islands. He has the confidence of the Filipinos, and when he speaks, as he did to me about the appointment of a Governor General, he speaks with authority and for all the Filipinos. I think it is unfortunate at this time when the President has appointed a man as well qualified as Colonel Stimson to this important work to have an interview of this kind come out in an attempt to make trouble for the new Governor General. [Applause.]

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER NEAR COUSHATTA, LA.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 280, a bridge bill, which is of considerable importance at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 280) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State Highway Commission of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Coushatta, La., and in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion by Mr. DENISON to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE WORK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objeciton.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, within a few minutes a motion will be made for the House to adjourn, which means that we shall adjourn in accordance with the resolution passed a few days ago, which will bring us back here on January 4, 1928. Before we part I wish to congratulate the membership of the House upon the work already done and to thank the Members on both sides of the Chamber for their cooperation in the doing of that work. We have passed three bills of major importance thus far and a number of minor, though important, matters. I think this a good record and that it is an earnest and an indication of what we may expect when the holidays are over and we come back here to settle down for the real work of the long session, which I hope will not be too long. [Applause.]

I now wish you all a very merry Christmas and a happy, prosperous New Year, and hope that you will all return here on January 4 fit and ready for the work that is before us. [Applause.]

MR. LEHR FESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes on a subject of general interest to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of to-day's session the House loses one of its most valuable and most valued employees, Mr. Lehr Fess, who has served as parliamentarian of the House under two Speakers, in five Congresses, and over a period of more than eight years—a notable eight years in the parliamentary annals of the House—resigns to-day to resume the practice of law, which he began at the close of the last session of Congress with one of the great legal firms of his State.

I have no doubt that I speak for every Member of the House, and certainly for the Members on this side of the aisle, when I express regret at the decision of Mr. Fess to leave the service of the House. He has discharged the trying duties of that difficult place with unusual tact and capacity. He is unquestionably one of the most efficient men who has occupied that exacting position in the history of the House, and his resignation is a loss both to the House and to the country.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note in this connection that while we hear in practically every session of Congress the suggestion that employees of the House are overpaid, one of the reasons for Mr. Fess's making this change is the financial consideration. We have here an instance in which one of the highest salaried employees at either end of the Capitol is voluntarily giving up his work and going into a new field, with the prospect of increased emolument.

But however successful and however prosperous Mr. Fess may be in his chosen profession—and I am certain he will be both—I am not convinced that his absence from the House is necessarily permanent. Of the six men who immediately preceded Mr. Fess as parliamentarian at the Speaker's table, every one, with a single exception, has eventually returned as a Member of the House. [Applause.] And while, so far as I am aware, Mr. Fess entertains no such ambition, I venture to hope that in the end he will not prove to be an exception to the rule. I am certain that I express the universal sentiment of the Members of this House when I wish him Godspeed and much success and a speedy return. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, if I may be indulged for just two minutes, I want also to pay tribute to the integrity and modesty and ability of the young man who has been here as parliamentarian clerk of the House for the past eight years. There is no man more modest than he, none with greater integrity, and certainly none who will prove more worthy of the confidence of those with whom he may come in contact, wherever he may go, than Lehr Fess. I have watched him with a great deal of pride. He came here as a young lad and he leaves us as a mature man. He takes into the world the experience which he gathered here, and he will give the world the benefit of that experience in the building up of a better life in the community to which he goes. I wish him Godspeed, good health, good luck, and the greatest success in his future endeavors. [Applause.]

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT ST. JOSEPH, MO.

Mr. FAUST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5547) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, or its assigns, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Missouri and Kansas, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the understanding was that no business would be done in the House, and the calling up of bills by unanimous consent is doing business. I have no personal objection to this bill, but I do have objection to the general practice of breaking our agreements. It is the way in which things are "put over" sometimes when it should not be done.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I can not allow the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL] to go unchallenged. It was never stated, so far as I know, that no business would be done to-day. On the other hand, it has been definitely understood that nothing other than unanimous-consent matters, where one Member could stop it, would be considered. There was no agreement, at least I never entered into any such agreement, that there should be no unanimous-consent requests made to-day.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I withdraw the objection. I think that is the general impression on the part of many Members of the House, notwithstanding.

Mr. OLDFIELD. If the gentleman will yield; is this a toll bridge?

Mr. FAUST. This is a toll-free bridge across the Missouri River which will be part of the United States highway 36.

Mr. BLANTON. How can it be a toll and free bridge?

Mr. FAUST. I mean free of toll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to say just a word in this connection. One of the greatest abuses that the House of Representatives has ever known was the promiscuous calling up of bills and the asking for unanimous consent for their present consideration. Abuses under that system became so bad that the present rule was adopted setting aside a day for the consideration of matters by unanimous consent, so that everybody, every Member of the House, would know that a bill could or could not be brought up. Why, it used to be the practice to have a Member who was opposed to a bill, called out into the lobby on the plea of some important consultation [laughter], and then, during his absence, to bring the bill up by unanimous consent and pass it, the Member making the request for unanimous consent having previously gone to the Speaker's room and made arrangements to be recognized. Nobody here knew anything about the bill, and the man who knew all about it and was opposed to it was out of the Chamber. In my judgment there ought to be a rigid enforcement of the present rule. It provides the only way to legislate intelligently here when there is a request for unanimous consent. Every Member of the House is entitled to have ample notice when a bill may or may not come up. I shall not now object, but I shall object if any other attempt of this kind is made to-day or hereafter.

The SPEAKER. May I make a remark in this connection? I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is an undesirable method of bringing up a bill, bridge bills or others; and the Chair has refused since his occupancy to recognize gentlemen to bring up bridge bills by unanimous consent unless he was assured that the question of time was an important factor. The Chair was told by the gentleman from Missouri that it was very important this bill should be passed to-day, because, for one reason, if it was not taken up to-day it could not be taken up until the third Monday in January, and therefore the Chair recognized him.

Mr. FAUST. May I just say to my friend that this is a little different from the ordinary bridge bill in the different parts of the United States, in that the highway commissioners of the States of Missouri and Kansas gave approximately one-fourth of the cost of this bridge. The balance of the cost is borne by the city of St. Joseph, which has issued bonds, and we are very anxious to get the work started upon it. I had no intention of violating any rule or understanding of the House, but I would appreciate having it passed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of St. Joseph, in the county of Buchanan and State of Missouri, a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, relative to cities of the first class, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between a point in Buchanan County, State of Missouri, and a point opposite in Doniphan County, State of Kansas, south of the present railway bridge owned and operated by the St. Joseph & Grand Island Railway Co., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the city of St. Joseph, its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is located, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation and expropriation of property in such State.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, after line 24, insert:

"SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAUST. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 7, after the word "Kansas," strike out the following: "south of the present railway bridge owned and operated by the St. Joseph & Grand Island Railway Co."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MR. LEHR FESS

The SPEAKER. Before adjournment the Chair would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment. In supplement of what was said by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], it is with genuine regret that the Chair contemplates the retirement of our parliamentarian, Mr. Lehr Fess.

The gentleman from Missouri has well expressed our appreciation of the unusual tact and capacity with which Mr. Fess has filled this position and our appreciation of his long and faithful service. To myself he has been a tower of strength, as I believe every gentleman who has occupied this Chair during the consideration of business in the Committee of the Whole feels. I know we all wish for him great success in his chosen field. [Applause.]

The Chair is also happy to say that he thinks his place will be worthily filled by Mr. Louis Deschler, who has entered upon the duties of this position with the greatest interest and enthusiasm. I wish for him a career parallel to that of Mr. Fess.

And now, just a word before we adjourn. I want to congratulate this House on being the most efficient lawmaking body in existence. [Applause.] We have passed three vitally important major pieces of legislation in less than two weeks. You have well deserved your holiday, and I wish you all a merry Christmas and happy New Year. [Applause.]

DEATH OF SENATOR A. A. JONES OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an announcement. It is with profound sorrow that I perform my duty by announcing to this body the death last night of Hon. A. A. JONES, senior Senator from the State of New Mexico.

Mr. JONES has for 40 years been an outstanding figure in the development and in the affairs of the State of New Mexico. Coming to that State in 1885 he engaged in the profession of public-school teaching in the town of Las Vegas, which has since been his home; he entered the profession of law in 1888 and rose to first rank in that profession. He served as president of the New Mexico Bar Association in 1893.

His political career began as mayor of Las Vegas in that same year, 1893; he next served as United States district attorney, and has been active in the political affairs of the

State from that time to the present. He served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior under Secretary Lane and in 1916 was elected United States Senator, succeeding himself in 1922. He was in the closing year of his second term as United States Senator.

He has been an honor to the State and an efficient legislator in the Senate. In the death of Senator JONES, New Mexico has met with an irreparable loss, and the Congress of the United States has lost a valuable and faithful statesman.

I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 68

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, a Senator of the United States from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members be appointed on the part of the House, to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220);

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned until January 4, 1928.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the joint resolution, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 4, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

253. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting photostat copy of a supplemental report on the additional claim of Knud O. Flakne for the sum of $800 in the reclaimed Mud Lake bottom; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

254. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the revocable leases of land under the control of the Navy Department which were executed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures.

255. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated December 17, 1927, reporting the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on Expenditures.

256. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting final report covering the purchases of property designated in the several acts providing for the acquisition of properties for the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 132. A bill authorizing the erection of a sanitary fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Dayton, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 204. A bill to authorize an additional appropriation for Fort McHenry, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 233. A bill to provide for the purchase of land in connection with the Fort Monmouth Military Reservation, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4588. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the repair and resurfacing of roads on the Fort Baker Military Reservation, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WASON: Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report of the joint committee on the disposition of useless executive papers in the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 73). Ordered printed.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7009. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7478. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4280. A bill to correct military record of John W. Cleavenger, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3737. A bill for the relief of John T. O'Neil; without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenses and services rendered in behalf of the Eastern, Emigrant, and Western Cherokees by blood; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1812) granting a pension to John Charles Inglee; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3875) granting a pension to Robert McConnell; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6696) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Donley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8219) to prevent destructive floods which cause the loss of life and property, interrupt interstate commerce, or delay the United States mails; and to prevent the recurrence of a flood such as that of the Mississippi River in 1927, which resulted in the loss of more than 246 lives, drowned out hundreds of cities, towns, and villages, drove 700,000 people from their homes, rendering them objects of charity dependent upon the Red Cross and other agencies, inundated 18,000 square miles, destroyed 1,500,000 farm animals, caused losses amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars, suspended interstate freight and passenger traffic, prevented telegraph and telephone communication, delayed the United States mails and paralyzed industry and commerce; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 8220) to prohibit the importation free of duty of foreign-made parts for use on American-made machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 8221) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 8222) to authorize the construction of a memorial to the memory of George Rogers Clark at Harrodsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8223) to authorize the sale of certain buildings at United States Veterans' Hospital No. 42, Perry Point, Md.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 8224) relating to investigation of new uses of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8225) to provide for the remodeling and improvement of the United States appraisers stores building at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 8226) to authorize the Inland Waterways Corporation to construct and operate warehouses and elevators on the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 8227) granting the consent of Congress to the Sunbury Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River from Bainbridge Street, in the city of Sunbury, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 8228) to extend from January 1, 1925, to December 31, 1928, the time within which tuberculosis contracted by World War veterans is presumed to be of service origin, and permitting the mother or father of a deceased World War veteran to receive his insurance or adjusted compensation without showing dependency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 8229) for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the sixth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8230) to provide for the procedure in the trial of certain criminal cases by the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 8231) to provide for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Shreveport, La., and for alterations to the present building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8232) to provide for a site and public building at Arcadia, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8233) to provide for a site and public building at Coushatta, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8234) to provide for a site and public building at Mansfield, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for a site and public building at Haynesville, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8236) to provide for a site and public building at Homer, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 8237) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 120) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time for the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 69) to investigate the Navy and merchant marine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALE: Resolution (H. Res. 70) authorizing payment of six months' salary and funeral expenses to Anna Kenyon on account of the death of Harold Kenyon, late Capitol policeman; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8238) granting an increase of pension to Mary Melinda Renwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 8239) for the relief of David A. Wright; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 8240) for the relief of Irving Levine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8241) granting a pension to Belle L. Corbett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 8242) granting a pension to Sarah Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 8243) granting an increase of pension to Angeline R. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8244) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Wetherhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8245) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 8246) granting an increase of pension to Martha L. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8247) granting an increase of pension to Anne A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8248) granting an increase of pension to Annie Pecor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 8249) granting a pension to Maude Grinstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 8250) granting an increase of pension to Loantha Cory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 8251) granting a pension to James P. Rothwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8252) for the relief of Gust J. Schweitzer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8253) for the relief of the heirs of Viktor Pettersson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8254) for the relief of John C. Lyon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 8255) for the relief of Bethlehem Fabricators (Inc.), of Bethlehem, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 8256) granting a pension to Elma Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8257) granting a pension to John B. Maddox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 8258) granting an increase of pension to Dianna Ricketts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 8259) for the relief of Harry H. Burris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8260) for the relief of Genevieve M. Heberle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 8261) granting a pension to George S. Brush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8262) granting a pension to Jennie Dubois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8263) granting a pension to Annie M. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 8264) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 8265) for the relief of John Gustav Baisch; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 8266) granting an increase of pension to Virginia E. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 8267) authorizing preliminary examination and survey of a portion of the inland waterway from Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8268) authorizing preliminary examination and survey of channel from Beaufort Inlet, N. C., to New Bern; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution (H. Res. 71) authorizing payment of six months' salary and funeral expenses to executor of estate of William H. Estey, late disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

371. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition by residents of the city of Decatur, Ill., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

372. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Francis P. Goodwin and 49 other citizens of Madison, Ind., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

373. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance received from residents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

374. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition from the citizens of Binghamton and vicinity against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

375. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Mrs. A. Banghart, Vassar, Mich., and 19 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

376. Also, petition of George Newberry, Mayville, Mich., and 96 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

377. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Perry, Silverwood, Mich., and six other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

378. Also, petition of George Newberry, Mayville, Mich., and 126 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

379. Also, petition of Howard Stringer, Hunters Creek, Mich., and 31 other residents of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all religious laws favoring one day of the week in preference to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

380. Also, petition of Carl Borck, Kingston, Mich., and 20 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

381. Also, petition of Carl Borck, Kingston, Mich., and 22 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

382. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Carmen, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

383. Also, petition of citizens of Athol, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

384. Also, petition of citizens of Adams County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

385. Also, petition of citizens of Canyon County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

386. Also, petition of citizens of Payette, Payette County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

387. Also, petition of citizens of Latah County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

388. Also, petition of citizens of Washington County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

389. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Raymondville, Lyford, and Combes, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

390. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of eastern district conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, regarding settlement and peace with neighboring states to the South and in China by arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

391. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of citizens of Marysville, Wash., protesting against the Sunday compulsory observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

392. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Orme S. Thompson and 367 other residents of Hillsdale County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

393. Also, petition of Mrs. Lois R. Rowley and 12 other residents of Hillsdale County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

394. Also, petition of Ben Eslon and 71 other residents of Branch County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

395. Also, petition of Glenn L. Peterson and 67 other residents of Eaton County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

396. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of B. Berglund and 150 other citizens of Wahkiakum County, Wash., in opposition to proposed Sunday observance legislation affecting the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

397. Also, petition of William Olmsted and 69 other citizens of Wahkiakum County, Wash., protesting against proposed Sunday observance legislation affecting the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

398. Also, resolution of the Washington State Horticultural Association, requesting adequate appropriations for entomological, pathological, and physiological work needed to solve problems affecting the fruit industry of the Pacific Northwest; to the Committee on Appropriations.

399. By Mr. KEARNS: Petitions from the citizens of Portsmouth, Ohio, against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

400. By Mr. LANKFORD: Petition of 25 citizens of Waycross, Ga., opposing the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) to provide for one day of rest out of every seven for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

401. Also, petition of eight citizens of Waycross, Ga., opposing the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) to provide for one day of rest out of every seven for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

402. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of numerous adult residents of Hudsonville, Jenison, Grand Rapids, Alto, Grandville, Casnovia, and Holland, Mich., against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bills that have been introduced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

403. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, protesting House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

404. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Hayes Barnett, L. A. Bagley, et al., with reference to House bill 78, protesting against passage of the same; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

405. By Mr. SCHAFER: Petition of G. M. Pflugradt and 36 other residents of Milwaukee County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

406. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of 572 citizens of Oregon, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

407. Also, petition of 695 citizens of La Grande, Oreg., against compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

408. By Mr. SMITH: Petition signed by Richard W. Young and 186 other residents of Pocatello, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

409. Also, petition signed by Frank Denton and 380 other residents of Ada County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

410. Also, petition signed by J. F. Kirkpatrick and 187 other residents of Bingham County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

411. Also, petition signed by A. I. McMahon and 75 other residents of Shoshone, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

412. Also, petition signed by Mrs. M. O. Evans and 228 other residents of Nampa, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

413. Also, petition signed by Mrs. G. C. Storey and 48 other residents of Hailey, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

414. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Mrs. Tom Norton and others, of Toppenish, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

415. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of 43 citizens of Liberty Center, Ohio, protesting against passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

416. By Mr. WINTER: Resolutions against the amendment restricting Mexican immigration into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

417. Petition received from the Unity Society of Practical Christianity, Toledo, Ohio, protesting against the injustice being done the Indian in the border crossing between Canada and the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, *January 4, 1928*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at whose word man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until evening, grant that the dawn of this new year may bring Thy blessing as pure and fresh as the dew of the morning. Guide and direct us in our work by Thine own indwelling spirit. Increase and inflame our devotion to Thee and to the welfare of our fellow men. Remove from us all pride, prejudice, and ignorance that we may be a united people worthy of Thy manifold blessings. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 21, 1927, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 280. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.; and

H. R. 5547. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, or its assigns, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Missouri and Kansas.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House (H. Res. 68) adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, late a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of BRONSON CUTTING, a Senator designate from the State of New Mexico, and ask that they may be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the credentials.

The Chief Clerk read the credentials, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Whereas a vacancy exists in New Mexico's representation in the Senate of the United States, caused by the death of ANDRIEUS A. JONES, of New Mexico: Now therefore I, R. C. Dillon, Governor of the State of New Mexico, by virtue of the authority in me vested by law, and for the purpose of filling said vacancy, do hereby appoint BRONSON CUTTING, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., as Senator from the State of New Mexico, in the Senate of the United States, until the people of New Mexico shall fill said vacancy by election.

Done at the executive office this the 29th day of December, A. D. 1927.

Witness my hand and the great seal of the State of New Mexico.

[SEAL.] R. C. DILLON,
Governor of New Mexico.

Attest:

JENNIE FORTUNE,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, the Senator designate is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator designate will present himself at the desk for that purpose.

Mr. CUTTING, escorted by Mr. BRATTON, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 48. An act to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 164. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at the Pacific Branch, Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 349. An act to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 278. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926; and

H. R. 483. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 7201. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 193. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 280. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.;

H. R. 444. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.;

H. R. 5547. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, or its assigns, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Missouri and Kansas;

H. R. 5582. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street, in the city of El Paso, crosses the Rio Grande, in the county of El Paso, State of Texas;

H. R. 5628. An act to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River;

H. R. 5642. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Red River at Fulton, Ark.;

H. R. 6053. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.; and

H. R. 6479. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. JONES. I ask that House bill 6657, which was sent to the Senate just before the holiday recess, be laid before the Senate and read at length.

The bill (H. R. 6657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved January 26, 1925, across the Columbia River, at or near Kettle Falls, Wash., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Congress has already passed a bill providing for the construction of a bridge at this point across the Columbia River, and the House bill simply provides for the extension of time of an act heretofore granting that right. The Commerce Committee authorized me to call up the bill, and ask that it be put on its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUBMARINE SAFETY DEVICES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of the Navy recommending that the Congress be requested to authorize the appointment of a commission of experts for the purpose of considering the development of safety devices for our submarines, such commission to be empowered to call witnesses and to pay their expenses, and also to make such inquiry and investigation into the *S–4* disaster as may be desirable.

I recommend to Congress the passage of a joint resolution authorizing the appointment of such a commission of experts, and that the sum of $20,000 be made available for the purposes stated.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution, and that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine *S–4*, and upon methods and appliances for the protection of submarines, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint a commission which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be selected from civil life and two shall be retired officers of the Navy. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as provided for original appointments.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to investigate and ascertain the methods and appliances adopted and used by the Navy in the operation of submarines to prevent collisions, to protect the lives of officers and crews, and to salvage the vessel in case of disaster; and to make recommendations wherein these methods and appliances now in use may be changed and improved for the good of the service and the better protection of human life.

SEC. 3. It shall be the further duty of the commission to investigate the full facts of the sinking of the submarine *S–4* in collision on December 17, 1927, with the United States Coast Guard destroyer *Paulding* off the Massachusetts coast, and the rescue and salvage operations carried on by the United States Navy subsequent thereto, to supplement the investigation now being made by a naval court of inquiry.

SEC. 4. To carry out and give effect to the provisions of this resolution the commission hereby created shall have power to issue subpœnas, administer oaths, summon witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive testimony taken before any proper officer in any State or Territory of the United States.

SEC. 5. The members of the commission shall select a chairman from among their number; they shall serve without compensation as such, but shall be paid out of the amount appropriated their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties by such officer of the Supply Corps of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy may designate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office. Nothing herein shall affect the pay or allowances of the commissioners selected from the Navy. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000, to be expended by the commission in accordance with the provisions of this resolution. The President is authorized, upon request of the commission, to designate such personnel of any department or Government establishment, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purpose of this resolution.

SEC. 6. The commission shall, as soon as practicable, submit a full report to Congress, by way of the President, giving the results of its investigation and its recommendations. All records of the commission, upon the completion of its duties, shall be deposited with the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the joint resolution, which carries out the recommendations embodied in the message of the President of the United States, speaks for itself.

The whole country has been inexpressibly shocked over the recent sinking of the submarine *S–4* and the terrible, lingering death of the six men shut up for long hours in the forward torpedo room of the submarine before a merciful death at length overtook them.

That every possible measure was taken by the Navy Department to rescue these men the Navy believes to be the case. I, myself, believe it to be the case, and so doubtless do many Senators here present; but it is not enough that such is our belief. It is not enough that a naval court of inquiry, the usual court to make investigation in cases of this kind, shall sit and report its findings pro or con.

The people of the country are stirred up over this tragedy of the sea as I have never known them to be over any other disaster in naval history with the exception of the blowing up of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Habana in 1898. If their pride and belief in their Navy is to be kept up, and without such pride and belief an adequate Navy never can be maintained, they must be convinced beyond peradventure of doubt that the United States Navy does care for its men, that it does provide every feasible means of safety for its men, and that it does employ its utmost resources to rescue the victims of disaster.

The fair name of the Navy demands that the verdict for or against the Navy shall be delivered by a commission that all men must know to be impartial.

For such a commission the President, in his wisdom, has asked us to appropriate. The civilian appointees, I understand, will be experts who have attained high rank in the engineering world.

The Secretary of the Navy is in hearty accord with the purposes of the joint resolution, and I believe that the Senate will unanimously approve its passage.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator ask for the passage of the joint resolution this morning?

Mr. HALE. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so referred.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in connection with what has just been said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by me to the Senator from Maine a few days ago with reference to this proposed investigation; also a letter which is typical of many letters received from constituents requesting an investigation into the *S–4* disaster.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 31, 1927.

Hon. FREDERICK HALE,
Chairman Senate Committee on Naval Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HALE: During my several days in Massachusetts I have found that the accident to the *S–4* has aroused public sentiment and provoked discussion in a greater degree than any occurrence in recent years. There has been widespread criticism upon the part of newspaper writers and others who were at Provincetown, apart from the general feeling that there is a lack of adequate protection for the men engaged in submarine service. Even though it should ultimately appear that all of this proceeds from lack of knowledge of the possibilities in dealing with such matters, public confidence can alone be restored by such an investigation as will make clear the facts.

In order that it may not be said in the future than an investigation was made only by officers or officials of the department directly concerned I feel that this matter should be gone into by the Naval Affairs Committee through the appointment of a subcommittee which would be given ample powers to make the most thorough inquiry. Let the general public, as well as naval officers, who have constructive criticism or helpful suggestions to offer, be heard.

It seems to me that no more important question can engage our attention than the protection of the lives of the men serving in the national defense, and that we would be remiss in our duty to them and to our whole people did we not at least clear for all time from their minds the doubts and misgivings which have gone out from Provincetown. I am requesting that upon the reconvening of the Senate you lay this matter before the committee for consideration.

Faithfully yours,

DAVID I. WALSH.

EASTERN STATES ASSOCIATION,
NATIONAL RAILWAY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND,
West Springfield, Mass., January 1, 1928.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The tragic and heartbreaking sinking of our naval submarine *S–4*, with the subsequent incompetent and futile rescue and salvage operations, has made most of us heartily ashamed of our present naval administration. As boys and as men we have glorified in the records of our Navy, always proud of its achievements, proud of its heroes, ready always to defend it from unjust criticism, and satisfied that it was the greatest in the world. To-day that feeling is gone. On street car or in shops, offices, lodge rooms, and even in our churches, that tower of strength that we have glorified in has tumbled into ashes at our feet. The knowledge that many of the boys on that boat—

perhaps most of them—were alive for days after it sank, to lie there and die, perhaps the hardest of all deaths, in shallow water, on their own home shores, because of an incompetent naval administration, has shaken us to our very soul and has made us, one and all, ashamed of the men at the head of our Navy.

Senator, I want you, and I ask you on behalf of the boys of this boat, on behalf of their families and loved ones, on behalf of the men of the Navy, and, last of all, on behalf of the people all over the country, to force through a full and complete investigation of this catastrophe. It will not be enough for us to have a naval board of inquiry hold an investigation and come out with a report that will be a virtual whitewash of the very men that were responsible and try and place the blame on some of the men that sank with their ship. Neither do we want a half-hearted investigation by your Naval Affairs Committee. Some of the men of your committee may be partly responsible for existing conditions; but in any event they have worked hand in hand in the past with the Navy Department. The Navy to-day has the blackest blot that was ever on its history, and the only thing that will count is to have an impartial and competent board of red-blooded men get at the real facts, make a full public report, and force the Navy Department to consider the safety of their men and to take proper safeguards against a repetition of such an accident.

I am in earnest about this, Senator; more so than anything I have ever taken up before. I know that the people of Massachusetts and, for that matter, all over the land feel as I do, and the time to do it is now.

One thing more. Sunday's press reports indicate that the divers have found several of the main compartments of the boat intact and not flooded with water, so that it is not a water-logged hull that the Navy has tried to make us believe it is; but the Navy will flood it, and this makes it all the more imperative for a full investigation to be started at once, even before the boat is salvaged, so that the committee may obtain first-hand information and the real facts, as it will mean everything to the success of this investigation to have these facts, so that they will not have to accept a naval-censored report.

There is a great deal more that I would like to write about, but I feel that I have said enough; and in closing, Senator, let me again ask you to go through with this. * * *

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. CHASE.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when the Senator from Maine introduced his joint resolution I rose primarily for the purpose of asking that it be broadened in its scope, so that not only the disaster to which the resolution referred might be investigated, but other disasters, some 18 or 20, which have happened in the Navy during the past few years, and particularly one where a submarine was sunk, and another where a number of ships were lost on the California coast.

I sincerely hope that when the Committee on Naval Affairs considers the resolution which was referred to it it will likewise consider the propriety of including within the scope of the resolution a broad and general investigation of the character that I have indicated.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think it would be well to confine this investigation as far as possible to submarine disasters. I expect within a very short time to call a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs to consider the resolution which I have introduced, and I can assure the Senator that we shall be very glad to hear him if he will come before the committee and state his views.

CLAIM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA (S. DOC. NO. 34)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of two claims presented by the Government of China against the Government of the United States arising out of the negligent or unlawful acts in China of persons connected with the military and naval forces of the United States, and I recommend that as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States an appropriation in the amount of $1,100 be made to effect settlement of these two claims, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF DISCOVERY OF HAWAIIAN ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 132)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

At the request of the Governor of Hawaii, made through the Secretary of the Interior, in pursuance of a resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the draft of a joint resolution, attached to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, to authorize the President to invite the Government of Great Britain, and the governments of certain of the British Dominions, to participate in the celebration at Honolulu of the Sesquicentennial of the Discovery of the Hawaiian Islands, and to provide for participation of the Government of the United States therein.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

CLAIM OF RICHARD L. SPRAGUE, AMERICAN CONSUL AT GIBRALTAR (S. DOC. NO. 35)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to the claim of Mr. Richard L. Sprague, American Consul at Gibraltar, for reimbursement for expenses incurred by him in providing relief for the crew of the American steamer *Kanabec*. I recommend that the Congress authorize an appropriation and that an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF OCCUPATION OF VERA CRUZ, MEXICO (S. DOC. NO. 33)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of the claims arising out of the occupation of Vera Cruz, Mexico, by American forces in 1914, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to the President on February 5, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated February 6, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 49, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, a copy of which is furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

I renew the recommendation originally made by President Harding that in order to effect a settlement of these claims the Congress, as an act of grace, and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of $45,518.69, and I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress, in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

CLAIM FOR DEATH OF REGINALD ETHELBERT MYRIE (S. DOC. NO. 32)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State regarding the claim presented by the Government of Great Britain on behalf of Mr. David S. Myrie for compensation on account of the death of his son, Reginald Ethelbert Myrie, in the Panama Canal Zone on February 5, 1921. I recommend that the Congress as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize the appropriation of a sufficient amount to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ROAD CONGRESSES (H. DOC. NO. 134)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State, with an accompany-

ing paper, to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing (1) the President to invite the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses to hold their sixth session in the United States, either in 1929 or 1930, as the association may determine, and (2) an appropriation of $25,000 for the expenses of such meeting, in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the president of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, who was a delegate on the part of the United States to the meeting of the permanent international commission of the association held in Paris in July, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

EXPLORATION OF ARCTIC REGIONS BY MEANS OF AIRSHIP
(H. DOC. NO. 133)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning the plans of the International Society for the Exploration of the Arctic Regions by Means of the Airship, for the establishment of geophysical observations of the inner Arctic regions, toward the accomplishment of which the 19 governments whose countries are represented in the society have been requested to make an annual contribution for five years, for required preparatory work, in accordance with a schedule furnished by the society and accompanying the report of the Secretary of State. The annual contribution requested of the United States is $300.

The attention of Congress is especially invited to the strong indorsements of this project given by the Secretary of the Navy, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the National Research Council, and the Carnegie Institution of Washington, as recited in the report of the Secretary of State.

In view of these favorable comments, and in conformity with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, I lay the matter before Congress for its determination whether it will authorize an annual appropriation of $300 for five years, as the contribution of the United States, on the condition that the other governments approached will also contribute the quotas assigned to them.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEYES. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings.

Mr. President, this bill was passed by the Senate at the last session. It has already been passed by the House at the present session. It seems to me very desirable that action be taken on this matter as promptly as possible; and, as I anticipate that it will be disposed of in a very few minutes, I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is granted, may I ask my colleague just what is the scope of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It relates to the so-called "Triangle."

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator what property is proposed to be bought under the bill?

Mr. KEYES. This is the so-called "Triangle" bill. It includes all of the property not now owned by the Government between Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall and extending from Fifteenth Street down to the Botanical Gardens.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would take in all of the south side of the Avenue?

Mr. KEYES. It takes in all of the south side of the Avenue.

Mr. BORAH. What is to be the cost of it?

Mr. WILLIS. What is the expenditure involved?

Mr. KEYES. The authorization is $25,000,000, the same as last year.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to submit an interrogatory to the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I suggest that the bill go over until after the morning business is completed.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Let us have one session of Congress proceed in order. Why not let the bill go over until after the morning business shall have been disposed of?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona is perfectly proper.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a proper suggestion, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Senators have been waiting for an opportunity to present morning business and have it disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not think the matter would take long.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the bill will go over temporarily.

FLOOD CONTROL FOR THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI

Mr. CARAWAY. I present a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall not object to the presentation of the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas, but after that shall have been done I hope we may proceed with the regular order and complete the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

Mr. CURTIS. I repeat I do not object to the Senator from Arkansas presenting his resolution, but after that I shall insist upon the regular order.

Mr. CARAWAY. The resolution merely asks for information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 90), as follows:

Whereas it has been suggested that the tentative report of the Chief of Engineers dealing with flood protection for the valley of the lower Mississippi contained an estimate for a very much larger sum than the amount named in the report filed; and

Whereas it is reported that it contained no recommendation for local contributions; and

Whereas it is reported that the original estimate and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission for said purpose likewise contained estimate for a very much larger cost; and

Whereas it is reported to have contained no recommendation for local contributions: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate said preliminary estimates, or suggestions and recommendations, if any, of both the Chief of Engineers of the Army and the Mississippi River Commission touching flood control for the valley of the lower Mississippi.

Mr. CARAWAY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I inquire if the resolution is directed to the President?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; it merely calls on the Secretary of War for certain information.

Mr. BRUCE. What is the motion, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas requests unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which has just been read.

Mr. BRUCE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

MEMORIAL OF A BOTTLE OF MADEIRA

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I present a memorial and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE MEMORIAL OF A BOTTLE OF FINE OLD MADEIRA TO CONGRESS

Your memorialist respectfully represents—

1. That it is wine of high repute, derived from an ancient vintage, and always kept carefully bottled and corked in a dark cellar, admirably adapted to the conservation of its flavor and aroma; and that, mellowed by time, it has now reached the stage of maturity at which a connoisseur would unhesitatingly set it down as a perfect thing of its kind, and even a sincere and consistent prohibitionist could not be safely trusted to resist its allurements.

2. That your memorialist is conscious of no wrongdoing whatever with which it can be justly reproached; that wine has been drunk from time immemorial; that the Holy Scriptures declare that a man hath no better thing under the sun than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry; and that nothing in the whole range of physical enjoyment has a larger share of innocent human happiness to its credit than wine.

3. That, if wine is sometimes consumed to excess in the United States, surely that is not its fault, but the fault only of the vulgarian or

beast who is so ungrateful as to forget the benefits that it bestows upon human beings, when not abused, and to abuse it; that, drunk in moderation, it is but a good, familiar creature, fitted as few other things are to stimulate mental vivacity, to foster social sympathy, and to brighten moments that would otherwise be given over to vacuity or tedium; that, just as Christ thought that the joy of the marriage feast, at Cana, would be incomplete without wine, and supplied the lack of it by a miracle, so, in all the truly civilized countries of the world, it is thought that a wedding, a dinner party, a family reunion, or any occasion, where the warm currents of the human heart have been set in motion by some unusually cordial impulse, is but a dull or sorry affair unless enlivened by a bottle or so of wine; that, from the time of Anacreon until the present day, its sparkling spirit has been the very soul of a great body of lyrical poetry, of every feast, and of every occasion graced by woman and inspirited by song; that the number of persons who can not drink wine except immoderately is but a small percentage of the whole, and are the victims not so much of its strength as of their own weakness; that it is the business of Government by wholesome laws to regulate and control such weakness; and that it is the grossest absurdity and injustice for it to allow such weakness, in defiance of the normal instincts of human nature, the dictates of human reason, and the reasonable demands of human liberty to be made the occasion for depriving millions of human beings who can use wine moderately, of a legitimate privilege which they highly prize; that temperance in the use of wine is a virtue, but that total abstinence from its use indicates either the kind of sobriety which La Rochefoucauld affirmed was a mere physical incapacity for strong drink, a totally false philosophy of life, or a Puritanical spirit which mistakes its own sour narrow-mindedness for the precepts of God and morality; that the legislative prohibition of wine does not evidence an advanced community but, on the contrary, one so backward and so lacking in self-restraint and refinement of manners that it feels impelled to resort to extreme police measures which are deemed wholly tyrannical and unnecessary by more polished societies; that in Paris, for instance, the use of wine is, for all practical purposes, universal among all orders of men, and that yet so rarely is a Parisian under its influence that when a man is seen in that condition in Paris he may almost with perfect confidence be set down as an American; and that, even if the degree of drunkenness in the United States for which those ardent sisters of your memorialist—whisky, brandy, and gin—are responsible, were sufficient to warrant their absolute interdiction (which your memorialist denies), that would be no good reason why such mild beverages as wine and its humbler sisters—beer, ale, porter, and the like—should also be prohibited.

4. That, nevertheless, an amendment to the Federal Constitution has gone into effect which should never have been initiated by your honorable body; that it was ratified in an hour of hysteria, brought about by the overstrained feelings of the World War and of political fears and hopes produced by the enormous sums of money expended by the Anti-Saloon League in browbeating or bribing legislative and other candidates; and that such are its crass folly and monstrous injustice that it actually undertakes to denounce as a criminal every beverage, except watery fruit juices, that contains an alcoholic content of as much as one-half of 1 per cent.

Wherefore your memorialist prays that this honorable body unite with the House of Representatives in taking such steps as will speedily bring to an end the vile tyranny that seeks to work its utter ruin, and will restore it to the honored place that it had in the social life of the United States before national prohibition established its odious régime of hypocrisy, perfidy, general disrespect for law, political corruption, and bloodshed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire who signed the memorial which has just been read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland can answer that question.

Mr. BRUCE. The memorial is not signed. I will say to the Senator from Idaho, but it is headed "The memorial of a bottle of fine old Madeira to Congress."

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes.

Mr. KING. It is signed by "Mr. Wine."

Mr. HEFLIN. If it be permissible at this time, I should like to ask who wrote it.

Mr. BRUCE. As the Senator from Alabama seems to think it not badly written, I will admit that I wrote it at the request of the memorialist.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BINGHAM presented a resolution adopted by the Exchange Club of New Britain, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation providing adequate and proper housing for the officers and enlisted men of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ashtabula, Jefferson, Austinburg, and Dorset, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented five memorials signed by 150 citizens of the State of Wisconsin remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Catawba County, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENEEN presented six memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Liberty and Olney, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of legislation imposing a tax on Chautauqua tickets, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COPELAND presented three memorials of sundry citizens of the State of New York remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HENRY A. BELLOWS

Mr. COUZENS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) for the relief of Henry A. Bellows, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 6) thereon.

CATHERINE HARDESTY

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 18) submitted by Mr. MCNARY on December 9, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Catherine Hardesty, widow of Martin T. Hardesty, late a messenger in the employ of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ROSE E. MILLARD

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 23) submitted by Mr. ODDIE on December 9, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Rose E. Millard, widow of Homer B. Millard, late a private of the Capitol police, under the direction of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and other allowances.

LOUISE K. PICKETT

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 43) submitted by Mr. DENEEN on December 12, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Louise K. Pickett, widow of Charles J. Pickett, late an assistant in the office of Senator DENEEN, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LEONA L. GALLAGER

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 50) submitted by Mr. MCLEAN on December 12, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Leona L. Gallager, only daughter and dependent of William G. Gallager, late a messenger of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a

sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EDNA A. YOUNT

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 62) submitted by Mr. WILLIS on December 15, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Edna A. Yount, daughter of Rev. J. J. Muir, late Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 81) submitted by Mr. WILLIS on December 17, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 82) submitted by Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana on December 17, 1927, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pensions, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported a resolution (S. Res. 91), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate hereby is authorized to employ during the Seventieth Congress an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,150 per annum.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, Senate bill 1792, to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases, introduced by me on December 15, at my request was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Another bill dealing with the same subject was introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Obviously the two bills ought to go to the same committee. I ask, accordingly, that the order of the Senate committing Senate bill 1792 to the Committee on Education and Labor be revoked and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 1982) granting the consent of Congress to Stranahan, Harris & Oatis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Ohio, and Edward Ball, of the county of Duval, State of Florida, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1983) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Lingo (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Poinsett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 1985) to authorize additional pay for military aides at the White House and for general officers of the General Staff, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1986) to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 1987) to accept the cession by the State of Colorado of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mesa Verde National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1988) forbidding forecasts or predictions of future cotton prices by Government officials; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1989) to amend the third paragraph of section 13 of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1990) for the relief of Edward Kesson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENE:

A bill (S. 1991) granting a pension to Annie Beaulac; and

A bill (S. 1992) granting an increase of pension to Mary Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 1993) to amend the Federal reserve act and the national banking laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 1994) to amend section 5197 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1995) placing certain employees of the Bureau of Prohibition in the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 1996) granting a pension to Jonah Smith;

A bill (S. 1997) granting a pension to Frank N. Hildreth (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1998) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Lowe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 1999) to provide for control of floods of the Mississippi River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2000) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; and

A bill (S. 2001) for the relief of Benjamin F. Johnson; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2002) to reduce construction charges against irrigable lands within the Flathead Indian Reservation, State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2003) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2004) authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street, adjacent to Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2005) for the relief of W. P. Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 2006) granting a pension to Nora Ownby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2007) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay officers and Filipinos formerly enlisted as members of the National Guard of Hawaii for field and armory training during years 1924 and 1925, and to validate payments for such training heretofore made; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2008) for the relief of the parents of Wyman Henry Beckstead; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2009) placing John A. McAlister, jr., on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2010) granting a pension to Nell Koenig (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2011) granting a pension to Gustave C. Barth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2012) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Frillman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2013) granting an increase of pension to Anna A. Wells (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2014) to authorize the State of Tennessee to organize and maintain an observation squadron, Air Corps, as an independent National Guard unit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2015) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2016) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Fain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2017) for the relief of Henry William Bennett, a British national; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 2018) granting an increase of pension to Bessie B. H. Cotten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2019) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations and to increase the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1926; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2020) for the relief of Leonidas L. Cochran and Rosalie Cochran Brink; and

A bill (S. 2021) extending and continuing to January 12, 1930, the provisions of "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and confirm by patent in the nature of a deed of quitclaim the title to lots in the city of Pensacola, Fla.," approved January 12, 1925; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2022) granting a pension to Merritt F. Robinson;

A bill (S. 2023) granting double pension in all cases where an officer or enlisted man of the Navy dies or is disabled in line of duty as the result of a submarine accident; and

A bill (S. 2024) granting double pension in all cases where an officer or enlisted man of the Army dies or is disabled in line of duty as the result of an aviation accident; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2025) creating the District of Columbia insurance fund for the benefit of employees injured and the dependents of employees killed in employment, providing for the administration of such fund by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

A bill (S. 2026) to regulate the practice of chiropractic, to create a board of chiropractic examiners of the District of Columbia, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2027) granting an increase of pension to Hattie L. Parks (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2028) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Clapp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2029) to promote consolidation and cooperation in the mining and marketing of bituminous coal; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2030) to provide for research into the causes of poultry diseases, for feeding experimentation, and for an educational program to show the best means of preventing disease in poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2031) for the relief of A. R. Free; and

A bill (S. 2032) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2033) for the relief of Daniel Mangan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2034) to authorize the erection of a monument on the battle field of Saratoga; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 2035) to regulate the distribution and sale in interstate commerce of certain toilet articles; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 2036) for the transportation of foreign mails of the United States, the creation and maintenance of auxiliaries for the use of the Army and Navy, the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2037) to aid in the promotion, building, and operation of an American merchant marine, and in the maintenance of American shipbuilding; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2038) granting a pension to Elizabeth Agnes Axson; and

A bill (S. 2039) granting an increase of pension to Jane Stockwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2040) to establish a separate classification of mail matter and more equitable postal rates for books; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 2041) to provide for the regulation of the transmission of intelligence by wire or wireless; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2042) for the relief of Rolette County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 2043) to amend section 80 of the Judicial Code to create a new judicial district in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Hurt (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Mariam Norris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2046) granting a pension to Joseph K. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2047) for the relief of Maj. Allen M. Burdett; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2048) to create a national military park at and in the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain, in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Minnie F. Farrell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2050) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Pingree; and

A bill (S. 2051) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Derby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2052) granting a pension to Sherman Detwiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2053) to establish a military record for Daniel P. Tafe;

A bill (S. 2054) to provide for the appointment as warrant officers of the Regular Army of certain civilian clerks of the Quartermaster Corps; and

A bill (S. 2055) to readjust the pay of certain warrant officers and retired enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2056) establishing a naval record for certain officers and enlisted men of the Naval Militia of California who performed active duty on the U. S. S. *Marion* or *Pinta* during the War with Spain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2057) granting compensation to John Spiropoulos; and

A bill (S. 2058) granting compensation to A. L. Anderson; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 2060) authorizing the construction of a road in Rainier National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2061) for the relief of W. H. Kaufman; and

A bill (S. 2062) for the relief of Molly Stark Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2063) granting a pension to Chesley K. Sims;

A bill (S. 2064) granting an increase of pension to Horace G. W. Best;

A bill (S. 2065) granting an increase of pension to Henry Luch; and

A bill (S. 2066) granting a pension to Mary Ella Flores; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 2067) authorizing the classification of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2068) for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2069) to extend the provisions of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2070) to authorize the appointment of stenographers in the courts of the United States and to fix their duties and compensation; and

A bill (S. 2071) to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act providing for the revision and printing of the Index to the Federal Statutes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2072) for the relief of Frank B. Hawley; and

A bill (S. 2073) for the relief of Homer F. Cox (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 2074) for the relief of William A. Hynes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2075) to provide for agricultural and horticultural experimentation and demonstration on restricted or trust allotted and inherited lands of Indians in Oklahoma; and

A bill (S. 2076) authorizing the enrollment of Carl J. Reid Dussome as a Kiowa Indian, and directing issuance of trust patents to him to certain lands of the Kiowa Indian Reservation, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2077) granting an increase of pension to Caledonia E. Abernathe; and

A bill (S. 2078) granting a pension to Leah A. Bouldin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 2079) authorizing an appropriation for mining experiment stations of the United States Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 2080) granting a pension to Thomas W. Bath; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2081) to amend section 1 of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, in Nevada, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2082) for the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 2083) for the relief of Thurman A. Poe; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2084) for the purchase of land in the vicinity of Winnemucca, Nev., for an Indian colony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 2085) granting an increase of pension to Eva Davis Cogswell; and

A bill (S. 2086) granting a pension to John W. Doe (alias John Bryant); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2087) to authorize the appointment of First Lieut. Clarence E. Burt, retired, to the grade of captain, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2088) to admit Calogero Maniglia permanently to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. STECK:

A bill (S. 2089) granting a pension to Nancy Blitz (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2090) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2091) granting an increase of pension to Minnie L. White (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Webster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2093) granting a pension to Charles A. McComb;

A bill (S. 2094) granting a pension to Mary Bickley;

A bill (S. 2095) granting an increase of pension to Mattie J. Mains; and

A bill (S. 2096) granting an increase of pension to Honora J. Hoffliger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 2097) to provide for the protection of municipal watersheds within the national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2098) for the relief of Sam H. Allen; and

A bill (S. 2099) for the relief of Emerson E. Hunt and C. N. McMillan; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2100) granting a pension to Susie Fast-Walker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2101) granting an increase of pension to Catherine L. Ferree (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2102) granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Kelley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to Delphene Trude (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2104) granting an increase of pension to Nelson E. Bucknam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 2105) to classify certain positions in the Railway Mail Service;

A bill (S. 2106) to classify certain positions in the Railway Mail Service;

A bill (S. 2107) to provide for steel cars in the railway post-office service; and

A bill (S. 2108) to amend the act of February 28, 1925, providing for leaves of absence with pay; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2109) granting an increase of pension to Ella K. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Blanchard;

A bill (S. 2111) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2112) granting an increase of pension to Johannah Stone (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Lona S. Burnett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Gates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2115) to authorize the granting of leave to ex-service men and women to attend the annual convention of the United Spanish War Veterans and auxiliary in Habana, Cuba, in 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 2116) for the relief of Albert S. Watts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2117) granting compensation to William Arbogast; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2118) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Morrow;

A bill (S. 2119) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Serig;

A bill (S. 2120) granting an increase of pension to Horace V. Andrews;

A bill (S. 2121) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hare;

A bill S. 2122) granting a pension to William C. Milliner;

A bill (S. 2123) granting a pension to James H. Kelly; and

A bill (S. 2124) granting a pension to Mollie Okey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 2125) authorizing and directing the Inland Waterways Corporation to initiate water carriage upon the Hennepin Canal, Illinois River, and conecting canals with Lake Michigan, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2126) to provide for compensation for Ona Harrington for injuries received in an airplane accident; and

A bill (S. 2127) for the relief of William S. Welch, trustee of the estate of the Joliet Forge Co., Joliet, Ill., bankrupt; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2128) granting an increase of pension to Minnie H. R. Bell;

A bill (S. 2129) granting a pension to Arthur H. Egleston;

A bill (S. 2130) for the relief of Marion M. Gray;

A bill (S. 2131) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Craig;

A bill (S. 2132) granting a pension to John Sundberg;

A bill (S. 2133) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hunt;

A bill (S. 2134) granting a pension to Charles E. Dern;

A bill (S. 2135) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wolf;

A bill (S. 2136) granting an increase of pension to Mary Helena Hallock;

A bill (S. 2137) granting a pension to Frank Lambert; and

A bill (S. 2138) granting an increase of pension to Charles Oakley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2139) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine claims of certain bands or tribes of Indians residing in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2140) amending section 5 of the act approved June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 218), so as to authorize the sale of timber on class 3 of the Oregon & California Railroad and Coos Bay wagon-road grant lands; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2141) granting compensation to Harvey J. Whitehorn;

A bill (S. 2142) granting compensation to Cecil E. Crim; and

A bill (S. 2143) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2144) granting a pension to Emma L. Meyer;

A bill (S. 2145) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Robertson;

A bill (S. 2146) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and to certain widows of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2147) granting a pension to Willard S. Linville; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2148) to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2149) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate all phases of crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2150) granting the consent of Congress to the Sunset Investment Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam to retain tidal waters in Inner Depot Bay, Lincoln County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2151) granting a pension to Samuel Dorman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2152) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Thomas (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2153) granting a pension to Adeline E. Myrick (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

(By request.) A bill (S. 2154) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913;

(By request.) A bill (S. 2155) to amend section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 855), entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes";

(By request.) A bill (S. 2156) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands bordering on and adjacent to Summit Lake, Nev., for the Paiute, Shoshone, and other Indians;

(By request.) A bill (S. 2157) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands in Inyo County, Calif., for Indian use;

(By request.) A bill (S. 2158) to reserve 120 acres on the public domain for the use and benefit of the Koosharem Band of Indians residing in the vicinity of Koosharem, Utah; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 2159) to provide for the withdrawal of certain-described lands in the State of Nevada for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Walker River Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 2160) to repeal the act prohibiting the interstate transportation of prize-fight films; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 2161) to amend sections 57 and 61 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909;

A bill (S. 2162) to authorize the licensing of patents owned by the United States; and

A bill (S. 2163) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 2164) to acend section 202, paragraph 10, of the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2165) granting an increase of pension to Ervilla J. Payne (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2166) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Shepard (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2167) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Folger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 2168) to cede to the State of Maryland certain lands within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 2169) for the relief of the heirs of Gen. Dick Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2170) to designate a building site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2171) for the advancement in rank of certain officers of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2172) authorizing Claude A. Connaughton, ex-midshipman of the United States Navy, to be reinstated as midshipman under certain conditions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2173) authorizing the presentation of the iron gates in West Executive Avenue, between the grounds of the State, War, and Navy Building and the White House, to the Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society for the memorial gateways into the Spiegel Grove State Park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Anne C. H. Howze (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2175) granting an increase of pension to Cora J. Valentine (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2176) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor P. Matthias (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Conner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Waltermire (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2179) granting an increase of pension to Susan Vining (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2180) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Jane Moore (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2181) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth R. Richwine (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2182) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Sample (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2183) granting an increase of pension to Abigail J. Walbert (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 2184) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant to William S. Cook a certificate of honorable discharge from the United States Army and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2185) to extend the time for the refunding of taxes erroneously collected from certain estates; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Wilson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2187) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stone (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2188) granting the consent of Congress to Frank M. Burruss, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; and

A bill (S. 2189) granting the consent of Congress to F. C. Barnhill, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2190) authorizing the construction and equipment of a flood relief and rescue vessel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2191) for the relief of Joseph M. Black;

A bill (S. 2192) for the relief of Lemuel Simpson; and

A bill (S. 2193) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant to Minor Moore a certificate of honorable discharge from the United States Army, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2194) granting a pension to Sarah J. Cato (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2195) granting a pension to Lavina J. Welch (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2196) granting a pension to Mary Ann Fowler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2197) granting a pension to Mary James (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2198) granting a pension to Permelia Elizabeth Yount (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2199) granting a pension to Hattie Carver (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2200) granting a pension to Frances C. Upchurch (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2201) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Fitzmaurice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS (by request):

A bill (S. 2202) to repeal part of section 6 of the act of May 28, 1896 (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2203) to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2204) to amend section 284 of the Judicial Code of the United States (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2205) providing for punishment of assaults upon letter or mail carriers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2206) to amend section 260 of the Judicial Code as amended (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2207) to authorize the removal of civil suits or criminal proceedings against officers, agents, and employees of the United States (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2208) to amend section 118a of the Judicial Code (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2209) to amend section 227 of the Judicial Code (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2210) to amend section 1 of the act of February 22, 1875, entitled "An act regulating fees and costs, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2211) for the issuance and execution of warrants in criminal cases and to authorize bail (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2212) to provide punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2213) providing against misuse of official badges for United States marshals and their deputies (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2214) providing for the punishment of persons escaping from Federal penal or correctional institutions, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2215) to authorize the construction of a public highway to connect the town of Alderson with the village of Glenray, W. Va. (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2216) to authorize the designation of persons to act for disbursing officers and others charged with the disbursement of public money of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS. Accompanying the bills are letters and other documents, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary without printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2217) relative to the dam across the Kansas (Kaw) River at Lawrence, in Douglas County, Kans.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2218) to amend section 25 of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2219) for the relief of the Central National Bank, Ellsworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2220) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of certain Indians of the Kickapoo Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2221) for the relief of James E. Gilleese (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2222) for the relief of the Topeka Tent & Awning Co.; and

A bill (S. 2223) for the relief of Lyda F. Foster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2224) for the relief of Harriet K. Carey;

A bill (S. 2225) for the relief of W. Laurence Hazard;

A bill (S. 2226) for the relief of Winfield Scott;

A bill (S. 2227) for the relief of F. L. Campbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2228) for the relief of the First National Bank of Ottawa, Kans. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2229) granting a pension to Serenus F. Horst (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2230) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Hyde (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2231) granting an increase of pension to Narcissa E. Harrold (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2232) granting an increase of pension to Bertha G. Kimball (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2233) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lloyd (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2234) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McBride (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2235) granting a pension to William McClure (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2236) granting a pension to Sanford S. Martin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2237) granting a pension to Maria Mather (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2238) granting an increase of pension to Lilly Ann Newberry (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2239) granting a pension to Laura A. Hall (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2240) granting a pension to Harriet Roberts (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2241) granting an increase of pension to Harriet D. Rake (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2242) granting a pension to Jeanette Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2243) granting an increase of pension to Hester Small (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2244) granting an increase of pension to Carrie B. Straight (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2245) granting a pension to Barbara E. Sharp (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2246) granting a pension to Sarah Travis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2247) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Yates (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2248) granting an increase of pension to Henry Phillips;

A bill (S. 2249) granting a pension to Mamie Birge (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2250) granting a pension to George Biddle (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2251) granting an increase of pension to William S. Contell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2252) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Dailey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2253) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Henry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2254) to correct the military record of Tearriel Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2255) to establish a military record for Charles Morton Wilson, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to relieve Elizabeth Robins Pennell from necessity of providing a surety on her bond for the benefit of the United States as residuary legatee and remainderman under the will of Joseph Pennell; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) authorizing the expenditure of certain funds paid to the United States by the Persian Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) to provide for an agricultural day; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) providing for the cooperation of the United States in the Pacific Southwest Exposition in commemoration of the landing of the Spanish padres in the Pacific Southwest and the opening of the Long Beach, Calif., world port; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 3, 1891; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPENSATION TO EX-SERVICE MEN

Mr. DILL introduced a bill (S. 2059) to amend section 200 of the World War veterans' act, as amended, which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, on request of Mr. DILL, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 200 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"If any ex-service man, after application, is shown to have a disability which shall be rated at 75 per cent or more, he shall be conclusively presumed to have acquired such disability in such service between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, and shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of $30 per month from the date of application, unless it can be shown that the disability was actually caused by his own willful misconduct after discharge from the service."

AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. HEFLIN. I send to the clerk's desk a joint resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) requesting the President to immediately withdraw the armed forces of the United States from Nicaragua was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States is founded upon the principle of self-government; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon the constituted authorities of the United States to recognize and respect at all times the right of self-government in other nations; and

Whereas the sending of armed forces by the United States into a neighboring Republic for the purpose of overthrowing a government resulting from the expressed will of the people is wrong, inexcusable, and indefensible; and

Whereas President Coolidge, in sending armed forces into Nicaragua to protect and defend Diaz, the imposter and usurper, and hold him in the office of President, to which he was never elected, and against the will of the people, is an act of imperialistic tyranny and a crime against the natives of Nicaragua who love the principles of self-government well enough to fight and die for them; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress and Congress alone shall declare war; and

Whereas soldiers of the United States are now and have been for months engaged in war in defense of the Diaz régime in Nicaragua, and losing their lives, in violation of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the forcing of United States soldiers to carry on war and sacrifice their lives in such a cause in Nicaragua—in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress and in violation of the Constitution of the United States—deserves the condemnation of all loyal Americans and calls for immediate action by Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to immediately withdraw from Nicaragua the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am compelled to object.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would be willing to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will withdraw my request for immediate consideration and ask that the joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CLAIMS OF GRAIN ELEVATORS, ETC.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the President to ascertain, adjust, and pay certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920, as per a certain contract authorized by the President, which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, on request of Mr. SHIPSTEAD, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[S. J. Res. 59]

Joint resolution authorizing the President to ascertain, adjust, and pay certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920, as per a certain contract authorized by the President

Whereas it is provided in the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel (c. 53, 40 Stat. L., approved August 10, 1917, and c. 125, 40 Stat. L., approved March 4, 1919), wherein the President was authorized to determine and fix a guaranteed price to be paid producers of wheat, and wherein the President was further authorized as follows:

"Whenever the President shall find it essential, in order to carry out the guarantees aforesaid, or to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder, he is authorized to make reasonable compensation for handling, transportation, insurance, and other charges with respect to wheat and wheat flour of said crops and for storage thereof in elevators, on farms, and elsewhere;" and

Whereas the President by an Executive order (No. 3087), dated May 14, 1919, in pursuance of the power conferred on him by said act, did order as follows:

"I further find it essential, and hereby direct, that in order to carry out the guarantees made producers of wheat of the crops of 1919, and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder, the United States wheat director utilize the services of the Food Administration Grain Corporation (now the United States Grain Corporation by reason of a change of name authorized by Executive order), as an agency of the United States, and I authorize the Food Administration Grain Corporation * * * to enter into such voluntary agreements to make such arrangements and to do and perform all such acts and things as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of said act;" and

Whereas the United States Grain Corporation in pursuance of said Executive order, and for the purpose of carrying out and making effective the guaranteed price, made, and entered into, a certain contract, known as "the grain dealers' agreement," with various independent and farmer grain firms and grain elevator companies in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Wyoming, and Oklahoma, and wherein it was agreed as follows:

"Fourth. In case the dealer (the elevator firms) shall be unable, after using every effort and all diligence, to ship in any week such total of grain as makes the equivalent of at least 20 per cent of the amount of wheat in his elevator and owned by him at the beginning of such week, the grain corporation shall pay to the dealer to cover insurance and interest for such week seven-twentieths of a cent per bushel on the wheat in the elevator owned by him at the beginning of such week;" and

Whereas the President, in an Executive order dated August 21, 1920, did approve, ratify, and confirm all acts done or authorized by the said United States Grain Corporation in carrying out and making the guaranteed price effective; and

Whereas a number of claims of the said grain dealers, for money earned under said contract, still remains unpaid, and are now justly due said claimants: Therefore it is

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to ascertain the amounts due on said claims, and he is further authorized to adjust and pay said claims, as ascertained to be due said claimants, out of any funds now in the hands of the United States Grain Corporation, and belonging to the United States, or out of the funds in the United States Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, and the President is authorized to make payment thereof therefrom to the several persons entitled thereto, as their respective interests may appear.

AMENDMENTS TO TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. BROUSSARD and Mr. THOMAS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE DESCHUTES PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1186) to provide for the construction of the Deschutes project in Oregon, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 744) to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ODDIE submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill add the following:

"For paying the Truckee-Carson irrigation district, Fallon, Nev., the proportionate share of the benefits assessed by said district against 5,480 acres of Paiute Indian lands within the Newlands irrigation project for the years 1919 to 1927, both inclusive, $4,438.80: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall hereafter annually ascertain for submission to Congress the amount of such assessments as they may accrue."

At the proper place in the bill add the following:

"For reimbursing the Truckee-Carson irrigation district, Fallon, Nev., the proportionate share of the drainage construction costs for 4,877.3 irrigable acres of Paiute Indian lands with the Newlands irrigation project, $16,972."

At the proper place in the bill add the following:

"For paying the Truckee-Carson irrigation district, Fallon, Nev., the proportionate share of the benefits assessed by said district against 4,877.3 irrigable acres of Paiute Indian lands within the Newlands irrigation project for necessary repairs to the Truckee Canal to restore said canal to its original capacity, $10,096.01."

RADIO EQUIPMENT FOR THE SENATE

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I have a Senate resolution to offer that I should like to have read and then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I would like to say just a word about the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 92), as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is hereby directed, at as early a date as practicable, to equip the desk of each individual Senator with the proper electrical connections to which a microphone for radio broadcasting may be attached, and also to install a microphone control switchboard to enable connection of each microphone with the broadcasting station as may be desired during the Senate proceedings, and the necessary expense for such installation of electrical connections and equipment is hereby authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The Committee on Rules of the Senate is hereby authorized to make arrangements for the broadcasting of such proceedings of the Senate as the committee may determine through such radio broadcasting stations as it may be possible to arrange for broadcasting without expense to the Senate or the Government.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I shall not discuss the resolution at length now, but I do want to call attention to the fact that this proposal will not entail any great expense. The cost of the wiring of the desks and providing for electrical connections by which the proceedings could be broadcast would not be large. I am reliably informed that there are broadcasting organizations in the country that will be glad to broadcast the debates of the Senate which might be determined upon as provided by the Committee on Rules.

I recognize that no parliamentary body has ever provided for radio broadcasting of its proceedings, but that is no reason why the Senate should not consider doing so. In fact, this body should set the example by passing this resolution.

Radio stations have broadcast the inaugural address of a President. Only recently the House of Representatives had a movietone taken of its opening, and anyone who saw the audiences watch and listen to the results of that were profoundly impressed. The interest of the American people in the proceedings of the National Congress will be tremendously increased and public opinion will be clarified and strengthened in regard to this body.

At some later time I shall discuss at length the full import of this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

VETERANS' BUREAU HOSPITAL AT SOAP LAKE, WASH.

Mr. DILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 93), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is hereby directed to investigate the advisability of establishing a Veterans' Bureau hospital at Soap Lake, in the State of Washington, and to report to the Senate at the beginning of the second regular session of the Seventieth Congress.

ARSENIZATION OF YELLOW FEVER, 1905

Mr. RANSDELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 94), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed 400 copies of the manuscript entitled "Letter from Dr. Reginald B. Leach, of Paris, Tex., dated February 22, 1916, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, submitting a report on the arsenization of yellow fever during the epidemic of 1905."

FOREIGN EXCHANGE AND EUROPEAN CURRENCY

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95), which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining be, and it is hereby, authorized to revise to date and publish with illustrations as a Senate document Serial 8, entitled "Foreign Exchange Quotations and Curves," and Serial 9, entitled "European Currency and Finance," both publications prepared under Senate Resolution 469, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, said committee to employ such personal services and incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution; such expenditures shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers authorized by the committee and signed by the chairman thereof.

MARGARET H. ROCHE

Mr. HARRISON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Margaret H. Roche, widow of Philip J. Roche, late a messenger employed as assistant doorkeeper under the direction of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LILLIAN NEAL

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 97), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Lillian Neal, widow of Raymond Neal, late an employee of the Senate under the supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. DALE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 98), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR JONES, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. BRATTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, late a Senator from the State of New Mexico, upon vouchers properly approved.

INVESTMENTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. NYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas war is contrary to the progress of civilization and injurious to trade and commerce; and

Whereas the peoples of all countries are petitioning for the blessings of continued peace and prosperity; and

Whereas with this thought in mind, the Monroe doctrine promulgated by President Monroe in 1823 asserted the principle (to which we have steadfastly adhered) "that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subject for further colonization by any European powers"; and that we should consider any contrary action "dangerous to our peace and safety"; and

Whereas the progress of events and the economic development of the vast natural resources of Central and South America, including the West Indies, through the expansion and enterprise of our financial powers, have now rendered necessary a further pronouncement upon our part to the effect that, as stated by former Secretary of State Charles E. Hughes, we do not intend "to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics, to assert an overlordship, to consider the spread of our authority beyond our own domain as the aim of our policy, and to make our power the test of right in this hemisphere"; and

Whereas the United States has declared that it has never given nor intends to give any such guaranty and protection: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby affirms that it shall never be the policy of the United States to guarantee nor protect by force the investments and properties of its citizens in foreign countries, and that we will hereafter, both in theory and practice, pursue the same policy in respect to any controversial questions arising therefrom or related thereto when dealing with small and weak nations that we recognize and follow in dealings with nations of the first class; namely;

That whenever any of our citizens invest their funds in foreign countries they become, in so far as such investments are concerned, to all intents and purposes citizens of such countries, and are thereby entitled to and subject to the protection and provisions of the laws of such countries, with, however, the additional right of appeal to their own Government (should any controversial questions arise in respect to such investments or properties) to the extent that whenever such claims appear to be justified our Government will assist them through its good

offices, and cooperate with them in presenting their claims, with a view to bringing about an amicable adjustment of any such difficulties; but that the United States will in no case forcibly interfere in the orderly settlement of such controversies, nor utilize its Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or otherwise employ force with a view to demanding or achieving the settlement of such claims; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States with the request that he publicly proclaim this doctrine of self-determination as being an integral part of the policy of the United States from now on, and memorialize the other nations of the world with the expressed hope that they, by taking similar action, will assist in conferring the blessings of peace and prosperity upon all their peoples.

INVESTIGATION OF NAVAL OIL RESERVE LEASES

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution, which I ask the clerk to read for the information of the Senate. It had been my intention to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, but upon talking with some Senators I have been requested to let it go over under the rule, so that at the conclusion of the reading of the resolution I myself will ask that it go over until to-morrow under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 101), as follows:

Whereas in the Sixty-seventh Congress the Senate passed Senate Resolutions 282 and 294, which resolutions directed the Committee on Public Lands to investigate the entire subject of the leases upon naval oil reserves with particular reference to the protection of the rights and equities of the Government of the United States and the preservation of its natural resources; and

Whereas said committee never completed said investigation, the same having been suspended because of the refusal of one Harry F. Sinclair to answer the questions of the committee, and said committee has never made any final report to the Senate; and

Whereas in the case of the United States against Harry F. Sinclair and Albert B. Fall it was disclosed upon the trial that a fraudulent corporation, known as the Continental Trading Co. of Canada, had been organized for the purpose of using the profits of its business in the bribing of public officials of the United States and for other dishonest, dishonorable, and illegal purposes; and

Whereas it was disclosed upon said trial that profits of said corporation were invested in Liberty bonds of the United States and that only a portion of said Liberty bonds so invested had been definitely traced and accounted for and that a large amount of Liberty bonds coming into the hands of said fraudulent corporation had been unaccounted for and unexplained: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said Committee on Public Lands be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to renew and to continue the investigation provided for in said resolutions 282 and 294, and said resolutions are hereby renewed as fully and as completely as though they were herein fully set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee is specifically directed to make an investigation as to the transactions and activities of the said fraudulent corporation, the Continental Trading Co. of Canada, and it is specifically directed to trace all the Government bonds held and dealt in by said corporation with the purpose of ascertaining the beneficiary or beneficiaries of all the illegal transactions connected with the fraudulent and dishonest sale or leasing of the said naval oil reserves.

Mr. NORRIS. I now ask, at the request of several Senators, that the resolution may go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

CONTROL OF ARMY AND NAVY AND AIR SERVICE

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives be requested to hold joint meetings and take such steps as they may deem necessary to thoroughly investigate the advisability of creating a nonpartisan, nonpolitical board, consisting of five or seven members, who shall have entire control and management (subject to such laws as may be made by the Congress of the United States) of the Army and Navy and Air Service of the United States Government in order that said Army and Navy and air forces may be entirely eliminated from politics and the control of any official of the United States, except the members of the board herein provided for, in order that those in control may not be subject to change in case of the success or defeat of any national political party, and that said committees be requested to report within a reasonable time.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I should like to make a short statement in reference to the concurrent resolution, and shall then ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. President, the resolution which I send to the desk does not propose to make any new law, neither does it abolish any positions or create new ones. It is simply a suggestion by which may be put in motion the machinery to help make more efficient the defense of this country.

Recent events, such as the sinking of the submarine *S–4*, and the inefficiency and incompetency and, I might say, willful negligence in not saving the lives of the men who were entrapped in it, are hardly excusable upon any grounds whatsoever.

The deaths in airplanes, the many wrecks that have occurred, and the recent Bolling Field hangar fire, causing the loss of a half million dollars or more, show that there is something radically wrong with the air service; and certainly there are men being promoted in all branches of the different services who are not entitled to promotion, but who have a political pull, and who are pushed up into higher positions over men who have had longer terms of service and much more distinguished service, which shows a lack of military discipline, and gives the appearance of politics governing the Army.

When we take into consideration the criticism of men who have for many years been connected with the Army and Navy and Air Service since its beginning, we all must admit that there is something wrong in all these departments; for when a man who is familiar with the situation has the nerve and the backbone to try to be of service to the humble privates—who are working, offering their all to the Government, even their lives, in its defense—and endeavors to correct the evils which exist, he is criticized, held up to ridicule and contempt, and often humiliated by being displaced.

I think it is high time that promotions should be made regularly and where deserved, and stop this political bootlicking in order to get a promotion; especially when a man has served or stands ready to serve on the field of battle, not for personal reward to be paid to him or for the plaudits of an excited public for something he has done, but for the defense of the honor of his Nation and the lives of its citizens.

I shall ask to have printed in connection with my remarks the sections of the Constitution in reference to this matter. I certainly hope that the resolution will be adopted and that the committees charged with this investigation will spare no pains to right the wrongs that are being done and to place our country on the very highest pinnacle of perfection for defense; and that this Congress will appropriate sufficient amounts of money to give us the greatest Army, the strongest Navy, and the most competent Air Service that the world has ever known.

We should have a well-clothed, well-housed, well-paid, and, at all times, a strong and thoroughly equipped Army, Navy, and Air Service, commanded by men of experience and of the highest type of character, well trained mentally and physically; and under no conditions should any man be put in command who is cruel to or mistreats his subordinates, for none is a more dastardly coward than the man who uses his authority to abuse those who are serving under him and who are not in a position to protect themselves from his inhumanity.

I am absolutely, and have been all my life and always will be, opposed to military rule, or even calling the militia into service, except in cases of war or the most urgent needs for the protection of homes, lives, and property.

We all fully realize that the best way to wipe out war is to let other people know that we are thoroughly protected, and, if they should attempt to impose upon us, that we can and will destroy them.

I ask to have inserted in my remarks some references to the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article I, section 1, clause 12: The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

Article I, section 1, clause 13: The Congress shall have power * * * to provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, section 1, clause 14: The Congress shall have power * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

* * * * * * *

The power to establish rules implies necessarily the power to modify or repeal to create anew.

(U. S. *v.* Eliason, 16 Pet. 302; U. S. *v.* Freeman, 3 How. 556; Gratiot *v.* U. S., 4 How. 117; Ex parte Reed, 100 U. S. 22; Smith *v.* Whitney, 116 U. S. 176.)

Article II, section 2, clause 1: The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States. * * *

* * * * * * *

The President is made Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States at all times, and Commander in Chief of the Militia only when called into the actual service of the United States. (Johnson *v.* Sayre, 158 U. S. 115.)

As Commander in Chief the President is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces *placed under his command* (italics added), and to employ them in a manner which he may deem most effectual. By virtue of his position he has undoubted power to establish rules and regulations for the government of the Army and Navy, or may modify or repeal or create them anew, and such rules and regulations can not be questioned on the ground that they are unwise. Army and Navy regulations made pursuant to the authority *conferred upon the President* [italics added] have the force of law. (Johnson *v.* Sayre, 158 U. S. 115.)

The power of the President as Commander in Chief must be exercised in accordance with the laws and usages of nations *and in the manner prescribed by Congress.* (Italics added.)

(Otis *v.* Bacon, 7 Cranch, 589; Little *v.* Barreme, 2 Cranch, 170; Prize Cases, 2 Black, 668; Totten *v.* U. S., 92 U. S. 107; Tracy *v.* Swartout, 10 Pet. 80; Ex parte Milligan, 4 Wall. 2; In re Cooper, 143 U. S. 500; Belknap *v.* Schild, 161 U. S. 18; Matthews *v.* McStea, 91 U. S. 12.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FORECASTS OF FARM PRICES

On motion of Mr. HARRIS, the resolution (S. Res. 78) opposing the issuance by the Department of Agriculture of unauthorized reports relative to prices of agricultural commodities, submitted by him on December 17, 1927, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

OKANOGAN PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. JONES. Out of order, I desire to ask permission to report from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation the bill (S. 1661) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated, and I submit a report (Rept. No. 7) thereon.

I want to say that this is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and after quite a full hearing the committee reports it unanimously. It feels that this is a local matter of rather urgent necessity, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the measure.

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read, if it is brief.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to contract with the Okanogan irrigation district for the transfer of the control of the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, constructed pursuant to the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, known as the reclamation law, upon the district agreeing to pay to the United States in discharge of all obligations the sum of $10,000 per annum for the period of 31 consecutive years, beginning with the year 1928. Upon such payments being completed, the said Secretary is authorized to convey to the district all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to said Okanogan project.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to assign to the district all claims that the United States now holds under contracts with water users and others owning land outside the boundaries of the said district, or owning land within the boundaries of said district but not consenting expressly or impliedly to the modifications in their water-right contracts necessary to conform to the terms of said proposed contract between the United States and the Okanogan irrigation district. During the irrigation season of 1928, prior to the execution of such contract with the Okanogan irrigation district, the district may, at its own expense, operate the canals and other works of the Okanogan project for the delivery of water to the water users thereunder, and during such irrigation season may deliver water regardless of the restrictions now imposed by the reclamation law relating to delinquency in payment of charges.

SEC. 3. The contract between the United States and the said district shall reserve to the United States the power at the option of the Secretary of the Interior to resume control of said project at any time when necessary to shut off water to enforce payment of the annual installments provided for in the first section hereof.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator if the only protection the Government has is the reservation just read, that the Government may resume control in the event of any delinquency?

Mr. JONES. I think so. I do not know of any other protection that is really required. The Senator knows that if we shut off the water it might force payment if it is possible to get it.

Mr. KING. When does title pass from the United States to the district?

Mr. JONES. Not until the end of the 31 years.

Mr. KING. Is interest to be paid upon the deferred charges?

Mr. JONES. No; except as is required under existing law. I do not remember the exact terms of the general law, but my recollection is that after the water users have been delinquent one year, then further suspension is done away with upon payment of interest. That is not modified by the pending measure at all.

Mr. KING. How much has the Government expended on the project?

Mr. JONES. The Government has expended on the project a little over a million dollars.

Mr. KING. And the district is to pay only $10,000 a year?

Mr. JONES. Yes; under the terms of the bill. The situation is that there was included in the original project about 9,000 or 10,000 acres of land and it has been found that there is not water for more than 3,800 acres. The situation does not grow out of any default upon the part of the people. The people there who can get the water will pay all of the charges, because it is one of the most productive sections in the country with water. But for several years there has been a shortage of water and there is no prospect of getting it. Many orchards there are 10 or 12 years old, with trees dead and others dying.

The department, after very careful investigation, has found that so far as anything they can see from an engineering standpoint at the present time they can not furnish water for more than 3,800 acres of land. Even on this basis they can only furnish about 2½ acre-feet. They find it is necessary to have at least 3 acre-feet. The people there must make provisions for the additional half foot.

The bill is for the purpose of curing a local situation which grows out of the absolute failure to have water to meet the demands in accordance with the original construction of the project. It is quite a complicated matter and has been in a very critical situation for two or three years. This is apparently the only solution that will take care of the situation to any extent at all.

Mr. KING. This means, of course, a loss to the Government of considerably more than a million dollars?

Mr. JONES. No; it means a loss to the Government of about $500,000, growing out of no fault of the people there.

Mr. KING. But in that statement the Senator does not take into account any past interest upon the investment or any future interest upon the investment.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; because we do not take interest into consideration at all in connection with reclamation in the regular way. They have paid four or five hundred thousand dollars already to the Government for operation, maintenance, and construction charges; but, as I said, hundreds of acres of the land which has been reclaimed has no water, and trees 8 and 10 years old are dead. I was out there and visited it personally this summer and found several other hundreds of acres where the trees are dying for lack of water this year. This is a problem we have tried to work out, and the bill will insure the Government payment to the extent of the reclamation of 3,800 acres, and unless we do something of this kind the Government will get nothing.

Mr. KING. This is one of the melancholy evidences, then, of the incompetency of the Reclamation Service in the determination of projects.

Mr. JONES. I would not put it just that way. This is one of the first projects taken up under the reclamation act. It was taken up in 1903. The Reclamation Service probably did not then have the information they should have had with reference to the water system. Nevertheless, that is the situation, and the bill is a means to try to bring about the best possible result for the Government.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NICARAGUAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by General Moncada, the leader of the army of Nicaragua, which was printed in the Outlook.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

NICARAGUA AND AMERICAN INTERVENTION

Since coming to the United States I have been many times asked to explain what is our point of view in Nicaragua toward the presence of your American marines. In most cases the question has been accompanied by others concerning the general situation in Nicaragua both before and since my meeting with Colonel Stimson.

Generally, I am asked, are we Liberals in Nicaragua in favor of having the United States supervise the election of 1928? Specifically, I am asked if at the time of my conference with Colonel Stimson, when the civil war was at its height, if I had won, could I have brought peace and prosperity to Nicaragua without the help of the United States? Could any Nicaraguan?

To answer such questions fully requires a brief review of the entire Nicaraguan situation.

Let me say this, as a preliminary:

We Liberals want the United States marines in Nicaragua. We believe that the marine officers such as now command our constabulary can best supervise the free elections necessary to put a representative government in office. Further, we believe that the United States owes it to Nicaragua to keep her marines there until such elections have taken place. It is her duty and obligation.

Napoleon III used to say that Nicaragua occupies a position similar to that of Constantinople. Though poor in the number of its inhabitants—800,000—Nicaragua is rich in natural resources, in the variety of its soils and climates, and its splendid position. Both the Atlantic and the Pacific wash its shores. The facilities it offers for a canal route through its territory have been well known since the time of the conquest.

For these reasons Nicaragua has always been coveted by certain powerful nations, and the United States has stood guard against the colonizing aspirations of the Old World, making clear its specific guardianship, first, in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty—signed in 1850 by England and the United States—wherein are defined the obligations of each contracting party with respect to the Nicaragua canal or any other canal which might be opened through the isthmus of Central America; and, second, in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which broadened the rights of the North American Republic, clearing her way toward the construction of the canal and the guardianship of the Caribbean. By building the Panama Canal the United States averted the danger of having one of Europe's feet planted on the New World.

For Nicaraguans two questions present themselves: Is it to the best interests of Central America that the United States or one of the powerful nations of Europe shall contribute to its development and progress? Is it to the best interests of Central Americans to receive a monarchical education, as they did when Spain ruled them as colonies, or a republican education, such as the United States can give them?

The answer is obvious. Liberty flowers in republican soil. The Monroe doctrine guarantees the existence of American nations, whether English speaking or Spanish speaking.

Some would maintain that Cuba, for example, is not a truly independent Republic, because of the influence exercised by the United States. But did Cuba elect its chief executive under Spain? Did she elect her Congress or have her own supreme court? And as to Nicaragua, we should never have recovered from England the Mosquito Coast, so precious to our sovereignty, without the aid of the United States.

Geographical causes, reenforced by duties and rights that can not be repudiated, have made the United States and its sister Republics in the south a single body. In the near future these nations of the New World will be governed by an international law distinct from that which operates between Europe and America—or, better still, a different law from the old one, which modern science, in disregard of frontiers, is rendering obsolete.

Nicaragua can progress only through labor, industry, and commerce, through education, roads, and railroads. She must link her two coasts and draw nearer to the Atlantic, to the civilizations of Europe and the United States. She must live in peace and learn to govern herself under republican institutions. Continuous strife impoverishes her, dishonors her.

It would be indeed worthy of the world's praise if Nicaragua could do all that unaided; but she is more than a hundred years old as an independent nation, and a true republic is yet to flower on her soil. Whether Conservatives or Liberals have been in power, there have been no fair or free elections for 100 years, except during the period of Carazo and Dionisio de Herrera, which are memorable to all Nicaraguans. The party in power always has perpetuated itself. A terrible state of anarchy reigned from 1821, the year of independence, to 1857. From 1857 to 1893 there was a measure of peace. But in 1893, when the Government fell into the hands of José Santos Zelaya, there was again continuous guerilla warfare. In fact, during his tyrannical régime of 17 years the Chamorro family warred on him continuously. And when Zelaya was forced out of Managua by the celebrated Knox note, the victors fought among themselves for the spoils, and a still bloodier civil war ensued.

Then American marines landed in Nicaragua to guarantee foreign interests. The marines maintained peace without interfering with the internal politics of the country. But meanwhile, as the Government in office habitually controls the result of elections unless a revolution intervenes, the existing Conservative government was continued in power. There was no genuine progress possible toward a really republican government. For this reason commissions of the Liberal Party went to Washington to enlist the moral support of the United States in favor of electoral liberty for Nicaragua. As a result, the Dodds law came into being and served us during the elections of Solorzano and Sacasa. In general, this law was and is good; but the best law in the world is futile when those intrusted with its enforcement are the first to violate it.

To President Martinez, President Diego Manuel Chamorro's immediate successor, the Department of State proposed the supervision of the election by American marines. This was excellent. Upon the inauguration of the President, however, elected in 1924, the marines were withdrawn. Solorzano, the new President, was a weak man devoid of ability and at bottom a Conservative. He distrusted liberalism, and therefore kept war materials away from the Liberals. Such war materials, however, being in the hands of the followers of Emiliano Chamorro, who in 1925 was plotting to overthrow the administration of President Solorzano, Chamorro was able to use violence and enter the Fortress of Tiscapa. There followed the persecution of Vice President Sacasa, violence at Leon, export of cattle to Guatemala, Salvador, and Costa Rica—the cattle having been taken as a tax from the haciendas of Liberals. All these things were done under the responsibility of Chamorro and of Lieut. Humberto Pasos Diaz, nephew of the present President. Finally, President Solorzano was forced to resign. Chamorro assumed power, and the duly elected judges were driven from the supreme court and thus the judicial power, as well as legislative and executive power, was destroyed and the bloody road was opened once more to civil war.

Civil war did result. During that painful period all forces, even natural forces, seemed arrayed against Nicaraguan liberalism.

We fell and we rose on the march through the wild hills, clutching at trees and bushes to keep our footing, thrown down precipices into infected marshes, into rivers, with our horses and equipment. We arrived at Teustepe and then at Tipitapa. Here we found the personal representative of President Coolidge, Colonel Stimson, bearing peace proposals, asking for a cessation of the war.

His words were simple, but solemn and decisive:

"In the name of the United States I exhort you that this war may cease and not another drop of blood be spilt in Nicaragua; on its part, the Washington Government accepts President Diaz's proposal for the supervision of the election of the chief authorities in 1928, which shall be free and fair, so that all Nicaraguan citizens may express their will at the polls. My Government considers that the very honor of the United States is involved in this. In recognizing Diaz, my Government has acted in good faith under a sincere interpretaion of the laws of Nicaragua, and wishes the present Chief Executive to continue in the discharge of his functions while the electoral law is reformed and a true nonpartisan national guard is created. With that guard and the marines a free and just election will be carried out."

The meaning of these words stirred me profoundly. I answered:

"I am here as a simple soldier, and it is my duty to consult with the other chiefs of the army and with the delegates of Doctor Sacasa, who are also in Tipitapa. I ask of you a period of eight days to give an answer. During that time I will return to the army to do what I can to convince it, or to return to war if its opinion should be contrary to mine."

In these conversations the delegates of Doctor Sacasa and MM. Arguello Espinosa and Cordero Reyes intervened. They protested, saying immediately that they had left to myself and the army the whole responsibility of the problem. I accept it.

I held in the highest esteem this valiant and self-sacrificing army, always generous and well disciplined although lacking wages and food. I meditated profoundly; and when I spoke at Boaco to the assembled generals and to the army itself, which formed in the plaza, I did what was possible to convince them that it was necessary to yield, to have confidence in the word of the personal representative of President Coolidge, which was equivalent to the word of the American Government itself and would be backed by the American people as something pertaining to the national honor. I also told them that, in spite of this sincere opinion, I was ready to accompany them if the majority should resolve to resist. They all approved of my position. With the signatures of all the generals, the resolution was transmitted to Colonel Stimson, who saluted the army when it disarmed at Tipitapa and wrote the promise that every one knows in the United States.

I have been asked since if at the time of my conference with Colonel Stimson could I, if I had won, have brought peace and prosperity to Nicaragua without the help of the United States?

Could any Nicaraguan?

Actually, it is not possible for me to answer that question. Having been victorious in the field of battle—and I think I had already defeated the forces of President Diaz—it would have been my duty as a loyal soldier to place the army at the disposal of the citizen recognized by us Liberals as the legitimate President. It would be his duty to take over the task of restoring constitutional order, the other laws of the land, and of establishing the peace.

I am perfectly convinced, however, that Sacasa or any other statesman will always need the help of the United States to establish a good government. When Colonel Stimson told me at Tipitapa that the President of the United States was willing to assist in the supervision of our election in 1928, I felt, and still feel, that this would open to Nicaragua the only way by which such good government and a lasting peace could be established. I told Colonel Stimson frankly that peace had so far only been attained through tyranny in Nicaragua. Tyranny brings with it no good and depraves the public conscience. To gain power over the dead bodies of our fellow citizens is only worthy of men who are superfluous in modern civilization.

Certainly, Nicaraguan Liberals everywhere have approved unanimously the arrangements of Tipitapa and are grateful for the efforts of Colonel Stimson toward peace. At first there was surprise and hesitation; but sober thought brought faith in the promises of the personal representative of President Coolidge, considering that they involve the honor of the whole Nation founded by George Washington.

We prefer officers of the American Navy to supervise the Nicaraguan elections, because they are educated in the tenets of honor and probity. They are more representative of their country than civilians would be. Through more than a year's contact with them I have found them to yield to none in discipline and respect for public liberties and in the discharge of their duty.

By the present law, called the Dodds law, there are 530 electoral polling places, of which more than half are in the rural districts, where their supervision is difficult.

The worth of the election in Nicaragua depends now on the manner in which the arrangements of Tipitapa are carried out. If they are carried out honestly, as I believe they will be, due to President Coolidge's word, the elections will be made with entire equity.

In general, Nicaragua stands in need of republican education. This end can be achieved in a period of twelve or more years under the supervision of the American Government. The passing of every four-year period will see this need diminished, for the National Guard will be organized under the direction of American officers and trained to respect the law and the national institutions; the National Congress will be composed of better men, because they will have been freely elected by the people; the judicial power will be composed of honorable magistrates, austere and patriotic in their actions. We want the independence and sovereignty of our country; and the more we want it, the better government we will build, granted we may live under the ægis of peace and labor. The watchful eye of the United States can be no better employed than in this noble cause. The very Monroe Doctrine compels the United States in that direction, for that doctrine postulates for the New World the fullest realization of republicanism and democracy. Because we have had no peace, because our national income diminishes or is used up by war and the fields lie uncultivated, our great duty is to do away with war. Any sacrifice is small to achieve this objective.

The voice of peace that sounded in our ears was so tremendous that it was impossible not to yield. It is to the good and the just that I believe the Washington Government this time, in the case of Nicaragua, is laboring. It was unjust, no doubt, to stop us on the road to victory; but peace is as great as victory, and liberty is as great as peace.

Our country needs a profound peace. If bad government continues to prevail in Nicaragua, if Liberals and Conservatives persist in warring for power, obeying personal ambitions, no nation will be found to extend a friendly hand to us or to treat with us.

Capital is a great necessity in Nicaragua for the development of the country's progress. We have neither railroads nor highways. We are out of communication with the civilized world. The construction of the railway to the Atlantic coast is very urgent to bring us nearer to the United States and to Europe. We need more American capital, and it is our first duty to seek it here, for we are obliged to do it by the close relationship that binds together the countries of America for their mutual defense.

The interest of the United States in the affairs of the Caribbean Sea is a vital interest. If it renounce the vigilance of that sea and its bordering countries, it places its very life in jeopardy, or, at least, exposes itself to terrible responsibilities and wars. This interest of the United States is equally beneficial to our countries, for they are thus defended from all aggression of powers foreign to the continent. In this all the countries of America share a common interest and a common destiny.

Opinion, I am told, is divided in the United States as to the policy that has been followed by the Department of State. We Nicaraguans think that we have acquired an explicit right and that the United States has bound itself to an explicit duty. We Liberals fought to place our country once more under the full authority of the constitution. In exchange for peace and free elections we constitutionalists agreed to disarm, and we who signed the agreement have lived up to our duty. If a few armed bands remain active in the north of Nicaragua, that is a natural consequence of our civil wars. After these promises it must be established in full justice that if the Monroe doctrine is to be abrogated that must not be done before the United States has discharged its duty as to the 1928 elections in Nicaragua, which should be rendered impartial by its influence. Let every Nicaraguan citizen, without distinction of color or political creed, vote freely, and let power pass into the hands of the representatives of a true national majority. When it comes that day will witness the birth of true democracy in Nicaragua, the first day of genuine republican life—an occasion of rejoicing for all sincere patriots.

Those that accuse the State Department of supporting President Diaz in obedience to the pressure of bankers and for mean reasons of internal and foreign policies fail in logic when they attack the agreements of Tipitapa and the supervision of the next election by the marines. They know that, upon the premature withdrawal of the marines, power would remain with Diaz or Chamorro, and constitutionalists would lose all hope of liberty and democracy. This would be a tremendous injustice.

There is talk to the effect that a move will be made at the next Pan American Congress against interference by the United States in the affairs of Nicaragua and other Caribbean countries. If it is accepted by the Washington Government, we Nicaraguans will demand that it be put into effect after January, 1929—that is, after North American mediation has effected an entirely fair election in Nicaragua. I may add that my opinion on the Monroe doctrine and the need for the influence of the politically advanced nations on the politically backward ones is firmly rooted in deep conviction.

If I have criticized sometimes the American policy in Nicaragua, I have done so on the ground that it has not protected the Nicaraguan people from abuses of power with the same energy that it has defended the stability of bad governments, such as those of Chamorro and Diaz. The Department of State offers the defense that it neither can nor should act against the sovereignty of the Republic; but the misfortunes of the Nicaraguan people are worthy of some consideration; and if we were not allowed to crown with laurels of victory the costly triumph achieved by the constitutionalist army, watch should be kept so that our adversaries might no longer invade the rights of a weakened and disarmed people.

Although it is said that nations can develop in isolation, history does not support the statement. Vestiges of lost civilizations—in India, Persia, and Egypt—enlightened Greece and Rome. Sparks of the light stamped upon by the barbarians remained in the religious orders of the Middle Ages and relighted the torch of civilization for Europe and America. So the more developed republics transmit their laws and their democratic habits to those that are still in their infancy. Nicaragua gained independence, but republican habits were foreign to us. Monarchical and absolutist roots had penetrated deeply into Nicaraguan society. We must learn from others the ways of republicanism and liberty.

Such were the ideas that brought about the surrender of the constitutionalist arms. We rest upon the promise of Henry L. Stimson, made in the name of the United States. The honor of the United States we consider a sufficient guaranty.

When the United States carries out its pledge and safeguards the establishment of a fairly elected representative administration, the gain will be twofold: It will strengthen constitutional government throughout Central America, and it will revive in all Latin America confidence in the disinterested purpose and good faith of the United States.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. RANSDELL] delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on December 8, 1927, a very able argument touching flood-control, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

Mr. RANSDELL. The record-breaking flood of 1927 in the Mississippi Valley makes it appropriate to discuss it alone before this conference on "Floods and waterways." Control of floods in the Mississippi Valley is so closely connected with the navigation of the river that the two are inseparable. Some of the eminent river engineers have said that if there were no improved lands in the valley and no people living there to be protected from floods they would build levees to aid in the navigation of the stream. This statement applies with greater force to the vast revetment works, which prevent the banks of the river from caving, thereby filling the channel with earth, and which compel the river to remain in its bed, constantly scouring it out and keeping it in good condition for navigation.

Moreover, navigable rivers were intended by their Creator, at least to a great extent, to serve the communities adjacent to them, and if flood waters are allowed to run riot in the overflow basin of the Mississippi,

with its millions of people and highly developed areas, one of the principal uses of the river would be destroyed. Congress derives authority to protect the Mississippi Valley from floods from section 8 of the Constitution, reading as follows:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; to regulate commerce * * * among the several States; and to establish post offices and post roads."

Surely the general welfare requires the prevention of such terrible floods as those of this year in the Mississippi Valley, which destroyed directly and indirectly about 200 human lives, many thousands of domestic animals, and over four hundred millions of property of various kinds. The overflow section of the valley embraces portions of the States of Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. When great floods of water sweep through it, flooding towns, cities, farms, highways, railways, and everything, commerce between the States is no longer regulated, but stopped as effectively as if done by a victorious army. The established post offices and post roads cease to function, and chaos reigns instead of an orderly commerce among the several States on road, rail, river, and in the air, aided and assisted by Federal post offices and post roads.

Suppose a foreign foe should invade the Mississippi Valley, would anyone question the right and duty of Congress under this section 8 to repel the invader with all the power of the Army and Navy and all our national wealth? There can be only an affirmative answer to this question, and if so, then why should not the Nation in like manner exert whatever means are necessary to prevent the angry forces of nature from destroying the people and the property of the valley?

During the late floods thousands of miles of interstate and State highways and nearly as many miles of interstate railways were submerged; and no commerce, either local or interstate, could pass over them. The only east-and-west railway through the State of Louisiana which remained in commission was the Southern Pacific at New Orleans, and that did business in a halting, dangerous, and uncertain way. There was practically complete stoppage of railroad and highway traffic in the valley. A limited commerce was carried on by boats under great difficulties, because there were few landing places. Even the airplane was to a great extent put out of commission as the landing fields were flooded, though the hydroplane found innumerable places to land.

Flood prevention in the Mississippi Valley is essential in order to insure national defense. The effect on our World War activities would have been disastrous had the valley been as badly overflowed in 1918 as it was in the spring of 1927, when every railroad crossing the river from Cairo south, except the Southern Pacific, was out of commission for several weeks and most of them for months. National preparedness, as well as commerce, demands that railway trains move continuously and without interruption, north and south, east and west, throughout and across this great valley. The floods of last spring entirely prevented these movements and will continue to do likewise in all the great floods of the future unless the strong hand of the Federal Government prevents.

A striking illustration of the importance of protecting the valley from invasion by water or by an armed foe is furnished by the fact that when the Federal forces acquired control of the Mississippi River during the Civil War by the capture of Vicksburg and other places the backbone of the Southern Confederacy was broken, and the bread basket of the southern soldiers could not reach them.

In the portions of this valley subject to flood there are about 30,000 square miles, aggregating 19,000,000 acres of rich land, which, if protected from floods and highly developed, are susceptible of supporting very large populations and adding enormously to the Nation's wealth. At the present time less than half of this area is under cultivation. The annual value of the agricultural products of the valley are about $250,000,000; and the manufacturing, mercantile, and commercial interests generally are about as much more, making an aggregate annual contribution of nearly $500,000,000.

It costs from $60 to $90 per acre to reclaim the valley lowlands, remove the timber, excavate the stumps, build houses and other farm improvements, dig drainage canals and surface ditches, construct fences, roads, etc., which is so expensive that any further development of this section will be slow, even if its people are assured of absolute protection from floods in the future.

The assumption that these lands would rise enormously in value if fully protected is erroneous, though doubtless there would be some increase in their value. This region is agricultural, and agriculture throughout the Nation has been at a low ebb for several years. The extremely fertile highly developed lands of Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri, which are never overflowed, and portions of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, not subject to overflow and just as fertile as the lands in the flooded regions, are little sought after and low in price.

Flood control on the Mississippi is not reclamation but protection of vast areas of improved lands on which are located many towns and cities, including New Orleans, the metropolis of the South, inhabited by fully 1,500,000 people. These valley dwellers are good citizens, who contribute more than their pro rata share to the Nation's wealth, and are progressive, energetic, law-abiding people, real nation builders, entitled to every consideration at the hands of their national father. They are not mendicants who come to Congress with outstretched hands but peers of our best citizenry asking simple justice and preservation from the ruthless enemy, which has so often destroyed their lives, their homes, and all they possess.

These brave people have carried on their fight against the Mississippi floods for more than two centuries—since the first levee was constructed to protect the village of New Orleans in 1717. For more than 150 years these contests were carried on without national aid, during which period, according to General Jadwin, about $125,000,000 were expended for levees. Since 1879 the amount spent locally for levees was $167,000,000, which, added to the $125,000,000 previously spent, makes $292,000,000 paid by the local communities for levee protection. If to this is added the direct loss of the 1927 flood, estimated by General Jadwin at $236,000,000, we have a total local contribution for levees to date, plus the direct flood losses of this one year, aggregating $528,000,000. As an offset to this huge sum the National Government has spent on levees $71,000,000, which leaves an excess contribution of the localities to this date of $457,000,000.

This shows that since levee construction on the Mississippi began the local people have expended for actual levee construction more than $4 for every $1 of the Federal Government, and this does not take into account the enormous losses from time to time caused by floods—especially the terrible direct loss this year of $236,000,000 shown in General Jadwin's report, to which may be fairly added an additional $200,000,000 of indirect loss, in the opinion of Secretary Hoover.

The various funds contributed by local levee districts, States and Federal Government have been expended more or less in a piecemeal way, each community doing its utmost to safeguard its own interests.

The situation was expressed very forcibly by General Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, in a recent speech at St. Louis in which he said:

"The effort has always been to reclaim the maximum amount of the richest land in the world in the shortest time and at the cheapest price. This reclamation has gone on piecemeal to get the greatest benefit from each local viewpoint. Responsibility has been divided, local interest has conflicted with general interest, and as a result the scheme has not always been scientific as a whole. Reasonable factors of safety have not always been used. Money has been saved with consequent risks. Financial inability or failure for other reasons to comply with the requirements of law in regard to local participation in costs have delayed works necessary for the safety of other sections lower down. Now a comprehensive plan must be substituted and control must be national."

This is a remarkably clear, concise statement which covers the case fully. If a comprehensive plan is substituted for the present piecemeal methods and the control really becomes national, that settles the question; for the only way this can be accomplished in a practical, workable manner is for the Government to pay all cost—not a percentage thereof, no matter how large. If a locality is required to contribute any part of the cost, it would be entitled to a voice in the expenditure thereof, proportionate to the amount contributed by it. Otherwise it would become the victim of the same kind of tyranny practiced toward our Revolutionary ancestors who were taxed without representation. Such a course is unthinkable; and just so certain as localities are required to pay part of the expense of flood control, just that certain will they receive and exercise their right to be heard as copartners in a joint enterprise.

This would mean a continuance of the old piecemeal methods of the past. Responsibility would be divided and the "local interest might conflict with the general interest." Absolute "financial inability" to contribute would be sure in a majority of the localities on the river which have suffered so terribly from the recent flood. Such a plan would not work any better in the future than in the past, and surely it has not been a complete success heretofore.

If a comprehensive plan be substituted for the present methods and the Government assumes national control, then all localities would be directed, regulated, dominated, overpowered by the superior authority of the Federal Government, for that is the meaning of the little word "control."

To elaborate somewhat, there has been too much division of authority in the past. The Mississippi River Commission has not had full power to plan flood-control works nor sufficient money to construct them. It has lacked both authority and money. Hereafter the jurisdiction of the Federal agency charged with flood control must have jurisdiction of the main river, any spillways or outlets which may be provided, and all such parts of its tributaries as are necessary to make the control works effective. In order that all these improvements may coordinate and form a composite whole there must be no conflict of authority or responsibility. Federal jurisdiction must extend to all phases of the improvements. There can be no success if the Government agency is compelled to make plans for the location of works, their construction and maintenance, in accordance with the views of different localities,

and their capacity to contribute to the cost thereof. There can not be the freedom of action required in planning and executing colossal flood-control works on the Mississippi unless the executive authority is empowered to do whatever is necessary independent of local interference.

Heretofore there has not been one common interest to which all parties contributed, directed by one controlling mind. In a high-water fight, if the levee breaks on the east bank of the river, that relieves the pressure on the west bank, and vice versa. Hence the interests of each bank are not only different but actually opposed to each other. It is impracticable for local authorities to combine and unite their forces under one leadership, and the only solution is for the Federal Government to assume full charge.

Combating floods of the Mississippi is war, and you can not win war if restricted in the territory over which you are allowed to operate or dependent upon fixed annual appropriations which are made conditional upon local contributions. There are about 1,800 miles of levees on the Mississippi and the lower stretches of its tributaries, which may be compared in time of great floods to a real battle line of that length, the attacking army being the accumulated waters of 42 per cent of the Nation's area rushing wildly to the ocean. During flood fights vast bodies of men, directed by many leaders, without systematic cooperation, each locality doing its utmost to protect itself, fight the rising water day and night. It is a desperate contest between the mighty forces of nature in angry mood on the one side and the puny efforts of her disorganized children on the other. In the language of war, we have been clinging for years to the same arms and strategy in fighting flood waters, levees, and we continue to suffer defeat. Not until the allied forces in the World War placed their respective armies under one commander in chief did they succeed. Our fight against floods should likewise be conducted by one leader—the Mississippi River Commission—vested with ample authority and funds. In no other way can success be attained.

The task of controlling the Mississippi floods is such a giant one, and the people of the valley have suffered so terribly from the overflows of this year, that it is impossible for them to make any material contribution. No one can tell exactly what the costs of the vast control works will be, but surely not less than half a million dollars, if the work is done properly and the valley fully insured against any repetition of the disaster of this year. How can the distressed people of that region be expected to contribute even a modicum of this large sum, which would be a big undertaking even for the Federal Government and absolutely impossible for the affected localities? In many of the levee districts along the river the people are so impoverished and so heavily burdened with the debts of former years, incurred in their efforts to fight the river's floods, that they can do nothing, and if forced by law to contribute will be utterly helpless.

Under these circumstances it would be unjust for our great Government to insist upon even a dole from the valley. It should treat this problem in a broad, truly national way, and no more think of demanding local contributions than it would require border States to contribute toward the expense of repelling a foreign invasion.

In conclusion, permit me to say that for business reasons alone, entirely aside from sentiment and that spirit of brotherly love which prompts us to help our brethren in distress and prevent immense loss of life and property, the people of the United States can not afford to have the lowland section of the Mississippi destroyed. When a calamity like the 1927 floods, which swept away directly and indirectly more than $400,000,000 of property, occurs in any portion of the Republic every part thereof is affected.

It has cost colossal sums to develop the farms, drainage systems, roads, railroads, and other improvements of this delta empire. A very heavy indebtedness rests on this property. The bonds and mortgage notes representing these debts are held largely by people in the East and North. If the valley receives protection from floods and is permitted to go ahead, prospects are good for the ultimate payment of these debts, but not otherwise. It must be remembered that agriculture is the principal industry of the valley and if in addition to his other troubles the valley farmer is forced to contend with destructive floods there is no hope for him.

As previously stated, the agricultural products of this valley aggregate in value every year $250,000,000, and that is only a portion of its wealth, for its manufactures and commerce are also very important. The loss of these vast sums in any one year would greatly lessen the purchasing power of the valley, and would be felt seriously by banking and commercial interests in the North, East, West, and other Southern States, for its connections in business and otherwise extend throughout the Republic.

President Coolidge correctly said in his message to Congress this week:

"This is all one country. The public needs of each part must be provided for by the public at large. No required relief shall be refused. An adequate plan should be adopted to prevent a recurrence of the disaster, in order that the people may restore to productivity and comfort their fields and their towns."

I thank the President for the encouraging words, though he also indicated that localities must contribute part of the cost of flood control. This is impracticable, as I have shown. There is only one way to achieve success, and that is for the Federal Government to adopt "an adequate" plan, as the President so wisely suggests—"a comprehensive plan," in the words of General Jadwin—assume entire control, and pay all costs.

I earnestly appeal, therefore, not only on sentimental but business grounds for complete protection of the Mississippi Valley from the flood waters of its great river, and respectfully urge the members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to give all their powerful aid in support of this worthy cause.

PLAN OF THE ARMY ENGINEERS FOR FLOOD CONTROL OF THE MISSISSIPPI IN ITS ALLUVIAL VALLEY

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce the address of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, the Chief of Engineers of the Army, at the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, dealing with the flood-control problem of the lower Mississippi River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GEN. EDGAR JADWIN

Flood control looms very large at this time and is the particular subject assigned to me for discussion. Permit me first to touch on a few of the high lights of our waterway plan and indicate briefly the progress that has been made.

The improvement of a harbor or a waterway can not be considered a success unless use is made of it commensurate with its cost and importance. Our seacoast harbors and our lake harbors and connecting channels are returning in savings to the public annually a greater sum than the entire amount spent on them both for new work and maintenance. Our waterway systems, as a whole, are paying much better than a bond rate of interest.

The increase in commerce in our harbors and on our waterways indicates that there is a marked "back to waterways" movement. Eliminating all known duplications in our traffic statistics, the total water-borne commerce of our harbors has increased from 300,000,000 tons in 1925 to 342,000,000 tons in 1926; on our Great Lakes, the increase has been from 130,000,000 tons to 137,000,000 tons; on the Panama Canal, from 23,000,000 tons to 25,000,000 tons; on the Mississippi system from 50,000,000 tons to 57,000,000 tons—a total of over 500,000,000 tons. The year 1926 was the first in which the water-borne commerce has passed the half-billion-ton mark. In the light of these statistics it is evident that waterways are carrying an increased traffic, that they are good investments, that they are paying handsome dividends, and that they are justified.

The river and harbor act of January 21, 1927, was passed since your last meeting. Work on the new items authorized in this bill has not been begun, as funds so far appropriated were considered as practically pledged for projects previously authorized by Congress. The estimates that have recently been submitted to Congress include funds for these projects, and it is hoped that a start on them can be made during the coming working season.

I have stated on numerous occasions that the establishment of a department of public works would be an unwise departure from our existing governmental organization. We understand that there is considerable propaganda being carried on to bring about a public works bureau in the Interior Department, to which many of the engineers of the Government service would be transferred. We do not believe the movement is a good one.

It would be equally practicable to try to combine all the doctors in various Government services in one department; if we did, we would be liable to develop a situation of affairs something like that which is said to have occurred on one of our Army posts some years ago. The doctor called up the quartermaster and told him—you know the quartermaster fixes the quarters, and so on—to send a man to fix a broken shutter on his house. He said, "I will be very glad to do it, Doctor. I think I will wait a little until you get several other things there. It won't be long before you will need other repairs, and I will send a man up there and we will do them all at once."

The doctor was querulous at the time. The quartermaster was not under his orders. He had to go to some higher authority in order to get him to do the small task.

A few weeks later the quartermaster called the doctor up and said, "Doctor, one of the children has the chicken pox. Won't you please come down to the house and look at the child and see if you can't prescribe for him?"

The doctor said, "Yes; I will be delighted to do that. I always like to help the children of the post; but it won't be long before the rest of the children will have the chicken pox, and if you don't mind I will

just wait until they are all sick and come down and straighten them all out at once."

Possibly we should congratulate ourselves, however, that with these suggestions about the engineers and the doctors nobody has yet been so foolish as to suggest that all the stenographers in the Government service be combined into one department, and that a secretary of stenographers be appointed so that whenever we wish stenographic work done we have to send to him to have it done.

I regret that the time limit placed will not permit me to indicate the progress that has been made on the various major navigation projects in which the Members of this Congress are interested or the status of some of the most important examinations and surveys that are now being made. The river and harbor section of my office and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors will be glad to discuss these matters with those of you who are interested.

Much has been said in recent months about the Mississippi flood that occurred this year. The urgent necessity for action by the Federal Government is generally understood and accepted. The question now squarely up to the people and the Congress is, "What shall be done about it?" That Congress will deal wisely and generously with the stricken people seems certain.

It has been my duty and that of the Engineer Department, as consulting engineers to the Secretary of War, the President, and to Congress in this matter, to give our views on the engineering features of flood control in the Mississippi Valley, and, as contemplated by law in such cases, to summarize the economic features involved. I am proud of the organization that has been able to solve so huge a problem in so short a time. The foundation of a simple but comprehensive plan was made possible by the coordinate and concurrent effort of numerous agencies of the department, assisted most efficiently by the various levee boards, State and other local authorities, railroad officials and flood control associations in the valley. My thanks to them are sincere.

The plan of the Army engineers for flood control of the Mississippi in its alluvial valley was submitted by me to the Secretary of War, and was sent by the President to Congress to-day.

Time will not permit me to discuss all the schemes that have been suggested for the control of the Mississippi River. Many of these are obviously too visionary to warrant serious study. We can not afford to dig enormous channels halfway across the continent through mountain ranges, nor pump through pipe lines over 2,000,000 feet of water per second from Cairo, Ill., to the Gulf of Mexico. Many plans that are frequently mentioned have been discarded either because the cost is out of proportion to the benefits, too much good land would be sacrificed, or because of the length of time necessary for their accomplishment or uncertainty as to their results and effects. Included in this group are: Dredging the bed of the river; dredging side channels; wholesale moving back of the levees; straightening the channel; clearing the batture, or flood way, and reforestation. These methods are all described fully and amply in the report which went to Congress this morning.

The reservoir theory is an ideal one when it can be applied. It expects to hold the water where it falls, on comparatively cheap land, and where it can be held without harm to anyone. It aims to attack the problem at the seat of the trouble. Some excellent plans for small areas have been consummated successfully on this theory. Undoubtedly the principle of reservoirs is sound, within limits.

The Mississippi is so large that it involves a problem different from any other that has been considered. The larger part of the rain water causing the highest water in the lower Mississippi falls below reservoir sites on the headwaters of tributaries. In addition, much of the water which could be retained in headwater reservoirs would be stopped so far from the flood areas that it would be difficult to so regulate the stoppage as to effect materially a reduction in stage below Cairo.

For the last six months the engineer districts in the Mississippi watershed have been making a study of the possibility of lowering flood heights by means of reservoirs. The results have been consolidated in my office by a special reservoir board.

Our problem, at this time, has been to study reservoir possibilities in so far as their effect on Mississippi floods may be. These studies have required us to discard many sites as being too expensive for the reduction in flood height caused by them. These studies show that in most cases the benefits for power, or local flood protection, are of greater value than their efforts for flood control on the Mississippi.

In the case of Pittsburgh and vicinity, Congress, in the flood control act of 1924, authorized an examination and survey for flood control at a cost of $50,000—$25,000 of which was to be provided by the Federal Government and $25,000 by the State. Work on this survey is progressing satisfactorily, and it is expected that the report will be made to Congress during the coming year.

At its last session Congress authorized the expenditure of $7,000,000 for the survey of a large number of rivers, including many tributaries of the Mississippi, to determine the best use of their water resources. Flood control, power, irrigation, drainage, navigation, and water supply must all be considered. Work on these surveys will be expedited when funds are made available in the next appropriation bill. Work done in connection with Mississippi River flood control will be of material assistance when the work gets under way. While the plans recommended to Congress at this time for the control of floods in the alluvial valley can not include plans for the tributaries, studies of these tributaries will be made and plans and estimates for the best development of their entire water resources will be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable. It is evident that many reservoirs which would be of little help in the Mississippi will be of great help in solving the flood problems of the tributaries.

Now for the plan for the lower valley. There were distributed a few minutes ago a number of copies of the map accompanying my report, which shows in brief the plan which is recommended. We thought we did not have enough copies at this time for everybody and the thought was that, after having looked it over, each man would pass it on to his neighbor in the same row, so before I get through all of you who wish to can see what the plan looks like on the map.

The "flood" used in the design of the recommended plan is that predicted by the Weather Bureau as the "maximum possible" and by the Mississippi River Commission as the "maximum probable." The stages predicted by these two groups of experts on such matters were practically the same. When there was a difference the higher stage was used by me. This resulted in a "project flood" with stages, if confined, of 66 feet at Cairo and 74 feet at Arkansas City. The Weather Bureau obtained its "maximum possible" flood at Cairo by using the maximum Ohio flood with "the Mississippi, Cumberland, and Tennessee Rivers contributing their tides at just the proper time to insure the greatest effect at Cairo—an impossible occurrence, it is admitted, but nevertheless a remotely possible one." The predicted stage at Arkansas City—74 feet—is the result of the above stage at Cairo and the Arkansas and White at their maximum predicted stage. Below the Red the same flood, reduced by river-channel reservoir capacity and with flow from the Yazoo and Red added, gives the "project flood," which is taken at 3,000,000 second-feet—about 25 per cent greater than the 1927 flood at this locality, which was itself the greatest flood ever experienced.

The plan and project heretofore pursued has been the construction of levees high enough and strong enough to confine all of the flood waters within the river channels. The levees that have been constructed fit into the plan now recommended, but are not sufficiently high for such floods as are now predicted. The cost of raising and strengthening them sufficiently to carry extreme floods would greatly exceed the cost of the plan proposed. Furthermore, the extent of the disaster which follows a crevasse increases greatly as the flood is forced to higher stages by confinement wholly within the levee system. The loss of life and property in the recent great flood in the alluvial valley followed the breaking of the levees which reclaimed the land for the use of man.

This reclamation had been pushed so far that insufficient room was left in the river for the passage of the unprecedented volume of flood water. The levees must be strengthened, but a halt must be called on further material increase in their heights and the consequent threat to the inhabitants of the areas they are built to protect. It is fortunate that none of the breaks have, so far, occurred immediately opposite any of our valley cities. Aside from all engineering considerations, it would be extremely unwise if the levees were raised immediately in front of such centers of population as Cairo, Greenville, or New Orleans. Any plan which contemplates material raising in these localities subjects the people to a threat, the consummation of which would be loss of life such as this country has never seen except in war.

Man must not try to restrict the Mississippi River too much in extreme floods. The river will break any plan which does this. It must have the room it needs and, to accord with its nature, must have the extra room laterally. In its original state the river had only one low-water channel until it reached the flat land near the Gulf, but in flood it overflowed an area 50 miles wide, which is really its natural flood bed. The water which can not be carried in the main channel with the levee at reasonable height must be diverted and carried laterally. Some additional capacity can be obtained in the main river by local setbacks of the levees. As a general setback is not practicable the remainder must be supplied by flood ways paralleling the general course of the river.

The plan recommended provides the requisite space for the passage of floods and levees of adequate strength to withstand them, so that should a flood recur of the magnitude of the flood just experienced—the maximum of record—it would be passed out to the Gulf without danger to life in the alluvial valley and without damage to property except in the flood ways allotted for its passage. Controlling side levees limit the area of the flood ways and protect land not in the flood ways where such protection justifies its cost.

Should Divine Providence ever send a flood of the maximum predicted by meteorological and flood experts as a remote probability, but not beyond the bounds of ultimate possibility, the floodways provided in the plan are still normally adequate for its passage without having its predicted heights exceed those of the strengthened levees.

The details of the recommended plan by which the surplus water will be carried with safety vary in different parts of the river. The alluvial valley of the river may be considered in three principal

sections—the northern, comprising the St. Francis Basin on the west side of the river; the middle, including the Yazoo Basin on the east and the Tensas Basin on the west, running on the east from near Memphis to Vicksburg and on the west from the Arkansas River to the Red River; and the southern, or Louisiana section, from the Red River to the Gulf of Mexico.

The portion of the alluvial valley from Cape Girardeau, the northern limit of the alluvial valley, to Cairo, can be protected by a slight increase in the size of the levees. The serious problem begins at Cairo at the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi. From here to New Madrid the main levee on the west bank chokes the river unduly and should be set back sufficiently to lower the head of water at Cairo by 6 feet in an extreme flood. The existing river-bank levee will be retained, but lowered 5 feet and strengthened. The flood way between the new and the old levees will be capable of cultivation at all times excepting in floods greater than that of 1922.

From New Madrid south to the mouth of the Arkansas, the levees will be raised moderately. Local setbacks will be made below Helena and at other bottle necks where necessary to restore greater cross sections in the main river. These modified works are designed to carry the highest predicted flood, except that it may be found expedient not to raise the levees opposite the backwater areas of the St. Francis and White Rivers. In this event, if a possible superflood should come, it may cause a crevasse in the levees at these points, increasing somewhat the height and acreage of backwater area, but doing comparatively little harm.

From the mouth of the Arkansas to the Old River, at the mouth of the Red, extreme floods can not be carried between levees of the Mississippi without dangerous increase in their heights. A flood way for excess floods is provided down the Boeuf River, on the west side of the river. Excess water can not be carried through the section on the east side, since it would be forced back into the main river by the high lands on the east bank below Vicksburg and have to be carried thence for 160 miles between the main river levees to the mouth of the Red River. The entrance to the flood way is closed by a "safety-plug section" of the levees at present grade, which is located in the vicinity of Cypress Creek, near the mouth of the Arkansas.

To insure their safety until this section opens, the levees of the Mississippi from the Arkansas to the Red will be raised about 3 feet. To prevent flood waters from entering the Tensas Basin, except into the flood way during high floods, the levees on the south side of the Arkansas will be strengthened and raised about 3 feet as far upstream as necessary.

The section at the head of the flood way will protect the land within the flood-way levees against any flood up to one of the magnitude of the 1922 flood. A flood of a magnitude somewhere between that of 1922 and of 1927 will break it, turning the excess water down the flood way, which will carry it safely to the backwater area at the mouth of the Red River.

Below the Red River setbacks of the levees will be made at critical places in the main river to insure the better discharge of flood waters, but the carrying capacity of the main river can not be increased materially without unwarranted hazard to life and property in the State of Louisiana. At the city of New Orleans an increase in levee height is considered unsafe, aside from the great cost of raising the levees and the wharves built upon them. To afford proper protection to New Orleans, with its population of nearly half a million and property value of over a billion dollars, a special flood way upstream from the city is essential. The most practicable location is on the east side of the river, discharging into Lake Pontchartrain. A controlled spillway at Bonnet Carre will limit the discharge through this floodway to that necessary for the protection of the city.

In high floods it is also necessary to divert down the Atchafalaya Basin the flood waters in excess of the discharge capacity between the levees of the Mississippi. This is accomplished by strengthening and raising the levees on the main river 3 feet for the necessary distance to assure their safety until levees at the head of the Atchafalaya Basin open. The levees on the south bank of the Red River will be strengthened and raised sufficiently to keep flood waters from entering the Atchafalaya Basin except in the flood way through the relief, or "fuse plug," levees at the head of the flood way. Back levees are to be constructed on both sides of the Atchafalaya Basin for the major part of its length to inclose the Atchafalaya flood way. Funds are included in the estimate for the extension of these levees to the south to limit the overflow in the lower part of the basin.

Existing levees on the Atchafalaya River will be strengthened and their grade adjusted so that the productive capacity of such parts of the flood way as are not already swamp land will be retained during any flood of record of a less magnitude than that of 1927.

The plan includes an extension of revetment of the banks of the river to reduce the danger of attacks on the foundations of levees and their destruction by caving banks, thereby to further reduce the possibility of crevasses and to stabilize the position of the river, in order that contraction or regulation works may be provided to assist in securing and holding the low water channels needed for carrying the commerce of the valley in low water as well as in high.

It is our intention, having held those back, to proceed with contraction works very similar to those which we are putting in so successfully between St. Louis and Cairo, but of a design suited to the location, with the hope that we can secure and maintain better depth from Cairo south on the river, as is now being done between St. Louis and Cairo.

The area in the alluvial valley that would be flooded by Mississippi River water if there were no protecting works is approximately 30,000 square miles. Under the plan recommended, barring accident, approximately 20,550 square miles will be completely protected from Mississippi River water. The remaining 9,450 square miles, of which approximately 3,340 square miles is cleared land, will be protected on an average of from 2 years in 3, to 14 years in 15, depending upon its location. The remaining 6,110 square miles are swamp and timber land which is not injured by flood.

The estimated cost of $296,400,000 for the construction of flood control and navigation work, does not include the costs of rights of way nor possible damage to structures which have invaded the natural flood bed of the river. It is expected that these costs, if any of them are legal and proper, will be borne by the States or other local interests which will, in general, be greatly benefited by the execution of the plan.

As required by law for reports on projects for flood control and for navigation, the report contained an economic study showing the general and local benefits of the plan and the local cooperation that should be required on account of local benefits. The question must be viewed from the standpoint not only of those in the valley needing flood protection, but also of the taxpayers in other parts of the country, including the regions from which the flood waters come, who suffer indirectly from flood disasters, and on whom the bulk of the burden of Federal expenditure must fall.

Several estimates of different well-protected parts of the delta valley result in an average price per acre of $224, when towns and all property, such as houses, roads, railroads, land, etc., are included. The total area of the valley originally subject to overflow is 29,780 square miles, or 19,065,600 acres, 12,000,000 acres of which is usable. This 12,000,000 acres, at $224 per acre, is worth about $2,688,000,000. Adding the probable value of New Orleans would bring this sum up to about $3,500,000,000. Movable property added would make it something like $5,000,000,000.

The value and population behind the levees are increasing all the time. It has been estimated that damages from the 1927 flood were over $200,000,000.

The plan for river control contemplates spending about $300,000,000, or about one-sixteenth of the value estimated above. On the basis of 12,000,000 acres of usable land, this is an average expenditure of about $25 per acre, but it must be remembered that this includes protection to cities, towns, etc.

The cost of the project is unquestionably justified. It will prevent a repetition of the widespread disaster, human suffering, dislocation of the economic life of the valley, interruption of interstate commerce, and the effect on the general welfare of the Nation that attended the recent flood. The expenditure would be justified even though such a flood occurs but once in 150 years. It will prevent the less extensive flood disasters that are likely to occur at much more frequent intervals. The protection afforded to the cities back of the levees in the valley against a flood even greatly exceeding that just past is especially justifiable from a humanitarian standpoint, since an unexpected break in the levees at these places would probably result in serious loss of life and might be an unparalleled catastrophe.

The estimated cost of $296,400,000 for the construction of flood-control and navigation works does not include the costs of rights of way for flood-control works, the cost of any drainage works required therewith, the cost of any flowage rights that may be required, nor damages, if any, resulting from the execution of the plan. No questions of rights of way or damages arise in connection with the navigation works. Local interests should, in the future as in the past, provide all rights of way for flood-control structures. They best can obtain the land at a fair value, and vexing questions as to Federal ownership, administration, or policing of the narrow strips of land will be eliminated. Their land is enhanced in value by the works. Tax collections show that the land in the upper Yazoo Basin has ten times the value that it had before it was leveed. The United States ought not to buy a part of the land to enhance the value of the rest.

Such drainage works as will be required in connection with new interior levee construction are of direct benefit to the lands affected, and their cost should be borne locally.

It is a fundamental principle that no damages lie against either Federal or State Government, or local agencies, on account of an accidental crevasse in the levees. The plan has been drawn to reduce to a minimum the damage to lands and structures resulting from the flow at high floods through the flood ways. All property affected lies in the natural high-water bed of the river. Much of this land was transferred to the States by the swamp act, approved September 28, 1850. The purpose of this act was to enable the States to construct the necessary levees and drains to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands therein. The principle involved was not new, as the

early French grants in the lower valley contained a proviso requiring the grantee to construct and maintain a levee line along the river front of his property. Whether or not the servitude of flooding was transferred to private owners when the land was sold, the servitude should not now be paid for by the Federal Government.

Moreover, the lands, with some exceptions, will have the same protection as is afforded by the present levee system. The exceptions are the lands in the Bonnet Carre flood way and in the setback flood way from Birds Point to New Madrid. The acquisition of flowage rights by the State or local interests may be necessary in these cases. In any case, the lands should remain in private ownership in order that their productive capacity may be fully availed of. The United States does not, in general, own the bed of navigable streams; much less need it own land flooded only at long intervals. Damages, if any, which may be found legal and proper as a consequence of the plan should be met by the States, since these will be directly benefited by the works.

The present flood control act, under which the department has been operating, provides that local interests shall pay one-third of the cost of levee construction. Seventy-one million dollars of Federal funds have been expended on levees; $15,000,000 of contributed funds have been spent by the Federal Government; State and local organizations have themselves spent about $152,000,000. In addition to meeting these great costs, the inhabitants of the valley have been subject to recurring flood damages. The direct damages suffered from the 1927 flood are estimated by the Mississippi Flood Control Association to have been $236,000,000.

In view of the national aspect of the flood-control problem, from the standpoint both of the cause and of the effects of the floods, and in view of the large sums spent in the past by the people of the valley for flood protection, the sacrifices they have made in meeting their allotments, the great losses suffered in the past flood, and the larger expenditures now required, it is believed that the United States should bear a larger proportion of the cost of construction than in the past, and that of the States or local interests should be as small as is consistent with the results desired. While the proportion must be determined in the wisdom of the President and Congress, a division by which the United States shall bear 80 per cent and local interests 20 per cent of the cost of levee construction and control works in general would be in general accord with the existing policy of the President and the precedents established by Congress.

It is very necessary in understanding a problem of this kind to try to present it simply. I can't read the entire report and give you all the technical details, because that would take about two hours. I am, however, endeavoring to give you the main points so that you will carry away with you the main features of the plan and you will understand them. There is no reason why everybody in this audience should not by looking at the map gather the principal features of the plan.

I am reminded in this respect (I thought of it after I got the first draft of my report done) of a conversation I once had with an artist. We were at dinner at the house of a mutual friend, and after dinner the conversation turned to art, a subject about which I don't know very much. I was interested in hearing what the artist had to say. His pictures were popular at that time in the Sunday comics. So I took the liberty, after we had gotten fairly well acquainted, of asking him how long it took him to make one of those sets of six pictures. He smiled and said, "That varies very much. I have struck off six pictures like that in less than an hour, and I have worked on six pictures like that for an entire week. When I finally got them done, it took me another three days to make them look as though I had done them in the hour."

It is somewhat that way in connection with this proposition. We are dealing with enormous figures. Enormous figures are just as easy to handle as small ones, if you will think in the proper units. You frequently hear it said that 2,000,000 and 2,000,000 make 4,000,000 just as surely and just as simply as 2 and 2 make 4. The big man has to have a bigger suit of clothes on him than a little man, but when he gets it on, all he has is a coat and a vest and a pair of trousers—it is just simply a difference in the sizes, as he has the same number of pieces.

The river we are dealing with is one of the greatest rivers, if not the greatest river of the world. It is hard to get in a few words a picture of its size. So many writers, in speaking about it in connection with the last flood, have spoken of it as being something alive. It has in flood ten times the capacity of the St. Lawrence in flood. It consumes 60,000,000 horsepower in getting from Cairo to the Gulf of Mexico in making the banks of the river, transporting its silt, and transporting its own water. This is power that it is not feasible to harness. Think of the enormous amount of it compared with the output of some of our plants with which you are familiar.

The river as a whole is one of the greatest assets of our country. It is supporting this magnificent navigation with which you are so familiar. It is also furnishing the water supply for a vast number of our communities between the Rockies and the Appalachians, carrying the entire drainage of a great number of States and assisting in many other ways. It has one vice and that is the flood vice; that is the one we are trying to regulate, but we must bear in mind that we can not take a force of that kind and force it into a place or into a suit that will not hold it.

I have in my department now something over 60,000 men, and when I make up my mind what is to be done, I have no hesitation in telling them what to do, and they generally do it. In France, on the construction, or the bulk of the construction for the Army, I had over 160,000 men, and the same thing held. Having made up my mind what to do, I told them to do it, and they did it.

I never do that way at all when I am talking or handling Mrs. Jadwin. I wouldn't think of trying anything of the kind. I will occasionally endeavor to try, but I counsel with her and try to guide her somewhat. It is the only way. The rest of you don't need to laugh, because I imagine you all have the same experience. [Laughter.]

The Mississippi is one river that you can't drive, but it is possible for you to control it and to guide it, and that is the fundamental basis of the plan that we are presenting to you to-day, the plan of the Army engineers.

The plan of the Army engineers differs fundamentally from the present project in that it limits the amount of flood waters carried in the main river to a safe capacity and sends the surplus water through lateral flood ways.

If you turn to this map, I am going to try to break away from the notes and run over a few of the points with you.

This is the Mississippi River from Cairo to the Gulf of Mexico. You will see a line with a number of X's in it, running around the outside on the west side, and coming back on the east side. That represents the area subject to flood, naturally. About two-thirds of that area was flooded in 1927. I will show you that on another map.

The green is the entire area subject to flood in the natural condition by floods from the Mississippi River. The darker brown is the part that was flooded in 1927. It was difficult to get all these facts on the same map, so we outlined the color by these lines here.

Starting up at Cairo, the levee is now 60 feet on an average. A good part of the floor of the town is 40 feet, so a good part of the town is 20 feet below the top of the levee. The last flood reached within about 3 feet of the top of the levee. Had it been confined, it would have gone within a foot and a half. The weather experts predict it is ultimately possible to have a flood that will be 6 feet above there.

The city has a levee running around it, what they call "ringing a town." I am unalterably opposed to ever raising that levee any farther, unless the grade in the city itself should be raised. If we should raise the levee farther and there should be a break in the middle of the night, the bulk of these people would be caught like rats in a trap and be drowned. We have never had a catastrophe like that in this country. The nearest we had like it was the Galveston flood, in which about 7,000 people were drowned.

Galveston went to work with the aid of the State—the State remitted their State tax for a period of about 17 years—and built a sea wall, raised the grade, and adjusted themselves to a plan which so protected them, so fortified them, that when the next hurricane came along in 1913 and again in 1915, of substantially the same force, they lost only 36 lives. The number was even smaller than those lost in the small city of Poplar Bluff, Mo., in the recent hurricane.

That shows you what can be done. The only thing to be done there is to set back these red lines you see and build a levee about 70 miles back of the main line and make a flood way there which will carry the water when the river gets high enough so it can not be carried in the main banks. This outer levee is lowered 5 feet. That will protect that area in there so that it can be used for any floods not greater than the flood of 1927.

At the mouth of the St. Johns, near New Madrid, you will see a line running around there with circles. That represents what we call back-water area. As the river rises, it backs and floods up the tributaries and utilizes a considerable area as backwater storage. That land is generally swamp land, growing large trees. That is one of the essential elements of the plan; the use of that land in flood belongs to the river and we must retain it, and we must not allow it to be encroached upon.

Going from New Madrid down to about the mouth of the St. Francis and the mouth of the White, the levees are now of such height and the foundations are such that it is safe to raise them sufficiently to protect the land in the St. Francis Basin back of that. It would be possible to dig a flood way, reaching around and going down either the White or the St. Francis Valley, but this would cost several hundred million dollars and does not seem to be necessary for that third of the river.

You will notice the back-water area outlined here at the mouth of the St. Francis River. It serves the same purpose, only in a larger way, as the one at the mouth of the St. Johns.

Going down a little further, you will find another back-water area at the mouth of the White River and the Arkansas. When we come down to this point, we receive the water of the Arkansas. We strengthen and raise the levee on the Arkansas so that there can be no break, permitting the Mississippi River water to go down to flood southern Arkansas and northern Louisiana as it did in 1927.

I told you that the Mississippi carried in flood about ten times as much water as the St. Lawrence. We construct a floodway 10 miles wide, going down the Bouef River. There were three locations considered for that. We could not put it on the opposite side of the river, because if we had it would come back to the river here and would have to be carried down the main river to the Red. We had to put it on the west side.

We had three locations and accepted the one that seemed to be the most natural and most direct one, and the shortest one. This is bounded on one side by hills or ridges for a good part of the way. Where these are too low we have put in small pieces of connecting levees, and on the other side a connecting levee, so as to confine the water to this 10 miles. That floodway would itself be protected on an average, according to past experience, 11 years out of 12. The land in there is about 80 per cent swamp and timberland.

We raise the main Mississippi levees there 3 feet, so that as the water rises it will not break them, but will break over this lower "fuse-plug section" at the head of the floodway and will then go down there. It takes off the crest of the flood and at the time it is carrying the maximum amount of water it is carrying 900,000 cubic feet a second, which is equivalent to three St. Lawrence Rivers in flood. It gives an idea of the size of the engineering we are working under.

We strengthen the main Mississippi levees and raise them about 3 feet until we get down to the Red River. You will see another backwater area outlined here at the mouth of the Red River. That is a large area, very largely growing timber at present. When we reach the mouth of the Red River we have in that ultimate possible flood 3,000,000 cubic feet a second. We send one-half of that—1,500,000—down the main river by New Orleans. I don't feel that it is safe to put any larger amount down that river.

On the Atchafalaya River we build secondary levees back here on that side and on this side, and a complete levee around in here, so that this part which has been largely flooded in the past will never be flooded again. When the water gets above the 1922 flood, then it will break the "fuse-plug section" at the head of the western one of these two flood ways and will go down there, leaving the eastern one protected completely even against that flood. In case we ever get the ultimate possible flood, it will break the eastern one also.

That flood way will be protected on an average 14 years out of 15. The levees will be kept at substantially their present height and be strengthened and adjusted slightly in height so the people will be able to develop and work that land with a somewhat better protection than they have had in the past.

Coming down, we have the Mississippi levees for a distance raised 3 feet, so there as the water rises it will surely not go over them, but go over the "fuse-plug sections" in the Atchafalaya. As we come down to New Orleans we construct the spillway you see going out into Lake Pontchartrain. This will take 250,000 cubic feet a second. That is closed all the time except when the water on the Carrollton gauge reaches 20 feet. Then that is opened and water is permitted to go out into Lake Pontchartrain until the gauge of its own accord falls below 20 feet at Carrollton.

Some question has been raised as to the effect of that silt on Lake Pontchartrain. The best estimate we can get on it is that it would cause a silting on an average of one thirty-second of an inch a year. Our engineers figure that out as being a raise in the bed of that lake of 1 foot in 360 years. It has been figured by various other engineers. I do not know of anybody else who figures the time so short as that. Some men who have given it a great deal of thought set the point at 1,000 years as the time to raise 1 foot. It is not expected any of that dirt, appreciably, will go out into Mississippi Sound. There will be a discoloring of the water, but it is not expected there will be an appreciable sediment there. The material when it settles will be there and will be a source of material if it is ever desired to pump it out for raising the lowlands in the neighborhood of the lake.

In case the ultimate possible should ever come, it is not expected to exceed the top of the levees. It is further expected the opening of the bottle necks down the river will give a slightly increased factor of safety. The figures show that the levees will be 1 foot above the top of this. By opening these bottle necks and by the addition of a small amount of dirt we could probably, if desired, add another foot. The levees themselves will be made 12 feet wide on top, instead of 8 feet as at present, so as to give a good foundation for a flood fight if it is ever found necessary. There would probably be a good warning in case of this, and it is quite possible to gain 1 or 2 more feet in that way.

The reservoirs that will probably be ultimately constructed on the tributaries of the Mississippi and other waters will probably of their own accord, even if they are used simply for upstream purposes, give an additional foot factor of safety against this ultimate possible flood.

While the project recognizes the interests and protects the rights of those who will be chiefly benefited and of those who furnish the funds, it gives a maximum of results for the minimum of cost. I have heard that there is propaganda on the part of some to establish a commission to prepare a plan for the flood control of the lower Mississippi, and I understand that they count on putting on that commission some very good men, some very good engineers, but these men are not experienced in the Mississippi Valley. We have counseled, we have had the advantage of the advice of all men who had experience in the last 30 or 40 years on the protection of the Mississippi Valley, Army engineers, civilians; we have had the advice of the levee board engineers; and we have had public hearings and have gotten the views of everybody practically who knows anything really at present about this subject. These men who are going on this commission, if it is appointed, may be good men, but it is going to take them a long time to get to know anything nearly as much about this subject as is known by the men who have worked up this project.

I venture the prediction that if these new men work 10 years on this project they can not get as good a plan as the one that I have presented to you here to-day, unless they recommend the same plan. [Applause.]

If this congress and the National Congress will get behind this plan and put it through, we will have the plan done, the work finished in 10 years.

I thank you. [Applause.]

NICARAGUAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, January 3, 1928, entitled "Nicaraguan 'Bandits.'"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

NICARAGUAN "BANDITS"

At Quilali Friday 5 United States marines were killed outright and 23 wounded in a sharp engagement with a force of 500 Nicaraguans fighting under the command of General Sandino, according to official dispatches from Managua.

From Washington, at the same time, comes the complementary bit of information that marine reinforcements are being rushed to the scene of action by transport from New York, all of which has the ring of war about it. And war it is, too, however much it may be camouflaged, a war of revolution in a Central American Republic against the might of the United States.

Gradually, if slowly, the American public is beginning to realize that it has been shamelessly deceived as to the real state of affairs in Nicaragua.

To sum it up in a few lines, a Liberal revolution was in full blast last year and was on the point of overthrowing our man, President Diaz, a Conservative, when President Coolidge sent Col. Henry L. Stimson down there to see what, if anything, could be done to stop the bloodshed and at the same time keep Diaz in power.

Colonel Stimson found a way. In an interview with General Moncada, the revolutionary commander in chief, he made it plain to the general that it was either a case of surrender or fight the United States. Moncada yielded and our forces then in Nicaragua began disarming his men.

But one of Moncada's lieutenants, General Sandino, refused to surrender. He and his command kept to the field. Sandino, Colonel Stimson reported, had only "about 150 followers"—men whom Washington officials ever since have referred to as "bandits."

Against these "150 followers" of Sandino, then, some 1,400 American marines, along with a couple of thousand or so native troops, have been fighting ever since. But lest you should get the idea that our marines have lost some of their effectiveness, let it be recorded here and now that the story of General Sandino and his "150 followers" was sheerest nonsense. Sandino had behind him a fair-sized army for a country as small as Nicaragua, and proof of this is to be found in the story of the last few months' fighting. Tabulation of casualties show that approximately 670 "bandits" have been killed since Colonel Stimson reported. And since at least twice that number have been wounded in those same engagements—two wounded men for each fatality in battle is a conservative estimate—Sandino's total casualties during the period under discussion must have been around 2,000. Yet at Quilali last Friday this extraordinary general seems to have had with him 500 followers alive and well and able to shoot to kill.

It is perfectly patent, therefore, that the American public has been disgracefully deceived. Not only has General Sandino's strength been grossly underestimated—obviously he is stronger to-day than ever, despite the casualties inflicted upon him—but the inspiration to make it appear that he and his followers are mere bandits was equally ridiculous. And any further attempt to keep up this fiction becomes an insult to the American public.

We should at least be honest with ourselves, as this newspaper observed recently upon a similar bloody occasion. We should not stoop to silly deception. We fool nobody but ourselves and not even ourselves for long. For the time being, at any rate, Nicaragua has become an American protectorate and what we are doing down there is not fighting bandits but Nicaraguans in revolt against our rule.

Admittedly we have certain well-defined rights in Nicaragua—our canal rights, for example. But unless we wish to spoil our chances for

winning the friendship of the rest of Latin America we must find a better way of protecting them than killing off vast numbers of natives on the pretext that they are bandits.

RETIREMENT OF EMERGENCY OFFICERS

Mr. TYSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions passed by the American Legion at its Paris, France, convention; also by the Los Angeles Post, No. 1, of Disabled Veterans of the World War; also by the Sons of the Revolution in the State of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

The committee on legislation of the American Legion, at the national convention held in Paris, France, October 19–23, 1927, submitted as a part of its report the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the American Legion at each of its national conventions has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War, so as to place them on the same footing as to retirement as the other eight classes of officers who are now on the retired lists; and

"Whereas the American Legion has previously indorsed the principle of this long-pending legislation; and

"Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress, which would have granted this justice, will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled at Paris,* That we hereby affirm our previous action on this legislation and urge its enactment by the Seventieth Congress."

DISABLED VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,
LOS ANGELES POST, NO. 1,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Resolution

Whereas there were nine classes of officers who fought for the United States in the World War, to wit, the officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; emergency, provisional, and regular; and

Whereas of the nine named classed of officers eight classes who became disabled in line of duty have been for the past several years drawing 75 per cent of their active-duty pay on account of such disability; and

Whereas the ninth class of such officers, to wit, the emergency Army officers, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service, have been for the past several years denied by Congress the retirement privileges which long ago were accorded the other eight classes of disabled officers; and

Whereas in all of the American Legion conventions, including the American Expeditionary Forces' Convention held in Paris, has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of the emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War so as to place them on the same footing as the other eight classes.

Whereas all other veterans' organizations of any standing have voted in department and national conventions to have enacted into law legislation to accord the disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges long ago accorded by Congress to the other eight classes of officers; and

Whereas bills to grant this justice have been pending in the national Congress since the armistice, have been twice passed by the Senate, have been repeatedly approved and favorably reported by congressional committees, and a large majority of the Members of Congress have expressed themselves as being in favor of the proposed legislation; and

Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved in annual meeting regularly assembled this 20th day of December, 1927, That we do favor the passage of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator L. D. TYSON, Representative ROY G. FITZGERALD, and the President of the Senate.

Approved December 20, 1927.

[SEAL.] D. V. W. W.

SONS OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 29, 1927.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution for the relief of disabled emergency Army officers was passed at a meeting of the Society Sons of the Revolution, November 29, 1927:

Whereas there were nine classes of officers who fought for the United States in the World War, to wit, the officers of the—

Army: Emergency, provisional, regular;

Navy: Emergency, provisional, regular;

Marine: Emergency, provisional, regular; and

Whereas of the nine named classes of officers eight classes, to wit, the officers of the—

Army: * * * provisional, regular;

Navy: Emergency, provisional, regular;

Marine: Emergency, provisional, regular—

who became disabled in the line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service have been for the past seven years under laws passed by Congress retired on 75 per cent of their active-duty pay on account of such disability; and

Whereas the ninth class of such officers, to wit, the emergency Army officers, who became disabled in line of duty to the extent that they were incapacitated for further active service have been for the past seven years denied by Congress the retirement privileges which long ago were accorded the other eight classes of disabled officers; and

Whereas the American Legion at each of its national conventions, including the recent American Expeditionary Forces convention held in Paris, has overwhelmingly voted to have enacted into law legislation for the retirement of the emergency Army officers permanently disabled in line of duty during the World War so as to place them on the same footing as the other eight classes of disabled officers who are now on the retired lists; and

Whereas all other veterans' organizations of any standing have voted in department and national conventions to have enacted into law legislation to accord the disabled emergency Army officers the same retirement privileges long ago accorded by Congress to the other eight classes of officers; and

Whereas bills to grant this justice have been pending in the National Congress since the armistice, have twice passed the Senate, have been repeatedly approved and favorably reported by congressional committees; and a large majority of the Members of Congress have expressed themselves as being in favor of the proposed legislation; and

Whereas measures similar to the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills of the Sixty-ninth Congress will be introduced in the Seventieth Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Society Sons of the Revolution, in the State of California, at Los Angeles, this 29th day of November, 1927, That we do favor and urge the passage of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator L. D. TYSON, Congressman ROY G. FITZGERALD, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Yours truly,

SOCIETY SONS OF THE REVOLUTION, IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
C. M. JAY, *Secretary.*

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, there is pending before the Commerce Committee a very important bill (S. 871), which I had the honor of introducing, to create a national institute of health.

I ask to have printed in connection with that bill a remarkable address entitled "The Ultimate Mission of Chemistry, Good Health," delivered recently by Dr. Charles H. Herty, of New York.

I ask also to have printed with the address, which is quite brief, the indorsement of this bill by the American Chemical Society, the American Medical Society, and the American Public Health Association, and a copy of the bill itself, all of which are included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE ULTIMATE MISSION OF CHEMISTRY, GOOD HEALTH

An address before the joint meeting of the Virginia Section, American Chemical Society, and the Woman's Club of Richmond, at Richmond, Va., on October 21, 1927, by Charles H. Herty, advisor, the Chemical Foundation (Inc.)

Wrapped in mystery and secrecy, and spurred on by hope of high reward, alchemists of the Middle Ages sought in vain to discover the philosophers' stone, with which they hoped to transmute all baser metals into regal gold. In the sixteenth century another group of alchemists, led by Paracelsus, caught a nobler vision. Again it was the philosophers' stone they sought, but one whose powers would prove a universal cure for the ills of the human flesh. Though they failed, up out of this welter of mysticism, secrecy, and empiricism there gradually evolved the science of chemistry and the modern method of scientific attack, namely, research.

Industry was quick to recognize the value of this new tool, and through its applications in improvement of manufacturing processes, the betterment of quality, and the discovery of new compounds, wealth is being created which amply repays the outlay. For industrial purposes a true philosophers' stone has been found, for gold is only a basis of currency, the manufacturer seeks bankable profits.

Only haltingly and all too inadequately has humanity followed the lead of the industrialists and recognized that the modern philosophers' stone for health is likewise research. Too often we accept sickness as

a necessary evil, and a part of the heritage of mankind which must be endured. Moreover, the results of research on health are not a direct, profit-making undertaking, as is the case in industry.

Yet entirely apart from the grief and suffering which result from ill health and premature death, the economic losses resulting from sickness are enormous, and have been calculated with reasonable accuracy. As a result of careful surveys by different investigators it has been found that this Nation spends annually for drugs, doctor's services, interest on hospital endowments, and for hospital maintenance, a sum of not less than $1,000,000,000. But this expenditure is only a minor item. For light on the still greater costs we are indebted to Dr. Louis I. Dublin, chief statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. After a thorough study of the mass of data available through this great organization, and with full explanation of how the figures are reached, Doctor Dublin has published his conviction "that sickness costs directly in lost wages, in reduced production, as well as in the necessary care, a total of two and a quarter billion dollars a year." Yet the greater losses are ahead of us, for Doctor Dublin further states: "Having due regard for the value of life at each age period, I estimate that the total capital value of the lives which can be saved annually through the application of modern preventive medicine and public-health measures is over $6,000,000,000."

$15,000,000,000 LOSSES INVOLVED

Still more do the figures mount, for in the total we must include economic losses from those forms of sickness and disease which, despite the advances of science, must be considered as at present unpreventable. At the recent annual meeting of the American Public Health Association in Cincinnati the president, Dr. Charles V. Chapin, stated: "What is unknown about maintaining and perfecting the health of mankind is far greater than what is known. The opportunities in the scientific field are as great to-day as before the days of Harvey, Lister, and Pasteur." It is a conservative estimate which adds another $6,000,000,000 from this source.

What staggering figures! A total of approximately $15,000,000,000! Frankly, I can not grasp their full significance except by comparison. There they stand, almost the equal of our national debt, and constituting an annual loss greater than all the debts owed us by foreign countries about which we talk so much and over which the world travails to-day. Fifteen billion dollars! More than two-thirds of the $22,000,000,000 required annually for feeding the Nation.

Only recently the Manufacturers Record set forth with justifiable pride, as illustrative of the growth of the new South, an enumeration of the costs of the many beautiful medical arts centers which have arisen in various southern cities. Do we realize that such buildings really represent the tax which our people pay because of the limitations of scientific knowledge as to the ills of the flesh?

These are not questions which concern those apart from us. They come home directly to each citizen. Look over the bottles of drugs in your medical cabinet. Consult your check books as to expenses for doctors' services. Think over the hospital charges you have incurred and then determine whether or not this is a question which comes home directly to each of you.

CHEMISTRY'S BIG PROBLEMS

Perhaps we shall think clearer if we get a new conception of what our physical bodies really are—nothing more nor less than organic chemical factories wherein the most delicate and complex reactions are occurring every moment. When these reactions are normal we feel ourselves to be in good health, efficient, and energetic, but the moment they become abnormal efficiency decreases, ambition lags, and sickness pursues its usual course of misery. Our physicians apply with skill the discoveries which science makes available to them, but after all they can only administer. Further advances must be made by the trained researchers in science.

Of all the sciences involved chemistry is predominant, especially organic and physical chemistry. In the unit cell the protoplasmic content brings us at once into the field of organic chemistry, and the flow of materials into and out from these cells presents intricate problems of colloid chemistry. The glands of the body are constantly producing minute quantities of hormones, organic compounds about which we know so little, yet enough to understand how deeply these secretions affect health, temperament, and emotions. The inhalation of oxygen causes changes in the blood stream which for years we have thought were well understood, yet in the light of the work done in the laboratory of the United States Public Health Service by Dr. Mansfield Clark it is probable that an entirely new interpretation will have to be given to reactions which have so long formed the basis of physiological diagnoses. The disruption of chemical equilibria within our bodies results in many important changes; perhaps the final explanation for the common cold lies just here. In health organic reactions are taking place under normal velocities, but when by some catalytic agency these reactions are accelerated or retarded, trouble begins. Hydrogenion concentration is a term in daily use in all biochemical laboratories. I need but mention the beneficent services of chemo-therapy in furnishing far-reaching specific cures. Bear in mind how little we know as yet about the vitamines. The varying recommendations as to diet, from year to year, reveal the many unsolved questions in metabolism. Problems of all sorts confront us. One's body is a chemical factory which through its very nature makes intensely difficult the research necessary to solve these problems, but is there anyone who in his heart doubts the eventual ability of science to find the solutions?

The very difficulties make all the more urgent a determined and comprehensive attack. I would not utter one word to detract from the high praise due those already at work in this field. In our universities men and women are giving unselfishly of their time, energy, and enthusiasm; yet, after all, such work is in most cases secondary to their teaching duties, and all too frequently funds for experimental equipment are pitifully small. Moreover, in many cases such work is all too isolated, too individualistic. In endowed institutions, made possible by the generosity of men of wealth, scientists are giving their entire time, but the number of such institutions is very limited, while the problems are legion.

THE HOSPITAL'S FUNCTION

In a few, but only a few, of our hospitals there is a linking up of the clinical evidence with the fundamental point of view of the scientists. Some day that situation will be changed. Are our hospital authorities content with supplying beds and medical advice for an unending stream of the sick? Will they not catch the larger vision that from these sick beds science can gain inestimable help in preventing those now well from undertaking so sad a journey?

No one will testify more willingly than physicians themselves to the fundamental importance of chemistry in the cure of sickness. They were once students in medical colleges. A glance at the curricula of those times readily explains the lack of knowledge of chemistry on the part of the physician in his daily practice, but he knows that it is chemistry that is needed, and he is seeking that aid. But, like the industrialist of a decade ago, he all too frequently uses the chemist merely as a routine analyst. The industrialist still uses the analytical chemist, but his loud clamor to-day is for the research chemist. So must it be in medicine.

The research chemist will tell you immediately that his work alone does not suffice. Cooperation of all branches of science is required. The chemist, the bacteriologist, the pharmacologist, the physicist, the clinician, must work side by side if truth is to be reached quickly. Happily that spirit of cooperation is increasing. It should be fostered.

Whence will come the supply of chemists adequately trained for this all-important service? Naturally, from our universities. In a recent survey of the lines of chemical research in progress by graduate students the National Research Council finds that of the 1,882 graduate students in chemistry, 475 are in the field of organic chemistry and 207 in physiological chemistry. If we add those who are specializing in colloid chemistry, in catalysis, in pharmacological, pharmaceutical, sanitary, and food chemistry, we see at once how large a proportion of trained men and women will leave our universities in the next few years equipped for this line of research. One of the greatest benefits of the establishment of a complete organic chemical industry in this country since the war is the directive tendency toward research which can be applied equally for wealth or for health.

POPULAR ACTION NECESSARY

Researchers, however, can not live by enthusiasm alone; they must be paid at least a decent living wage. From what sources may we expect that financial aid which will enable this increasing army waging the battle against disease to function efficiently? We can look forward confidently to the founding of more and greater endowed institutions. The continued growth of the graduate schools of our universities means the multiplication of the hands and the time of able professors. But after all is it the true American spirit which would lead us to be content to await the largess of the rich or the devoted enthusiasm of professorial staffs in order to remove through scientific research this financial drain upon each of us as individual citizens? No! In other lines of financial betterment we do not sit idly by twitting our thumbs and waiting for a legacy from some rich citizen unknown to us or trusting that some generous friend will share with us the product of his brain.

We are proud of the fact that we hustle for ourselves, and we count as our most precious heritage that independent spirit which leads us to look after our own business. Invoking the same spirit of independence, I say to you that since we are all subject to sickness, since ill-health is characteristic of no particular section and is no respecter of age, sex, or position in life, the financing of research for better health is a matter for united action by all our people.

Fortunately it is not necessary to make a house-to-house campaign to solicit funds for such an undertaking. The machinery is already provided—appropriations by Congress from the Federal taxes. This method is already being utilized for the ailments of business through the splendid work of the Department of Commerce; for the sickness of crops and livestock in the energetic laboratories of the Department of

Agriculture. When the corn borer threatened this great staple crop the last Congress in a jiffy appropriated $10,000,000 for its extermination. Hogs and cows receive their full meed of attention from the national community chest—but, oh, how pitiful in comparison are the appropriations for scientific research on the ills of the human flesh. Remembering that these problems are fundamentally chemical, it will doubtless amaze you to learn that of the many millions of public funds appropriated last year, only thirty to forty thousand dollars were available for the chemical research work of the hygienic laboratory of the United States Public Health Service, in contrast with the $10,000,000 for the corn borer, and in the face of an annual economic loss through sickness of $15,000,000,000. And this in a day when every tongue is loud in praise of the wonderful accomplishments of science.

THE RANSDELL BILL

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL, United States Senator from Louisiana, has seen the light. In the closing days of the last session he introduced a measure which aims to correct this situation. He proposes to reintroduce this bill immediately after the opening of Congress in December; hearings will be held, and the measure will be vigorously pushed.

The Ransdell bill (S. 5835) provides for the creation of a national institute of health within the the United States Public Health Service. No new administrative body is contemplated, the institute constituting an integral part of the Public Health Service, a branch of the Government service which has always been held in high esteem for its efficiency. An appropriation is included adequate for the construction of suitable buildings and for equipment and maintenance. A system of fellowships will enable trained researchers to pursue investigations either in Washington or at distant points in this country or foreign lands, wherever the problem can be worked upon best. Acceptance by the Public Health Service of gifts from individuals who wish to endow specific lines of research is authorized. The bill includes all of the provisions of the Parker bill (H. R. 10125), a measure which seeks greater efficiency in Government health work by combining all of these activities within the Public Health Service.

UNANIMOUS INDORSEMENTS

Senator RANSDELL'S bill received the unanimous indorsement of the organized physicians of the country, the American Medical Association, at the annual meeting in Washington in May of this year. Just a few days ago in Cincinnati it received similar approval from the American Public Health Association, while the American Chemical Society started the wave of popular approval by a unanimous vote of the council at Richmond, Va., last spring.

What possible obstacles will confront the bill when it comes up for action by the next Congress?

First. A lack of understanding on the part of Members of Congress. As citizens it is our duty to see that our lawmakers are informed regarding the situation and its remedy.

Second. The economy program of the administration. But surely it would be false economy to refuse to spend a few million dollars in order to save the billions now being sacrificed.

Third. Flood control will be in the forefront of the thoughts of every Member of Congress. Rightly so, for the recent Mississippi flood, with its attendant loss of life and of property, estimated at from $250,000,000 to $500,000,000, was a national disaster, and the avoidance of its recurrence is a national responsibility. The rush of those mighty waters awoke us to our duty. The ravages of sickness and disease, however, are confined to the quiet bedroom, and so ubiquitous are these afflictions that they do not constitute news. Devastating floods come only at intervals, but the far greater economic losses from ill health are continuous. These billions are entirely apart from the suffering and sorrow which no power of mathematics can estimate. From out these shadows science can lead the way to light. With conviction in your hearts, speed the day when America shall make this great contribution to humanity.

INDORSEMENTS OF THE BILL

AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY

[Extract from the proceedings of the council, Richmond, Va., April 11, 1927]

The chairman offered the following resolution, which was unanimously passed:

"Whereas the prevalence of sickness among our people, with attendant suffering and economic losses, points clearly to the need of a greater amount of fundamental research for the alleviation of this condition; and

"Whereas all are subject to sickness, all should participate in providing for this necessary fundamental research: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Council of the American Chemical Society approves the principles embodied in the bill S. 5835, introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress by Senator RANSDELL, providing for a national institute of health and for needed administrative reforms in the United States Public Health Service, and urges its early and favorable consideration by the Seventieth Congress."

AMERICAN MEDICAL SOCIETY

[Extract from the proceedings of the Washington session, house of delegates, May 18, 1927]

Dr. E. J. Goodwin, Missouri, read a supplementary report of the reference committee on legislation and public relations:

"1. The reference committee recommends that the house of delegates reaffirm its approval in principle of the Parker bill approved at the Dallas session, coordinating all public-health activities of the Federal Government under the direction of the United States Public Health Service. We also recommend the approval of the Ransdell bill, which is identical with the Parker bill excepting that the Ransdell bill appropriates $10,000,000 to establish and operate a national institute of health under the control of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

* * * * * * *

"The report as a whole was adopted on motion of Doctor Goodwin, seconded by Dr. A. T. McCormack, Kentucky."

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Resolution passed by the governing council at Cincinnati, Ohio, October 19, 1927:

"Recognizing the need for thoroughly coordinated efforts on the part of all Government agencies concerned with questions of public health; and

"Convinced that fundamental research is the necessary foundation for all progress in health problems: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Public Health Association hereby approves the principles of the Ransdell bill (S. 5835), introduced in the Senate of the Sixty-ninth Congress of the United States on March 2, 1927."

THE RANSDELL BILL

In the Senate of the United States, December 9, 1927. Mr. RANSDELL introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

[S. 871, 70th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to establish a national institute of health, to authorize increased appropriations for the Hygienic Laboratory, and to authorize the Government to accept donations for use in ascertaining the cause, prevention, and cure of disease affecting human beings, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the President finds that it will promote greater efficiency in the conduct of the public-health activities of the Government he is authorized, by Executive order, to transfer to the Public Health Service all or any part of any executive agency (other than an agency of the military or naval forces, the War Department, the Navy Department, or the United States Veterans' Bureau) engaged in carrying on a public-health activity. Any such Executive order shall also designate the records, property (including office equipment), personnel, and unexpended balance of appropriations to be transferred.

SEC. 2. (a) The President is authorized, by Executive order, to direct that officers or employees of the Public Health Service shall be detailed to any other executive agency which is carrying on a public-health activity in order to supervise or cooperate in such work.

(b) Upon the request of the head of an executive department or an independent establishment which is carrying on a public-health activity, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized to detail officers or employees of the Public Health Service to such department or independent establishment in order to supervise or cooperate in such work.

SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized to detail medical or scientific personnel of the Public Health Service to educational and research institutions for special studies of scientific problems relating to public health and for the dissemination of information relating to public health, and to extend the facilities of the Hygienic Laboratory to health officials and scientists engaged in special study.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish such additional divisions in the Hygienic Laboratory as he deems necessary to provide agencies for the solution of public-health problems and facilities for the coordination of research of public-health officials and scientists and for demonstrations of sanitary methods and appliances.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish and operate a national institute of health under the jurisdiction of his department and the administrative control of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service which shall be devoted to scientific research in the fundamental problems of the diseases of man and matters pertaining thereto. The Secretary is authorized to select a site on land owned by the Government and available for this purpose, or to acquire a site by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in or near the District of Columbia, and to erect thereon suitable and necessary buildings, including furniture and equipment for the use of such institute. In

the administration and operation of this institute the Surgeon General shall select persons who show unusual aptitude in science. The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may make such rules and regulations for the government and administration of such institute as he deems advisable. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized to transmit to Congress through the Bureau of the Budget estimates of the amounts necessary for the construction on the site now occupied by the Hygienic Laboratory of buildings adequate for the Public Health Service, also estimates for amounts necessary in connection with the establishment and operation of the national institute of health described in the foregoing section, together with such other amounts as he may deem necessary to carry out the objects and purposes of this act.

(b) The administrative office and bureau divisions of the Public Health Service in the District of Columbia shall be administered as a part of the departmental organization, and the scientific offices and research laboratories of the Public Health Service (whether or not in the District of Columbia) shall be administered as a part of the field service.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, gifts by will or otherwise for study, investigation, and research in the fundamental problems of the diseases of man and matters pertaining thereto. Any such gifts shall be held in trust, and shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in securities of the United States, and the income thereof shall be administered by the Surgeon General for the purposes indicated in this act. The Surgeon General is authorized to establish fellowships in the Hygienic Laboratory and the national institute of health, and utilize the proceeds thereof in aid of individual scientists who have demonstrated or give promise of marked proficiency in research and investigations relating to the diseases of man. Gifts in the amount of $500,000 or more shall bear the name of the donor.

(d) Individual scientists designated by the Surgeon General to receive fellowships may be appointed for duty in the Hygienic Laboratory and the national institute of health established by this act. During the period of such fellowship, these appointees shall hold appointments under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be subject to administrative regulations for the conduct of the Public Health Service. Scientists so selected may likewise be designated for the prosecution of investigations in other localities and institutions in this and other countries during the term of their fellowships.

SEC. 5. (a) Hereafter sanitary engineers, dental officers, and scientists of the Public Health Service, selected for general service and subject to changes of station, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, subject to the same conditions and limitations as medical officers of the Public Health Service, except that—

(1) Examinations shall be in the several branches of the profession of the person to be appointed;

(2) Any sanitary engineer, medical, dental, or other scientific officer in the Public Health Service upon the date of passage of this act, or transferred to the Public Health Service under the authority of this act, after examination by a board of officers convened by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and upon the recommendation of such board and the Surgeon General, may be appointed to any grade designated by such board and approved by the Surgeon General; and in computing longevity pay and pay period the service of any such officer shall be counted in the same manner as though he were in the service on June 30, 1922; and

(3) Whenever in the opinion of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service commissioned officers are not available for the performance of permanent duties requiring highly specialized training and experience in scientific research, including the duties of chiefs of divisions of the Hygienic Laboratory, any person, after examination by a board of officers convened by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and upon the recommendation of such board and the Surgeon General, may be appointed to any grade designated by such board and approved by the Surgeon General.

(b) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall designate the grades of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service other than medical officers, corresponding to the grades of medical officers.

(c) Hereafter commissioned officers of the Public Health Service shall be entitled to promotion according to the same length of service as officers of corresponding grades of the Medical Corps of the Army and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall have the equivalent rank of, and shall be entitled to the same pay and allowance as, the Surgeon General of the Army.

(d) The limitation now imposed upon the number of Assistant Surgeons General and senior surgeons of the Public Health Service, on active duty, is hereby repealed.

(e) Hereafter officers of the Public Health Service in the grade of Assistant Surgeon General on field service shall be designated and known as medical directors.

SEC. 6. Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall appoint, in accordance with the civil service laws, all officers and employees, other than commissioned officers, of the Public Health Service, and may make any such appointment effective as of the date on which the officer or employee enters upon duty.

SEC. 7. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a nurse corps, which shall consist of a superintendent and such other nurses as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary. The members of the nurse corps shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as nurses of the Army.

SEC. 8. Hereafter the advisory board for the Hygienic Laboratory shall be known as the national advisory health council, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to appoint, from representatives of the public-health profession, five additional members of such council. The terms of service, compensation, and allowances of such additional members shall be the same as the other members of such council not in the regular employment of the Government, except that the terms of service of the members first appointed shall be so arranged that the terms of not more than two members shall expire each year. Such council, in addition to its other functions, shall advise the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in respect of public-health activities.

SEC. 9. As used in this act, the term "executive agency" means any board, bureau, division, service, or office in the executive branch of the Government.

BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE RIVERS

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce an address by Hon. J. Hampton Moore before the Rivers and Harbors Congress on bridges over navigable rivers, and an address delivered at the same time on channels and bridges by Mr. Chriss A. Bell, of Portland, Oreg.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE

President WILSON. Ladies and gentlemen, in the development of highway construction and train transportation the question of bridges over our navigable rivers has become a question of great national interest. We are fortunate to have to discuss that problem before us this afternoon Hon. J. Hampton Moore, of Philadelphia, Pa., president of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. [Applause.]

Mr. J. HAMPTON MOORE. Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, it seems to me at this time it might be well to have one or two extemporaneous speeches, but the texts assigned to the various speeches have been such that I find most of them deem it wise to confine themselves to notes. Your secretary, Mr. Thompson, assigned to me a text that required me to place myself upon paper. If there are any mistakes in the matter of statistics or even in the matter of judgment with respect to this paper, they are my own.

Rather than "Bridges over navigable rivers," this paper might be entitled "Artificial limitations upon the commerce of a Nation"; for whatever tends to abridge navigation is a menace to the national progress and prosperity. It is apparent that bridge building has become a great American industry. Along with road building which has been largely inspired by the demands of automotive traffic, it has grown immensely throughout the United States. But it has been, and is now being accelerated by promoters who, taking advantage of the good roads movement and the demand for speed and convenience on land, find they can market stocks and bonds on the probable returns from privately operated bridges. The result in certain instances has been a reckless disregard of the rights of navigation and a challenge to the future commerce of the country.

One engineering authority recently has gone so far as to suggest that if ships using the navigable rivers can not pass under the bridges, they should cut down their masts, hinge their funnels, and dismantle their wireless apparatus in order to accommodate themselves to bridge limitations. A conciliatory, fair weather suggestion, but not lacking nerve!

Unfortunately, it has not been difficult for individuals or corporations to secure national bridge privileges. My friend Riley and I were in Congress for a long time, and he recalls, as I do, there is not very great difficulty in getting a permit, or at least an act through, and there is no very great inquiry as to those who desire to obtain the privilege. All that is thrown back, under the general bridge law, upon the United States Army engineers.

Congress has been extremely liberal in granting them and has recently authorized the conference upon promoters of the right of eminent domain, which sooner or later involves a charge upon the taxpayers, and the right to sell out to States or subdivisions thereof, even to the extent of unloading upon the people who had no voice in the

organization of the enterprise. The statistics on bridges over navigable streams are imposing. With the assured success of many public bridges charging tolls, and private bridges also, they are becoming more so. When in 1925 the War Department attempted to list the bridges over navigable waters in the United States, it was found that there were about 6,000 in all. A more recent calculation shows that at the present time there are approximately 6,800 bridges, about 3,900 of which are highway bridges paid for by the people, about 2,330 belonging to railroads, and about 570 miscellaneous or privately promoted. All these bridges extending over navigable waters come within the jurisdiction of the United States and are subject to the oversight of the War Department. I suspect there can be no valid objection to any of them which meet public requirements, are not obstructive to navigation, and do not trespass upon public or private rights; but in recent years larger bridge plans, involving heavier costs, have been presented, and some of them have been highly objectionable with respect to the rights of navigation they threaten. There has, indeed, grown up a need for closer scrutiny of bridge plans. The various Army engineers to whom have been assigned the duty of reporting upon these plans have encountered the opposition of shipowners and operators, who have been obliged to defend themselves against promoters of bridges looking only for the profits to be derived from construction.

It is now being generally recognized that low, fixed bridges, such as were freely erected in the earlier days by the railroads of New England in particular, were a great mistake and at variance with the public interest. Communities that have grown up along the streams behind such bridges realize that their approach to the sea has been cut off. The ships are barred and transportation both in the matter of rates and convenience is made more difficult.

On certain navigable streams that lead into the ocean, inquiries are made by those who make charges as to how many charges are to be made, and extra charges are imposed because of the menace of the bridge. That also includes bridges and things of that kind. The people living upstream are the people we have been trying to reach, particularly upon the Atlantic seaboard.

People living upstream are thus commercially handicapped, as in the case of the New York Barge Canal, where, while a splendid service is being rendered upon the channels provided, the size of the ships is limited by the height of the fixed bridges over the canal.

In certain parts of the country where navigable streams have assumed both a national and international importance, and where the big ships come and go, the problem is serious. Here it concerns a vastly greater volume of business, which in turn affects production and transportation, as well as National, State, or municipal revenues. In the end it is a taxpayer's burden. Fortunately, for navigation as well as for commerce generally, recent hearings before the United States Army engineers have developed sturdy opposition to bridges that obstruct navigable waters or interfere with future commerce. The contest over the Columbia River Bridge between Long View, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg., is in point. Two citizens obtained an act of Congress for this bridge.

They obtained it without any very great difficulty and apparently without any very loud protest at the time they applied for it.

Their act did not follow the new form, nor did it leave everything the judgment of the Army engineers. It delegated the power of inquiry to the Secretaries of War, Commerce, and Agriculture. The city of Portland objected to the bridge plans, not only because of the height of span and pier obstructions in the river but because of the primary rights of navigation and the constitutional right of one port to be on an equality with another.

That has been variously interpreted throughout the years, but Portland evidently had the nerve to raise that question as to the equality of ports, saying that a bridge was to be erected between the city and the sea, which bridge unquestionably would affect the commerce of the hinterland depending upon the port of Portland for its outlet to the sea and for its distribution to the countries of the world.

It was reasoned that if other ports along the Pacific coast or elsewhere were free from bridge obstructions, so that the vessels of the world might come in, then Portland would not be on an equality with other ports.

So far as the ordinary lay construction of the matter of uniformity was concerned, it would seem that was a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution.

This same argument may readily apply to eastern rivers, such as the Delaware, or the Hudson, the Patapsco, the James, the Savannah, or the St. Johns, or to the Mississippi and its many tributaries. The Columbia River case is still pending, but during the hearings sufficient testimony was adduced to show that Pacific coast interests are not satisfied with a 135-foot clearance above mean low water, which has been accepted elsewhere a standard, and demand and will probably receive a greater height to protect navigation and provide for future commerce. Bridge-span requirements at San Francisco and at Vancouver, running as high as 220 feet, were cited in support of Portland's case. If, therefore, a vertical clearance of 175 or 200 or even 220 feet is to be required to protect ports on the west coast, it is clear that an equality of ports will not exist on the Atlantic coast, where more moderate clearances for bridges over great navigable waterways have already been established.

I find that the report of the three secretaries, which seems now not to be strongly objected to, requires a height of span so that the flood waters may be considered, especially in times of flood. The tidal conditions may be considered, so there will be a clearance above mean low water of 186 feet. I have been told it was even higher than that, but that is a very great height, and Portland to that extent has won its fight for its right to have the big ships come and go into the city of Portland or the port of Portland, which extends considerably far in from the Pacific coast.

Take the Detroit River bridge, under which, had it been built in 1925, it would, according to the secretary of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, have passed 90,000,000 tons.

They are boastful—and I think justly so—about the tremendous tonnage that flows from Detroit. Whether it stops there or not, they have got it on the river.

The plans for this bridge contemplated a vertical clearance of 120 feet at the harbor lines and of 135 feet in the center of the span. A contest waged before the Army engineers resulted in a change of plans from 120 to 135 feet at the harbor lines and from 135 to 152 in the center of the span.

Therefore Detroit protested against a 135-foot clearance and won its contest. Therefore Portland gets 186 and Detroit gets 152. Then some of us who have been getting only 135 are put out of the class of uniformity. I suppose the question will arise with respect to some of us later on when the big ships come and find they can not pass through.

Here was a substantial vindication of the effort to protect future commerce in one of the greatest tonnage centers.

I emphasize future, because that is what the whole fight in opposition to certain bridges is about—not that they shall meet the commerce of to-day, not that they shall meet the tonnage conditions of to-day, when they are only beginning to talk about the development of the Mississippi, when we really are only beginning to get improvements along the Atlantic coast; not to confine us to the business of today, but to take care of that great future commerce which every one of us expects and which we have a right to expect by virtue of the governmental attention now being given to waterways, not only as great arteries of commerce, but as these important agencies that have been described here by our western brethren to-day, so essential to the welfare, progress, and the prosperity of the whole country. [Applause.]

Similar successful protests against inadequate span plans were made with respect to a bridge over the Cape Fear River at Wilmington, N. C., and others over the Delaware River at Palmyra and the Chesapeake Bay outside of Baltimore. In the case of the Chesapeake Bay bridge, which is to be about 8 miles long, vessel owners and captains were earnest in their protest because of the great expanse of water thus blockaded and the dangers incumbent upon finding the open span in bad weather or when ice is in the bay.

Just imagine, if you please, a bridge 8 miles across the great Chesapeake Bay, one of the most fruitful and one of the best bodies of water for commercial purposes and for the propagation of sea-food life that we have in the United States.

Plans for the bridge across the Delaware at Tacony-Palmyra were objected to because of their inadequacy, and were finally revised so that instead of 11 piers in the river there will now be 8.

Think of that in the Delaware River just above the city of Philadelphia—1 span still within the city, one approach—not 11 spans (we have had that cut down), but 8 spans in the Delaware River! Yet the engineers have no recourse. Congress said, "Let the bridge be built, and let it be built there; and you, War Department, see that the rights of navigation are protected." Then, of course, it becomes a matter of local interest. The national interest, unless somebody, some such association as ours along the Atlantic Coast, rises up to protest, the engineer is obliged to find very largely in accordance with the local interest, because he has orders to build, and the national interest, apparently, is forgotten, except for the contingency that I have mentioned.

The channel span has been increased in width to 250 feet, and a bascule lift has been provided.

Therefore we have taken care that a span was not 200 feet wide, but that it is 250 feet wide, although it costs the constructor of the bridge a little more to build and a little more to set back his approaches. Here is a great national problem, the blockading of a great national waterway which is being built up by the Federal Government itself to traverse the Atlantic seaboard from New England to Florida, and then to connect up with these other great waterways in the West that you have heard described here so eloquently this morning.

The Tacony-Palmyra bridge is a private project which will be of benefit to local interests, but it crosses the intracoastal waterway from New England to Florida, and would endanger coastal commerce if inadequate or deficient in construction. It is also in the line of ship travel from New York to Philadelphia and other points to be served by the ship canal across New Jersey.

I think you will see that there is justification for a little closer attention to the construction of bridges by private operators.

The privately promoted Palmyra project, which is to cost about $5,000,000, follows closely upon the completion of the great Philadelphia-Camden bridge, a public enterprise which has thus far cost the people of the two States $37,000,000. It is located only 7 miles above the latter. I had great honor while being mayor of Philadelphia in being the chairman of the executive committee to build this bridge and to make contracts for the expenditure of this vast amount of money, and to come to Congress, as well as to the War Department, to ascertain the height of span that would be required. We were told that 135 feet would be adequate. We were given to believe that that would not be objectionable anywhere along the Delaware River. So that was accepted, because it was in the nature of an order, and we regarded it as a new standard established not only by Congress but by the War Department.

Bear in mind what I have said about Portland going still further toward the sky; bear in mind what I have said about Detroit demanding a higher clearance. Here we are with a marvelous, magnificent, beautiful $37,000,000 bridge limited to 135 feet, and within 7 miles, just above us on the same river, over a channel that the Government is now appropriating money to dig to 20 feet in depth, a $5,000,000 bridge that was to have had a span only 200 feet in width, that was to have had 11 piers in the river, that now by reason of our own objections has been modified to the extent that the span will be widened to 250 feet and the bascule obtained and the number of piers lessened from 11 to 8. The public bridge has but one span, which is about 1,750 feet long. Yet within sight of it up the river is another bridge, privately owned for private profit, that puts 8 spans in the river, even with the modified plans.

The private bridge, as indicated, will have eight spans. And yet it has been found since the clearance of 135 feet above mean low water was agreed upon for the big bridge—and that was presumed to establish a standard—that numerous vessels that could have gone north of the bridge to points like the Reading coal piers, have been unable on account of the height of masts, to do so. With these facts before us, it is easy to understand why Portland is contending for a greater height of span for a bridge which stands between it and the Pacific Ocean, and why Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, Norfolk, and other major ports of the Atlantic coast should be on guard. The Delaware River presents three other bridge projects which are giving navigation interests concern. One of these is on the upper Delaware between Bristol and Burlington. The franchise from Congress was obtained by two citizens, one a resident of Pennsylvania and the other a resident of New Jersey. Evidently they saw a good thing if they could get the franchise, and having gotten it, with no difficulty in obtaining support for the dispensation of stock or bonds to capitalize the enterprise, then ask the local communities on either side for improvements like approaches, which, of course, send the taxation back to the people themselves.

Their plans are strongly objected to by barge and tugboat men and by shippers who regard them as inadequate to present as well as to future navigation requirements. Oddly enough, Congress which authorized this bridge, has made appropriations for a 20-foot channel on this section of the river, to encourage sea-going vessels to run upstream as far as Trenton. We build the channel, we spend your money, we do what we think is a great public service, then private interests step in and say, "This looks good to us. Here is where we make our crossing. Here is where we send the automobiles. Here is where we sell our stock. Here is where we make our profit." These vessels would have to accommodate themselves to this bridge. The Bristol-Burlington bridge, likewise, would cross the intracoastal waterway, which includes the projected ship canal to New York Bay.

I will not take time to discuss bridges being built to the approach of Newark and New York. Several are being built there. The question has been conned over. Piers are being erected and have been erected, but in most instances the clearances have been such as to ultimately satisfy most of the people. Of great national interest, however, are two projected bridges to cross the 35-foot channel of the Delaware below Philadelphia—one extending from Red Bank to League Island and the other crossing the river at Wilmington, Del. League Island is the navy yard at Philadelphia, generally acknowledged to be the finest fresh-water navy yard of the country, where we have stored up innumerable vessels of the Navy, priceless in cost at the present time, and a bridge is to be erected there at the navy yard, the approach runs into it.

I suspect the Army and Navy will have something to say as to this. I suspect Philadelphia will wake up to this situation, much as we may believe that it will be a convenience to land travel. No Congress grant has yet been obtained for either of these projects. Each of them will doubtless receive the attention of the War and Navy Departments since they threaten the national interest as well as the commercial interests at Philadelphia; but that they can be financed and will be pressed with great vigor no one familiar with the conditions doubts.

Running across to Wilmington to a point called Penns Grove. There may be some interest other than automotive travel behind this bridge; we do not know. Neither of these two lower Delaware River bridges have received the grant from Congress, but there is tremendous pressure behind them, and will be, an urge that will probably have to be fought out on the floor of the House. When these grants come, then the only recourse, the only protection of the great harbor of Philadelphia will be that accorded by the Army engineers who in their discretion will protect the rights of navigation so far as these bridges are concerned. In a discussion of the encroachments of land upon water traffic and the growing popularity of automobiles, motor buses, and trucks, it may be pertinent to cite some Pennsylvania statistics bearing upon the two methods of transportation. It is true that the Federal Government makes appropriations for waterways and harbors, but it will not be denied that Congress, even reluctantly, allots about $55,000,000 a year only, for that purpose. For good roads Congress now appropriates $75,000,000 a year, but the total cost of highways to both the Federal Government and the States in 1925 was, according to an estimate of the Bureau of Public Roads, no less than $648,000,000.

Now, they give us grudgingly about $55,000,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury for waterways, and there is very scant contribution to them, but to good roads out of the taxpayers' money, both of the Federal Government and the State, came in 1925—a peak year—$648,000,000. Do you see the tremendous advantage that the road has over the waterway? I do not have the tonnage figures for good roads during 1925 when so large a public expense was incurred for the accommodation of automotive traffic, but National Rivers and Harbors Congress figures show an approximate water-borne commerce tonnage in the United States for that year of 482,600,000. The approximate value of water-borne commerce in the United States in 1926 was in excess of $26,500,000,000. I say I don't know; I can't tell you just what the road tonnage statistics were, but I can tell you that we did in business, on the waterways of the United States in 1926, $26,000,000,000 of business. That is something to stick in your vest pocket with respect to the utility and the serviceability of waterways in the United States, which are so often decried by those who raise the cry of "pork barrel" for some sinister and unfair purpose.

These are staggering figures in favor of the protection of navigation, especially on our major rivers and at our important ports. They apply with equal force to smaller rivers and smaller ports which create a large proportion of the total tonnage. You can't wipe out the little river. It is a feeder of the bigger river. You can't wipe out the canal. It is a feeder of the larger stream. They have to be considered, and our whole scheme would fail, in our judgment, unless we take care of that back land where the fellow hasn't been able to get out because you haven't given him the transportation facilities on which to come. Another illustration pertains. It gives us the concrete facts: In the State of Pennsylvania in the year ending May 31, 1927, State money was spent on highways to the extent of $50,256,589.62. This included road construction, maintenance, and administration. The expenditure was almost exclusively for the benefit of the privately owned automobile, the profit-taking motor bus, and the road-absorbing motor truck. Even railroads receive no such overhead or assistance from the State. If there is a railroad man present, let me put this under his hat for a moment. Even railroads receive no such overhead or assistance from any State. They just passively fight waterways sometimes when they feel like it; they just passively permit the construction of roads for the benefit, in the sense of overhead, of the greatest competitors they have, the motor bus and the motor truck. They never peep. [Applause.]

But—and here are the cold figures—the amount collected in licenses from automobiles and trucks in return for the amount spent on highways was $25,552,121.01, just about one-half the outgo. What did navigation return on the strength of the investment in the Delaware River made by the Federal Government? At the customhouse in Philadelphia, for the fiscal year ending June 30 last, there was collected in customs from ships sailing up the unobstructed Delaware more than $52,000,000—twice as much from the ships on the river as was collected from all the automobiles and motor trucks on all the roads of Pennsylvania. The cost of the roads for the year, as indicated, was $50,000,000 plus. The Delaware River improvement and maintenance cost for the year was about $1,700,000. Which was the better investment? The roads cost us $2 for every one we spent. The waterways gave us back $52,000,000 for $1,700,000 spent. Do I make that illustration clear? [Applause.]

Apart from the primary rights of navigation and the problem of bridges, these figures support the contention that navigation pays, that it is serviceable, and should be free and unobstructed. There is unquestionably a call for bridges, but they should be so constructed and maintained as not to interfere with the ancient rights of navigation or the future rights of trade. Free and unimpeded navigation can not be disregarded without affecting detrimentally the commerce of the country.

Since the beginning of time the natural waterways have been the people's highways. In the United States the support of these natural highways, both as to improvement and maintenance for the development of commerce and for protection in times of peace as well as in times of war, has been approved by Government and people. The expenditure made upon them has contributed to Government revenues and to the national prosperity. To erect over them barriers that

impede navigation not only discredits the Government that assumes to develop and protect them, but threatens an unjustifiable limitation upon the commercial progress of the Nation. The seriousness of such barriers over the entrances to major ports can not be defended on any ground, be it commercial, agricultural, or industrial, or in the sense of preparedness for war.

I thank you. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. CHRISS A. BELL

President WILSON. Gentlemen, the next subject is "Channels and bridges." The speaker is Mr. Chriss A. Bell, of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg. [Applause.]

Mr. CHRISS A. BELL. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have traveled some 3,000 miles to speak to you for a very few minutes, because it was impressed upon me very strongly that our time for the presentation of any subject is limited. I assume they may have thought because I was traveling 3,000 miles that I would want to talk about three hours, but such is not the case.

Primarily, I am here to assure the Rivers and Harbors Congress and the delegates from the various communities that we of the West are in hearty sympathy with all of the principles under which you are working. Flood control and the general waterways system of the entire country are as important to us out there as to you.

Secondarily, I am supposed to speak upon the question of harbors and bridges. More properly, I think it might be said the subject would be discrimination, or a suggestion for preventing discrimination between harbors by the erection of bridges. I will confess that I had hoped I might bring possibly not a new thought, but an unexpressed thought to you; but the gentleman who has preceded me, Mr. Moore, whose subject is practically the same as mine, has touched upon almost every point, if not every point, in his presentation that I proposed to use as arguments for the purpose of asking the adoption of a principle to prevent discrimination. However, gentlemen, as he suggested in his paper, we of Portland sometimes are fighters, and I came here 3,000 miles to have my say, and if you remain in the room 5 or 10 minutes I will have it.

Like Mr. Thompson and some others, because of the fact of our limited time, and wishing to place this matter as concretely as I could before you, I have reduced it to notes and will follow them.

At the session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in 1926 a platform was adopted, stating that the navigable waters of the United States are national highways and that the public has the right to the use thereof with the least possible obstruction to commerce, and urging that no permit be issued for the construction of bridges which in any way would limit, obstruct, or impair the navigation thereof. There is, however, a fast-growing controversy as to which should have preference, commerce represented by cargo shipments to and from our seaports and the ports of the world or the so-called commerce represented by auto traffic, demanding bridges crossing our navigable waterways for the purpose of shortening distances for tourist travel and for the purpose of local quick transit.

That this controversy has a threatened danger to the navigation of our harbors is a recognized fact by our prominent engineers who have examined into the subject. General Jadwin recently stated before a congressional committee as follows: "There is a steady urge to encroach on these first-grade harbors, and we are getting it in various sorts of ways. I am inclined to the position that we have got to sit very tight and take the position that these harbors belong to the United States and not to the States where they are located. We are just sitting tight, and I think we should hold places like New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Buffalo, Cleveland, and other places, because it means too much to the country to block them either commercially or from the standpoint of national defense."

That is the statement of General Jadwin. To this list we of the West, of course, insist upon adding the four or five major ports of that coast—Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego.

It was not, of course, intended by General Jadwin that he name all of the ports, and I only mention those on the Pacific coast because there were none mentioned in his report, and to call to your attention the four or five major ports of that territory.

As indicated, the controversy is brought about largely by the immense increase of auto traffic in the United States, resulting in the building of more and better roads. It frequently, if not generally, arises and is fostered in any given case by the fact that the financial houses selling bonds to the general public and construction concerns specializing in bridge building are looking for opportunities to promote bridges connecting local thoroughfares and communities. This character of promotion takes into consideration but one question; that is, Is the traffic present and prospective sufficient to justify a prospectus for a bond issue that the public will absorb, thereby insuring the initial cost? No consideration is given to the bigger question of whether or not the proposed structure will immediately or in the future become such an obstruction to navigation as will interfere with the development of the entire community, including the producing and distributing territory of the navigable water to be bridged.

In order to show that we have concrete proof of the statement made by Mr. Moore, and that I have just made, that these matters frequently, at least, are promoted by bond houses, I have only to say that within my own personal knowledge in the States of Oregon and Washington I know of five such that have been so promoted. I desire to quote or read from the contents of a letter that has been sent out by such a bonding house; how broadly it has been sent, I am not prepared to say, but certainly the letter has been sent sufficiently broadcast that the engineers of certain types in our own locality have received the same.

"Our company is vitally interested in the development of toll bridges in the United States and Canada," says a letter from a bond house. "We are ready to develop and completely finance bridges of any size up to $50,000,000 where traffic and franchise conditions are completely favorable. We are pleased to compensate engineers to their entire satisfaction for notifying us of attractive locations which, after investigation, we accept and develop. We desire a map of the location, showing converging highways, location of nearest existing bridges, a general idea of motor traffic in the vicinity," etc.

A bridge so promoted is of immediate interest to the local communities which it is proposed to tap and serve with rapid transit. The local merchants see increased tourist traffic passing through their city, an increased trade from the immediate territory tapped. This statement may be more applicable to our more or less undeveloped West than it is to the eastern situation, but I question if it is much more applicable.

Under such circumstances, it is not difficult to work up an active community demand for the bridge. Having been sold the idea of an immediate gain, it is difficult for the community to visualize the project in its true proportions as affecting the entire territory that is or can be served by the waterway to be bridged. If there is no immediate direct and apparent obstruction to the commerce of the river or harbor, the possible danger to future development will not be recognized. In most cases the immediate obstruction to commerce or discrimination between ports, as the case may be, in the way of delays, additional costs incurred and danger threatened to navigation, is difficult to show to such an extent that it will overcome the national craze for quick transit and the local desire for expected immediate increase in business.

The part of the community actually engaged in commerce so obstructed or discriminated against is declared narrow and selfish in its objections. If the objection is made by another community that may be adversely affected by the obstruction, it will be urged that the objection is caused by jealousy and the selfish desire to impede the growth of a possible competitor for the benefit of the harbor.

Add to this the all too frequent attempt by a rival port, situated on a different harbor or navigable river, but competing for the inbound and outbound cargoes gathered in the surrounding general territory, to hamper the growth of its rival. You have such a project going before Congress and the departments with substantial and effective political backing.

History from the beginning of the commercial life of the world proves that the community which can and does reach the world markets by water and there distribute products which can be produced, manufactured, or gathered from its entire back country and can and does receive in return from the world's markets produce that may be absorbed and consumed by its distributing territory is the community or port which thrives, continues to grow, and eventually reaches its full destiny.

The immediate gain of local quick transit tourist traffic revenue is small in comparison. The incidental delays to local traffic across the waterways so used should not be permitted to interfere to any extent that will hamper and divert such commerce. It is indeed difficult for the individual citizen desiring to reach his home or office in the shortest space of time to realize that a bridge across the river may cause a delay of importance to commerce. It is difficult for a local merchant desiring to bridge a river or harbor for the purpose of connecting improved highways and thereby tapping new territory and diverting tourist traffic to his doors to realize that the bridge may become a menace to the entire territory served by the waterway so obstructed which will, in the end, do his own community much more harm than can be offset by any gain from tourist traffic or local quick transit.

The foregoing very brief presentation of facts that actually do and have occurred leads to the suggestion of a remedy for the purpose of placing on a parity all ports of the United States situated on waterways giving access to the markets of the world.

I might add that the same principles apply to inland ports, but I personally have been interested only in the seagoing business, in ports having seagoing business, and understand in conversation with some here to-day that there is a regulation of the War Department which, in a measure at least, protects inland ports in their relation one to the other.

Congress has full and unquestioned control of the navigable waters of the United States. The Constitution in express terms takes away the power of Congress to pass an act granting a preference to the port of one State over the ports of another State. True, the question at issue

when this prohibition was made a part of the Constitution probably was confined to the question of discriminatory taxes and duties, yet back of that immediate question was the great principle that the Federal Government then being founded was not to discriminate between the various independent States or between the peoples and port of one State and the peoples and port of another.

At all times and in all laws this is the principle which dominates the action of the American people. Each individual, each community, is to work out its own salvation without interference from the Federal Government, except in the specific matters over which it is given control. In these matters there must be no discrimination between the various States.

If, then, the Federal Government permits the harbor of a major port which is the outlet of a vast territory which is exporting the products thereof by ocean-going vessels to the distributing ports of the entire world and in exchange is receiving for distribution products gathered at the ports of the entire world, to be obstructed by a bridge having lesser clearances, vertical and horizontal, than have been adopted for a competing port, there is a discrimination that is apparent and needs no argument. Likewise, if at the time of such fixing of a vertical clearance, or within any reasonable time in the future, such ports may look for the visit from vessels whose masts or top works are higher than the clearance allows, then again there is an obstruction and discrimination which needs no additional proof. The dimension of the locks of the Panama Canal established by the governmental commission having charge thereover was fixed at a usable length of 1,000 feet, depth over sills 41.5 feet. After investigation it was decided that the canal could not be bridged by any structure having lesser vertical clearances than 225 feet.

Do these figures not establish minimums for the guidance of the Federal Government in establishing vertical clearance and harbor depths? Is not a permit to bridge any port of the United States having an export and import business by ocean-going vessels using the canal with a structure having a vertical clearance of less than 225 feet a discrimination between ports and contrary to the principles expressly set forth in the Constitution? Is not such a permit also an immediate potential obstruction to navigation?

If it can be said in answer—and I believe this is the answer of the engineers—that the Federal Government has the power to remove an obstruction and therefore it will be assumed that the clearance immediately allowed is sufficient for the time and will be removed if in fact later development proves it to be an obstruction or discrimination, sight is lost of the greatest form of discrimination as between the ports. The moment a harbor is bridged its possibilities as a port are established. The shipping world looks to it as a fixed matter.

As the country develops and shipping demands increase and larger ships are built, the port with an impaired clearance is gradually but surely outstripped by its competitors and its fate as a minor port is established. The commerce to which it is entitled by gradual growth with unobstructed navigation goes to the port that can accommodate it.

Based upon this very brief presentation it is urged that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress not only adopt a platform and pass resolutions indorsing the principles herein suggested, but that it take active steps through proper committees to place before Congress and urge the passage of a resolution establishing a standard for bridge clearances for major seaports of this country, and, in addition, that Congress call a conference of the nations of the world having merchant marines for the purpose of establishing a national standard if this may be done.

I was also strictly instructed at home before leaving that one of the things the National Rivers and Harbors Congress did not do, and one of the things that it disliked to listen to, was a project, a definite, certain project that you were working upon principally, adhering strictly to that.

In this short address I had no intention of making any comment about what is sometimes termed the Longview fight, but the reference made by Mr. Moore may justify a very brief history of a fight that is now over, probably, for the purpose not of getting any assistance for a project, but of emphasizing what may happen to a port.

The city of Portland has about 350,000 people. It is where I was born and raised and my father before me. I might say, incidentally, we have all been engaged in the work of navigating the rivers there and we know something of them—that is, in my own recollection. It is situated on the Willamette River 12 miles above its junction with the Columbia and about 100 miles from the Pacific.

Within my recollection it was impossible for a seagoing vessel drawing more than 14 or 15 feet to go down the stream loaded. There were numerous bars and numerous shoals between Portland and the sea. I forget the exact depth at the mouth of the river at that time on the bar, but it matters not. By the expenditure of many millions of dollars the Federal Government has established a depth at the bar of over 40 feet. Few harbors in the world have a greater depth—comparatively few.

The far-seeing men of Portland, having a belief in the destiny of their town in the improvement of the river from the mouth to Portland, matched the Government dollar for dollar for everything spent in the improvement of the river between the sea and Portland Harbor, with a result that by the expenditure of approximately $10,000,000 of our own money and a like amount of the Government's money in river improvements alone, taking in no consideration of municipal docks, but merely in the digging of a channel for a growing community having a growing commerce, they have provided at this present time a depth the entire distance of more than 30 feet. We are here to-day before the departments, and receiving very courteous consideration, asking for a 35-foot project, which means a project that will float a 35-foot vessel, requiring some additional depth.

When we get the 35-foot project, if our community develops as we hope and believe and know it will, we will go after a 40-foot project.

Some few years ago a large lumbering concern having bought immense tracts of timber below us, between us and the sea, desired a place for their mills and they literally built a town. Before turning a wheel, before anyone save the workingmen were in the community, they built hotels, they built houses, they built stores, and spent millions of dollars received from a bond issue in the building of a town which now has approximately 12,000 people—a wonderful piece of work, a splendid piece of development, and one which is for the benefit of the entire community.

We are assured that the inception of a bridge across the river was not the thought of the Longview people, and from all that we can obtain I am sure we are safe in saying that it was a promotion project in its inception, but bear in mind there would have been no place for the city of Longview, no necessity for a ferry, no necessity for a bridge, if it had not been for the billions of dollars spent by the city of Portland in fixing its channel.

Some few years ago the promoters saw the opportunity of joining two highways, Federal-aid highways; saw the possibility of traffic increase to an extent that on paper, at least, will pay for a bond issue. Many of us believe, as suggested by Mr. Moore, that the project will eventually have to be taken over by the State.

First, they succeeded in getting a project approved, allowing us only a clearance vertically of about 135 feet actually, and at this point let me make clear one thing, because we are extremely jealous of this point out our way, perhaps not so important to you people: It is true that the clearances now given us are 186 feet above the water, but low water in the Columbia River is never reached. That is the zero mark that the engineers use for determining the depth to which they are going to dig. The average high water which we have every year, not taking into consideration exceptional years, at that point is approximately 20 feet. Therefore the actual clearance that ships may have over certain periods of the year is about 165 or 166 feet; at other periods of the year it goes to 175 feet.

As I say, this town, backed by strong financial interests, backed by competitive ports, has been able to secure the permit to throw across the harbor a bridge having this clearance. True, it is substantially more than the Camden bridge and some others, but just as truly we have had vessels already desiring to come to Portland, and some have been to Portland, which need greater clearances. We have in prospect, and believe we will succeed in securing it, the visits of the passenger liners, the around-the-world passenger liners, and other character of ships which justify us in saying we are still not satisfied. What we can do is another question.

I merely cite that, not asking in any sense for an indorsement of any kind or character, but to call attention to the real tangible fight against obstructing discrimination in any port, whether situated in the East or West, anybody may have by reason of selfish interests.

I thank you very much. [Applause.]

THE TARIFF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution (S. Res. 52) coming over from a previous day, submitted by Mr. McMASTER on December 13 last, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Senate favors an immediate lowering of tariff schedules, and tariff legislation, embodying lowered schedules, should be considered and enacted during the present session of Congress: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. McMASTER. I ask that the resolution may go over until to-morrow without prejudice. I shall call it up to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the resolution will go over. Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

RELATIVE TO PARDONS

The bill (S. 1398) relating to pardons was announced as first in order.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, to add the following: "but such pardon shall in no manner affect the right of any person to a trial or to prosecute an appeal or writ

of error from a judgment of conviction," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That a pardon shall be effective to all intents and purposes from the time of its delivery or presentation, by or under the authority of the President, to the individual named therein as the object of Executive clemency, whether the same shall have been accepted by such person or not, but such pardon shall in no manner affect the right of any person to a trial or to prosecute an appeal or writ of error from a judgment of conviction.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to say further that the amendment recommended by the committee was suggested in the first place by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] only in so far as relates to an appeal from a judgment of conviction. The words "to a trial or" were incorporated upon my own proposal, but upon reflection I have concluded that they have no proper place there, because unless a trial has taken place it is within the power of the prosecuting officers to dismiss anyway, and probably a defendant would have no right to insist upon a trial, or, at least, could not effect it. I accordingly move to amend by striking out the words "to a trial or," appearing in line 9 of the amendment proposed by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 9 of the proposed committee amendment strike out the words "to a trial or."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in explanation of the legislation, I desire to say that some few years ago the Supreme Court of the United States decided that a pardon, in order to be effective, must be accepted by the person in whose favor it had been issued by the President. It came about in this way: A trial was in progress when a witness refused to answer questions propounded to him upon the ground that the testimony might incriminate him. This was during the administration of President Wilson.

The President was immediately appealed to to issue a pardon to the witness, which he promptly did, and the pardon was tendered to the witness. He refused to accept the pardon and continued in his refusal to answer questions propounded to him. He was thereupon committed for contempt, sued out a writ of habeas corpus, which went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was there held that the pardon was ineffective, that his jeopardy continued, and that he was wholly justified in refusing to answer.

The logical effect of that decision is that if a party should be tried and convicted and sent to the penitentiary for a period of 20 years and should have served 10 years and then it was thought that he might with entire propriety be released, and the President should issue a pardon to him, he could say, "No; thank you; I do not care for any pardon. You house me very comfortably here and provide me with food and clothing and with medical attendance when I require that kind of thing. I do not think I want a pardon." It occurs to me that that is approaching the absurd. Accordingly, it is proposed by the pending legislation that a pardon shall be made effective either when it is delivered or when it is presented to the object of the Executive clemency.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE, WASHINGTON

The bill (S. 747) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Kettle Falls, Wash., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. A similar bill has already been passed.

Mr. CURTIS. A bill covering that matter has been passed.

Mr. WILLIS. The bill should be indefinitely postponed, it being covered by another bill which has become a law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT, ETC.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 3, before the word "day," to strike out "2d" and to insert "15th," so as to read:

ARTICLE

SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 15th day of January——

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the author of the joint resolution, is this resolution similar to the ones which the Senate has passed upon previous occasions almost unanimously?

Mr. NORRIS. This is practically the same joint resolution that we have passed on three different occasions in three separate Congresses. The changes are immaterial. For instance, the last time the Senate passed the joint resolution instead of providing that the term of the President and the Vice President should begin, say, on the 2d day of January it fixed the day of the week; and the same provision was made as to the beginning of the terms of Members of Congress. On a prior occasion the joint resolution fixed the day of the month, as is done in the pending resolution. When the joint resolution was introduced at this session I changed it to its present form; but there is really no difference between the two. The only objection to this form is that the beginning of the term may come on Sunday, which is true under existing conditions. The House committee in reporting the resolution have reported it favorably every time it has been sent over there, but they have always insisted on putting in the day of the month rather than the day of the week. We thought, to avoid any controversy with the House or with the House committee, it would be just as well to change it in this instance.

Mr. FESS. It may be out of order, but I should like to know whether the House has ever taken any action on any of the joint resolutions which the Senate has heretofore passed.

Mr. NORRIS. The House committee has made a favorable report on the joint resolution, with some amendments, on every occasion when it has been sent to that body, but the House itself has never taken any action on the joint resolution; the joint resolution has always died on the calendar.

I think it would be interesting even to other Members than the Senator who has asked the question if I should read a paragraph from the report submitted by the committee on the pending joint resolution:

This proposed amendment to the Constitution has, in practically the same form in which it is now reported, passed the Senate in each of the three preceding Congresses. It passed the Senate the first time on February 13, 1923. On the 22d day of February, 1923, it received a favorable report from the House committee and was placed on the House Calendar. No action was taken by the House, and it died on the 4th day of March, 1923, because of the adjournment of Congress. It passed the Senate the second time on the 14th day of March, 1924, and on the 15th day of April, 1924, it was favorably reported by the House committee. It remained on the Calendar of the House, without any action being taken thereon, from the 15th of April, 1924, until the expiration of the Sixty-eighth Congress on the 4th day of March, 1925. It again passed the Senate, in the Sixty-ninth Congress, on February 15, 1926. It was again favorably reported by the House committee on the 24th day of February, 1926, and remained on the House Calendar, without any action thereon, from said date until the expiration of the Sixty-ninth Congress on the 4th day of March, 1927.

For something over a year the joint resolution was on the calendar of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FESS. Does the Senator from Nebraska have any hope that there will be more promise for the passage of the joint resolution in this Congress?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think so. I think the sentiment of the country has been largely increasing in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment, and, so far as I know, there is no opposition to its passage.

Mr. FESS. There has been none at all in this body of any kind whatsoever, has there?

Mr. NORRIS. There has not been much opposition. I think the last time it was pending here there were two votes against it, and on the first occasion there were only seven votes against it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think I understand the object of the proposed constitutional amendment, but I should like to have the Senator from Nebraska briefly state to the Senate what will be accomplished by its adoption.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Florida well knows, under the Constitution as at present Members of

Congress and the President both begin their terms of office on the 4th day of March after their election, but the old Congress convenes on the first Monday in the following December and continues in session until the following 4th of March. Therefore the new Congress, already at that time elected, remains out of office while the old Congress after the election, even though it may have been repudiated, still remains in office and legislates. The effect of the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment would be in that respect to put the new Congress at work practically on the 1st day of January after its election in November, as is done in all the States, practically without exception, as to their legislatures.

Another change would be that the so-called short session of Congress would be entirely eliminated; there would be no such thing as a short session of Congress. The Congress would convene in January and could remain in session until it desired to adjourn. The Senator from Florida will recognize, of course, the importance of that change. It would mean the elimination of the jam which always takes place about the 4th of March every other year when the terms of Members of the House and those of one-third of the Senate expire, and which always makes it possible for a filibuster to take place at that time even by one Senator, and thus interfere very greatly, I think, as we all know, with the proper consideration of such legislation as may then be before Congress.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As I understand the Senator, the Vice President's occupation will not be gone but his issue will be gone.

Mr. NORRIS. His issue will be gone; but he will, I presume, devote his great ability to other issues which will, perhaps, be just as important.

Mr. FLETCHER. So that the Congress which meets in January could continue in session for two years?

Mr. NORRIS. The first one could and the next one could continue in session for a whole year. The short session would be entirely eliminated.

Another change will come about. Under the provisions of the existing Constitution if it should occur that a President were not elected in November and the election should be thrown into the House of Representatives, the old Congress would elect the President and Vice President for the ensuing four years. If this proposed amendment should become part of the Constitution the new Congress rather than the old Congress would choose the President and Vice President. I think it is very important that a Congress which may have been repudiated at the ballot box should not be able to elect a President who would then remain in office for four years beyond that time.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. There is one contingency that might arise in connection with a presidential election, to cover which no action has ever been undertaken, and it ought to be covered, it seems to me, in legislation such as this. For example, if between the date when the Electoral College meets and votes and submits its report and the date of the inauguration both President and Vice President should die there is no provision either in the Constitution or in the law that would provide for filling the vacancy.

Mr. NORRIS. That is a difficulty, I will say to the Senator, which exists at the present time. This proposed constitutional amendment does not attempt to remedy that. There is another difficulty which might arise in a case where the election is thrown into the House. Under the Constitution, if it should occur that one or more of the candidates for President standing on the list of the three highest should die there is no way now under the Constitution by which that predicament could be properly met. But I wish to say to the Senator that I omitted everything in the preparation of this joint resolution which was not absolutely necessary to meet the particular issue of getting rid of the short session. I presume when the resolution shall be considered by the House committee they will add an amendment that will meet the contingency to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, because every time a similar joint resolution has gone there they have added that kind of an amendment; and if they shall add such an amendment in this instance, it is my intention to ask the Senate to concur in it when the joint resolution comes back to the Senate.

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me, it appears to me almost incredible that the Nation in its nearly 150 years of national life has not made provision for a possible interregnum in the Executive office.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it is strange that no such provision has been made.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, while we are discussing the uncertainties which exist under the present Constitution another could be very readily suggested, which is of very profound importance, and is easily conceivable. The Constitution provides for the case of a failure of the House of Representatives to elect a President by the time the presidential term of office begins. In that event the Vice President becomes President or acts as President; but the question arises if the House of Representatives might later reach a conclusion whether they would have the power to do so after the Vice President has once taken the place. That is a very likely contingency in case the election is thrown into the House of Representatives.

I rather regret the introduction of these possibilities into this discussion, because there are many varying views about these matters, and they may possibly to some extent obstruct the speedy passage of this much-needed amendment to the Constitution proposed by the Senator from Nebraska. If we are going to make provision for all possible cases, the one I have mentioned certainly ought to be given consideration; but I have always felt, Mr. President, that we might very well trust to the future, as has been done in the past, with reference to many of these questions. Nothing of the kind has ever happened in the course of our history, stretching back now for a period of something like 140 years. We can very easily suppose conditions where the most serious embarrassment would arise under the Constitution that exists not only in this respect but in many other respects, but they never have arisen; we have never been troubled; and I feel disposed to take chances rather than to embarrass the adoption of a proposed constitutional amendment which has been prompted by actual past experience of an embarrassing nature.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has stated what I tried to state in answer to the question of the Senator from Ohio. The object I had in view was to clear this question of all minor considerations, to accomplish the one important result, and not to take up various contingencies that might arise and try to remedy them in this proposed constitutional amendment, because to attempt to do so would merely open up an endless avenue of discussion as to subjects upon which Senators and Members of the House and legislatures of the States would disagree very greatly, and it might endanger this particular proposed amendment against which I can see no possible objection, and the benefits of which will be great.

These contingencies which might arise could have arisen at any time, but the possibility of their happening is very remote, and when they do arise there are still several things that could occur to prevent any break in the continuity of the Government.

For instance, the Constitution provides that if there is no election of a President, and the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives shall, as it stands now, proceed to the election of a President; and then it says that if they fail to elect by the 4th of March the person elected Vice President by the Senate shall become President.

We can imagine a condition where neither the House nor the Senate would succeed in electing either a President or a Vice President, and there would be nobody to take the office; but that is very remote. In the House, for instance, the election must take place from the three highest on the list. In the Senate the election must take place from the two highest on the list; and I can not conceive of a tie-up in the Senate in the case of a Vice President unless the Senate should be tied. We have been in existence for 140 years and none of these contingencies has ever happened yet, and there is not a chance in a million that they will happen in the next million years.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that the case might perhaps occur of the death of the candidate of the majority of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then the Senate would be powerless, because they can vote for no one except the two candidates having the highest votes.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true; yes. That is true now. It would still be true if this amendment were adopted just as it stands now.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I will state that I had no intention of offering an amendment. I was simply making an inquiry.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator's question has brought out some enlightening discussion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to propound a question to the Senator from Nebraska.

I observe that the date for the convening of the Congress has been changed in this joint resolution to the 2d day of January.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that about every seven years the 2d day of January falls on Sunday.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any reason why the 2d day of January should be specified, instead of the first Monday in January?

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator—I think he was not in the Chamber—that I explained that once. As far as I am concerned, there is not any reason. I would just as soon have it the first Monday, and as it was passed the last time it was the first Monday; but as we passed it, I think, in the Congress before that, we specified the day of the month. The House every time has changed it from the day of the week to the day of the month, and it will happen sometimes on Sunday; but that is what happens now. When the term of office expires on the 4th of March, that happens on Sunday.

Mr. BARKLEY. But Congress does not meet then.

Mr. NORRIS. No; but the Congress is in session.

Mr. BARKLEY. The present provision is that Congress shall meet on the first Monday in December. It struck me that in the interest of harmony, and to eliminate the necessity of having to delay the convening of Congress one day about every seven years, it would be better to have it the first Monday in January.

Mr. NORRIS. If it stays as it is now we would have to meet on Sunday, which would be the same condition that we have at the present time. About once in seven years the Congress would meet on Sunday. Once in seven years the Congress now is in session on Sunday until noon, and once in seven years the beginning of the term of the President takes place on Sunday. It may be that it would be desirable to have it always occur on a week day, and that is the way I first introduced the resolution, and I had that in view to avoid going into office on the Sabbath day. Personally, it is perfectly immaterial to me; and I will say to the Senator that this time it was changed because our experience has been that every time the House committee have taken it up they have made this change; and I thought that rather than to get into a controversy over a very immaterial proposition that might delay the joint resolution to some extent I would change it here, and the committee felt that way, and so we left it the day of the month.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if it is introduced in this form the House may change it back the other way.

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps.

Mr. BARKLEY. My information is that practically all the legislatures of the States convene on some Monday—probably the first Monday in January, or the first Monday of some other month.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not always Monday; but I agree with the Senator that the legislatures of the States, so far as I know, convene on a week day rather than on a Sunday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the reading of the joint resolution.

The reading of the joint resolution was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 2, line 5, before the words "day of," to strike out "15th" and insert "2d," so as to read:

and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 2d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 18, before the words "the Vice President," to strike out "where" and to insert "of the failure to choose"; in the same line, after the words "Vice President," to strike out "has not been chosen"; and in line 20, after the word "shall," to insert "then," so as to read:

SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 2d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

SEC. 3. If the House of Representatives has not chosen a President, whenever the right of choice devolves upon them, before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President. The Congress shall by law provide for the case of the failure to choose the Vice President before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the House of Representatives chooses a President or until the Senate chooses a Vice President.

SEC. 4. This amendment shall take effect on the 15th day of October after its ratification.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dill	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Barkley	Edge	Keyes	Sackett
Bayard	Ferris	King	Sheppard
Bingham	Fess	La Follette	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McKellar	Shortridge
Blaine	Frazier	McMaster	Smoot
Blease	George	McNary	Steck
Borah	Gerry	Mayfield	Steiwer
Bratton	Glass	Metcalf	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Thomas
Broussard	Greene	Neely	Tydings
Bruce	Hale	Norbeck	Tyson
Capper	Harris	Norris	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Hayden	Overman	Waterman
Curtis	Heflin	Pittman	Watson
Dale	Howell	Ransdell	Wheeler
Deneen	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will explain to us a little more fully than he has the reason for changing the date of the beginning of the Executive's term from March to January, and the reason for putting the beginning of the term of Congress back from March to January.

In other words, while I appreciate fully the disadvantage of having the Congress elected in one November not begin until one year from the following December, I do not quite appreciate why the date should be put back quite as far as the Senator has proposed, and why it would not be satisfactory to him and to others desiring this change to have the Congress elected in November begin in the following March.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to give the Senator my reasons for these particular changes; and I believe they are convincing.

In the first place, the question in regard to the President: Why have we included the President, and why is the President going into office on a different date from Members of Congress? That is a very proper question.

Under another provision of the Constitution, the votes for President and Vice President must be canvassed by the joint session of the House and the Senate; so there is two weeks' difference between their going into office, in order to give the Senate and the House an opportunity to organize and to canvass the votes, in order that the Congress may perform its function provided by another provision in the Constitution. Therefore it seems necessary that the term of the President should begin at a different time from the terms of Members of Congress, and that Congress shall have two weeks' time to canvass the votes for President and declare the election.

The reason why the time for the convening of Congress has been placed at January instead of March is one of convenience for Congress itself.

Everyone here knows that the best time to legislate in Washington is during the winter or spring months. It would be still better if the Congress could begin sooner, but I thought and the committee thought it would be wrong to make the meeting time so soon after the election, and we followed the usual course adopted by all the States in the Union, I think, where the members of the legislatures and State officials are chosen in November and take their offices early in January.

If Congress did not convene until March, and the term began then, as it does now, and we started the session in March, we would get to the middle of the summer before we would get fairly started, and everybody knows that the summer is not a good time to legislate in the city of Washington.

We undertook to provide for the meeting of Congress as soon after the election during the winter as possible, so that the Congress could get through with its work by the beginning of summer. It is quite evident, I think, that if we did away with the short session and have both sessions the same length, on an equal basis, we could transact the business of the country in the interval from January to June. As it is now, when we do have a long session, because we know that the short session is

coming on the next year and that we are going to be crowded, we try to do as much as we can in the long session, and it runs on into the summer and sometimes clear through the summer.

Was there any other question the Senator had to propound?

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator for his explanation, which is very clear. I should like to ask the Senator one other question, Whether the effect of this amendment would be two long sessions of Congress, a long session each year?

Mr. NORRIS. I think the effect of this amendment would be to make the short session longer and the long session shorter. It would equalize them. The time consumed would be just the same. Congress would have it within its power to end a session at any time it saw fit to.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator will realize that a great many of the State legislatures meet only every other year.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the committee considered the advisability of having a short session every other year, which would meet simply for the consideration of appropriation bills?

Mr. NORRIS. No; the committee has not given any consideration to that, because we have had before us no amendment to the Constitution that would bring about such a condition. It would take an amendment to the Constitution different from this one to provide for a short session that could consider only appropriaion bills, let us say.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the matter been considered of the real advisability of having two long sessions; in other words, having a long session every year? Does not the Senator think that the prevailing popular outcry against too much legislation has something of truth in it, which might lead to the advisability of not having Congress in session quite as much as this would provide?

Mr. NORRIS. There is some weight in that, but I will say that I think the trouble comes because Congress during the short session finds it a physical impossibility to transact the business of the country and attend to the legislation that legitimately and logically comes before Congress. Say, for instance, that we come to the middle of February. The trouble comes not only from the bills that are not considered at all, but the bills that are taken up. A Senator may be interested in some particular legislation. He knows that it must be passed before the 4th day of March, and legislation is pending that he does not like, which he would like to see defeated, which perhaps a large number of Senators or Representatives would like to see defeated. He knows that those who are behind the legislation are determined, and will make a hard fight for it, and he realizes that they are going to consume time that will make it impossible before the 4th of March to get up the particular legislation in which he is interested.

The result is that we get half-baked legislation put on the statute books, legislation passed when Senators know at the time of its passage that there are certain changes which ought to be made, that in it is something that should be stricken out. But they are more interested in something else they are trying to get up, which they want to have passed before the 4th of March, and they let slip by a lot of things they ought to criticize, which perhaps should be defeated, which could be changed, at least, or modified. The result is that we do pass a lot of legislation that has not been given proper consideration, and from that cause I think comes the cry, with some justification, that we are having too much legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear all of the Senator's remarks, and I do not know whether he has already argued the point I am about to suggest or not. Would not the greatest benefit to come from this amendment be the prevention of legislators legislating for the country after they have been defeated?

Mr. NORRIS. That is one of the greatest. I have been over that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has already covered that?

Mr. NORRIS. We have discussed that to some extent.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there not some way by which that feature might be changed?

Mr. NORRIS. What feature?

Mr. BINGHAM. The one just spoken of by the Senator from Tennessee, to prevent legislators from passing on legislation after they have been defeated. Is there not some way to change that without increasing the length of time that Congress shall be in session? The feature of the bill to which I object, and which I should like to see changed before I vote for the amendment, is the feature which provides for additional talking time for Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the disagreeable feature of too much talking in Congress comes, all will admit from their own experience, when we approach the 4th of March during a short session.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the greatest complaint.

Mr. NORRIS. That is, where we have talking without any reference to any particular, ostensible, visible object. If it were not compulsory for Congress to adjourn on the 4th day of March and end its deliberations, that kind of talking would not take place. I think we could do business in more of a business-like way if we were not limited as to the time of adjournment than though we were limited. It is a mistake, in my judgment, to say that we are going to limit by law the sessions of Congress, because we invite filibusters, we invite half-baked legislation, we invite ill-considered legislation, and give a premium to the man who can talk the longest, if he wants to hold up the Congress even by his own voice, which he can do if we are approaching adjournment time in a short session.

We will find, if we place in the hands of Congress itself the absolute control over its adjournment date, that there will not be any attempts made such as are made now every two years, and the condition we had in the Senate just before the adjournment of the last Congress would be a thing that would be unknown.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President will the Senator yield again?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, if this amendment shall be adopted, it will do away with the necessity for the proposed revision of the rules suggested by the Vice President, in the opinion of the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so; yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to ask the Senator, who has spent so much time in studying this matter, whether it is not true that most State constitutions provide for an adjournment date of the State legislatures; and that does not lead in most cases to the kind of talk which the Senator has just been speaking about. The two or three constitutions with which I happen to be familiar, and which I have looked up, provide definite adjournment dates. The matter is not in the hands of the legislators themselves, but is provided for in the State constitutions.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not familiar with the constitutions of all the States, but in a great many cases the time the legislature can remain in session is fixed by constitutional limitation. I think we ought to draw this distinction, which seems to me perfectly clear, that the business of a State is an entirely different proposition from the business of the 48 States which we represent here. The importance of a State legislature, as far as legislation is concerned touching all the people, is infinitely less than the importance of Congress, which controls the entire country, and all the foreign relations, and everything connected with the Federal Government.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I think the Senate of the United States is the only body that permits unlimited debate. No legislature that I know of permits extended debate without limit. The legislatures usually have rules by which they can cut off debate, so that the very thing the Senator is trying to reach here it might be argued is unnecessary, because State legislatures do not have to have such a provision. I do not think the State legislatures are operating under the same system of rules under which we operate.

Mr. NORRIS. No; they are not. The Senator reminds me of a thing about which I want to say just a word, the limitation of debate in the Senate. I voted for the present rules. I did it with a good deal of hesitation. I have a great deal of sympathy with a Senator who says he will never vote for a rule that limits debate in the Senate. In the House of Representatives, where the body is larger, it is necessary that some provision of that kind be made, or they could not transact business. But Senators will find if they will examine the legislation that has gone through the Congress in the last 10 years—and I speak of it with some reluctance because I might be misunderstood—that the place where the legislation is really wrought out is in the Senate. That is no reflection upon the House. The Members of the House are just as able, they are the same kind of people, they are just as patriotic as Senators. They are able to do the same things we can do, but on account of their very numbers they are limited, and they must cut off their hands in order to accomplish anything; they must deprive themselves of the right to debate and the right even to offer amendments in order to accomplish anything, because of the size of the body.

One reason why I have felt anxious for this amendment, which I do not believe is fully appreciated either by the Senate or by the country, is that it will make of this body a deliberative assembly in the truest and the highest sense of the word. That which causes criticism of it now is what happens every two years, when a filibuster takes place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator have in mind that we are proceeding under Rule VIII, and that at 2 o'clock a motion will be required to bring his joint resolution before the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Vice President. I subside.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I supposed that since we were on the calendar, the discussion of this matter could continue beyond 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no vote, a motion to continue the consideration of the joint resolution at 2 o'clock would be in order.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that if the matter shall not have been disposed of before 2 o'clock, the rule be suspended and we continue the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will continue.

Mr. NORRIS. I had about concluded what I wanted to say.

Mr. FESS. I ask the Senator to permit me to correct what might be thought an error. I do not want to be considered as saying that I am in favor of limiting debate in the Senate, except that debate ought to be germane to the subject that is being discussed. The only objection I have to the present method of proceeding in the Senate is that we permit a Senator to go afield and talk on anything under the sun while we are discussing a particular measure. As long as a Senator is discussing the measure pending, I think he ought to go on as long as he has anything to say. Otherwise, I doubt the wisdom of unlimited debate.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for a very brief statement, I dislike extremely to vote against this amendment, which has already passed the Senate three times by a very large vote. If it were possible to place the amendment in such form as to provide that the next Congress to come in after an election would be the Congress chosen at that election, I should be glad to vote for it, but to vote for an amendment which means two long sessions in each year, and therefore more chance for legislation and more chance for unnecessary talking, does not seem to me a wise thing to do. Therefore, although I shall probably be in a very small minority, I regret that I shall have to vote against the resolution in its present form.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not opposed to having the resolution brought up for consideration, and I shall detain the Senate but a moment, knowing how futile would be any effort on my part to defeat the resolution.

In the first place, there is no necessity for this resolution in order to effectuate the principal object the Senator from Nebraska has in mind. I gave some little attention to this question in the Sixty-eighth Congress and offered a bill at that time reading as follows:

A bill to appoint the days for the annual sessions of Congress

Be it enacted, etc., That the first annual session of each Congress shall be upon the 6th day of April next following the election of such Congress; the second annual session of Congress shall be upon the 2d day of January next following; and the third annual session of the Seventieth Congress and of each alternate Congress thereafter shall be upon the 2d day of January next following the appointment of the electors of the President and the Vice President.

Congress has the power under the Constitution to change the time of meeting of the Congress; and if it is not desirable that so long a period shall intervene between the election of the Congress and its convening, that can be cured very easily, if the Congress so desires, by the passage of a bill of the character indicated by the measure which I have just read.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which I made in the Senate on March 11, 1924, explanatory of my position and giving reasons why I would vote against the proposed amendment. It is wholly unnecessary. We are seeking to tinker with the Constitution when we can accomplish all we desire or legitimately should desire by enacting a measure similar to the one which I have offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The statement referred to is as follows:

I offered this measure for the purpose of avoiding, if we possibly could, a constitutional amendment, as I am very much averse, in the language of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], to constantly tinkering with the Constitution of the United States. In support of this measure, and as a reason for it, I ask to be permitted to offer a few observations.

The Constitution provides that—

"Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day."

The bill to appoint the days for the annual sessions of Congress fixes the date for the first annual session upon the 6th day of April next following the election of such Congress, and the date for the second annual session upon the 2d day of January next succeeding. Provision is also made for a third session on January 2, following the election of the President of the United States, this short session before the end of a presidential term being necessary in order to canvass and declare the vote of the Electoral College for the President and Vice President. This short third session will only be held by alternate Congresses.

The four months intervening between the election in November and the inauguration of the President in March is not too great a time to enable the outgoing President to clear up the work of his administration and to afford the new President time to select his Cabinet and prepare for the assumption of the duties of the presidential office. The short session of the old Congress preceding the change in administrations will also be of advantage for disposing of pending business.

But the interval of 13 months between the election and the first annual session of Congress is too great, and the bill shortens this interval to five months. This interval could be further shortened by providing for the election of Congress in January, which might also cool the judgment of the people. The new Congress assumes office on the 4th of March, and one month later, on the 6th of April, meets in regular session. This affords the new President one month for the preparation of his message and is as early a date as would be proper for the assembling of Congress.

April 6, 1789, was the day upon which the First Congress assembled in the city of New York, canvassed the vote of the Electoral College, declared that George Washington had been chosen President, and organized the Government of the United States under the Constitution. This date, April 6, instead of March 4, should have been accepted as the date for the beginning of the terms of office prescribed in the Constitution, as the Government under the Constitution, both in the de facto and de jure sense, had its beginning upon that day.

It is not necessary to amend the Constitution. The day for the election may be moved up as near the 4th of March as may be desired, and the day for the convening of Congress may be moved back as near the 4th of March as may be desired. The fixing of the days for the election and convening of Congress is within the express powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators will do me the honor to read what I have said upon this subject before they vote upon the proposed amendment to the Constitution which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. In my judgment, there is no necessity for amending the Constitution of the United States. We can reach reasonably satisfactory results by executing the plan I have suggested in the bill which I just read to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I understand that if present he would vote as I shall vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I have just noted the absence of my pair, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GEORGE. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I will therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BAYARD. I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who is absent. I am given to understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote, and I shall therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. Each of these Senators if present would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—67

Ashurst	Edge	Jones	Shipstead
Barkley	Ferris	Keyes	Shortridge
Bayard	Fess	La Follette	Smoot
Black	Fletcher	McKellar	Steck
Blaine	Frazier	McMaster	Steiwer
Borah	George	McNary	Swanson
Bratton	Gerry	Mayfield	Thomas
Brookhart	Glass	Moses	Tydings
Broussard	Gould	Neely	Tyson
Bruce	Hale	Norbeck	Wagner
Capper	Harris	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Harrison	Nye	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hawes	Oddie	Waterman
Couzens	Hayden	Pittman	Watson
Curtis	Heflin	Ransdell	Wheeler
Deneen	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Dill	Johnson	Sheppard	

NAYS—6

Bingham	Dale	King	Sackett
Blease	Greene		

NOT VOTING—21

Cutting	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Stephens
du Pont	McLean	Reed, Pa.	Trammell
Edwards	Metcalf	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Gillett	Overman	Schall	
Goff	Phipps	Simmons	
Gooding	Pine	Smith	

So the joint resolution was passed.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a few days preceding the close of the last session of Congress the Governor of Alabama and the Muscle Shoals Commission served notice upon the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also upon the President of the United States that the State of Alabama owns and controls the bed and banks of the Tennessee River and the property known as the Muscle Shoals project. At the request of the President of the United States the Attorney General has submitted an opinion covering that important subject matter, a copy of which I have on my desk at this moment.

It is in the nature of a memorandum which has been submitted to the Attorney General by two very able and capable assistants in his office. I ask unanimous consent that the opinion be published as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEYES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings, which was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds this morning.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, to add a new section, section 4, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire economically and at an early date adequate sites for suitable accommodations in the District of Columbia for the executive departments, and independent establishments of the Government not under any executive department, and suitable grounds, parking, and approaches thereto, the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, is hereby amended so as to authorize and direct him to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, all the lands obtainable with the funds that may be appropriated, including buildings and other structures, included within the triangle bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue and B Street, extending from Fifteenth Street to Sixth Street Northwest, and reservations A, B, C, and D, except property owned by the United States or the District of Columbia as such lands appear in the records of the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated in addition to the amounts authorized in said act of May 25, 1926, and without regard to the limitations contained in the first paragraph of section 5 of such act, the sum of $25,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. The buildings constructed under said act approved May 25, 1926, when completed and ready for occupancy shall be turned over to the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks for care, maintenance, and protection, including the furnishing of heat, gas, and electricity therein, together with all machinery, tools, equipments, and supplies to be used in connection therewith.

SEC. 4. That after title has been vested in the United States to any of the properties herein or heretofore authorized to be acquired or taken within the area embraced in this act, the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby further authorized to enter into contracts for demolishing the buildings thereon, and for clearing and grading the land at such time and to such extent as he may deem proper, and to enter into contracts for plans and specifications for the architectural landscape treatment of the portion of the lands acquired which he may deem proper, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission created by the act of March 1, 1919, to reserve for planting and for open spaces for the proper grouping of the Federal buildings which have heretofore been authorized or may hereafter be authorized to be constructed within the area embraced in this act, the expenditures on account thereof to be charged to the appropriations authorized under the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire in charge of the bill. I have heard some objection to the bill upon the theory that it is proposed under the terms of the legislation, if it shall be enacted, that the building known as the Southern Railway Building is to be purchased by the Government and then demolished. I desire to know whether that is contemplated under the proposed legislation?

Mr. KEYES. I think not, at least not for a great many years. The Southern Railway Building is a modern building. I think when we passed a similar bill at the last session it was rather expected that the District of Columbia would want to acquire that building for use of the District government. Since last winter, however, the District government apparently has adopted a different program which it hopes to carry out and which will greatly benefit the appearance of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and that is to erect a group of district buildings in the vicinity of John Marshall Place. For that reason I believe the District would have no real use for the Southern Railway Building; but the Federal Government certainly will have. That building will be used without doubt for a great many years as an office building to house many of the Federal activities which are now scattered over the city of Washington. It will be a very useful building and will save a great deal of rent to the Federal Government, and I have not the slightest idea that the building will be taken down for years to come.

Mr. WILLIS. As I understand, the amount proposed to be expended under the provisions of the bill is $25,000,000?

Mr. KEYES. That is the amount.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it contemplated that there will be other measures during this session of Congress for the purchase of other real estate in the District to carry out the building program, and if so, what is the probable amount involved?

Mr. KEYES. I think there is one bill which has been introduced to acquire one or two squares on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue down by the Peace Monument. That land would probably be necessary for the new avenue which is contemplated from the Union Station to the vicinity of the Peace Monument, to connect Pennsylvania Avenue with the Union Station.

Mr. WILLIS. That is the street which is proposed to be called Ohio Avenue?

Mr. KEYES. I understand that there are some who desire to have it named Ohio Avenue.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the plaza proposition, which has nothing whatever to do with the triangle. All the lands provided for in the pending bill are within the triangle.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I do not want to delay action on the pending bill, but I desire this afternoon to make some comments on the coal situation.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator to permit the bill to pass, and that he then ask unanimous consent to speak on the coal situation.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know what the plan for to-day's session is. Is it intended that the Senate shall go into executive session pretty soon?

Mr. SMOOT. That was the plan, I will say to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not think I shall speak more than 10 minutes, but I wish to speak to-day.

Mr. KEYES. Will the Senator from New York not allow us to act on the pending bill? It will, I think, take only a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that when the pending bill shall have been passed the Senator from New York may be allowed to speak for 10 or 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, unanimous consent is granted.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMMISSIONERS IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for just a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. There has come over from the House of Representatives a joint resolution similar to one which was introduced by me in the Senate and referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee has to-day favorably reported the joint resolution to which I refer. It is identical with the House joint resolution excepting that it uses the word "three," while in the House joint resolution the time of extension of the term of the commissioners is for five years. I now ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution may be taken up, and if that shall be done, I shall offer an amendment to it so that it will correspond with the report of the Senate committee. If my amendment shall be agreed to, I then shall ask that the joint resolution may be passed.

Mr. OVERMAN. To what does the joint resolution relate?

Mr. NORRIS. It is a joint resolution providing for the extension of the term of commissioners of the Court of Claims.

The House joint resolution provides for an extension of the term of the commissioners of the Court of Claims for five years while the joint resolution as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary provides for an extension of only three years. Under the law we have commissioners for the Court of Claims, and their terms expire sometime next month. The object of the passage of this joint resolution is to extend their activities under the present law for three years more. I think myself their office should be permanent, but it is not.

Mr. OVERMAN. We had quite a hearing in the committee on the matter, and the committee was unanimously in favor of the joint resolution but recommended a change from five years to three years.

Mr. NORRIS. The committee changed their term from five years to three years, but the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution providing for an extension of five years. That, of course, is the committee action, and I can not change their action and increase the term from three to five years; so I wish to amend the House joint resolution, making the change from five to three years to correspond with the action of the Senate committee on the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims.

Mr. NORRIS. I move to amend the joint resolution, in line 9, before the word "years," by striking out "five" and inserting "three."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the joint resolution, in line 9, before the word "years," by striking out "five" and inserting "three," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (February 24, 1925, ch. 301, par. 1, 43 Stat. 964; U. S. Code, p. 899, sec. 269), providing for commissioners in the Court of Claims, their appointment, powers, and procedure be, and the same are hereby, continued in full force and effect for the term of three years from the date of the approval of this joint resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NORRIS. I now ask that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) continuing commissioners in the Court of Claims, which was to-day reported from the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, there is a great conflict going on at the present time between the mine owners and the striking union miners. I am not seeking at this time to fix any responsibility, but simply to present to the Senate the situation as it is. Perhaps in the course of my remarks I may suggest something by way of a legislative remedy for the prevention of future situations of this kind. I desire to have read by the clerk a telegram which I have just received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 3, 1928.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR COPELAND: Reading your article on the coal situation prompts me to wire first-hand information. The Young Women's Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Beechview, Pittsburgh, made investigation on December 2 in mines Nos. 2 and 3 at Castleshannon and mine No. 8 at Coverdale. We found large families of bright children without shoes and stockings and not sufficient food or clothing—conditions almost unbelievable could exist in America. We found a newborn babe without any clothing, the first one born in the barracks of Coverdale. We immediately opened a receiving station in Beechview, and we were the first organization to extend relief to these destitute women and children in the mines. It seemed the heavens opened, and in less than three weeks we distributed 1,000 pairs of shoes and stockings, 500 well-filled baskets of groceries, and a lovely Christmas treat for 1,200 children. This is to say the sympathy of the people is expressed in greater degree than upon any previous demand. Judging from the quality of all kinds of clothing, the contributors must have sacrificed. We were happy to provide ample clothing even for this very small portion of the area in distress. The use of coal being a public service, surely the Government will come to the rescue of these people, who are honest and industrious and must not be allowed to perish. We are not concerned in the controversy, but from a humanitarian standpoint we are urging you to use all the power at your command. I met you when you spoke in this city at a meeting. The barracks in which they are forced to live you could insert a lead pencil between the boards.

Very sincerely,

IDA L. ALLEN,
Teacher and Treasurer of the Relief Committee.
Mrs. H. G. SCHRAEDER,
Chairman.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the telegram contains a recital of conditions, not in Armenia or in some remote part of the earth, but within less than half a day's journey of this Capitol. This is a situation, too, in a country boasting of prosperity. I have on my desk photographs recently taken by the Daily News of New York, from an inspection of which any Senator who desires to know the conditions in Pennsylvania can learn them. The good woman who sent the telegram refers to the barracks where the miners are living. Here [exhibiting] are photographs of those barracks, the crude buildings between the boards of which she says a lead pencil may be inserted, and directly across the street are the buildings which are owned by the mine companies and which were occupied by the miners until recently, but from which they have been dispossessed.

Here [exhibiting] are photographs of constable notices and photographs showing how the miners have been turned out of house and home and how their goods have been sold. They are destitute; they are without the means of support. Why is it possible in this great rich country of ours to have a situation like this?

Mr. President, we must face this problem. For two years, during the Sixty-ninth Congress, I begged the Senate to take some action which might make it possible for the President to act in a crisis of this character, but the Senate did not choose to take action. We must, however, face the situation and in some way find a solution.

Let me tell you what the situation is, Mr. President. Every time there is a strike—and I am speaking now about the bituminous coal mines—new mines are opened and old mines increase their output beyond any point which the future needs of the country will justify. In addition, mines which have been lying dormant have been resurrected.

I think I am right in saying that there are 32 States in the Union where bituminous coal is found. It is not like the anthracite deposit which is found in but a few counties in the State of Pennsylvania, for bituminous coal is found and mined throughout our Nation.

Every time there is a strike somewhere and certain mines are closed new mines are opened in some remote section of the country. During the war almost 4,000 new bituminous mines were opened because of the need of the world for bituminous coal. At

the present time we have in operation in this country between ten and fifteen thousand bituminous coal mines. There are sufficient miners to operate those ten or fifteen thousand coal mines if there were any need of the coal, but since there is no such need, the miners are without work.

When I recite the situation as it exists this very day I am not seeking at all, Mr. President, to blame the mine owners or to say that they should put these men at work. The fact is the mine owners themselves are suffering. The fact is there is no work for these men.

During the year which has just closed there were mined 519,000,000 tons of soft coal, which is near the peak in quantity of soft coal mined since 1919. This, too, was at a time when industry was slack and fuel oil and water power were being substituted for coal. However, the point I wish to bring out is that although year after year we have been opening new mines, now, instead of needing the great number of available coal miners, we have a surplus of from 200,000 to 300,000 such miners. Some of them are in the State of the Senator from Alabama, working, as I remember the statement made to me by the Secretary of Labor yesterday, for $1.92 a day. But they do not work every day; they only work two or three days a week, because there is no demand for their service. That is true all over the country. So many men have been brought into coal mining and there are now so many miners that under no circumstances is it possible to set them all at work.

What are we to do about it? This morning I introduced a bill—and a similar bill was introduced in the House by Mr. JACOBSTEIN, of my State—to do away with the antitrust laws so far as they operate to prevent cooperative mining and cooperative marketing. It is strange to think that under any circumstances it could be desirable to lessen competition, but there is such a competitive strife and such a degree of cruel competition going on in bituminous coal mining that the whole industry is threatened with bankruptcy. Every Senator in this Chamber who is conversant with the facts, knows that I state the truth. To-day the situation is such that coal is being carried six or eight hundred miles from one State to another, and because of competitive conditions is sold at the same price as coal which is carried 100 miles within the borders of the State of production. Any sacrifices are made, on the part of those who have coal, to sell it; and in order to break the union in certain quarters coal is being shipped from nonunion sections of this country to sections where they have union mining, in order that those union miners may be put out of business.

We can not disregard the situation. We must deal with it intelligently. We can not afford to pass it over and simply disregard it as we have done in the past. We must take effective action.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. To what extent has the condition which the Senator now describes been enlarged or developed recently? My impression is that there has been a very great surplus of bituminous coal employees for many years; and I should like to know how much worse the condition is to-day than it was four or five years ago.

Mr. COPELAND. In reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has always taken such an intelligent interest in all these matters having to do with human welfare, I will say this: Of course, it was during the war that this condition was first brought to our attention in a striking way. There was a demand from everywhere that we should cultivate more acres, and raise more wheat and corn, and more everything else; and so at that time we were urged to develop more coal. Since then, however, nearly 4,000 new mines have been opened, and why have they been opened? I want to make that clear to the Senator.

Every time the mines are closed up, we will say, in Massachusetts——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Unfortunately, we have not any.

Mr. COPELAND. Well, in Pennsylvania—put it that way—I think you are fortunate that you have not any mines in Massachusetts. You have cotton mills, however, in Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We do not think it is fortunate, in view of the price we have to pay for our coal.

Mr. COPELAND. It is unfortunate; is it not?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes; I think so.

Mr. COPELAND. When coal sells at $2 or $3 at the mines, and, when it gets to the people of Massachusetts they pay $6 to $10 for it, certainly there is something wrong with the methods of distribution.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is something wrong with our economic system when the costs of transporting coal are so excessively greater than the costs to produce it.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. That is true, of course, of everything in the way of products necessary for the family. If the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] were speaking, he would call attention to the fact that the farmers get seven and one-half billion dollars for what we pay twenty-two and one-half billion for. Between the producer and the consumer the price has been trebled.

However, when a strike occurs in the northern regions the mines in the Southern States and other places are operated full tilt, and, if need be, new mines are opened.

This bill provides against the opening of new mines except under certain conditions. Since the Senator has raised this question, I refer to section 5 of the bill:

> Every application for car service to a new bituminous coal mine shall be submitted by the carrier to the Interstate Commerce Commission for its approval. This application must be accompanied by a certificate of necessity and approval by the Secretary of Commerce.

Why is this?

Suppose mines were discovered in Massachusetts—and there might well be mines discovered in the western part of Massachusetts, up in the Berkshires. Suppose coal lands were discovered in that State. The owners of these coal lands would immediately apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for car service in order that they might ship this coal. At the same time that they applied for the car service they would make an appeal for miners; and just at this particular time, when there is so much unemployment in Massachusetts because of the Republican "prosperity," a lot of the men from Massachusetts would be induced to go into coal mining. They would become coal miners.

Then, when the strike is over in Pennsylvania, we will say, and the mines of Pennsylvania open, mines which can be operated much more cheaply than those in Massachusetts, then the coal mines in Massachusetts are closed, or operated at a loss, and these men who have become coal miners are put out of business or work part time. That has gone on and on and on until to-day we have 250,000 surplus coal miners, and that is the reason why the dreadful situation shown by these photographs exists in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and other fields.

I observe that the chair is occupied at this time by a distinguished Senator who is himself an authority on the subject of coal [Mr. SACKETT in the chair]. He realizes, unquestionably, that it is a fact that by reason of the interference of the antitrust laws it is not possible for mines to be consolidated. It is not possible to put the expensive, impracticable mine out of business. It is cheaper to operate at a loss than to shut down completely. The result is that we have a tremendous amount of expensively produced coal upon the market. How are you going to settle that? The only way I can see is to do away with the interference of the antitrust laws, and permit these consolidations.

Then, in the next place, every mine has its own marketing outfit. It has its own machinery for selling its coal; and if the mine owners of a given mine in Kentucky venture to cooperate with the owners of another mine in Kentucky, or with one in West Virginia, they come under the displeasure of the Federal Trade Commission, and the antitrust laws are put in operation against them.

I do not see any way to solve this problem except by waiving the operation of the antitrust laws so far as they relate to bituminous coal. I would not for a moment vote to do that for anthracite coal, because anthracite coal is taken from a relatively small number of mines in a limited number of counties in a limited area of one State, and there could be developed such a monopoly in anthracite coal that any price the market would bear could be charged for that product.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does not that condition exist now?

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, yes; it does exist now; but, of course, in the case of anthracite coal they are taking advantage of the fact that they are an intrastate group, and in that way they seek to avoid any Federal interference.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The difference between the anthracite situation and the bituminous situation is that one is already monopolized and the other is competitive.

Mr. COPELAND. That is it; and it will be increasingly competitive as the years go on, at the expense of the public, the mine owners, and workers, unless we curb it; and not alone will we have 250,000 surplus miners, but if we have no curb placed upon the opening of new mines there will be a million. There

will be any number of surplus miners as time goes on. It is essential that we protect the public from the wastes and inconveniences which result from the present ruinous and uneconomic competition.

This measure, which has been thought out not alone by the authors of the bill but by many eminent economists as well as some officials of the Government, seeks to meet the present situation and also to prevent the conditions, fear of which undoubtedly the Senator from Massachusetts has in his mind, that there might be created a bituminous coal trust as offensive to the people of the United States as the anthracite trust is. We have sought to protect against that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to say to the Senator, if I may, that I am in sympathy with the condition he describes and to which some relief should be extended. I have grave doubts about the relief suggested by the Senator, however, but I am willing to be enlightened. The Senator is to be commended for the great interest he has always taken in this important subject, and I am anxious to cooperate with him in finding a solution.

Mr. COPELAND. I assume that at the proper time, or perhaps now, the Senator will suggest the particular objection he has; but before he does that, perhaps I may venture to show him how we have anticipated some of the objections that he will raise.

For instance, the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out that in Pennsylvania there is in effect a monopoly; and that is true. We have suffered from it. He has suffered from it in his State; we have suffered from it in our State; and when we had this terrible strike two years ago, when we could get no action because of the unwillingness of Congress to act, we had a situation where the people in Boston and the people in New York suffered physically. There was not only suffering, but there were deaths which could be attributed to the lack of hard coal by reason of this monopolistic situation on the part of the owners of the anthracite mines.

But I doubt, myself, that it will ever be possible to monopolize bituminous coal mining. You would have to buy a large part of the land in 32 States to do it. The initial investment would be so tremendous that it would be impossible to carry out such a project. However, in order that there might be no monopolistic tendency, we have provided that in the formation of these associations, which might be called trade associations, there shall be a State or geographical limitation imposed upon their membership.

Under the bill that I have introduced these associations are limited to the confines of a single State, or to a limited geographical area, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce. In other words, western Pennsylvania and northern West Virginia, if the latter State could ever agree with western Pennsylvania in anything—I think perhaps that is doubtful—might be formed into one association. There could be another which would cover Kentucky and Tennessee; another, perhaps, covering Ohio and Indiana; but there would have to be limited areas in order that the monopolistic feature which the Senator fears might be avoided.

Mr. President, I did an unusual thing in the reference of this bill. I did it deliberately. I had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Perhaps it should go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce; but I had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor because the other bill, the bill which I introduced in the Sixty-ninth Congress, which was approved by that committee and put upon the calendar, and the same bill which I introduced this year, was referred to that committee. I was told by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor that the coal men or other persons have asked for a hearing.

That bill and the one I am discussing to-day are related. If there is to be a hearing upon the bill which was presented last year, we might at the same time have a hearing upon this bill. The same men are interested who will come before the committee; and I bespeak for this bill the careful consideration which the importance of the subject deserves. We must find a way to solve the problem, or the bituminous-coal industry is bankrupt.

I am not sure that the railroads are particularly anxious to have this question solved. They are buying bituminous coal cheaper than they ever did before, and they can carry it great distances, to parts of the coal fields where union miners are employed, and can put out of business those mines where union miners are employed, to create situations such as we have pictured here.

Unless we find a way to solve the question, we are going to have not only in western Pennsylvania, but in every State where coal mining is done, a repetition of what is going on now in that territory. I hope that the Senate will recognize the situation, which has so much to do with human welfare, not alone of these workers, but of workers generally throughout the country.

I leave the discussion to-day with this description of what we are seeking to undertake, hoping that when the matter comes formally before the committee, and later, as I hope it will, before the Senate, there may be consultation and discussion. We have no pride of authorship in this bill. We are here simply to present the matter as it appears to us, but to beg of the Senate that there shall be found a solution of this tremendous problem.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York a question?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BAYARD. I probably misunderstood him. He said a moment ago that the railroads were carrying coal to districts where the unions were out on strike. Does the Senator mean to say that the railroads are conspiring with the owners of the mines in distant districts to bring their coal into the districts where the union miners are striking for the purpose of breaking the strike?

Mr. COPELAND. That is the effect.

Mr. BAYARD. In other words, the Senator's claim is that the railroads are in conspiracy with the owners of the mines to break up the unions?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know that I should like to use the word "conspiracy"; perhaps we will say that there is a "gentlemen's agreement" in order to accomplish the thing the Senator has suggested.

An examination of my bill will disclose that it has in it the following constructive features: First, it provides for voluntary cooperation and consolidation of soft-coal mines; second, it legalizes such consolidations by exempting them from the operation of the Sherman Antitrust Act; third, it limits these consolidations to regional areas approved by the Secretary of Commerce; fourth, it sets up the necessary legal machinery for restricting the overproduction of soft coal; fifth, it places in the Secretary of Commerce the responsibility and power to supervise such trade associations in order to protect the public, the independent mine owners, and mine labor from exploitation.

I bespeak for this bill a careful study of every Senator. The proposed legislation has a fundamental relationship to the prosperity and well-being of the country.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator be good enough to name the railroads and the mining companies that he believes have entered into the gentlemen's agreement that he has mentioned, and also to specify where the agreement is now being executed?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, is the Senator more interested in the matter which he has mentioned than he is in the seeking of a solution to prevent a repetition of the situation described by the writer of that telegram? Is he more interested in going into a discussion of the other subject? I have no definite information, let me say frankly to the Senator. I have not wanted to have. I do not know even the names of these mining companies down in western Pennsylvania. I am not interested in the names of mines or of railroads. But I am interested in a situation which threatens the life of an industry so fundamental to American progress as bituminous coal mining, and the Senator from West Virginia, I am sure, must have a greater interest than I have, because there are a tremendous number of those mines in his own State.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from West Virginia is very deeply interested in the matter, indeed. Otherwise he would have asked no questions.

May I further inquire of the able Senator from New York, to what place coal is now being shipped from nonunion mines for the purpose of destroying the unions in the territory to which the coal is being transported?

Mr. COPELAND. Does that have a bearing on the question?

Mr. NEELY. How can the Senate determine the value of the Senator's conclusions without knowing the facts upon which they are based?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in order that the Senator may have full information I suggest to him that he see Mr. Kerwin, the director of conciliation of the Department of Labor, and he will there see charts and get information that will be illuminating to him, as they have been to me.

Mr. NEELY. I understood the Senator to say that the bill which he has introduced represents not only his own thought and judgment but also the conclusions of some of the officials of this administration.

Mr. COPELAND. I would not quite say that, Mr. President. The conclusion was reached in our minds after consultation with officials of the administration, among others. I do not need to say this in this presence, but in no sense whatever do I represent this administration.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator is capable of greatly improving it. But since this administration has manifested considerable hostility to the coal-mining industry in West Virginia and other Southern States, I am anxious to know, for example, whether Doctor Smith or Mr. Hoover has collaborated with the Senator from New York in the preparation of his proposed legislation.

Mr. COPELAND. I will be very happy to state that Mr. Hoover—and who was the other gentleman?

Mr. NEELY. Doctor Smith.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. Hoover and Doctor Smith have not collaborated.

Mr. NEELY. Doctor Smith is the eminent economist who thinks that West Virginia should have waited a half a century before attempting to interfere with Pennsylvania's monopoly of the soft-coal business of the country, a monopoly that was for many years almost as exclusive as that which our erring sister State now enjoys in the matter of political corruption.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, last year the Senator from West Virginia and I were on opposing sides relative to the importance of the bill which bore my name, and which was upon the Calendar of the Senate for two years. I have no criticism to pass upon him because of the position which he took. I regard the Senator from West Virginia as a conscientious and able legislator, an ornament to the Senate. But I do not wish him to form the impression that this particular legislation which I have discussed this morning is the legislation which we were talking about last year. I venture to say that if the Senator from West Virginia will consult the mine owners in his State, and if he will take pains to consult the heads of the workers—they do not have unions, I believe, in his State, but if he will consult those who are active in the organization of labor, not "organized" in the technical sense, but those who work—he will find that they will be eager for this sort of legislation.

I do not care what Doctor Smith or Doctor Brown or Doctor Jones may have said about West Virginia in the past, the fact remains that these mines in West Virginia have been opened and they are giving to the country what the Senator from West Virginia says is the best coal ever mined. I have no reason to doubt that. Anyhow they are operating. But certainly the Senator from West Virginia does not want to have many more mines opened in West Virginia, or Virginia, or Pennsylvania, or Ohio, or Indiana, or any other State, because every time new mines are opened, immediately the fundamentals of the industry are attacked. We can not prosper as a manufacturing nation unless we have bituminous coal, and a stabilized price, and a stabilized flow of coal. Those are the things which are involved in this bill.

So far as the administration is concerned, let not the Senator be troubled. I am not speaking for the administration. I have never been invited to breakfast by the administration. I have never partaken of any of the buckwheat cakes and sausage. I have never ridden upon the *Mayflower*. I am just a poor benighted resident of New York.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, excepting the place from which the Senator comes, everything he has enumerated speaks volumes in his favor. May the Senator find consolation in the parable which teaches that he who is momentarily denied the crumbs that fall from a rich or great man's table may eventually receive a great reward in heaven.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, Mr. President, with this very happy retort, I think we may close the discussion for the day. But I serve notice now that the Senate has not heard the last of this question. I do beg Senators to study it, to inform themselves regarding the evils of the present situation, in order that together we may work out some means of solving what is a very important national question.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, there is more rejoicing around the throne over one sinner who returns to the fold than over ninety and nine who are already there. During the last session of the Congress a few of us experienced great difficulty in preventing the Senator from New York from passing a bill under which the coal industry might have been destroyed. The measure that the Senator offered last year was, in my opinion, destructive. The one he offers now seems to be constructive. Let all of us who have been trying to save the most depressed, unprofitable, and bedeviled but withal the most important industry of the country, rejoice over the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New York has at last taken his place on the right side of the coal-mining question. Although in the past the Senator's sins in this matter may have been as scarlet, they shall now be as white as snow.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I would not care to have this facetious statement pass unchallenged, because in the RECORD it will look serious. I do want to say that while I have fuller information than I had before, it has not wiped from my mind the conviction that the country still needs the legislation for which I was striving last year.

Mr. NEELY. That is "the most unkindest cut of all." It compels me to retract much that I have just said in the Senator's favor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 5, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1928

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Charles Burton Robbins, of Iowa, to be the Assistant Secretary of War, vice Hanford MacNider, resigned.

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE VICE CONSULS OF CAREER

Howard F. Diehl, of Ohio.
Richard C. Dutrow, of Maryland.
George M. Graves, of Vermont.
Randolph Harrison, jr., of Virginia.
Comer Howell, of Georgia.
Odin G. Loren, of Washington.
James S. Moose, jr., of Arkansas.
Charles K. Morris, of Minnesota.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED

Howard F. Diehl, of Ohio.
Richard C. Dutrow, of Maryland.
George M. Graves, of Vermont.
Randolph Harrison, jr., of Virginia.
Comer Howell, of Georgia.
Odin G. Loren, of Washington.
James S. Moose, jr., of Arkansas.
Charles K. Morris, of Minnesota.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Machinist (T) Marvin T. Braswell to be a temporary ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

This officer has passed satisfactorily the examinations prescribed for appointment. This is in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress, approved July 3, 1926, entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dr. Maurice A. Roe to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

Doctor Roe has passed the examination prescribed by law and the regulations of the service.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

George C. Crom, of Florida, to be register of the land office at Gainseville, Fla. Reappointment.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James Damron, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney, southern district of West Virginia, vice Bernard J. Pettigrew, appointed by court.

Thomas J. Harkins, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney, western district of North Carolina. Mr. Harkins is now serving under appointment by court.

Edwin L. Gavin, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney, middle district of North Carolina, vice Frank A. Linney, appointed by court.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Harry A. Weiss, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal, northern district of West Virginia, vice Louis Buchwald, deceased. Mr. Weiss is now serving under appointment by court.

Joseph John Jenkins, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal, middle district of North Carolina, vice Charles G. Bryant, appointed by court.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

CHAPLAIN

Rev. Michael Ambrose Hally, of Pennsylvania, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant, with rank from December 15, 1927.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE CAPTAIN

First Lieut. Carleton Burgess, Cavalry, from December 13, 1927.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Commander Bruce L. Canaga to be a captain in the Navy from the 2d day of September, 1927.

Commander Walter B. Woodson to be a captain in the Navy from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Commander Louis P. Davis to be a captain in the Navy from the 2d day of October, 1927.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 7th day of October, 1927:

Harold G. Bowen, an additional number in grade.

Edgar G. Oberlin, an additional number in grade.

Commander Nelson H. Goss to be a captain in the Navy from the 14th day of November, 1927.

Commander Stanford C. Hooper, an additional number in grade, to be a captain from the 16th day of November, 1927.

Commander William O. Spears to be a captain in the Navy from the 16th day of November, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Ward W. Waddell to be a commander in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Henry G. Cooper, jr., to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of September, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Mark C. Bowman to be a commander in the Navy from the 7th day of October, 1927.

Lieut. Commander Jesse B. Oldendorf to be a commander in the Navy from the 14th day of November, 1927.

Lieut. Harold B. Sallada to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 7th day of September, 1927.

Lieut. Felix B. Stump to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 7th day of October, 1927.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1927:

Roland R. Killian.

Artyn L. Main.

Wilbur F. Broun.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1927:

Lucius K. Scott.

Richard R. Dennett.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1927:

Edward L. Woodyard.

Allen P. Calvert.

Roy W. Lajeunesse.

Asst. Surg. Arra B. Chesser to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 1st day of July, 1927.

Acting Chaplain Earl M. Criger to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 2d day of June, 1927.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Maggie Winningham to be postmaster at York, Ala., in place of Maggie Winningham. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charles S. Prescott to be postmaster at Wedower, Ala., in place of C. S. Prescott. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Edna Young to be postmaster at Warrior, Ala., in place of Edna Young. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Martin E. Forsyth to be postmaster at Union Springs, Ala., in place of M. E. Forsyth. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Emerson E. Etheredge to be postmaster at Town Creek, Ala., in place of E. E. Etheredge. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

James L. Ragland to be postmaster at Pell City, Ala., in place of J. L. Ragland. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ruth K. Conerly to be postmaster at Lockhart, Ala., in place of R. K. Conerly. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Roy M. Boak to be postmaster at Lineville, Ala., in place of R. M. Boak. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Stephen H. Murphy to be postmaster at Huntsville, Ala., in place of S. H. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Lonnie W. Johnston to be postmaster at Hanceville, Ala., in place of L. W. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Henry A. Cathey to be postmaster at Florence, Ala., in place of H. A. Cathey. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ada M. Burks to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ala., in place of A. M. Burks. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Robert B. Evans to be postmaster at Elkmont, Ala., in place of R. B. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John N. Edwards to be postmaster at Eclectic, Ala., in place of J. N. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired on January 3, 1928.

Jacob E. Hood to be postmaster at Cordova, Ala., in place of J. E. Hood. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Thomas P. Bonner to be postmaster at Ashland, Ala., in place of T. P. Bonner. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John Thompson to be postmaster at Altoona, Ala., in place of John Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

ARIZONA

Edith A. Macia to be postmaster at Tombstone, Ariz., in place of W. A. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1926.

Samuel Simpson to be postmaster at Sonora, Ariz., in place of Samuel Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1926.

John R. Livingston to be postmaster at Chloride, Ariz., in place of J. R. Livingston. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

COLORADO

Harry A. W. Larkin to be postmaster at Tabernash, Colo., in place of T. S. Percy, resigned.

Lillian D. Watson to be postmaster at Louisville, Colo., in place of L. D. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

IDAHO

Oakley A. West to be postmaster at Weiser, Idaho, in place of O. A. West. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Mabel P. Wetherell to be postmaster at Post Falls, Idaho, in place of M. P. Wetherell. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Joseph Y. Haight to be postmaster at Oakley, Idaho, in place of J. Y. Haight. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Fred V. Diers to be postmaster at Mackay, Idaho, in place of F. V. Diers. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charles L. Edwards to be postmaster at McCammon, Idaho, in place of C. L. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Helga M. Cook to be postmaster at McCall, Idaho, in place of H. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

James M. Shaw to be postmaster at Kooskia, Idaho, in place of J. M. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Wheeler W. Elledge to be postmaster at Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, in place of W. W. Elledge. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Roy M. Parsons to be postmaster at Hagerman, Idaho, in place of R. M. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

George W. Prout to be postmaster at Council, Idaho, in place of G. W. Prout. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Elsie Harrell to be postmaster at Cambridge, Idaho, in place of Elsie Harrell. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Florence V. Clark to be postmaster at Bellevue, Idaho, in place of F. V. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Richard L. Baker to be postmaster at Ashton, Idaho, in place of R. L. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

INDIANA

Betty M. Miller to be postmaster at West Baden, Ind., in place of B. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

E. Delight Bradford to be postmaster at Vanburen, Ind., in place of E. D. Bradford. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Orville C. Bowen to be postmaster at Upland, Ind., in place of O. C. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

George A. White to be postmaster at Union Mills, Ind., in place of G. A. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Reader J. Meroney to be postmaster at Topeka, Ind., in place of R. J. Meroney. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Glen R. Brown to be postmaster at Spiceland, Ind., in place of G. R. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Celia Johnson to be postmaster at Russiaville, Ind., in place of Celia Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charles E. Noble to be postmaster at Rolling Prairie, Ind., in place of C. E. Noble. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

James E. Turner to be postmaster at Roann, Ind., in place of J. E. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Gerry E. Long to be postmaster at Porter, Ind., in place of G. E. Long. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Luella Moore to be postmaster at Orleans, Ind., in place of Luella Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Almeda B. Lochard to be postmaster at North Madison, Ind., in place of A. B. Lochard. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John F. Trimble to be postmaster at Morristown, Ind., in place of J. F. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Harry S. Irvin to be postmaster at Morocco, Ind., in place of H. S. Irvin. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Neil W. Troutman to be postmaster at Montpelier, Ind., in place of N. W. Troutman. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

James W. Robinson to be postmaster at Milford, Ind., in place of J. W. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charlie O. Alton to be postmaster at Milan, Ind., in place of C. O. Alton. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Roy E. Tilford to be postmaster at Martinsville, Ind., in place of O. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 30, 1926.

William H. Morey to be postmaster at Lowell, Ind., in place of W. H. Morey. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John J. Himsel to be postmaster at Jasper, Ind., in place of J. J. Himsel. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ned A. Parham to be postmaster at Howe, Ind., in place of N. A. Parham. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ralph W. Monfort to be postmaster at Hartford City, Ind., in place of R. W. Monfort. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Richard H. McHie to be postmaster at Hammond, Ind., in place of R. H. McHie. Incumbent's commission expired expired January 3, 1928.

Erasmus R. Bartley to be postmaster at Greencastle, Ind., in place of E. R. Bartley. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Elvin R. Long to be postmaster at Denver, Ind., in place of E. R. Long. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Edward C. Bales to be postmaster at Dana, Ind., in place of E. C. Bales. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Job C. Burnworth to be postmaster at Columbia City, Ind., in place of J. C. Burnworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Finley Franklin to be postmaster at Clayton, Ind., in place of Finley Franklin. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

James E. Thompson to be postmaster at Clarks Hill, Ind., in place of J. E. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Samuel C. Morgan to be postmaster at Campbellsburg, Ind., in place of S. C. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Hugh R. Foss to be postmaster at Cambridge City, Ind., in place of H. R. Foss. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Roy J. Lingeman to be postmaster at Brownsburg, Ind., in place of R. J. Lingeman. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Earle O. Gilbert to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Ind., in place of E. O. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Claude A. Warr to be postmaster at Brook, Ind., in place of C. A. Warr. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Earl L. Eldridge to be postmaster at Boswell, Ind., in place of E. L. Eldridge. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John S. Moore to be postmaster at Battle Ground, Ind., in place of J. S. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Samuel Ratcliff to be postmaster at Bainbridge, Ind., in place of Samuel Ratcliff. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

David R. Alpaugh to be postmaster at Andrews, Ind., in place of D. R. Alpaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

IOWA

Leander G. Kelley to be postmaster at Lamoni, Iowa, in place of Daniel Anderson, resigned.

George M. Wright to be postmaster at Russell, Iowa, in place of G. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Keith Gray to be postmaster at Postville, Iowa, in place of Keith Gray. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

John M. Garrett to be postmaster at Moulton, Iowa, in place of J. M. Garrett. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

James F. Albert to be postmaster at Moravia, Iowa, in place of J. F. Albert. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Wilbur C. Patterson to be postmaster at Cresco, Iowa, in place of W. C. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Ella Yeager to be postmaster at Cincinnati, Iowa, in place of Ella Yeager. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Freddie Baldwin to be postmaster at Chester, Iowa, in place of Freddie Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Howard C. Copeland to be postmaster at Chariton, Iowa, in place of H. C. Copeland. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

KANSAS

Samuel M. Simmons to be postmaster at Spring Hill, Kans., in place of S. M. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Cyrus W. Ricketts to be postmaster at Paola, Kans., in place of C. W. Ricketts. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Edward W. Melville to be postmaster at Eudora, Kans., in place of E. W. Melville. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Loraine A. Lyon to be postmaster at Edgerton, Kans., in place of L. A. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Maurice W. Markham to be postmaster at Baldwin City, Kans., in place of M. W. Markham. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

KENTUCKY

John Eversole to be postmaster at London, Ky., in place of S. A. Lovelace, deceased.

MAINE

William C. Libbey to be postmaster at Belfast, Me., in place of W. C. Libbey. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

MARYLAND

William A. Brown to be postmaster at Cecilton, Md., in place of W. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1926.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harry S. Tripp to be postmaster at Spencer, Mass., in place of H. S. Tripp. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

William H. Anderson to be postmaster at Monson, Mass., in place of W. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

MICHIGAN

Arthur E. Baisley to be postmaster at Wyandotte, Mich., in place of A. E. Baisley. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Floyd P. Fox to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Mich., in place of F. P. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Alexander M. MacKay to be postmaster at West Branch, Mich., in place of A. M. MacKay. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Henry W. McClure to be postmaster at Tecumseh, Mich., in place of H. W. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Belle Quick to be postmaster at Swartz Creek, Mich., in place of Belle Quick. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Nora Covert to be postmaster at Springport, Mich., in place of Nora Covert. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Edwin D. Greenhoe to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mich., in place of E. D. Greenhoe. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Herman G. Muellerweiss to be postmaster at Sebewaing, Mich., in place of H. G. Muellerweiss. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Gertrude Moffatt to be postmaster at Sandusky, Mich., in place of Gertrude Moffatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Walter G. Wykoff to be postmaster at St. Johns, Mich., in place of W. G. Wykoff. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Hannibal A. Hopkins to be postmaster at St. Clair, Mich., in place of H. A. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ernest E. Vibert to be postmaster at Saginaw West Side, Mich., in place of E. E. Vibert. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Gordon R. Whitney to be postmaster at Rose City, Mich., in place of G. R. Whitney. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Fred H. Buckberry to be postmaster at Romulus, Mich., in place of F. H. Buckberry. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Edward W. Huff to be postmaster at Rock, Mich., in place of E. W. Huff. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charles H. Heath to be postmaster at Richmond, Mich., in place of C. H. Heath. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

William C. Miller to be postmaster at Pinckney, Mich., in place of W. C. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Maud Miller to be postmaster at Peck, Mich., in place of Maud Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Dee J. Wilson to be postmaster at Orchard Lake, Mich., in place of D. J. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Frank S. Neal to be postmaster at Northville, Mich., in place of F. S. Neal. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

William A. Keeler to be postmaster at North Branch, Mich., in place of W. A. Keeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Lincoln Rodgers to be postmaster at Muskegon, Mich., in place of Lincoln Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Aaron R. Merritt to be postmaster at Mulliken, Mich., in place of A. R. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Mark L. Osgood to be postmaster at Monroe, Mich., in place of M. L. Osgood. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Oscar Wertanen to be postmaster at Mass, Mich., in place of Oscar Wertanen. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Archie Lowry to be postmaster at Marion, Mich., in place of Archie Lowry. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Sadie Wheeler to be postmaster at Manton, Mich., in place of Sadie Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Mark Boyd to be postmaster at McBain, Mich., in place of Mark Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Norman E. Borgerson to be postmaster at Lowell, Mich., in place of N. E. Borgerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Nettie B. Goheen to be postmaster at Lincoln, Mich., in place of N. B. Goheen. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Inez O. Peasley to be postmaster at Lexington, Mich., in place of I. O. Peasley. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Frank J. Gehringer to be postmaster at Lenox, Mich., in place of F. J. Gehringer. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Frederick R. Gibson to be postmaster at Lawton, Mich., in place of F. R. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Gerald McKindles to be postmaster at L'Anse, Mich., in place of Gerald McKindles. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Earl E. Secor to be postmaster at Imlay City, Mich., in place of E. E. Secor. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ernest C. Baldwin to be postmaster at Hudson, Mich., in place of E. C. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

William H. Cansfield to be postmaster at Howell, Mich., in place of W. H. Cansfield. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Arthur A. Graves to be postmaster at Grosse Ile, Mich., in place of A. A. Graves. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Henry C. Hemingsen to be postmaster at Grant, Mich., in place of H. C. Hemingsen. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Robert G. Hill to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, Mich., in place of R. G. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

George L. Olsen to be postmaster at Grand Haven, Mich., in place of G. L. Olsen. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Mary E. Chadwick to be postmaster at Frankfort, Mich., in place of M. E. Chadwick. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Walter J. Kern to be postmaster at Frankenmuth, Mich., in place of W. J. Kern. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Clarence J. Fuller to be postmaster at Fowlerville, Mich., in place of C. J. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Adrian J. Van Wert to be postmaster at Essexville, Mich., in place of A. J. Van Wert. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John Fenine to be postmaster at Dowagiac, Mich., in place of John Fenine. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Jean M. Jackson to be postmaster at Croswell, Mich., in place of J. M. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Milford W. Covert to be postmaster at Clio, Mich., in place of M. W. Covert. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charles F. Goetzen to be postmaster at Chesaning, Mich., in place of C. F. Goetzen. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Jesse A. Hurd to be postmaster at Ceresco, Mich., in place of J. A. Hurd. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Aaron W. Miles to be postmaster at Big Rapids, Mich., in place of A. W. Miles. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Homer E. Buck to be postmaster at Bay City, Mich., in place of H. E. Buck. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

John C. Davis to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Arthur G. Creevy to be postmaster at Barryton, Mich., in place of A. G. Creevy. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ambrose C. Pack to be postmaster at Ann Arbor, Mich., in place of A. C. Pack. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Volney W. Ferris to be postmaster at Allegan, Mich., in place of V. W. Ferris. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Erva J. Mallory to be postmaster at Albion, Mich., in place of E. J. Mallory. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Frankie Harris to be postmaster at Ada, Mich., in place of Frankie Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

MINNESOTA

John J. Ruff to be postmaster at Long Lake, Minn., in place of J. J. Ruff. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

NEBRASKA

Ray W. Jones to be postmaster at Utica, Nebr., in place of R. W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Leon M. Suchanek to be postmaster at St. Paul, Nebr., in place of L. M. Suchanek. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Fred L. Hunt to be postmaster at Niobrara, Nebr., in place of F. L. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Claude B. Grace to be postmaster at Mascot, Nebr., in place of C. B. Grace. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Samuel H. Wolfe to be postmaster at Lodgepole, Nebr., in place of S. H. Wolfe. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Fred F. Thomas to be postmaster at Linwood, Nebr., in place of F. F. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

August J. Baumann to be postmaster at Grand Island, Nebr., in place of A. J. Baumann. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

George A. Fowler to be postmaster at Fairfield, Nebr., in place of G. A. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Elva J. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Elm Creek, Nebr., in place of E. J. Fitzgerald. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Otto A. Steinkraus to be postmaster at Dodge, Nebr., in place of O. A. Steinkraus. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Charles A. Rogers to be postmaster at Decatur, Nebr., in place of C. A. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Erma G. Stoll to be postmaster at Curtis, Nebr., in place of E. G. Stoll. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Clarence G. Struble to be postmaster at Chester, Nebr., in place of C. G. Struble. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

William S. Burrows to be postmaster at Albion, Nebr., in place of W. S. Burrows. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

NEVADA

Belle Roberson to be postmaster at Beatty, Nev. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harvey E. Gates to be postmaster at Troy, N. H., in place of H. E. Gates. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Charles E. Winn to be postmaster ta Somersworth, N. H., in place of C. E. Winn. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

George P. Furbush to be postmaster at Rochester, N. H., in place of G. P. Furbush. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Harry F. Smith to be postmaster at Peterboro, N. H., in place of H. F. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1927.

Stella E. Coburn to be postmaster at North Rochester, N. H., in place of S. E. Coburn. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Harold B. Pinkham to be postmaster at Newmarket, N. H., in place of H. B. Pinkham. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Arthur J. Gould to be postmaster at New London, N. H., in place of A. J. Gould. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Charles L. Bemis to be postmaster at Marlboro, N. H., in place of C. L. Bemis. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Harriet O. Harriman to be postmaster at Jackson, N. H., in place of H. O. Harriman. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Jesse C. Parker to be postmaster at Hillsboro, N. H., in place of J. C. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Maurice H. Randall to be postmaster at Haverhill, N. H., in place of M. H. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

May F. Sumner to be postmaster at Goffstown, N. H., in place of M. F. Sumner. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Harry L. D. Severance to be postmaster at Claremont, N. H., in place of H. L. D. Severance. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

Adin R. Chapman to be postmaster at Berlin, N. H., in place of A. W. Wight. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1926.

NEW JERSEY

Frank J. Allen to be postmaster at Delair, N. J., in place of W. C. Joseph, resigned.

Harry H. Hilyard to be postmaster at Williamstown, N. J., in place of H. H. Hilyard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

John B. Buzby to be postmaster at Clayton, N. J., in place of J. B. Buzby. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

NEW YORK

Alonzo L. Waters to be postmaster at Medina, N. Y., in place of P. I. Brust, removed.

John J. Finnerty to be postmaster at Croton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of J. J. Finnerty. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ole B. Johnson to be postmaster at Forman, N. Dak., in place of O. B. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

OHIO

Fred H. Tibbetts to be postmaster at Columbus, Ohio, in place of F. H. Tibbetts. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

OKLAHOMA

John W. Bishop to be postmaster at Fairview, Okla., in place of J. W. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired August 8, 1926.

PENNSYLVANIA

Annabelle Busler to be postmaster at Avis, Pa., in place of M. C. Flegal, deceased.

Howard M. Gardner to be postmaster at York Springs, Pa., in place of H. M. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1927.

Charles O. Wescoe to be postmaster at Fullerton, Pa., in place of C. O. Wescoe. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1927.

RHODE ISLAND

S. Martin Rose to be postmaster at Block Island, R. I., in place of S. M. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1926.

TEXAS

William B. Byrd to be postmaster at Lipan, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Harman Straub to be postmaster at La Feria, Tex., in place of Lucile Hamner, resigned.

William M. Owens to be postmaster at Memphis, Tex., in place of W. M. Owens. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Maude W. Hoople to be postmaster at Lorenzo, Tex., in place of M. W. Hoople. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

VERMONT

Belle H. Covell to be postmaster at Williamstown, Vt., in place of B. H. Covell. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Earle H. Bishop to be postmaster at West Rutland, Vt., in place of E. H. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Ernest W. Chase to be postmaster at Rochester, Vt., in place of E. W. Chase. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Charles W. Humphrey to be postmaster at Poultney, Vt., in place of C. W. Humphrey. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Walter W. Wright to be postmaster at North Troy, Vt., in place of W. W. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Dora W. Brown to be postmaster at Lunenburg, Vt., in place of D. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Lyman H. Leach to be postmaster at Essex Junction, Vt., in place of L. H. Leach. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Douglas C. Montgomery to be postmaster at East Arlington, Vt., in place of D. C. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Stanley E. Brownell to be postmaster at Burlington, Vt., in place of S. E. Brownell. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Joshua H. Blakley to be postmaster at Bellows Falls, Vt., in place of J. H. Blakley. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Frank E. Robinson to be postmaster at Barre, Vt., in place of F. E. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

VIRGINIA

Paul B. Jenks to be postmaster at Wilder, Va., in place of T. E. Jenkins, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hugh W. Cox to be postmaster at Morgantown, W. Va., in place of Earl Pepper. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

WISCONSIN

Eva Jensen to be postmaster at Cambridge, Wis., in place of C. B. Jensen, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1928

MEMBER UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

Albert H. Denton to be a member of the United States Shipping Board.

MEMBER FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Garland S. Ferguson, jr., to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, vice John F. Nugent.

MEMBER BOARD OF MEDIATION

G. Wallace W. Hanger to be a member of the Board of Mediation.

UNITED STATES JUDGE

Ira Lloyd Letts to be United States district judge, district of Rhode Island.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY

James Damron to be United States attorney, southern district of West Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Robert Bulthuis, Baldwin.
Sarah J. Burns, Benson Springs.
Benjamin Burnett, Brewster.
Luther L. Callaway, Chiefland.
Albert H. Maxwell, Eastport.
Robert A. Boucher, Eau Gallie.
Edward J. Raub, Gull Point.
Carrie Bowers, Lake Placid.
Jessie N. James, Lantana.
Charles I. Matthews, Longwood.
Lera H. Taylor, Mayo.
Max V. Robinson, Melbourne.
Coy K. Duff, Mims.
James A. Pitt, Minneola.
Pauline Wylie, Orange Park.
Burdett Loomis, jr., Pierce.
Willie Felts, Pinellas Park.
Josiah P. Wilbar, Salerno.
Vitano W. Baggott, Sherman.
James S. Huselton, Venice.
Stephen R. Mallory, Wellborn.

LOUISIANA

Henry A. Forshag, Crowley.

NORTH CAROLINA

Salathiel F. Gordon, Badin.
Albert T. Davidson, Biltmore.
Charles E. Boone, Blue Ridge.
Ruth F. White, Colerain.
Roscoe Hill, Eure.
Claudia L. York, Harmony.
Christopher C. Whitaker, Landis.
Lester H. Haymes, Milton.
Chester C. Lord, Montreat.
Mary E. Liles, Naples.
David M. Cloninger, Newton.
Mae A. Elliott, Union Mills.
William T. Fletcher, Boonville.
William C. Thorne, Elm City.
Sam J. Smith, Erlanger.
Thomas E. Sparrow, Hillsboro.

OREGON

Fred D. Wagner, Ashland.
Henry A. Barrett, Athena.
Arthur C. Wahl, Banks.
Willis L. Cady, Beaverton.
William H. Hays, Brownsville.
Arley A. Sollinger, Canyon City.
William G. Hoover, Fossil.
Andrew R. Siegmund, Gerbais.
Frank W. Castor, Haines.
Nellie Elliott, John Day.
Emma L. Hufstater, Knappa.
William R. Cook, Madras.
Duncan E. Douglas, Marshfield.
Otis A. Wolverton, Monmouth.
Gaphart D. Ebner, Mount Angel.
Oliver P. Shoemaker, Newport.
Evelyn D. Davenport, Oak Grove.
Pauline W. Platt, Ontario.
Grace W. Gamwell, Powers.

PORTO RICO

Agustin Carbonell, Caguas.

TENNESSEE

John P. Gallaher, Ashland City.
Clara M. Cain, Bradford.
Lucile Brown, Cornersville.
Charley M. Mount, Franklin.
Stephen H. Bedwell, Friendship.
Herod H. Jenkins, Hartsville.
John J. Graham, Knoxville.
Ernest C. Lowery, Leoma.
Eva Shelton, Linden.
A. Henderson Johnson, Newbern.
William S. Weatherly, Puryear.
Cyrus L. Fairless, Trenton.

WYOMING

Fred W. Smith, Glenrock.
Alvah J. Macy, Moorcroft.
Harry R. Ellison, Parkerton.
Conrad Johnson, Pine Bluffs.
L. Roy Ness, Powell.
Robert E. Chittick, jr., Shoshoni.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, *January 4, 1928*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"The Day-Spring" from on high hath visited us, and we thank Thee, our Heavenly Father; His star hath shown on the brow of night and opened the gates of the morning, and again we praise Thee. O God, the ceaseless surge of time and tide rolls on; helpless we are to stay the travel of the years. We implore Thee to help us to be diligent and not fretful, lest we fail ere the set of sun. Oh, may we not be chilled by the outlook. Give us a sane and a reasonable faith—a faith with its radiant facts, with its convincing principles, and with its simple commandments. Yes, give us a sympathy that includes all humanity. Again, dear Lord God, give us a religion with the arch of blue above its head and all Thy earthly children round its altars. O give us a large measure of health, wisdom, and charity for the new year. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 21, 1927, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BECK, of the seventh district of the State of Wisconsin, and Mr. KURTZ, of the twenty-first district of the State of Pennsylvania, presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution of the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 72

Whereas GEORGE S. GRAHAM, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania from the second district thereof, has been unable from

sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said GEORGE S. GRAHAM at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, N. Y., and that the said oath when administered as herein authorized shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said GEORGE S. GRAHAM.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, there are several precedents for administering the oath to a Member in this way.

The SPEAKER. There are a number of precedents.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the resolution as read provides, I believe, that the oath may be administered by the Speaker or by some one designated by him. I presume that contemplates a Member of the House, though I do not know and I do not think it is very material. My recollection is that in one case where a Member took the oath out of the city of Washington he was permitted to take it before any officer entitled to administer oaths in the State. However, I do not think it is very material.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I will call my friend's attention to the fact that in the Aiken case the oath was administered in the State of North Carolina by some officer having authority to administer oaths.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would, if possible, designate some Member of the House, but failing in that, he thinks he would have to designate some person who has the right to administer oaths.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, does the resolution state that a Member of the House may be designated?

The SPEAKER. No. The resolution gives the Speaker a free hand in designating the person who may administer the oath, but the Speaker would feel bound by the precedents. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, LABOR, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, presented a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform the House that the bill will be taken up to-morrow immediately after the convening of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were presented to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

GEN. THOMAS C. CATCHINGS

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with much sorrow that I announce to the House the death of Gen. Thomas C. Catchings, of Vicksburg, Miss., who served with great distinction in this body for 16 years.

General Catchings was one of Mississippi's most distinguished men. He was a brave Confederate soldier; he was a great lawyer, a great attorney general, a great statesman, and, above all, a Christian gentleman of the highest character and integrity. He was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and, together with Speaker Crisp and Mr. Outhwaite, represented the majority membership of the all-powerful Committee on Rules.

While he attained high eminence in his profession and gained a national reputation for his ability and distinguished service in this House, yet the greatness of his fame rests upon his tireless efforts and splendid accomplishments in all matters connected with river and harbor work. It was due to his ability and his influence, together with the confidence his colleagues reposed in him, that the Yazoo River was diverted through a canal to Vicksburg, a stupendous work requiring years to accomplish, the benefit of which has many times justified the cost of the undertaking.

At Vicksburg those rugged hills, once red with the blood of fratricidal strife, are now marked by a beautiful military park, whose lofty and enduring monuments commemorate alike the glory, the heroism, and the virtues of those who over half a century ago wore those colors which suggested "the gray of the early morning and the blue of the noonday sky." That beautiful and historic military park is another tribute to the ability and influence of General Catchings.

Mr. Speaker, my State has lost one of her most distinguished sons, and a great and useful man has passed away. [Applause.]

THE "S-4" DISASTER

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, as there is nothing urgent before the House at this time, I ask unanimous consent for permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: On my return to New York for the Christmas holidays I found the dominant thought in the mind of everyone with whom I met was the *S-4* disaster.

I also found a great deal of apprehension that everything that was humanly possible at the time to save lives was not really accomplished. I also found that people generally had the impression that it was possible to hook a submarine or to have salvage apparatus and equipment right on hand, able to lift a sunken boat out of the water.

I did not know much about the subject, and I am sure you will all understand I do not know very much about it now; I surely am not attempting to qualify as an expert after a short trip of 36 hours on a submarine. The thought came to me that if it were possible to go on the spot and also to see the construction and operation of a submarine, at least, it would be possible to understand the language of the experts on the job. I obtained permission from the department and boarded the *S-8*, a sister ship of the *S-4*, at New London last Monday and went to Provincetown to talk with the men on the job and observe the operations there. I simply desire to relate to the House what I saw.

Gentlemen, in the first place, you must bear in mind that the *S-4* weighs a little over 800 tons and now lies embedded in the mud in 100 feet of water. This must be kept in mind in considering the task of both rescuing the men within the hull and salvaging the ship.

On December 17 last, about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the *S-4* was standardizing; that is, the *S-4* had just left drydock, she was clean, and they were making submerged speed tests by traveling over a marked and measured course at the point of Cape Cod, near the harbor of Provincetown, Mass.

There is a mile marked out at the end of the hook of Cape Cod. There are two posts there, and when the ship comes abeam of the posts it is timed and continues the run until it arrives at the end of the course which is similarly marked. There are four large markers, and the location is known as a submarine course for that purpose. She was making her tests of speed submerged, going full speed at the time. Her two periscopes, naturally out of the water and visible. The *S-8* had just finished its tests, and the supervisory officials from the department had left the *S-8* and had boarded the *S-4* to check up on these tests.

The Coast Guard cutter *Paulding* was outside of the hook when the officers noticed a four-mast schooner within the harbor of Provincetown or on the inside of the hook. The *Paulding* was on rum-chasing duty. The vessel apparently looked suspicious to the *Paulding* and she turned around and came into the hook. As she came in the *S-4*, submerged, was traveling along the marked course and the *Paulding* was going, I am informed, at 18 knots an hour; the ships collided and the *S-4* sank.

The *Paulding* immediately dropped a buoy on the spot to mark the position of the *S-4* and steamed into the harbor. The cutter *Paulding* immediately reported the accident by wireless.

The message was received at New London, the submarine base, and Admiral F. H. Brumby immediately boarded the salvage ship U. S. S. *Falcon*—I will tell you more about the ship in a minute—and proceeded to the scene of the accident. The U. S. S. *Bushnell*, the flagship of Admiral Brumby and the tender ship of the group of submarines to which the *S-4* belonged, was at Portsmouth, and she immediately steamed to the point of disaster. The *S-8*, which had just left the position, intercepted the message and immediately returned to Provincetown under the command of Lieut. Frank Worden. It was the *S-8* that used its oscillators and immediately started sending out messages, but it was several hours before she received any reply from the living members of the *S-4* crew. The *S-8* arrived on the spot, I believe, late that night and the *Falcon* arrived with Admiral Brumby in the early hours of the next morning and immediately started rescue operations. The *Bushnell* arrived later that morning.

The submarine is a little over 200 feet long. It was hit amidship on the starboard side, I believe—that is, on the right

side—about the center of the ship. The submarine is divided into several compartments, all airtight compartments, and the six men who were alive were in the forepart of the ship, the torpedo room. It would seem that these men alone had the opportunity to close the bulkhead door of their compartment. Apparently the men in the control room were killed or drowned instantly.

The very first compartment on the forward part of the ship is the torpedo room. Then comes the room that corresponds to the forecastle of a ship—the bunk room and mess room, all in one, of the crew.

Under this space and also further aft are the storage batteries. Then there is a small space there for the officers' quarters, very small space indeed. The officers' wardroom on the ship is really not much larger than this table. The table is a little narrower than this table with a bench on both sides and [indicating] just big enough for four to dine at a time. Right back of that to one side is the gyroscope compass and on the left of that is the hatchway to the conning tower. Back of that is the control room where the men operate the engines and where they operate the controls when the vessel submerges. Back of that are the engine rooms and then the motors.

The vessel is propelled by Diesel engines when it is on the surface. When it is submerged it operates by electric energy from storage batteries.

There are 120 storage batteries on a submarine and each battery or each cell weighs a ton. So right there you have 120 tons of dead weight. When the ship is on the surface these batteries emanate hydrogen gas, and by a system of ventilation the hydrogen gas is forced out. When the ship is submerged there is not so much gas emanating because the batteries are being discharged, but there is no way of forcing this gas out, so that the system of ventilation is changed, and it all circulates within the ship, the gas intermingling with the pure air. If the air in the ship at any time contains 6 per cent of hydrogen gas it causes an explosion, but it is kept down to about 2 per cent during the time the ship is submerged. As soon as salt water comes in contact with these batteries it creates chlorine gas and this, of course, is fatal to human life. Therefore, without a doubt, a very few minutes after the accident happened chlorine gas was formed and that must have gotten most of the men who were not in the torpedo compartment at the time. Death must have been caused by drowning of some of them and the rest almost instantaneously from chlorine gas. It must have been just a matter of minutes.

Now, the *S–4* is down in slightly over 100 feet of water in the mud. She is now full of water with the exception of the torpedo compartment, so that when you take the weight of 800 tons you must add the weight of the water in her at the present time. There is not a crane or a derrick existing that will lift that much, even if it were on land, discounting the fact that to actually lift her it must operate on water and very choppy and rough water at that point.

As soon as the *Falcon* arrived in the early morning of December 18, 1927, it moored over the U. S. S. *S–4* and located the submarine, or what was then believed to be the submarine, with a grapnel. A diver was sent down to verify the catch and reported that it was the *S–4*. He also verified the existence of life in the torpedo room. Besides the grapnel line, a descending line was secured to the *S–4*. I do not believe that at any time was the *S–4* lost to the *Falcon* or to the officers in charge of the operations. It is true that later, owing to the very heavy sea, both of the lines, the grapnel line and the descending line, snapped and it was necessary then to again catch the *S–4* with a grapnel to replace these lines that were broken on account of the very heavy sea at the time. It was during these operations, during the time that the men were working to fix the second grapnel on the *S–4* in order to replace the broken descending line, that some of the tugs and boats approached the scene and were ordered back by the officer in charge. It is hardly fair to say that the *S–4* had been lost. What apparently gave cause to the statement that the *S–4* had been lost was the necessary maneuvers to again attach a line to the vessel. A grapnel is dropped to the bottom and the towing boat must necessarily go to and fro until the grapnel catches securely onto some part of the hull. After this was again done a diver descended on this line and secured another line more firmly and permanently than a grapnel hook could hold and this descending line is used by the divers in going right down to the boat.

There are two tubes or salvage air lines to which the air pipe can be attached; one is to the ballast tanks and the other is to the compartments of the submarine. If a submarine is to be lifted quickly without the aid of pontoons it is necessary to first free the ship from water in the ballast tanks. If the water is cleared from the flooded compartment and the ballast tanks are still full, it is my understanding that there is then still insufficient buoyancy to float the ship. So they connected with the ballast tanks and started the pump. The ballast tanks were, of course, full, as the ship was submerged when the accident occurred. There is no doubt about that.

They pumped for one hour, I am told, when they noticed bubbles coming up through the water. They apparently emptied one tank and then arrived at the point where either the hull was fractured or else the ship was so tilted that the compressed air took the path of least resistance, continuing out of the Kingston valves instead of distributing itself to the other tanks and forcing the water out of them. So nothing was being accomplished after one hour of pumping. They knew that they had emptied one tank and that was all they could do—on the ballast tanks—leaving two filled with water.

They immediately shifted to the compartment air line and started to pump. It was at this point that the weather became very bad. The *Falcon* was bobbing all over the place, and Diver Michels' line became fouled. It was later learned that water was getting into the torpedo room through this line, demonstrating that the tube had been punctured or broken. So, it seems nothing could be done during the life of the men to lighten the ship sufficiently to float her.

Under ideal conditions if it were possible to empty the ballast tanks by pumping compressed air into them and forcing the water out of the ship and then clearing in like manner at least part of the compartments of water, it would be possible to float the ship, even with one or two of the compartments filled. Unfortunately, these conditions did not exist in the *S–4*.

These operations took two days, and when it was seen that it was impossible to lift the ship an air line was attached to the CS valve and tube, the listening tube that connects the torpedo department. This is a T-shaped contrivance with rubber bulbs on each side very sensitive, and when the vessel is submerged they listen in by using a stethoscope and can hear the revolutions of a propeller of a ship or the pumping of the ship and know that a vessel is in close proximity.

Everyone that has spoken to me about this matter has asked me the same question: "Why did they not pump air into that compartment and keep these men alive?" Well, you may say, why did they not? The reason, as I understand it, is that these men were in an air-tight compartment full of air of normal pressure. If more air were pumped it would soon make a high-pressure chamber out of that compartment, and human life will not last long under such conditions. It would have been necessary to pump air at the rate of 45 pounds to the inch before they could open any valve and release the foul and excess air. If there were less air pressure and a valve opened it would immediately fill the compartment with water. So, gentlemen, you see it is much easier to sit around the table and say, "Why did they not pump air into that compartment and thus keep these men alive?" than it is to be on the job operating 100 feet below the surface of the water trying to get air into an air-tight compartment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, can I have 10 minutes more?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So what they did then was to pump 5 pounds of air and then release 5 pounds, and they kept that up for 36 hours. In the meantime, it was ascertained that the men were no longer alive. During all of this time the work on the surface of the water continued. Permanent moorings were placed, preparations for diving and rescuing continued, and continue feverishly to this very moment.

Something was said about taking the U. S. S. *Bushnell* away and taking one of the divers, who had been injured, to Boston. Some criticism was directed against Admiral Brumby because of that. What happened was this: As soon as there was a sign of life within the hull, they tried to operate under every condition, and against their better judgment they sent down divers, although the water was deep and the *Falcon* was bobbing and tossing furiously. Of course, as you know, the diver is connected with the ship both by a rope and by air tube. If the ship is bobbing and tossing, one can readily see that the diver is either yanked about, pulled up, or a severe strain is placed on the lines. Communication with the divers becomes extremely difficult. Besides, the tube is liable to break; and if it breaks, the diver gets no air and is either drowned or asphyxiated immediately. Notwithstanding those conditions, they kept sending divers down. Owing to the heavy sea it was necessary to give the tube and line considerable slack, and by

giving the tube and line slack they were fouled on part of the deck of the *S–4*.

This happened to Diver Michels. When they did not receive any more signals from Michels, they sent Diver Eadie down. He went down and found Michels's line fouled with the wreck. He sent for a hack saw and he sawed for 45 minutes before he could release Michels. The minute Michels was released, his suit being full of air, he bobbed up to the surface. As a rule when working under water 100 feet they lift the diver up for 30 or 40 feet, and leave him there for 10 minutes, and then another period of 5 or 10 minutes after 40 more feet. In that way the pressure is gradually decompressed. When Michels came to the surface, after they had unscrewed his helmet, they put him in a decompressing chamber and gradually decompressed the pressure, and on the advice of the doctor he was sent to the hospital at Boston. The weather was so severe at this point, the wind blowing almost a gale and heavy seas, that it was simply impossible to send any more divers down at that time. It was then that the *Bushnell* was rushed to Boston to take Michels to the hospital. At no time was the place abandoned and at no time were operations or preparations for operations as soon as weather permitted discontinued. I wish that I could give you a more graphic description of the heroic conduct of these men. Let me read of their conduct and deeds direct from the official communication from Admiral Brumby to the Navy Department commending these men for their heroism and service and recommending that they be officially recognized for these deeds:

(File No. P15/MM 142–69–39)

U. S. S. "FALCON,"
Provincetown, Mass., December 27, 1927.

From: Commanding officer.
To: The Secretary of the Navy (the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation).
Via: (1) Capt. E. J. King, United States Navy, senior aide.
(2) Commander control force.
Subject: Michels, Fred G. (142–69–39) CTM. U. S. N.

1. The commanding officer desires to call attention to the heroic conduct of Fred G. Michels, chief torpedoman, in connection with the attempted rescue operations on the U. S. S. *S–4*.

2. When the U. S. S. *Falcon* arrived at scene of wreck of the U. S. S. *S–4* a heavy sea was running, wind force 7 to 8 Buford scale, temperature of air 25° F. Due to the weather conditions the *Falcon* was unable to plant moorings, and anchored near life rings which had been planted over the U. S. S. *S–4*, approximate position, by the U. S. S. *Wandank*. The U. S. S. *S–4* was found by dragging grapnels. The *Falcon* then anchoring well to windward of grapnel catch, paying out chain and dropped back to bring the grapnel catch on the quarter. The U. S. S. *Mallard* and U. S. S. *Lark* were anchored on port and starboard quarter of the *Falcon* and lines run to them. This gave a very slack moor, dangerous for diving on a wreck job in deep water, but with the probability of life involved, divers were asked to go down. Eadie, Carr, and Michels were the best divers on the *Falcon*. Eadie was first selected and went down grapnel line, examined the *S–4*, found that there was life in the torpedo room, and secured descending lines. Carr was next diver selected to hook air hose to *S–4's* main ballast tanks, and succeeded in doing this. Michels was the next diver selected to hook air to the compartment's air line, but due to the bad moor of the *Falcon*, the very adverse weather conditions for diving, Michels was very badly fouled.

3. Michels is an old and experienced diver and well realized the condition under which the dive was made. I feel that he freely exposed himself to danger beyond the call of duty and devotion to service, and in recognition thereof I recommend he be awarded the Navy Cross.

HENRY HARTLEY.

(First indorsement)

U. S. S. "BUSHNELL,"
Off Provincetown, Mass., December 31, 1927.

P15
From: Capt. E. J. King, United States Navy.
To: Commander control force.
Subject: Fred G. Michels (142–69–39), CTM, USN.

1. Forwarded, approval strongly recommended.

2. I was present on board the *Falcon* at the time of this incident as senior aide to the officer in charge of *S–4* rescue operations, having been sent to this duty because of my previous experience in connection with salvage of *S–51*.

3. The weather and sea conditions were extremely bad for diving, and the *Falcon* had had only time for the very precarious moor described in letter above. The only divers then on board whose capabilities were positively known were Eadie and Carr and Michels, of whom Eadie was the first and Carr the second diver sent down—and nothing but the endeavor to save life warranted sending either of them down.

4. By the time Carr had come up it was thoroughly dark and the rising wind and sea appeared to make further diving impossible, but Michels was called upon to try to attach an air hose to the *S–4's* compartment salvage air line, on the extremely remote possibility that the "gag" valves, normally kept open, in this line were closed in the motor room, engine room, control room, and battery room, and the line undamaged in the breached battery room, thus permitting air to be fed into the torpedo room, where six men were known to be alive.

5. Michels was thoroughly aware of all the circumstances, including the extremely remote chance that the accomplishment of his task would be of any use, and had full appreciation of the grave risks he was incurring, but his response to the call was prompt and willing. The desperateness of his dive is confirmed by the fact that though he is an excellent diver, of large experience in deep diving, the yaw and lift of the *Falcon* were so great that he could not keep his life line and hose (frapped together throughout their length) clear while trying to secure the blowing air hose to *S–4's* conning tower connection, and became so badly fouled that another diver, Eadie, had to be sent down to clear him. Eadie has been recommended for a medal of honor. Michels was on the bottom under the described conditions for over three hours.

6. The award of at least a Navy cross to Michels is thoroughly deserved by him.

E. J. KING.

(Second indorsement)

U. S. S. "BUSHNELL,"
Off Provincetown, Mass., January 2, 1928.

P15
From: Commander control force.
To: Chief of the Bureau of Navigation.
Subject: Fred G. Michels (142–69–39), CTM, USN.

1. Forwarded.

2. I was on board the *Falcon* during the diving mentioned, and I fully concur in the first indorsement.

3. I recommend that Michels be awarded the Navy cross.

F. H. BRUMBY.

(File No. P15/MM 140–00–54)

U. S. S. "FALCON,"
Provincetown, Mass., December 22, 1927.

From: Commanding officer.
To: The Secretary of the Navy (Chief of the Bureau of Navigation).
Via: (1) Capt. E. J. King, United States Navy, (2) commander control force.
Subject: Heroic work performed by Thomas Eadie, chief gunner's mate (140–00–54), United States Navy.
Reference: (a) Navy Regulations, article 1707.

1. On December 18, 1927, the *Falcon* moored over what was presumed to be the U. S. S. *S–4* after a grapnel caught on some object on bottom. Eadie was selected to prove the grapnel catch, using grapnel line for his descending line. The catch proved to be the *S–4*. Eadie made examination of the *S–4*, sounding with a hammer, and reported life in the torpedo room. On reaching the limiting time on bottom, he was brought to the surface and work proceeded on the information he gave.

2. Carr was diver next selected to hook air hose to the *S–4* salvage air lines. Carr succeeded in doing this; time on bottom 1 hour and 15 minutes, or 15 minutes longer than the period I had decided was the safe limit, due to temperature as well as depth.

3. By this time darkness had set in, a heavy sea running, wind force 7–8 Bufort scale.

4. Michels was the choice among the remaining divers to attempt hooking air hose to *S–4* compartments for breathing purpose.

5. Diving conditions were now very bad and would have been discontinued except for the reason that life was involved. Michels having much experience as a deep-water diver, it was decided to take this chance to get air on the *S–4* compartments before the wind and sea forced the *Falcon* from her moorings.

6. Michels went down, taking a water light and air hose, tools, etc., for making the connection. The usual telephone communication was carried on and Michels was apparently making progress. When about three-fourths hour on bottom Michels reported that he was badly fouled.

(File No. P15/MM 140–00–84)

Subject: Heroic work performed by Thomas Eadie, chief gunner's mate, United States Navy.

* * * * * * *

The telephone tender could not understand him clearly. Taking the phone I was able to judge from the apparent difficulty he was having to talk over the phone that his condition of foul was serious, and advised him that Eadie would be sent down to clear him. (There was a relief or rescue diver dressed and ready, but all things considered, Eadie was asked to make his second dive within a period of five hours and readily consented.)

7. When Eadie was dressed, telephone trouble developed, delaying his descent, so that Michels was on the bottom about one and one-half

hours before Eadie reached him. Eadie was given a diver's lamp, cutting plier, hammer, and large wire cutter.

8. Eadie found Michels's life line and hose was foul of broken part of *S–4* starboard side where rammed by the *Paulding* and also on starboard side by parts of *Paulding's* plating torn off by the collision, also tangled with the air hose he had taken down, and so badly tangled that he was lying down and could not rise. Eadie first cleared Michels so he could stand and set about to clear his hose.

9. Eadie cleared one side, but could not find where the hose passed in and around some twisted and bent metal, presumably a part of the *Paulding's* plating. He next searched for most likely place to attempt to cut away this metal, and asked that a large hacksaw be sent down to him. Hacksaw was sent down on his air line and phone cable. Working with saw and hammer Eadie was able to cut away a piece of metal after having alternately sawed and hammered steadily for about 40 minutes. Upon cutting away the metal, Eadie was then able to trace Michels's air hose and complete clearing him.

Eadie's total time on bottom to clear Michels, 1 hour 45 minutes.

Michels's total time on bottom, 3 hours 20 minutes.

Temperature of water, 34° F.

Depth, 102 feet; sea, heavy.

(File No. P15/MM 140–00–84)

Subject: Heroic work performed by Thomas Eadie, chief gunner's mate, United States Navy.

* * * * * * *

10. I have had much experience with deep-water diving and consider Eadie's work in this case worthy of the highest praise. His skill and judgment were insurpassable. His courage and fortitude were heroic. A man not possessing these qualities would have failed. Eadie not only saved Michels's life but exposed himself to personal danger much above the call of duty and devotion to service.

11. I have the honor to recommend Thomas Eadie, chief gunner's mate, for a medal of honor in accordance with the reference.

HENRY HARTLEY.

(First indorsement: File No. P15/MM 140–00–54)

U. S. S. "FALCON,"
Provincetown, Mass., December 23, 1927.

From: Capt. E. J. King, United States Navy.
To: The Secretary of the Navy (Chief of the Bureau of Navigation).
Via: Commander control force.
Subject: Heroic work performed by Thomas Eadie, C. G. M., U. S. N.

1. Forwarded, approval strongly recommended.

2. I was on board *Falcon* at the time of this event and am fully cognizant of all the circumstances. In addition, I already know Eadie from his excellent work, morale, and judgment during the salvage of the *S–51*.

3. Eadie's conduct on this occasion deserves all the praise and every credit that may be given to a real man who deliberately, knowingly, and willfully took his own life in his hands to respond to the desperate need of a companion diver under wholly adverse diving conditions. What is more, by his cool, calculating, and unhurried work he succeeded in his tremendous task.

4. There is no doubt in my mind that Eadie's deed in saving Michels entirely fulfills the law's requirement of "extraordinary heroism in the line of his profession."

E. J. KING.

(Second indorsement: File No. P15/MM 140–00–54)

U. S. S. "FALCON,"
Provincetown, Mass., December 23, 1927.

From: Commander control force.
To: The Secretary of the Navy (Chief of the Bureau of Navigation).

1. Forwarded, strongly recommended.

2. I was on board the *Falcon* during the entire operation, and I was fully informed as to the progress of events. Eadie knew the danger of the undertaking, but he was not deterred.

3. I have never known so fine an example of cold-blooded, deliberate heroism as that shown by Eadie.

4. He is thoroughly deserving of a medal of honor.

F. H. BRUMBY.

(File No. P15/MM 120–61–18)

U. S. S. "FALCON,"
Provincetown, Mass., December 27, 1927.

From: Commanding officer.
To: The Secretary of the Navy (the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation).
Via: (1) Capt. E. J. King, U. S. Navy, senior aide.
(2) Commander control force.
Subject: Carr, William J., C. B. M. (PA) 120–61–18, U. S. N.

1. The commanding officer desires to call attention to the heroic conduct of William J. Carr, C. B. M. (PA), U. S. N.

2. When the U. S. S. *Falcon* arrived at scene of wreck of the U. S. S. *S–4* a heavy sea was running, wind force 7 to 8 Buford scale, temperature of air 25° F. Due to the weather conditions the *Falcon* was unable to plant moorings and anchored near life rings which had been planted over the U. S. S. *S–4*, approximate position by the U. S. S. *Wandank*. The U. S. S. *S–4* was found by dragging grapnels. The *Falcon* then anchoring well to windward of grapnel catch, paying out chain and dropped back to bring the grapnel catch on the quarter. The U. S. S. *Lark* and U. S. S. *Mallard* were anchored on port and starboard quarter of the *Falcon* and lines run to them. This gave a very slack moor, dangerous for diving on a wreck job in deep water, but with the probability of life involved, divers were asked to go down. Eadie, Carr, and Michels were the best divers on the *Falcon*. Eadie was first selected and went down grapnel line, examined the *S–4*, found that there was life in the torpedo room, and secured descending line. Carr was next diver selected to hook air hose to the *S–4's* main ballast tanks and succeeded in doing this.

3. Carr is an old and experienced diver and well realized the condition under which the dive was made. I feel that he freely exposed himself to danger beyond the call of duty and devotion to service, and in recognition thereof I recommend he be awarded the Navy Cross.

HENRY HARTLEY.

(First indorsement. P15)

U. S. S. "BUSHNELL,"
Off Provincetown, Mass., December 30, 1927.

From: Capt. E. J. King, United States Navy.
To: Commander control force.
Subject: Carr, William J., C. B. M. (Pa.), 12016–18, U. S. N.

1. Forwarded; approval strongly recommended.

2. I was present on board *Falcon* at the time of Carr's dive. The conditions were very bad and nothing but the endeavor to save life warranted the dive being made. Carr was thoroughly aware of all the circumstances and responded promptly and willingly to the immediate need to attach an air-blowing hose to *S–4's* salvage tank air connection, which he did.

3. Carr's work on this occasion should be classed as worthy of all praise and adequate for the award of a Navy cross.

E. J. KING.

(Second indorsement. P15)

U. S. S. "BUSHNELL,"
Off Provincetown, Mass., January 2, 1928.

From: Commander control force.
To: Chief of Bureau of Navigation.

1. Forwarded.

2. I was on board the *Falcon* during the diving mentioned, and I fully concur in the first indorsement.

3. I recommend that Carr be awarded the Navy cross.

F. H. BRUMBY.

I venture to state that every Member join in the admiral's praise and commendation of the services rendered by these men.

There remains now but one thing, and that is to bring the *S–4* to the surface in order to remove all of the bodies and to examine the hull and conditions, the only and mute source of information. As I have said before, a body of 800 tons, with perhaps additional 200 or 300 tons of water, can not be lifted outright from the bottom of the ocean. The only known way at this time is the process employed in the raising of the *S–51*. Large pontoons are filled with water, sent to the bottom, and secured with chains to the hull of the vessel. When sufficient pontoons have been so secured the water is released from each pontoon by attaching an air line to it and forcing compressed air, which releases the water. The pontoon is then made air-tight, and when sufficient pontoons are so prepared and there is sufficient buoyancy the vessel is lifted to the surface.

This work is exceedingly slow and tedious; most of it must be carried on under water, and naturally will take considerable time.

It took 65 diving days to lift the *S–51*. She was in 30 feet more depth of water than is the *S–4*. So one can easily figure how long it will take by working night and day to get the *S–4* floating. When we speak of days, we speak of diving days. It must be remembered that they can not work when the water is choppy or weather conditions make diving impossible. Yesterday the water was so cold that diving was impossible—not that it was too cold for diver's comfort, but the moisture in the air froze in the air line. The tube is made in sections and the connections of the tube are such that inside one tube there is a smaller tube, over which the two ends meet. As the air enters one tube, it naturally enters the smaller surface and when it gets to the next section which is larger the air expands, and moisture is created at this point, and that moisture freezes. The minute it freezes the tube is stopped up and the diver re-

ceives no air. You can not keep a man under water unless you pump air to him. So that in that way the temperature of the water interferes with the diver, because it is humanly impossible to get air down to the diver if the air-supply line is choked with ice.

I found the morale of the men, the crews of the other submarines, excellent. They understand that this is one of those unavoidable disasters that come to men who are engaged in that perilous work.

I have stood on the floor of this House and I have criticized the Navy very often. I have criticized it because of its aviation policy, and in a good many other instances; but after observing those men on the ship, commencing with Admiral F. H. Brumby and Capt. E. J. King and Capt. Henry Hartley, and Chief Gunner Tiffals and Divers Fred G. Michaels, Thomas Eadie, William J. Carr, and all the men who are on the job, and working night and day, it seems to me that the least we can do is to admit publicly that they are doing everything that is humanly possible, and give them encouragement to continue this work under such trying and difficult conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. So far as giving them more encouragement is concerned, I received a telephone message at my house the other day from Mrs. Jones, the widow of the lieutenant commander who commanded the *S–4*. She told me she had four children and that all she possessed in this world was $45 a month insurance from her husband's insurance. She asked me to see whether there was not some way by which some legislation could be passed giving her relief and for the support of herself and her children.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I believe that at the proper time we ought to give consideration not only to the question of insurance for the men and officers who are in the submarine service, but we ought to grant additional compensation—not one dollar a dive, but additional pay for submarine service similar to that given for those in the flying service.

And another thing I want to say in this connection concerning the divers. These men not only put their heart and soul in their work but risk their lives every time they go down on an operation such as they are working now. Yet the Government, and that means us, for Congress has the power to fix compensation, allows them extra pay of only $1.20 an hour when they are under water. To give you an idea of the cost of divers when a private firm was asked for divers in the salvaging of the *S–51* the estimate of cost was $1,300 a day for four divers, the Government furnishing all the necessary surface equipment.

Permit me to say that it is much easier to operate a submarine by long distance sitting in a warm, comfortable office than it is from the conning tower of the boat itself. It is easy to criticise and say what should be done not knowing actual conditions. Let us not try to discover from the House Office Building mechanical devices for raising vessels from the bottom of the sea. With all due deference, I do not believe that the solution will come from that source. What we can do and what we should do is to equip the Navy with the best available and last word in submarines. We should also see to it that life on board of these submarines is made as pleasant as conditions will permit. For many years to come there will be danger in submarine navigation. We have accidents on the surface of the water; we have train and automobile collisions, and unfortunate accidents are bound to happen. Naturally it grips the heart to think of men trapped in a compartment of a boat 100 feet under the water in communication with the world and yet unable to be helped. Yet we hear often of men trapped in mines, men working in excavations who are likewise trapped under conditions that make it impossible to be rescued in time to save life. It must also be remembered that when a vessel sinks in deep water all hope of rescue or salvage is out of the question. So that all that we can do is to take every possible precaution by providing equipment, training, and caring of personnel to minimize inevitable and unavoidable accidents that are bound to happen.

Living conditions on the submarine are not exactly comparable to the Ritz-Carlton or to the Mayflower Hotel. I believe that both officers and crew should receive additional pay such as we are now allowing for flying service. Quarters for the officers and men should be provided when the submarines are at their base. Insurance should be provided by the Government for the dependents of men who lose their life in line of duty.

Now, let the House of Representatives send word down to Provincetown that we have confidence and faith in these men who are working night and day, and we know they are doing everything which is humanly possible under the circumstances. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I wish to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] in commenting on this tragedy and in confirming, to a considerable extent, what he has said. He has been on the scene and has given us a splendid account of the situation. But I wish to treat the matter from a somewhat different angle. Three days after the sinking of the *S–4*, with her crew of 43 officers and men, I reached my home on the cape, only some 60 miles distant from the scene of the accident, and since it had happened in the waters of my own district I felt it my duty to go to Provincetown, alike as a Representative in Congress and as one of the public, deeply affected by the calamity and anxious for the rescue of the six men known to be still alive in the submarine. I want to say here that the Navy was presumably doing its best, but, assuming that this was so, the fact remains that their best was not good enough, and the country has a right to demand something better in the future, to demand that adequate plans and preparations be made to prevent the recurrence of such a national calamity. That such adequate plans and preparations were not in existence is now, I think, an established fact and, lacking them, failure to save the lives of the imprisoned men and to raise the sunken craft within a reasonable time was a foregone conclusion. An element of sentiment must necessarily enter into a happening of this nature, and it should. Accordingly I want the Members of this House to know that there on the end of Cape Cod, the tip of my district, the men who lost their lives in the *S–4* did not go unwept and unsung. On Christmas night the church people held religious services at the water's edge and members of the local Masonic lodge held a special service directly over the sunken craft. I feel that the people of that locality should be thanked for what they did, as they were expressing, audibly, the feelings held throughout the whole Nation.

Perhaps my arrival at Provincetown was in a way at an inopportune time. I know that the weather had been rough on Sunday and Monday—so rough that the whole fleet of rescue ships had left the submarine and put into the shelter of the harbor, an act which may have been necessary but which brought local criticism, such as the remark which I heard, "Could at least one ship not have stayed out if merely as an escort to the boys down there, even though they could do nothing?" This was a mere matter of sentiment, it is true, but the men of Provincetown were deeply affected, and naturally.

As I say, my visit was unfortunate in one sense, since I arrived on a day when the sea was calm; and nothing was being done. I went, first, to the town offices, where every accommodation had been furnished for the many newspaper representatives who were there, frequently making heroic sacrifices in order to try and secure and give the Nation the news of the disaster. I found all of them deeply exercised, because on that day they could get almost no news. There seemed to be a strange inactivity, except for small boats, and after trying nearly all day without avail to discover what was going on and why grappling irons were being used it became known through one of their number, who had formerly been in the Navy, decoding a wigwagged message, that the *S–4* had been lost. It was not found until 5.17 that afternoon. On Sunday a diver had gone down and attached a marker buoy. The intervening storm had caused this to break loose and thus all of Wednesday, when the sea was practically calm and a large fleet of vessels was on the spot, was wasted in an effort to locate the lost submarine. And this on a day when salvaging operations could have been carried on under most favorable conditions! It is difficult to understand why greater care had not been exercised in placing the marker and taking ranges. This seems to me to be a matter for pertinent criticism, and surely it could have been prevented if proper methods had been used. America produced the first practical submarine, but it has been left for another nation not only to make use of the submersible as an effective weapon of war but to improve and develop the reasonable safeguards which should, beyond question, surround a type of craft the operation of which is extra hazardous. The statement has been made—and I believe is authentic—that if such an accident had happened in the German Navy the ship could have been rescued within 24 hours and the lives within her have been saved, simply because Germany is fully prepared against such an emergency. They have plans all worked out and practiced in ad-

vance for dealing with it, and among them, I am informed, is a regulation that the first diver to go down and locate the sunken craft marks her position not with one buoy but with three, one of red, one white, and one green, securely attached to the bow, amidships, and stern. If such a method had been followed by our Navy, is it likely that all three would have broken away? I think not; and priceless hours would not have been wasted. This criticism is in no sense one of the divers—for whose courage and ability I have the most boundless admiration—but it is one of policy. I may say the same of Admiral Brumby. He is an able officer and to be commended in that he has not remained in his cabin and directed the work therefrom, but has been on deck in all kinds of weather personally aiding and supervising. Still I must regret that at times he was so curt in his answers to those making inquiries of him.

The newspaper men and others reported this fact to me, and it has been the subject of newspaper comment. Under these circumstances I did not feel like seeking an interview with him. Mr. McGinley, of Pennsylvania, whose son was locked in the sunken vessel, also expressed his concern over his failure to obtain reasonable information, although he bore it stoically, saying "If I could only go home with the body of my boy I would be satisfied." But he was merely told that the raising of the vessel might be put off until spring. This, too, is a matter of sentiment largely, but it has its part in such a calamity.

I had no wish to criticize the Navy, but when things of this nature came to my attention I felt that I had a right to express myself. I felt obligated if possible to help the newspaper men and through them all of the country to get the truth as to what was being done.

I also felt justified in making certain other general criticisms pertinent to the tragedy, the first being, "Where was the tender when the submarine was engaged in underwater evolutions? Why was it not present to warn craft away from the path of the submarine?" I was told by a captain, who had been attached to a life-saving station in that vicinity for 30 years and who had seen submarines operating on that measured mile for 10 years, that such was the custom. He said, "I have watched them for 10 years, and there has always been a tender present to warn vessels off the course. I have since learned that this has indeed been the custom, although it was not a matter of naval regulations. But surely it should be in the future, and should have been in the past.

Many newspapers have printed editorials bearing on this subject, as well as the loss of the *S–4* after she had been located and the unwillingness of the officials to give out the story, and I believe that such criticisms are valid. The latter one may, of course, be answered by a statement that the Navy hoped every minute to find the lost vessel and did not wish to add to the terrible worry of the Nation; but does it not rather seem predicated on a desire to cover up a grave mistake by what, as it proved, were futile and unfortunate methods, since the fact was certain to become known?

One editorial, from the Boston Herald of December 27, I should like to incorporate in these remarks, and I offer the following:

[From the Boston Herald, Tuesday, December 27, 1927]

CRITICISM OF THE NAVY

Years ago when Sir William Howard Russell summed up his conclusions as to the results of his famous mission to the Crimea he offered a general observation to the effect that an incursion of outsiders often proved salutary in the case of such highly organized and consciously superior establishments as the British Army. That was a mild statement, coming from the man whose ability to see straight and to write straight had made all England uneasy over conditions in the peninsula, and finally had encompassed the defeat of a British ministry. Russell told the truth; the truth stung and produced resentment, but in the end the truth prevailed.

We are reminded of that incident by the tone assumed by some officials in their replies to the criticisms of the salvaging operations at Provincetown. Many of these criticisms have been hysterical, unjust, silly, as we have said before on this page. But not all of them. The public is uneasy over the story of the sinking of the *S–4*, with the loss of more than two score of lives. The public conceives that it has some rights in the case, the right to know all the facts and the right to obtain full and fair answers to all fair questions. There are naval officers who denounce such questions as an imposition, an unjustified inquisition. The Secretary of the Navy himself has adopted a somewhat querulous tone in the presence of inquirers. Certain defenders of the Navy have talked as though Members of Congress, citizens of the Republic, relatives of the lost men, have no rights in such a situation, that their duty is to keep out of the way and gratefully accept whatever information may be doled out to them.

We have three remarks to offer on the present situation:

1. The public rightly insists on its right to information. The money spent on armament comes from the taxpayers of the Nation. The lives lost in peace time no less than in war time come from the citizenship of the Nation. The Navy Department and the whole naval service are the instrumentalities to which the Nation entrusts the doing of certain necessary things. When all is said and done the men in office in Washington and the men in uniform scattered about the country have one purpose at heart, and there is no more justice in the denouncing of the members of a lawmaking and money-voting body as outsiders and fools whose sole interest is in playing politics than there is in the denouncing of the officers of the Navy and the members of the Navy Department as anxious only to protect their own close corporation and to clear the service from blame. It will be a distinct gain when that fact is recognized. A shining illustration of what sometimes occurs even in war time is the story of the exposé of Northcliffe and the Times of the fact that British soldiers were trying to fight in France with the wrong kind of shell, and he was begged to withhold that story from the public lest he impair the patriotism of the British people.

2. The Navy might well learn something of the arts of publicity. There would be less unrest to-day and far less criticism had the officers at Provincetown done all within their power to provide the people with exact and full information about a calamity which had gripped the emotions of the whole Nation. The public is very prone to surmise indifference and incompetence when in peace time and under conditions requiring no secrecy information is altogether withheld or grudgingly bestowed.

3. There is just one way to convince the public that the naval officers, of "training perhaps unparalleled in any other profession," and masters of "the technical affairs and internal management" of their department—to paraphrase the language of a reserve officer—that these officers have made no mistakes, have done everything within their power to save the lives of the men in the sunken submarine, and in general that the Navy is as quick to adopt new methods, and as ready to go by the shortest route to any desired goal, as private enterprise is said to be. There is a widespread belief that this is not the case. Red tape? There are a good many men outside the service whose opinions are entitled to respect who think that red tape in emergencies hinders and hampers far too much the energies of brave and eager workers. The bureaucratic mind is a thing by no means unknown in Washington. We are proud of our Army and Navy engineers, but all the engineering ability of the country is not in the service, and we have heard many times that outsiders are not always made welcome when they have reforms to advocate or improvements to suggest.

We may remind the Navy that not all its critics have been civilians of late. We may note in passing that nobody seems to be more touchy over an intimation of fallibility than have been many able men in uniform of late. The naval and the departmental methods may be all right. We hope they are. But it now is the job of the Navy and the department to convince the public of the fact, if it is a fact. An investigation conducted exclusively from within is hardly likely to allay the uneasiness of the earnest multitude who seriously consider the story which has come through from Cape Cod. If Congress shall decide that there shall be another kind of investigation, with expert engineers and the best ability the Nation can provide, but out of uniform, it will be well for the naval authorities to accept the decision in good spirit, to cooperate in every way in the process of the examination. That way probably lies the restoration of the prestige of the Naval Establishment. We impute no sinister motives to anybody. But there are doubts to satisfy, and if in the quest of information the way to important reform or improvement shall be shown, so much the better for the service and for the Nation.

I, for one, do not at the present time wish to offer any resolution for an investigation of this tragedy. Nevertheless, I think that the country is demanding that a searching investigation be made before the matter is regarded as closed, and this is evidenced by the scores of letters which I have personally received from many parts of the United States, the writers of which were not all merely distressed and incensed citizens by any means. Many have come from reputable inventors, civil engineers, and former members of the Navy itself. Personally, I should prefer to wait until the naval board of inquiry now sitting on the accident had made its report.

I shall not take the time of the House fully to present the criticisms and countless suggestions which have come to me as a result of this tragedy. As a result of the seeming inactivity and the dreadful waiting for news during those early days it was inevitable that there should be both from all quarters. Nor do I wish to add anything to such criticisms as I have to-day made, many of them inspired by the feeling which I found rife at Provincetown, except to say that I can not feel that, as stated by the Secretary of the Navy—

submarines are not built merely to be rescued, but are strictly for military purposes, and so must carry nothing which might interfere with their use in time of war.

Rather I should say that they should be equipped with every possible safeguard commensurate with the limited space in them, even if some, or all, of these had to be removed in war time, when every sailor and soldier is called upon to gamble with his life. Certainly I am not a mechanical engineer, and perhaps my criticisms were—as was suggested by the department—those of one inexpert in the work of salvaging, but I do know that engineers have developed plans whereby life on sunken submersibles can be saved and the ship herself raised within reasonable time, and it is inconceivable to me that our Navy has tested all of them and found them all worthless or impractical. Certainly the telephone buoy is used in foreign submarines. Then there is the matter of grappling rings, as employed on German U-boats. If I have been correctly informed, Lieutenant Commander Ellsberg, who was in charge of raising the *S–51* and was for a time working on the *S–4*, having been reenlisted as a reserve officer, stated in a public illustrated lecture that if the ship which was sunk two years ago had been so equipped, much time and most dangerous labor in tunneling under her in order to place chains to be attached to the pontoons would have been saved. He even made the statement, I believe, that such rings could and should be attached to all submarines in the future. Why have they not been? Surely the doing so offers no insurmountable mechanical difficulties, since bands therefrom could go to the keel. Nor would they entail great expense, and they might be removed in time of war if they should impede the speed of the ship.

Finally there is the question as to why we have no salvaging ship especially designed to meet such emergencies as the sinking of the *S–4*, similar to the German tender *Vulcan*, which is a horse-shoe shaped craft especially built for that purpose and fitted with lifting devices and pontoons. Perhaps in answer to these inquiries the Navy Department may say that they have not been provided because of lack of necessary appropriations and that every dollar allowed it is allocated and needed for other purposes. They may say that the Bureau of the Budget and Congress are to blame. In part this may perhaps be a fact, yet if, after the sinking of the *S–51*, the Navy Department had asked the Congress for a special appropriation to test out and apply safety and life-saving devices to submarines and provide a rescuing ship I am inclined to believe that the money would have been gladly appropriated and perhaps the *S–4* would not still be 100 feet under the waters off Provincetown and some, at least, of the lives of her crew would have been saved.

This is not time for mere recriminations or even explanations. The Navy should act, Congress should act, immediately, to see to it that every possible safeguard is provided to prevent a recurrence of this horrible event. If submarines can not be made intrinsically safe, as is probably the case, let us assure for them comparative safety by providing every conceivable safety devices which can be applied for use in times of peace, both for their protection and swift salvaging in case of accident. If necessary, let us, too, build one or more ships similar to the *Vulcan*, fully equipped for the work of rescue and have them available in the general vicinity of submarine operations. Let us see that submarines, when submerged, are properly guarded from above and that all testing grounds are marked on marine charts. The cost might be considerable but what is that compared with the safety of costly submarines and the lives of American sailors, which will never be valued in mere money?

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not wish to seem to be condemning the Navy, of which we have every right to be proud. Had I been on board a submarine with the gentleman from New York I have no doubt but that I should have been impressed, as he was, with the fact that every possible effort was made, under the existing conditions. Nevertheless I feel that nothing is so good that it can not be made better and that the Navy should be the first to admit that improvements might and should be made. If the conditions which existed when the *S–4* went down can not be changed, Heaven help us! But I believe that they can and will be in the future. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether he will print his remarks in to-day's RECORD?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I came into the Chamber after the gentleman had commenced his remarks, and I would like to take advantage of this occasion to say that I will make some observations to-morrow when we have up for consideration the appropriation bill which our committee has just reported. I will not hesitate to criticize the Navy, but I would like it understood that nobody is criticizing the devoted men who are endeavoring to remedy the errors already made. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair inform me whether there is upon the Speaker's table a communication from the President of the United States?

The SPEAKER. There is.

Mr. BUTLER. May we have that communication read at this time?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the communication from the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of the Navy recommending that the Congress be requested to authorize the appointment of a commission of experts for the purpose of considering the development of safety devices for our submarines, such commission to be empowered to call witnesses and to pay their expenses and also to make such inquiry and investigation into the *S–4* disaster as may be desirable.

I recommend to Congress the passage of a joint resolution authorizing the appointment of such a commission of experts and that the sum of $20,000 be made available for the purposes stated.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered printed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I have here the official resolution, following the request of the President of the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be read and then referred to the proper committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine *S–4* and upon methods and appliances for the protection of submarines

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint a commission which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be selected from civil life and two shall be retired officers of the Navy. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as provided for original appointments.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to investigate and ascertain the methods and appliances adopted and used by the Navy in the operation of submarines to prevent collisions, to protect the lives of officers and crews, and to salvage the vessel in case of disaster; and to make recommendations wherein these methods and appliances now in use may be changed and improved for the good of the service and the better protection of human life.

SEC. 3. It shall be the further duty of the commission to investigate the full facts of the sinking of the submarine *S–4* in collision on December 17, 1927, with the United States Coast Guard destroyer *Paulding* off the Massachusetts coast, and the rescue and salvage operations carried on by the United States Navy subsequent thereto, to supplement the investigation now being made by a naval court of inquiry.

SEC. 4. To carry out and give effect to the provisions of this resolution the commission hereby created shall have power to issue subpœnas, administer oaths, summon witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive testimony taken before any proper officer in any State or Territory of the United States.

SEC. 5. The members of the commission shall select a chairman from among their number; they shall serve without compensation as such, but shall be paid out of the amount appropriated their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties by such officer of the Supply Corps of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy may designate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office. Nothing herein shall affect the pay or allowances of the commissioners selected from the Navy. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000, to be expended by the commission in accordance with the provisions of this resolution. The President is authorized, upon request of the commission, to designate

such personnel of any department or Government establishment, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purpose of this resolution.

SEC. 6. The commission shall, as soon as practicable, submit a full report to Congress, by way of the President, giving the results of its investigation and its recommendations. All records of the commission, upon the completion of its duties, shall be deposited with the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question, if I may?

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, if I have the floor so that I can answer my friend's question I would be delighted to do so.

Mr. McCLINTIC. It seems to me that no one in this House could possibly object to the provisions contained in that resolution and inasmuch as some proceedings have already been started, does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea to ask unanimous consent to pass that resolution?

Mr. BUTLER. No; it should go to the Rules Committee for further amendment and for such amendments as the House may see fit to make to it. However, I will ask the Committee on Rules to pass upon this resolution at its very earliest opportunity.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I make an inquiry? Does this resolution go to the Rules Committee?

Mr. BUTLER. I thought it did, sir, or I would not have introduced it.

Mr. SNELL. It is in the nature of an investigation, and while it is more comprehensive than the average resolution of that character, I think it ought to go to the Rules Committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The resolution provides for the creation of a commission outside of Congress itself.

Mr. SNELL. I admit the resolution goes much further than the ordinary resolution providing for a commission of investigation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, the ordinary resolution authorizing an investigation by a committee of Congress, whether a standing committee or a special committee created for the purpose, necessarily goes to the Committee on Rules; but when it is to create a commission outside of Congress itself, while I have no objection to its reference——

Mr. BUTLER. I thought that would be the shortest and quickest route for it to take, I will say to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But I want to offer this suggestion, if I may. I do not know who has the floor.

Mr. SNELL. This is all by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There was something said in the message of the President about a letter from the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I have it here.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was wondering if it would not be of interest to the House to have that letter read.

Mr. BUTLER. I intended next to ask the permission of the House to have the letter read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, I will be delighted, if I have the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. This resolution was drawn by the Navy Department and sent to and approved by the President, and then handed to the gentleman for introduction.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman knows that unless there is a provision placed in the resolution which would cause the commission to go out of existence within one year or two years, the commission may be alive for the next 100 years. Does the gentleman think it wise to not provide against that?

Mr. BUTLER. I agree with the gentleman, and I am against commissions of all kinds. I would suggest that the Committee on Rules amend the proposed resolution to provide that the commission shall go out of existence as soon as it can make a report and then fix a time within which they must report.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that if the resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules, the House can rely upon that committee reporting the resolution very promptly and making such additions or amendments of the resolution as may be deemed necessary.

Mr. SNELL. And we will consult the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I had assumed that the proper place for this resolution was the Committee on Rules, and therefore I made my request that that committee should act promptly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in some doubt, under all the circumstances, as to whether this resolution should go to the Committee on Rules or the Committee on Naval Affairs, but will give the question some consideration to-day before referring it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. That is within the jurisdiction of the Chair.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in the meantime may not the letter of the Secretary of the Navy be read?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter of the Secretary of the Navy.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1928.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is desirable that a commission of experts be assembled to consider the development of safety devices for our submarines, and that such commission be empowered to call witnesses and to pay their expenses. In the opinion of such a board it may be desirable to secure expert testimony from those experts who developed submarines for other nations as well as our own. Such a commission appointed without congressional authority might perform valuable service in the consideration of plans already submitted and in the analysis of the work of the Navy Department in the development of the submarine, but could not undertake a more comprehensive investigation without congressional authority. It is desirable also that such a commission be empowered to make such inquiry into the *S–4* disaster as they may deem necessary to supplement investigation by the naval court of inquiry. For these reasons it is desirable that congressional authority be obtained for the appointment of such a commission of experts and that a small appropriation be made available for their necessary expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

CURTIS D. WILBUR.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] be allowed to proceed for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

NICARAGUA

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the significance of the situation in Nicaragua, as I see it, is that a stupid and inept administration has gotten us into a difficult situation and now we are having to fight our way out of it. We have been embarked upon a foolish and dangerous venture, and now we must make our way out of it the best we can if we can do so consistent with national honor and safety.

WE ARE AT WAR IN NICARAGUA

There is war in Nicaragua. It is not the war of the American people; it is the war of those whom it is our ill-fortune to have in charge of the American Government. It is a war which they entered upon without the consent of the real rulers of this country.

That it is war no one can in sincerity question. We read this morning that 1,000 American marines are being embarked for service in Nicaragua; that already there are 1,400 there, and that naval vessels are being rushed to Nicaraguan waters. It is stated that the work of garrisoning the ports will be taken over by the blue jackets so as to leave the total of 2,400 marines free for fighting. And all this after 12 months of the Coolidge brand of "pacification."

I clipped from a paper this morning a dispatch from San Salvador:

A memorial directed against the "hostilities" by American marines in Nicaragua was presented to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh to-day by a group of private citizens of Nicaragua who are living in San Salvador.

The memorial greeted Colonel Lindbergh as a flying ambassador and representative of the true spirit of the United States, as a hero of the air as well as a messenger of peace. It requested the colonel to use his good offices so "that the American marines may cease their hostilities in Nicaragua," as this would help to make "friendship prevail instead of distrust."

The memorial further referred to various declarations of President Coolidge concerning respect for right and freedom, and stated that the President's words were not evident in the Nicaraguan situation.

PEACE IN THE AIR, DEATH IN THE JUNGLE

Our ambassador of peace wings his way through the air and our emissaries of death struggle in the jungles of Nicaragua,

fighting in a cause not an American cause. Of course, I do not blame the marines who are there nor the officers who are in command. They are but performing their work of soldiers, doing what they are commanded to do. I place the responsibility squarely where it belongs, upon the administration which sent them there. The administration is responsible for the death of every American marine who may fall, and for the sacrifice of American honor and of principle which is involved in the fact that they are in Nicaragua. [Applause.]

The memorial presented to Lindbergh recites truly that he is representative of the true spirit of the United States as a messenger of peace. If it were left to the people they would recall the marines, instead of sending recruits to help them in the distasteful task which they have been sent to perform. Had the people been consulted, no marine would have been sent upon the soil of Nicaragua. It is the administration's war; it is not the people's war. The people have not been consulted. They want peace; they desire to respect the rights of our sister Republic. They would rather serve Nicaragua than to oppress her.

The administration has its purposes to accomplish. I dare to say here that those purposes are not American and not consistent with the ideals and institutions of America. It is the administration's war. A year ago we were told that there were about 5,000 of our armed forces in Nicaragua. That number included, of course, blue jackets from the Navy—how many marines I do not know. A large number have been there ever since.

A BLOODY BUSINESS

I read this dispatch, clipped from a newspaper dated December 14 last:

UNITED STATES HAVING HARD JOB IN TRYING TO QUELL NICARAGUAN TROUBLE

WASHINGTON, *December 4*.—Pacification of Nicaragua is proving about the hardest job the United States marines have ever tackled. Despite the optimistic statements issued from time to time by State and Navy Department officials the northern half of the Central American Republic is still, after a seven-month campaign, seething with insurgency and general disorder.

To date the pacification has cost the lives of more than 800 Nicaraguans, according to figures compiled to-day from official reports, while several hundred others have been seriously wounded in clashes with the American interventionists and native guards. In the last month there have been at least 86 known deaths among the natives.

Based on announcements by the marine command in Managua and by officials here, minimum casualty figures show 714 Nicaraguans to have been slain, 152 killed or wounded, and 220 wounded in the period from May 15 to December 11. At the same time 7 marines and 6 native guardsmen have been killed and 2 marines wounded.

Recorded casualties among the Nicaraguans (who have been termed bandits by the State Department) are not complete. Upon several occasions after skirmishes with the insurgent natives the marine command has declared that the extent of the casualties among the "bandits" could not be determined. Nor do these figures include the number of Nicaraguans who, lacking medical attention, have died from their wounds.

Early in October the casualty figures showed that upward of 540 Nicaraguans had been killed. On November 15 the toll was 628 killed, 187 killed or wounded, and 152 wounded. Since then the following clashes between natives and marines have taken place:

November 21: Near Telepaneca, 3 Nicaraguans killed.

November 23: Somoto, 4 Nicaraguans killed; large number wounded; 1 marine wounded.

November 25: Laguna, 4 Nicaraguans killed; 7 wounded.

November 26: Elchipote, 37 Nicaraguans killed; unknown number wounded. (Originally 4 natives were reported to have fallen in this engagement, but that figure was officially corrected by Col. L. M. Gulick, marine commander.)

December 5: Between Jicardo and San Fernando, number of Nicaraguan casualties unknown; 2 native guardsmen killed.

December 9: Antigua, 20 Nicaraguans killed; 20 wounded.

December 10: El Portero, 5 Nicaraguans killed; several wounded.

December 10: Somoto, 3 Nicaraguans killed; 3 wounded.

December 11: Santa Rosa, — Nicaraguans killed; several wounded.

December 11: Telepaneca, 8 Nicaraguans killed; several wounded.

Included among the recent casualties were two marine airmen, Second Lieut. E. A. Thomas and Sergt. Frank Dowdell, who were captured by a band of Nicaraguans after their plane had crashed into a mountain near Ocotal early in October. The Navy Department reported that they were killed by their captors.

Recently the Marine Corps announced that the "bandit extermination" program would be prosecuted with increased vigor at the end of the rainy season late this month. The aviators now in Nicaragua have been reenforced and have been supplied with new equipment for the avowed purpose of conducting an intensive bombing campaign as soon as dry weather arrives.

Under the marine rule of the Central American country, according to reports received in Washington, all persons traveling through northern Nicaragua must register with the marine command in Managua, so that the airmen will have information about their routes and itineraries and not drop bombs on them. This is considered here to presage a ruthless drive against all "bandits" and insurgents in the northern Provinces.

Think of it; we have killed some 800 to 1,000 Nicaraguans and probably wounded 2,000 additional. We have killed and wounded these men who were not "bandits" but were fighting for their country and the right to govern themselves.

All these casualties and all this bloodshed occurred before the recent battle when a number of marines lost their lives and probably some hundreds more of Nicaraguans were killed and wounded. Can anybody honestly deny that war is being carried on in Nicaragua?

AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL WAR

Technically our country is not at war. From a legal standpoint the United States has not entered a war. There is only one way by which we may legally enter into a war, and that is by a declaration of Congress. The Constitution gives to Congress the exclusive power of declaring war.

It is true that the President is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, but it was never within the minds of those who wrote the Constitution giving him these powers that he might command the Army and Navy as his fancy might dictate. It was intended that the President's function as commander of the Army and Navy should be under the direction and control of the Congress of the United States through its power to declare war. If the President can send our marines to wage war in Nicaragua the President can send our Navy to England and bombard London to-morrow.

It may be that Congress has not said to the President you shall not use our armed forces in the invasion of a country with which we are at peace. You shall submit such matters to Congress for its decision as the Constitution contemplates. Nevertheless the failure of Congress to exercise its power has in no sense diminished the right to do so. We have the power to remedy the situation that exists in Nicaragua by a resolution commanding the President not to pursue the course which he is following. [Applause.] A resolution which would restrain him from usurping the functions of a military dictator.

VIOLATES SPIRIT OF CONSTITUTION

The extreme seriousness of this situation lies in the fact that the President is deliberately violating the spirit of the Constitution by carrying on a war without the consent of Congress. I imagine that if you should ask those who compose the group about him, to whom he looks for support and advice, they would assert that they compose the cult of original "constitutional worshipers." My observation of such gentlemen is that they love the Constitution when it protects them in their special privileges and interests, but they defy its spirit when it stands between them and what they want to do. They love the Constitution when it serves them; they despise it when it protects the liberties of the people.

As one who has regard for the welfare and happiness of his fellow creatures from the standpoint of the Nicaraguans themselves, of course I deplore what has been done. I sympathize with them. They are under the heel of a foreign oppressor. It fills me with shame to admit this of my country. My comfort is that it is not the people who have done this wrong; it is an administration which misrepresents the people.

The Nicaraguans have no liberties, they have no self-government, they have none of the cherished things for which our fathers died. Naturally we feel for them, as we would feel for any people fighting for liberty. Anyone who really believes in Americanism and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed must grieve for the Nicaraguans who are laying down their lives for these principles.

But, after all, Nicaragua is a small country, with only a sparse population, and perhaps sometime, in the ultimate end, when American imperialism has worked its will with them, they will be given some of the benefits of the material welfare that belongs to our civilization. When we have at last forced it upon them it may be there will be some compensation for their sufferings and for the loss of their liberties. What concerns me most, however, is not what Nicaragua is losing, not what the Nicaraguans are suffering, but what America is suffering and what America is losing.

AMERICA MUST PAY THE PRICE

Every man must know that America can not exist as an imperialism abroad and a democracy at home. It can not continue as "the land of the free and the home of the brave" with its foreign policy under the dominion of a military autocracy.

We can not hold here at home that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and yet in foreign countries ruthlessly deprive the people of their right of self-government. We can not preserve liberty here and practice autocracy abroad. We can not have the free ballot box at home with American marines dictating at the elections of a foreign country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] America can not exist democratic at home and autocratic abroad.

IS AMERICA TO BECOME AN IMPERIALISM?

Mr. Speaker, if we are to give up those principles which we have cherished and held dear, then the people of this country should be consulted about it. The real sovereigns, the real rulers of America, should have some chance to express themselves.

If it be true that the love of liberty is dead—liberty for ourselves and for all others—and that we are to embark upon a policy of imperialism abroad, which can only result in the counterpart of that policy here at home, the issue should be submitted to the American people for their decision. It is not right, it is not fair, for those whom we have placed in office on other issues to commit this country to such a policy.

I want to see my country great, but great in its love of liberty. I want to see my country powerful, but I want it powerful in just and righteous conduct toward our sister nations. I want to see our influence spread, but I no not want it to be spread by the force of arms. I would rather have it spread by the influence of love. I want others to adopt our culture because of its worthiness. I would rather that we should deserve to rule the world without doing so than that we should rule without deserving to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the worst thing about all of this is, that as we strike our sister Republic down the blow comes back and at last we strike ourselves. The most serious consequence of all is the consequences which shall be worked upon the institutions of our country. Are we to have an imperialism in America? Are we to be converted into a nation which shall compete with the nations of the Old World in the exploitation of the weak, the helpless, and the poor? Have we ideals like those of ancient Rome by which we shall claim for ourselves the right of dominion and draw tribute from servile populations of the remote corners of the earth? Is that our ideal? Let me say to you that if it is we will go as Rome went. The Romans could not hold to their own liberties, yet take away the liberties of others. And so they lost their liberties, and so we shall lose ours.

TO WAGE WAR WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF CONGRESS IS USURPATION

Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in making war without the consent of Congress and without the consent of the people of the United States is a violation of the spirit of the Constitution. It is an usurpation which if persisted in will result in ruin to us in the end.

There is little doubt that we would have had war with Mexico a year ago had not public opinion in the United States responded, had it not beat upon the door of the White House and challenged the President and dared him to provoke the war which he openly threatened. He listened to the voice of the people then. God grant that there may come from the people now some such expression of aversion to his policy as will drive the President from the course which he is pursuing in Nicaragua.

This war that is being carried on in Nicaragua is the administration's war, but the treasure that the President is expending in it is the people's money, and the blood that he is causing to be spilled is the blood of American boys. And the consequences which may ensue will fall upon the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Of course I am always diverted and edified by the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to ask whether the fact that we are in Nicaragua to-day is not with the consent and sanction and practically at the request of the only government there is in Nicaragua and practically at the joint request of the recently warring factions. Now may I——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. May I answer. The gentleman is putting another question——

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. For the purpose of assisting the Nicaragua Government to restore peaceful and orderly conditions in Nicaragua?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not if the President is to be believed. He stated in his message to Congress a year ago as the reason why we were in Nicaragua that it was for the protection of American lives and property and to protect the concession for the canal which we may some day decide to construct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We are there to protect American lives and property, so the President said. His statement was challenged then and the charge was made that there were no Americans whose lives were being jeopardized in Nicaragua and that no American property was in danger. The matter finally settled itself down to the general belief that the President was merely helping certain American bankers to collect debts for loans which they had made.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, in reference to what the gentleman from New York said, everybody will recall the government he speaks of in Nicaragua, the Diaz government, was reputed to have been given assurance in advance of Diaz being installed that our Government was going to support him. Diaz is the man asking help in Nicaragua, and we know what sort of a man he is.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And the President sent his representative to Nicaragua not as a representative of the people, for probably he could not have been elected as a constable by any constituency in the United States. [Applause.] He is said to have made some kind of a trade with Moncada based upon the assurance that Moncada should be the next President of Nicaragua. This is the common report.

So Moncada quit fighting. Benedict Arnold also quit fighting, but the Revolutionaries fought on and won American independence. So far as we know, those who are fighting against us in Nicaragua to-day are fired with just as sincere a love for their country as our ancestors were for ours. It is unspeakably hypocritical and dishonest to call such men "bandits." They are fighting for liberty. Whether we think them right or wrong, we as brave men must respect their sacrifices and the spirit in which they give their lives. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is rather embarrassing to me to sit and listen for half an hour to such an indictment of my own country, particularly when that indictment for its facts is founded on newspaper articles. I am ready to grant to any man that there may be two schools of foreign policy regarding the protection of life and property in foreign countries. There is not any question of doubt in my own mind to which school I belong. Therefore I have chosen to reply in brief to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

In the first place, the United States has but one principle on foreign policy that any man can claim is at all permanent and fixed. That is the Monroe doctrine. I challenge any man to cite any other principle of the American Government that is permanent in dealing with foreign nations that does not vary with succeeding administrations. Now, the Monroe doctrine, as everyone of you knows, came into existence as the result of the Holy Alliance in the Old World, which was formed in the year 1815 for the sole purpose of arresting, if possible, the spread and growth of Spanish-American republics, and the plan of procedure of the so-called Holy Alliance was to restore the Crown in Spain; and Spain in payment for the restoration was to come to the Americas and stop the establishment of Spanish-American republics and create instead Spanish-American monarchies. By 1823 the Holy Alliance had functioned with her part of the contract and Spain was ready to begin the performance of her part of the bargain, to wit, interfere with the establishment of governments according to the wishes of the several peoples. And every time I read our history I thank God for the fact that Monroe had the courage of his convictions and that there was none of the demagogue in him. In his message to Congress in January he made a great speech, not to Congress, not to America, but to the world at large. Here, in our language, in brief, is what he said:

> Any attempt by any foreign power to interfere with the destiny of any America would be interpreted by the United States as an unfriendly act.

I will ask you gentlemen who are students of history, Was that pronouncement respected by Spain and the rest of the nations? I call your attention to the fact that James Monroe did not come to Congress with that message and ask for another

dollar to increase the national defense. He did not ask for the privilege of enlisting another man in the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps. He merely made his speech, and the Old World heard and respected that pronouncement of the American doctrine, known afterwards as the Monroe doctrine.

Again, I will call your attention—and particularly the attention of my colleague from Alabama—to an incident which happened during the administration of a President of his own political faith, Grover Cleveland. When England undertook to interfere in a minor matter under the pretext that it was vital to her interest, in cold-blooded language President Cleveland issued a restatement of that doctrine to the mistress of the seas; and when President Cleveland spoke he did not have a Navy much more serviceable than a good fleet of fishing smacks, and his Army did not contain 125,000 trained soldiery. And yet Mr. Cleveland said in substance to England, "You are violating the Monroe doctrine, and the peace of the world will be more secure if you stay out of that affair."

Did the greatest naval power in all time respect that restatement of the Monroe doctrine? It goes without saying that she did.

Again, I will ask, Did Cleveland request any increase for naval defense or for the Army defense? Not one nickel. And yet the mistress of the sea respected that restatement of the only downright simon-pure statement of the foreign policy of America that has ever been made.

Then, following Cleveland, what do we have again? Mr. Roosevelt, when the nation that builded the biggest military machine that has ever been assembled by a single power sent a part of her fleet down into Venezuelan waters over a little boundary dispute, what did Mr. Roosevelt do? In our language he gave them a limited time to withdraw their fleet out of those waters. Did Germany respect it? She certainly did. Yet Roosevelt's Army was less than 125,000 men and his Navy was no better than Cleveland's. Yet he commanded the respect of the biggest military machine, I say again, that the world ever saw down to that hour.

I say that Cleveland and Roosevelt, by the restatement of that all-American doctrine, contributed more to the peace of the world, in my humble judgment, than could have been done by any manner of means otherwise.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Not now; not until I am through with my statement.

Then we come down to this Nicaraguan affair. It is the most glorious opportunity for a man who wants to be careless of his facts and who is not in favor of preserving the national honor of America among the nations of the world to make an inflammatory speech to the uninformed, such as that which we have had from the gentleman from Alabama and others for a number of years. [Applause.]

I said at the outset that there might be two schools of foreign policy. I said I would state the one to which I belong, and I will do it now. So far as I am concerned, I believe it to be the responsibility of the United States to protect my life and my property wherever I may be in all the world [applause] so long as I am obeying the laws of the country in which I happen to reside; and I will say again, that if the national sovereignty does not extend beyond the boundary of the United States, why have a national sovereignty in times of peace?

You damage my property in Ohio. It will not be the Federal Government that will come and punish you. It will be, first, the county sovereignty and if they are unable to punish you, then it will be the State sovereignty, but never in all the history of America has the Federal sovereignty been called upon to protect a single individual's property in a State.

In other words, I believe America's future is dependent upon two things: First, fair treatment of every foreign country with which she deals; and, second, a firm, courageous, and fair foreign policy so that her own citizenship will respect her influence in the affairs of the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Again, Great Britain and Italy asked the United States to protect their nationals in Nicaragua and to protect their property. I will submit to you, and I will submit to my friend from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], if we were not foursquare up against the proposition of either protecting the lives and property of the nationals of the rest of the world in Nicaragua or of saying to them, "You may protect your own"?

In other words, maintain the Monroe doctrine or disavow it like a man. To have said to the rest of the world, "We will not protect your nationals and you can not," would have made us guilty of murder every time a national had been killed. Those of you who choose to put yourselves in that category are welcome to the assignment, but for me, put me on the side of the American principle that to be a citizen of the United States means you will be protected as to life and property throughout the world as long as you are a law-abiding citizen.

Now, the situation was a revolution between two men who wanted to be President of Nicaragua. Those details have been recited here repeatedly. If they have not, I can insert them. They are chronologically accurate and can be put in if you want them. In the contest between the two men danger threatened. Our nationals appealed to us, the parent country, for protection. We sent the marines, the international police. Is there anything startling about the fact that we sent the marines to Nicaragua? If you will acquaint yourselves with the facts, you will find that the marines have been in Nicaragua the majority of the time since 1895 down to 1924; and that, too, at the request of the government in Nicaragua each and every time. [Applause.] Why were they withdrawn? President Harding got tired of the change in governments by revolution in the Central Americas and thought he could do something to contribute to peace. So he invited those countries to come to Washington to see whether they could not make a treaty of adjustment, and they made a treaty in which each agreed with the other, the Central American powers, not to recognize any man gaining his power by a coup d'état or revolution. General Chamarro signed for Nicaragua, and yet in less than 18 months he had raised a revolution in Nicaragua and seized the government. Certainly we could not recognize him. Although we were not a signatory to the treaty, it was made under the guidance and protection of the United States, and we refused to recognize that government. Then after he had thrown out a number of his congressmen until he could get control of the congress, he elected a man as his successor and that man by the Nicaraguan constitution, which is in writing and in my office, could not qualify; and, of course, we refused to recognize him. Then in Nicaragua they themselves restored the regularly elected congressmen, and they elected Mr. Diaz, who does meet the qualifications of the constitution. I am referring to the written constitution of Nicaragua. He does meet the requirements. He was elected according to their constitutional methods by a two-thirds majority of the congress which was elected by the people at a regular election, when the United States was not in there militarily.

What could we do? To have refused to recognize that government would have been to do the very thing my friend from Alabama charges us with now doing, namely, decide and control who shall be the president.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I prefer not to yield until I have finished my statement. Then I will yield, if I have the time or if the House will grant me additional time in which to answer.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman take this into consideration: Congress's authority; has that been respected, and under what law is this being done?

Mr. BEGG. All right. That is easy and will not take long. The Constitution of the United States absolutely puts the control of the armed forces in the hands of the President of the United States, and nobody contests that. This is not war. This is preserving the peace and protecting the lives and property of our own nationals as well as the nationals of other countries, because there is no stable government there. Had Nicaragua a stable government able to do justice in the event of injury to our nationals, as well as injury to the nationals of other countries—like the gentleman from Alabama referred to London, I would criticize the President of the United States even more severely than he, were we to go in. I would criticize him if he were to do such a thing as that; but that is not the case in Nicaragua. There is no stable government there and there has not been, and the United States is protecting the peace of the world by sending the marines to Nicaragua greater by a thousand times, in my judgment, than if she kept out and failed to do her duty.

Now, let us see what might happen. Great Britain suggested that if the United States would not consent to protect the nationals of Great Britain that she would dispatch a man-of-war, fully armed and fully equipped, to Caribbean waters in order to protect her own nationals.

Now, let us assume we had followed the policy suggested by my friend from Alabama and had said, "No; we will not send our marines to Nicaragua; we will let every fellow look out for himself." Great Britain would have dispatched her man-of-war and you gentlemen know better than I that this man-of-war of Great Britain would not have allowed the rattle of the anchor chain to have been stilled before 100 yards alongside of her would have been settling in her berths a French man-of-war, and that man-of-war would never have gotten the anchor on the bottom of the ocean until 100 yards farther over would have been an Italian man-of-war. None of the three would have been settled in its berth before there would have been a Jap man-of-war sliding in alongside of them.

Why, gentlemen, there is not a more spectacularly beautiful sight in the world than to see the warships of the powers all congregated in a single harbor; nor is there one more hazardous to world peace than to permit them to congregate in the same waters, each there to protect a selfish interest.

I maintain that instead of contributing to war or starting war by sending the marines down there to do police duty, we have performed the greatest peace-time effort that has been performed since the World War was ended.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BEGG. I can not at this minute.

Then, what has the United States at stake? If we were to let the war powers congregate and go into Nicaragua, the control of the Panama and the Nicaraguan Canals, which are the bottle necks of commerce between the Occident and the Orient, might be jeopardized.

I will say to you that if you can show me how the American standard of living in economics can be maintained with some other power than the United States controlling the bottle neck of commerce, I must be shown. In other words, the prosperity of the United States insists that we must control the routes between the oceans for commerce. The peace of the world, it seems to me, insists that we must maintain a stable form of government in Nicaragua until such time as the citizenship is developed to the point where it can maintain orderly government like the rest of the civilized nations of the world. [Applause.]

Under the privilege to extend my remarks I will insert a statement which I printed in the Manufacturers Record, of Baltimore, in reply to an article by a Mr. De Kalk:

As regards the statement that President Diaz is merely a puppet set up as President to administer the country without consulting the electorate, it may be said that in the elections of October, 1924, Solórzano was elected President and Sacasa Vice President. In October, 1925, General Chamorro carried out a coup d'état and made himself master of the situation. The Vice President left the country, going first to Salvador and then traveling to the United States. Solórzano resigned and went to San Francisco. General Chamorro had himself elected a senator, despite the provisions of article 141 of the constitution, providing that "Soldiers in actual service shall not be permitted to hold offices filled by popular election." He then had himself elected first designate and took over the Presidency. General Chamorro could not be President, as such action would be recognized as contrary to the provisions of Article II of the general treaty of peace and amity signed by the five Central American Republics on February 7, 1923. This article reads as follows:

"Desiring to make secure in the Republics of Central America the benefits which are derived from the maintenance of free institutions and to contribute at the same time toward strengthening their stability and the prestige with which they should be surrounded, they declare that every act, disposition, or measure which alters the constitutional organization in any of them is to be deemed a menace to the peace of said Republics, whether it proceed from any public power or from the private citizens."

Consequently the governments of the contracting parties will not recognize any other government which may come into power in any of the five Republics through a coup d'état or a revolution against a recognized government, so long as the freely elected representatives of the people thereof have not constitutionally reorganized the country. And even in such a case they obligate themselves not to acknowledge the recognition if any of the persons elected as president, vice president, or chief of state designate should fall under any of the following heads:

"1. If he should be the leader or one of the leaders of a coup d'état or revolution, or through blood relationship or marriage, be an ascendent or descendent or brother of such leader or leaders.

"2. If he should have been a secretary of state or should have held some high military command during the accomplishment of the coup d'état, the revolution, or while the election was being carried on, or if he should have held this office or command within the six months preceding the coup d'état, revolution, or the election.

"Furthermore, in no case shall recognition be accorded to a government which arises from election to power of a citizen expressly and unquestionably disqualified by the constitution of his country as eligible to election as president, vice president, or chief of state designate."

The United States refused to recognize Chamorro, as it had publicly announced on June 30, 1923, that it would adopt as its policy in the future recognition of governments in Central America the provisions of Article II of the treaty quoted above. Chamorro continued in office without recognition for several months, but in the autumn of 1926 finally retired, turning over the Presidency to Señor Uriza. The United States declined to recognize him also, as he had not been elected in a constitutional manner. Chamorro had put out of office a number of members of Congress elected in 1924 at the same time that Solórzano and Sacasa were elected, and had substituted his own followers in their place. These men now left the Congress and those originally elected were reseated, and this Congress then elected Adolfo Diaz as first designate on November 10, 1926. Article 106 of the Nicaraguan constitution provides as follows:

"In case of the absolute or temporary lack of a President of the Republic, the office of Chief Executive shall devolve on the Vice President, and in default of the latter, in one of the emergency candidates in the order of their election. In the latter case, if the Congress is in session, it shall be its duty to authorize the intrustment of the office to the representative whom it may designate, who must fulfill the requirements for President of the Republic."

At the time of this election President Solórzano was in California and Vice President Sacasa was in Guatemala, having been absent from Nicaragua for nearly a year. On November 17 the United States recognized Diaz as constitutional President.

In other words, the United States refused to recognize Chamorro and Uriza, who were not constitutionally elected, but when Diaz was constitutionally elected it recognized him. There is no question of setting up a puppet government. The Congress elected at the same time that Solórzano and Sacasa were elected, elected Diaz under the terms of their constitution, and he was recognized by the United States. If the United States had not recognized him it could have justly been charged with meddling with the internal political affairs of a neighboring republic. There was no choice in the matter.

It is not correct to say that Solórzano was elected "with our marines still in control of the country." In October, 1924, there was a legation guard of 100 marines in Managua. This guard had been there since 1912 at the direct request of each succeeding administration. They had nothing whatever to do with the conduct of the elections in 1924. Prior to that time the Liberals had charged that they could not carry out a revolution on account of the presence of the marines, and that if the United States Government did not supervise the elections they could not get into office through the ballot box. They thus charged the United States with maintaining in office a government that did not represent the will of the people. On the other hand, should the marines be withdrawn it was freely admitted by the Liberals and others that there would be a revolution within a very few days. To meet this situation the United States Government suggested to Nicaragua that it employ an expert in electoral matters to draw up an electoral law and that it be put in force in the elections of 1924. Also that in accordance with the convention of 1923 it convert its army into an efficient, well-organized constabulary. This Government stated that it felt that should the new electoral law be properly enforced the government coming into office January 1, 1925 (when Solórzano and Sacasa actually did come in) would represent the will of the majority of the people, and that therefore that administration could maintain itself in office without further assistance than its own efficient constabulary. The marines could then be withdrawn without injecting any new element of danger into the situation.

Dr. Harold W. Dodds, of the National Municipal League of New York, was employed in 1922 and drew up a new electoral law, which was voted in 1923, and it was this law that was first applied in the elections of 1924. This Government suggested that as the new law was unfamiliar both to the officers that had to enforce it and the electorate who would exercise their rights under it for the first time, the Nicaraguan Government might find it advantageous to ask Doctor Dodds and other assistants to help them in carrying out its provisions. The Nicaraguan Government did ask Doctor Dodds to help with the registration of the voters in the spring of 1924, but declined to have any assistance during the actual voting in October.

Solórzano, therefore, was not elected with our marines or any other American officials in charge. The Nicaraguan Government, under President Martinez, who was backing the candidacy of Solórzano and Sacasa, refused to have any outside assistance and this Government had nothing whatever to do with those elections. The responsibility for them rests wholly and solely upon the Nicaraguan Government. Solórzano was not a Liberal, but a dissident Conservative. Sacasa was a Liberal. It was a coalition ticket.

After Sacasa fled the country, he came to Washington to request that the United States intervene by force to put him back in the Presidency by ousting Chamorro. In other words, he asked the United States to meddle in the internal political affairs of Nicaragua and to use armed force to that end. He was told that this Government

does not do this; that in accordance with its announced policy of upholding the treaty of 1923 it would not recognize the dictatorship of Chamorro, and also that it would not intervene unless American lives and property should be in danger.

The American minister was not withdrawn from Nicaragua when a dictator assumed office. That was when he was most needed to try to use his influence to prevent any rash action and to protect American lives and property. His staying there did not give recognition to the new government, and it is not so understood in international law. He remained on, not out of friendship for the usurping authorities but to protect American interests and the lives of American citizens.

It is stated that a number of members of the Nicaraguan Congress were impeached, including sympathizers of the Liberal President—Solórzano was not a Liberal—and Vice President who had been thrown out; that their places had been taken by Conservatives, and that this rump Parliament proceeded to impeach the exiled Vice President, Sacasa. The article contends that "At the same time the unconstitutional strictly partisan so-called 'Congress' elected Adolfo Diaz to the Presidency." As stated above, this is not correct. The Liberal members of Congress, who had been put out by Chamorro, were reseated and Chamorro's followers were put out after Chamorro's retirement, and the Congress that was elected with Solórzano and Sacasa in 1924 elected Diaz to the Presidency. He was then recognized by the United States. The statement is made that Diaz offered the United States "anything we wanted in exchange for American protection. So flagrant were some of the proposals of submission to the will of the United States if he were retained in power that even Washington was forced to restore the dignity of the frightened weakling." There is no truth in this. Diaz did ask for American protection against the armed intervention of Mexico, but that was all. Mr. De Kalb in his article has let it go with a general statement. It is safe to say that he could not make it more specific.

In the next paragraph Mr. De Kalb states that Sacasa went to Puerto Cabezas on September 1, 1926, and organized a legitimist government, and that "he was undoubtedly supported by Mexico, in which she was entirely within her sovereign rights." In other words, Mexico admittedly did what the United States had refused to do; that is, to support by arms one of the factions in dispute. The United States refused to recognize Chamorro or to intervene by arms against him or anybody else, or on behalf of anybody. When the constitutional government came in the United States recognized it. Mexico did not, but supported Sacasa with arms, thus taking sides and intervening in the internal political affairs of a neighboring country. Mexico was carrying on imperialism in its most flagrant sense, which, Mr. De Kalb says, "she was entirely within her sovereign rights" in doing. The United States maintained a strictly proper attitude and is then charged with imperialism. It was only after Sacasa started his revolution, supported by Mexico, to overthrow the constitutional government in Nicaragua that the United States intervened, and it intervened at first merely to protect American lives and property. United States forces were landed where the fighting was taking place, which was on the east or Atlantic coast. Neutral zones were established where there were Americans living and holding property in order to protect them. The neutralization was impartially carried out, however, and Conservatives, as well as Liberals who came within the neutralized zones, were disarmed by the American forces.

With regard to the statement that Colonel Stimson insisted upon the retention of Adolfo Diaz in the presidential chair until the new election in 1928, it may be said that after thoroughly canvassing the situation he found that there was no person acceptable to both the Liberals and Conservatives who could be put in temporarily, hence the only feasible solution was to retain the constitutional President for the balance of his term.

Our acts in Nicaragua have not "sown seeds of distrust and hatred." Those who have sown seeds of distrust and hatred are those who willfully misstate the facts and who, without taking the trouble to find out the true situation, are only too ready to condemn their own Government and declare anything that it does wrong and illegal, at the same time expressing as "entirely within her sovereign rights" the interested action of a foreign government. The officials in charge of the foreign affairs of the American Government do not resent honest criticism. If anyone goes into the facts and can find a better solution of the problems confronting them, they would welcome their suggestions, but loose, irresponsible statements misrepresenting facts and made without having taken the trouble to verify them only do an immeasurable harm.

The United States Government has consented to supervise the 1928 elections at the joint request of the Conservative Government and the Liberal opposition. This is a policy of helpfulness to a neighboring country, a policy that has as its aim the making of those countries into stable, strong, independent governments. If the United States had "adopted a policy of imperialistic aggrandizement" it would be more suiting to such a policy to fish in troubled waters and not to try to bring about stability. If the United States had entered upon a policy of imperialistic aggrandizement there would not now be an independent government in Cuba, an independent government in Panama, an independent government in the Dominican Republic, and in Haiti, nor anywhere in Central America, for that matter. The countries where the United States has lent its helping hand are the most prosperous. Cuba, when it won its independence, was bankrupt politically, financially, and economically. It is now an independent country; it has a stable government; a country with a little over 3,000,000 inhabitants, but having $1,300,000,000 American capital invested there, and a yearly trade of $560,000,000 with the United States alone. The trade of the United States with Cuba is greater than that of any other country in Latin America. These facts speak louder than the irresponsible statements of misinformed propagandists against their own government.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio may have correctly stated the feeling of a majority of the people of the United States upon one question of international policy, namely, that it is the policy of the United States to protect the lives and property of American citizens. He may have stated a necessary policy growing out of the Monroe doctrine, but that which throughout this entire Nicaraguan difficulty has been always in my mind is, When was the life of any American citizen ever in danger in Nicaragua? When was any property of any American citizen, which it was the Government's duty to protect, ever in danger in Nicaragua?

Surely the gentleman from Ohio will not assert it is sound American foreign policy for the Government of the United States to say that if a private citizen of America lends money to a private citizen of another country, we will see that he is able to collect his money. This is not the protection of property which I understand is embraced in the doctrine generally laid down, that it is the duty of the Government to protect American lives and property. This does not mean it is the duty of the Government to collect the debts of a citizen against citizens of a foreign country when he has taken his chances in the marts of trade of the world. There is a distinction, too, in the duty of the Government as to protecting life and as to protecting property.

Accepting the doctrine laid down by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], I ask what are the facts? No one has ever yet cited an instance, so far as I know, when the life of any American citizen was in danger in Nicaragua or when the property of any citizen situated in Nicaragua was threatened with destruction. I should like to know what are the facts.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ROMJUE. When certain resolutions were before the committee about a year ago, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House at a meeting to consider these resolutions had this question put to them: When and what American life had been destroyed or threatened with destruction, and what and where was a single dollar's worth of property destroyed or threatened with destruction? Not a single member of that committee could answer, and yet they asserted, as has been asserted here to-day, that we are there to protect American lives and property.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I just wish to add, Mr. Speaker, in view of the turn which affairs have taken in Nicaragua within the last few days, it seems to me it is highly important that the administration, upon whose initiative the action has been taken and war has been waged—because it is war—ought at least to make known to the American people when an American life was in danger or when any item of property which it is the duty of the American Government to protect was threatened. If this can be done, perhaps we can get a different perspective upon this question, but this has not yet been done by the administration or by the gentleman from Ohio or by anyone speaking for the administration. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. TILSON. I withhold it.

The SPEAKER. There are a number of messages to lay before the House, and before doing that the Chair will state he has given some consideration to the reference of the resolution of investigation offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Under ordinary circumstances such a resolution, not involving the membership of the House, would be referred to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

In this case it would be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. But in view of the fact that a request was made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the ranking minority member that it should go to the Committee on Rules, the Chair will refer it to the Committee on Rules, but does not desire it to be a precedent for general reference.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to make this statement, that although we may have originally gone into Nicaragua for the protection of American lives and property, we are there to-day by the consent, with the authority, and at the request of the Government of Nicaragua and with the full concurrence of the Liberals as well as the Conservatives, in fact in pursuance of the agreement, effected by Mr. Stimson, for the settlement of the revolution in Nicaragua. We are not waging a war in Nicaragua. On the contrary, we are assisting the Government of Nicaragua and the people of Nicaragua to restore orderly and peaceful conditions in that distracted country.

It is, in my judgment, not only our right but our duty to be there, Mr. Speaker, under existing circumstances; our duty to our own people, who are there by right; our duty to the people of other countries, who have the right to look to us to restore peaceful conditions in Nicaragua. The circumstances leading to our armed forces being in Nicaragua at this time have been too often related, must be too familiar to us all, to bear repetition at this time. A bitter, brutal, bloody, internecine conflict was under way, with no prospect for peace whichever side prevailed. Our marines were in Managua, the capital, as they had been there before under similar circumstances. They were not only protecting the capital but guarding the railroad, the one means of communication with the coast. In that situation the President requested Henry L. Stimson, a very distinguished citizen of New York, a former Secretary of War, who has recently been appointed Governor General of the Philippines, unanimously confirmed by the Senate for that great office, to go to Nicaragua and try and settle the business. His coming was hailed with satisfaction and relief by Liberals and Conservatists alike. He succeeded in his mission. He brought about a settlement under which they are assured, for the first time in their history, of a really fair election in Nicaragua in this year.

Liberals are participating in the government as well as Conservatives. A nonpartisan constabulary, organized and officered by marine officers, has been established. The fighting of the two factions has ceased. Both sides have laid down and turned in their arms. The people have been returning to peaceful pursuits. Not only Moncada, the Liberal general in chief, but all the Liberal chieftains, except one Sandino, agree to and have abided by this settlement. Sandino broke away and with a small band has been terrorizing and keeping up a condition of guerilla warfare in the north near the Honduran border. The only war being waged in Nicaragua to-day is the combined effort of our marines and the newly organized constabulary to overcome Sandino. Notwithstanding Sandino's audacious enterprise, the prospect for a return to general peace is, I believe, Mr. Speaker, brighter than it has ever been before.

It is lamentable, terribly unfortunate, that this Sandino situation exists in Nicaragua to-day. That we should be obliged to risk and spend the lives of our brave marines in such an enterprise. But, on the other hand, the settlement effected by Mr. Stimson must be carried out. We must do our part to make it effective. Indeed, for one I feel that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle might be in better business than in attempting to harass and embarrass the administration of their country in coping with the very difficult and unavoidable present situation.

Mr. Speaker, rather than withdraw the marines at this time, which is apparently what our friends across the aisle are advocating, I feel that, in view of all that has occurred, peace must be restored in Nicaragua at whatever cost and maintained. Indeed, that we must see this Stimson settlement through, though the effort requires even more than the Marine Corps.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended one minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Suppose the Republic of Mexico should request the President of the United States to send our Army into Mexico to help him to preserve peace, to help him engage in war with another country—does the gentleman contend that the President of the United States would have that authority until Congress so directed him?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Of course, if it was to assist the President of Mexico to wage war with a foreign country; no. If it was a question of assisting the existing government in the maintenance and preservation of law and order, I believe it would be the right and duty of the President to acquiesce.

Mr. BEGG. President Wilson did that very thing.

Mr. BLANTON. No; President Wilson was protecting American life and property. Repeated acts of war constitute war. The President of the United States has no authority whatever to engage in war either with or against foreign countries until the Congress of the United States authorizes it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

REGINALD ETHELBERT MYRIE (S. DOC. NO. 32)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State regarding the claim presented by the Government of Great Britain on behalf of Mr. David S. Myrie for compensation on account of the death of his son, Reginald Ethelbert Myrie, in the Panama Canal Zone on February 5, 1921. I recommend that the Congress as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises authorize the appropriation of a sufficient amount to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF THE OCCUPATION OF VERA CRUZ, MEXICO (S. DOC. NO. 33)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of the claims arising out of the occupation of Vera Cruz, Mexico, by American forces in 1914, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to the President on February 5, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated February 6, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 49, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, a copy of which is furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

I renew the recommendation originally made by President Harding that in order to effect a settlement of these claims the Congress as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises authorize an appropriation in the sum of $45,518.69, and I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

CLAIM OF RICHARD L. SPRAGUE (S. DOC. NO. 35)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to the claim of Mr. Richard L. Sprague, American consul at Gibraltar, for reimbursement for expenses incurred by him in providing relief for the crew of the American steamer *Kanabec.* I recommend that the Congress authorize an appropriation and that an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 4, 1928.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR EXPLORATION OF THE ARCTIC REGION (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning the plans of the International Society for the Exploration of the Arctic Regions by Means of the Airship for the establishment of geophysical observations of the inner Arctic regions, toward the accomplishment of which the 19 governments whose countries are represented in the society have been requested to make an annual contribution for five years for required preparatory work, in accordance with a schedule furnished by the society and accompanying the report of the Secretary of State. The annual contribution requested of the United States is $300.

The attention of Congress is especially invited to the strong indorsements of this project given by the Secretary of the Navy, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the National Research Council, and the Carnegie Institution of Washington, as recited in the report of the Secretary of State.

In view of these favorable comments, and in conformity with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, I lay the matter before Congress for its determination whether it will authorize an annual appropriation of $300 for five years, as the contribution of the United States, on the condition that the other governments approached will also contribute the quotas assigned to them.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ROAD CONGRESSES (H. DOC. NO. 134)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing (1) the President to invite the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses to hold their sixth session in the United States, either in 1929 or 1930, as the association may determine, and (2) an appropriation of $25,000 for the expenses of such meeting, in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the president of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, who was a delegate on the part of the United States to the meeting of the permanent international commission of the association held in Paris in July, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

CLAIMS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 34)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of two claims presented by the Government of China against the Government of the United States arising out of the negligent or unlawful acts in China of persons connected with the military and naval forces of the United States, and I recommend that as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States an appropriation in the amount of $1,100 be made to effect settlement of these two claims, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE DISCOVERY OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 132)

The Speaker also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

At the request of the Governor of Hawaii, made through the Secretary of the Interior, in pursuance of a resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the draft of a joint resolution, attached to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, to authorize the President to invite the Government of Great Britain and the Governments of certain of the British Dominions to participate in the celebration at Honolulu of the sesquicentennial of the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands, and to provide for participation of the Government of the United States therein.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1928.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. GALLIVAN, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

WIDOWS' PENSIONS, WAR OF 1812

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill seeking to amend the pension laws with respect to Civil War widows. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have to-day introduced a bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 1, 1920, which section is a part of the act of May 1, 1920, granting pensions to Civil War soldiers and Civil War soldiers' widows, as well as to the widows of the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. The only changes that this bill makes in the present law are: First, where the present law provides that the widow must have married the soldier, sailor, or marine prior to June 27, 1905, in order to have a pensionable status, this bill changes that date from June 27, 1905, to June 27, 1915, which is the same date the Committee on Invalid Pensions uses in granting special acts.

I think this change should be made for the reason that there are many deserving cases where the widow married the soldier after June 27, 1905, and many cases are now being pensioned by special act that could be eliminated by the general law if this change were made. The second change is in the case of remarried widows. The present law provides that a remarried widow of a Civil War soldier is entitled to a pension—

if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage has, or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband, or husbands, or by a divorce without fault on the part of the wife.

The bill I have introduced, instead of using—

or by divorce without fault on the part of the wife—

uses the wording:

by divorce on any ground except adultery on the part of the wife.

This change is the exact wording of the act of May 1, 1926, applying to Spanish-American War widows. I see no reason why a Spanish-American widow should be pensioned under a more liberal law than a Civil War widow. And I see no reason why the same kind of a provision should not apply in both cases. I know of several cases in my own district where, in each case, a deserving widow has permitted a worthless husband to divorce her without her making an appearance in court and resisting the divorce suit, not knowing, at the time, the effect it would have on her application for pension, when, in fact, the widow could have secured the divorce had she made the application. As the present law now stands, reading—

without fault on the part of the wife—

the Pension Bureau has construed that law to mean that where the husband secured a divorce, the widow is not entitled to a pension; nor is she able to prove, under the rules of the Pension Bureau, that the divorce was granted without fault on her part. I think this is an important change that should be made in the present law. The third change that the proposed bill would make in the present law is the provision reading as follows:

Provided, however, That such widow as mentioned in this section, of any Civil War veteran, upon arriving at the age of 70 years, shall receive $40 per month, and upon arriving at the age of 75 years, shall receive $50 per month; *and provided further,* That such widow, as mentioned in this section, of any Civil War veteran shall not be entitled to such pension unless it be shown that she married such soldier, sailor, or mariner at least five years prior to his death, and lived and cohabited with him continuously from date of such marriage until the date of his death.

Everyone knows that a large majority of these Civil War widows are now past an age when they are able to earn a living for themselves, and many of them are helpless, and many are helpless and destitute. Everyone knows that a helpless and destitute widow can not live on $30 per month. These widows are passing away rapidly, at the rate of 19,000 a year, and it is only a matter of a few years until they will not need pen-

sions. The husbands of these widows came to the relief of this country at a time when the Government sorely needed their services. They offered all they had for the benefit of their country. I feel that the Government now owes a duty to these widows to provide the comforts of life for them the remainder of their days, and it is not doing so when it is simply making them the pitiful allowance of $30 per month. This proviso will be helpful to the widows and is liberal with the Government. Under this provision the Civil War widow would draw only the $30 until she arrives at the age of 70 years. She would then draw $40 until she arrives at the age of 75 years, and from that time on $50 per month. This provision also provides that in order for a widow to have a pensionable status under the provisions of this bill she must have married the soldier at least five years prior to his death and lived and cohabited with him continuously from the date of such marriage until the date of his death. Certainly this provision is not unfair to the Government. The last change in this bill is simply bringing the widow of a soldier of the War of 1812, and of the war with Mexico, up to $50 instead of $30 as now provided by law. I have been informed that there are over 7,000 bills for special acts for pensions and increases of pensions for these widows that have already been filed. I have filed a number myself that are deserving cases. It is a physical impossibility for the clerks of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to examine and pass on all of these claims during this session of Congress, and that means that many deserving cases will not be considered. This bill would provide for a majority of these cases. I believe a large majority of the Members of Congress are in favor of this bill or a similar bill. We owe a duty to these widows and to the country to enact some needed legislation along this line. Delay in this matter means that many deserving widows must suffer. I sincerely hope the Committee on Invalid Pensions will give early and favorable consideration to this bill or to a similar bill that will give relief to these widows who are entitled to receive such relief.

THE FEASIBILITY OF AMERICAN RAILROADS ENGAGING IN WORLD SHIPPING

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the merchant marine, and to include therein a statement by Mr. Hurley, a former member of the Shipping Board, bearing on the acquirement and operation by American railroads of ships to engage in foreign commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently urged the importance and advantage of connecting rail and ocean transportation, and the adoption of a uniform through export and import bill of lading between connecting rail and ocean carriers. I have also suggested the feasibility of United States railroads engaging in foreign ocean shipping. In a recent letter to the United States Shipping Board Hon. Edward N. Hurley, of Chicago, discussed this subject in a most illuminative manner. Mr. Hurley was the war-time chairman of the United States Shipping Board, has given a great deal of study to an American merchant marine, and has written several books upon this and kindred subjects.

Under leave granted to do so, I quote from Mr. Hurley's letter to the Shipping Board, as follows:

WHY RAILROADS SHOULD ENGAGE IN WORLD SHIPPING

As a manufacturer interested in overseas trade I wish to present some suggestions as to how our Government may be helpful in establishing a permanent merchant marine, which it must have if its industries are to meet the increasing competition for world trade and which also will help build up our national defense.

The railroads of our country are vitally interested in foreign trade, as by its increase or decrease their tonnage and earnings are directly affected. Ninety per cent of all passenger and freight business for overseas emanates from the interior and is carried to our ports by the railroads. I am submitting for your consideration further reasons why they should become engaged in overseas shipping in cooperation with our present privately owned shipping companies.

Railroads could become interested in our overseas shipping either directly by building and operating ships or indirectly through stock ownership in American shipping companies that are now carrying our foreign commerce.

There is no law prohibiting any railroad from owning or operating ships or from holding stock in shipping companies engaged in overseas business. Section 11 of the Panama Canal act, which prohibits railroads from owning and operating ships in intercoastal trade, should be repealed. If the railroads become engaged in world shipping, they should be allowed to participate in intercoastal traffic.

Freight rates on all ships engaged in the intercoastal business should be under the direction and control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The mid-west manufacturer feels that he is being discriminated against by his Government in being required to pay an excessive toll on his railroad freight to the Pacific coast as against his Atlantic coast competitor who ships goods by water through the Panama Canal at very low rates. The mid-west manufacturer has paid his share of the cost of building the canal and should not be penalized.

Some equitable adjustment of rates should be made by the Interstate Commerce Commission that would be fair to the mid-west manufacturers, the people on the Pacific coast, and the railroads and shipowners. Furthermore, the Shipping Board should not sell low-priced ships for intercoastal business, thus enabling purchasers to cut freight rates and further demoralize the coastwise business, thereby creating unfair competitive transportation conditions through a government-owned canal.

America is known as the land of efficiency. In no other industry is its efficiency so striking as in railroading. The railroads owe it to the public of America, to themselves, and their stockholders to extend this efficiency to ocean shipping. The vicissitudes of a hundred years of herculean struggles have built for them organizations capable of applying to shipping the efficiency which is needed and can be had by cooperating with the leaders of shipping companies now engaged in operating passenger and freight ships.

Congress and public opinion no longer frown upon amalgamations of railroads, as they did for 30 years. Railroads some years ago were forced to buy up competing water transportation routes on lakes and rivers. Those water lines in Northern States, to be sure, could operate only in summer, but that was enough to cripple railroad service by their competition and left the land lines to stagger under overload through the winter months. This practice grew on the meat which fed it, and the consequent abuses became offensive. The result was Federal control through the Interstate Commerce Commission and attendant legislation. Out of this grew coordination of rail and water transportation rates, with great advantages to the shippers by reason of through bills of lading, with apportionment of rate to each carrier, whether by land or water.

The opening of the Panama Canal has brought about serious competition in transcontinental business for the railroads. The appropriation of public moneys for the building of that waterway carried with it legislation calculated to guarantee this means of competitive ship and railroad operations, since railroads may not own coastwise tonnage. The Southern Pacific was allowed to retain its New York to New Orleans ship line as a feeder for its main line largely because that ship line was almost entirely built up with the support of the Southern Pacific rail lines.

Although the railroads are thus made keenly aware of the cheapness of water carriage as compared with land transportation, it is doubtful whether any railroad authority has ever made a real study of the relative costs. A freight vessel of 10,000 tons burden transports the equivalent of 10 full-size trainloads. It operates without the cost of franchise, capital charges for roadbed, right of way, signals, or heavy taxes paid to States.

A scientific study of the strategic value of steamship connections to the Southern Pacific might reveal some factors of the greatest importance to the officials and directors of our eastern and other trunk lines. But even more illuminating would be a study of the great trunk line operated by the Canadian Pacific. No railroad in America has made greater progress in a given period of its existence, and this in spite of the fact that this line traverses thousands of miles of almost uninhabited territory and but little developed land. Its vast fleets of great steamships plying on both the Pacific and the Atlantic have been no inconsiderable factor in this success. Its experience points an object lesson to other American railways.

Let us now consider some of the elements with respect to which the railroad as a steamship owner and operator may favorably affect the cost factor in ocean transportation. First of all, in the matter of freight solicitation: The Luckenbach Steamship Co. has made the statement that 22 per cent of its gross revenue is directly chargeable to the expense of solicitation. This ratio is verified by other steamship companies. Every railroad maintains solicitation agents in every city, town, and hamlet in its territory and the same facilities would serve to procure freight for steamship lines as well. The large trunk lines also maintain expensive offices in foreign countries, which offices might be similarly utilized without additional expense. As a matter of fact, these soliciting facilities already are engaged in helping steamship lines engage freight, in order that such freight may be routed by each line into its own terminals.

Fuel takes over 30 per cent of a steamer's gross revenue. Here, also, the railroads serving the territory where coal is produced would find an added revenue in their direct control of ocean carriers. Terminal facilities are maintained already by the trunk lines in every seaport which they enter; and in most cases these expensive terminal facilities are extended without charge to any steamship line which loads cargo moving over the railroad concerned, or which discharges there.

In a great many of our large ports, notably in New York, through which moves by far the largest volume of our foreign trade in manufactured goods, there is duplication of port facilities to an enormous extent. Both the steamship and railroad companies maintain expensive wharves and docks and both are served by harbor lighterage facilities valued at millions of dollars and adding frequently as much as $1 per ton to the cost of moving freight from one terminal to another. Much, if not all, of this duplication and excess expense could be eliminated by railroad ownership of steamship lines operating in foreign trade.

Absolute control of the cargo to its ultimate destination would enable the railroad in such ports as New York to eliminate a great deal of harbor expense, such as lighterage and towage. It would, furthermore, enable the road to avoid much car "lay up"—one of the most annoying expense items to every road. The coordination between rail and water carriage which would result from railroad ownership of strategic steamship lines would result not only in enormous savings to the railroads, but would serve to reduce the cumulative expense which shippers or consignees must eventually absorb.

The railroads have had a very expensive object lesson in the comparative cost of ocean transport as against rail carriage. Until quite recently rail carriers found that freight from points as far west as St. Paul, destined for the Pacific coast, was routed to the Atlantic seaboard for transshipment via intercoastal steamship lines through the Panama Canal. Obviously shippers and consignees did not reconcile themselves to the extra long period of transit without having a compensating advantage in greatly reduced freight costs. In other words, intercoastal steamship lines could, in effect, absorb the cost of a rail haul one-third to one-half as great as that on direct rail delivery, then make a water haul four times as long as the direct rail haul, and could still undercuote the railroads on their direct haul.

The chief factor contributing to this cheap transportation to the Pacific coast was the Panama Canal. Another factor was the building of our great war-time fleet—some fifteen hundred freight steamers having been built by the Government, a very large number of which have since passed into private hands. These steamers were sold at prices in some cases far less than the cost of a new locomotive. Many others are still available to private purchasers at similarly low prices, and a little foresight on the part of railroads will lead to an appreciation of the unique opportunity which awaits them.

The shipping act of 1920 mandates the Shipping Board to develop port facilities, with a view to the expansion of American commerce. Yet it is obvious that merely running steamers into and out of a port does not create commerce. The real creators of our commerce are the carriers which have made our ports. In the beginnings of our industrial expansion it was the Erie Canal which gave New York its first great impetus. It was a similar rivalry, so generated, which spurred the people of Baltimore to create and develop the Baltimore & Ohio Railway. It was the people of Philadelphia who gave the Pennsylvania system its first backing. New York holds its supremacy as a port largely because of the fact that four great trunk lines make that port their main terminal.

There are certain systems that enjoy a preferential position with regard to freight movements of goods entering into foreign commerce by reason of highly lucrative territory which they cover. These railroads could, with great profit to themselves and to the country, participate in the ownership of ocean tonnage. They could not only reduce costs, as above pointed out, but they could readjust their rate structures to meet the needs of exporters in certain highly competitive fields. Transportation could be made, as it were, an exportable commodity and be sold on a large scale and on a sound economic basis.

OPPORTUNITY RIPE FOR RAILROADS

The first American railroad in this country to give this subject the scientific inquiry and study which it deserves will grasp the opportunity to make itself the premier rail system of the Nation. It will attain the same relative preeminence which is enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific. Such a railroad will find on examination that construction costs in American shipyards are to-day from 25 to 35 per cent greater than costs in foreign yards. They will find also that the Government is not unwilling to sell good ocean-freight bottoms at a cost of about six to eight dollars per dead-weight ton—tonnage which would cost from six to eight times more if purchased in foreign or American yards. The railroad would thus have an initial capital cost well below its foreign competitors, being placed in a position of receiving an inducement in the form of low interest on capital charges.

Several railroad mergers already have been consummated, and plans for even greater amalgamations are now awaiting action by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Were one of these mergers to contemplate including in their unified ownership and control a substantial steamship operation for European service, there can be no doubt that it would prove of great interest to Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the public.

It is equally probable that the Panama Canal act prohibiting the operation of railroad-owned tonnage through that waterway would be repealed if it could be shown that the interests of the shippers and the public in general would be safeguarded, as they most assuredly can be. It is not less likely that the disruption of the intercoastal steamship conference—an event which is threatened momentarily—will eventually develop into a grave menace to the general freight-rate structure of the trunk lines of the country. If that occurred, it would set the roads back where they were 20 years ago and tend to undo a great deal of the enlightened legislative provision already made for sound transportation facilities and avoidance of friction with the public.

Railroad administrators surely must be aware of the delicate nature of their present status, and must realize that even a slight disturbance of that adjustment would be likely to cause the loss of almost all the ground that has been gained. A well-conceived project designed to bring about greater coordination of rail and water transportation facilities would be a most useful factor in serving to strengthen and conserve the impregnable position in which railroads are at last placed.

Doubtless there is little concerning railroad operation practice in Europe the study of which would serve to improve railroad efficiency in America; but Europeans can teach us much in the matter of eliminating the obstacles to close and effective cooperation between land and water carriers. Highly developed port and terminal facilities are made to serve jointly the railroads and steamship lines in all of the greatest ports of England and the Continent. Railroads in England control channel tonnage in trade with Ireland, Holland, France, and Belgium. The Swedish State railways and the Danish State railways control deep-water tonnage trading in the Baltic, all with advantage to the public and to themselves.

The past 15 years have witnessed a notable change in the manner of handling some of our basic commodities in foreign trade. The great industrial companies in America controlling oil, steel, sulphur, lumber, coal, nitrate, motors, fruit, sugar, etc., have acquired ocean shipping facilities operating in foreign trade as well as coastwise and intercoastal trade. These industrial companies sell water transportation on a wholesale basis, applying the same principle as is now so successfully used for mass production in manufacturing. However, this places the smaller manufacturers of such commodities as can not be so standardized or are not manufactured on a vast scale at a disadvantage with respect to deliveries in foreign markets.

This situation affords a strategic opportunity for the railroads to come to the relief of these small shippers and others who control no shipping of their own. By so doing they not only would materially advance their own interests, but they would render an important public service. If vast aggregations of capital centered in a single industrial enterprise may legitimately increase its control over foreign markets by engaging in the steamship business, why may not a railroad offer equal advantages to the thousands of smaller shippers on its line whose existence and prosperity are largely involved with the fortunes of the railroads?

It is pertinent to point out that this country has outgrown its swaddling clothes in the matter of international contacts. Twenty years ago only 5 per cent of our total production of all agricultural, manufactured, and mineral commodities entered into foreign trade, and of those the greater part was raw materials or food supplies. We are confronted to-day with the necessity of finding markets abroad for our manufactured goods in tremendous quantities, with a surplus which can not possibly be consumed at home. Industrial capacity already under power could produce an enormous exportable surplus. We are fast approaching the economic and industrial condition of such countries as England, Belgium, and Holland, of whose production from 50 to 75 per cent enters into foreign trade. It is that economic condition which has forced Great Britain to be a great sea power in respect of her transportation. The same is true of Germany.

A merchant marine has not been a real necessity to America in the past, but the time is not far ahead when the same forces which operated through the usual course of business expediency to encourage ship operation on the high seas in the nations of Europe, both great and small, will force American business to compete with the foreign fleets of the world. It will not be a matter of academic theory. It will come to us as it did to them—a matter of self-preservation and of sound business expediency. No set of men, no combination of interests, and no other organized enterprise is so well fitted to take up this task of transportation on the seven seas at this time as are our American railroads.

It is perhaps unbecoming to any steamship man to admit inefficiency in his own line of business; but the fact is that few if any steamship companies operating, whether in America or elsewhere in the world, ever have made a really scientific study of rate classification. A great deal of money is lost by steamship owners everywhere because they do not follow a sound and scientific system of rate making. It is a fact proven beyond hope of contradiction that American railway management, working in conjunction with the experts of the Interstate Commerce Commission, have developed the work of rate schedule making into an exact science. In this respect, also, the railroads can contribute much toward increasing net return from steamship operation.

In conclusion, and by way of summary, let me say:

American railroads may legitimately and with material advantage to themselves and to the Nation at large engage in the ocean steamship business for these following reasons:

First. American public policy no longer is inimical to a reasonable expansion of railroad activities beyond the immediate sphere of their present operations.

Second. Congress is correctly interpreting the temper of the American people with respect to amalgamations, toward a fair return on capital invested in railway enterprise, and any soundly conceived plan to make even more secure the prosperity of the railroads, while at the same time securing a more economic and efficient system of coordinating rail with water transportation.

Third. Railroad management and experience in efficient organization can bring to the steamship business in America a cost-reducing factor which is foreign to anything now known in American steamship experience.

Fourth. Any one of the great trunk lines, with vast terminal facilities in New York and other seaboard cities, can utilize such facilities through its own steamship operations with attendant savings to shippers and with profit to itself.

Fifth. By availing itself of the opportunity to purchase Government tonnage at prices so low as to be almost nominal, a railroad may very materially appreciate its capital structure and increase its earning power, with comparatively slight capital interest charges.

Sixth. By reason of the present political exigencies which demand the upbuilding of an American merchant marine and the maintenance of ship lines in foreign trade, a railroad engaging in such enterprise may fortify itself by gaining the support of Congress, of the executive branch of the Federal Government (and especially of the public and the Interstate Commerce Commission), not only with respect to such enterprise but in the matter of rail consolidations which may be linked up with the mergers.

Seventh. Finally, in view of the opening up of a new era with respect to foreign commerce expansion wherein the United States is certain to make pheonomenal strides in obtaining markets abroad for manufactures already being produced in very great excess of our own domestic demand, railroads are afforded an unique opportunity to gain the prestige and increased power which is certain to follow their more active and direct participation in international trade movements.

I wish to say that I am firm in the belief that participation by the railroads in the ownership and operation of our merchant fleet should be encouraged by the Shipping Board. If the railroad executives, directors, and their bankers will make a careful analysis of the amount of their passenger and freight traffic that now goes overseas, I am sure they will find that it is an important part of their present business, and any increase in overseas tonnage that might be brought about by railroad activity in owning and operating ships can result only in further increasing their business and earnings.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 5, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 5, 1928, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.—caucus room)

A meeting to hear William P. Wooten, chairman of the spillways board, and Col. Charles L. Potter, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and other members of the commissions discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Rear Admiral Magruder.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

257. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of receipts of Indian tribal funds, expenditures recommended therefrom by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of Indians, and estimates of amounts required to be expended under treaty stipulations and agreements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

258. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communication from the executive officer, Office of the Supervising Architect, Treasury Department, submitting a report of rental collections on account of public buildings and sites, privileges, and ground rent; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

259. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting detailed report of the expenditures under the appropriation "Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

260. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Raritan Bay and Raritan River, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

261. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1929 for publishing ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President, amounting to $2,000 (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

262. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1929 for the Bureau of Immigration, Department of Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, amounting to $235,000 (H. Doc. No. 129); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

263. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1929, to be immediately available, for the International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, relating to the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, $75,000 (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

264. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of claims arising out of damages to private property due to the operation of naval aircraft, which was ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid by the department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, from the appropriation "Aviation, Navy, 1927"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

265. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "for the relief of retired and transferred members of the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

266. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

267. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "to amend section 11 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled 'An act to provide for the creation, reorganization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve'"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

268. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to provide for the relief of the widow of Surg. Mervin W. Glover, United States Public Health Service, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

269. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of the seventh annual report of the Board of Actuaries containing a valuation of the assets and liabilities of the civil service retirement and disability fund and other information (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on the Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

270. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting summary of reports with a brief statement of the action of the department in respect to accidents sustained or caused by barges while in tow through the open sea during the fiscal year 1927; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

271. A letter from the Chairman of United States Shipping Board, transmitting report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement, from October 16, 1926, to October 15, 1927, by the United States Shipping Board and for the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7478. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHREVE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8269. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 242. A bill to amend section 90 of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize employment of additional civilian caretakers for National Guard organizations, under certain circumstances, in lieu of enlisted caretakers heretofore authorized; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 471. A bill to provide for an aircraft procurement board, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7008. A bill to authorize appropriations for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FURLOW: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7195. A bill to provide for the purchase of horses and mules for the Military Establishment; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 7203. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated; with amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7753. A bill to authorize the disbursement of and accounting for the appropriation, "Pay, etc., of the Army," as one fund, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FURLOW: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7937. A bill to authorize mapping agencies of the Government to assist in preparation of military maps; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MORIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8105. A bill to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors, United States Military Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 83. A bill to approve act No. 24 of the Session Laws of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within Hanapepe, in the district of Waimea, island and county of Kauai"; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 84. A bill to approve act 25 of the Session Laws of 1927 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within Waimea and Kekaha, in the district of Waimea, on the island and in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii"; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 340. A bill to authorize the incorporated town of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of an additional school building, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5575. A bill to amend the Hawaiian organic act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 7367 A bill to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Seward, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. J. Res. 99. A joint resolution for the relief of flood-stricken farm areas in the United States, with special reference to aid in the employment of county extension agents; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. J. Res. 112. A joint resolution to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended, to include poultry within their provisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 8126. A bill to repeal the last proviso of section 7 of "An act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park in the Territory of Alaska," approved February 26, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 6989. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission act, 1920, approved July 9, 1921, as amended by act of February 3, 1923; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6991. A bill authorizing the erection of a nonsectarian chapel at the Army medical center in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6094. A bill to amend section 7 of Public Act No. 45, entitled "An act authorizing the use for permanent construction at military posts of the proceeds from the sale of surplus War Department real property, and authorizing the sale of certain military reservations, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 854. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Stevens; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Richard Brannan; with amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1533. A bill for the relief of Theodore Herbert; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Daniel Mangan; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1970. A bill for the relief of Dennis Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2296. A bill to amend the military record of Robert Zink; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of Emile Genireux; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of John Jakes; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUGHES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Ella G. Richter, daughter of Henry W. Richter; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3166. A bill for the relief of Bert H. Libbey, alias Burt H. Libbey; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3241. A bill for the relief of Seymour Buckley; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Estle David; with amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3400. A bill to correct the military record of Andrew B. Ritter; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of George A. Winslow; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Giles Gordon; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3510. A bill to authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Capt. George E. Kraul a captain of Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920; without amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of James E. Westcott; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4079. A bill for the relief of William A. Hynes; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4080. A bill for the relief of William Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4104. A bill to correct the military record of James William Cole; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4168. A bill for the relief of John Strevy (deceased); without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4652. A bill for the relief of Charlie R. Pate; with an amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4654. A bill for the relief of Kennedy F. Foster; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4655. A bill for the relief of David E. Goodwin; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4660. A bill to correct the military record of Charles E. Lowe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4661. A bill to correct the military record of William Mullins; without amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4663. A bill authorizing the President to appoint J. H. S. Morison to the position and rank of major, Medical Corps, in the United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4902. A bill to correct the military record of Charles Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5228. A bill for the relief of Finas M. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5231. A bill to correct the military record of James Shook; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5232. A bill to correct the military record of Owen J. Owen; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5381. A bill to correct the military record of Thomas Spurrier; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5994. A bill for the relief of George C. Hussey; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6006. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Langan; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6007. A bill for the relief of John Magill; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6162. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6180. A bill for the relief of William H. Armstrong; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6185. A bill for the relief of Thomas Jefferson Shropshire; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Henry Shull; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6438. A bill for the relief of David Parrett; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Lasher, whose name appears in the Army records as Ralph C. Lasher; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1530. A bill to amend the military record of William F. Wheeler; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5380. A bill to correct the military record of G. W. Gilkison; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5383. A bill to correct the military record of John W. Siple; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 934) for the relief of Maurice J. Keegan; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1538) to amend the naval record of Walter Joseph Carroll; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2190) granting an honorable discharge to J. H. Hulse; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5215) for the relief of Frida Steen and Ingebright Steen; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1586) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Walters; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3285) granting a pension to Margaret J. Easterling; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7150) for the relief of John Aloysius Kelley; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 7503) granting an increase of pension to David Greene; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7663) granting an increase of pension to Michael H. Daly; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1410) granting a pension to Katherine H. Norwood; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3933) granting a pension to Anna L. Myers; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4941) granting a pension to Phoebe Snow; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7147) granting an increase of pension to Fidelin Brecette; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7168) granting a pension to Maud E. Sparks; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7169) granting a pension to Florence G. Melton; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7699) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Butler; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8183) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Dawson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of Claude Bell; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6700) for the relief of William Meyer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6896) for the relief of the Alaska Products Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 7383) for the relief of Charlotte Robenalt; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 7487) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Lawrence; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 7539) for the relief of William Roderick Dorsey; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 7775) for the relief of Sucs de L. Villamil & Co., of San Juan, P. R.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 7972) for the relief of Nicholas Andrew Brown; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 7976) for the relief of Mrs. Moore L. Henry; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 7979) for the relief of Bessie Greene; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8188) for the relief of Gilpin Construction Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Department of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 8270) to amend section 52 of the Judicial Code of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8271) permitting Indians of the Six Nations born in Canada to pass and repass the borders of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 8272) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce in foreign countries, and to encourage the industries in the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8273) to amend the act entitled "An act to admit to the United States, and to extend naturalization privileges to, alien veterans of the World War," approved May 26, 1926; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 8274) to provide for the acquisition of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Taos, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 8275) to authorize the erection of additional buildings to the United States Veterans' Bureau hospital at Fort Snelling, Minn., and to authorize the appropriation therefor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8276) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8277) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8278) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8279) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 8280) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the northwestern bands of Shoshone Indians may have against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ARENTZ (by request): A bill (H. R. 8281) to provide for the withdrawal of certain described lands in the State of Nevada for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Walker River Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8282) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands bordering on and adjacent ot Summit Lake, Nev., for the Paiute, Shoshone, and other Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8283) to enforce the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 8284) to authorize the payment of amounts appropriated by the Legislature of Alaska on account of additional duties imposed upon Territorial officials; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8285) to amend section 4 of the act of May 1, 1920, to revise and equalize rates of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the war with Mexico, to certain widows, including widows of the War of 1812, former widows, dependent parents, and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to certain Army nurses, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 8286) to authorize the sale of certain lands near Garden City, Kan.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 8287) granting the consent of Congress to Stranahan, Harris & Oatis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Ohio, and Edward Ball, of the county of Duval, State of Florida, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 8288) to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8289) to provide for bailiffs and criers of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 8290) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide revenue to regulate commerce in foreign countries, and to encourage the industries in the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 8291) to amend section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. p. 855), "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and the sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 8292) to reserve 120 acres on the public domain for the use and benefit of the Koosharem Band of Indians residing in the vicinity of Koosharem, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 8293) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8294) authorizing appropriation of funds for the construction of a highway from Red Lodge, Mont., to the boundary of the Yellowstone National Park near Cooke City, Mont.; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8295) for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 8296) to amend an act entitled "World War veterans' act, 1924," as amended, approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8297) to amend subsection B of section 302 of the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8298) authorizing acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8299) to provide for the acquisition, improvement, equipment, management, operation, maintenance, and disposition of a civil air field and any appurtenances, inclusive of repairs, lighting and communication systems, and all structures of any kind deemed necessary and useful in connection therewith; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8300) to provide for the acquisition, improvement, equipment, management, operation, maintenance, and disposition of a civil air field and any appurtenances, inclusive of repairs, lighting and communication systems, and all structures of any kind and deemed necessary and useful in connection therewith; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8301) to amend the act entitled, "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, approved July 3, 1926; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 8302) to authorize the issuance of patent for lands containing gold, silver, cinnabar, lead, tin, copper, or other valuable deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 8303) to amend section 200 of an act entitled "An act to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the laws affecting the establishment of the United States Veterans' Bureau and the administration of the war risk insurance act, as amended, and the vocational rehabilitation act, as amended," approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 8304) to establish a separate classification of mail matter and more equitable postal rates for books; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8305) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with Air Nitrates Corporation and American Cyanamid Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8306) to provide a complete code of insurance law for the District of Columbia (excepting marine insurance as now provided for by the act of March 4, 1922, and fraternal and benevolent insurance associations or orders as provided for by the act of March 3, 1901), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8307) to amend section 5 of the act approved June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 218), so as to authorize the sale of timber on class 3 of the Oregon & California Railroad and Coos Bay wagon-road grant lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 8308) to amend section 15 of the national defense act as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to provide a more equitable system of promotion for Army chaplains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8309) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," approved February 24, 1923; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8310) for the further protection of fish in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8311) to provide for the naming of a mountain or peak within the boundaries of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., in honor of Hon. John E. Raker, deceased; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8312) to amend the act of May 1, 1926 (title 38, secs. 364 to 364 (f), Appendix of the Code of the Laws of the United States of America); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8313) to provide further for the national security and defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 8314) to amend an act of Congress approved March 4, 1927 (Public, No. 795, 69th Cong.), to provide for appointment as warrant officers of the Regular Army of such persons as would have been eligible therefor but for the interruption of their status, caused by military service rendered by them as commissioned officers during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8315) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8316) for the relief of desert-land entrymen under the Crystal Lake Irrigated Lands Co., Jefferson County, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 8317) providing for a per capita payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8318) to promote civilization and self-support among the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, and to carry into effect the provisions of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. p. 642); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8319) providing for the purchase of certain inventions, designs, and methods of aircraft, aircraft parts, aeronautical and aviation technique of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of New York; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8320) providing for the purchase of certain inventions, designs, and methods of aircraft, aircraft parts, aeronautical and aviation technique of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of New York; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8321) to authorize the President of the United States to take temporary control of and operate anthracite and bituminous coal mines in certain emergencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8322) providing for the garnishment of and levy of execution on wages and salary of civil employees of the United States; to the Committee on the on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8323) to increase the salaries of the Assistant Attorneys General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8324) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, approved 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8325) to amend the World War veterans' act, approved June 7, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8326) to authorize the construction of a dormitory at Riverside Indian School at Anadarko, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8327) for the relief of certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps who were discharged because of misrepresentation of age; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8328) to aid the department memorial committee in the observance of Memorial Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8329) to provide further for the national security and defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8330) regulating the pay of reserve and National Guard officers when called to active duty; to the committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8331) authorizing all retired enlisted men who were on active-duty status during the period of the war with Germany and who did not serve as commissioned officers to be returned to the retired list and to receive the full pay and allowances of the grade they held during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8332) to authorize the transfer of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8333) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924, approved June 7, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8334) to authorize the installation of heating plants in Infantry barracks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8335) to authorize appropriations for conversion of barracks into officers' quarters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8336) to authorize appropriations for installing gas ranges and water heaters in officers' quarters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 8337) to amend the air mail act of February 2, 1925, as amended by the act of June 3, 1926; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 8338) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to relocate the submarine base which is now at New London, Conn.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8339) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to custody of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Minnesota, the bell formerly on the old cruiser *Minneapolis*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8340) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8341) to amend the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) to provide for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Second Pan American Conference on Highways at Rio de Janeiro; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine S–4 and upon the methods and appliances for the protection of submarines; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 124) to provide for the transfer of the submarine base from New London, Conn., to Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 125) for the appointment of Bruce J. Newlon, of Nebraska, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) providing for the cooperation of the United States in the Pacific Southwest Exposition in commemoration of the landing of the Spanish padres in the Pacific Southwest and the opening of the Long Beach, Calif., world port; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 127) directing the Department of Commerce to publish the names of heads of families returned at the Second, Third, and Fourth Censuses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM: Resolution (H. Res. 73) requesting the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House information concerning the recent fighting in the Republic of Nicaragua between the United States marines and hostile Nicaraguan forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOWLING: Resolution (H. Res. 74) to print 2,500 copies of the soil survey of Tallapoosa County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 75) to print 2,500 copies of the soil survey of Autauga County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution (H. Res. 76) that the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a committee to investigate the causes of the present soft-coal strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 77) in support of general tariff revision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 8342) granting a pension to Minnie M. Quick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 8343) granting a pension to William J. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 8344) granting a pension to Mary F. Van Ormer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 8345) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Ann McClain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8346) for the relief of Mary L. Spring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 8347) granting an increase of pension to Josephine L. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 8348) granting an increase of pension to Colin Houchin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8349) for the relief of the Waupaca Golf Club for the payment of illegal taxes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 8350) for the relief of H. V. Stovall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 8351) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Wing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8352) for the relief of Nicholas R. Snyder; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8353) granting a pension to Mary Trower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COHEN: A bill (H. R. 8354) granting a pension to Isaac Adler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8355) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hankey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8356) granting a pension to Catherine A. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8357) granting a pension to Rachel Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 8358) for the relief of the parents of Wyman Henry Beckstead; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8359) for the relief of Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 8360) granting a pension to Garrard Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 8361) granting a pension to William F. Mayers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8362) granting a pension to W. F. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8363) granting a pension to J. H. Woolsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8364) for the relief of Vito Basile; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8365) for the relief of Harry C. Hall; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8366) for the relief of Joseph Gottlieb; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8367) for the relief of Vercy A. Leadbitter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8368) for the relief of Ida M. Schreiner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8369) for the relief of Josephine Thibodeaux; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8370) for the relief of Jeremiah F. Mahoney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8371) for the relief of the heirs of John Buck; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8372) to authorize the appointment of Capt. M. M. Cloud, retired, to the grade of colonel, retired, with the pay of a major, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8373) granting an increase of pension to Florence Moseley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8374) granting an increase of pension to Madison M. Burnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8375) granting an increase of pension to Alice French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8376) granting an increase of pension to James F. Lyons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8377) granting an increase of pension to Evelyn G. Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to America Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 8379) granting a pension to John J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8380) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 8381) granting a pension to Peter R. Schug; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8382) for the relief of Edward J. Hughes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8383) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose J. Kuhlman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8384) granting an increase of pension to James Burns King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8385) granting a pension to Chester Leslie Dailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8386) granting an increase of pension to Inez B. Degler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 8387) granting a pension to Emma Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 8388) for the relief of Jennie Bruce Gallahan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 8389) granting a pension to James M. Deaton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8390) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8391) granting an increase of pension to Florence Brayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8392) for the relief of Helen Bernice Fronk; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8393) for the relief of William J. McCarthy; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8394) for the relief of Frank Topping and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8395) granting a pension to Ellen M. Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8396) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8397) granting an increase of pension to Florence B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8398) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Worrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8399) granting an increase of pension to Salina V. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Mrs. L. E. Burton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8401) for the relief of Jack Mattson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 8402) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 8403) granting an increase of pension to Fannie J. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 8404) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8405) granting an increase of pension to Malinda McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8406) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hollopeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8407) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 8408) granting an increase of pension to Mariah T. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 8409) granting a pension to Christina Hildinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8410) granting a pension to Laura Jane Chrysler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8411) granting a pension to Ellen Treadwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8412) granting a pension to Rose Lapier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 8413) granting a pension to Joseph N. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 8414) granting a pension to Daniel W. Tidmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 8415) for the relief of G. C. Clegg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8416) granting an increase of pension to Philippina Hopler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8417) granting an increase of pension to Mary Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8418) granting an increase of pension to Emily I. Lacey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8419) granting a pension to James C. Poinan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8420) granting an increase of pension to Cyathia Shuart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8421) granting a pension to Catherine A. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8422) granting an increase of pension to John E. Ray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8423) for the relief of Timothy Hanlon; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8424) granting a pension to Alice Jeannette Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 8425) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 8426) granting a pension to Martha E. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8427) granting an increase of pension to Maggie L. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8428) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Hay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8429) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8430) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 8431) granting a pension to Elizabeth Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 8432) granting a pension to Nola F. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8433) granting a pension to Fannie Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 8434) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. LeValley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8435) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8436) granting an increase of pension to Ida L. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 8437) granting a pension to Annie E. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8438) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 8439) granting a pension to Ada W. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 8440) for the relief of F. C. Wallace; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8441) for the relief of Edward Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8442) granting a pension to Patrick Lysaght; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 8443) for the relief of Joseph W. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8444) for the relief of Charles F. Getchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 8445) for the relief of Peter P. Cahill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8446) for the relief of John Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8447) for the relief of Agnes Loupinas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 8448) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hastrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 8449) granting a pension to Etta Horine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8450) granting a pension to Lucy A. Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8451) granting a pension to Sophie Witting Bridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8452) granting a pension to Kittie Bridge Guynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8453) granting a pension to W. L. Rudd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8454) granting a pension to Richard B. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 8455) for the relief of Mary Jane Perry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONAST: A bill (H. R. 8456) granting an increase of pension to Mary Spence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8457) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8458) granting a pension to Mattie J. Kirby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8459) granting an increase of pension to Jane Cattrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8460) granting a pension to Grant Cowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8461) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Schofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 8462) granting a pension to Mildred Griebel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 8463) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward I. Gallagher, of New York, administrator of the estate of Charles Gallagher, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of Raymond Nelson Hickman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8465) granting a pension to Cornelia Bronaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 8466) granting an increase of pension to Tillie Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8467) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Freeston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8468) granting a pension to Annie Hanes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8469) granting a pension to Beulah J. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8470) granting a pension to Andrew Heflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8471) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8472) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Sullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8473) granting a pension to Viola Crutchfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 8474) for the relief of Elmer J. Nead; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8475) granting a pension to Charity J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8476) granting an increase of pension to Florence Bogart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8477) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8478) granting a pension to Mollie Rambo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8479) granting a pension to Alfred C. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8480) granting a pension to Loyd C. Wolfe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8481) granting a pension to Laura Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8482) for the relief of the heirs of John V. Singer; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 8483) for the relief of Frank Wetyen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8484) for the relief of Henry Manske, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8485) granting a pension to Charles Osborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8486) for the relief of the estate of Franklin D. Clark; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 8487) to adjudicate the claims of homestead settlers on the drained Mud Lake bottom, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 8488) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Barnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8489) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8490) granting a pension to Henry G. Shelton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8491) for the relief of Frank R. Meadows and John L. McKown; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8492) authorizing the submission to the Court of Claims of the claims of sundry citizens of Idaho for damage sustained by reason of the overflow of their lands in connection with the construction of the reservoir to irrigate lands belonging to the Indians on the Fort Hall Reservation in Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8493) granting an increase of pension to Louise J. Covel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8494) granting an increase of pension to Dora A. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8495) granting a pension to Elmina Lalone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8496) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. Crozier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8497) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McCombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8498) granting a pension to Angelina Relation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8499) for the relief of Arthur C. Lueder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 8500) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Buckmaster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8501) granting a pension to W. F. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 8502) granting an increase of pension to Mary Flanigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Waugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8504) for the relief of A. E. Work; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 8505) granting a pension to May K. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to Addie Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8507) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8508) granting a pension to Frances Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 8509) for the relief of Albert O. Tucker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8510) granting an increase of pension to Anna K. Vibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 8511) for the relief of the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 8512) granting a pension to Archie Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 8513) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Lawwill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8514) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Burd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8515) for the relief of Helen Rixon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8516) granting a pension to Jacob Hindman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting a pension to Paralee Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 8518) for the relief of H. C. Lafferty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 8519) for the relief of A. N. Worstell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 8520) granting an increase of pension to Jennette Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of M. S. Mellett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8522) granting an increase of pension to Emilie Wesche; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) for the relief of Henry A. Bellows; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

418. Petition of the Maratime Co., Boston Mass., that Congress appoint a committee to adjust the war-debt claims of the Maratime Co. against the United States and Allies; to the Committee on War Claims.

419. Petition of city clerk of the city of Chicago, transmitting a resolution requesting amendment of the Volstead Act and taking of a referendum vote on the question of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

420. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of numerous residents of the city of Providence, R. I., against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

421. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of McPherson, Kans., to establish a national academy for training diplomats; to the Committee on Education.

422. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Mr. A. Roberts, 2118 Light Street, New York City, with other citizens, protesting against House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

423. Also, petition of Dennis Casey, of 159 East Sixtieth Street, New York City, in favor of repeal of national origins; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

424. Also, petition of Mr. S. MacDermott, a citizen residing at 159 East Sixtieth Street, New York City, who, with other petitioners of the United Irish-American Societies of New York, are in favor of repeal of the national-origin provision; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

425. Also, petition of Mr. A. L. Carlson, 1807 Antony Avenue, New York City, and 195 citizens of New York, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

426. Also, petition of Mr. S. Granquist, 268 East One hundred and eighty-first Street, New York City, and 165 other citizens of New York, protesting against Lankford Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

427. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of Walter Hard, Otto C. Bennett, and 32 other citizens of Manchester, Vt., urging that as the first amendment to the Constitution prohibits legislation enforcing observance of any religious institution, Congress is petitioned not to pass House bill 78, or any other national religious legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

428. By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of citizens of Shawano County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

429. Also, petition of citizens of Waupaca County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

430. Also, petition of citizens of Wood County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

431. Also, petition of citizens of Marathon County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

432. Also, petition of citizens of Waushara County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

433. By Mr. BROWNING: Protest against House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill that may have been introduced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

434. Also, petition of protest against House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any compulsory Sunday bills that may or have been introduced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

435. Also, protest against House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any compulsory Sunday observance bills that may have been introduced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

436. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of 136 citizens of Mecklenburg, Catawba, and Burke Counties, N. C., to Congress not to pass House bill 78 or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

437. By Mr. CARLEY: Petition of Mr. J. W. Sand, of 659 Fifty-first Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and 60 other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

438. Also, petition of Mr. O. J. Dahl, of 640 Fiftieth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and 120 other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

439. Also, petition of Mr. Hans P. Hansen, of 659 Fifty-first Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and 70 other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

440. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of certain residents of the first district of Wisconsin, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

441. By Mr. CORNING: Petition of sundry citizens of the city of Albany, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford bill, relating to Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

442. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Floyd C. Neal, of Akron, Mich., and 13 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

443. Also, petition of T. W. Starkey, of Caro, Mich., and 33 other residents of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

444. Also, petition of Rev. William Bekemeier, of Richville, Mich., and 88 other residents of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all religious laws favoring one day of the week in preference to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

445. Also, petition signed by 355 residents of Port Huron, Mich., and vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the committee on the District of Columbia.

446. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition made by citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., against compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

447. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78), made by the citizens of Canajoharie, N. Y.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

448. Also, petition made by citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., against compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

449. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of several thousand citizens of the third district of California, opposing the passage of House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

450. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

451. Also, petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

452. Also, petition of citizens of Lockport, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

453. Also, petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

454. By Mr. DE ROUEN: Petition of citizens of Vinton, La., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

455. Also, petition of citizens of Calcasieu Parish, La., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

456. Also, petition of citizens of De Quincey, La., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

457. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition protesting against the passage of legislation in behalf of compulsory Sunday observance, particularly House bill 78, by 39 residents of Archie, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

458. Also, petition of certain citizens of Ballard, Mo., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

459. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Shasta County, Calif., protesting against proposed legislation known as the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

460. Also, petition of citizens of Tehama County, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

461. Also, petition of citizens of Janesville, Susanville, Wendal, and Standish, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. Also, petition of the citizens of Camino, Placerville, Plymouth, and Folsom, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. Also, petition of the citizens of Esmeralda, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

464. Also, petition of citizens of Sutter Creek, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

465. Also, petition of the citizens of Ione and Jackson, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

466. Also, petition of citizens of Scott Bar and Fall River Mills, Calif., protesting against the proposed Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

467. Also, petition of citizens of Groveland, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

468. Also, petition of citizens of Jackson, Sutter Creek, Martell, Ione, and Lodi, Calif., protesting against proposed legislation known as the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

469. Also, petition of citizens of Garden Valley, Kelsey, Georgetown, Coloma, and Greenwood, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

470. Also, petition of citizens of Flournoy, Calif., protesting against legislation known as the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

471. Also, petition of citizens of Mount Shasta, Calif., protesting against proposed legislation known as the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

472. Also, petition of citizens of Red Bluff, Calif., protesting against legislation known as the Lankford Sunday bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

473. Also, petition of citizens of Lake City, Calif., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance legislation pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

474. Also, petition of citizens of Standish, Calif., protesting against the compulsory Sunday closing legislation pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

475. Also, petition of the California Development Association, favoring appropriation for the United States Geological Survey and the United States Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

476. Also, petition of the Placer County Chamber of Commerce, through its secretary-manager, Mr. P. N. Goss, pertaining to the resumption of hydraulic mining; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

477. Also, petition of the Placer County Chamber of Commerce, through its secretary-manager, Mr. P. B. Goss, pertaining to withdrawals of public lands and prohibiting mining thereon; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

478. Also, petition of the Placer County Chamber of Commerce, through its secretary, Mr. P. B. Goss, Roseville, Calif., pertaining to patenting of mineral-deposit land; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

479. Also, petition of the Placer County Chamber of Commerce, through its secretary-manager, P. B. Goss, Roseville, Calif., pertaining to the exemption of gold mining from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

480. Also, petition of the Placer County Chamber of Commerce, through its secretary-manager, P. B. Goss, Roseville, Calif., pertaining to increased appropriation for the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

481. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of A. L. Hall, William Busby, Warren Short, J. D. Boynton, H. D. Derrick, county attorney, C. W. Moore, and others, opposing Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

482. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of Ben Yotijo and approximately 50 others in opposition to compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

483. Also, petition of Mrs. Sarah J. Glover and approximately 30 others in opposition to compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

484. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of 36 citizens of Forbes, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

485. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 288 citizens of Montgomery County, Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, making Sunday observance compulsory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

486. Also, petition of 330 citizens of Montgomery County, Dayton, Ohio., praying for the defeat of House bill 78, making Sunday observance compulsory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

487. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Nez Perce County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

488. Also, petition of citizens of Latah County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

489. Also, petition of citizens of Lewis County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

490. Also, petition of citizens of Latah County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, and any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

491. Also, petition of 125 citizens of Washington, Adams, and Gem Counties, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78 or any compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

492. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Petition of residents of Foxboro, Mass., protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

493. Also, petition of residents of Brockton, Mass., protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

494. Also, petition of residents of Brockton, Mass., protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

495. By Mr. GARBER: Letter from F. Bucholz, sergeant, Troop A, Thirteenth Cavalry, Fort Riley, Kans., indorsing pending Army legislation known as the 25-year retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

496. Also, resolution of the Yuma Chamber of Commerce, Yuma, Ariz., indorsing the Swing-Johnson bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

497. Also, letter from the Scrivner-Stevens Co., wholesale grocers, Oklahoma City, Okla., indorsing the Capper-Kelly bill, known as the "fair trade act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

498. Also, petition protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, especially against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

499. Also, letter from James B. Macelwane, president of the Seismological Society of America, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1913 and House bill 7480; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

500. Also, petition of certain citizens of Major County, Okla., protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and especially against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

501. By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: Petition of Robert Snider, Tell City, Ind., and seven other adult citizens of Perry County, Ind., protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation on Sunday observance or any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath or Lord's Day or the adoption of any resolution or bill that will in any way give preference to one religion above another, but that the American principle of total separation between religion and the State may forever remain inviolable; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

502. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Falfurrias, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

503. Also, petition of citizens of State of Texas against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

504. Also, petition of citizens of Laredo, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

505. By Mr. GUYER: Petition of citizens of Franklin County, Kans., protesting the enactment of any Sunday observance legislation, and particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

506. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 78 citizens of Northwood and Nottingham, N. H., protesting against any legislation tending toward compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

507. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Petition of 98 citizens of North Dakota, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

508, 509. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of Tillamook and Lincoln Counties; West Springfield, Lane County; Cornelius; Grants Pass, Josephine, and Jackson Counties; Linn County; Marion County; Columbia County; Clackamas County; Milwaukie; Clatsop County; Washington County; Gaston, Washington County; Linn County; Oregon City, Clackamas County; Washington County; Toledo, Lincoln County; Linn County; Oregon City; Eugene, Lane County; Veronia; Newport, Buxton, and Washington County, all in the State of Oregon, opposing the Lankford Sunday bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

510. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of L. W. Adams and 35 other residents of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

511. Also, petition of T. J. Abraham and 69 other residents of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

512. Also, petition of James Fremire and 134 other residents of Eaton County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

513. Also, petition of Mrs. Howard Hill and 59 other residents of Branch County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

514. Also, petition of Roy C. Nelson and 231 other residents of Calhoun County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

515. Also, petition of G. Reefman and 29 other residents of Charlotte, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

516. Also, petition of W. F. Doons and 14 other residents of Calhoun County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

517. Also, petition of W. D. Parkhurst and 37 other residents of Somerset, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

518. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of representatives of American negro organizations and citizens for the sustaining of the entire Constitution of the United States and the enforcement of all of its provisions and laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of J. M. Osborn, W. C. Smith, Mrs. Olive Cockrell, John F. Yarbrough, Eunice West, Basil Payne, and many other citizens of Birmingham, Ala., in opposition to House bill 78, the District of Columbia Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

520. By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: Petition of A. B. Cook and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

521. By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Fountain Head, State of Tennessee, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

522. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of 49 citizens of Clarke County, Wash., opposing compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

523. Also, petition of 48 citizens of Toledo, Wash., opposing enactment of Sunday observance legislation; also 675 citizens of Centralia, Lewis County, Wash., opposing Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

524. Also, petitions of 408 citizens of Clarke County, Wash., opposing compulsory Sunday observance legislation; also, petition of 49 citizens of Mason and Grays Harbor Counties, Wash., opposing compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

525. Also, petitions of 95 citizens of Puget Island, 101 citizens of Cosmopolis, 144 citizens of Oakville, 44 citizens of Kalama, 84 citizens of Oakville, 56 citizens of Winlock, 111 citizens of Camas, and 93 citizens of Wahkiakum County, all in the State of Washington, opposing enactment of Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

526. Also, petition of 10 citizens of Vadar, Wash., opposing compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

527. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Lewis County, Wash., opposing compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

528. By Mr. KADING: Petition signed by 36 citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

529. Also, petition signed by 185 citizens of Sheboygan County, Wis., protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

530. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of citizens of New Boston, Ohio, against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

531. Also, petitions of citizens of Portsmouth, Ohio, against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

532. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Claribel Richtee and 11 other residents of Niles, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

533. Also, petition of Mr. K. L. Murphy and 83 other residents of Niles, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

534. Also, petition of Mr. Ben Meccia and 11 other residents of Benton Harbor, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

535. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. Contor and 13 other residents of Cassopolis, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

536. Also, petition of Mr. George Schruek and 16 other residents of Benton Harbor, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

537. Also, petition of Ella Dobberteen and 89 other residents of Sturgis, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

538. Also, petition of Mr. William Wilcox and 155 other residents of St. Joseph, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

539. Also, petition of Mr. Harry Chapman and 35 other residents of Bangor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

540. Also, petition of Mr. J. R. Tamer and 23 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

541. Also, petition of Mrs. Ida L. Brown and 11 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

542. Also, petition of Mr. James T. Henwood and 12 other residents of Van Buren County, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

543. Also, petition of Mr. W. C. Norris and 110 other residents of Hastings, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

544. Also, petition of Mr. H. C. Rowe and 100 other residents of Paw Paw, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

545. Also, petition of Mr. M. C. Haase and 15 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

546. Also, petition of Mr. Adam Gakley and 195 other residents of Allegan County, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

547. Also, petition of Mrs. Lillie Smith and 24 other residents of Hartford, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

548. Also, petition of Mr. Otis Landon and 52 other residents of Hastings, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

549. Also, petition of Mr. C. N. Keiser and 25 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

550. Also, petition of Mr. W. H. Wakeham and 138 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

551. Also, petition of Mr. M. Gettig and 29 other residents of Bangor, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

552. Also, petition of Frank Marker and three other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

553. Also, petition of Mr. J. B. McPherson and three other residents of Dowagiac, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

554. Also, petition of Louis Schultz and 10 other residents of Douglas, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

555. By Mr. KIESS: Petition from citizens of Potter County, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

556. Also, petitions from citizens of Potter and Tioga Counties, in Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

557. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of the John J. Dwyer Post, No. 261, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Long Island City, N. Y., protesting against any action which would amend section 202, paragraph No. 7, of the World War veterans' act of 1924, and known as the Ashurst tubercular amendment by Senator Ashurst, of Arizona; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

558. By Mr. KING: Petition from Col. L. W. Shepherd Post, No. 628, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, of Quincy, Ill., appealing to Congress asking increased pension rating to Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

559. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition signed by Mrs. Blanche Gorman, of Blackduck, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

560. Also, petition signed by Mary Drinkwine, of Staples, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

561. Also, petition signed by Mrs. G. C. Maddock, of Brainerd, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

562. Also, petition signed by Will Finn, of Sauk Center, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

563. Also, petition signed by B. W. Rantz, of Swanville, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

564. Also, petition signed by Anna E. Johnson, of Burtrum, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

565. Also, petition signed by C. H. Spute, of Glen, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

566. Also, petition signed by Allen Tope, of Eagle Bend, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

567. Also, petition signed by J. C. West, of Swanville, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

568. Also, petition signed by F. J. Courtright, of Staples, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

569. Also, petition signed by A. C. Hanson, of Wadena, Minn., and others protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

570. Also, petition signed by F. O. Gotvin, of Verndale, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

571. Also, petition signed by Dr. C. F. Reichelderfer, of Staples, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

572. Also, petition signed by Mrs. J. R. Wilson, of Becida, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

573. Also, petition signed by J. E. Manley, of Staples, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

574. Also, petition signed by Zella B. Ayer, of Pillager, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

575. Also, petition signed by Martha I. Gleason, of Remer, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

576. Also, petition signed by Mrs. George A. Albrecht, of Pillager, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

577. By Mr. KORELL: Petition of 1,374 citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the so-called Lankford Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

578. Also, petition of the eight Seventh-Day Adventist Churches of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the so-called Lankford Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

579. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of citizens of Framingham, Mass., indorsing bill for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

580. Also, petition of residents of Natick, Framingham, Wrentham, Walpole, Norfolk, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, relating to Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

581. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of James Madison Council, No. 73, of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of the State of New York (Inc.), in meeting assembled at Buffalo, N. Y., on December 12, 1927, demanding the registration of all aliens in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

582. By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: Petitions of citizens of Greene County, Mo., protesting against the passage of legislation providing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

583. Also, petition of certain citizens of Saline County, Mo., asking that soldiers who served 90 days or more in the Missouri Enrolled Militia be given a pensionable status; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

584. Also, petitions of a number of citizens of Saline County, Mo., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

585. Also, petitions of a number of citizens of Sedalia, Pettis County, Mo., urging the enactment of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

586. Also, petition of a number of citizens of Odessa, Lafayette County, Mo., urging the enactment of legislation granting increases of pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

587. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of numerous adult residents of Coopersville, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any other similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

588. Also, petition of numerous adult citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any other legislation of a similar nature; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

589. Also, petition of numerous adult residents of Grand Rapids, Grandville, Jenison, McBrides, and Ionia, Mich., protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

590. By Mr. MEAD: petition of numerous citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

591. By Mr. MONAST: Petition of numerous residents of Pawtucket, R. I., against Sunday compulsory observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

592. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

593. Also, petition of citizens of Roswell, N. Mex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

594. Also, petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against (House bill 78) compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

595. Also, petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

596. Also, petition of citizens of San Marcial, N. Mex., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

597. Also, petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

598. By Mr. NEWTON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

599. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Exchange Club, of Woodhaven, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds to provide adequate and proper housing for the officers and enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Appropriations.

600. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., favoring an amendment to the Volstead Act for the sale, manufacture, and transportation of light wines and beers for beverage purposes, and to provide for a referendum vote of the people to establish the sentiment of the majority on the question of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

601. Also, petition of the Hazard Wire Rope Co., of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 5772; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

602. Also, petition of Edward Danielson and Lillian Danielson, of 414 Lincoln Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., and 197 other citizens of Brooklyn and Long Island, opposing the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

603. By Mr. RAINEY: Resolutions adopted by White Hall (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce favoring flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

604. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of residents of Delevan, N. Y., also petition of residents of Randolph, Cuba, Westfield, East Randolph, Ashville, Salamanca, Maple Springs, Silver Creek, Steamburg, Stockton, Allegany, Olean, and Jamestown, all in the State of New York, opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

605. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of citizens of the city of Lowell, Mr. Osborne L. Smith and others, against compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

606. Also, petition of citizens of the city of Lowell, Mr. Henry A. Derby and others, against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

607. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of L. E. Proffer and others, of Unionville, Mo., protesting against the imposition of a tax on Chautauqua season tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

608. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of Mrs. Mary Simmons and numerous other citizens of Terrell, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

609. By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: Protest against House bill 78, signed by 2,000 men and women of Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

610. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of 13 residents of Alvarado, Minn., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or of any other compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

611. Also, petition of 47 residents of Underwood, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

612. Also, petition of 13 residents of Alvarado, Minn., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or of any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

613. Also, petition of 67 residents of Bluffton and New York Mills, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

614. Also, petition of 44 residents of Barnesville and Downer, Minn., protesting against passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

615. Also, petition of 29 residents of New York Mills, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

616. Also, petition of 44 residents of Barnesville and Downer, Minn., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

617. Also, petition of 29 residents of New York Mills, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

618. Also, petition of 67 residents of Bluffton and New York Mills, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

619. Also, petition of 89 adult residents of Barnesville, Minn., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

620. Also, petition of 67 adult residents of Hazel, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

621. Also, petition of 47 adult residents of Underwood, Minn., protesting against the passage of Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

622. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petitions of numerous citizens of Beach, Williston, Ray, Glenburn, Crosby, Bowbells, Judson, Portal, Minot, Brisbane, Hamlet, Wildrose, McGregor, Corinth, Wheelock, Amidon, Midway, Sentinel Butte, Max, Tolley, Croff, Berg, Watford City, Van Hook, Belfield, Zenith, Surrey, Butte, Ruso, Kermit, Epping, Ambrose, Spring Brook, Grassy Butte, N. Dak.; Watauga, S. Dak.; and Fairview, Mont., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

623. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of numerous citizens of Umatilla County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

624. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Deschutes County, Oreg., protesting against enactment of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

625. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

626. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Baker and Baker County, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78 or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

627. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Umapine and Freewater, Oreg., and Touchet, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

628. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Milton-Freewater, Oreg., protesting against enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and especially protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

629. Also, petition of 64 citizens of Sisters, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78 or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

630. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Lonerock, Oreg., protesting against enactment by Congress of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

631. By Mr. SMITH: Resolution of Pocatello Post, No. 4, the American Legion, Pocatello, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the conveyance of land in the Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho, to the United States Veterans' Bureau and to the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

632. Also, petition signed by A. E. Lindsey, jr., and 215 other residents of Ada County, Idaho, protesting against the enact-

ment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

633. Also, petition signed by A. M. Lambson and 16 other residents of Custer County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

634. Also, petition signed by Fred J. Petersen and 22 other residents of Bannock County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

635. Also, petition signed by G. S. Garner and 44 other residents of Camas County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

636. Also, petition signed by C. D. Freeman and 111 other residents of Jerome County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

637. Also, petition signed by W. R. Sprecher and 139 other residents of Twin Falls County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compusory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

638. Also, petition signed by C. W. Bruce and 73 other residents of Idaho Falls, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

639. Also, petition signed by C. N. Shelton and 135 other residents of Pocatello, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

640. Also, petition signed by Jim Ladd and 72 other residents of Mountain Home, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

641. Also, petition signed by W. E. Miller and 65 other residents of Blaine and Lincoln Counties, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

642. Also, resolution passed by the Blaine County Post, No. 24, American Legion, indorsing the bill (H. R. 320) providing for the establishment of a permanent United States Veterans' Bureau hospital at Boise, Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

643. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Reve J. Coppard and 45 other residents of Bancroft and Soda Springs, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

644. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of citizens of North Bangor, N. Y., protesting against Lankford bill (H. R. 78)—Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

645. Also, petition of various citizens of Potsdam, protesting against Lankford bill (H. R. 78)—Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

646. Also, petition of various citizens of Saranac Lake; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

647. By Mr. STEELE: Petition of 30 citizens of Lithia Springs, Douglas County, Ga., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

648. Also, petition of 140 citizens of the city of Atlanta and Fulton County, Ga., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

649. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Indiana, Pa., and vicinity, opposed to the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

650. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Mr. Albert Beck and others, of Granger, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

651. Also, petition signed by Mrs. M. T. Taylor and others, of Granger, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

652. Also, petition signed by O. W. Burnell and others, of Grandview, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

653. Also, petition signed by Mrs. N. Southworth and others, of Palouse, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

654. Also, petition signed by Harold Silke and others, of Sunnyside, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

655. Also, petition signed by Mr. A. B. Bruner and others, of Granger, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

656. Also, petition signed by George Blystone and others, of Yakima, Wash., protesting against enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

657. Also, petition signed by Mr. J. C. Christensen and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

658. Also, petition signed by Mr. Glenn J. Heagy and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

659. Also, petition signed by Sam L. Staley and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

660. Also, petition signed by Mrs. O. H. Stump and others, of Granger, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

661. Also, petition signed by John Wilcox and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

662. Also, petition signed by J. H. Kinney and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

663. Also, petition signed by Miss Milly Lynd and others, of Whitman County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

664. Also, petition signed by John W. Foster and others, of Wapato, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

665. Also, petition signed by A. D. Robinson and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

666. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from citizens of Garfield County, Colo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

667. Also, petition from the citizens of Rifle, Colo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

668. Also, petition from citizens of Grand Valley, Colo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

669. Also, petition from citizens of Glenwood Springs, Colo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

670. Also, petition from the citizens of Collbran, Colo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

671. Also, petition from the citizens of Delta, Colo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

672. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Van Wert County, protesting passage of House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

673. Also, petition of citizens of Liberty Center, Ohio, protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

674. Also, petition of 74 citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, protesting passage of the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

675. Also, petition against discrimination in tax bill against chautauqua season-ticket purchasers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

676. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of Conway, Mass., against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

677. By Mr. WARE: Petition of citizens of Covington, Kenton County, Ky., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

678. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of Alice A. Carleton, secretary of Tabernacle Church, and 930 other residents of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the passage

of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

679. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: Petition of W. A. Burton, Fannie Bell, S. Yarbrouh, Mr. and Mrs. F. O. Springer, Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Fitzwater, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Leonard, jr., Mrs. Ella Smith, Mrs. F. E. Watson, Hy. Howell, John Ramo, and Gideon Hinkle, in opposition to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

680. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Bell, Mrs. Minnie Thomas, Mrs. Ethel Manken, Mrs. Geneva Manken, et al., in opposition to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

681. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by Wilson Janis and other residents of Kyle, S. Dak., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

682. Also, petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by F. B. Sherwood and other residents of Cottonwood, S. Dak., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

683. Also, petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by Stanley Beck and other residents of Wasta, S. Dak., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

684. Also, petition of numerous citizens of McLaughlin, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; also petition of numerous citizens of Perkins County, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

685. Also, petition of certain residents of Lead and Central City, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

686. Also, petition of certain residents of Lawrence County, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

687. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of certain citizens of Little River County, Ark., against enactment of any Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

688. By Mr. WOOD: Petition signed by residents of Tippecanoe County, Ind., protesting against the adoption by Congress of the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

689. By Mr. WURZBACH: Petition of Pauline Montimore, and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 (compulsory Sunday observance bill); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

690. Also, petition of Thomas J. Dilwood and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 (compulsory Sunday observance bill); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

691. Also, petition of Thos. P. Hamm, Mrs. P. E. Carter, and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 (compulsory Sunday observance bill); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

692. Also, petition of Blanche Ricker, D. H. Howell, A. Haughton, and other citizens, of Corpus Christi, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

693. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Charles W. Stultz, Herman Barkdall, and others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

694. Also, petition of John H. C. Smith, Charles R. Smith, Amos Hurd, and others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

695. Also, petition of C. C. Colliflower, Martha Williams, Nelia Glenn, and others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, *January 5, 1928*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning, send out Thy light and Thy truth that they may lead us. As the duties of another day await us we would thank Thee for Thy loving care of us, for Thy gifts of health and strength, and for the companionship of friends with minds made reverent by honest thought. Give us new hopes and cares which may supplant our own too small concerns. Make us too great for narrow creeds of right and wrong, which fade before our unslaked thirst for good, and grant us peace serene, through Him who is the Prince of Peace, our Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dill	King	Sackett
Barkley	Edge	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	McKellar	Shipstead
Bingham	Fess	McLean	Shortridge
Black	Fletcher	McMaster	Smoot
Blaine	Frazier	McNary	Steck
Blease	George	Mayfield	Steiwer
Borah	Gerry	Metcalf	Swanson
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Thomas
Brookhart	Greene	Neely	Tydings
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Tyson
Bruce	Harris	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hayden	Overman	Waterman
Couzens	Heflin	Pine	Watson
Curtis	Howell	Pittman	Wheeler
Cutting	Johnson	Ransdell	Willis
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	
Deneen	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is but one measure on the calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to that arrangement, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE OF COMMERCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the general secretary of the International Parliamentary Conference of Commerce, dated Brussels, November 1, 1927, inviting Congress to be represented at the fourteeenth general assembly of the conference to be held on the 19th of June next and following days at the Palais du Sénat, at Paris, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter of congratulation from the presiding officer of the Hungarian Parliament with respect to the transatlantic flight of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State relative to suggestion of candidates for the Nobel peace prize to be laid before the Nobel committee of the Norwegian Parliament, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with an accompanying report of withdrawals and restorations of public lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil-service retirement and disability fund, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PURCHASE OF DESIGNS, AIRCRAFT, AIRCRAFT PARTS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, the price paid therefor, the

reason for the award in each case, and the names and addresses of all competitors in the various competitions held by the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the joint committee's operations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

OFFICERS DELINQUENT IN RENDERING ACCOUNTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the Comptroller General of the United States, submitted pursuant to law, showing officers who were delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts to the proper offices in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, the cause therefor and whether the delinquency was waived, together with a list of such officers who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SETTLEMENT OF SHIPPING BOARD CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement from October 16, 1926, to October 15, 1927, by the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

P. L. ANDREWS CORPORATION *v.* THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 38)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion filed by the court in the cause of the P. L. Andrews Corporation *v.* The United States, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. McLEAN presented the following joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Joint Resolution 36, requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates

Resolved by this assembly—

Whereas by the provisions of the Federal revenue act of 1926, which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, this State is being subjected to a form of coercion in order to compel the imposition of State death taxes at rates higher than its citizens desire to impose upon themselves for their own needs and benefit; and

Whereas any form of coercion, or financial inducement to States, by Federal authority is in distinct conflict with the spirit of our constitutional government, is offensive to sound policy, and is destructive of the responsibility of citizens and of States with respect to the power to levy taxes, the most vital of the powers which inhere in government; and

Whereas joint levies of taxes by the Federal Government on the one hand and by the States of the Union on the other hand, are unprecedented in the history of this country, and are particularly offensive when the Federal enactment operates in any way to influence or control the exercise of sovereignty by the respective States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the judgment of the general assembly that the Congress of the United States should forthwith repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, leaving this field of taxation exclusively to the States of the Union in times of peace; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States, and they are hereby requested to spread these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to select such other means as may be appropriate to apprise the Senators and Representatives of other States of the contents hereof.

Approved April 29, 1927.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Office of the Secretary, ss:

I, Francis A. Pallotti, secretary of the State of Connecticut, and keeper of the seal thereof, and of the original record of the acts and resolutions of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of the resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates with the original record of the same now remaining in this office, and have found the said copy to be a correct and complete transcript thereof.

And I further certify that the said original record is a public record of the said State of Connecticut, now remaining in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 22d day of November, 1927.

[SEAL.] FRANCIS A. PALLOTTI, *Secretary.*

Mr. McLEAN also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Greenwich, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation prohibiting the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from Nathan Hale Camp, No. 1, and Admiral Foote Camp, No. 17, both Sons of Veterans, U. S. A., of New Haven, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation to transform the old Ford Theater, in the city of Washington, into a museum to house the Lincoln relics recently purchased by the Government, and to provide a meeting place for the Grand Army of the Republic and its auxiliary organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of Hartford, New Haven, and New London, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation restoring to the medical profession the right to prescribe any form of intoxicating liquor to patients and in any quantity which their professional judgment may dictate, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GREENE presented resolutions adopted by the board of selectmen of the town of Alburg, Vt., favoring the passage of legislation authorizing the construction and operation by the Gulf Coast Properties (Inc.) of a bridge across Lake Champlain, connecting the towns of Alburg, Vt., and Rouses Point, N. Y., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Seattle, Wash., praying for the repeal of the United States marine inspection laws controlling the operation of steam vessels, their captains and crews, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ferndale and King County, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION OF WATERSHEDS OF NAVIGABLE STREAMS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read from the clerk's desk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a telegram, to which I would like the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. MCNARY].

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *January 4, 1928—10.40 p. m.*

Senator M. M. NEELY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our organization has previously indorsed the McNary-Woodruff bill, which comes up before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to-day. This means much to West Virginia. The Monongahela National Forest will benefit. We urge that you see that this communication is placed in the hands of the committee to-day to be placed on record.

THOMAS W. SKUCE,

Secretary West Virginia Association of Foresters.

THE DIRECT-PRIMARY SYSTEM

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the National Grange at its recent annual convention, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted at the annual convention of the National Grange, Cleveland, Ohio, November 17, 1927

Whereas the enemies of popular government have for years been making a nation-wide campaign to discredit and repeal the direct-primary system of making nominations for public office; and

Whereas there is no argument against the primary system that can not be used with equal force against our system of conducting general elections: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange in session at Cleveland, believing in the fundamental principles of Americanism, pledges its hearty support to the maintenance of the primary system.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. EDGE, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to which was referred the bill (S. 1946) relative to the pay of certain retired warrant officers and enlisted men and warrant officers and enlisted men of the reserve forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, fixed under the terms of the Panama Canal act, as amended, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1256) to amend the Penal Code of the Canal Zone, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 8) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 21, 1927, that committee presented to the President of the United States an enrolled bill and enrolled joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220);

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2256) authorizing the President to order Clifton E. High, late first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army, before a retiring board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 2257) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 2258) to give war-time rank to certain officers on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILL (by request):

A bill (S. 2259) granting first preference to World War veterans in all departments of the Government; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2260) granting a pension to Peter Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2261) for the relief of Edna B. Erskine;

A bill (S. 2262) to refund $927 to the Architectural League of New York;

A bill (S. 2263) for the relief of A. R. Free; and

A bill (S. 2264) for the relief of Ollie Keeley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2265) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bruno; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2266) to amend an act entitled "An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2267) authorizing the granting of pensions to dependents of the officers and men who lost their lives by the sinking of the United States submarines *S–51* and *S–4* in twice the amount due under existing law in each case; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2268) for the relief of William Zeiss, administrator of William B. Reaney, survivor of Thomas Reaney and Samuel Archbold; and

A bill (S. 2269) for the relief of Alice Hipkins; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2270) granting an increase of pension to Carrie E. Costinett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2271) to permit the admission, as nonquota immigrants, of certain alien wives and children of United States citizens; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2272) to amend section 4132, as amended, of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PINE:

A bill (S. 2273) to refer the claims of the loyal Creek Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2274) for the relief of William H. Chambliss; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2275) granting compensation to Wallace B. Bogart; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (2276) authorizing the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a national home for soldiers and sailors of all wars; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2277) relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 2278) to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers and real-estate salesmen; to create a real-estate commission in the District of Columbia, and to provide a penalty for a violation of the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2279) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in the city of Bismarck, Burleigh County, N. Dak., for Indian school purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2280) to authorize the coinage of Longfellow 1-cent pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2281) granting a pension to Imogene Ellsworth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2282) granting a pension to Mary E. Truesdale (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2283) for the relief of Belle Piper Miller; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOULD:

A bill (S. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Thurston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2285) granting a pension to August Rieke (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2286) granting a pension to Frank Schwartz (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2287) granting a pension to Hannah Case (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2288) authorizing the payment of war-risk insurance to Bertha M. Smith; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2289) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Minnesota, the bell formerly on the old cruiser *Minneapolis;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2290) for the relief of Regina Schoor; and

A bill (S. 2291) for the relief of certain seamen who are judgment creditors of the Black Star Line (Inc.) for wages earned; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2292) providing for the employment of certain civilian assistants in the office of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and fixing salaries of certain officials; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 2293) to authorize the construction of a George Rogers Clark Memorial Lighthouse on the Ohio River at, or adjacent to, the city of Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2294) to amend the first paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLEASE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to prohibit the intermarriage of certain races; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FESS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) authorizing an additional appropriation to be used for the memorial building provided for by a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution in relation to a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States of America, its insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War," approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to take action relative to adjustment of freight rates upon export grain and grain products moved by common carriers subject to the interstate commerce act, and the fixing of rates and charges; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. CAPPER, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1706) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRAZIER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $15,000 for the relief of distress among the needy Indians of the Turtle Mountain Band, North Dakota, intended to be proposed by him to the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1929, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. WHEELER. I send to the desk a resolution and ask that the clerk may read it.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 102), as follows:

Whereas the executive branches of this Government have been and are now carrying on a war in Nicaragua without the Congress of the United States first having declared war as is provided by the provisions of Article I of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas American boys connected with the Marine Corps of this Government are being killed in said warfare so being made and carried on in violation of the Constitution because of mismanagement and inadequate protection being afforded them; and

Whereas it is claimed by the executive branches of our Government that said boys are in Nicaragua to protect American investments and concessions in said country; and

Whereas the claim has been made that some of the investments are based on concessions obtained by questionable and unconscionable methods owing to the lack of capital in the Republic of Nicaragua; and

Whereas such investments and concessions, if unjust in their terms endanger legitimate business not only in Nicaragua but in other foreign countries; and

Whereas American investments abroad, already amounting to many billions of dollars, are increasing rapidly and controversies regarding the rights and duties of holders of such concessions constitute an increasingly important part of our foreign relations and produce tensions which may easily lead to war; and

Whereas statements purporting to be issued by the executive branches of our Government, or by the spokesman for the White House, were published in the newspapers of the country to the effect that our armed forces in Nicaragua were to be strictly neutral as between the contending forces in that country; and

Whereas subsequent events clearly show that our armed forces have not acted as neutrals but have taken an active part in a controversy wholly within and affecting solely the rights of the people of a friendly nation in defiance of every fundamental principal upon which this Government was founded: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to investigate the terms and conditions under which concessions have been procured in Nicaragua by United States citizens and by corporations and other associations in which United States citizens are financially interested, and the nature and extent of such concessions, with particular reference to (1) the source and sanction of such concessions, and (2) the principal aspects of public policy involved in the treatment, as property rights for purposes of diplomatic protection of such concessions.

Resolved further, That the said Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to investigate who ordered the marines to be sent to Nicaragua, why they were sent there, why they have been kept there, why they have not acted as neutrals, whether or not it is the purpose of the executive branches of our Government to continue to usurp the power of Congress given it by the Constitution of the United States, namely, the power to declare war, and any other matter or thing which to the committee or a subcommittee thereof may seem meet and proper in the premises.

For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of such committee or subcommittee shall not exceed $30,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee. Such committee or subcommittee shall make a final report to the Senate as to its findings.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations at this time, but I give notice that at a later date I shall have something further to say concerning the resolution and the situation in Nicaragua.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JANIE HARRIS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 103), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Janie Harris, widow of Albert Harris, late a waiter in the employ of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 104), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words; to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—CHESTER R. HOPPER

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to return to Chester R. Hopper the affidavits and papers filed by him in connection with the bill for his relief, being the bill (S. 1009) granting a pension to Chester R. Hopper, which failed of passage in the Sixty-ninth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions and act:

On December 21, 1927:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

On December 27, 1927:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220).

CLAIM OF NORWAY FOR REPRESENTATION OF AMERICAN INTERESTS IN MOSCOW (S. DOC. NO. 37)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway for the payment of interest on certain sums advanced by it for this Government in connection with its representation of American interests in Moscow, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 5, 1928.*

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL DAIRY CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 36)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State concerning participation by the Government of the United States in the Eighth International Dairy Congress, which will be held in Great Britain in June–July, 1928, under the patronage of His Majesty King George V.

Concurring in the view of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture, as stated in the report, I request of Congress legislation authorizing acceptance of the invitation of the British Government to the Government of the United States to appoint delegates to that congress, and an appropriation of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses of delegates.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 5, 1928.*

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] has asked to be relieved from further service upon the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions. I ask that an order to that effect may be entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] may be assigned to service upon the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also ask that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] may be assigned to the minority vacancy upon the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] asks to be relieved from further service upon the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] be assigned to the minority vacancy upon the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be assigned to the minority vacancy upon the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] be assigned to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TARIFF

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. MCMASTER on December 13, 1927, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Senate favors an immediate lowering of tariff schedules, and tariff legislation, embodying lowered schedules, should be considered and enacted during the present session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over until Monday without prejudice, and that it be taken up Monday for disposition.

Mr. MCMASTER. Mr. President, I will say in regard to the request of the Senator from Kansas that a number of Senators who are interested in the resolution deem it advisable that it shall go over until Monday. Therefore, I gladly accede to the request of the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARTICLE BY HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is an article in Current History for September, 1927, written by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], entitled "Dollar diplomacy in Latin America," which shows a great deal of research and gives a great deal of valuable information. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

"DOLLAR DIPLOMACY" IN LATIN AMERICA

By HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate

The Monroe doctrine is dead, and has been dead for many years. It lived only as long as its original spirit was followed. That spirit was the protection of human liberty. It was departed from by the United States in her policy toward Latin America fully 25 years ago. To-day the Monroe doctrine remains only as a diplomatic subterfuge. Its ideals are being used as a cloak to cover acts subversive of human liberty and contrary to the institutions and traditions of our Nation.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century new political principles were challenging the existing order of society. The thirteen American Colonies had revolted against the European monarchical system; the French Revolution had thrown down a firebrand into the heart of Europe itself; and in Central and South America republicanism was advancing by leaps and bounds. This new confession of political faith which was overturning the world was best expressed in our great Declaration of Independence, wherein it is stated that we dedicate ourselves and the soil of America to the principle that governments receive their powers "only from the consent of the governed."

The treaty of the Holy Alliance had been signed by the leading monarchs of Europe with the main objective of building a barricade against the spread of this new theory of government. President Monroe and other American statesmen of the time looked upon this alliance, with its determination to maintain and extend the European colonial system, as a threat against the freedom of the whole western continent.

Accordingly there was enunciated a policy on behalf of the United States Government to the effect that any attempt on the part of European powers to interfere with the governments of our sister Republics in the western continent would be met with the armed resistance of the United States. In the same message President Monroe stated clearly what was to be the relation of the United States toward these Republics. "It is still the true policy of the United States," he said, "to leave the parties—the sister Republics—to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course."

This was the famous Monroe doctrine. No statement of public policy has ever at its inception been more purely and unselfishly dedicated to a political ideal. It has been restated again and again, by successive Presidents and Secretaries of State. For instance, John W. Foster, Secretary of State in Harrison's Cabinet, in an address entitled "Misconceptions and Limitations of the Monroe Doctrine" before the American Society of International Law, said: "If the Monroe doctrine did not contain a high moral principle of ethics and government which commanded the respect of all civilized nations we could not build a Navy vast enough nor create an Army large enough to enforce it against the hostile sentiment of the great powers of Europe."

During the past 25 years, however, much confusion has arisen regarding this historic policy, even in the minds of the statesmen who were conducting it. President Wilson, addressing the Southern Commercial Congress at Mobile on October 27, 1913, said, in speaking of the Latin-American Republics:

"They have had harder bargains driven with them in the matter of loans than any other people in the world. Interest has been exacted of them that was not exacted of anybody else, because the risk was said to be greater; and then securities were taken that destroyed the risk. An admirable arrangement for those who were forcing the terms. I rejoice in nothing so much as in the prospect that they will now be emancipation from these conditions, and we ought to be the first to take part in assisting in that emancipation. * * * We must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor. * * * Human rights, national integrity and opportunity as against material interests—that is the issue which we now have to face. * * * We must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material interests made superior to human liberty and national opportunity."

On August 30, 1923, Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State in the Harding Cabinet, in an address before the American Bar Association assembled in convention in Minneapolis, made these high professions:

"The Monroe doctrine does not attempt to establish a protectorate over Latin-American states. * * * I utterly disclaim as unwarranted the observations which occasionally have been made implying a claim on our part to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics, to assert an overlordship, to consider the spread of our authority beyond our own domain as the aim of our policy, and to make our power the test of right in this hemisphere. I oppose all such misconceived and unsound assertions and intimations. They do not express our national purpose; they belie our sincere friendship; they are false to the fundamental principles of our institutions and of our foreign policy, which has sought to reflect, with rare exceptions, the ideals of

liberty; they menace us by stimulating a distrust which has no real foundation. They find no sanction whatever in the Monroe doctrine. There is room in this hemisphere, without danger of collision, for complete recognition of that doctrine and the independent sovereignty of the Latin-American Republics."

What was the cause of the last two rather heated restatements of the spirit of the Monroe doctrine? What had been done since the lofty expressions of John W. Foster to call forth the above indictment from President Wilson or the violent protest of Mr. Hughes?

PRESIDENT TAFT'S VIEW

Viallate, in his Economic Imperialism (p. 62), quotes William Howard Taft, who in the meantime had also been President, as stating our Latin-American policy as follows:

"While our policy should not be turned a hairbreadth from the straight path of justice, it may well be made to include *intervention to secure for our merchants and our capitalists opportunity for profitable investments* which shall inure to the benefit of both countries." (Senate hearings on "Foreign loans," p. 86. The italics are mine.)

It is to Theodore Roosevelt that we must look for a solution of this apparent contradiction of aims and policies. Under President Roosevelt the spirit of the Monroe doctrine suffered a fundamental change. Until his administration the European powers had been left free to collect their own loans and protect their own nationals and property in the Latin-American countries. For over 80 years European governments had from time to time bombarded Latin-American ports and landed troops on Latin-American territory to enforce settlement of disputes; and our diplomacy had always allowed a reasonable time to elapse before the Monroe doctrine was strictly applied. One of the chief results of this was that the enmity of the Latin-American Republics rested on the direct aggressors.

But President Roosevelt initiated the policy of making the United States the "policeman of the Western Continent." The assumption which he raised was that it was our duty to use the military forces of the United States to insure the settlement of all disputes in Latin America and to protect European as well as American life and property there if they were endangered; that if we did not do so the European powers would come in, would stay permanently on the Western Continent, and so would threaten our national safety. The Monroe doctrine was stretched to cover this new policy. At once Latin-American enmity began to rest on the United States alone, since we were the policeman in all difficulties.

Obviously the Roosevelt policy itself was nothing but an indication of a fundamental change in our own attitude toward Latin America. From this it was only a logical step to the policy of President Taft, Roosevelt's successor—"intervention to secure for our merchants and our capitalists opportunity for profitable investments."

At the beginning of President Wilson's first administration we had made such progress in this direction and the Monroe doctrine had been stretched so far that John Callan O'Laughlin, First Assistant Secretary of State under President Roosevelt and at present editor of the Army and Navy Journal, could say in his Imperiled America:

"We are seeking to make and we proudly call the Caribbean Sea an American lake. * * * We are maintaining a financial protectorate over Santo Domingo. We are applying the same system to Haiti and Nicaragua and have arranged for the purchase of the Danish West Indies. We kept a dictator out of Venezuela and drove another out of Nicaragua."

It is interesting to compare these various interpretations of the Monroe doctrine with what our Latin-American policy actually has been at the times they were uttered and under the men who were uttering them. Mr. O'Laughlin states the case correctly for the day in which he was speaking. President Wilson, in spite of his fair words at Mobile, did nothing to arrest and everything to sustain the very policy in Latin America against which he was protesting. Mr. Hughes's policy will be referred to later. In terms of deeds, not words, our course in Latin America has advanced without a single deviation along the channel laid down for it by Presidents Roosevelt and Taft.

At the present time, instead of maintaining "financial protectorates" over our sister Republics in Latin America, it would be more correct to say that we are holding them under a form of military and financial dictatorship. These various military and financial dictatorships have been imposed upon the Latin-American countries under successive administrations and by the force of American arms since 1909 up to and including the present day.

In the case of the Dominican Republic we began by placing over her a military government under United States auspices, supported by the United States marines, with a lieutenant commander of the Navy as the "officer administering the affairs of finance and commerce for the military government." To secure payment of six different American loans, the first in 1907 and the last in 1922 and a seventh loan in 1924, "a specific charge on the customs revenues" was made, these revenues to be "collected during the life of the bonds by an official appointed by the President of the United States." The "agreement" by which the revenues of the Dominican Republic were thus laid under mortgage was made between the United States and the United States controlled military government in Santo Domingo, the bond issue bearing the guaranties of the military government as an "irrevocable obligation of the Dominican Republic." (Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, hearing before subcommittee on foreign loans, Exhibits 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, et seq.)

MILITARY RULE IN SANTO DOMINGO

A provisional government was established in Santo Domingo by the military governor, United States Admiral Robison, on October 21, 1922, to provide for holding elections and reorganizing the government. On July 12, 1924, Gen. Horacio Vasquez, elected President for four years, was inaugurated. The convention between the United States and the new Vasquez government stipulated that all acts of the United States military for the past 17 years be ratified; all American loans be assumed as public debt, including a sinking-fund issue bearing 9 to 18 per cent interest; and a new refunding loan be accepted running up to $25,000,000. The customs receivership was extended until all loans were paid. Thus liberty in our sister Republic of Santo Domingo has a new birth under a fresh mortgage of her public revenues to American bankers, subject to foreclosure by intervention of the United States marines at any time when the public revenues fall short of bond and interest requirements.

We entered Haiti with our marines in 1915, during a revolution, under Wilson's first administration. The excuse under which we acted was that of restoring order in the country. By 1916 we had advanced so far with this program that the legislative body of the Haitian Government was dissolved and deputies and senators were forcibly expelled by American marines, after which the legislative palace was padlocked. Shortly afterwards an election was held under American auspices and a Senate and Chamber of Deputies more to our liking were elected. The first duty of this new Congress was to adopt a new constitution. The American legation made specific recommendations as to clauses in this new constitution, and these were duly handed to the members of the new Congress by the new Haitian Government.

These "suggestions," however, were not universally adopted by the new Congress; and again, in June of 1917, gendarmes under the command of a United States officer of marines invaded the legislative palace.

The files were looted and all records pertaining to the work already done by the Congress were taken away. Deputies and Senators were expelled, the legislative palace was once more padlocked, and a military guard was sent to prevent the reassembling of the legislators.

Then, in 1918, a constitution for Haiti was drafted in Washington and forwarded to Haiti to be submitted to a vote of the people. A farcical "plebiscite" was held, with United States marine officers in command of gendarmes running the polling; blue ballots were for and red ballots were against, and the Haitian people, now thoroughly intimidated, were told to cast blue ballots. The American-written constitution was adopted by a vote of 99,000 to some scattering few hundreds in opposition.

This constitution, now in force, provides for the election of the President and of the members of Congress by the people. It states that the election shall be called by the President on an even-numbered year, but does not specify what year. The constitution also provides that until an election is called the legislative authority shall be vested in a council of state composed of 21 members, all of whom are appointed by the President. This council of state is given authority to choose a President in case no popular election is held. Up to date no even-numbered year has been found in which to hold an election, although nearly 10 years have elapsed since the constitution went into force. All efforts on the part of patriotic Haitians to obtain a popular election have failed. The same President, Borno, is elected by the council of state year after year, he having himself appointed the council of state which elects him.

This Haitian incident gives an excellent cross-section of what our Latin-American policy has actually become. Under President Wilson, who said "we must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor," we entered Haiti by force, twice dissolved her legislative assembly at the point of the gun, wrote a constitution and forced it upon the Haitian people, and set up on Haitian soil a government contrary to all the principles of political freedom. This policy was in turn denounced by President Harding, but was carried on by him without change. It was being actively carried on by the State Department at the moment that Secretary of State Hughes was saying: "I utterly disclaim, as unwarranted, the observations which occasionally have been made implying a claim on our part to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics, to assert an overlordship, to consider the spread of our authority beyond our own domains as the aim of our policy, and to make our power the test of right in this hemisphere."

FINANCIAL DICTATORSHIP

South American Republics have not escaped the net of American financial dictatorship. In Bolivia, on May 31, 1923, an issue of $33,000,000 of 25-year 8 per cent bonds was contracted to New York

bankers, secured by a mortgage on all public revenues as well as by stock of the Bolivia National Bank, with this unique redemption feature: "This bond is redeemable * * * on or after May 1, 1937, and not before, at the rate of 105 per cent of its par value and accrued interest." Bolivia's public revenues were, under the contract, placed in the control of a commission of three men, two of whom, including the chairman, were American bankers. A telegram from the United States Secretary of State certified to the execution of the instrument. (Exhibits 4, 5, 6, "Foreign loans" subcommittee, 1925–26.)

The case of the Salvador 1923 loan is only another illustration. The details are reported by the New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle (October 13 and 16, 1923), the Diario Official of El Salvador (February 20, 1923), and in the Senate committee hearings on "Foreign loans" (Exhibits 1, 2, 3, "Foreign loans" subcommittee, 1925–26). In that year Salvador contracted for new bond issues aggregating $18,500,000, at 8 per cent and 7 per cent, respectively, for American loans and 6 per cent for a smaller British sterling loan. Secretary Hughes on October 16, 1923, issued the following statement defining the official relations of the State Department to the loan contract in question:

"The Department of State has no relation to the matter except with respect to facilitating the arbitration and determination of disputes that may arise between the parties and the appointment of a collector of customs in case of default. * * * The Secretary of State has consented to use his good offices in referring such disputes to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. * * * Also, at the request of the Government of Salvador and the interested bankers, the Secretary of State has consented to assist in the selection of the collector of customs. * * * The contract also provides that the collector of customs, if appointed, will communicate to the Department of State for its records such regulations relating to the customs administration as may be prescribed, and also a monthly and annual report."

This means in plain terms that the Secretary of State, 60 days after his Minneapolis speech denying any "claim on our part to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics," himself takes over the superintendence of the customs revenues of the Republic of Salvador. Six millions of the above-mentioned bonds were sold to the President of the United Fruit Co. at 88 per cent of par value, according to the contract approved by the State Department. Commenting on the whole transaction the Diario Official of El Salvador states that President Molina at first withheld his approval "because of the clauses robbing Salvador of her financial autonomy." But at length, through public need in Salvador and pressure on the part of the United States, the contract was signed—on the centenary of the signing of the Monroe doctrine.

The situation in Nicaragua, lately much in the public eye, is the same as elsewhere in Latin America, with several flagrant features of its own. The excuse of protecting our canal-route concessions in Nicaragua is made the justification for controlling by force the internal affairs of that country, although no party or individual in Nicaragua has ever proposed to violate those concessions, and no sane man supposes that they could be violated by any Nicaraguan Government. Behind all this is a shadow of financial intrigue and imposition so shameful that American public opinion would instinctively repudiate our Nicaraguan policy if the facts were widely known. These facts are a matter of record in the Senate Hearings on Nicaragua, 1914, and on Foreign Loans, 1927.

Instances could be multiplied indefinitely; any well-informed American citizens is now aware that our present Latin-American policy is frankly one of economic aggression involving political dictatorship. It is still covered by the name of the Monroe doctrine, but it has nothing in common with that doctrine as originally enunciated. In Costa Rica, Honduras, and Guatemala, as well as in the countries already mentioned, the American financial protectorate is based on the same general methods. American banking and bonding interests, trading corporations, public utilities, hemp and timber concessions, represent the principal enterprises for which our Federal Government practices "dollar diplomacy" in Latin America. The State Department acts as commercial agency and diplomatic referee. The Navy Department furnishes and directs the United States marines to enforce the terms of the contract. The customs revenues of the various Republics are the principal securities for American loans and investments, and the levying and collection of these funds are placed in the hands of agents either directly or indirectly responsible to the United States Government.

BENEFITS TO LATIN AMERICA

I am well aware of certain material advantages which we have brought about in Latin America during the past 25 years; I can from personal observation testify to the good roads, the harbor improvements, the sanitary betterment and the great work we have done in the elimination of preventable disease. But this is not the real question. If such things have not been achieved by the Latin-American countries themselves, and if they have been bought at the price of liberty and freedom, they are not worth while and will not endure.

The danger exists not only for Latin America but quite as clearly for our own institutions at home. Since when have we entertained the pernicious theory that we must lift all neighboring countries to our own standards of life by military force and political control if need be? The moment that theory is actually accepted by the United States we shall have lost the cause for which the American Revolution was fought and in whose name our Republic came into being as a Nation. The country that denies freedom abroad has lost freedom at home.

Old-fashioned as it may seem, I still believe in the principles of human liberty. I still believe that the only way for humanity to advance is for the different unit-peoples all over the world to be left to govern themselves. I still believe that right and justice as between nations can not only be professed but can actually be practiced. I still believe in honest diplomacy, in doing what you promise, in calling a spade a spade.

In the case of the Monroe doctrine we must do one of two things. Either we must abandon the idealism of the Monroe doctrine altogether, acknowledging frankly what our acts are in Latin America and accepting the consequences both at home and abroad, or we must revive the idealism of the Monroe doctrine, cleave to it in deeds as in words, and make our acts square with our professions.

It is a moral issue of first proportions. But moral issues work themselves out in practical results.

The question before us is, Can we afford, in dollars and cents, to pursue our present policy in Latin America much longer? Has "dollar diplomacy" really paid, in terms of national gain? It undoubtedly has paid well for a few interests and individuals. But does all this actually pay to the general commercial enterprise of the Nation? The following statistics for 1925 and 1926 are taken from the monthly summary of the Department of Commerce for the year ended December, 1926:

United States exports to—	Calendar year		Change (per cent)
	1925	1926	
Mexico	$144,720,323	$134,994,164	−7
Costa Rica	6,800,819	6,312,416	−7
Honduras	9,569,937	7,540,286	−21
Nicaragua	7,434,539	5,264,272	−15
Salvador	9,193,916	9,556,521	+4
Cuba	198,655,032	160,487,680	−19
Dominican Republic	17,763,577	14,572,376	−18
Haitian Republic	13,711,585	10,857,427	−22
Total	407,849,726	350,585,142	−14

Thus, granting that the activities of the State Department and the employment of the United States marines have brought profits to perhaps a score of our leading industrial and financial interests, what is the gain to the general business of the country, to the merchants, manufacturers, and farmers who have to work without the special services of the Federal Government in their behalf? Their lot seems to be to bear in taxation a share of the expense of a policy which benefits only a privileged few, a policy which netted a loss in trade of $57,200,000 to the Nation, or 14 per cent of our total exports to eight of our sister Latin-American Republics in the calendar year just closed. These are serious figures. When an export trade shrinks at the rate of 14 per cent a year, something is radically wrong with the policy which controls it. It is time to face the question in all candor. Are we not "killing the goose that lays the golden egg" in Latin America?

The moral issue can not be evaded. An unconscious boycott of American goods, based on growing enmity, is obviously beginning to operate in Latin America. And every day that our present hypocritical Latin America policy goes on, we are losing prestige in the field of international relations; every day we are gaining the increased enmity of all the American Continent outside our own borders.

The time may come when we shall need friends in the western continent and elsewhere in the world. Before we discovered "dollar diplomacy" we had grown from a wilderness and a strip of seaboard to be the greatest and most respected Nation in the world; we traded with all countries; our flag was welcomed wherever it went; and our trade followed the flag, because it was universally understood that behind our policy lay "a high moral principle of ethics and government." But to-day in Latin America we are rapidly dissipating the proud heritage of our traditions and history.

I said that both the spirit and the letter of the Monroe doctrine were dead. No European power is likely ever again to attempt to colonize the American Continent. If such a move were made, it would immediately call forth the armed opposition of the United States, regardless of the Monroe doctrine or any other policy. Thus to keep the bare name of the Monroe doctrine alive, when its only excuse is as a cover for ulterior acts and motives, is a constant source of irritation on the American Continent. The most statesmanlike policy which the United States could pursue in Latin America to-day would be officially to revive in all their force and integrity, in terms of present-day conditions, the ideals which the Monroe doctrine originally espoused.

A NEGRO'S VIEWS OF SENATOR BLEASE

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to myself appearing in the Pittsburgh Courier, of Pittsburgh, Pa., on December 24 last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

A DANGEROUS MAN

Senator COLE BLEASE, Democrat (of course), of South Carolina, is a dangerous man. He is a menace both to the Nation and to the Negro race. Rising from the depths of illiterate South Carolina, he has for years disgraced and sullied the National Capitol by his presence and by his ignorant, insane, anti-Negro propaganda. He loses no opportunity to spew his venom upon the Negro nor does he ever hesitate to fan the flames of race prejudice on every occasion. When the Aiken massacre shocked the intelligent people of his State and of the Nation, and when humanitarians in every part of the country were denouncing the foul crime, it was the unspeakable BLEASE who aligned himself with the forces of lynchocracy and offered them his services. Supposed to be representing the 900,000 negroes of his backward State, he never misses an opportunity to insult them and their brethren in every part of the country. Supposed to be representing the 900,000 white people of South Carolina, he has aligned himself with the forces of reaction in opposing the passage of child labor laws that would emancipate little children from machine slavery in the cotton mills. Sworn to uphold the Federal Constitution, he not only connives in but advocates its violation. Wedded to the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, he strives for the violation of the manhood rights guaranteed by the preceding ones.

Now he runs true to form by seeking to put a further premium upon bastardy, adultery, fornication, and concubinage in this country. To this end he has introduced a bill in the United States Senate which would prohibit the intermarriage of negroes and Caucasians anywhere in the United States as it is prohibited in his own benighted State of South Carolina. This bill would render any such marriages, of no matter what duration, null and void and would subject the parties to them to imprisonment, along with the officiating clergymen or magistrates. When it is considered that already 29 States in the United States have enacted similar legislation, the possibility of such a pernicious law is by no means as remote as some might think. Another bill he has introduced in the Senate would require separate accommodations for white and black passengers on the street cars in the District of Columbia, where already segregation and discrimination because of color stalks triumphant.

The two hateful bills have been referred to committees where it is probable that they may be buried, but with this man continually urging their passage there is no way to be sure that at some future time they may not actually come up for passage. Like many of his southern white brethren—and many in the North—BLEASE is an indefatigable propagandist for crackerism in all its hated forms. He fails to recognize or ignores the fact that the Negro is a citizen, and the Federal Constitution means little or nothing to him. In his bitter hatred of the Negro he will go to any lengths to insult, hamper, and humiliate him. A power in the principal legislative body of the Nation, he is using his position at every opportunity to undermine the foundations of good government. More than any other Member of the Senate, he is a danger and a menace, and all those who sincerely strive for the better race relations will breathe easier when he is finally returned to the obscurity from which he ought never to have emerged.

INVESTIGATION OF NAVAL OIL RESERVE LEASES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) submitted by Mr. NORRIS on January 4, 1928, was read, as follows:

Whereas in the Sixty-seventh Congress the Senate passed Senate Resolutions 282 and 294, which resolutions directed the Committee on Public Lands to investigate the entire subject of the leases upon naval oil reserves with particular reference to the protection of the rights and equities of the Government of the United States and the preservation of its natural resources; and

Whereas said committee never completed said investigation, the same having been suspended because of the refusal of one Harry F. Sinclair to answer the questions of the committee, and said committee has never made any final report to the Senate; and

Whereas in the case of the United States against Harry F. Sinclair and Albert B. Fall it was disclosed upon the trial that a fraudulent corporation, known as the Continental Trading Co. of Canada, had been organized for the purpose of using the profits of its business in the bribing of public officials of the United States and for other dishonest, dishonorable, and illegal purposes; and

Whereas it was disclosed upon said trial that profits of said corporation were invested in Liberty bonds of the United States and that only a portion of said Liberty bonds so invested had been definitely traced and accounted for and that a large amount of Liberty bonds coming into the hands of said fraudulent corporation had been unaccounted for and unexplained: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said Committee on Public Lands be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to renew and to continue the investigation provided for in said Resolutions 282 and 294, and said resolutions are hereby renewed as fully and as completely as though they were herein fully set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee is specifically directed to make an investigation as to the transactions and activities of the said fraudulent corporation, the Continental Trading Co. of Canada, and it is specifically directed to trace all the Government bonds held and dealt in by said corporation with the purpose of ascertaining the beneficiary or beneficiaries of all the illegal transactions connected with the fraudulent and dishonest sale or leasing of the said naval oil reserves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair with respect to the resolution which has just been adopted. The parliamentary inquiry is whether under the law that resolution should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I should like to state to the Chair, if he has not followed the reading of the resolution closely, that the original resolution authorizing the investigation did go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and money was authorized to be used for that purpose. The resolution which has just been adopted merely directs the committee to proceed and continue the investigation. Now the question arises whether it is necessary that the resolution extending the jurisdiction of the committee and directing them to proceed further with the investigation should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I myself do not believe that the committee died with the end of the session. I think under the Supreme Court's decision it continues, but in this resolution it is stated that the other resolutions are renewed as fully as though they were set forth in this resolution.

Mr. MOSES. May I suggest to the Senator that in that event further expenditure under the resolution is to be paid out of a new appropriation, a new contingent fund for the Seventieth Congress, and I think, therefore, that the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I myself do not believe in being technical about it, but if the resolution should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses it will only mean a delay of a day or two, and rather than have any doubt about it or have the question raised, I ask that the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to may be reconsidered and that the resolution may be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the resolution was adopted is reconsidered, and without objection the resolution is referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HENRY A. BELLOWS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order and will be proceeded with.

The business on the Calendar of General Orders was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) for the relief of Henry A. Bellows, which proposes to pay him for the period during which he served as a member of the Federal Radio Commission.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution may go over for the reason that we are having hearings tomorrow on the question of the confirmation of the newly nominated members of the Radio Commission, and I think it would be well to have the joint resolution go over until after that hearing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will go over. That completes the call of the Calendar.

ENFORCEMENT OF PROHIBITION

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two very interesting editorials from the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, one entitled "Lawlessness—and a little Latin" and the other entitled "Demoralizing the elders."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LAWLESSNESS—AND A LITTLE LATIN

The number of inhabitants in South Carolina in Governor Richards's administration is doubtless greater than it has been in any other, and

the number of persons who make, sell, or transport intoxicants is certainly as great proportionately as it ever has been. Probably it is greater. That is sufficient to prove that the Richards administration is the most lawless that the State has had. It has more lawbreakers.

Although the Greenville News is unable to follow this argument of the News and Courier, it says that "in violating some of these laws (doubtless referring to those relating to Sunday observance, prize fighting, and others) last year we were not conscious of having turned criminal. We were enjoying the bliss of ignorance in our wholesale career of crime."

The News says too much, however, when it asserts that these laws were being violated last year and the year before. Of that no evidence is available. The News can't prove the violations. Hence it should not allege them. Governor Richards this year has produced the evidence of the lawlessness, and his administration is entitled to the credit. We bestow it. Having discovered the existence of great numbers of lawbreakers, who were not at large so far as the records disclose, in McLeod's time or Cooper's, the incumbent administration must accept them as its characteristic.

No one could go to court and swear out warrants against golf players and druggists of Aiken and Camden for violations in 1926, and until that is done they are entitled, under the Constitution, to the presumption of innocence—indeed, until they are convicted.

One of our friends, returning from the State fair, reports that he saw more people together than he has ever seen before in South Carolina, and that he saw more "drunks." It is astonishing that anyone drinks whisky in Columbia. How did the stuff get there? Have we not prohibition, both Federal and State, and a State administration holily resolved to enforce it? Yet it seems to persons with long memories that the energies of the State are not so fiercely directed against the violators of prohibition now as they were against the "blind tigers" between 1903 and 1900. Those were the days. The chasing of lawbreakers was incessant, and nothing was left undone to protect the traffic of the dispensers.

"It is difficult to blame all this on the Richards administration," the News observes. Who said anything about "blaming" it? Governor Richards is a fine old fellow, honestly intent on doing good. It would be ridiculous to "blame" any human creature for failing to chew as much as he has bitten off. He has passed 60.

How can the dear old gentleman control the thousands of wild young bucks under 30? His generation has passed, and no one expects him to be aware of what us youngsters are about.

Besides, as the News and Courier has said, our generation is demoralizing most of the elders. The governor is one of the few, the noble few, Pikes Peaks of nineteenth century virtue left standing. We, the wicked and perverse, admire and extol him.

"O temopora! O mores!" Governor Richards made neither the tempora nor the mores. Despite the lawlessness of his administration he is doing much good by precepts and example. He may continue to bite off more than he can chew, and there will be much to amuse, but the Commonwealth of South Carolina will not be disgraced or seriously damaged while Richards is governor. "Clarum et venerabile nomen gentibus."

DEMORALIZING THE ELDERS

Without disagreeing with the Bamberg Herald that gambling games at fairs should be forbidden and prevented, these expressions of its editorial article excite our interest: "It is the moral effect on our young people, however, that especially interests us. If our Government authorities permit open gambling at fairs, our boys may well argue to themselves, Why is it wrong to gamble elsewhere?"

What is of more concern, we mildly hint to the Herald, is the "moral effect" on our old people of the behavior of the young.

Does not the Herald suspect that the young people are leading their elders astray?

If all the girls smoke cigarettes, how is "mother" to resist the temptation?

If the young man takes a flask to a dance, will not "daddy" succumb?

If the sophomore, girl or boy, bet $2 on the Carolina-Citadel game, how are the "old grads" to escape the contagion?

In old times the example of old people contaminated the young, but that was before the young got loose. Should not something be done to rescue the middle-aged and the venerable from the insidious influence of their children and grandchildren?

A generation ago, when the elders were in control, they forbade their young wrongful indulgences because they were wrong, not because there was a law against them. In some way or other these elders absorbed the idea of the wrong of betting from teaching.

One can think of the possibility of teaching young people what is wrong now by appealing to their good sense.

"SENATOR WALSH'S PART"—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun there appeared a very excellent and able article by Mr. Frank R. Kent discussing the part played by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in the recent Teapot Dome scandal. I ask that I may have the article inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—SENATOR WALSH'S PART

Though it is true, as the sly Mr. Slemp with a satisfied smile so astutely says in accounting for Republican strength and the futility of Democrat attack, that "prosperity absorbs all criticism," it does seem that to the reflecting few there would come occasionally as they consider certain facts a feeling that this would be a pretty sad sort of country if it were not for the Democrats, regardless of their dissensions, stupidity and shortcomings. To those who think that uncovering corruption in politics and government is a real public service, who consider the moral welfare of a people as important as their material welfare, unless their memories are bad, it must seem that, out of power though it is, the Democratic Party has not been without its uses in the last four years.

It was pointed out here the other day that if it had not been for Senator REED of Missouri, a Democrat, the two most outrageous political scandals that have occurred in a generation—those connected with the election of Mr. VARE in Pennsylvania and Mr. SMITH in Illinois—would have totally escaped national notice, and these gentlemen would in a few days take their Senate seats without so much as a critical or unkind word.

The present ugly—it's a mild word—situation in Washington, where the grand jury is investigating charges of jury tampering in the interests of Mr. Sinclair, who, along with Mr. Fall, has been denounced by the Supreme Court for "fraud, conspiracy, and corruption," ought to call attention to the public service of another Democrat—Senator THOMAS J. WALSH of Montana—even greater than that of Senator REED.

It ought to recall that, if it had not been for Senator WALSH, Mr. Fall and Mr. Doheny and Mr. Fall and Mr. Sinclair would have succeeded in stealing the naval oil reserves of the Nation at Elk Hills and Teapot Dome and would—all three of them—to-day be living among us as honorable and respectable men, utterly free of that indelible Supreme Court brand that marks them. It was Senator WALSH, blocked and thwarted at every turn by the Republican organiaztion and without sympathy or help from the Republican administration, and in the face of a barrage of newspaper criticism that he was "playing politics," seeking publicity, making a mountain out of a molehill, who kept at his job until he brought the amazing facts to light.

When the results of his work are considered it does seem that, even in such a material age as this, something more of national appreciation and gratitude should go to him. The Nation has recovered its great oil reserves. The men who had conspired to take them away have been compelled to pay back to the Government more than $10,000,000. The Supreme Court in two burning decisions has unanimously upheld the WALSH contentions, and in denouncing the defendants employed words that in the last campaign when used in the Democratic platform and by Democratic spokesmen were called partisan and demagogic.

One criminal case ended in a jury acquittal of Mr. Fall and Mr. Doheny, but in the other jury case it has resulted in a mistrial, due to the espionage established over the jury by a detective agency employed by Sinclair interests. There will be a new trial in January.

Since the Supreme Court decisions and the Sinclair trial a great many newspapers that in the 1924 campaign minimized the whole Fall-Doheny-Sinclair business scoring the Democratic charges as hysteria and political claptrap, have teemed with denunciatory editorials. Some are in a high state of indignation. Some seem to favor burning Mr. Sinclair at the stake. Very few, however, ever mention the name of the quiet, determined, resourceful, able, and modest man whose dogged fight against great odds prevented the complete success of one of the greatest frauds ever attempted against the Government of the United States.

It does seem that it would occur that Senator WALSH has done something worth even now a word of praise; that glorious as it is to be prosperous, magnificent though it may be to reduce taxes when revenues are vastly in excess of expenditures, splendid though it is to preach economy and advocate happiness, the single-handed uncovering of so vast a governmental conspiracy, with such complete vindication of the effort, ought to entitle Senator WALSH to a little more credit than he gets. It ought, in fact, to make him more or less of a national hero. Prosperity seems not only to absorb all criticism but, so far as the public is concerned, about every other mental faculty there is.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Florida wishes to address the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to make some observations on the subject of the American merchant marine, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed with those remarks at this time, although there is now no measure pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Florida proceeding? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, James Freeman Clarke, as I remember, made at one time a statement which very much impressed me. It was to the effect that the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks of the next election and the statesman thinks of the next generation.

We have reached a very critical stage in respect of our merchant marine, and I wish to appeal to the talents and abilities in both this body and the other—and there are in both bodies men so equipped as to be classed as statesmen—to consider this subject from the standpoint of statesmanship, from the standpoint of the next generation.

Our merchant marine has reached a stage where, in all probability, we will lose our position on the high seas in a very few years. Our ships are vanishing now, and it is absolutely necessary that Congress take a positive position with reference to establishing and maintaining an adequate American merchant marine.

We are without much guidance or leadership at present with respect to that great subject. With the utmost respect for the President, and without any purpose of criticizing or finding fault, I feel that it is proper now to analyze briefly his message to Congress delivered at the beginning of this session, on December 6, 1927.

Under the heading of "Merchant marine" the President said:

> The United States Government fleet is transporting a large amount of freight and reducing its drain on the Treasury.

That is a condensed statement, very clearly put, and covering a great deal of ground. I fully agree with every word of it.

He further said:

> The Shipping Board is constantly under pressure, to which it too often yields, to protect private interests, rather than serve the public welfare.

If I understand the English language, that is a severe indictment of the Shipping Board, somewhat more remarkable in view of the fact that six members of that board have been appointed by the President, and one of them has been reappointed. No doubt the President had before him facts which justified this severe arraignment of the Shipping Board. I should say, however, without being authorized to make any defense of the Shipping Board, that in my judgment this yielding to private interests rather than serving the public has been largely due to the policy insisted upon by the White House.

Undoubtedly the Shipping Board has served private interests without regard to public interests in pursuing a policy directed, it would seem, from the White House to get speedily out of business, and to transfer promptly and without delay the ships owned by the Government into private hands. In pursuance of that policy ships have been sacrificed. They have been practically given away. Private interests have been served, the public interest has been ignored, in following that course, resulting from emphasis being placed on the secondary purpose as expressed in the merchant marine act of 1920, rather than upon the primary purpose as emphasized in that act over and over again. In the very beginning of the act and throughout the act, when powers were given to the Shipping Board to sell the ships, it was provided that always they must keep in view the primary purpose of establishing and maintaining an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean to imply by his remarks that the ships as now operated are not carrying out the purpose of the law and helping to maintain an effective merchant marine?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the present plan of operation is succeeding fairly well. I find no fault with that. It is the policy of getting out of business and getting rid of the ships that has been insisted upon which, in my judgment, has resulted in serving private interests rather than the public interests.

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, the shipping act does provide that at the earliest moment these ships shall be turned over to private operation. Is it not a fact, however, that the ships which the Senator has in mind, having been turned over to private operation, are being operated effectively to maintain for us an American merchant marine?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will show to the Senator before I get through that, notwithstanding these sacrifices, and notwithstanding the pursuit of this policy day in and day out for eight or nine years, there is to-day less tonnage privately owned under the American flag in foreign commerce than there was in 1914—excluding, I mean, the tankers, which everyone knows are owned by oil companies and other concerns using them in carrying their own products and not engaged in general commerce.

The Senator, however, is in error with reference to the language of the act of 1920. That act does not say that the purpose is to pass these ships into private hands as speedily as possible. It says that the purpose and policy of Congress is to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine to serve our commerce in times of peace and as auxiliaries to the Navy in times of war, ultimately to be passed into private hands. The secondary thing is passing into private hands not the primary thing at all; and the emphasis has been laid by the administration upon the secondary purpose ultimately to pass into private hands. "Ultimately" means finally, not speedily, not at once; but finally the idea of Congress was that these ships might pass into private hands.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has spoken about the decline in the tonnage. Of course the decline of which he speaks has no relationship to the lines which have been sold by the Shipping Board, because those lines are operated effectively in maintaining an adequate American merchant marine. I refer specifically, for instance, to the President ships. They were sold cheaply; they are now in private hands; but they are being operated—effectively operated, as I view it—and so the American merchant marine in toto has not suffered by reason of the sale and disposal of those particular ships to private parties.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand the Senator's proposition. With reference to the President ships, there were seven magnificent passenger and cargo carriers, costing the Government over $30,000,000, sold for $4,500,000 payable during a period of five years, with a guaranty only that they would be operated in that service for five years. That time has nearly expired. What will become of the ships after that guaranty terminates no one can tell. They may go into the coastwise trade. They may abandon that service entirely. They have a perfect right to do it. But though they were the finest ships afloat on any ocean, they were sold for something like 10 per cent of their cost, and they were new ships.

I can give other illustrations. It would take me all day to cite these instances, but one I recall particularly:

A German ship was seized by this Government. She was used in the transport service. She cost to build $1,600,000. After the war the Shipping Board concluded to recondition that ship and make her a passenger ship and put her in the service from Los Angeles to the west coast of South America. They spent $2,000,000 on the ship. They spent, within a month of her sale, $43,000 on hotel supplies placed in the ship; and they sold that ship, with the furnishings and hotel supplies and all equipment, for $100,000. That ship was the *City of Los Angeles*. Is not that a clear illustration of taking care of private interests rather than regarding the public interest?

Other instances of a similar kind can be pointed out; and it seems to me that they must have arisen under the policy dictated by the administration to get out of business and pass these ships into private hands.

Says the President:

> More attention should be given to merchant ships as an auxiliary of the Navy.

Precisely; I quite agree with that. That is a most important thing to consider in this connection. If Great Britain had not owned the enormous merchant fleet that she did own at the beginning of the submarine policy on the part of Germany, she would have been out of the war within eight weeks after the submarines began sinking merchant ships on the sea. It was her merchant marine rather than her floating batteries, her navy, her battleships and cruisers, that saved the situation for Great Britain in that time of trouble.

Is not that a lesson for the United States? Can we afford to sink our ships, give them away, and have them pass out of existence? As a great Nation, can we take such a position as that? I say to the Senate now that the question is now, to-day, not whether we shall have private ownership or private operation of a merchant marine, or Government ownership and Government operation, but whether we shall have any merchant marine at all or not. That is the question. So the President is entirely right in emphasizing the importance of merchant ships as auxiliaries of the Navy.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I would like to ask the Senator if he has investigated a supposed lobby that is representing a powerful interest on the Pacific coast, that has been exerting a great deal of influence to secure these ships from the Shipping Board for speculative purposes, rather than as a service to the country?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no particular knowledge of that lobby, and I have made no study or investigation respecting it. I will be very glad, indeed, to have the information which the Senator suggests.

I do say this, that to guarantee the operation of a particular service for a period of only five years is practically no guaranty at all. Five years is but an hour in the life of a nation, and that has been heretofore the extent of the guaranties in the sale of these ships, guaranteeing to maintain the service for a period of five years, without any guaranty at all with reference to replacements, without any guaranty that other ships will be substituted for those that may go down or be lost or wear out. In a five-year period a whole line may go to pieces, and of course eventually the ships must disappear. They wear out. There has never been in any contract in any sale any guaranty for replacing the ships.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator has quoted from the President where he urged that our merchant marine be developed along the line of an auxiliary to the Navy. Have not that thought and idea been suggested again and again on the floor of this Chamber? That has been urged again and again, and I now ask the Senator what concrete act or step has been taken by anybody to develop the merchant marine along that line?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that he is quite correct; that is one of the purposes set out in the merchant marine act of 1920. That act provides that in case of reconstruction regard shall be had for placing guns and that sort of thing on ships. That has been the idea running in the minds of Congress throughout all the legislation on this subject, and we have sought to emphasize that, and the merchant marine act does emphasize it. But what sort of auxiliary to the Navy do we have when we are told that we must get out of the business and pass these ships into private hands?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Practically nothing has been done.

Mr. FLETCHER. Nothing has been done.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Just vain words.

Mr. FLETCHER. The suggestion has been made—and I have no doubt that will be attended to—that Congress decide, as I think they ought to decide, definitely, positively, and clearly, that we propose to have an American merchant marine; and the only certain way of having it, the only known way, the only possible way at the present moment is for the Government to construct the ships and operate the ships. That being true, the Government will see to it that in all reconstruction and in all new construction this thought of serving the Navy will be provided for.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will concede, will he not, that in order to accomplish the thing he has in mind it is necessary to change the law? The law, as it is at the present, as I recall to his attention section 5 of the merchant marine act of 1920, states specifically—

> That in order to accomplish the declared purposes of this act, and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof—

which is to have an effective merchant marine and prepare for the national defense—

> the board is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as practicable, consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale after appraisement and due advertisement—

And so forth.

In other words, the Shipping Board is acting under this act, and the act specifically provides that these ships must be sold as soon as possible.

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not say they must be sold.

Mr. COPELAND. It says "authorized and directed to sell." That is the language.

Mr. FLETCHER. As soon as practicable, and on a business basis; not as a bankrupt concern, not as a concern forced to sell, not as the primary purpose of the act at all, but in pursuance of the expressed purpose to establish and maintain an American merchant marine.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not think there is any difference between the Senator from Florida and myself, but I am convinced that if these ships are to be operated as the Senator suggests it is necessary to change this law, because, as I read the law, the Shipping Board is under obligation to dispose of these lines—is directed to dispose of these lines as soon as possible.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not as soon as possible, but as soon as practicable, only when they can accomplish the primary purpose, the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine. Otherwise, they have no business to sell.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. The merchant marine act of 1920 really does not need any tampering with or amendment or modification, in my judgment. It is plain and clear, if it is interpreted as it should be interpreted. The fault has been a misconstruction of the act, and an interpretation placed upon it which is not authorized or justified. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York to a proviso in section 7 of the act, near the middle of the page:

> *Provided further*, That where steamship lines and regular service have been established and are being maintained by ships of the board at the time of the enactment of this act, such lines and service shall be maintained by the board until, in the opinion of the board, the maintenance thereof is unbusinesslike and against the public interests.

My information is that, without regard to that provision of the law, the Shipping Board has sold a number of these services without declaring them unbusinesslike, without declaring that the service was against the public interests. In my judgment, in so acting the Shipping Board has not only misconstrued the law, but it has deliberately violated the law.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is ample foundation for the Senator's thought on that subject, and I quite agree with him, the merchant marine act has not only been misinterpreted and misconstrued, but actually violated in the administration of the act. In doing that, this board, and not merely this present board, but whatever board was in office at the time these transactions took place, has served private interests and ignored the public interests.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I seriously question the statement that the Shipping Board has violated the provision to which attention has been called by the Senator from Tennessee. These services are maintained, and it was specifically provided that when the ships were sold, the service should be maintained. I want to say further that this act contemplates a geographic distribution of the service. I doubt exceedingly if the Senator can point to the sale of any service which violates in any sense whatever the provision which he has read.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to reply——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I recall that there was a hearing in Memphis, Tenn., in reference to shipping matters some years ago, and members of the board who were there were very much surprised to find that there was any such provision as that in the law. Evidently it had not been called to their attention, or they had not noticed it before. To be accurate about the language of an inquiry I made at that time I would have to have it before me, and I have not it before me; but as I recall, I asked when they had declared the operation of certain lines unbusinesslike, or against the public interests. They said that they had not declared the operation of any lines unbusinesslike, or against the public interests. Therefore it seemed to me that in not having first declared, as required by this law, that the lines that were sold were either operated in an unbusinesslike manner or against the public interests, the board was without authority of any kind to sell such lines.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me a moment—I dislike to cut in on him, but it is not quite fair to let the comment of the Senator from Tennessee pass unnoticed. As a matter of fact, whether the Government operates these ships or whether they are operated by private individuals, if it is an unbusinesslike procedure and a useless procedure, why should anybody operate them?

As a matter of fact, whether the board knew it or not at the time of the conference spoken of by the Senator, when these services were sold on the Pacific coast there was no service interrupted, there was no port which was no longer served. Attention was given by the Shipping Board to the needs of that particular district. So, although it is not for me to defend them, and I desire to do it merely as a matter of simple justice, I do not believe the Shipping Board has violated the shipping act in any sense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can easily understand why the Senator takes that view, because evidently he has not yet read the proviso. If the Senator will listen to the proviso again he will see how they violated it. It provides:

That where steamship lines and regular service have been established and are being maintained by ships of the board at the time of the enactment of this act, such lines and service shall be maintained by the board—

Not by private interests—

until, in the opinion of the board, the maintenance thereof is unbusinesslike and against the public interests.

Of course it referred to the operation of the ships of the board. There can not be any question about it.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator take that proviso entirely separate and apart from the context?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. It was just giving the board the right to sell under certain circumstances and denying it the right to sell under other circumstances.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will bear with me just a moment, if the board could dispose of these ships in such a way that there would be no interference with service, and that no section of the country should be interfered with, and that an effective American merchant marine might be carried out, according to the general purposes of the act, it would seem to me that the board acted very wisely.

Mr. McKELLAR. But at the same time they disregarded the law.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I would like to ask the Senator from New York if he thinks it is a wise thing for our ships to be turned over to the dictation, practically, of one international banker on the Pacific coast who is trying, through his influence, to obtain a monopoly of the shipping interests of our western coast section?

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator from Florida will allow me to answer, I do not know that the statement made by the Senator from Nevada is the case. It would take more than one session of the Senate to convince the Senate that the statement or the implication is correct.

Mr. ODDIE. I think when the time comes there will be no question of convincing the Senate that this banker I have referred to on the Pacific coast, whose name I will not mention now, is exerting influence in obtaining these ships and that it will result in a practical monopoly if he has his will.

Mr. FLETCHER. A Senator sitting near me suggests that that is probably true of other coasts than the Pacific coast.

Mr. ODDIE. It goes farther than the Pacific coast.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, referring again to the matter under discussion, if a line is being conducted and proves to be unbusinesslike, and is losing money, hopelessly losing money, it does not help the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine, even to sell or give away that line to private parties. That does not help the situation any. The private concern, if it is a losing proposition, is going to break, too, and it is not fair to them to make such a sale.

On the other hand, it was expected all along that some of the lines established by the Shipping Board would at the beginning prove unprofitable. The idea was to extend our trade. The idea was to expand our commerce and open up new markets and develop trade, and the Shipping Board was expected to lose money in the beginning. But it was believed that eventually the public would get the benefit of these enlarged markets and this extension of our trade, and eventually the lines would become profitable.

Then, in my judgment, would be the time to sell, not when the line is nearly bankrupt and losing money every day. What sort of condition is it in to-day? Here is an enterprise of mine, we will say, in which I am losing money by the millions, day after day. Who will come and relieve me by buying this failing enterprise? Of course, that is an absurd thing to expect to take place, and yet that is the basis on which we have been proceeding. It is not fair. We can not get the price for such an enterprise that we ought to get for it. It is not the time to offer it for sale. The time to offer it for sale is after we have developed the routes and built up the trade and opened up the markets. Then we can say, "This line is a profitable enterprise. If private individuals want to acquire it, we are ready and willing to sell it."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator believe that any American line can be made to pay in competition with foreign ships without some sort of subvention?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it absolutely can be made to pay.

Mr. COPELAND. Has it been done as yet by the Shipping Board?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Shipping Board is now making a profit on the United States lines.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it making a profit if we count interest and depreciation?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; counting all factors entering into it. According to the statement made to me they made $330,000 last year.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator, I am sure, will not take offense if I say I do not agree with him. I think there are many items left out of those figures. I doubt exceedingly if the United States Line has ever made a profit.

Mr. FLETCHER. I refuse to admit and I have always refused to admit that the American people can not operate ships just as well as any other people anywhere at any time. They have not been encouraged to do it. There has been an enormous amount of money made in shipping in this country by American citizens.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I am sure, while no one wants for a moment to minimize the ability of the American business man in any connection to compete favorably with the business man of any nation in the world, the Senator must admit that our shipowners are to-day compelled to compete with shipowners of other nations of the world on an entirely different financial basis.

Mr. COPELAND. And an impossible basis.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know about that. We have in New York, I think, perhaps the world's financial center. I think centers of trade have moved across the ocean. Centers of finance have moved across the ocean. Why we in this country can not finance the operations as well as the people of any other country on earth I can not comprehend. We can do it, but of course if people hold back and say "We are not going into this business until we are offered a subsidy, we are not going into this business until the Government in some way comes to our support and guarantees us a big profit," there will be some delay about it, because this Congress will not, and I do not believe any future Congress will, be hasty about granting subsidies to the shipping interests.

Mr. EDGE. Speaking of subsidies, the Senator is admitting, as I followed his discussion, that the American merchant marine is, and necessarily will be for some time to come, operated at a loss. Does the Senator believe as a clear business proposition that it is more defensible to pay a deficit, an admitted deficit, a known deficit, through appropriations by Congress, than to pay a businesslike subsidy for service? In either event the taxpayers pay.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is a vast difference. In the case of a subsidy, which we have tried in this country, there are apt to grow up, as there did grow up, tremendous scandals, and that is the situation in the case of subsidies of all varieties in other countries so far as I have been able to learn—favoritism, special interests, various reasons cause scandals to arise, and eventually all benefit intended by the subsidy disappears.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. Is it not true, however, that the English Government subsidizes English vessels and that no scandal or scandalous results have ever followed from that practice?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it is not true. All that England ever did was to loan money at a low rate of interest to shipowners to build ships——

Mr. COPELAND. O Mr. President!

Mr. FLETCHER. And specified that they should be equipped as auxiliaries of the navy, and for that reason they helped build the ships.

Mr. BRUCE. I was under the impression that the English Government also subsidized the operation of the ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. No. No country in the world does it.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. COPELAND. O Mr. President, England does more than is suggested by the Senator from Florida. England not only pays a part of the construction cost of all vessels which are built in conference with the navy but England also pays the salaries of certain of the officers. Also she permits the crew to serve as naval auxiliary members, and then, in addition, she pays very liberal mail subventions.

I want to say further, if the Senator from Florida will permit me, that we have to choose, in my judgment, between the position taken by the Senator from Florida—and if there is no other way to do it I am with him, because I want to see an American merchant marine—between Government ownership and Government operation on the one hand and facing the fact that there must be some sort of subvention paid by the Government. For my part I favor the idea of a postal subvention. The times when we have had prosperity in our Navy can be readily shown by drawing a graphic chart showing the high tonnage when we have paid these postal subventions and when we have given no aid to the American merchant marine, showing how it has become depressed, its tonnage has been reduced, and we have practically been wiped off the seven seas. We must face that situation.

Mr. EDGE. Adverting to the statement I made a moment ago, it is my impression that it certainly was the situation a few years ago, though I have not followed it closely in recent years, that practically every country in the world administering a successful merchant marine has some form of subsidy, call it what we may, but some form of direct government aid.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator will look carefully into the laws of the various countries, he will find himself in error. I have endeavored to trace that matter down, and I have been unable to find any instance of direct government aid. In Germany, for instance, where they operate the railroads they give special rates, perhaps, to some freight which is moved by their ships. As to subventions, we have been pretty liberal ourselves. Our mail contracts are quite liberal, and if it is thought wise to increase the pay for carrying the mail, perhaps I might agree with the Senator on that point. That is not exactly a subsidy, because we do not lose money by that operation. The Government receives quite as much as it pays for the carrying of the mail, as I understand it, and therefore there is no loss, there is not out-of-pocket expense, but it is a help to the ships.

Mr. BRUCE. I will ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that the cost of operating ships in foreign countries is much less than the cost in this country with respect to wages and cost of materials of every sort?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, to be perfectly fair about it, that perhaps it does cost a little more to operate the ships under our flag than the foreign operators are required to meet.

Mr. BRUCE. For information I will ask the Senator how far are ships operated in other countries by the government? In Norway, for instance, do they not operate the ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think Canada is the only Government directly operating its merchant marine.

Mr. BRUCE. May not our inability to run a merchant marine successfully be due to the weaknesses that are inherent in the matter of Government operation itself?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the Shipping Board has not operated in competition with private operators at all. They have avoided it. They have been supplementing rather than competing with the private operation of ships.

But with reference further to the comparative cost of operation, we had numerous hearings extending over months and months of time on that subject. The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], will recall when we had up the ship subsidy bill. It finally came out, and I think this was the ultimate conclusion reached by the experts, including Mr. Lasker himself, who was then chairman of the Shipping Board, that what is known as the La Follette Seamen's Act really cut no figure so far as our American ownership of ships and operation of them was concerned; that there was, perhaps, a difference in wages and some other expenses because of better conditions on board ship, better food, better accommodations required by our laws than many foreign countries required. But the total difference in cost between operating an American ship and operating a foreign ship, even considering those most economically operated abroad, was about 2 per cent of the cost of operation.

The cost of operation is not the total cost involved when it comes to shipping, but the difference between the total cost of the operation of foreign ships and American ships would be only about 2 per cent as against the American owner. That is a very small item when it comes to an investment of millions of dollars in ships. A difference of 2 per cent in the cost of operation in favor of the foreign shipowner does not eliminate the American from the seas at all. It would not be considered, other things being equal. Besides, we have other advantages; I might point them out, but I shall not now go into a discussion of that question.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Florida also would wish to say this about the La Follette Act: We would not want our American workmen, whether they be on land or on sea, to be treated as serfs, would we?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course not.

Mr. COPELAND. And the humanitarian purpose of the La Follette Act coincides, I am sure, with the wish of the American people. The crews on American ships are treated in a humane way; they have air space, toilet facilities, and a very good quality of food, so that they are treated as decent human beings. So far as I am concerned, if Government ownership were necessary in order to have our crews treated in that way, I should be in favor of Government ownership against everything else, because we would not want to make serfs of our people. However, there are other matters in reference to our merchant marine which have been pointed out by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] which are more fundamental. I do not think the treatment of crews is the important consideration in the increase in the cost of operation, but there are other matters which I am sure the Senator from Florida will point out in the course of his remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New York is correct with reference to the La Follette Seamen's Act and its operation. It makes it possible to attract the American lad to the seas. Of course, there are foreign countries which employ the cheapest possible labor and give their sailors the most economical accommodations and treat them more or less as serfs. We can not compete with those. I will admit that the American competing with a ship line operated in that way would be operating at a disadvantage, so far as competition is concerned in that instance, but we have got to build up sea power and we can not build up sea power without building up seamen and making it worth while for the American lad again to find his place on the seas.

To do that we must provide means for safety and decent accommodations on board the ships. We can do all that, and at the same time get better results out of the crews, and out of the officers. We get better results in other directions than does the foreigner. One capable, able seaman thus accommodated on board a ship, assured of safety appliances and all that sort of thing, and decent living accommodations, is worth a dozen Lascars or other people whom I might mention. So there are equalizing conditions.

Pursuing the subject further, the President said:

> The possibility of including their masters and crews in the Naval Reserve with some reasonable compensation should be thoroughly explored as a method of encouraging private operation of shipping.

I am not in disagreement with that; that is along the line suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If we could work that out, we might accomplish something in that connection.

> Public operation—
>
> Says the President—
>
> is not a success.

With reference to that, I wish to say that we never really have had bona fide, genuine Government operation in the United States. The operation has been conducted through contracts with private operators of those ships. One of those contracts, known as the M. O. 4 contract, was, as came out in our investigation and as was admitted on all sides, a most infamous contract. It is utterly incredible that intelligent men would enter into such a contract, for under it the Government bore all the losses of the operation, and the greater the losses the more profit the operator made. The idea of operating through private operators was that there might be developed purchasers for the ships; that such operators would build up the trade, increase the commerce, open up new markets, and that after awhile they would be in position to buy the line. That was one idea—the main idea, I think—of continuing the operation through private operators; that we would thereby develop buyers for the ships. However, what interest is it to an operator ever to put himself in condition to own the line when he can make

more money as an operator under Government contract, under the terms of which the more money the Government lost the more money he made. Of course, that contract has been changed and modified in many respects, and it is a much better contract now. There ought to be contracts made with private operators whereby they would share in the losses and which would make it to their interest to have the lines succeed. That, however, has not been done. Could one ever expect any business to make a pronounced success when it was being conducted in that kind of way?

Of all the shipping services under the Shipping Board the only line which is operated by the Government is the United States Lines, consisting of seven passenger ships and conducting a trans-Atlantic service from New York. It is a most important and essential line for this country. There is some cargo space in those passenger ships.

It is important also that that line should be strengthened and built up. There ought to be two good 20-knot ships added to the *Leviathan*. A proposition has been made, and is being considered by the Shipping Board, to recondition the *Agamemnon* and the *Mount Vernon* and put them alongside the *Leviathan* in that service. That would make a magnificent fleet, and the earnings of the United States Lines would be increased by over a million dollars a year if we add to it the *Mount Vernon* and the *Agamemnon*.

Mr. COPELAND. And they would be net earnings?

Mr. FLETCHER. They would be net earnings. That can be done at the expense of some $12,000,000. The Shipping Board recommend it, and the Budget Director, after a very thorough examination and consideration of the subject, agreed to it and reported in favor of it, but the President struck it out. So the Budget comes to Congress with that provision stricken out. I can not understand why, for if those two ships shall be added to the United States Lines that line will become one of the strongest in the world. It will earn a net profit in season and out of season to an enormous extent, and away will go the claim that we are losing money operating the ships, and, therefore, we must get out of the business and pass these ships to private hands.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I am sure the Senator will wish to add this fact, that if those two ships were added to the United States Lines we could then carry the great bulk of our trans-Atlantic mail, which we do not do now.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. COPELAND. We are paying to-day to British ships a million and a half dollars for carrying our mails because we have no effective service to do the carrying.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. So if the two ships were added, as the Senator suggests, we could then have the additional revenue for our ships instead of paying it to British ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; the Senator is entirely correct. The schedules could then be so arranged that we could carry the mails in our own ships and receive that benefit.

But, of course, the President does not say that public operation is a failure; he does say that it is not a success. Mr. President, how could we ever expect any business to be a success when we are declaring from the housetops day after day that the business is losing money faster than we want to insure the loss; and when we are saying that, in spite of everything, we are going to quit this business and get out of it? What shipper is willing to make contracts, what shipper is able to make long-term contracts with a shipping line that tells him "To-morrow we may be out of business"? We can not expect a business to be successfully conducted on any such basis as that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. In connection with what the Senator has said I wish to make this suggestion: I had the pleasure of visiting South American ports two or three years ago and I was told by Americans that one of the most effective arguments used against the building up of an American merchant marine was this, that when a merchant contemplated turning the carrying of his goods over to an American line shipping competitors came to him and said, "You had better not do this; you know in the past the Americans have not maintained a merchant marine; we have been giving you good service all the time and now if you turn your business over to the American line the chances are that it will not be running in a few years and then you will have to come back to us"; and they practically intimated what they might expect if that condition came about. Now, apparently we are doing nothing to controvert any argument of that kind, and our action in the past and our failure to make any provision for replacement of these ships for the future does not make it very difficult for our foreign competitors to convince shippers that under the present conditions they had better not transfer their business.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a natural condition; there is no question about that, and it interferes with our success.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Is not that very inconstancy of policy one of the inseparable concomitants of Government ownership? Inconstancy, incertitude of policy, fluctuations in appropriations from time to time, the existence of conditions which make it impossible to calculate proper adjustments of means to ends are but the ordinary shortcomings and limitations of Government ownership. The managers of private business know exactly what they can count on from year to year, what their revenues are, what their assets are, what the demands for expenditures are, and they frame their policy, and their policy is not subject to congressional vicissitudes of any kind or legislative caprice or whim. That is one of the very reasons why private operation is always incomparably more successful so far as pecuniary results are concerned than is Government ownership and operation. The Government is attempting to grow orchids in maintaining these shipping lines; it is in a business for which it is unfit, just as it has proved itself to be unfit for every form of industrial enterprise. That is the way it strikes me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I see the Senator's point. That has been urged, and there is a good deal in it. I would a great deal rather see private enterprise take hold of the shipping in a business way, run and replace and reconstruct and rebuild, and go on with this business as it should be done in this country. We ought to have some 8,000,000 tons of merchant ships to carry about 60 per cent of our overseas trade; but they will not do it.

Mr. BRUCE. I shrink from subsidies. I, of course, am too good a Democrat not to do that to begin with. I shrink from subsidies; and yet, at the same time, in view of the indispensability of a merchant marine in time of war, I may say, or merchant vessels that can be converted into war vessels, I think I am prepared to vote reasonable subsidies for the maintenance of these lines, provided they are turned over by the Government to private enterprise.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest to the Senator that that will not solve the problem; but, with further reference to his observations about the Government being in position to operate ships, what about our Navy? What about our Army? What about our Post Office Department? The same sort of argument would apply to those.

Mr. BRUCE. When you come to the Post Office Department you have to think of other things besides pecuniary profit. There are all sorts of most peremptory reasons why the mails of the country should not be turned over to private handling; but I recall the fact that Mr. Burleson, the former Postmaster General, testified before a congressional committee that if the rural-mail delivery of this country were turned over to private contractors there would be a saving to the Government of no less than $18,000,000 a year.

Mr. FLETCHER. But, again, the Government is successfully operating the Panama Steamship Line and has been ever since it took over the line. It lowered rates to all South and Central American ports from ports of the United States. It has been a success, although it carries all supplies for the use of the Government on the Canal Zone at less than commercial rates. It is a profitable enterprise.

Mr. BRUCE. I was reading something on that subject the other day, and the writer—I know not how correctly—reached just exactly the opposite conclusion from that which the Senator reached. He said that notwithstanding the enormous tonnage of freight which passes through the Panama Canal, it has been running at a loss—that is to say, when interest is calculated on the cost of the original investment and due allowance made for depreciation, and due allowance made for all the other things that private enterprise has to make allowance for unless it is prepared to pass into bankruptcy.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Maryland has reference to the Panama Canal. I was not talking about the Panama Canal at all. I was talking about the Panama Steamship Line.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not catch that.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a different proposition.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; it is.

Mr. FLETCHER. But in addition to the Panama Steamship Line, the Government is successfully operating the Black Warrior-Mississippi Line. Canada considers her merchant marine one of her chief assets and is making a complete success of its operation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I desire to speak by the book now with reference to the bounties paid by Great Britain.

Great Britain pays about a million dollars a year to merchant seamen enlisted in her naval reserve. She pays about $300,000 in the form of annual retainers to seamen who drill one week every year with the navy. Great Britain pays about $100,000 a year to seamen who are known as Royal Naval Volunteers; but this is not all. She pays naval subventions to something like 20 fast steamers so built as to be readily converted into auxiliary naval cruisers. These subventions amount to about half a million dollars every year. Nor is this all. The Cunard Line receives an annual subvention of three-quarters of a million dollars in return for the obligation which I have already mentioned, of selling or of leasing any vessel of the line to the Government in case of need. Besides all this, the British Government pays liberally for the carriage of the mails. In the case of France, according to the last report I have France paid in construction bounties $3,441,000 in one year and in operating bounties $466,000; and Italy rivals France in the extent to which government aid is given. In other words, outside of the United States there is no maritime power operating a merchant marine without very liberal governmental subvention of some sort.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the United States pays liberally for the carrying of the mails. That is one thing. The United States has exempted from taxation all material entering into the construction of ships or the furnishing of ships. It comes in free of duty. We have provided in our legislation various means of encouraging capital. Then we have also provided a fund which we loan at 4 per cent interest for the building of ships. That is taken care of in our legislation. So that we are not so far behind in these indirect benefits and encouragements to shipping.

Germany came out of the war with about 500,000 tons of ships. She now has nearly 2,000,000 tons. She had over 6,000,000 tons at the beginning of the war, and she is building ships day after day. All these maritime nations are building ships. Great Britain built something over 3,000,000 tons—and I will refer to that a little later—last year; and there were less than 300,000 tons built in the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. Not a ton for the transoceanic trade.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; not a ton for overseas trade.

Then the President said—and I must hurry on, because I am taking up too much time, and I want to get through with this:

> No investigation, of which I have caused several to be made, has failed to report that it could not succeed or to recommend speedy transfer to private ownership.

I may say in that connection, that generally speaking, throughout the country, I think, a majority of the people of the United States would rather see these ships in private hands and privately operated; but after eight or nine years of delay and effort to get rid of the ships we have offered them at $5 a ton, where they cost over $200 a ton; we have advertised everywhere and by every means that "price makes no difference; come and take the ships," and they are not taking them. Private enterprise stays out. American money is invested in foreign-flag shipping and is making money. The interest of the foreign shipowners is against an American merchant marine, and especially against the Government's owning and operating a merchant marine, because they know they can not run the Government's ships off the seas.

There are difficulties in connection with Government ownership and operation. I concede that; but we are face to face with the proposition, Shall we have any merchant marine or shall we abandon the seas? That is the whole question; and the only certain way that we now know of for having any kind of a merchant marine carrying even 30 per cent of foreign trade is for the Government to own and operate and for the Government to construct and replace and balance the fleet.

> Our exporters and importers—
>
> Says the President—
>
> are both indifferent about using American ships.

No wonder, if that be true—and I am not disposed to question it—I would qualify it, because I think in many instances they are anxious to patronize American ships—but how can they count upon the service when they are told every day that next month this ship may be sold to somebody else and pass into other hands and the service be abandoned?

> It should be our policy to keep our present vessels in repair and dispose of them as rapidly as possible rather than undertake any new construction.

I suppose that is the reason why the President struck out this provision for $12,000,000, recommended by the Shipping Board and passed by the Budget, for reconditioning the *Mount Vernon* and the *Agamemnon*.

> Their operation is a burden on the National Treasury, for which we are not receiving sufficient benefits.

I seriously question that proposition. I think there are losses which will have to be met out of the National Treasury and that may continue for some time, but I feel absolutely convinced that the benefits to the American people far exceed these losses; and why talk about losses to the Government out of the Treasury if the people are benefited?

Why, Mr. President, speedily get rid of the ships? We might just as well abolish entirely the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. We might save ourselves the hundreds of thousands of dollars that we appropriate annually to establish new offices and new agencies and endeavor to extend our foreign trade. We might just as well abandon all that effort—and I have been a strong supporter of proper appropriations to maintain the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—if we abandon Government ownership and operation of the ships.

What is the use of building up trade, what is the use of making an effort to find new markets, if you must depend upon your competitors to carry your goods to those markets?

For instance, just as an illustration, here is Russia—a country very rich in natural resources. They have an abundance of raw material, but Russia is not manufacturing much now. On account of communism, lack of machinery and facilities, lack of skilled labor, and all that sort of thing, she is not increasing her manufacturing power. The American people are increasing their industrial strength, and encouraging manufacturing. What chance have our manufacturers to get our goods into Russia in exchange for her raw materials if we are to depend upon Germany to carry our products over there?

There is Germany, a great manufacturing country, right next to Russia. Germany has the ships. If the United States has not any, what possible chance has the American manufacturer to get rid of any of his surplus in that country?

That is one illustration, but it applies all over the world. The Senator from Washington spoke about the information he obtained in South America. I was once down there as a member of the joint international high commission, which was holding a session in Buenos Aires. I was told this story, which I have no reason to doubt: Brazil wanted an enormous quantity of cement for building walls, roads, and other structures, and she advertised for bids. Certain tests had to be submitted to, and the bids came in. The American manufacturers of cement stood the highest tests. The price of the American cement f. o. b. here was the lowest, and America was about to walk away with the contract for millions of tons of cement when Brazil said, "What will you deliver it for in Rio?" Then the manufacturers here began to look around, and they found that there was not an American merchant vessel plying between any port of the United States and Brazil. They had to look to the Lamport and Holt line, a British line, and when they applied to them for rates on that cement, they found the rates so high that Belgium and Great Britain got the contract for the cement and the American manufacturers were cut out.

That can happen with steel rails, with agricultural implements, with everything that we have to go to foreign markets to sell. We have an enormous surplus in this country of farm products, and a surplus of manufactured products. Are we going to say that we will rely upon foreign countries to deliver those products to the markets abroad? Are we to be abjectly dependent upon foreign countries to carry our goods to the waiting markets overseas? If we are, we are helpless, and we will find it impossible to maintain living conditions in the United States, and we will find it not worth while to consider expanding or extending our foreign markets.

A correspondent of mine has submitted some questions to me. I have not the liberty to use his name, but the questions are quite pertinent in this connection.

> If Congress should attempt to abandon Government ownership of vessels in foreign trade at this time, what position would it leave the country in?
>
> Would it result in private interests coming forward to take over the Government lines now engaged in foreign trade? Or would it mean

just the complete abandonment of existing Government ownership lines, or most of them?

Private interests are not now disposed, or even able, to take over Government-owned lines. What, in such case, would become of them?

Is the taking over of Government lines now a thoroughgoing success?

Or are those who have taken over the ships, at nominal prices for the ships, able to say that with Government ownership abandoned they would be better able to maintain the lines, build new tonnage as required, and bring the lines measurably up to a parity with the foreign lines with which they compete?

Would immediate abandonment of Government-owned lines cause foreign lines to be more considerate of existing lines of American ships in foreign trade? Or would it, on the contrary, cause foreign lines to focus upon the few American privately owned lines and drive them from the seas? And that accomplished, would not American importers and exporters find themselves called upon to pay ocean freight rates so much higher than now are charged as to make the losses of the Shipping Board trivial, in comparison with the greater cost of ocean transportation almost wholly in foreign ships?

Would the inevitable increase in ocean freight rates that would follow Government abandonment of shipping lines have a tendency to increase or decrease our foreign trade, now in such a healthy state of growth? In other words, has not the gratifying growth of our foreign commerce of recent years been due in large degree to the low freight rates that have prevailed, owing to the presence of so many American ships in foreign carrying?

Are any of the existing privately owned American lines engaged in foreign trade now in a position to build more efficient and swifter ships to supplant the comparatively inefficient slower ships now being operated?

What chance is there of new construction except by the Government?

How much would the chance of new construction be increased by abandonment by our Government of its shipping lines?

Would such new construction as might be undertaken, if at all, inure to the benefit of American shipbuilders, if dependent upon privately owned lines? Or would the new ships be built in foreign countries at greatly reduced cost?

Would the United States, if it engaged in new construction, replacement of semiobsolete, inefficient, slow ships, have them built abroad or at home?

In short, would not immediate abandonment of Government ownership of ship lines in foreign trade cause a rapid lapse back into the condition American ships in foreign trade were in at the outbreak of the World War? Would it not mean the destruction of American shipping in foreign trade, instead of its reconstruction now so greatly needed, and sure to be more than ever needed as time goes on?

Opponents of Government ownership all say, "Get rid of the ships." How can they be got rid of? Who will buy them? If bought, can they be maintained in foreign trade at present or in the near future with private provision for replacement as needed?

If not replaced, how long can existing lines of ships continue?

If replaced with more modern, swifter ships, who will replace them?

Who has suffered because of the Government-owned lines? Not the American people, who never enjoyed so long a period of low freight rates as they have enjoyed since the Government began operating ships in foreign trade. The Government? Is a great saving to the people a loss to the Government?

Are foreign ships suffering because of our Government-owned lines? If ocean freight rates are unremunerative, as we are told they are, and foreign ships carry two-thirds of our foreign trade, as now they do, do they not lose two dollars for every dollar lost by the Government-owned lines? And do not the people enjoy the advantage of the low freight rates?

What shipowners would rejoice more or benefit more than foreign shipowners through the immediate abandonment of Government-owned lines?

There is but one answer to that question.

If Americans who advocate the abandonment of Government ownership of ship lines in foreign trade until private American ownership of the lines is assured are not serving the ends of foreign ship lines, whose ends are they serving?

The Shipping Board is now losing through the spigot and American importers and exporters are saving at the bung. But the abandonment of Government-owned lines would cause the importers and exporters to lose through the bung, while the Government would save through the spigot. Whom would that benefit?

Besides desiring an American merchant marine privately owned, the people desire a real American merchant marine. Would they get it more surely under present conditions from private than from Government ownership?

Do the reports of the Shipping Board indicate that its lines in foreign trade could better succeed under private ownership, bearing the board's losses, than they now do, the Government bearing the losses? That is to say, does not the present operation of American ships in foreign trade prove conclusively that they can succeed only through Government ownership for some time longer?

Should not the Government make the lines more secure, more intrenched in foreign carrying, with shippers having greater dependence upon their permanency and more ready to employ them by continuing them until, beyond a peradventure, they could be maintained permanently, than to risk utter loss by selling or "getting rid" of them now?

Is not Government ownership a bulwark against the loss of lines of American ships? Would not the danger of the loss of the existing American lines be infinitely greater at present under private than under Government ownership? Why take such a risk? Who would benefit by the risk being taken? The people? Private American shipowners? The importers and exporters? No; the competing foreign ships.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The President speaks of the burden upon the Treasury of $12,000,000 a year for maintenance of our merchant marine. Is not that sum saved manyfold over, perhaps a hundredfold over, to the shippers of America?

Mr. FLETCHER. Unquestionably. In 1924 more than that was saved to the wheat growers of this country when the Shipping Board pulled out of the reserve fleet 105 ships and put them into the carrying of wheat to Europe. It was saved again to the cotton growers of the South in 1926, when the Shipping Board pulled out of its reserve fleet 95 ships and put them into the service, because the British ships, upon which we had been depending, were engaged in carrying coal from Norfolk to England on account of the coal strike in England.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him again, in this connection I recall very distinctly that in the fall of 1926 we had almost an embargo on cotton because we could not get ships. The Senator knows we had a tremendous crop that year, and it was necessary for us to have ships to transport the cotton to Europe. It was for what it did at that time that I want to commend the Shipping Board for the splendid way in which they came forward and furnished the ships so that cotton could go abroad during the fall of 1926.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is entirely correct, and I feel like joining him in that commendation. They are in position to serve the American people as no private enterprise could ever serve them, because no private enterprise will ever have a reserve fleet tied up idle.

The Shipping Board has, and as our trade needs it, and as our farmers need it, and as our manufacturers need it, as any of our people who have a surplus to go abroad need it, they can call upon that reserve fleet for service and save themselves.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that prior to the Civil War American genius produced a merchant marine which carried from 83 to 87 per cent, and some historians say 93 per cent, of our foreign commerce. Does not the Senator think that if we should repeal some of the archaic laws that are upon the statute books; if we would permit Americans to buy ships in foreign countries and place them under American registry; if we would permit American shipowners to have their ships repaired in foreign ports without being penalized for so doing; if we would permit American shipbuilders to bring into the United States materials necessary for the construction of ships without the payment of extortionate tariff rates, an American marine would soon be established sufficient to care for our foreign commerce?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think many of the things the Senator mentions we have now. For instance, we admit free of duty all materials entering into the construction and even the furnishing of ships.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is in error there, if he will pardon me.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is my recollection of the law. I agree with the Senator that it was a mistake to require that when repairs are made on our ships in foreign yards, 50 per cent of the cost of the repairs shall be added as a penalty. I think that is a mistake. I would like to see that law repealed.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that I have a bill pending touching that subject, and I hope he will see that it is reported out of the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will be very glad to give attention to it.

The Senator has spoken of our shipping in earlier days. I have a chart before me which shows that in 1830 vessels flying the American flag were carrying 89.9 per cent of our overseas trade, in 1840 they were carrying 82.9 per cent, in 1850 they were carrying 72.5 per cent, in 1860 they were carrying 66.5 per cent. Then came the Civil War, then the building of ships out of steel, and new kinds of carriers and various causes

resulted in a decline, so that in 1870 we carried only 35.6 per cent of our commerce overseas in American vessels. In 1880 we carried 17.4 per cent, in 1890 we carried 12.9 per cent, in 1900 we carried 9.3 per cent, and in 1910 we carried 8.7 per cent. In 1920, after spending $3,000,000,000 to build these ships, we carried 42.7 per cent of our foreign commerce in American bottoms. In 1924 we carried 36.3 per cent. Mind you, we begin this policy of getting out of business and getting the ships into private hands, and this is the result: In 1924 we carried 36.3 per cent, in 1925 we carried 34.1 per cent, and in 1926 we carried 32.2 per cent. Probably in 1930, unless Congress takes some positive stand in this connection, we will be getting back to where we were in 1910.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree with me that if we will repeal some of the restrictive measures now on the statute books, we will go a long way toward the rehabilitation of our merchant marine. The Senator knows that our coastwise trade is in the hands of Americans, who have a complete monopoly, and their boats carry millions of tons of freight annually. If we will adopt rational measures with respect to vessels that are engaged in foreign trade and permit such vessels to engage in coastwise trade, we will build up our merchant marine without subsidies or pursuing the policy which is so eloquently advocated by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

It is the opinion of those best acquainted with the handling of our Government-owned ships that inefficiency and extravagance have been largely responsible for the losses which have resulted. Certainly the policies pursued can not be commended by any business organization. If we placed the ships owned by the Government in the hands of competent men, undoubtedly the results would be far better.

I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that some of our ships are obsolescent and of types that will soon make them obsolete. They were built under high pressure during the war, and to meet a situation entirely different from that now obtaining. As we have made progress in aerial navigation, we have made progress in shipbuilding. Shippers are demanding faster and better ships, in order that their commodities may quickly reach their destined markets. Germany is building ships which are faster than most of ours, and this will result in their capturing markets in South America and elsewhere which the United States should dominate. England is constructing better ships for commercial purposes and our war-built vessels will not be able to compete with them. Diesel engines and other improved machinery are being employed in German boats, as well as those built in other countries. If we would compete with the ocean carriers of other nations, we must change our present policy. That America can operate at a profit vessels to engage in foreign commerce, and can successfully compete with the other countries, I have no doubt. But we must abandon the present policy and adopt a rational one.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am much obliged to the Senator for his interruption. Every maritime nation in the world is building merchant ships just as fast as they can lay the keels, except the United States.

As the Senator suggests, we have got to improve our ships. We have to build faster ships; we have to construct them upon the latest improved lines. But what private American citizen is going to do it? Where are the individuals or the concerns that are going to do it? There is but one way to do it, and that is for the Government to do it.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. May I ask the Senator from Florida why it is that private individuals will not go into this business? Our people are very avid for gain. They never lose a point when it comes to providing the efforts of a business enterprise in one direction or another. Why is it that private enterprise in this country will not take the form of building and operating ships as it once did, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has pointed out?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think one reason is that we have been talking about doing something for private shipowners. At every session of Congress there is some suggestion that we are going to subsidize the undertaking and there is hope of a subsidy. That is one thing that holds them up. To my mind there is perhaps another reason more controlling. For instance, if the Senator and I should form a corporation and make up our minds that we were going to establish a line between Baltimore and Rio and we would go to the Shipping Board and make them a proposition for ships, we could get them for a song. We could start our line. But before investing much money in that line we would want to consider what the prospects are of a foreign ship line running us off the seas by the reduction of rates in a few months.

Mr. BRUCE. In other words, we would be uncertain as to whether we could successfully compete with foreign lines, and that would be because the cost of operation as respects foreign lines is much lower than the cost of operation of American lines.

Mr. FLETCHER. There might be various other reasons. At one time foreign lines organized what they called "fighting" ships. The purpose of those ships was to lower rates as against independent undertakings, to run those undertakings out of business, and then immediately the rates would go up again.

Mr. BRUCE. If there is any real profit in it the American people would also build and operate fighting lines and fighting ships. Is not the real reason after all that we do not take to the sea because it is not profitable for us to take to the sea and because it is profitable for us to adhere to the land?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is not quite the case. There is a profit in the business. Seven hundred million dollars is the freight bill paid by our people.

Mr. BRUCE. That is a tremendous prize for the spirit of American competition to struggle for. It is worth struggling for but for the fact that there are economic reasons which render it inexpedient for our people to embark on that particular form of enterprise unless some artificial lure is held out to them in the shape of a subsidy or what not that would tend to equalize the disparity between the cost of operating foreign ships and the cost of operating American ships.

Mr. COPELAND. Is there not another thing, that unless the American shipowner is put on the same plane of equality with the foreign shipowner, he can not compete?

Mr. BRUCE. That is to say, put on the same footing of competitive equality?

Mr. COPELAND. Exactly. The cost of building a ship is an item. Suppose he could not get one from the Shipping Board? If he were to go into the American shipyards to-day, he would find that the cost of building a ship here is tremendously greater than it is abroad.

Mr. BRUCE. Precisely. My attention has been called to that fact.

Mr. COPELAND. There is no question about it. For that reason there is now a bill before the Commerce Committee proposing to equalize the difference actually existing and to pay a subsidy of that sort and give that kind of assistance in order that the American shipowner may build and own a ship at the same price that it may be done abroad.

Mr. BRUCE. That is the only thing to be done as I see it. As long as we have the merchant marine that we have now, I am most heartily in favor of keeping it in repair and making whatever necessary replacement the circumstances require. Until we do turn over these ships to private enterprise I think that should be done. I do not think we should begrudge the necessary appropriation for that purpose, and I am free to say I am inclined to question the wisdom of the President in taking the position he did in regard to the appropriation of which the Senator was just speaking. I had the pleasure last spring of going over on one of our boats, the *Leviathan*, and coming back on the *Leviathan*, and as far as I could see a more superbly operated ship never was built. I was highly gratified, indeed my national pride was elated, by what seemed to me to be the splendid management of that ship in every respect.

But I do believe the Government is unfit in the long run, in the long reckoning, for any form of industrial enterprise, whether the operation of ships or otherwise. If we look carefully into the figures, we will find that not one solitary industrial enterprise ever conducted by the Government has been conducted except at a loss. I have repeatedly challenged Senators to state one single, solitary instance in which, over any considerable period of time, the Government ever conducted anything in the nature of an industrial enterprise except at a deficit, and that challenge has never in one instance been successfully met.

I think, so far as carrying on the shipping business or any other business in the nature of business that is ordinarily conducted by individuals, the Government is simply growing orchids. It is not engaged in the raising of potatoes or corn or wheat, but in the growing of orchids. That is what it is doing now in attempting to operate these ships. At the same time I do hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I have listened to his most instructive and admirable address, and I confess some of my presuppositions in regard to the subject have been very considerably shaken by what he has said. I do feel that the situation should be met by the Government. As long as we have the fleet, we should maintain it in the proper way for the purpose of saving the lives of our people,

not to go any further. Then I do hope at some time that our policy will be to look ultimately to the transfer of this great industry to private hands even if we have to pay a price for it, like the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] suggested, in the nature of some kind of a governmental subsidy or subvention.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am much obliged to the Senator for his interruption, but I must hurry on and finish; otherwise I would like to take time to discuss to some extent the points which he has raised. I mentioned three instances a while ago to which I might refer again as evidencing the possibilities of the Government conducting this enterprise. I mentioned the Panama Steamship Line and the Black Warrior-Mississippi Line; also the Canadian Steamship Line operated by the Canadian Government.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I have listened to what the Senator from Maryland stated and I have great sympathy with his feeling in regard to Government operation, and I rather think the Senator from Florida himself has some sympathy with it. I am very much opposed to it as a principle, but I have looked into the possibility of an American merchant marine both from the standpoint of what we have been and from the standpoint of what we are now and ought to be. I am convinced that there is no possibility of an American merchant marine under our present range of cost in production and operation unless we will in some way subsidize to make up the difference, which now seems to be out of the question. It seems to me that we are now facing the alternative whether we will abandon the merchant marine or permit the Government to go ahead with it. From the standpoint of commerce it might be better to let it go, but from the standpoint of national defense it would seem to me an indefensible position to take. For that reason, being very strongly opposed to Government operation, I can not see that there is any other assured way, and I have come to that conclusion very reluctantly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am obliged to the Senator for his remarks. I think he is absolutely sound in his position. I only disagree with him in that I believe that for the sake of our commerce, for the sake of our trade, for the sake of our producers, the farmers and the manufacturers, we must have a merchant marine in overseas trade and, of course, as a means of national defense. We can not escape that position.

Mr. FESS. I think I may have been misunderstood. I meant for the sake of argument to omit the commerce. The commerce feature is an important one.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is very important. It is vital, it seems to me, to the welfare of the country.

I may say now, generally speaking, with reference to an adequate American merchant marine, that there appear to be two distinct policies advanced. First, that favored by the present administration, to the effect that the Government should speedily get out of the shipping business; second, that the Government should continue permanently to own and operate merchant ships in overseas trade.

In the merchant marine act of 1920 the fixed policy of the Government was announced to be to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine. It was declared that the intention was to have this merchant marine "ultimately pass to private hands." It was unfortunate, perhaps, to announce such intention, although it is distinctly a secondary consideration. The prime purpose was to establish and maintain a merchant marine under our flag in foreign commerce adequate to serve our needs in time of peace as well as in times of emergencies.

MISTAKEN CONSTRUCTION

The policy announced was all right if properly construed, but those who have had the administration of the act in charge have seemed to largely ignore the prime purpose and lay emphasis upon the second thought. They have appeared to construe the language of the act as meaning the goal to be attained was to get the ships into private hands speedily and get the Government out of the shipping business. In pursuance of this idea those in authority supported primarily plans and schemes for disposing of the ships. They went so far as to sell the *City of Los Angeles* for $100,000, she being a German-built vessel seized by us during the war, costing approximately $1,600,000, on which the Shipping Board spent $2,000,000 to recondition, and also some $47,000 for hotel supplies within a month of her sale. In pursuance of this policy also the combination cargo and passenger ships—some of the finest afloat on any ocean, having cost the Government over $30,000,000—were sold to the Dollar Line for $4,500,000, payable in five years, with the guarantee that they continue the service and fly the American flag during that period of time. A five-year guarantee of service when sales are made is ridiculous when we consider that time is not more than a minute in the life of a nation. It is not necessary to recite numerous sales at terrible sacrifices in pursuance of this idea of getting rid of ships and getting out of the shipping business. One argument in support of this idea was that the Government was losing some forty to fifty million dollars a year and it was desirable to save this loss.

NO EARNEST, SINCERE EFFORT TO SUCCEED

No notice was taken of the fact that no serious, businesslike effort was being put forth to make the business a success, but everything was done to discourage the building up and establishment and maintenance of a merchant marine. Those in authority put themselves in the absurd position of offering the property for sale, which was worse than worthless, according to their claims, inasmuch, as alleged, those who acquired them were bound to lose money. American merchants were admonished of the futility of making contracts for the movement of exports and imports with Government-owned ships because any day, practically without notice, those ships were likely to pass into other hands and under different management and control. No business could succeed on any such basis. Those engaged in it were apparently determined to make it a failure.

FAILURE TURNED INTO SUCCESS

Public sentiment reacted to this situation and finally there came a time when more serious attention was given to the problem of operation, with the result that the alleged and exaggerated losses have gradually disappeared and the business is being conducted in a more intelligent, energetic, and efficient manner. It is gratifying to note that the direct operating profit of the United States Lines, embracing five trans-Atlantic passenger ships, for the fiscal year 1927 was $635,842.97; the loss for the fiscal year 1926, using the same factors, was $650,000; the net result shows an improvement in 1927 over 1926 of $1,285,842.97. I am assured that the United States Lines's vessels are in very good condition; that the item of repairs carries several hundreds of thousands of dollars in betterments that could probably be considered as a capital charge. The merchant line of freight ships operated by the Government is also showing a decided improvement, with gratifying results. Those lines, owned by the Government and operated by private operators, are being conducted on a more businesslike basis without very great loss—the losses in nowise approach the saving in freight to our shippers.

ATTITUDE OF BUSINESS MEN

I have noted with no little concern the position taken by those who favor the first-mentioned policy, including the resolutions adopted May 4, 1927, by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the comment thereon by newspapers to the general effect that the—

protest is as strong as any protest ever made and has the weight of millions of thinking men behind it.

In supporting this resolution Mr. Gadsden said:

I make no pretensions to any special knowledge of shipping matters.

And further:

As I understand the temper of the business men of this country, we are opposed to Government entering into any phase of business, and we are looking hopefully to the time in the near future when the Government will retire from the shipping business and turn back this great field of American business into the hands of American business.

SHIPPING BOARD'S POSITION

During the discussion Chairman O'Connor of the Shipping Board said:

We absolutely want to get out of business, and we are willing to sell to any man, any American, who will come and buy the ships at any time, at any place, and the price does not make much difference. I believe that is a fairly good offer to anybody here who has the idea that the Shipping Board does not want to sell ships. Come down to us; we will sell the ships if you will pick the route out, or we will tell you what the routes are, we will furnish you with the figures as to how the ships are running, how they are running at the present time, whether they are making money or losing money. We will give you all the information, and then you can make up your minds which one of the 23 routes you want to buy and we will sell the ships.

He further said:

We want to get out of business just as soon as we can, and we are trying to do that very thing. I make this statement to you: There is no man that can come to you and state to you publicly, so that it will be heard, that he has tried to buy ships from the Shipping Board and was refused, unless he wanted the Shipping Board to hand them over to him for nothing. That we can not do. They are Government property, and we are going to try to get just as much money for them as we can, especially in individual sales. In route sales, as I said before,

gentlemen, the price does not make the least bit of difference to the Shipping Board. Come and make us an offer, anybody here. We have 23 routes now for sale. Come and make us an offer, if it is $5 a ton, $10 a ton, or $7 a ton. Those vessels cost the good old Government of the United States $200 a ton. There is a vast difference between a $5.50 capital investment and a $200 capital investment. We are giving you a big subsidy to buy the vessels; so if you know anybody who wants to buy, come on and buy. We are ready to sell.

What is the use of talking about getting out of business and delivering the ships into private hands in the face of this offer, which has been repeated over and over again? What is the use of talking about the handicap of American owners when they are offered ships at $5 a ton that cost $200 a ton and still refuse to get into the business.

CORRECT POLICY

In my judgment, and if I had the authority, I should not say another word about selling ships; I should not insert another advertisement or permit any talk about the Government going out of business. On the contrary, I should announce to the world that private enterprise having failed utterly to take the proper interest in ships and the building up of an American merchant marine, the Government is in the shipping business to stay, and the policy shall be from now on to eliminate the words in the merchant marine act, "ultimately to pass to private hands," and shall be to aggressively carry out the prime purpose of the merchant marine act—to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine, and to that end the Government shall continue permanently to own and operate vessels in overseas trade. I should make this issue in the next campaign; I should put this pledge in the Democratic platform and go to the country on it, announcing clearly and unequivocally the policy of this Government to permanently own and operate merchant ships in foreign trade, to serve American commerce, protect American business abroad, and meet our competitors on common ground abroad, and serve our country in time of need.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Merchant ships are just as necessary in time of war, or when extraordinary conditions arise, as are cruisers, destroyers, and floating batteries. This was demonstrated clearly, so that any man with any sense at all could understand it, during the World War. After the German submarines became active England would have been forced out of the war within eight weeks but for her merchant marine. Our allies had lost 6,000,000 deadweight tons to December, 1916, and after that they were losing 650,000 tons a month, making their total losses 8,000,000 deadweight tons for 1917. No wonder the Allies sent forth their urgent appeal to us for ships, ships, and more ships if the war were to be won. Each appeal was warranted by the acute necessity. Mr. Hurley says in his book, The Bridge to France:

Germany never would have begun her ruthless submarine warfare on February 1, 1917, if the United States had possessed a substantial merchant marine.

Chairman O'Connor further said during the discussion of this resolution:

It comes rather hard to me to look out of that window and look at the Washington Monument and then sit here in this room and hear a resolution trying to put the American business men in the hole. They will realize that they are going in the hole, gentlemen, the minute you get the ships off the ocean that the Government is operating at the present time.

There is not a shadow of doubt if all the Government-owned ships were given away to private parties within six months they would, in the main, pass into foreign hands or come under the control of foreign interests.

In 1914 not more than 10 per cent of American commerce was being moved in American bottoms. The United States had only 9.4 per cent of the world tonnage. Great Britain had 41.6 per cent. Now we have 21.6 per cent and are carrying about 30 per cent of our foreign commerce. Does the American manufacturer and producer wish to go back to that situation? Does he not remember that when the German ships were out of commission, the British ships commandeered for war uses to a great extent, freight rates went up on wheat from New York to Liverpool from 3 cents to 50 cents a bushel and from $2.50 to $50 on cotton per bale from Galveston to Liverpool? Does he not remember when contracts for cement and for steel were offered the United States producers in South America, they were unable to obtain the contracts—not because their products were not superior, not because their prices were not lower, but because foreign competitors were able to control freight rates, and the cost of delivering the goods was made such that foreign competitors could make deliveries at a better figure?

SOME ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Chairman O'Connor further said in the discussion of this resolution of protest:

Ask your farmers out in the Middle West, ask your cotton planters in the South what the Shipping Board did for them last fall. Ask them what it did for them in 1924. We saved the day for them. We saved the day last fall for them by putting ships in. Private owners did not have an American ship to carry a cargo of grain out of the southern ports last fall—not an American ship. They did not have any British ships; they did not have any other kinds of ships, because they all left our grain piled in our elevators, they left the grain piled in cars, they left your cotton stored on the docks—for the reason that foreign ships that were carrying that freight could get more money for carrying coal to England.

At the time of the coal strike in England 90 ships were drawn from this Government-owned reserve fleet and put into service by the Shipping Board, and in that way our surplus products of grain, cotton, and the like were able to reach the markets overseas. Private owners were not and could not be in position to render that service. I call attention to further statements by Chairman O'Connor:

Take your locomotive works: How many locomotives did they ever ship to the southern ports from this country direct until the United Shipping Board put vessels on to carry locomotives there? Ask some of them. Ask the Baldwin locomotive people or some of the rest of them how many they shipped and why they did not ship them? Because the American locomotive manufacturer was up against a proposition of a $4-a-ton transhipment charge before we put our vessels in there. We cut that charge away, and they are now able to compete with the world. The General Electric Co. and the Western Electric Co. are in the same position. There is no transshipment charge on their goods now. They are going right where the people want them in the southern ports, right direct from New York, with weekly sailings.

FOREIGN INTERESTS

There is no doubt but that every foreign competitor desires above all things that the Government shall go out of the shipping business and all ships be turned over to private hands. In looking out for the interests of the United States, I am not given to taking the advice of other countries. It is claimed we are violating a great principle by continuing the Government in the shipping business. I deny it. I am perfectly willing that private enterprise should undertake this business; I would greatly desire that—but for 50 years private enterprise has failed, although we did what we could to encourage it. We were in a helpless condition when the war came on in 1914—in an unnecessary, humiliating, indefensible, foolish position of absolute dependency upon foreign ships to move our products to market and bring to us the things we needed. Now, for 10 years past we have spent time and money trying to prove that the Government could not handle this business successfully and trying to persuade private enterprise to get into it. We have been willing to sacrifice the ships, although the people of this country paid some $4,000,000,000 for this enterprise; the authorities have made every effort to throw that away, and yet with all these inducements private enterprise holds back and refuses to establish and maintain an American merchant marine worth while. We are in very much the same position that we were in during the war when the German submarines became active. Marine insurance companies came to Washington and appealed to the Government to go into the insurance business; they declined to write marine insurance—they said the hazard was too great. Responding to their appeal, the Government established a Bureau of War Risk Insurance and protected shipping during those trying days. The rates were reasonable, nowise exorbitant—in fact, if there was any increase it was very nominal. After the war these insurance companies wanted the Government to get out of the business. All right, it did; showing a profit of some $17,000,000 made while engaged in it.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION

It is all nonsense and an unwarranted reflection upon every honest man connected with the Government to claim that men can not be found with sufficient honesty, intelligence, and patriotism to conduct this business. Canada's Government owned and operated ships constitute one of the most valuable assets of that country; Australia has been successfully operating her ships; the Panama Canal Line is a great success, showing satisfactory earnings, notwithstanding they carry all Government supplies at much less than commercial rates. The Government owns and operates the Mississippi & Black Warrior Line, moving a tremendous commerce, keeping down rates, and serving as an additional facility of transportation for great areas of the country. The Government transport lines in the Army and Navy are efficiently and economically conducted. I am thor-

oughly convinced that the one certain way and, so far as we sell, the only possible way for us to have an adequate merchant marine is for the Government to own and operate merchant ships in overseas trade. We must maintain the routes we now have, although the Shipping Board seems willing to practically give them away if private enterprise would keep them up. I would stop this talk, absolutely, about the sale of routes and the sale of ships; I would not even sell the hulls of our so-called obsolete ships for the purpose of being destroyed or scrapped, as per notices in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 16. On the other hand, I would lay them up in fresh water, possibly in the James River, and keep them there without any expense, even for paint, so that they could be drawn upon for use in emergencies—just as supposedly useless hulls were resurrected and pressed into service during the World War.

REPLACEMENTS AND RECONSTRUCTION

I do not favor appropriating large amounts of money for the purpose of building new ships in order to replace others that may, in the course of years, be out of commission, if power is to remain in the Shipping Board to sell these new ships at any price they may consider reasonable. I would favor appropriating money to add to the United States Lines such ships as will strengthen and make more profitable that line; I would appropriate money for the purpose of building new ships in order to balance our fleets where needed, but with the understanding and the emphatic declaration that such ships are to be owned and operated permanently by the Government. I would favor a definite program of replacement to supply the facilities our country needs whenever individual Americans fail to provide them.

MIDDLE WEST CLAIMS

The Middle West properly demands that steamship routes by way of the Gulf and South Atlantic ports should insure a permanency of service at ocean rates on a parity with the North Atlantic. They justly insist that the ships the United States Government is now operating should be continued in operation.

They are outspoken in the view that in the interest of commerce and national security the Shipping Board should continue to operate through private companies all present lines and services now established and make such additions to lines and services from time to time as may be required.

They very reasonably urge, too, a definite policy of replacement, reconstruction, and modernization of vessels, as our foreign competitors are doing, in order to meet the competition presented by the best of foreign ships. I am in full accord with this position. It is sound and patriotic and vitally important to the whole country.

THE SOLUTION

In all candor, having been with this problem since 1909, studied it, read and heard everything put forth on the subject that I could reach, I must say to our Middle West friends and to all others interested—and that embraces all our people—that in order to insure the things you want you must go one step further and insist that the fixed policy of the Government shall be that the Government must own and operate these ships in foreign trade, not interfering with private ownership and operation under our flag, but to adequately supply this country's needs.

The wealth of this Nation is estimated at $400,000,000,000. We have a foreign trade estimated at $10,000,000,000 anuually. Our freight bill for the transportation of this commerce is estimated at $600,000,000 annually. What folly it is for the United States to be abjectly dependent upon other countries to carry our goods! Can we expect any fair show in foreign markets, can we ever hope for any expansion of our trade if we must rely upon our competitors to deliver our goods? "Retire from the shipping business"; turn back this great field of "American business into the hands of American business" is fine talk. I can imagine the hearty applause of every foreign shipping interest. If the American business man is not more stupid than I can think of his being, he would raise his voice in protest. He would ask, What then? Who is ready to take over the 24 routes now operated by the Shipping Board or its agents? Who is prepared to operate the 300 ships now engaged by the Government, or any considerable number of them, even if they are given away? What American business men are prepared or ever expect to be prepared to render the service to American commerce evidenced by the figures of the Shipping Board for 1926, when they covered 11,270,341 miles and carried exports and imports valued at approximately $850,000,000 at a cost to American shippers of 2.2 cents for each dollar's worth of goods carried? Can we afford to have less part in our foreign trade than we are now taking, when—even now—70 per cent of our international trade is carried in foreign-flag ships?

We scrapped 850,000 tons of naval vessels, many of them the most modern types of fighting ships, at a cost of $400,000,000, lost our naval position, and now these "business men" want us to scrap our merchant fleets in order not to interfere with private business. We might as well scrap the remainder of our Navy if and when this Government ceases to own and operate merchant ships.

If the Shipping Board goes out of business and the Government ships in foreign trade pass into private hands, within a year thereafter they will be in control of foreign shipping interests. In any case, whether that follows or not, the world routes of trade will be focused in New York and use of the ports of the South Atlantic and Gulf, so far as overseas trade is concerned, will be greatly curtailed, if not abandoned.

Every maritime nation in the world is doing its best to build ships and put them into foreign trade service except the United States.

From 1921 to 1926, for transoceanic service—vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over—

Great Britain built 600 vessels, totaling 3,500,000 gross tons;
Germany built 172 vessels, totaling 650,000 gross tons;
Italy built 83 vessels, totaling 506,000 gross tons;
France built 72 vessels, totaling 450,000 gross tons;
Japan built 52 vessels, totaling 250,000 gross tons; and
United States built 14 vessels, totaling 137,000 gross tons.

In 1921 the United States had in foreign trade, privately owned, 843 vessels of 2,964,113 gross tons; Shipping Board, 1,716 vessels of 7,656,604 gross tons.

June 30, 1927, the situation was—in foreign trade:

Privately owned, 525 vessels of 2,197,507 gross tons; and
Shipping Board, 780 vessels of 4,093,950 gross tons.

In other words, from 1921 to 1927 our shipping in foreign trade has gone from 2,559 vessels of 10,620,717 gross tons to 1,305 vessels of 6,291,457 gross tons. This while we have been supposedly making every effort to create and maintain an adequate American merchant marine and especially to get it into private hands.

Apparently private ownership has increased since 1914, but under the head of "Privately owned" there are tankers, totaling 1,011,000 gross tons, owned and operated by oil companies for the transportation of their own products. Deducting these, it will be noted no progress has been made toward interesting private capital in the enterprise and we can not rely upon that method of establishing and maintaining an adequate American merchant marine.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter from the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce, dated August 11, 1927, which gives the figures respecting our tonnage; also a letter from the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce of October 1, 1927.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The letters are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, August 11, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of the 2d instant requesting a statement showing—

1. American tonnage in overseas foreign trade—
(a) Owned by the Government.
(b) Privately owned.

Divided into—
(a) Passenger ships.
(b) Cargo ships.
(c) Passenger and cargo.
(d) Tankers.
(e) All others, e. g. Tramps.

On June 30, 1927, the total registered (foreign trade) tonnage of the United States included 1,305 vessels of 6,291,457 gross tons, as follows:

Vessel	(a) U. S. Shipping Board 1,000 gross and over		(b) Privately owned			
			1,000 gross and over		500 to 999 gross	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
Passenger	13	214,351	95	638,391	3	1,938
Cargo	745	3,756,367	261	538,036	9	6,481
Tankers	8	48,055	156	1,011,829	1	832
Refrigerators	14	75,177				
Total	780	4,093,950	512	2,188,256	13	9,251

Under "passenger ships" are included passenger and cargo ships, as they are not stated separately in the records, and I have given the refrigerator ships, as these are separated. I regret that the number and tonnage of tramp vessels can not be given, as they are not shown in the records, but they are included in the totals of "privately owned."

The Panama Railroad Co. has four vessels of 24,445 gross tons documented. It has several other vessels which are not documented and consequently are not of record in this office.

The Mississippi-Warrior service has 11 vessels of 9,788 gross tons, the Inland Waterway Corporation 1 vessel of 1,411 gross tons, and the Engineer Corps 2 vessels of 2,822 gross tons, all of which are documented. The Engineer Corps has many other vessels which are not documented.

You will understand that many of the vessels included in the above figures of registered vessels were laid up on June 30. Of the Shipping Board vessels, only 283 of 1,745,529 gross tons were active on that date.

Respectfully,

A. J. TYRER, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, October 1, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Complying with your request of August 30 last, I am submitting herewith the following statement showing privately owned vessels (500 gross tons and over) and United States Shipping Board vessels (1,000 gross tons and over) in foreign and domestic trade on June 30, 1921, and June 30, 1927:

	June 30, 1921		June 30, 1927	
	Vessels	Gross tons	Vessels	Gross tons
Foreign trade:				
Private ownership	843	2,964,113	525	2,197,507
Shipping Board	1,716	7,656,604	780	4,093,950
Total	2,559	10,620,717	1,305	6,291,457
Domestic commerce:				
Private ownership	1,082	2,266,517	1,432	4,638,848
Shipping Board	82	347,167	99	445,756
Total	1,164	2,613,684	1,531	5,084,604
Grand total	3,723	13,234,401	2,836	11,376,061

Respectfully,

A. J. TYRER, *Commissioner.*

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me from Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, dated December 14, 1927; and also a communication from the Military Order of the World War dated October 26, 1927, all sustaining the position which I have taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The communications referred to are as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In a recent letter you asked me to give you the exact wording of resolutions adopted by the National Grange at its recent annual session held in Cleveland, Ohio, November 16–25, regarding the merchant marine and the Federal Farm Loan Board.

Following is resolution with reference to merchant marine:

"Whereas an adequate American merchant marine is vital to our prosperity and security as a nation; and

"Whereas private enterprise, under prevailing conditions, can not fully supply the need in transoceanic service: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Grange favors continued ownership and operation of merchant ships by the Government through the agency of the United States Shipping Board, as necessity demands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we favor appropriations by Congress to keep our merchant fleet modern and efficient."

The grange formally indorsed Worthy Master L. J. Taber's utterance on the question of the Federal farm-loan system, in which he said:

"We do not need a Federal farm-loan system adjusted to suit the desires of the Nation's financial institutions, or its business interests. With such adjustment it would simply be an adjunct to the Federal reserve act. We do need, and must maintain, a Federal farm-loan system sound in its financial operation, guided and controlled by men competent to handle this huge undertaking, yet who are in sympathy with and understand the problems of rural life."

A resolution adopted by the grange included the following expression of sentiment regarding the farm-loan system:

"*Resolved*, That we are opposed to any legislation looking to further concentrated control of the farm loan system."

Trusting that this may give you the information desired, I am

Yours very truly,

FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAPTER,
MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1927.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We appreciate the clear presentation of the situation surrounding the United States merchant marine which you pictured to us at the luncheon last week.

I am pleased to advise you that at a recent meeting the chapter has indorsed your views on the subject of Government operation.

Yours very sincerely,

EDWIN S. BETTELHEIM, Jr., *Adjutant.*

Mr. FLETCHER. I also wish to have inserted in the RECORD an article published in American Farming, in October, 1927, written by Alfred H. Haag, which is entitled "Why we need a merchant marine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

WHY WE NEED A MERCHANT MARINE—INDISPENSABLE TO EXTEND OUR FOREIGN TRADE AND GUARD NATIONAL SAFETY

By Alfred H. Haag, director department of international shipping, Georgetown University

Probably the most vital issue confronting the American people to-day is the much-discussed shipping problem.

The apparent lack of appreciation on the part of the American people of this issue is primarily due to the insidious propaganda that is and has been waged against any move toward the establishment of a permanent and adequate merchant marine owned, controlled, and operated by the American people. It is high time that they realize that most articles which have been published opposing the upbuilding of our merchant marine are nothing more or less than artful foreign propaganda.

American ships of commerce are an economic necessity and an indispensable factor as an auxiliary to our Navy in times of national emergency.

It is inconceivable that the richest nation in the world, with a wealth of $400,000,000,000 and an international trade of almost $10,000,000,000 annually, with freight revenues for transporting this trade amounting to $600,000,000 per annum, can not support a merchant marine of the best-equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce. The fact is that to-day 70 per cent of our international trade is carried in foreign-flag ships.

Flag-waving arguments have no effect in influencing American shippers to use American-flag ships, and will have none until such time as our flag waves from the ensign staff of a ship offering the same advantages in speed, regularity, and frequency of sailings as that offered by our competitors. Not until that time can we be assured of the full support of American shippers; nor is it fair or reasonable for us to expect them to accept inferior commercial service under the guise of patriotism.

The postwar trend has been toward cargo-liner service—that is, a port to port service, in contradistinction to tramp service—and this service now represents 75 per cent of the world's merchant tonnage. Our competitors were quick to recognize this trend and have either built or acquired modern tonnage with increased speeds and other economic advantages, so that to-day we are far behind in this respect.

During the period from 1921 to 1926 the principal maritime nations built for transoceanic service vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over, totaling approximately as follows:

Country	Number of vessels	Gross tons
Great Britain	600	3,500,000
Germany	172	950,000
Italy	63	506,000
France	72	450,000
Japan	52	250,000
United States	14	137,000
Total	973	5,793,000

Or for every 1 ship of this class that the United States has built Great Britain has built approximately 42, Germany 12, France 5, Italy 4, and Japan 4.

Of ships building or contracted for at the present time, of the same class and service, the records disclose that for every 1 ship of this class that the United States is building or has contracted for at the present time Great Britain is building or has contracted for 35, Germany 12, Italy 7, Japan 5, and France 2.

Another striking comparison is in the number and speed of vessels, suitable for transoceanic service, registered under the flag of the principal maritime nations.

Ships of 12 knots and over: Great Britain 1,280, France 277, United States 235, Japan 206, Italy 186, Germany 153.

In this class we rank third, being outclassed by our principal competitor, Great Britain, 5 to 1. Of ships 20 knots and over, Great Britain attains an advantage of 6 to 1.

The foregoing illustrates very definitely our weakness in efficient ocean carriers compared with our principal competitor nations. Even Germany has been able to establish herself as a formidable competitor in the world's trade routes. In her fleet of to-day over 60 per cent of her total tonnage is less than five years old with the economic supremacy that that implies.

We seem to be content to operate ships which were constructed to meet a war emergency and unless a policy of replacement is adopted immediately we shall soon fade from the picture and again have to rely on our active competitors to carry our commerce to and from the ports of the world.

American shipping costs more, due to higher construction and operating costs, and we are adding to that handicap by operating obsolete types of vessels in competition with the faster and more modern types of our competitors. It is vitally necessary to embark immediately on a new construction program to provide our Nation with competitive types of commerce carrier.

It seems rather inconsistent for this Nation to have scrapped 850,000 tons of naval vessels (many of them the most modern types of fighting ships), and with it world naval supremacy, at a cost of almost $400,000,000 and then hold on like grim death to obsolete types of merchant ships while other nations have disposed of their inefficient ships without delay.

At the Washington Arms Conference in 1922 the United States made a sincere effort to assist other nations to curtail their expenditures by acquiescing in the apparent desire for world disarmament; and we proved our absolute sincerity in agreeing to and complying with the scrapping program. We even consented to one of the Washington treaty nations constructing capital ships after the Washington conference. In addition to this, when we glance over the world's shipbuilding activities for the past five years, we find all the nations who participated in the treaty have far outbuilt this country in combatant types of vessels. And to-day we are considerably below the naval strength agreed to at the Washington Arms Conference, which in spirit and principle was intended to cover all types of fighting ships. The American people most certainly felt that the strength of their Navy should be at least the equal of that of any of the Washington treaty nations. But after five years we find that we are trailing far behind.

It is astounding the progress our competitor nations have made in the upbuilding of their merchant and naval fleets, particularly since the signing of the Washington treaty; and it would be rather interesting to know how far American dollars have aided other nations in the strengthening of their sea power.

Of the $12,000,000,000 in private American loans, it is reasonable to assume that American dollars have aided these nations considerably in furnishing their shipyards with work in the construction of modern commerce carriers and naval vessels with which American ships must compete. It would seem that after all "Uncle Shylock" is a most liberal individual in assisting his friends across the seas, and it is high time that some consideration be given to our problems at home, particularly that of our sea power, which vitally affects the welfare of the entire Nation, both from an economic standpoint as well as that of national security.

If our Nation is to continue to prosper, it is highly essential that the American people awaken to the fact that American ships of commerce are an absolute necessity, not only to insure American industries uninterrupted ocean transportation in carrying their surplus products to the markets of the world, but to insure the continuous flow of our inbound commerce essential to industry.

In the matter of national defense it is obviously necessary that we have an adequate fleet of commerce carriers to support our Navy, as it is the combined strength of both the naval and merchant fleet that reflects the sea power. They are one and inseparable, and if we are to live up to American traditions and ideals our sea power must be second to none.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a short letter from Mr. Malcom M. Stewart, chairman of the Middle West Foreign Trade Committee, inclosing a bulletin which is entitled "A middle-west view of present shipping situation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the papers will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communications are as follows:

MIDDLE WEST FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE,
Cincinnati, Ohio, December 19, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: The advance copy of our December bulletin will be interesting to you, and I would appreciate it very much if you have any comments to make you would give me the benefit of your reaction.

Very truly yours,

MALCOM M. STEWART, *Chairman.*

MIDDLE WEST FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE,
Cincinnati, Ohio, December 22, 1927.

A MIDDLE WEST VIEW OF PRESENT SHIPPING SITUATION

To the members of the Middle West Foreign Trade Committee and others interested:

I attach copy of the resolutions adopted by the Middle West Foreign Trade and Merchant Marine Conference, held under the auspices of our committee at St. Louis on November 16, 1927. The action taken by the conference is in accord with the policies adopted and advocated by our committee during the past several years.

TO MAKE EFFORTS EFFECTIVE

In order to make effective the work of our organization it is essential that our members do everything they can to further the policies we are constantly and consistently supporting. Your Senators and Representatives want your views on these questions, particularly at this time when the Congress must take some action on the merchant-marine question. I urge therefore that you immediately request your Senators and Representatives to support the policies advocated by our recent conference.

I desire also to call to your particular attention statements made recently by the President on the merchant marine. We were hopeful the President would at this time come out for some definite aid for the merchant marine and would recommend that in the meantime the Congress do whatever might be necessary to keep our shipping services efficiently maintained and on a par with those operated under foreign flags.

ONE VIEW BY THE PRESIDENT

In his message to the Congress on December 6 the President has this, and only this, to say on the vital merchant-marine question:

"The United States Government fleet is transporting a large amount of freight and reducing its drain on the Treasury. The Shipping Board is constantly under pressure, to which it too often yields, to protect private interests rather than serve the public welfare. More attention should be given to merchant ships as an auxiliary to the Navy. The possibility of including their masters and crews in the Naval Reserve, with some reasonable compensation, should be thoroughly explored as a method of encouraging private operation of shipping. Public operation is not a success. No investigation, of which I have caused several to be made, has failed to report that it could not succeed or to recommend speedy transfer to private ownership. Our exporters and importers are both indifferent about using American ships. It should be our policy to keep our present vessels in repair and dispose of them as rapidly as possible rather than undertake any new construction. Their operation is a burden on the National Treasury, for which we are not receiving sufficient benefits."

ANOTHER VIEW BY THE PRESIDENT

On the same day in an address to the members of the Republican National Committee the President is quoted as follows:

"Waterways and harbors, however, are useless without ships. Our Government operation of our merchant marine has been helpful in many ways, but it is far lacking of complete success. It would be much cheaper and far more beneficial to get it into private hands under some system of Government support which would enable it to meet the lower costs of building and lower rates of wages of foreign shipping."

PRESIDENT'S VIEWS UNDEFINED

We do not know what the President had in mind when he stated the Shipping Board too often yields to pressure to protect private interests. We do know that very recently a majority of the Shipping Board refused to yield to private interests who wanted certain lines on terms that would be contrary to the direct mandate of the merchant marine act, 1920, and for which action the members of the Shipping Board are being severely criticized by those interested.

IMPORTERS AND EXPORTERS NOT INDIFFERENT

We do not believe our exporters and importers are indifferent about using American ships, but we do think constant agitation to get the

Government out of the shipping business, before sufficient aids are given private enterprises to take over the lines, is not hleping the patronage of our lines.

UNDUE PRESSURE ON SHIPPING BOARD

Constant efforts are made by people who want to get the Government out of the shipping business to make it appear that the law directs the Shipping Board to sell all vessels, regardless of the consequences. The law clearly directs the Shipping Board first to establish and maintain the merchant marine and, second, to sell the lines to private companies if by such sales the primary purpose of the law can be attained.

NECESSARY TO FOREIGN TRADE

With all due respect to the President, we maintain that the operation of the American merchant marine, either by private enterprise or by the Government, is of vital necessity to the proper growth of our foreign trade and for our national defense, and that the benefits derived from this operation even by the Government far exceed the burden on the Treasury. The expenditures for our shipping services are comparable to the appropriations made for our Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce for the promotion of our foreign trade. And we find a vast majority of our people support this view.

NO BURDEN ON TREASURY OR TAXPAYERS

Until some form of aid is given by the Government to enable private enterprise to permanently maintain all of our essential shipping services, we strongly urge that the Government continue the operation of the services through private American companies who have the support of the communities served, and that the Congress from time to time authorize whatever new construction may be necessary to efficiently maintain the lines, the cost of such new construction to come from the construction loan fund of the Shipping Board, and with no call on either the Treasury or the taxpayers.

This is no commitment to permanent Government ownership and operation, but it is a most definite commitment to a permanent, efficient American merchant marine.

And as long as the Government remains in the shipping business we favor the retention of the regional United States Shipping Board to maintain the services. This board was created by the Congress as an independent body to manage our merchant marine and it was never contemplated that the President should direct the policies of the board any more than he would the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Shipping Board represents the views of all sections of our country, not alone one section, on this all-important question.

Your Senators and Representatives will appreciate your views. I would be pleased to hear from you on this question.

MALCOLM M. STEWART, *Chairman.*

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like also to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Mr. H. B. Arledge, special representative of the Middle West Foreign Trade Committee, dated November 26, 1927, written to Mr. C. A. Swope, secretary, Traffic Club of New York, in reply to some questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE—VIEWS OF MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTHERN INTERESTS IN CONNECTION WITH ADDRESS BEFORE TRAFFIC CLUB OF NEW YORK BY IRA A. CAMPBELL, OF AMERICAN STEAMSHIP OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

MIDDLE WEST FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1927.

Mr. C. A. SWOPE,
Secretary of Traffic Club of New York,
Waldorf Astoria, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. SWOPE: As a member of the Traffic Club of New York, who is greatly interested in the development of our foreign trade and the maintenance of the American merchant marine, I desire to make a few comments on these subjects in connection with the address of Mr. Ira A. Campbell, general counsel of the American Steamship Owners' Association, before the club on October 25, and which address has recently been distributed to the members in pamphlet form.

I am writing particularly from the viewpoint of Middle Western and Southern commercial people with whom I am actively associated. I spent a number of years in the North Atlantic with the Pennsylvania Railroad System. The Middle West and South want nothing more than an equality of opportunity with our other sections and ports, and we have usually found most of our New York friends in accord with our efforts.

It has been clearly demonstrated on many occasions that the majority of the American people are in complete accord with the declaration in the preamble of the merchant marine act 1920 that "for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels." A majority of the people heard on this question have stated that they prefer the merchant marine to be under private ownership and operation, but until it is possible for private enterprise to take over for permanent maintenance the essential lines they desire the Government to continue the present policy of having the Shipping Board operate the services through private American companies.

It is generally admitted, and it was quite conclusively shown during the subsidy campaign of 1922, in which campaign I took an active part in an effort to secure aids for private owners, that American ships can not compete on equal terms in foreign trade with vessels operating under foreign flags. In view of this fact, why should any of the essential cargo lines that are now being maintained by the Shipping Board—lines that carry no mail and which could not benefit from any mail subsidy such as referred to by Mr. Campbell—be sold with only a stipulation that the purchaser must continue the service for a mere five years. If a purchaser did maintain the service for five years and during that time Congress granted no substantial aid to private American shipping companies, it is a hundred-to-one shot that upon the expiration of the five years the purchaser would discontinue the service and place the vessels in some profitable trade, probably our protected coastwise trade. Then the Shipping Board would likely be without suitable vessels with which to reestablish the service and the American merchant marine in foreign trade would soon be only a memory. It is a fairly safe guess that most of the Shipping Board services that have been sold under five-year guaranties of operation to which Mr. Campbell referred will be discontinued upon the expiration of the guaranty periods.

Why is it not best to continue the present method of operation until the Congress does grant the necessary aid and then turn the lines over to private enterprise, instead of trying to force sales at this time that are not sound. In the interim we can continue under the merchant marine act, 1920, urging Congress to make good the declaration in that act by the appropriation of sufficient funds for operations, reconditioning of some of the present vessels and construction of new vessels that are urgently needed to place our lines on a parity with our foreign competitors. We can not expect our producers and receivers to patronize lines that are inferior to those used by their competitors. Funds for this construction could be taken from the construction loan fund of the board, with no call on the taxpayers. This fund was created and still exists for the purpose of making loans to private American shipping companies, but no such companies are seeking loans to construct vessels for foreign service.

Surely this is no commitment to permanent Government ownership and operation, but it is a very definite commitment to a permanent American merchant marine.

The Shipping Board lines are not competing with any private American lines, regardless of statements that are sometimes made to the contrary, and these lines are necessary for the proper growth of our commerce. Constant improvement is being made by the Shipping Board and its private American managing agents in the operation of these lines, and instead of attempting to belittle their efforts and suggest arguments for foreign lines to use against us we should solidly support the board and its agents. The public deals with these private companies, and the relations between the public and these private American operating companies can and should be the same as if the lines were privately owned.

Mr. Campbell quoted from section 7 of the merchant marine act, 1920, to the effect that the board should not continue to operate the lines unless it appears that within a reasonable time they can be made self-sustaining. He apparently overlooked further down in this section the provision that lines being then maintained by the board shall be maintained until in the opinion of the board the maintenance thereof is against the public interests. It is also an error to assume that the primary purpose of the merchant marine act, 1920, is to sell the vessels. The primary purpose is clearly stated to be the establishment and maintenance of the American merchant marine and the secondary purpose is to sell the vessels if the primary purpose can be attained by such sales.

The funds spent on our merchant marine are comparable to the expenditures made by our excellent Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce, all for the purpose of developing our foreign trade. We do not believe in giving up something we have for something we may have for only five years or less.

We supported the merchant marine act, 1920, and the subsidy bill of 1922, and we will support any proper measure that will enable private American shipping companies to compete on equal terms with their foreign competitors. And in the meantime we will continue to urge the proper and efficient maintenance of our present lines and services and close cooperation with the Shipping Board and its private managing agents in carrying out the mandate of the Congress in the merchant marine act, 1920.

I earnestly urge the members of our club to stand by and support the board and its agents until it is possible to turn our lines over to private enterprise for permanent maintenance. I am sure none of us is impressed by Mr. Campbell's comparison of our Government-owned

shipping to a Russian-owned shoe-manufacturing business. It is not even comparable to our late-lamented Railroad Administration. The Government owns the ships and operates them through private American companies who have the support of the local communities served, and under present conditions we can not hope to retain these essential services under any other plan.

I commend the subject to the careful consideration of the members of our club.

Very truly yours,

H. B. ARLEDGE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Southern Ruralist of April 1, 1927. Mr. C. A. Cobb, the editor of that paper, has written quite a number of editorials on this subject, and has a vision and a far-sightedness that is quite refreshing. What he says is to the point, and is so clearly and admirably expressed that it shows he has a full comprehension of the importance of an American merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

SHIPPING BOARD RIGHT

The United States Shipping Board has very properly turned down the ridiculously low bids for our great passenger ships—the *Leviathan*, the best ship in the world, among them—and for the freight ships of the American merchant lines. It took great courage to successfully beat off the concerted attacks of foreign owning and operating interests and those private interests here in our own country who would preempt the seas for themselves and who have gone so far as to urge the Government to sink our ships if necessary to get the Government out of the "shipping business." There hasn't been a bid they have not urged the Government with all their power to accept, however inadequate, however irresponsible, or however much money it would lose the American people. What they have wanted above all else has been to get the Government out of their way. As to consequences, they seem not to care a whit.

We are not the United States we were back in 1914. We are the great creditor Nation now and the whole world is in debt to us. Industrially, through war pressure and demand born of the war, we moved into first place among the nations of the world and the whole world is our competitor. Agriculturally, we for a long time have been the greatest export Nation in the world. The world is our agricultural market. Without our own transportation facilities we would be at the mercy of those nations that are fighting for the business we feel that we must have. Handling the commerce of the world, they would divide the business of the world among themselves.

Every nation in Europe is struggling mightily for industrial as well as agricultural independence. These are the same nations that hauled the ocean-borne freight of the world before the war. Can we trust them to handle ours and theirs now? Would they haul our goods to their markets to compete with products of their own industries and own farms? It is different with cotton, to a degree. The world must come to us for that. But what price would we pay were we off the seas and at the mercy of foreign shipping interests? Fortunately, we have a little light on that matter that is surpassingly important.

Back in the fall of 1926 practically all available tonnage was withdrawn from general service in order to haul coal to Great Britain. You will recall that the miners of that country had at the time been on a strike for a long time and that the nation's coal supplies had been completely exhausted and that she had to come to the United States for relief. The demand for coal-carrying space sent carrying charges soaring. Not only that, except for the fact that we had our own boats there would have been none for cotton or wheat or the other products of agriculture which are more difficult to handle and more expensive to handle than coal, and which in large quantities must be moved in the fall of the year.

To show how attractive the coal cargo is, take the case of a ship of 8,800 dead-weight ton capacity. Such a ship carrying coal from Norfolk to the British Isles in October and November, the season of peak cotton movement, brought the operator $67,500. That same ship hauling cotton from Savannah or Charleston would have returned the operator a gross of only $41,000. And while the boat carrying coal would have delivered its cargo "free in and out," the vessel loaded with cotton would have had to bear cost of stevedoring here and abroad, and the loss of time in loading and unloading. These extra costs would run to around $7,000, leaving only $34,000 to go to the operator of the vessel carrying cotton. Take this $34,000 from the $67,500 earned by the vessel carrying coal and the difference is $33,500 in favor of coal. No private concern in the world could have been expected to turn down any such sum as that in order to save the cotton grower or the wheat grower from whatever calamity might befall him.

And yet our Government did that very thing, and in so doing rendered the Nation a service the value of which defies calculation in dollars and cents. With the prospects of a tremendous oversupply of cotton, the situation was bad enough. We shudder at the thought of what it would have been had there been no boats to haul that cotton. We have only to recall the distress of 1914 to get a fairly clear picture of the situation we would have had to face. We don't want 1914 any more!

During the period from July to October, Shipping Board boats moved 16,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour from Gulf ports, chiefly to points in Europe. During September and October Shipping Board vessels moved approximately a million bales of cotton from Gulf ports. From July to late fall the Shipping Board made available and assigned a total of 92 vessels for use in moving agricultural products to foreign countries.

Doesn't this justify us in opposing with all vigor the junking of our ships? Hasn't the fact been convincingly demonstrated that this Nation must have its own carrier service? Isn't the farmer's interest as great or even greater than that of anybody else? And aren't we right in rejoicing that the Shipping Board has at last turned a deaf ear to those selfish souls—principally a little group in the East—who seem utterly oblivious to the fact that there are others than themselves? Aren't the facts so overwhelmingly favorable as to put to shame those who unwittingly have attempted to discredit the work of the Shipping Board and the handling of our merchant fleet?

We must have an efficient merchant marine. If private capital won't give it to us—and private capital seems utterly unwilling to make a move in that direction without huge Government subsidy—then we must have Government operation, operation in the interest of safety and service to all.

Here's hoping that the wishy-washy policy of the administration toward this great problem is at an end, and that courage, definiteness, firmness, and a sense of broad national service will characterize the attitude from now on. We need that above all things else.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask that an editorial appearing in the Southern Ruralist of June 15, 1927, and entitled "More ships and better service," be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

MORE SHIPS, BETTER SERVICE

It has gradually been driven home to the administration at Washington that the American public is thoroughly sold to the firm establishment of an American merchant marine that will meet the needs of the American shipping public. The dillydallying attitude that has characterized the administration of our merchant marine from the executive end will be tolerated no longer, and neither will our people stand complacently by and see ships that cost millions given away to private enterprises or junked. These ships are just as precious to the American public now during peace times as they were during the war, and they can do just as much to solve the problems of the producing public of America as they did to win the war. In no uncertain terms those who staged the investigation sponsored by the Shipping Board throughout the country last summer were told that we must have ships and ships a plenty.

Our first preference was for private ownership, but if there were no private concerns who could step in and do the job in a thoroughgoing manner with justice to every section, then the public would look to the Government itself to move forward with shipbuilding and ship operation without delay. It is interesting to see that public opinion, which is all but unanimous throughout the country now as to the value of our own shipping service, is about to bring forth a definite plan and establish a definite policy. The mean things that have been said about the inability of the Government to profitably operate ships have definitely been discredited. Government ships have not only established new lines but are actually showing a profit in the midst of the keenest competition the world has even seen and rendering a type of service that could not and would not have been possible had the merchant ships of the Nation been in other hands. It has taken the unlimited ability of the Nation itself to do what has been done.

In spite, however, of the fact that our ships have made good as carriers of the products of commerce and in spite of the fact that they have saved this Nation countless millions of dollars that would have been sacrificed had we had no merchant marine, there are those who still insist that the Government must get out of the shipping business even if the ships have to be taken out to the deep sea and sunk. Realizing that a definite policy is going to be worked out during the next session of Congress, enemies of our merchant marine, chiefly private ship-operating concerns of the East, are already seeking every opportunity to do injury to our merchant marine however slight the pretext.

Nothing more clearly demonstrates this fact than the recent utterances of J. A. Campbell, president of the Youngstown Sheet Metal Co., Youngstown, Pa. A little while ago at the annual meeting of the stockholders of his company he took occasion, according to published accounts of his address, to denounce the Shipping Board for hauling steel products from Antwerp, Belgium, to New York at $2.85 per ton when the North Atlantic conference freight rate was $4 per ton for the same service. It has developed since his statement was made, which was given very wide publicity and which was pointed out by

eastern papers as reflecting the inefficiency and impotency of our American merchant marine service, that the actual rates charged were not as Mr. Campbell had said they were, but that no steel had been hauled from Antwerp to North American ports below rates ranging from $4.50 to $6.75 per ton. Had Mr. Campbell taken the trouble to get the facts from the records he would not have been guilty of the gross injustice with which he has been credited. The fact is, the Shipping Board is scrupulously meeting its responsibilities and deserves to be presented to the American public in the true light.

It is doubtless true that Mr. Campbell was sincerely at fault. He undoubtedly was retailing what he had heard, and doubtless heard from a source more directly interested than himself. In this connection we are told by authoritative sources in the Capital City of the Nation itself that the forces of opposition will visit Washington in all their power during the next session of Congress to see to it that our ships are junked if necessary to accomplish their purpose. We can not conceive of our Government being misled into agreeing to a policy that can be characterized accurately as nothing less than wholesale vandalism. The American people will not stand for it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also should like to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Southern Ruralist of September 1, 1927, entitled "Without ships we lose," and an editorial from the same publication of the issue of October 15, 1927, entitled "The public not to blame."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

WITHOUT SHIPS WE LOSE

As the success of our merchant marine disperses the smoke screen of opposition it is clearer than ever that one of the most urgent needs of the farmer is ample ships flying the American flag to carry his wares to customers abroad. Having had no ships for generations, our people, especially those of the interior, have had little opportunity to know about the value of a merchant fleet. Not knowing of its value, more often than not they were opposed to any attempts by the Government to establish a merchant fleet capable of demonstrating the value of such an institution to our people.

The World War taught us a lesson, one certainly that we should not soon forget. When it broke upon us it found our country without boats, and without boats we found ourselves unable to move those products of the Nation that enter into international trade. The merchant ships of other nations had been called in off the seas to haul soldiers and war supplies. Without ships, cotton, wheat, and tobacco dropped to the lowest price levels for many years, and brought disaster to agriculture throughout the country. Our farmers and others who had export commodities for shipment abroad were not the only losers. The Nation itself, on account of the need for the immediate construction of a merchant fleet, was forced under the pressure of war-time prices and labor conditions to spend countless millions of dollars in constructing boats that could have been built for a fraction of the war-time costs before war was declared. We had to have the ships, however, and could not stand back on expenses.

When the war was over the Government still owned these ships. It still owns a good many hundred, many of which have contributed immeasurably to the stability of agriculture, particularly here in the South. Except for the fact that the Government was able to place ninety-odd ships in the ports of the South last fall when the coal strike in England brought on another crisis similar to that of 1914, the price of cotton would have gone down to 5 or 6 cents again. Wheat and tobacco would have dropped, too. We of the South should always keep the important fact before us that the exports of cotton and tobacco represent more than one-third of the total exports of the whole country. Ships can make us, and lack of ships can break us.

Going back again to 1914, it cost the cotton farmer that year some three-quarters of a billion dollars more to grow the crop than he got for it. This enormous loss was wholly due to the fact that we had no ships. On two or three occasions President Coolidge has called upon the other great powers to join in a program of disarmament. Up to the present these conferences have been largely without desirable results. The most recent, the one held in Geneva a few weeks ago, was tragic in its ending, leaving the way open for competitive building of great navies. Already Congressmen and Senators are talking about the battleships that must be constructed to bring the American fleet up to an equality with the British fleet. All of this may be necessary. We do not know. Certainly the people of the Nation and their interests must be adequately protected. But to the naval expert and the armament builder protection is one thing and to the statesman it is another. The unfortunate thing is that naval experts instead of statesmen dominated the Geneva meeting. The call in 1914 was not for more battleships but for merchantmen. It was that call that gave us our great merchant fleet, of which we still have a remnant sufficiently large for foundation purposes and that must be preserved. In another emergency of similar character the call would undoubtedly again be for a merchant fleet. Again we urge that we strive by all reasonable means at our command to preserve the merchant fleet we have.

A merchant fleet will function 365 days in every year in the interest of the agriculture, commerce, and industry of the Nation, war or no war. Money spent on a merchant marine will be money that will bring a definite return every year whether there is war or peace. That can not be said, certainly to the same degree, of a battle fleet. A merchant fleet is clearly a constructive force, a building force, serving not only to protect the people in an emergency such as we had in 1914 and again in the fall of the past year, but to make us absolutely free at all times to carry our commerce where and when we will. Such a fleet is imperative if we are to build up all the ports and efficiently serve all the sections of the entire Nation. In spite of this very obvious fact, we had no merchant-fleet policy when the war was over, and what is even more tragic, we still have none, and the Stars and Stripes will be forced off the seas and the whole Nation placed back in its former helpless condition unless the people themselves rise up and demand that something definite be done toward establishing our fleet on a permanent basis once and for all. When the war was over there was an enormous hue and cry for the junking of our boats, and many actually went to the scrap heap. Those same forces are bringing every possible influence to bear upon Congress and upon the administration to force the Shipping Board and all its interests out of business. Private interests at home and merchant fleet owners abroad have joined hands to this end. In spite of all opposition, however, our merchant fleet, though greatly depleted in the number of ships, is making good—making good under conditions that might normally be expected to hopelessly destroy any sort of commercial enterprise. In spite of that fact, however, we have moved forward, and as stated already, our merchant fleet has made and is making its rich contribution to agriculture and all other industries alike.

So, again, war or no war, we must have a merchant fleet. War or no war, a merchant marine is one of the most pressing needs, not only of agriculture but of the entire industry of the Nation. Money that goes into the building and upkeep of battleships might be wasted, but money that goes into merchant ships will bring a rich return.

THE PUBLIC NOT TO BLAME

President Coolidge, according to recent White House news dispatches, is greatly disappointed at the lack of public interest in our merchant marine. He can not understand the indifference, and feels that lack of keener public interest has been and is now the greatest handicap to the successful operation of our merchant fleet.

A little while ago officials of the United States Shipping Board spent a month or so in the field holding public hearings. These hearings were held for the specific purpose of determining definitely the attitude of the public toward our fleet of merchant vessels—what the public wanted the Government to do. These meetings called out the thinking leaders in all phases of our agricultural and industrial life. They were held in every section of the country. Out of these hearings came the overwhelming and unqualified demand: Give us an adequate merchant marine. Let us have it under private operation if possible, but if that is not possible, then let the Government give us an adequate merchant marine—that was the public answer.

The opinion was emphatically voiced at these meetings that the shifting indefiniteness of the administration was the one great difficulty, and that until the negative, positionless policy of the powers that be in Washington was changed to one of positive action and definite policy the public would have little basis upon which to build confidence. For a long time it has very clearly been a case of lack of leadership at Washington and not public apathy that is to blame for the alleged indifference of the people. Had the President and his associates in power realized the need of the hour and had he and they taken a definite stand and laid down a definite policy, a different story would be to tell to-day. If the President's statement is a forerunner to the adoption of a definite and vigorous policy, he need not worry about the response of the public, for the public is convinced as never before in history of the vital need of an adequate tonnage of merchant vessels.

In this connection it is deeply gratifying to those who have realized the vital importance of a merchant marine and who have helped the Shipping Board fight its battles through these years of greatest trials that our boats are making good. It is remarkable that our fleet has been kept afloat and efficiently functioning in the interest of our international trade in spite of an antagonistic administration, and while in the hands of officers chosen for the purpose of scrapping the whole outfit. But it has made good in spite of all of these.

Administration leaders who have fought the building of a merchant marine are returning from investigations abroad. They left this country with the feeling that the fight they had made in the Halls of Congress to scrap our boats was in line with the best interests of the people. Back from Europe, however, where they had opportunity to study our country in the light of its relationship to other countries of the world, where they have seen our commerce in international trade, and where they have witnessed first-hand the reshaping processes of competitors, they tell us that if the United States is to hold a respectable position in international trade that we have got

to have our own boats. They tell us that the life of our international trade, because of developments overseas and because of the negative policy at Washington, hangs by a thread, and that if for any reason official Washington is unable to reverse its attitude and proceed promptly to build up an adequate fleet of merchant vessels that serious economic reverses are ahead of us.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES, of Washington, puts it this way: "No merchant marine means the destruction of our commerce by the ruthlessness of foreign competitors, and we have learned by sad and expensive experience the necessity of having a fleet in time of war." The foregoing is about in line with what other responsible students of the problem are saying. As a matter of fact, it is so nearly what they all say that it would serve as a sort of unanimous quotation.

One of our most widely read New York business writers has swung around to the position where he believes "that the greatest opportunity for the capture of world trade since the war now is opening before the Shipping Board." Such a statement coming from that quarter—the stronghold of the opposition—would have been regarded as rank heresy had it been made three or four years ago, when we knew less than we know now about the position this country occupies in world affairs.

All of which brings us back to the point that we made in the beginning. The trouble with the building of an adequate fleet of vessels lies at the doors of the White House and not at the doors of the public. The White House has not even thrown the poor dog a bone, to say nothing of giving it the attention and support it deserves. In spite of his protestations, Mr. Coolidge has no alibis. And in spite of all opposition we are going to have our own boats. The people will see to that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, 12 years ago, on November 12, 1915, I delivered an address at a dinner of the Academy of Political Science in New York. The closing portion of that address I would repeat now. In my judgment it is applicable to the situation in which we find ourselves to-day. Without reading it, I ask to have the last page of the address inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Thought, however mature, conviction, however deep, get us nowhere until they begin to operate in will and act. Merely recounting with reiteration the deplorable situation, and nothing more, evidences a species of cynicism, an unhealthy state of mind—lays no keels.

There never was a time when a change in shipping conditions would be less disturbing and more advantageous than right now. Now is the best possible time to inaugurate such changes. Nothing will be gained by delay. We have all the information upon which to act. Satisfaction with present conditions means a sacrifice of golden opportunities and an inexcusable lack of proper conception of our responsibilities.

Monetary and trade supremacy had its inception on the banks of the Nile. It moved westward to the shores of the Mediterranean and thence further westward out into the open sea of commercial activity. It passed from Portugal to Spain, then to Holland, then to France, and then to England. Venice, Lisbon, Amsterdam, Antwerp succeeded each other as centers; then London, the frontier town of the Middle Ages, at last supplanted them all.

The earlier struggles were directed to the attainment of some particular national supremacy, and that was to be founded on monopoly. That meant trouble. But the distinctive feature of commerce to-day is its international character. It is not a question of monopoly or particular supremacy; it is a question in large measure of leadership, and in this the factors are natural advantages, better methods, better facilities of exchange, efficient and economical service, a sound currency and financial influence, and the freest markets. I have seen it averred that in all the world's history nothing has had lasting importance like trade. Pitt declared, "British rule is British trade." Chamberlain expressed the same thought in the statement, "The empire is commerce."

The marvelous resources of the United States, her financial strength and facilities, the awakening of the East and the promising outlook in Latin America, the Isthmian Canal, the opportunities for forming new commercial ties, the relations founded on a better understanding, and mutual good will toward all the world mean, if we but discharge our responsibilities, the establishment of commanding centers of trade in the United States and drawing westward again commercial leadership.

The great English poet and dramatist gives us this picture:

Antonio is sad. Salarino says to him:

> "Your mind is tossing on the ocean,
> There, where your argosies with portly sail,
> Like signiors and rich burghers on the flood,
> Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea,
> Do overpeer the petty traffickers,
> That curtsy to them, do them reverence,
> As they fly by them with their woven wings."

To which Antonio replies:

> "Believe me, no; I thank my fortune for it,
> My ventures are not in one bottom trusted,
> Nor to one place; nor is my whole estate
> Upon the fortune of this present year,
> Therefore, my merchandise makes me not sad."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think the Senator from Florida is to be congratulated upon the very interesting and able address which he has just concluded. I hope it will engage the attention of Senators. We have many problems which need to be solved, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out. There will be legislation proposed, and if we are to have a merchant marine to carry on our commerce and also as a means of national defense, there must be early action. Whether we agree or not with the Senator from Florida in his definite conclusions, we can not, as patriots and as citizens of this great country, disagree with the conclusion that it is vital to the national welfare to preserve and maintain an effective merchant marine.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, and Mr. LANHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representativs disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KEYES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the bill and agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KEYES, Mr. WARREN, Mr. FESS, Mr. REED of Missouri, and Mr. ASHURST conferees on the part of the Senate.

AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senate is soon to adjourn until Monday. I am very sorry that this step is to be taken, for there is a tremendously grave and unfortunate situation confronting our country at this hour. American boys are now being killed in Nicaragua. We have no right, moral or legal, to use an armed force in Nicaragua; no just cause or lawful excuse. We are violating the constitution of Nicaragua and we are violating the Constitution of the United States by the presence and activities of our armed forces in our neighboring Republic of Nicaragua.

A most remarkable situation confronts the American people. The President is conducting a war down there, and has been conducting it for months, without ever consulting Congress. Congress met on the 5th of December last, but the war proceeds through Executive orders without the lawmaking body of the Nation ever being consulted. I am not willing to permit the Senate to adjourn until Monday without giving some Senators an opportunity to protest against this unlawful and un-American conduct. I do not want to see another American boy killed in this war in Nicaragua. L. C. Russell, a fine American boy from my State, has been killed down there. He was forced to go out against natives of Nicaragua who were fighting for self-government; forced to fight against natives who were seeking to drive out of their statehouse an impostor and usurper; forced to fight against natives who were seeking to remove from the office of President the man who with armed bandits drove the President of Nicaragua out of office.

Mr. President, it looks as if this Government is entering very fast upon the road to imperialism. It looks like our Army is now being used to collect the debts of Wall Street financiers. I wonder if Washington and his ragged Continentals, who left their bloody foot tracks in the snow at Valley Forge ever thought that they were fighting to establish a government that would one day become the handy instrument of predatory wealth and a collecting agency for men who put their filthy lucre above the welfare of their country and the lives of its soldiers?

Nicaragua is a sovereign nation, separate and apart from our own. We have no right to go there with an army and force our will upon the people of Nicaragua. We have already incurred the ill will and hostility of nearly all of the Central and South American nations by our foolish and unwarranted war upon the people of Nicaragua. And we are digging up snakes perhaps that we will be unable to kill for years to come. Think of it! Peaceful, liberty-loving America butchering her men on Nicaraguan soil in a war with the patriotic natives who are fighting for self-government, for the same principles that our fathers fought for in the War of the Revolution. And what is the sentiment of Nicaragua with regard to this situation?

The sentiment of the masses of Nicaragua is overwhelmingly against Diaz and his fostered government.

They have recently had elections in the various municipalities of Nicaragua. I hold in my hand a copy of a splendid magazine published here in Washington, entitled "The New Age." It contains an article written by Dr. Albert H. Putney, director of the school of political science of the American University, Washington, D. C. It is the December number of the magazine, and in the article to which I have referred Mr. Putney tells us:

Recent municipal elections in Nicaragua resulted in an overwhelming victory for the Liberal Party.

And yet, in spite of that, Mr. President, we are down there with our troops fighting to sustain and keep in power the minority party—a bastard régime—holding an impostor in the office of President by the armed forces of this great liberty-loving Government of the western world. It is simply outrageous. The fathers and mothers of this Nation have a right to protest against such irregular, outrageous, and inexcusable conduct.

In the face of this grave and serious national situation why are we going to adjourn until Monday? Is it for the purpose of giving the administration a chance with the Senate adjourned to rush more American boys down there to be killed in one big effort to overpower with overwhelming numbers the natives who are fighting for home rule and self-government? They are working fast. The newspapers tell us this morning that the Diaz government has applied for a loan from Wall Street. So Wall Street is to furnish the money to help buy the presidential election in Nicaragua, and American soldiers with guns and bayonets are to patrol the streets about the ballot boxes, intimidate the Liberals, and do their bit to help Diaz control the election.

It is worse than the force bill which a Republican Congress undertook to put upon the South in reconstruction days—our Government sending armed forces to hold elections in foreign republics, to keep one faction from voting and aiding the other faction to remain in power. My God, what are we coming to?

Mr. President, I have here a letter from an American father who has just lost a son in the war in Nicaragua. My heart goes out in tender sympathy to him; God bless him and his good wife in their sorrow; their son has been butchered in Nicaragua—let me read the letter?

ST. LOUIS, *January 4.*

John S. Hemphill, of Ferguson, Mo., a suburb, whose son, Sergt. John F. Hemphill, was killed last Saturday in action between the United States marines and the troops of General Sandino, Nicaraguan rebel, to-day made public an open letter to President Coolidge protesting against what he termed the "disgraceful war" in Nicaragua.

He said:

What we are doing is no less than murder for the sole purpose of keeping in power a puppet President and acting as a collector for Wall Street.

Mr. President, that is the way an American patriot and father feels about this terrible thing. His son has been killed down there in this outrageous, unauthorized, and awful war. Congress has not authorized war in Nicaragua, and yet we are in war down there. We are sending more troops down there now, and instead of doing something to stop it, the Republican Senate has adjourned over to Monday. We should withdraw the marines and bring them out and wash the hands of this Government of it all. That is what we ought to do. We are fast becoming an imperialistic power. We are not going any further on that road without my vigorous protest.

Indeed, I have protested before, but this Nicaraguan affair is the most daring and far-reaching step that we have taken. But let me finish this letter:

My son survived honorable service through the World War against Germany only to be officially murdered in a disgraceful war against this little nation.

I hope enough Senators will join me in this movement to stop this effort to adjourn, that we will stay here and debate this question to-morrow, and let the fathers and mothers whose sons are yet to be killed in a long-drawn-out war in South American countries if this war continues—that some of us were here doing what we could to stop this thing.

Is this strange and unauthorized warfare going on much longer, this war inaugurated by the President and Secretary Kellogg? Are we going to sit here and remain silent while we are in session and permit it to continue? If so, we ought to resign and go home. There are men in the States at home who would protest if they were here. Certain big Wall Street interests who have bought bonds in Nicaragua do not want this question discussed in the Senate. They want to keep the people ignorant as to what is going on in Nicaragua. Be quiet, they whisper, certain financial interests have joined hands with the Roman Catholic Church power in Nicaragua.

Let me give you the facts to back that statement.

Mr. Putney, in this same December article in The New Age, says:

The Liberal newspapers in Nicaragua have recently acquired courage to renew attacks upon the control of the schools of their country by Roman Catholic priests, and the great degree of control which the hierarchy exercises over the present Conservative government. A newspaper at Managua (La Noticia) has been publishing a series of detailed statements showing the sums of money which the Government has been giving to the Roman Catholics for educational purposes.

This same paper has also published many letters from its subscribers showing the bitter feeling in the minds of the mass of the citizens of Nicaragua against the present union of church and state, with the church as the controlling influence in that country.

Senators, are we going to remain silent and permit these American boys to continue to be butchered in such a cause—an unholy alliance between the money changers of Wall Street and the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Nicaragua? Diaz is a Roman Catholic. He does not represent a majority of the Catholics of Nicaragua. There has been a revolt against this man and his party among many Catholics, and all the other elements are against him. Two-thirds of the people of Nicaragua condemn this bastard government; and yet we, of this great Nation, have our soldiers down there, spending the money of the taxpayers of the Nation, spilling the blood of the best boys in the Republic, and murdering soldiers under the flag for such a cause!

Mr. President, it is time that this country was waking up. I call on other Senators here to express their opposition to this course. I have a resolution pending now in the Foreign Relations Committee calling on the President to withdraw our troops. If we could stay in session, we could get action on it by Monday, and maybe save the lives of many American boys. But if we adjourn, this forum will be closed and no action can be taken. And the devilish work will continue in Nicaragua.

One hundred and fifty-odd years ago this Government was struggling for its liberty. Patrick Henry loved it so well that he said he was willing to die for it. He said, "Give me liberty or give me death." To-day the patriots in Nicaragua who are going up against this great, strong Government love their own land and self-government so well that they are willing to die for it. It is claimed that we have killed hundreds of them, mowed them down like cutting wheat at the harvest time—for what? To protect American rights and interests? No. But what are we doing? Two influences are at work—certain financial interests in Wall Street and the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

I know it will offend some people for me or anyone else to talk that way, but I am going to tell the truth about every question that affects my country. I am not going to be mealy-mouthed about any of these questions when the welfare of my country is involved and the lives of American boys are at stake. I am going to lay my finger on the facts, cost what it may to me personally.

Now, I am going to ask the Committee on Foreign Relations to act at once on my resolution. I know that the great chairman of that committee will do what he can—I believe he will—and I hope the other members will join him. I am going to insist upon action on that resolution. I am going to continue, as best I can, to give the facts to the people of the country.

Thank God, it is still their country, although many of its instrumentalities are becoming paralyzed. Insidious, predatory influences are moving slowly but steadily upon many of the instrumentalities of the Government; and I want to say that I am astounded that we have not had more protests against this bloody, outrageous war that is going on without authority

in Nicaragua. The time was when almost every Senator would have been on his feet denouncing it.

What is the trouble? Are we losing our courage, seeking to move along the lines of least resistance, afraid of the frown of some big influence? Mr. President, no man who puts his political fortunes against the lives of American boys at a time like this is worthy of being in either branch of Congress. We ought to stand here and fight for the rights and the lives of these boys. They can not speak for themselves here. Here is a broken-hearted American father, with crape on the doorpost of his American home, bowed in grief over his dead boy, butchered in Nicaragua, writing the President that this is a disgraceful war, and that the Army has become a collecting agency for Wall Street.

God help the Republican Party if it will not rise to the occasion and help us to deliver this Government out of the clutches of this unholy alliance—out of this miserable and indefensible war in Nicaragua!

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, in 1914 there was a landing of the marines at Vera Cruz, Mexico. The landing was without any authority from Congress, but by the order of the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. The matter was taken up in the other House by resolution similar in character to the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama at this time. Some considerable criticism was made against President Wilson for what was charged at that time to be a step that might lead to war without any authority from Congress.

I was a Member of that body at the time. I very distinctly remember the eloquent address of the Senator from Alabama in denouncing the persons who had taken the position that he is taking to-day; and, to refresh the memory of the country, I want to read from that address of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

In referring to the matter of landing the marines, which was charged by a certain group in the House with which I did not have sympathy at the time, to be an effort to drive from power in Mexico a President, namely, Huerta, a statement to that effect was made by a Republican Member; and the Senator from Alabama used the language I am about to read on the 20th of April, 1914. The World War broke out on the 1st of August, 1914. This has nothing whatever to do with the World War, because no one ever dreamed of a world war in April, 1914.

The eloquent Senator made this statement:

> This is a solemn occasion—too solemn for partisan politics—and yet some gentlemen on the Republican side have lugged into this discussion the claptrap rubbish of political desperadoes, so thirsty for the fountains of political power, so hungry for a return of the emoluments of Republican control, and so dead to the demands of patriotic duty that they are willing to embarrass the administration, slander the President, brook indignities upon our soldiers, and insults upon our flag in order to make political capital, to gain partisan advantage.

Further on:

> The gentleman now seeks to shackle the feet and manacle the hands of a Democratic President when our dignity and honor are at stake, when our soldiers are humiliated, and our flag insulted by the ungodly and brutal tyrant of Mexico. [Applause.] The gentleman now makes mean insinuations about the motives that prompt this peace-loving, patriotic, Democratic President to uphold the dignity and honor of the American Union.

Further on:

> They have denounced his policy of watchful waiting and urged that he should put an end to the terrible conditions in Mexico; and now, when our country, without any fault on her part, is insulted by the self-constituted authority of a murderous and drunken tyrant, the President is criticized and abused by men who, in their desire to serve their party, prove faithless to their country.

Further on:

> Mr. Speaker, now that the President of the United States—the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy—has found conditions serious enough to send battleships to Mexican waters, it is the duty of every Member of Congress and of every patriotic American citizen to stand faithfully by him as he goes to uphold the dignity and the honor of this, the greatest Government on the globe.

I commend these words to the Senator at this time.

Mr. HEFLIN. The case cited by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is in no sense on all fours with the present one. At the time to which he refers the President of Mexico had just been murdered. Huerta, his trusted military chief, had butchered him, had killed him in the statehouse, and the outlaws and bandits had taken charge. The Government of Mexico had been overthrown and bandits had attacked American citizens and seized property of the American Government. It was then that the President landed those troops temporarily. Be it said to his credit, he gave prompt attention to America's rights and interests and then brought the armed forces home. He did not stay there long.

But in the case of Nicaragua the situation is entirely different. No American property had been seized, no American citizen had been attacked. The truth compels us to admit that our soldiers have been used to protect a bastard government over the will of two-thirds of the people of Nicaragua who are seeking to return to national control the officers duly elected by the people of Nicaragua. It is their right and duty to do that. The President started this war in Nicaragua when Congress was not in session, and he continues to carry it on when Congress is in session. He has never obtained the consent of Congress to involve the United States in war in Nicaragua.

No, Mr. President, there is nothing at all in the suggestion the Senator from Ohio has made about the speech I delivered in the House in 1914. I want to repeat now, in the time of my good friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that I am going to ask the Senate to remain in session to-morrow and discuss this Nicaraguan question, and to have a session Saturday for the purpose of acting on my resolution which requests the President to withdraw our armed forces from Nicaragua. I ask unanimous consent that we may have a session of the Senate to-morrow and Saturday for the purpose of discussing and taking action upon my resolution providing for the immediate withdrawal of our soldiers from Nicaragua.

Mr. JONES. The Senator probably is not aware of the fact that the Senate has already entered into a unanimous consent agreement that when we adjourn to-day, we will adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am sorry that has been done; it must have happened when most of us were at lunch, and there were but few Senators here.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no, Mr. President; it happened immediately after the convening of the Senate to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Alabama ought to make a statement of that nature without being sure of his facts. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] at the beginning of the session this morning asked unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Monday. He stated reasons for making the request, and I, in the open session of the Senate, with rather a large attendance, said that I had no objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not know that, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES. The request was made right after the call of the roll, when a quorum was present.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not know that. I happened to be called out of the Chamber temporarily. I regret that I was not present. There is no Senator in this body who has a better record for attendance here than I have. I do not mean to boast about that; it is my duty to be here. But I was unfortunately out when this thing happened. But that does not change the seriousness of the situation. It will not affect the other purposes for which we did adjourn to come back in session to-morrow and discuss the Nicaraguan question. I wish it could be done. I ask it in the names of the boys who are yet living, who may have to die in a useless and cruel war in Nicaragua, and in the names of those dead boys who have been sacrificed to the outrageous, unholy purposes that I have mentioned.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am going to detain the Senate for only a few minutes.

I see the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in the Chamber, and I am wondering if I can not interrupt his silence, and ask him to state when he expects to have a farm relief bill reported out from his committee?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, answering the inquiry of the able Senator from Tennessee, I think the committee is in a position to take up consideration of that important subject matter about the 1st of February. I hope to pass it some time between the middle of February and the 1st of March, and have it promptly signed by the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has recently introduced in the Senate what is now known everywhere as the famous McNary-Haugen farm relief bill. It is substantially the same bill that Congress passed at the last session, but which the President vetoed. I trust that the Committee on Agriculture will, at the earliest possible moment, report that very excellent measure favorably.

The sooner the better. I regret that it is to be put off until February.

Mr. President, the President recently reported that 70 per cent of the population of America were exceedingly prosperous. He admitted that the other 30 per cent, the farmers of the country, were not in a prosperous condition. Surely, under circumstances like that, it is necessary for the Congress to do something for the benefit of so large a part of our population. I trust that the committee, therefore, will report as soon as possible this bill, and report it favorably. I think it would be well to report it without change.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the control and disposition of the surpluses of agricultural products so as to prevent such surpluses from controlling the prices of all the crops. It also has for its purpose to prevent undue and excessive fluctuations in the markets for such commodities, to minimize waste and speculation, and to further the organization of the producers of such products into cooperative associations. The bill sets up the governmental machinery to carry these various purposes into effect. That it is a workable, feasible, practicable, and constitutional measure I have not the slightest doubt.

Mr. President, the average condition of the average farmer in this country since 1920 has, indeed, been deplorable. This particular season, it is true, prices of farm products have been even measurably adequate. During all this time the prices of nearly everything the farmer had to buy have been continuously and steadily rising. The cost of their labor, of their farming implements, of their transportation, and of their taxes has constantly increased. For the most part their farms, their homes, their stock and cattle, and even their growing crops are mortgaged. This condition is known to everyone. Newspapers publish it. Farmers' magazines aver it. Bankers and business men admit it. Farmers' organizations state it. All politicians and statesmen agree to it. Even President Coolidge declares it and deplores it.

President Coolidge in recent addresses has dwelt upon what he calls the prosperity of this country. He went so far as to say that the only problem is whether this country desires continued prosperity.

Mr. President, it is true that the prosperity of certain classes of our people exists. The net earnings of General Motors, Standard Oil, and United States Steel, for instance, have exceeded anything in the history of industry. The railroads and other transportation companies are more prosperous than they have ever been. The banks are in a better condition than they have ever been before. Public utilities are prosperous. Those who labor in industrial plants, in banks, or for transportation and utility companies are, no doubt, by reason of Federal laws, drawing the biggest wages in their history. So, if President Coolidge had limited his remarks to these businesses favored by Federal laws and to those who work for them, his views as to our prosperous condition would be correct. However, he did admit a fact which is apparent to every individual person in this country—that the farmers were not included in this prosperity.

The farmers comprise 30 per cent of our population, and they are in the worst plight of their history, and any prosperity that does not affect 30 per cent of our people is not a real prosperity and can not last. Inasmuch as agriculture is the basis of the greater portion of our wealth, unless agriculture is in a prosperous condition, it is just a question of time when all must suffer. Prosperity for all classes except the farmers is like a marriage celebration without the bridegroom—a very unsatisfactory and hopeless business.

Mr. President, the energies of our people may be divided into five classes—capital (banking), industry, transportation, labor, and farming. The first four divisions comprise 70 per cent of our population and the last one, agriculture, 30 per cent. The Federal Government has legislated its most beneficent bounties on the first three, namely, capital (banking), industry, and transportation. In the Wilson administration it included labor in the favored classes, and very properly so. But, substantially speaking, the Federal Government has not yet done anything for the farmers.

The entire wealth of this country was estimated by the Federal Trade Commission in 1922 to be three hundred and fifty-three billions of dollars. The farm wealth for that year was estimated to be sixty-three billions of dollars.

That commission later estimated the entire income of this country to be approximately ninety billions. Of this amount, those engaged in agriculture only receive twelve billions, or 12½ per cent of the total.

In other words, 30 per cent of our population—the farmers—have only about 17 per cent of the national wealth and only 12½ per cent of the national income. According to Government statistics which I have recently examined, it has been found that the average income of the average farmer in America, including all that he uses from the farm, is the pitiful sum of $730 a year, while the average income for all groups engaged in occupations other than farming is $1,445, just $45 less than double the income of the farmers. When you take away from the income what he uses from his own farm, his cash income is but a little more than $313.

Some assert that this lack of prosperity of the farmer is due to laziness, inefficiency, and lack of attention to his business. An eastern industrialist said to me a while back: "The farmers do not need any legislation. Just as soon as they quit riding around in automobiles and get down to business they will be all right. What they need is more alarm clocks and fewer automobiles." Incidentally, this man, who spoke of farmers riding in automobiles, owned three cars himself. He, of course, did not know what he was talking about. The enormous surplus crops that the farmer produces disproves the statement. It is his very energy, efficiency, and attention to his business that causes the surplus crops. If he were lazier and less efficient, he would produce no surplus, and, accordingly, get higher prices for his products.

I was reared on the farm. I know that in no occupation does a man work harder, longer, under a greater strain to his physical system, or under such trying conditions as does the farmer. He works in all kinds of weather and more hours than those engaged in any other occupation.

That the farmers' troubles are due to Federal legislation favoring all other classes, to whom the farmers must pay tribute, I now propose to show.

Mr. President, we have passed banking laws which provide for an adequate return to those engaged in the banking business and to all those who invest in public-service corporations and for all those who have money to lend. To these, by various Federal laws, we virtually guarantee a reasonable income.

Next, we have built up a protective tariff wall, the highest in history, for those engaged in industry. While this tariff was originally intended to bring revenue for the Government, that purpose is now but incidental. The real purpose of the tariff is to shut out competition with foreign-made goods and to enable those engaged in industry to impose a tax upon the consuming public. It has been estimated that the tariff enables industry to increase its income probably three billions of dollars annually. This tax which industry is permitted to levy upon the rest of the country is paid quite largely by the farmers. It might well be gradually eradicated.

Under the Esch-Cummins law and recent Supreme Court decisions the railroads and other public utilities have been guaranteed not only a fair, but a generous return upon their investments, and even sometimes where they have not made investments.

Under our income tax laws most corporations simply add their taxes to the cost of their productions and the public, which includes the farmers, pay these taxes.

Then through the creation of monopolies and by trade agreements often secretly made without regard to the Sherman antitrust law, industry virtually fixes its own prices and, of course, these prices are always made as high as traffic will bear; and the farmer has to bear his portion of this burden.

These special benefits and grants have all been made by Congress to the favored 70 per cent of our population and have made them very prosperous, while they have impoverished the farmers.

Indeed, not only does the farmer have no beneficial part in this legislation, but he has to pay substantially one-third of these benefits going to other favored classes.

In other words, under present conditions the farmer has to buy everything that he has to buy in a protected market, or in a stabilized market, or in a market in which prices are fixed by agreement, and sell everything he has to sell in the open markets of the world. He is caught coming and going. Speaking generally, he is the only producer in the world who has nothing whatsoever to do in fixing the price of the thing he produces. When any member of the favored classes has anything to sell the purchaser must pay his price. When the farmer has anything to sell he must take what is offered by the purchaser.

So, Mr. President, with all this favoritism to industry and to transportation and to capital and all this unfairness to agriculture, is it any wonder that to-day we find big business fairly rolling in wealth and paying enormous dividends and, on the other hand, we find the farmers in debt and impoverished, their rent and taxes tremendously high, their livestock and farming implements, their farms and their homes mort-

gaged, and in many cases being foreclosed and sold at public outcry?

When an industrial organization finds that its surplus will be too large it closes down a factory, and the result is that there is no surplus. The farmer can not do that. When he starts a crop growing nature alone can stop it, and, if there appears to be a surplus, it falls back on him and destroys him financially. Surely under these circumstances the Government ought to step in and prevent the surplus from controlling the price of the whole crop.

Some of my Democratic friends say that they are opposed to this bill because of the Jeffersonian doctrine of "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." They say that if we were to pass this bill it would be a special privilege to the farmers and, therefore, contrary to that doctrine. They lose sight of the first part of the slogan, "Equal rights to all." It is apparent from what I have heretofore said that it does not violate that doctrine. In this bill we give no special privileges to the farmer. All we do is to put the farmer on the same economic basis with the other 70 per cent of our population. It is directly in accord with the teachings of Mr. Jefferson. All we do is to give him "equal rights." Not only that, but it is in direct accord with the express provision contained in the last Democratic platform.

To my Democratic friends I say that if there had never been any special privileges granted to other classes, then I admit that the Government ought not to give a special benefit to the farmers, but, inasmuch as the Government has already granted privileges to the 70 per cent, as above set out, I contend that it is in exact line with the Jeffersonian doctrine to grant the same equal rights to the farmers that we have already granted to the other 70 per cent, so as to put all classes of our people on an equality.

Again, some say that we ought to repeal the tariff laws, the transportation laws, the banking laws, and the immigration laws.

Mr. President, we all know that we are not going to do that. When we Democrats get into power, we do not repeal the tariff laws. We simply reduce them on certain articles and apparently there is no intention on the part of anyone to do away with the tariff laws. Nor is it likely that we will repeal the banking laws, or the immigration laws, or any other laws conferring favors upon the favored 70 per cent. Under these circumstances, what is our manifest duty?

Why, Mr. President, the only way that we can carry out the doctrine of Mr. Jefferson is to put the farmer on the same economic basis with the other 70 per cent of our population that are now deriving special benefits from the Government.

Again, it is objected that the bill will not work. Let me give you an illustration of how it will work.

Suppose the McNary-Haugen bill had been in effect in 1926 when the enormous cotton crop, amounting to nearly 20,000,000 bales, was produced. Suppose the commission dealing with cotton under that bill had, after an examination into every fact, found that the average cost of producing cotton that year was 12 cents a pound, that a reasonable profit to the farmer was 3 cents a pound, and that the commission, acting under the bill, had given notice that if cotton went below 15 cents the commission would buy the surplus crop and take it off the market to be sold when cotton went above that price.

Remembering our experience with wheat in 1920 when Congress fixed a minimum price of $1.50 a bushel, which was never reached, and when the Government did not have to buy any wheat, my judgment is that, if the commission had had to buy even 5,000,000 bales surplus last year, still there would have been no loss this year, because cotton went above 15 cents. So, in the cited case, instead of losing, there would have been a substantial gain for the farmers and the Government, and the farmers would have received a reasonable price for their cotton last year and would thus have avoided a bankrupt condition. It would have meant the difference between prosperity and the lack of prosperity in the cotton-producing business. We all know that there has never been a surplus of cotton carried over a period of three years in our history.

What could have been done for cotton could be done in the case of all staple agricultural products.

Again, it is objected that if the farmers are allowed to stabilize the price of their products, it will cause an increase production. This does not at all follow. The fear of an equalization tax will prevent any abnormal production; but even without this tax there need not be any fear.

The Government subsidizes the steel industry and there is not an overproduction of steel.

The Government through tariff laws and other laws subsidizes the shoe industry, but there is no overproduction of shoes. The copper industry, the iron industry, the public-utilities industry, and practically every industry are subsidized, and yet there is no overproduction. The price of transportation is absolutely fixed, and instead of there being more railroads the building of railroads has almost ceased.

Again, it is claimed that this bill involves price fixing. And so it does. But we have price fixing in every other industry, so why not permit the farmer to have something to do with fixing his prices?

Of course, no lawyer who ever read the Head Money Cases decided by our Supreme Court believes the bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. President, there is no question of greater importance in this country than the equitable distribution of wealth and income. It is so regarded by the foremost economists from Adam Smith on down. There can be no such thing as prosperity when wealth and income become centralized in one small group or groups of our population. It was claimed by the experts a few years ago that one-tenth of our population owned 90 per cent of the wealth. And this must be substantially true. It is not a good condition. It is a dangerous condition. When the wealth of Rome became centralized in a few landowners, with the rest of the nation serfs and slaves, without property and with scant incomes, Rome fell. When the king, nobility, and priesthood of France, comprising less than a million people, owned three-fifths of the entire land, leaving only two-fifths for the peasantry, comprising 25,000,000 people, we had the French Revolution. And the revolution in Russia was due to the same fundamental cause—the impoverishment of the masses. We must not permit our national wealth to be centralized to so great an extent. We must be fair and just to all classes of our people. If we confer rights upon one class, we must confer them equally upon all classes of our population. If we confer benefits upon one class of our people, we must confer them equally upon all classes of our population. It is the rankest kind of class legislation to confer untold benefits upon 70 per cent of our population and to deny equal benefits to the other 30 per cent, and especially when the other 30 per cent of our population are engaged in the most fundamental of all industries, namely, the production of food and clothing from the ground. We must not legislate in favor of one class at the expense of another.

Under the present conditions the farmer catches the rough end of the equation both ways. He is taxed enormously for the benefit of the other 70 per cent of our population. And when he sells his products he is often forced to sell at less than the cost of production, so that he can not make a living wage. The farmer, being the producer of those things which sustain life, should have the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. President, we want no serfs of any kind, nature, or description in this country. We want every man to be an upstanding citizen, entitled to equal rights and equal benefits under the law. This is what we seek for the farmers of this country. This is what this bill proposes to do. This bill may not be perfect. It may not give the farmer all to which he is entitled. It may not put him on equality with other industries. But it is a step in the right direction.

Agriculture is our basic industry. There are three things without which modern life can not exist—food, clothing, and shelter. Two of these—food and clothing—are produced by the farmer. That this is an important service, none can deny. That it is the most important, many will affirm. If the farmers should suddenly stop work and go on a strike, even for one short season, the wheels of industry would admittedly cease to turn, business of all kinds would stop, and famine, earth's greatest scourge, would stalk across the earth, casting its sinister shadows from coast to coast and carrying death and destruction in its wake, and humanity would perish. Such, my friends, is the great importance of the work done by farmers. Simple justice demands that those performing that work should not be put at a disadvantage by law.

As it is, they are very poorly compensated. The very least we can do is to place them on the same footing, so far as legislation can do it, with the other four economic groups. That is the purpose and object of this bill. I believe it will accomplish that purpose, and so believing, I shall vote for this bill again, as I have voted for it before, earnestly hoping that it will be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him? I want to ask the Senator a question just at this point.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator attribute the adversity of the farmer at the present time entirely to the existence of the exportable surpluses of various crops?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that it has more to do with it than any other one factor.

Mr. BRUCE. What are the other causes entering into his adversity?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is the principal one.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator think that is the only one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. As I said, everything he buys he has to buy in a protected market and everything he sells he has to sell in the open markets of the world, and that, together with the surplus, constitutes the principal reasons for his present condition.

Mr. BRUCE. But the Republican Party has undertaken to protect him by imposing tariff duties on importations of agricultural products.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it has; but while it has tried to protect him by taking the tariff off of those things that he uses it has left the tariff on all those things which compose the things that he uses. I do not believe in a high tariff.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but he shares those other tariff burdens on his hat and his clothes, and the like, with the rest of us, does he not? We all pay the penalty in that kind of tariff burden.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but he shares it to a greater extent than others.

Mr. BRUCE. But how? I thought there were certain exemptions made in the tariff in favor of the farmer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; there are—for instance, farm implements—but all of the things which compose the farm implements, with which they are manufactured, are taxed, and in that way the farmer has to bear the tariff burden just as before.

Mr. BRUCE. But those duties, of course, are also applicable to other members of the community.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; they are not. They do not fall on 70 per cent of the people, because they do not use them.

Mr. BRUCE. But import duties do fall on other commodities which are used by the other elements of the community as well as the farmer. Conditions are equalized in that respect. May not these exportable surpluses be brought to an end in a perfectly natural way by economic influences which are at work at the present time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not, for the reason that we have been trying it for seven years, and their condition, with the exception of a little spurt in their favor this year, has been constantly getting worse and worse. The Senator knows that the great majority of the farms of the country to-day are mortgaged, and many of them mortgaged for more than they are worth. The Senator knows that the great lending companies—the insurance companies and other companies in the country lending money on farms—have had to take in at forced sale many of those farms. What is the Senator's idea about what we are going to do when those farms are all bought in at public sale by the companies which have loaned money on them? How are we going to manage our farming business except through them?

Mr. BRUCE. I think the World War brought about a period of extraordinary inflation. The farmers, of course, naturally enough, were influenced by the enhanced prices for agricultural products which they obtained at that time to enlarge their operations, and even to buy more land than they could pay for; and on the strength of the same inflation a vast number of small-scale banks sprang up throughout the country which went to the wall, as might have been expected, as soon as the inevitable period of deflation set in. Then, again, many persons totally ignorant of farming went to farming and helped still further to swell the inflation, so now, as I see it, the farmer is simply suffering from the consequences that always accompany a period of deflation. But the situation is improving; the trend of prices is upward; large numbers of farmers are leaving the city and going to the country, and are there sharing those generous wages which the inhabitants of industrial cities have been receiving.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary.

Mr. BRUCE. The situation is taking care of itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. The truth is that all of us know that constantly the farmers have received no benefits from the Federal Government while these other classes have constantly received benefits from the Government; the industrial classes through high tariff laws, the banking classes through law, the transportation companies through law, all for their benefit. That has given tremendous impetus to all other business and largely at the expense of the farmer. That is what is the matter with the farmer to-day. It is not because of his acts; it is not because of his default; it is not because of his shortcomings; but it is because of Federal legislation. The special benefits from the Government which are now being enjoyed by other classes should be passed to the farmers if they are to have a fair deal.

Even the Senator from Maryland himself admits that the farmers are not prosperous to-day; the whole country knows it is so. Why is it not the duty of the Congress of the United States under those circumstances to look into these matters and to equalize the rates?

AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a few moments ago the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] delivered an attack on the administration and on the conduct of affairs in Nicaragua which it seems to me ought not to pass without a brief answer at this time because it was based on false assumptions and on an incorrect grasp of the situation.

At the present time in Nicaragua our relations with the Conservative Party and with the Liberal Party, the two great parties which have fought for a hundred years for the control of Nicaragua, are so friendly, the administration's conduct of our affairs there has been so ably carried on, and our presence there is welcomed by so many people of both parties that it seems to me most unfortunate that any remarks should be made on this floor showing such a total lack of appreciation of what is actually going on. Such remarks may lead to trouble and to a misunderstanding of our position by our neighbors in Latin America.

It was stated by the Senator from Alabama that he thinks our actions are leading to criticism and ill will in Latin America. Certainly his remarks are inclined to promote just that state of affairs. At some future time I should like to go more fully into what has happened between the United States and Nicaragua since Congress adjourned in March, 1927, but at the present time I only desire to state briefly just what is happening there to-day and to refer to the relations between General Sandino and the Liberal Party and the activities which have just taken place which have called forth this torrent of criticism and several very unfortunate resolutions embodying a number of extremely inaccurate "whereases." These resolutions have been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and will undoubtedly there be carefully examined.

The rainy season in Nicaragua begins in June or July. During the next six months of the year it is almost impossible for anyone to carry on a military campaign. As Senators know, there are two distinct parts of Nicaragua, the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific seaboard, and there is very little connection between the two.

On the Pacific seaboard there is a great plain where there is much agriculture, where there are several cities, and where the capital is located. On the eastern seaboard there are mountains and valleys covered with forests where there are no wagon roads and no railroads, but only trails which are barely passable to pack animals in the dry season and practically impassable in the wet season. The rains generally end some time in December, when the country begins to dry up and some of the people then usually go back to their favorite occupation of carrying on political manifestations with bullets instead of ballots. As a matter of fact, at the present time practically all of Nicaragua is in a state of peace with the exception of a small area in the northern part near the boundary of Honduras, in a coffee-growing section, which during a large part of the year is practically inaccessible.

Last April, at the request of the President, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War and at the present time Governor General of the Philippines, went to Nicaragua to find out the exact state of affairs, to interview the leaders on both sides, and to see whether some working arrangement might not be brought about whereby we could secure that great desideratum of popular government, namely, a fair and open election. It is generally conceded that in the 100 years of Nicaragua's history there has scarcely ever been a fair election. It was extremely to be desired that at the next election every one who wished to do so should be given an opportunity to vote.

The people of Nicaragua are divided into two bitter political factions, the Conservatives and the Liberals. They do not differ very much in principle, as their names would seem to indicate. Those names apply rather to two geographical divisions. The people in one city being "conservative" and in another being "liberal." They have carried their animosity to such an extent that it is practically impossible, or, at any rate, extremely uncomfortable, and has been for many years, for any Conservative to attempt to do business in a Liberal city or for any Liberal to do business in a Conservative city. It reminds one of the situation in the Middle Ages when the independent cities of Italy were so divided by political parties and

carried on such bitter warfare as to make it impossible for the members of one political party to live with the adherents of the opposite political party. It will be seen that Mr. Stimson faced an extremely difficult mission.

It is not necessary at this time to go into the history of how President Diaz became president or why we recognized him, instead of recognizing President Chamorro at one time, or various other people. Mr. Diaz was in power at the time of Mr. Stimson's visit in April. General Moncada, the ablest general in Nicaragua, a Liberal and the active fighting head of the Liberal Party, had a considerable number of troops and a good many generals under his command and was threatening the Conservative section of Nicaragua. After having interviewed many people on both sides of the question, Mr. Stimson succeeded in securing an interview with General Moncada himself, and explained to him the attitude of this Government, which was merely the attitude of friendliness, of a desire to have fair elections carried on, a desire held by both Liberals and Conservatives alike. After several interviews an arrangement was arrived at with Mr. Stimson whereby General Moncada and the generals under him, with the single exception of the young General Sandino, agreed to bring in their arms, to stop fighting, and to accept the good offices of the United States and the word of the United States that it would see to it that the next election to be held in 1928 would be a fair election and that every Nicaraguan could go to the polls and cast his ballot without fear or favor. The Liberals heartily agreed to this, because the Conservatives were in possession of the larger part of the country, and, according to the history of Nicaragua, it would have been impossible for the Liberals to have voted freely unless some such arrangement had been made. Consequently General Moncada persuaded all his generals, with one exception, to accept Mr. Stimson's service.

Then followed an extraordinary series of events. President Diaz, the Conservative, abolished the censorship of the press and permitted General Moncada to publish his statements in the press, a privilege which had been denied him for a long time. He also agreed that the supreme court, which had been altered in an illegal manner during the time when General Chamorro was President—and it will be remembered that we did not recognize General Chamorro as President—should be reconstituted, and, furthermore, by an extremely generous act, President Diaz agreed to accept Mr. Stimson's suggestion that the six or seven Provinces of Nicaragua where the Liberals live and which are Liberal in sentiment and by heredity should be governed by Liberals instead of having Conservative governors who could only rule by force of arms and would always be making trouble.

In the course of the next few weeks President Diaz carried out his promises. Six of General Moncada's Liberal generals were placed in charge of these six Liberal Provinces. Freedom of the press was declared; the supreme court was reorganized; every effort was made to give a fair deal to both sides; and as a matter of fact the great majority of the Liberal Party in Nicaragua to-day, instead of being dissatisfied, as the Senator from Alabama assumes, with the attitude of the United States Government and the present condition of things, welcomes it, and looks forward complacently and eagerly to the next election, when its members will have an opportunity to vote and have their votes counted just as much as the Conservatives.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true, as the Senator has just stated, that the arrangement made with Mr. Stimson was satisfactory to Diaz and the Conservatives and to a very large majority of the Liberals, and that there are only a few left who are dissatisfied with the Government, why is it necessary for the Government of the United States to maintain its marines down there? If there are only a few people left on one side, and practically all the people are on the other side, why can they not maintain their own Government without our assistance?

Mr. BINGHAM. For the same reason that, although the great majority of people in the city of Washington desire to live in a peaceable and law-abiding manner, it is necessary to maintain several hundred police on the streets.

Mr. KING. But we do not import them.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but, according to the Senator's own statement, the Diaz régime, combined with the Liberal régime, have all these policemen and have all the country except a little bit of a spot, and all the people are with them. They are in the great majority, and here are just a few insignificant fellows; and yet this big majority, with all the offices, with all the arms, with all the weapons, with all the territory, insist that the Government of the United States shall bring its marines down there to keep that big majority in office and keep it from being hurt by these few fellows who are out in the hills and do not have anything.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I think the Senator was not present when I attempted to review the bitterness between the two political parties. The Senator, coming from the State that he does, and having lived in a country that has for a hundred years accepted the decisions of the ballot box and whose political parties, though they have had certain bitter fights, have never entered into anything like the bitterness of those countries, is, if he will pardon me for saying so, unable to appreciate the bitterness of these factions and of the strife which would break out if we withdrew our marines.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him there again?

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to finish my brief statement; I yield to the Senator, however.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, it seems to me, is rather going back on his own statement. His statement is that after Stimson was there everything was lovely, and, as he said—I think using his own words—the great majority of the Liberals were satisfied.

Mr. BINGHAM. They were satisfied with our occupation, not with the Conservatives; and if we were to withdraw our marines they would immediately proceed to that civil war which has been the curse of Nicaragua for nearly a hundred years.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, it appears that there must have been perhaps a majority that was dissatisfied.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not with our occupation.

Mr. NORRIS. If the great majority was satisfied, I can not understand why it is necessary for us to send our marines down there to supervise an election and keep order. When practically the entire country is in control of the other two factions combined, when they are all agreeable and lovely and satisfied, why should we mix in?

Mr. BINGHAM. But they are not, Mr. President. They are not "lovely and agreeable and satisfied" with each other. They are satisfied with the attitude of our Government and have asked the United States to maintain its forces there in order that they may not cut each other's throats and in order that they may have a peaceable election.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we are in this condition—that the Conservatives, represented by Diaz, the government that we put in power, the government that we made——

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will not make a speech in my time.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; I will try not to. It is a little difficult, when I have the example of the wonderful speech the Senator is making, not to try to follow his leadership; but when everything is in control now of Diaz and Moncada, who are both united in the same proposition——

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not say they were united.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President; the Senator misunderstood me. I said that they had both asked the United States to have its marines stay there to see that they had a fair election.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; let us put it that way. We have this condition of affairs, then: Diaz, representing the Conservatives; Moncada, representing the great majority of the Liberals, united that we shall stay there and supervise their election.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what they have asked.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what they have asked. Let us take that as a foundation to start with——

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, this sounds to me very like the beginning of a new speech, and I desire to get through my remarks in a very few minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it is not going to be a speech. I am going to ask a question. Just take the statement that the Senator has made. These two factions have united, and they say to us, "Now, we are all united. We want a fair election, but we want you to keep your Army down here to see that we get it." Why should we not say, "If you are all agreeable, and there is nobody but Sandino and a few bandits over here in the hills, it does not make any difference whether they vote or not; attend to your own elections, and let the marines go home?"

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is my question.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am endeavoring to answer that by the speech which I am trying to make.

General Moncada, the leader of the Liberals, and the ablest general down there, who had been carrying on the war on behalf of Mr. Sacasa, who was on the Atlantic shore, was completely satisfied with the proposals made by Mr. Stimson, agreed to them, and endeavored to get all his generals to agree to them; and they all at one time did agree. General Moncada himself has made a statement in regard to the Sandino incident. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to this young bandit, who, in his early twenties, is enjoying the rôle of fighting up and down the little valleys in the north central part of Nicaragua, ravishing the coffee plantations, stealing the coffee of the planters, taking it across the boundary to sell it at low prices to the merchants of Honduras, and thereby getting money with which to carry on his depredations. He was once with General Moncada. Mr. Stimson, in a volume entitled "American Policy in Nicaragua," says:

> In contrast with the sensational statements of some of our own press, the following public statement issued by General Moncada after the affair at Ocotal fairly describes the Sandino incident:
>
> Existing on money from both natives and foreigners and merchants at Jinotega, as he had done before under threats of pillage and bloody reprisal, he—Sandino—interned in the mountains, took foreigners in the army and dedicated his time to murdering his enemies, both Conservatives and Liberals. He proved extremely cruel to prisoners, to whom life was never pardoned. I will not approve such a kind of war. I will never accept it. * * *
>
> In order to defend the cities of Jinotega, Esteli, and Ocotal, the American command sent marines and soldiers of the Nicaraguan National Guard. Eighty-seven men of these mixed forces existed at Ocotal when it was attacked by Sandino and an overwhelming force. Sandino threw himself against them with all his army. The defenders resisted heroically for 16 hours. * * *
>
> Sandino suffered great losses, exceeding 400 men. This, of course, has not been murder. There was an armed conflict in a legitimate defense. We Liberals are greatly sorry for the death of our brothers, but it is our duty to deny all contact with mercenaries, censuring such a war lacking in ideals. In Nicaragua the Liberals greatly desire peace and are confident of the word of the President of the United States given to us through his personal representative, Mr. Stimson. All the other Liberal chiefs except Sandino complied with their duty.

There, Mr. President, we have a statement from the active head of the Liberal Party, and one of the ablest liberals in Nicaragua, stating exactly the position of this bandit Sandino. Sandino has been elevated by a few misinformed people who are more desirous of making trouble for the United States than peace for Nicaragua, into being a great national hero struggling against the Conservative Party. As a matter of fact, Sandino is a bandit, an outlaw from his own party, who has been unfaithful to the word which he gave his leader, General Moncada. Because it is more profitably to do so, he has withdrawn into the fastnesses of northern Nicaragua and there attempted to carry out the usual work of banditry. It has been necessary for the Nicaraguan constabulary—a recently organized group of police, trained at the request of the Nicaraguans by the Marine Corps—to go into the mountains and attempt to stamp out this banditry and this nest from which trouble is coming. The larger part of the troops involved are the constabulary of Nicaragua, this newly organized body which we are attempting to train so as to guarantee a fair election at the polls. A few of them, their teachers, have been the marines.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Assuming that all the Senator has said is absolutely within the facts—and I take it he knows something about the situation—what justification arises in the Senator's mind for our Government to go into the country of another government and interfere in its internal affairs in the way the Senator has pointed out? Is it the Senator's idea that it is one of the duties and powers of the American Government to send its troops all around the world to any nation that may happen to have internal dissensions and undertake to settle those dissensions in that other country?

I should like to have the Senator say what is his justification for our country going down and interfering in the internal affairs of Nicaragua.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question as to whether I should like to have the United States go into all parts of the world to maintain peace, my answer is "no." On the other hand, we have certain very definite interests in the Caribbean Sea, to wit, the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal is a vital feature of our national defense. We spent over $400,000,000 in digging the Panama Canal as a defense measure. We are deeply interested in maintaining that part of our national defense.

The countries near the Panama Canal have a peculiar interest to us in connection with our isthmian policy, or that part of the Monroe doctrine which we must maintain for our own safety and for our own defense. We can not permit European countries to go in and establish themselves in these Caribbean countries, which would threaten the Panama Canal and our connections there. When revolutions arise, when it becomes impossible to protect life and property, it is the custom of all nations to intervene by sending their marines—which is not an act of war, but is an act recognized under international law—to see to it that their nationals are protected.

This kind of operation has in the past sometimes led to permanent occupation, not by the United States but by other countries. I may say in passing that in regard to Nicaragua we have received complaints from three or four European countries stating that if we did not go down there they would have to go there themselves. To aid the Nicaraguans to peace becomes a part of our national defense, a part of our isthmian policy, a part of our maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. We must either "put up or shut up." We have either to get out and let the other countries go in and protect their nationals or we have to do it ourselves. It seems to me that is part of our duty, and so long as it is done as wisely and patiently as this administration has carried it out, as the last administration carried it out, as the administration before that, the Democratic administration, carried it out in various Caribbean countries, it seems to me it has been well done.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much interested in what the Senator has said about the protection of the Panama Canal, and I am reminded of something to which I want to call his attention, when he speaks about the necessity of our protecting that canal, and says that is the one reason why we should intercede in Nicaragua to supervise their elections. The Senator probably noticed in one of the morning papers, as I did, that some fellow down in Panama, right in sight of the Panama Canal, has written and implored the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, to send marines to Panama to supervise the election that is going to take place there. Should we do that?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a question for the President to decide.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, it is a little embarrassing, probably, for the Senator to take a position on that until he knows what the administration is going to do about it. But if the Senator——

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a very sage remark, Mr. President, but whether he likes or not the Constitution of the United States gives to the President the duty of recognizing the countries which are to be recognized, and does not give that duty to the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator has taken a position justifying our action in Nicaragua, and given as a reason that we want to protect the Panama Canal. If we are going to supervise an election away up in Nicaragua in order to protect the Panama Canal, how much more reasonable is it that we should supervise an election right down there in the vicinity of the canal, and why should we not, if that is our policy, supervise the election, and what excuse can we give to the country and to the world for the answer of our Secretary of State, who has answered that request by stating that we decline to go into Panama to supervise their election?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator probably is sufficiently familiar with the history of Panama to realize that there is no such bitter animosity between the parties in the Republic of Panama as there is in the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. NORRIS. Who is going to decide how much bitterness there must be between political parties before we intercede?

Mr. BINGHAM. Very fortunately, the Constitution does not say that that question must be decided by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the President have that to decide? If he does, I want to call the attention of the Senator and, through him, of the President and the Secretary of State to the fact that there is some very bitter feeling in Ireland; that there is terrible strife in Ireland, and the excitement is extremely bitter. They fight over there, too. They have their shillalies all trained, and they are ready, and why should we not go to Ireland and supervise their election?

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will tell us, before he gets through, how far Ireland is from the Panama Canal.

Mr. NORRIS. It is just a little bit farther than Nicaragua, and Nicaragua is a great deal farther than Panama. Are you going to stop at Panama? Why should we not protect the Panama Canal even in Ireland as well as in Nicaragua?

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator does not consider Ireland to be one of the Caribbean countries.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not said so.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator implied that.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have not said so.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is very wrong if he thinks that I am not in sympathy with the farmer. There is every reason why I should be in sympathy with him. To begin with, I am the son of a farmer, a man whose exclusive occupation was that of a farmer for some 50 years of his life, and I myself have been engaged to no limited extent in the business of farming. There is no one in this country who exceeds me in the measure of respect and admiration that I feel for the farmer in many respects.

I think that the farmer is the backbone of all that is best in our American life. Mr. Jefferson said years ago that he is the most virtuous and patriotic member of American society. I share that view. In my opinion, a greater misfortune could not possibly befall this country than for the position of the farmer to remain one of permanent and irremediable distress. There can be no lasting prosperity for anybody unless he is prosperous, and with my conservative nature, that does not lend itself readily to extremist or radical views of any sort, how could I have any but the strongest feeling of political fellowship in every respect with him? No matter what revolutionary shocks this country may be called upon to endure, I believe we shall always be able to survive them, and mainly because of the conservatism, the strength of character, and the sterling qualities of the American farmer.

However, it is not true that nothing has been done for the farmer. In point of fact, Congress is quicker to respond to his demands than to those of any other individual who is a part of our body politic. The best friend I could have in the world is some one who could tell me at this time just what really can be done by human agencies, by legislative authority, to improve the condition of the farmer.

I have read practically every leading publication that has issued from the press in relation to the farmer since I have been a Member of this body. I have been in correspondence with members of granges and farmers' associations. I have purchased supplies for my table from a farmers' cooperative marketing association. I am eager to the very last degree to have pointed out to me some practical means by which the present adverse condition of the farmer may be bettered.

As I have said, it is not true that nothing has been done by Congress for the farmer. Much has been done since I have been here. Has the Senator from Tennessee forgotten that only a year or so ago, through the operation of the Hoch-Smith Act, we placed the Interstate Commerce Commission in a position deliberately to discriminate as regards railroad rates in favor of the farmer?

Mr. WHEELER. They have not done it, though.

Mr. BRUCE. They should do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. But they have not.

Mr. BRUCE. They have not?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. BRUCE. Then go to the White House and ask the President, the next time he makes an appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to appoint some one who will help to carry out the letter and the spirit of that law.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the President has already expressed his views about it.

Mr. BRUCE. Then change your President.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of us would like to do that.

Mr. BRUCE. As a Democrat I hope we shall, though I say this with great respect to the present incumbent, for whom I have a high degree of regard in not a few particulars.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that wheat in Canada was bringing approximately 21 cents more just across the American border than it was in the United States, at a point just a few miles away, and that was notwithstanding the fact that we had a tariff of something like 30 cents.

Mr. BRUCE. Forty cents.

Mr. McKELLAR. Forty-two cents.

Mr. BRUCE. Forty-two cents, to be exact.

Mr. WHEELER. The increase was partly due to the fact that the Canadian railroads give a cheaper rate to the wheat farmers of Canada than to the American farmers.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I cite that to the Senator for the purpose of showing him——

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to have that called to my attention. That is but an administrative shortcoming which ought to be readily corrigible.

Mr. WHEELER. It ought to be.

Mr. BRUCE. It ought to be.

Mr. WHEELER. But just as long as the present administration is in power, it never will be.

Mr. BRUCE. That may be. All I have to say is that I never in my life united more cheerfully in the passage of any legislation than I did in the passage of the Hoch-Smith measure. I said to myself "Here at last is something workable. Here at last is something that will really benefit the farmer without doing injury to the rest of the community." I cast my vote for that measure. Mind you, at the same time I was conscious of the fact that, after all, the adversity of the farmer was by no means referable exclusively to high transportation rates, because only a short time before, notwithstanding all that had been said in Congress about the bearing of oppressive railroad rates on the farmer, Mr. Daniel Willard, the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, had gone on the stand before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and testified that if all the net profits that the railroads of his country had derived from the transportation of agricultural produce the year before were divided up between the wheat and corn growers alone of this country the division would signify an increase of only 4 cents a bushel to them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The figures that were given to me in Montana by some of the millmen who understand the situation show that the differential amounts to 10 cents on wheat as between the American farmer and Canadian farmer due to railroad rates.

Mr. BRUCE. If that is correct, I will gladly at any time go with the Senator from Montana to the Interstate Commerce Commission and ask them to redress, through the agency of the Hoch-Smith law, any inequality that exists between the situation of the farmer in this country and that of the Canadian farmer, if it can be redressed.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I happen to have the figures before me, as I have had occasion to look them up. The cost of carrying wheat from Saskatchewan to the lakehead is 26 cents a bushel. The cost of carrying it from Montana to the lakehead is 44 cents.

Mr. BRUCE. I suppose one reason is that the Canadian railways, or some of them, are run by the Canadian Government, which to a certain degree conducts them without regard to pecuniary deficits. In other words, Government railways in Canada probably carry the wheat of the Canadian farmer at a loss—that is my surmise about it—and they do that deliberately as a matter of sound public policy.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator can readily understand that the American farmers living in the Northwest can not possibly compete with the Canadian farmers when that situation exists.

Mr. BRUCE. That is true. I am with the Senator from Montana; I am with the farmer, as I always am when any sound appeal is made on this floor to my support. I have given a striking illustration of what, through the Hoch-Smith measure, Congress is disposed to do for the farmer.

What else has it done since I have been here? Was it not only last year that with my approval Congress appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 to arrest the progress of the corn borer? Was it not only last year that Congress with my approval took the very extreme step—I think any Member of the Senate will say it was an extreme step—of appropriating a large sum of money for the purpose of supplying the farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the Northwest with seed? That was a measure that almost trenched upon the province of purely socialistic legislation; yet Congress was prepared to enact it.

Mr. WHEELER. We did the same thing with the railroads. After the war we deliberately took out of the Treasury of the United States and gave to the railroads large sums of money.

Mr. BRUCE. But we did not do that out of love for the railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. BRUCE. We did it out of considerations affecting the welfare of the public generally, including the farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator at all that we did it for the benefit of the farmer. I do not agree that we took any money out of the Treasury of the United States and gave it to the railroads for the benefit of the farmers, for the fact remains that it never did the farmer one single bit of good. The railroads have never reduced rates to the farmer in the slightest degree since that time.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator knows that through the splendid management of our railroad systems, in spite of the harm done to them by Government administration during the World War, railroad rates have been inflated to a less degree than almost anything else in the whole economic field in this country. When general costs of living had gone up some 75 per cent, railroad rates had gone up only some 52 per cent. There could not be a finer illustration of the high degree of economy and efficiency with which the railroads of this country are operated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I think the statement of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] needs a little modification. I remember that the Esch-Cummins bill had provisions which did not meet my approval, and consequently I voted against it. I believed, however, that the Government should make a just settlement with the railroad companies. From what I heard I believed that the payments made to some companies were improvident. During the period the railroads were in the possession of the United States, after being taken over during the war, they suffered some damage and deterioration. Perhaps that is not true of all the railroads. It was proper that the Government should reimburse the railroads for any damages which had been occasioned to them by the Government. We took private property during the war, but compensated the owners for the losses which they sustained.

When we took over the railroad properties the same obligation rested upon the Government to compensate the owners for any injuries or damages to the same. I repeat, that by the operation of the railroads by the Government during the war and for some period thereafter, undoubtedly there was physical injury to some properties, and what we sought to do was to compensate the railroads for the damages which the carriers had sustained by the action of the Government.

Senators will also remember that the financial requirements of the Government were such that it embargoed the money market, so that railroad companies were unable to borrow money required to keep their railroad systems in proper shape. That was an injury to the railroad companies. It was inevitable of course by reason of the war; but all that we sought to do by congressional legislation was to put the railroads as nearly as we could in the same condition they would have been in except for the intervention of the Government. It was not the purpose of Congress to give to the railroads a single dollar, but only to make them whole for any losses sustained by reason of the action of the Government in taking over the railroads. If the settlement was improvident and the railroad companies received greater consideration than was due them, I think it was a mistake in judgment of those intrusted with the responsibility of making the settlements. I never understood that the Government intended that the railroads should receive any gratuity.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank the Senator most cordially for his timely and apposite interruption.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me again just a moment——

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I would say that I agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to this extent, that the railroads ought to have been paid for any damage done to them; but I submit that any fair-minded man who made a survey of the situation would have found that the Director General left many of the railroads in much better shape than they were in when they were taken over. I think the Congress of the United States took decidedly hasty action when it appropriated money to the railroads for some claims they made.

Mr. BRUCE. I think, as far as the region in which I live is concerned, that what the Senator said is certainly not correct. During the World War I happened to live on the Northern Central Railroad, which down to the time the Government took it over was one of the most splendidly managed properties in the country. The disorganization and demoralization which resulted from Government operation of that road was too lamentable for words. Finally it reached such a point that at times I saw what I had never before seen in the course of the 25 or 30 years that I had lived on it. I would see a train approach my station and be so inefficiently handled that when it stopped the last car in the train would be two or three hundred feet beyond the station platform.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know anything about the particular station at which the Senator lived.

Mr. BRUCE. I can not go further into that matter because it is a purely collateral one.

But after all, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] might have added, the real object of the Government in making those railroad appropriations was that of an ordinary tenant who before he leaves rented premises puts them in the original condition of repair in which they were when he took possession. The Government had the sense to know that until that great machine was refashioned, until the transportation service of the country was in as good a plight as it was when the Government took it over, all our material and economic interests of every kind, including our agricultural interests, would necessarily suffer, and therefore we spent that money.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again at that point?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the point I am making exactly. The United States Government went out during the war and urged every farmer in the United States to borrow more money to plant more wheat and to plant more wheat, until he went into debt clear over his head. Immediately afterwards the deflation came and the Federal reserve bank insisted that those loans be called. The result was that the farmers were deflated all over the country and went broke. The Government of the United States never came to their rescue, and said to them, "We are going to put you in the same position you were in before the war." They never have been put in that same position since the war, although the Government of the United States tried to put every other business in the country in the same position it was in previous to the war, except the farmer, and he has not been put there yet. The Congress of the United States has let him go on and go broke and suffer.

Mr. BRUCE. The inflation was so tremendous as regards land operations and land values throughout the country that the economic consequences could not possibly be taken care of by any ordinary administrative or legislative agency.

Mr. WHEELER. I will admit that it is a difficult thing, but the complaint the farmer makes is that the Government did that for the silver mines and the manganese mines and the railroads and innumerable other kinds of industry, but the poor devil of a farmer out on the farm has suffered because of the fact that he did not have the influence down at Washington that others seemed to have.

Mr. BRUCE. The silver mines have always gotten more out of the country than they have put back into it.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator about that, of course.

Mr. BRUCE. Especially when the Senator from Montana was addressing himself to the task of inducing Congress to adopt the ratio of 16 to 1 as respects silver and gold, which, too, at one time was supposed to be a panacea for all the misfortunes of the farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that was one time when the Senator from Maryland bolted the Democratic ticket.

Mr. BRUCE. That is the only time in my life when I did.

Mr. WHEELER. I did once; so we are even.

Mr. BRUCE. The thing in my political life of which I am proudest is that I refused to support Mr. Bryan when he was first a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, though I voted for every other Democratic candidate in my time from Winfield S. Hancock down, and even voted for Mr. Bryan twice after he abondaned his free-silver platform.

Then another thing the Senator should recollect is that even before I happened to be a Member of this body Congress was so liberal as to place the farmer entirely outside of the scope of the Sherman antitrust law. So in many respects—I might multiply my illustrations still more—Congress has been astute to put the farmer on a favored footing.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not think for one moment that the farmers of the country have ever been well enough organized to violate the Sherman antitrust law, does he?

Mr. BRUCE. The farmer has less disposition to violate the law than any other member of the American body politic. That is because, as Jefferson truly said, he is the most virtuous and patriotic individual in our country.

Among the complaints of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is the complaint that the farmer pays such high taxes. That complaint is not applicable to the Federal income

tax, because the farmer pays relatively only a small part of that tax. The Senator must have had in mind local taxes. Within whose political control, may I ask him, are such taxes in farming regions? Why, mainly, of course, the farmer. If taxes are higher than they should be in counties and other municipal subdivisions of rural communities, then the farmer should gird up his loins and bring them down, because he is in a better position, politically speaking, to do it than any other American citizen.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I am sure the Senator has in mind the fact that the farmer to-day pays probably twice or three times as much as before for everything he buys in the way of implements and everything he buys in the way of supplies, and he does pay, as has been stated here, probably three times as much in taxes, but he does not earn any more to-day than he ever did. The Senator is well aware of that.

Mr. BRUCE. His gross income is larger, but his net income is not.

Mr. COPELAND. No; his gross income is no larger. The price he gets to-day for his products is low, and his land is not capable of raising as much in the way of crops as it did 25 years ago.

Mr. BRUCE. If that is so, it is largely due to agricultural depletion, and after all the farmer must bear the brunt of responsibility for that.

But so far as the tariff is concerned the Senator is mistaken. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] will correct me if I am in error, but my impression is that under the present law there is no import duty on agricultural implements imported into this country.

Mr. COPELAND. I am well aware of that; but, nevertheless, because of the increased cost of manufacturing those implements, the cost to the farmer to-day is two or three times as much as it was 20 years ago; not because of the tariff in that instance.

Mr. BRUCE. But agricultural implements can be brought into this country free. There is no import duty, as I understand it, on agricultural implements.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, if we had free trade these agricultural implements would still be free, and there is nothing freer than free, and they are free now.

Mr. BRUCE. As the colored people used to suggest, there is such a thing as being "free until you are fool."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There are a great many commodities that are consumed that are highly taxed.

Mr. BRUCE. So far as general Government import taxes are concerned, the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is aware that all of us share those with the farmer. The farmer does not pay any more taxes on his boots or his shoes or his hat or any of the commodities that he uses along with myself than do I or does the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, without arguing now as to why it is so that these prices are high, the fact remains that we have an economic situation where the farmer must pay two or three times as much for everything he buys to-day as he did 20 years ago; and has, if anything, less income to-day than he then had.

Mr. BRUCE. The farmer has more gross income at the present time and less net income, because agricultural products are, of course, bringing higher prices absolutely than they have done for some time past.

Mr. COPELAND. They are not very much higher, I think.

Mr. BRUCE. But as to his net income, the profit made by him is not equal to that of the other members of the American community, because he can not make up on what he sells what he loses on what he buys. That is undoubtedly true, and it is in that that his hardship consists. Now, how is that hardship to be corrected? For God's sake, will not some Member of the Senate tell me how?

Mr. FRAZIER. By the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from North Dakota says by the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill, and he believes that to be so. He may be right and I may be wrong, but I can not see that at all.

In the first place, the Senator from Tennessee is mistaken when he brushes aside the constitutional objections to the McNary-Haugen bill in the cavalier way that he does, because the fact will be recalled that some four or five—I will not undertake to enumerate them all—of the very ablest lawyers in this body—the former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Lenroot, who is certainly a very able lawyer; the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who certainly answers that description, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who certainly answers that description, and others, all expressed the opinion when the McNary-Haugen bill was under discussion here at the last session of Congress that it was an unconstitutional measure; because the equalization fee provided for it was an unconstitutional, nugatory, and void thing. I—following, of course, at a long interval—do not hesitate for a moment to say that that is my opinion also as a lawyer.

Mr. WHEELER. But all of them voted for the child labor amendment, which was declared unconstitutional, too, did they not?

Mr. BRUCE. I did not do so.

Mr. WHEELER. But I say that all the gentlemen whom you have mentioned did so.

Mr. BRUCE. I feel that my democracy, to say nothing more, would have to carry an indelible reproach to the end of its existence if I had voted for the child labor amendment to the Federal Constitution. Nothing could possible be plainer to my obscure vision than the fact that any law that attempts, as the McNary-Haugen bill does, to say to the farmer, willing or unwilling, "You shall pay an equalization fee out of every bushel of wheat or out of every bushel of corn or out of every unit of any sort that you sell" is unconstitutional and void. How could there be any difference of opinion on that point? Has the Federal Government, has any State government the power to say to me, assuming that I am a trader or a farmer, "When you sell something you must make a contribution to an equalization fund for the general benefit of your calling, whether you desire to do so or not"? That would be the very essence of arbitrary, tyrannical legislation, and it would violate every constitutional principle upon which the rights of the American citizen are founded. It would plainly be a taking of property without due process of law; it would plainly be an unconstitutional infringement on the private right of contract.

Mr. WHEELER. Congress took the saloon property, did it not, and took the breweries?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; and it was always held that the granting of the saloon privilege was a mere license; it was always held by the courts that it was revocable at any time.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Government has taken property in many other ways.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad it did take the saloon license away, antiprohibitionist as I am; but, of course, the Senator knows that what I have stated has been held over and over again by the courts.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator believe there is any legislative way by which the farmer may be helped?

Mr. BRUCE. That is what I was coming to. My constitutional objections to the McNary-Haugen bill as a lawyer are absolutely insuperable, and, then, I do not believe that it would produce the practical consequences which its sponsors think it would produce. I think, first of all, that it would give a tremendous stimulus—assuming that the equalization fee plan worked—to agricultural production. In other words, the act would result in very much the same kind of agricultural inflation that followed the economic consequences of the World War; and our last estate would be worse than our first.

Even if that could be overlooked, one of the very first consequences of the act, if it were workable, would be to make conditions of living to every man in the United States that much harder. Every one of us eats bread, for instance. Of course, the economic effect of the McNary-Haugen bill, if it proved workable, would be to make a loaf of bread dearer to every inhabitant of the United States than it was before.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Maryland will yield——

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the policy that the Senator from Maryland outlined awhile ago, that is, that the farmers should leave the farms and go to the industrial centers, would again raise the price of foodstuffs to the consumer.

Mr. BRUCE. I will come to that. That is a most timely suggestion, because I do not want to preach a gospel of despair, least of all in connection with the farmer.

Is there any sort of legislation that will answer the purposes? Well, I think an out and out subsidy would grant temporary relief. Of course, I am afraid that like every artificial stimulus the stimulus of the subsidy would lead to the headache and other bad consequences of "the next morning." For instance, I considered very carefully the debenture plan suggested by the grange which, of course, is a splendid association of farmers. That provides for nothing less than a subsidy; that is to say, for the receipt by the export farmer of a certain

percentage of import duties collected by the Government. That is unquestionably a subsidy pure and simple. And so as to every other suggestion that has been made here. They are in the nature, it seems to me, of mere subventions, mere subsidies, mere artificial governmental aids of one sort or other. So I can not see—I wish I could see—anything to fall back upon at all at the present time apart from some conservative forms of governmental assistance, except the working of natural economic laws; which laws are in operation. As I have said, there is the drift from the country to the city—but there is nothing so terrible about that, for the drift will be back to the country as soon as conditions there improve.

Mr. WHEELER. But the drift to the city will raise the price of wheat, the price of bread, which is the thing we are all talking about, and, of course——

Mr. BRUCE. I do not object to the price of bread being enhanced if it is enhanced through natural agencies and in a perfectly normal, natural, and legitimate manner.

Mr. WHEELER. But the claim is made against the McNary-Haugen bill by those who are opposing it that it is immediately going to raise the prices of all foodstuffs to the people. I wish to point out, however, that if the farmer does not get better prices and is to be compelled to leave the farm and to go into the industrial centers looking for work the effect will not only be to raise the price of foodstuffs but likewise to increase the bread lines which now exist in the city of Chicago.

Mr. BRUCE. The increase in the price of foodstuffs would keep pace with the increase in wages which the inhabitants of cities enjoy, and the people who moved from the farm to the city if they received the higher city wages would be in just that much better position to pay the farmer that they left behind good prices for his breadstuffs.

Mr. WHEELER. But the industries of the country to-day in many places are overcrowded, and there are bread lines in Chicago at the present time.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not know that the industries are overcrowded; and certainly we have no bread lines in the section of the country where I live.

Mr. WHEELER. I say there are bread lines in Chicago, and if the Senator does not think there are bread lines any place else let him go to New England.

Mr. BRUCE. Of course, there is going to be some unemployment; there is going to be some abatement in the extraordinary degree of industrial prosperity which we have enjoyed. Why is it? It is because the manufacturing industry of the country has caught up with the slack of the World War; that is all. When the World War came a vast amount of domestic constructive work had to fall into abeyance and had to be caught up by intensified industrial activity; but now industrial activity has caught it up and we have returned to normal conditions.

Mr. WHEELER. The present industrial condition is due also to the high tariff wall which we have built up around the Nation and which has restricted our world market.

Mr. BRUCE. At the same time that tariff wall is not so high that the volume of our import collections has not increased enormously. Inordinate as it may be pronounced by some of us to be, somehow the tariff has at least worked remarkably well in producing revenue for the country.

Mr. WHEELER. I think if the Senator will analyze the sources from which it is raised and how it is raised he may reach quite a different conclusion.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator is not more opposed than I am to inordinately high tariff duties. I wish the whole subject might be placed in the hands of some tariff commission, clothed with such a measure of dignity and occupying such a position of aloofness as to discharge some of the same useful functions that are discharged by the Interstate Commerce Commission; but the Senator from Montana, I know, would not like that standard of comparison at all.

So, Mr. President, I do not see anything to do except to wait.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President——

Mr. BRUCE. Just a moment and then I will yield to the Senator. Natural causes are at work correcting the agricultural situation. On the whole the trend of agricultural prices has been upward now for some years back; on the whole the farmer is getting more and more for his products, and, of course, that tendency is going to be stimulated all the time by this very influx of farmers from the country to the city which has been deprecated in some quarters, although I think unwisely deprecated. The whole theory of the sponsors of the McNary-Haugen bill is based on the idea that the present agricultural adversity is due to exportable surpluses; that is all; no other theory underlies that bill. What difference can it make to the farmer whether these exportable surpluses are terminated by natural economic causes or by artificial legislation?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree entirely with the Senator's premise. I think it is for the purpose of curing the evil, not by trying to industrialize this Nation, but by trying to keep the farmers upon the farm and to give them a living wage; because I submit it is not only an economic problem but it is a moral problem as well which this country has got to face if we drive our farmers all into the industrial classes.

Mr. BRUCE. We can not drive them all into them; we will drive just enough to bring about an enhancement of the prices that the farmer receives for his products, which is the very object Senators have in view.

Mr. WHEELER. We will drive them to the cities and make industrialists out of them, and it is a difficult thing now to keep the farmers upon the farm, even when they are making money.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator knows that the greater our cities are and the more numerous their populations are the wider is the market for the farmer.

Mr. COPELAND. It works the other way also. Let me suggest another phase. If the farmer can not buy in the industrial sections, we are going to have trouble. The Senator and I come from great cities where there are great manufacturing plants, but, as we do not consume the things made there, there can be no prosperity in our cities unless there is prosperity on the farm. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that, taking manufactured steel, for instance, over half of the steel manufactured in the United States is used on the farm. It is amazing that over half of the steel manufactured in the United States goes into fence wire, plowshares, hammers, chains, and other things that are used on the farm.

Mr. BRUCE. And more than 30 per cent of the population of the country is on the farm.

Mr. COPELAND. More than half of the steel produced in the United States is used on the farm, and unless the farmer has buying power in the city we are going to have distress.

Now, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I am advised by wise farmers that the actual cost of producing wheat to-day is $1.75 a bushel, and yet they can not get more than $1.25 for it. The other 50 cents is the labor put in by the farmer and his family without any return. I am not here to have any dispute with the Senator as to the remedy, but we must face the situation. Here is a disease. Here is this great farm industry going into bankruptcy. There must be found a way to cure it; and if no other way can be found, apparently the only measure before us that has in it any possible hope of relief is this particular measure.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not see any hope of relief in it at all. Every branch of human industry at times has to pass through a process of liquidation. When it is the steel industry, or some other great manufacturing industry, we do not think so much about it. It does not affect so many people, to begin with; but the industry passes through a period of liquidation, and that is followed by a period of reorganization and revival, and the industry starts off again on a new career of usefulness and success. I think that before very long, if we will just cease trying to apply artificial remedies to the agricultural situation, it will take care of itself. There will be some more hardship, even some more distress perhaps, but ultimately the situation will be permanently taken care of; whereas, assuming that the McNary-Haugen bill is workable, I can not see that any lasting results are likely to flow from the purely fictitious kind of relief for which it provides.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it seems to me that if we can not give protection to all we can not give protection to any. What I mean to say is, we have a tariff law protecting the manufacturer. We are contributing to him.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but we have endeavored to protect the farmer by the tariff. Some Members of the Senate seem to forget that we have a tariff on wheat. Have we not imposed a tariff on wheat, and have we not imposed a tariff on corn, and have we not imposed a tariff on potatoes?

Mr. KING. And on wool and on sheep.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; certain kinds of wool. Indeed we have. Tariff legislation has done all that tariff legislation possibly could do for the farmer.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will permit me, we know that the tariff on wheat has not been effective.

Mr. BRUCE. That is not the fault of Congress.

Mr. COPELAND. But let us go back to the general proposition of the tariff. By reason of it everything that the farmer

buys is increased in price. He is contributing to the manufacturer by reason of this enhanced price.

Mr. BRUCE. No more than I am or the Senator from New York is.

Mr. COPELAND. No; that is true; but, nevertheless, he is doing it. As a result of the existence of labor unions—and I am in favor of them—the price of labor has been fixed. The law of supply and demand does not operate. It is fixed.

Mr. BRUCE. Not altogether. You can not say that altogether.

Mr. COPELAND. The result is that the farmer's boy goes to the city, and when the farmer wants to hire a man he has to compete with high-priced labor. So the farmer is the victim of the labor union in fixing the price he has to pay for labor, the victim of the tariff system, the victim of the high freight rates; and if he is to contribute to these matters which have become fixed by reason of legislative action, is it not fair, if we can find some way of doing it, to give him the benefit of the same kind of legislative action?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but the difference is this: The farmer at the present time is the victim of natural economic causes to which the other elements of American society are not subject. That is what it comes to. In other words, when he goes out to sell his product he has to compete with the whole world. The wheat grower in Montana, for instance, has to compete with the Canadian wheat grower, and with the wheat grower in Hungary and in India and in Russia and in Argentine; in fact with the whole world; and, of course, while Congress is a pretty ambitious body, I take it for granted that it is not ambitious enough to endeavor to correct world-wide conditions which are beyond its power.

That is not true of anybody but the farmer. That is his crowning misfortune. Now, how are you going to make that good to him?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know that I know how to make it good to him. I am not sure that this bill would, but it is the only remedy that is offered; and it seems to me—and I say this in all kindliness—that if the Senator has no remedy to offer he can not find fault with some of us if we take this one.

Mr. BRUCE. If the Senator will pardon me, it seems to me he puts himself in the position of a friend of mine a few years ago who came to me one day and said, "I am in trouble." I said, "What is your trouble?" He was a young man whom I had known for a great many years, a friend of mine, a man of standing. I said, "What is your trouble?" He scratched his head helplessly and said, "Why, I gave a friend of mine a check on a bank where I did not have any funds." I said, "What in the name of heaven did you do that for?" He said, "Because I had to give him something."

That is what the Senator proposes to give to the farmer. He says, "Take the McNary-Haugen bill, because nothing else is in sight." That is not a suggestive reason to my legislative conscience and intellect.

I have, however, said far more than I intended to say on this subject.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the Senator withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to move that the Senate vacate the order which was entered this morning to adjourn until Monday so that it can meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock for the purpose of discussing the Nicaraguan situation.

We can use that time to good advantage and accomplish something by remaining here to-morrow and Saturday and discussing this very important question. It is a question of great moment to the American people, and I believe that if Senators generally had known this morning that this adjournment course was contemplated this action would not have been taken. I was called out of the Chamber for a moment by some Alabama friends. If the request for adjournment had been made in my presence, I would have objected.

I want to move, therefore, that the Senate vacate that order and that we meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock for the purpose of discussing and making known to the country the facts about the Nicaraguan situation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the unanimous-consent agreement can not be vacated by a motion.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I ask unanimous consent that it be vacated.

Mr. WILLIS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 9, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5, 1928

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath:

To be chief boatswains

Boatswain Albert M. Totzke.
Boatswain John H. Kahnberg.
Boatswain Frederick T. Ford.
Boatswain Harvey S. Browne, jr.
Boatswain Charles Martinson.
Boatswain Otto Estad.
Boatswain Simon B. Natwig.
Boatswain Albert Nelson.
Boatswain Hans Hanson.
Boatswain Karl M. Varness.
Boatswain Sverre Halvorsen.

To be chief gunners

Gunner William Woods.
Gunner Charles Heinzel.
Gunner Henry C. Sumner.
Gunner Helge C. Hermann.
Gunner Bertram G. Balcombe.
Gunner Antone J. Sousa.

To be chief machinists

Machinist Louis Spaniol.
Machinist Thomas G. Odderstol.
Machinist Edward Derum.
Machinist Alden E. Blood.
Machinist Magnus J. Knudsen.
Machinist Ross G. Blackburn.
Machinist Frank J. Bennett.
Machinist William W. DeWever.
Machinist William F. Kilroy.

To be chief carpenters

Carpenter Thomas Abrahamson.
Carpenter Walter Stegman.

To be chief pay clerks

Pay Clerk William O. Duker.
Pay Clerk Raymond N. Gillis.
Pay Clerk Harry F. Brodbeck.
Pay Clerk Owen P. Thomas.
Pay Clerk Thomas L. Ryan.
Pay Clerk Albert Trachtenberg.
Pay Clerk Louis Brezovic.
Pay Clerk George D. Batey.
Pay Clerk Jacob Rosenberg.

To be chief radio electricians

Radio Electrician Walter W. Reynolds.
Radio Electrician William W. O'Steen.

The above-named officers have passed the physical and professional examinations required for the promotions for which they are recommended. This is in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1926.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Clifford M. Cox to be postmaster at Ozark, Ala., in place of J. A. Eason. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1927.

ALASKA

Stephen Birch to be postmaster at Kennecott, Alaska, in place of Stephen Birch. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Henry S. Sogn to be postmaster at Anchorage, Alaska, in place of H. S. Sogn. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

ARIZONA

J. Lee Conrad to be postmaster at Scottsdale, Ariz., in place of J. L. Conrad. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

ARKANSAS

George E. Davis to be postmaster at Wynne, Ark., in place of G. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Charles E. Kemp to be postmaster at Trumann, Ark., in place of C. E. Kemp. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Abram J. Hansberry to be postmaster at Ozark, Ark., in place of A. J. Hansberry. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Jason O. Burns to be postmaster at Batesville, Ark., in place of J. O. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

CALIFORNIA

Homer T. Riddle to be postmaster at Loyalton, Calif., in place of A. G. Sawin, resigned.

William J. Murray to be postmaster at Yucaipa, Calif., in place of W. J. Murray. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Marshall N. Johnson to be postmaster at Windsor, Calif., in place of M. N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ernest D. Gibson to be postmaster at Van Nuys, Calif., in place of E. D. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Henry F. Stahl to be postmaster at Vallejo, Calif., in place of H. F. Stahl. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Mary E. Rozier to be postmaster at Tuolumne, Calif., in place of M. E. Rozier. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Wade J. Williams to be postmaster at Tranquillity, Calif., in place of W. J. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ruby Vinten to be postmaster at Terminal Island, Calif., in place of Ruby Vinten. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Peder P. Hornsyld to be postmaster at Solvang, Calif., in place of P. P. Hornsyld. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Patrick C. Mulqueeney to be postmaster at Sawtelle, Calif., in place of P. C. Mulqueeney. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Algera M. Rumsey to be postmaster at Saugus, Calif., in place of A. M. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Grace E. Tooker to be postmaster at Santa Monica, Calif., in place of G. E. Tooker. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Terry E. Stephenson to be postmaster at Santa Ana, Calif., in place of T. E. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Pastor A. H. Arata to be postmaster at San Luis Obispo, Calif., in place of P. A. H. Arata. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ferris F. Kelly to be postmaster at San Juan Capistrano, Calif., in place of F. F. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Harrie C. Caldwell to be postmaster at San Fernando, Calif., in place of H. C. Caldwell. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

George G. Hughes to be postmaster at San Bruno, Calif., in place of G. G. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ellery M. Murray to be postmaster at St. Helena, Calif., in place of E. M. Murray. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

William Henson to be postmaster at Riverdale, Calif., in place of William Henson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Sula D. Abbott to be postmaster at Placentia, Calif., in place of S. D. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Frederick S. Lowden to be postmaster at Orland, Calif., in place of F. S. Lowden. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Presley E. Berger to be postmaster at Ontario, Calif., in place of P. E. Berger. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

George W. Archer to be postmaster at Norwalk, Calif., in place of G. W. Archer. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

John H. Tittle to be postmaster at Needles, Calif., in place of J. H. Tittle. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Charles G. Barnes to be postmaster at Morgan Hill, Calif., in place of C. G. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Fred F. Darcy to be postmaster at Montebello, Calif., in place of F. F. Darcy. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Fred Lewis to be postmaster at Mayfield, Calif., in place of Fred Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Edmund V. Wahlberg to be postmaster at Manhattan Beach, Calif., in place of E. V. Wahlberg. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Thomas P. Cosgrave to be postmaster at Madera, Calif., in place of T. B. Cosgrave. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Claude D. Richardson to be postmaster at McFarland, Calif., in place of C. D. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Raymond A. Rigor to be postmaster at McCloud, Calif., in place of R. A. Rigor. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ira B. Jones to be postmaster at Los Molinos, Calif., in place of I. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Charles F. Riedle to be postmaster at Los Banos, Calif., in place of C. F. Riedle. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Daniel McCloskey to be postmaster at Hollister, Calif., in place of Daniel McCloskey. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Corinne Dolcini to be postmaster at Guadalupe, Calif., in place of Corinne Dolcini. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Maude H. Parsons to be postmaster at Gerber, Calif., in place of M. H. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Lela P. Meday to be postmaster at El Segundo, Calif., in place of L. P. Meday. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

William P. Nye to be postmaster at Covina, Calif., in place of W. P. Nye. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Presentation M. Soto to be postmaster at Concord, Calif., in place of P. M. Soto. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Robert E. Thomas to be postmaster at Clovis, Calif., in place of R. E. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ruth E. Powell to be postmaster at Claremont, Calif., in place of R. E. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

James B. Fugate to be postmaster at Chino, Calif., in place of J. B. Fugate. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

George Cunningham to be postmaster at Boulder Creek, Calif., in place of George Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Clifford M. Barnes to be postmaster at Big Creek, Calif., in place of C. M. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Theodore Rueger to be postmaster at Benicia, Calif., in place of Theodore Rueger. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Walter L. Haley to be postmaster at Associated, Calif., in place of W. L. Haley. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

John H. Hoeppel to be postmaster at Arcadia, Calif., in place of J. H. Hoeppel. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

James H. Whitaker to be postmaster at Anaheim, Calif., in place of J. H. Whitaker. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

COLORADO

Zella M. Hutchens to be postmaster at Seibert, Colo., in place of H. A. Simmons, removed.

Charles L. Rudel to be postmaster at Fleming, Colo., in place of C. L. Rudel. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

CONNECTICUT

Allen C. Bennett to be postmaster at West Willington, Conn., in place of A. C. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Frederick W. Griffin to be postmaster at Cheshire, Conn., in place of F. W. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

William M. Mooney to be postmaster at Washington, D. C., in place of W. M. Mooney. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

FLORIDA

Pearl Beeler to be postmaster at Nokomis, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Joseph P. Hall to be postmaster at Sanford, Fla., in place of J. P. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lydia E. Ware to be postmaster at St. Andrew, Fla., in place of L. E. Ware. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William E. Burch to be postmaster at Palmetto, Fla., in place of W. E. Burch. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lola Miller to be postmaster at Palm Beach, Fla., in place of Lola Miller. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel J. Yoder to be postmaster at Moore Haven, Fla., in place of S. J. Yoder. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Eugene D. Rosenberger to be postmaster at Micanopy, Fla., in place of E. D. Rosenberger. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ernest B. Wells to be postmaster at Lawtey, Fla., in place of E. B. Wells. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Elisha D. Wightman to be postmaster at Fruitland Park, Fla., in place of E. D. Wightman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Walter C. Gholson to be postmaster at Chattahoochee, Fla., in place of W. C. Gholson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

James L. Ambrose to be postmaster at Bunnell, Fla., in place of J. L. Ambrose. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Capers S. Weathersbee, jr., to be postmaster at Branford, Fla., in place of C. S. Weathersbee, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Gabriel I. Daurelle to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Fla., in place of G. I. Daurelle. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

GEORGIA

Mrs. Hubert H. Berry to be postmaster at Sparta, Ga., in place of J. M. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

J. Arthur Westbrook to be postmaster at Powder Springs, Ga., in place of E. D. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

HAWAII

Manuel J. Carvalho to be postmaster at Makaweli, Hawaii, in place of C. H. F. Spillner, resigned.

John I. Silva to be postmaster at Eleele, Hawaii, in place of J. I. Silva. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

ILLINOIS

Elizabeth K. Welch to be postmaster at Lexington, Ill., in place of H. E. Flesher, removed.

Elmer C. Thorp to be postmaster at Winslow, Ill., in place of E. C. Thorp. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry J. Busefink to be postmaster at West Salem, Ill., in place of H. J. Busefink. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ralph K. Crawford to be postmaster at West Point, Ill., in place of R. K. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles E. McPheeters to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ill., in place of C. E. McPheeters. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Rollin A. Gouwens to be postmaster at South Holland, Ill., in place of R. A. Gouwens. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William J. Parsons to be postmaster at Silvis, Ill., in place of W. J. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis H. Richards to be postmaster at Scales Mound, Ill., in place of L. H. Richards. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel M. Combs to be postmaster at Ridgway, Ill., in place of S. M. Combs. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ted Henderson to be postmaster at Ridge Farm, Ill., in place of Ted Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Homer H. Cravens to be postmaster at Plymouth, Ill., in place of H. H. Cravens. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Benjamin F. Bosley to be postmaster at Ransom, Ill., in place of B. F. Bosley. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles B. Switzer to be postmaster at Piper City, Ill., in place of C. B. Switzer. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis E. Selby to be postmaster at Pekin, Ill., in place of L. E. Selby. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lydia Drain to be postmaster at Oconee, Ill., in place of Lydia Drain. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Marion F. Stewart to be postmaster at Moweaqua, Ill., in place of M. F. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Clark D. Smith to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of C. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George E. Whitmore to be postmaster at Mendota, Ill., in place of G. E. Whitmore. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Margaret T. Layne to be postmaster at Menard, Ill., in place of M. T. Layne. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Mayme F. Brooke to be postmaster at Matteson, Ill., in place of M. F. Brooke. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Daisy M. Uphaus to be postmaster at Macon, Ill., in place of D. M. Uphaus. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William T. Bedford to be postmaster at La Salle, Ill., in place of W. T. Bedford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William Sutton to be postmaster at Kempton, Ill., in place of William Sutton. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ina R. Stout to be postmaster at Hopedale, Ill., in place of I. R. Stout. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Adam P. Brown to be postmaster at Henry, Ill., in place of A. P. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Silas H. Rich to be postmaster at Gridley, Ill., in place of S. H. Rich. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Elmer L. Trowbridge to be postmaster at Green Valley, Ill., in place of E. L. Trowbridge. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John R. Hanlon to be postmaster at Grant Park, Ill., in place of J. R. Hanlon. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas M. Jones to be postmaster at Goreville, Ill., in place of T. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles O. Selfridge to be postmaster at Good Hope, Ill., in place of C. O. Selfridge. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Bennett F. Henderson to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ill., in place of B. F. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George J. Patterson to be postmaster at Genoa, Ill., in place of G. J. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Walter J. Ehrler to be postmaster at Galena, Ill., in place of W. J. Ehrler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George L. Spangler to be postmaster at Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of G. L. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Perry Westerfield to be postmaster at Frankfort Heights, Ill., in place of Perry Westerfield. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Glenn S. Wade to be postmaster at Farina, Ill., in place of G. S. Wade. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William E. Mickle to be postmaster at Emden, Ill., in place of W. E. Mickle. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Louis O. McKerrow to be postmaster at Elmwood, Ill., in place of L. O. McKerrow. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John E. Moyer to be postmaster at Dixon, Ill., in place of J. E. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William W. Taylor to be postmaster at Divernon, Ill., in place of W. W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George A. Kraus to be postmaster at Danvers, Ill., in place of G. A. Kraus. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Carroll C. Porter to be postmaster at Dahlgren, Ill., in place of C. C. Porter. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred E. Flessner to be postmaster at Cullom, Ill., in place of F. E. Flessner. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Robert L. Endicott to be postmaster at Crossville, Ill., in place of R. L. Endicott. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Guy H. McKelvey to be postmaster at Coulterville, Ill., in place of G. H. McKelvey. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Herbert D. Short to be postmaster at Coffeen, Ill., in place of H. D. Short. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas F. Wharrie to be postmaster at Coal City, Ill., in place of T. F. Wharrie. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas R. Pearse to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Ill., in place of T. R. Pearse. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Cecil W. Bishop to be postmaster at Carterville, Ill., in place of C. W. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Alice Jenkins to be postmaster at Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Alice Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Della M. Green to be postmaster at Cambria, Ill., in place of D. M. Green. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Russell S. Brown to be postmaster at Brighton, Ill., in place of R. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis A. Roberts to be postmaster at Blandinsville, Ill., in place of L. A. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William Hughes to be postmaster at Bement, Ill., in place of William Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Raymond Phillips to be postmaster at Beecher City, Ill., in place of Raymond Phillips. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Guilford M. Humphrey to be postmaster at Beardstown, Ill., in place of G. W. Morton. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1926.

John H. Holthaus to be postmaster at Aviston, Ill., in place of J. H. Holthaus. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred W. Pitney to be postmaster at Augusta, Ill., in place of F. W. Pitney. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Frank Gain to be postmaster at Astoria, Ill., in place of Frank Gain. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Esther V. Wheeler to be postmaster at Ashmore, Ill., in place of E. V. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Hugh Martin to be postmaster at Argenta, Ill., in place of Hugh Martin. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis B. Tuthill to be postmaster at Anna, Ill., in place of L. B. Tuthill. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

INDIANA

Austin Palin to be postmaster at Wingate, Ind., in place of Austin Palin. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Edmund H. Imes to be postmaster at Westville, Ind., in place of E. H. Imes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Edmond M. Wright to be postmaster at North Salem, Ind., in place of E. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Albert J. Baumgartner to be postmaster at Elkhart, Ind., in place of A. J. Baumgartner. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Harry M. Weliever to be postmaster at Darlington, Ind., in place of H. M. Weliever. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Elizabeth Hatfield to be postmaster at Centerville, Ind., in place of Elizabeth Hatfield. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Hugh Horn to be postmaster at Bicknell, Ind., in place of Hugh Horn. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

IOWA

Carl Wulkau to be postmaster at Williams, Iowa, in place of Carl Wulkau. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1927.

Gabriel Pederson to be postmaster at Waterville, Iowa, in place of Gabriel Pederson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Thomas A. Sanders to be postmaster at Malcom, Iowa, in place of M. A. Brewer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

William Linnevold to be postmaster at Decorah, Iowa, in place of William Linnevold. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Sigvart T. Kittlesby to be postmaster at Calmar, Iowa, in place of S. T. Kittlesby. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

KANSAS

Frank A. Moore to be postmaster at Tribune, Kans., in place of F. A. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Patrick H. Lindley to be postmaster at Havana, Kans., in place of P. H. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Harry W. Adams to be postmaster at Elkhart, Kans., in place of H. W. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

LOUISIANA

Louis Hebert to be postmaster at White Castle, La., in place of Louis Hebert. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1927.

Walter B. Eisely to be postmaster at Tallulah, La., in place of W. B. Eisely. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Novilla T. King to be postmaster at Simsboro, La., in place of N. T. King. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William R. Morgan to be postmaster at Mandeville, La., in place of W. R. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lilha B. Brown to be postmaster at Lecompte, La., in place of L. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Edward F. Crawford to be postmaster at Gretna, La., in place of E. F. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George W. Varnado to be postmaster at Franklinton, La., in place of G. W. Varnado. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ralph N. Menetre to be postmaster at Covington, La., in place of R. N. Menetre. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Robert M. Johnson to be postmaster at Colfax, La., in place of R. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

J. Rodney Murrel to be postmaster at Church Point, La., in place of J. R. Murrel. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas L. Ducrest to be postmaster at Broussard, La., in place of T. L. Ducrest. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

MAINE

Doris C. Sanborn to be postmaster at Dryden, Me., in place of A. E. Cram, resigned.

MARYLAND

Guy M. Coale to be postmaster at Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of G. M. Coale. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

James J. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Sandy Spring, Md., in place of J. J. Shoemaker. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Jessie P. Smith to be postmaster at Luke, Md., in place of J. P. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William Marshall to be postmaster at Lonaconing, Md., in place of William Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William J. Lyon to be postmaster at Hughesville, Md., in place of W. J. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

James O. Wilson to be postmaster at Hebron, Md., in place of J. O. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Luther Bennett to be postmaster at Goldsboro, Md., in place of Luther Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Walter A. Aaronson to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Md., in place of W. A. Aaronson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

MASSACHUSETTS

Walter L. Tower to be postmaster at Dalton, Mass., in place of W. L. Tower. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

MICHIGAN

Russel W. Swhier to be postmaster at St. Clair Shores, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1928.

Murl H. DeFoe to be postmaster at Charlotte, Mich., in place of M. H. DeFoe. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

MINNESOTA

Lambert L. H. Osberg to be postmaster at Winthrop, Minn., in place of L. L. H. Osberg. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Julia H. Johnson to be postmaster at Windom, Minn., in place of J. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Lewis B. Krook to be postmaster at New Ulm, Minn., in place of L. B. Krook. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

James H. Smullen to be postmaster at Lesueur Center, Minn., in place of J. H. Smullen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

John Briffett to be postmaster at Lake Benton, Minn., in place of John Briffett. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Jennie M. Payne to be postmaster at Goodridge, Minn., in place of J. M. Payne. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

MISSOURI

William H. Tanner to be postmaster at Sikeston, Mo., in place of A. T. Winchester. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1927.

MONTANA

Rose C. Spangler to be postmaster at Superior, Mont., in place of R. C. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

NEBRASKA

Paul E. Watts to be postmaster at Unadilla, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Joseph H. Harrison to be postmaster at Ravenna, Nebr., in place of J. H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

John S. Myers to be postmaster at Grant, Nebr., in place of J. S. Myers. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis A. Wight to be postmaster at Gibbon, Nebr., in place of L. A. Wight. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Fred H. Carlson to be postmaster at Alliance, Nebr., in place of F. H. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

NEW JERSEY

Anna Heus to be postmaster at Demarest, N. J., in place of Emma Heus, to correct name.

Richard T. Beak to be postmaster at Shrewsbury, N. J., in place of R. T. Beak. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

John P. Adair to be postmaster at Highlands, N. J., in place of J. P. Adair. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

NEW YORK

Albert Lynd to be postmaster at Nassau, N. Y., in place of Alice Huested, deceased.

Wallace Moore to be postmaster at Madalin, N. Y., in place of J. T. Hoffman, removed.

Fred H. Van Doren to be postmaster at Lodi, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Waldron R. Hulst to be postmaster at Lagrangeville, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

C. Irving Henderson to be postmaster at Worcester, N. Y., in place of C. I. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

M. Clifton Seaman to be postmaster at Woodmere, N. Y., in place of M. C. Seaman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Jennie C. Stanton to be postmaster at West Camp, N. Y., in place of J. C. Stanton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Julius H. Fisher to be postmaster at Wellsville, N. Y., in place of J. H. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George T. Anderson to be postmaster at Whitesboro, N. Y., in place of G. T. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Robert L. Putnam to be postmaster at Weedsport, N. Y., in place of R. L. Putnam. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ray W. McEwen to be postmaster at Waverly, N. Y., in place of R. W. McEwen. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Marion E. Wroten to be postmaster at Trudeau, N. Y., in place of M. E. Wroten. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Oliver Keator to be postmaster at Tillson, N. Y., in place of Oliver Keator. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William M. Ackerman to be postmaster at Sparkill, N. Y., in place of W. M. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Armon P. Gunnison to be postmaster at Sodus Point, N. Y., in place of A. P. Gunnison. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William A. Hilton to be postmaster at Skaneateles, N. Y., in place of W. A. Hilton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Helen M. Braisted to be postmaster at Silver Bay, N. Y., in place of H. M. Braisted. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William W. Bates to be postmaster at Sidney, N. Y., in place of W. W. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Frank A. Erickson to be postmaster at Sherman, N. Y., in place of F. A. Erickson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William H. Savage to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in place of W. H. Savage. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John D. Fratsher to be postmaster at Saugerties, N. Y., in place of J. D. Fratsher. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George H. Farley to be postmaster at Sag Harbor, N. Y., in place of G. H. Farley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Max C. Headley to be postmaster at Rushville, N. Y., in place of M. C. Headley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Bruce S. Preston to be postmaster at Roxbury, N. Y., in place of B. S. Preston. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Park J. Johnson to be postmaster at Ripley, N. Y., in place of P. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Mabel S. Griswold to be postmaster at Pottersville, N. Y., in place of M. S. Griswold. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Frank V. Palmer to be postmaster at Philmont, N. Y., in place of F. V. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John T. Mills to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, N. Y., in place of J. T. Mills. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

James Owens to be postmaster at Ossining, N. Y., in place of James Owens. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Carl R. Allen to be postmaster at Oriskany Falls, N. Y., in place of C. R. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles H. Brown to be postmaster at Orchard Park, N. Y., in place of C. H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Edith A. Parker to be postmaster at Moravia, N. Y., in place of E. A. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Perry R. Bennett to be postmaster at Milford, N. Y., in place of P. R. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ernest K. Smith to be postmaster at Middleburg, N. Y., in place of E. K. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lizzie M. Tuthill to be postmaster at Mattituck, N. Y., in place of L. M. Tuthill. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles L. Stackpole to be postmaster at Lyon Mountain, N. Y., in place of C. L. Stackpole. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry Strube to be postmaster at Long Island City, N. Y., in place of Henry Strube. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lizzie G. Hall to be postmaster at Little Valley, N. Y., in place of L. G. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Herbert L. Merritt to be postmaster at Katonah, N. Y., in place of H. L. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Joseph R. Cowell to be postmaster at Jordan, N. Y., in place of J. R. Cowell. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Skidmore Pettit, jr., to be postmaster at Jamaica, N. Y., in place of Skidmore Pettit, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Thomas J. Wintermute, jr., to be postmaster at Horseheads, N. Y., in place of T. J. Wintermute, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Frank W. Thornton to be postmaster at Holland, N. Y., in place of F. W. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Clara E. Tettemer to be postmaster at Hewlett, N. Y., in place of C. E. Tettemer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Claude H. Preston to be postmaster at Heuvelton, N. Y., in place of C. H. Preston. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Walter J. Pelham to be postmaster at Hensonville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Pelham. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ray F. Dunlop to be postmaster at Harrisville, N. Y., in place of R. F. Dunlop. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ella E. Rodger to be postmaster at Hammond, N. Y., in place of E. E. Rodger. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Will E. Roberts to be postmaster at Granville, N. Y., in place of W. E. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Paul W. Christenson to be postmaster at Gowanda, N. Y., in place of P. W. Christenson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Arthur Decker to be postmaster at Goshen, N. Y., in place of Arthur Decker. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Edward T. Cole to be postmaster at Garrison, N. Y., in place of E. T. Cole. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William A. Patterson to be postmaster at Gansevoort, N. Y., in place of W. A. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Walter A. Pierce to be postmaster at Fort Ann, N. Y., in place of W. A. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Philip F. Schaefer to be postmaster at Fleischmanns, N. Y., in place of P. F. Schaefer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Gaylord F. Carpenter to be postmaster at Elbridge, N. Y., in place of G. F. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George A. Matthews to be postmaster at Eden, N. Y., in place of G. A. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Raymond L. Hodge to be postmaster at East Syracuse, N. Y., in place of R. L. Hodge. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Rhoda Hoyt Lee to be postmaster at Dundee, N. Y., in place of R. H. Lee. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Mabel I. Alverson to be postmaster at Dexter, N. Y., in place of M. I. Alverson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George C. Palmer to be postmaster at Cuba, N. Y., in place of G. C. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Clarence L. Grippen to be postmaster at Corinth, N. Y., in place of C. L. Grippen. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Norman D. Higby to be postmaster at Constableville, N. Y., in place of N. D. Higby. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Carolyn F. Parker to be postmaster at Chestertown, N. Y., in place of C. F. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Margaret R. Mulligan to be postmaster at Central Islip, N. Y., in place of M. R. Mulligan. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles W. Brock to be postmaster at Cattaraugus, N. Y., in place of C. W. Brock. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ernest K. Hudson to be postmaster at Castleton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of E. K. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Lawrence R. Ryckman to be postmaster at Brocton, N. Y., in place of L. R. Ryckman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George H. Farley to be postmaster at Broadalbin, N. Y., in place of G. H. Farley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Maud Rogers to be postmaster Bridgehampton, N. Y., in place of Maud Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Rudolph W. Schoverling to be postmaster at Bayville, N. Y., in place of R. W. Schoverling. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Clarence G. Jones to be postmaster at Barneveld, N. Y., in place of C. G. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Arthur L. Howard to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of A. L. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Howard E. Whealey to be postmaster at Baldwin, N. Y., in place of H. E. Whealey. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Joseph A. Douglas to be postmaster at Babylon, N. Y., in place of J. A. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Annie J. McFadden to be postmaster at Ardsley, N. Y., in place of A. J. McFadden. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles N. Wood to be postmaster at Angola, N. Y., in place of C. N. Wood. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

NORTH DAKOTA

Clarence B. Stinson to be postmaster at Warwick, N. Dak., in place of C. B. Stinson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Elizabeth J. Olson to be postmaster at Medina, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Olson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Donald B. McDonald to be postmaster at Maxbass, N. Dak., in place of D. B. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Nellie E. Gagner to be postmaster at Lignite, N. Dak., in place of N. E. Gagner. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ella C. Sweeney to be postmaster at Berthold, N. Dak., in place of E. C. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

OHIO

Milton W. Stout to be postmaster at West Liberty, Ohio, in place of M. W. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Russel A. Medaugh to be postmaster at Spencerville, Ohio, in place of R. A. Medaugh. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Alta N. Johnson to be postmaster at Rushsylvania, Ohio, in place of A. N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

James E. Simpson, jr., to be postmaster at Racine, Ohio, in place of G. A. Circle. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Charles T. Cline to be postmaster at New Matamoras, Ohio, in place of C. T. Cline. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Fred O. Simpson to be postmaster at Belle Center, Ohio, in place of F. O. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

OREGON

Charles R. Tyler to be postmaster at Yambrill, Oreg., in place of C. R. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Josephine T. Stark to be postmaster at Sutherlin, Oreg., in place of J. T. Stark. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Lyle B. Chappell to be postmaster at North Bend, Oreg., in place of L. B. Chappell. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

PENNSYLVANIA

Amos E. Chick to be postmaster at Wehrum, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Susanna S. Hartman to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of S. S. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Wayne Elliott to be postmaster at West Chester, Pa., in place of Wayne Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles F. Wenrich to be postmaster at Wernersville, Pa., in place of C. F. Wenrich. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Maurice F. O'Connell to be postmaster at Susquehanna, Pa., in place of M. F. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Thomas Y. Tarlton to be postmaster at Summithill, Pa., in place of T. Y. Tarlton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Peter L. Rohrer to be postmaster at Smoketown, Pa., in place of P. L. Rohrer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Richard L. Harpel to be postmaster at Sinking Spring, Pa., in place of R. L. Harpel. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Eberhard D. Smith to be postmaster at Sellersville, Pa., in place of E. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George B. Wilcox to be postmaster at Portland, Pa., in place of G. B. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Nora L. Pickering to be postmaster at Peckville, Pa., in place of N. L. Pickering. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Raymond A. Kistler to be postmaster at Palmerton, Pa., in place of R. A. Kistler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel J. Matthews to be postmaster at Olyphant, Pa., in place of S. J. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Naomi G. Hazell to be postmaster at Norwood Station, Pa., in place of N. G. Hazell. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

David B. Seasholtz to be postmaster at North Wales, Pa., in place of D. B. Seasholtz. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Bert D. Stephens to be postmaster at Nicholson, Pa., in place of B. D. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William E. Marsden to be postmaster at Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of W. E. Marsden. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William E. Henry to be postmaster at Nazareth, Pa., in place of W. E. Henry. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Phares S. Auxer to be postmaster at Mountville, Pa., in place of P. S. Auxer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John W. Clouse to be postmaster at Moscow, Pa., in place of J. W. Clouse. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John L. Eppley to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of J. L. Eppley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry B. Haines to be postmaster at Maytown, Pa., in place of H. B. Haines. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Claude W. Keiser to be postmaster at Lykens, Pa., in place of C. W. Keiser. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry M. Stauffer to be postmaster at Leola, Pa., in place of H. M. Stauffer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Allen L. Shomo to be postmaster at Hamburg, Pa., in place of A. L. Shomo. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Irene M. Tiffany to be postmaster at Hallstead, Pa., in place of I. M. Tiffany. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Warren R. Grove to be postmaster at Greencastle, Pa., in place of W. R. Grove. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Edward E. Fricker to be postmaster at Glenside, Pa., in place of E. E. Fricker. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George W. Larkins to be postmaster at Ford City, Pa., in place of G. W. Larkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Oscar W. Welsh to be postmaster at Douglassville, Pa., in place of O. W. Welsh. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

J. Beaver Gearhart to be postmaster at Danville, Pa., in place of W. L. Gouger. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1927.

Harry M. Logan to be postmaster at Conshohocken, Pa., in place of H. M. Logan. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John K. Hagerty to be postmaster at Chester, Pa., in place of J. K. Hagerty. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George H. Houck to be postmaster at Cairnbrook, Pa., in place of G. H. Houck. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Otis J. Pandel to be postmaster at Burnham, Pa., in place of O. J. Pandel. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Luther F. Gilbert to be postmaster at Boyertown, Pa., in place of L. F. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Stanley L. Bechtel to be postmaster at Bally, Pa., in place of S. L. Bechtel. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John F. Schwarztrauber to be postmaster at Archbald, Pa., in place of J. F. Schwarztrauber. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

RHODE ISLAND

Frank A. Rixford to be postmaster at Woonsocket, R. I., in place of F. A. Rixford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Edwin S. Babcock to be postmaster at Saunderstown, R. I., in place of E. S. Babcock. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Catherine M. Green to be postmaster at Portsmouth, R. I., in place of C. M. Green. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Thatcher T. Bowler to be postmaster at Newport, R. I., in place of T. T. Bowler. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Hartzell R. Birch to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I., in place of H. R. Birch. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

George T. Lund to be postmaster at Greystone, R. I., in place of G. T. Lund. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

George W. Warren to be postmaster at Bristol, R. I., in place of G. W. Warren. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Mary V. Nichols to be postmaster at Bradford, R. I., in place of M. V. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Almira B. Lewis to be postmaster at Ashaway, R. I., in place of A. B. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas J. Bolin to be postmaster at Neeses, S. C., in place of T. J. Bolin. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Fred L. Timmerman to be postmaster at Graniteville, S. C., in place of F. L. Timmerman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Carl M. Norton to be postmaster at Estill, S. C., in place of C. M. Norton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel L. Myers to be postmaster at Chester, S. C., in place of S. L. Myers. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Dora C. Folk to be postmaster at Brunson, S. C., in place of D. C. Folk. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Waulla E. Westbrook to be postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C., in place of W. E. Westbrook. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Guy M. King to be postmaster at Wessington, S. Dak., in place of G. M. King. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

TENNESSEE

Harry K. Dodson to be postmaster at Kenton, Tenn., in place of H. K. Dodson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

John F. Gaines to be postmaster at Gainesboro, Tenn., in place of J. F. Gaines. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

TEXAS

Grover C. Stephens to be postmaster at Sierra Blanca, Tex., in place of G. C. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

James M. Cottle to be postmaster at Moran, Tex., in place of J. M. Cottle. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Andrew J. Harrison to be postmaster at Goldthwaite, Tex., in place of A. J. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

William N. Moore to be postmaster at Fort Worth, Tex., in place of W. N. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Vivian B. Boone to be postmaster at Fabens, Tex., in place of V. B. Boone. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Arno L. Wahrmund to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of A. L. Wahrmund. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Henrietta Fricke to be postmaster at Brenham, Tex., in place of Henrietta Fricke. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

VERMONT

Edward H. Willis to be postmaster at Pittsford, Vt., in place of E. H. Willis. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Murray K. Paris to be postmaster at Lyndon, Vt., in place of M. K. Paris. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

WASHINGTON

James H. Adams to be postmaster at Waitsburg, Wash., in place of J. H. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Emmett V. Fleming to be postmaster at Springdale, Wash., in place of E. V. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Robert O. Logsdon to be postmaster at Sprague, Wash., in place of R. O. Logsdon. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Warren P. Cressy to be postmaster at South Bend, Wash., in place of W. P. Cressy. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles M. Perkins to be postmaster at Seattle, Wash., in place of C. M. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

James Lane to be postmaster at Roslyn, Wash., in place of James Lane. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred B. Goldsworthy to be postmaster at Rosalia, Wash., in place of F. B. Goldsworthy. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John W. Cowdery to be postmaster at Rainier, Wash., in place of J. W. Cowdery. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George W. Edgerton to be postmaster at Puyallup, Wash., in place of G. W. Edgerton. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Hazel P. McVicker to be postmaster at Port Blakely, Wash., in place of H. P. McVicker. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles A. Fiedler to be postmaster at Newport, Wash., in place of C. A. Fiedler. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

James C. Blevins to be postmaster at Naches, Wash., in place of J. C. Blevins. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Anna M. Robertson to be postmaster at Montesano, Wash., in place of A. M. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Andrew H. Byram to be postmaster at Millwood, Wash., in place of A. H. Byram. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ernest R. Anderson to be postmaster at La Center, Wash., in place of E. R. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles C. Mulligan to be postmaster at Kirkland, Wash., in place of C. C. Mulligan. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Tillman E. Kamerer to be postmaster at Hanford, Wash., in place of T. E. Kamerer. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Herbert P. Fisher to be postmaster at Garfield, Wash., in place of H. P. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Henning E. Johnson to be postmaster at Du Pont, Wash., in place of H. E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

William W. Woodward to be postmaster at Darrington, Wash., in place of W. W. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Will T. Howard to be postmaster at Coupeville, Wash., in place of W. T. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Arthur B. Cass to be postmaster at Connell, Wash., in place of A. B. Cass. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Julius C. Raaberg to be postmaster at Clarkston, Wash., in place of J. C. Raaberg. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Eliza F. Head to be postmaster at Cathlamet, Wash., in place of E. F. Head. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Allison C. Presson to be postmaster at Buena, Wash., in place of A. C. Presson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Mark Harris to be postmaster at Brush Prairie, Wash., in place of Mark Harris. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred H. Tonkin to be postmaster at Black Diamond, Wash., in place of F. H. Tonkin. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles P. Stapp to be postmaster at Anacortes, Wash., in place of C. P. Stapp. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Louis H. Gurnsey to be postmaster at Addy, Wash., in place of L. H. Gurnsey. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William G. Powell to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Wash., in place of W. G. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

WEST VIRGINIA

George Kirchner to be postmaster at Everettville, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

WISCONSIN

Lewis H. Cook to be postmaster at Wausau, Wis., in place of L. H. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Henry J. La Grandeur to be postmaster at Somerset, Wis., in place of H. J. La Grandeur. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Walter F. Martin to be postmaster at Mukwonago, Wis., in place of W. F. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William A. Devine to be postmaster at Madison, Wis., in place of W. A. Devine. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Theodore B. Ottum to be postmaster at McFarland, Wis., in place of T. B. Ottum. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Carl L. Christianson to be postmaster at Bloomer, Wis., in place of C. L. Christianson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas A. Walby to be postmaster at Hudson, Wis., in place of T. A. Walby. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John Meili to be postmaster at Alma, Wis., in place of John Meili. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

WYOMING

Henry C. Miller to be postmaster at Douglas, Wyo., in place of H. C. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 5, 1928

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Thomas M. Wilson to be consul general and secretary.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Vincent B. May to be register of land office, Las Cruces, N. Mex.

Frank P. Light to be register of land office, Lakeview, Oreg.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Bennie Leviton, Fargo.
Pet L. Cooke, Sparks.

KENTUCKY

James W. Felkins, Albany.
Roy Fraim, Alva.
Ella Dabney, Coxton.
James H. Turner, Evarts.
Chris L. Tartar, Somerset.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Adin R. Chapman, Berlin.
Harry L. D. Severance, Claremont.
May F. Sumner, Goffstown.
Maurice H. Randall, Haverhill.
Jesse C. Parker, Hillsboro.
Harriet O. Harriman, Jackson.
Charles L. Bemis, Marlboro.
Arthur J. Gould, New London.
Harold B. Pinkham, Newmarket.
Stella E. Coburn, North Rochester.
Harry F. Smith, Peterboro.
George P. Furbush, Rochester.
Charles E. Winn, Somersworth.
Harvey E. Gates, Troy.

NEW MEXICO

Frederic L. Sammis, Cimarron.
James R. Roberts, Elida.
Earl Douglass, Farmington.
Marie J. O'Bryan, Santa Fe.

NORTH CAROLINA

John B. Lonon, Ashford.
John F. Barlow, Banners Elk.
Andrew J. DeHart, Bryson City.
George E. Sweet, Cornelius.
Alice W. Starr, Creswell.
James H. Darden, Faison.
John S. Downing, Fayetteville.
Nugent B. Hester, Fuquay Springs.
Andrew J. Runion, Hot Springs.
Marvin E. Barrett, Jackson.
Leah J. Franck, Jacksonville.
Robert W. Taylor, Lucama.
John A. Klein, Morehead City.
Flora E. Schlabach, Moyock.
Rosa J. Cooper, Nashville.
John H. Williams, Pikeville.
George W. Cox, Raeford.
Calvin L. Hill, Saluda.
Jacob H. Quinn, Shelby.
Robert H. Dixon, Siler City.
Sudie M. Morgan, Spindale.
Grace B. Fagg, Stoneville.
William P. King, Windsor.
Fronie Perry, Wingate.

OHIO

Fred H. Tibbetts, Columbus.

PENNSYLVANIA

William H. D. Moyer, White Haven.

TENNESSEE

Bassil G. Taylor, Mason.

VIRGINIA

G. Buford Bralley, Austinville.
Virgie C. Goode, Bassetts.
Ralph W. Teates, Bealeton.
Ella E. Ames, Belle Haven.
Charles R. Whitmore, Broadway.
William H. Haney, Claremont.
John R. Jones, Cleveland.
Charles W. Kilgore, Coeburn.
Gilmer T. Slusser, Fincastle.
Emmett L. Allen, Glenallen.
James O. Humphreys, Goshen.
Ernest M. Williams, Ivanhoe.
Caroline E. Bristow, Ivor.
Thomas L. Waters, Konnarock.
William E. Shaver, Maurertown.
Henry A. Storm, McLean.
Charles M. Saunders, Milford.
Harrison H. Dodge, Mount Vernon on the Potomac.
Frank M. Brown, National Soldiers Home.
Ruth O. Griffin, Newsoms.
Edward P. Schultz, Onancock.
Alice M. Welch, Phoebus.
Robert M. Bradshaw, Rice.
Walter E. Richmond, Rural Retreat.
Emmett W. Brittle, Wakefield.
Richard D. Holland, Windsor.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hugh W. Cox, Morgantown.

WISCONSIN

Albert C. Holmes, Evansville.
Edward C. Rehfeld, Horicon.
Lawrence W. Daniels, Kansasville.
Russell E. Burlingame, Statesan.
Ernest W. Mederith, Union Grove.
William A. Devine, Madison.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 5, 1928

POSTMASTER

NEW MEXICO

Nemesina Sandoval to be postmaster at Bernalillo, in the State of New Mexico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, *January 5, 1928*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All our times are in Thine hands, O God, and gratitude fills our hearts to-day! Give us the light of Thy truth; invigorate our understanding that we may have right discernment in the solution of all problems. Ours is a moral duty which no one can ignore and no individual can evade. May we stand forth on the golden roll of those of every age who have wrought righteousness, tamed wickedness, and contributed to the ethical assets of their day. In the volume of life's experience may we be inspired by the lessons of courage, of faith in God, of confidence in our institutions, and devotion to the principles of education and liberty. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment an act (H. R. 6657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment an act (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 1398. An act relating to pardons;

S. 1661. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas appeared before the Speaker's rostrum and took the oath of office.

ACQUISITION OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia, to be used as sites for public buildings, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 483, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia, to be used as sites for public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have some explanation of this proposition. I reserve the right to object for the present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The amendment gives authority, when the title to this property down on the triangle is vested in the United States, for the demolition of the buildings on this property, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, with the consent of the Public Buildings Commission, to take such portion of the triangle as is not needed immediately for public buildings and plant trees in the area thus provided for, so that it may be cleaned up and made ready for the public buildings that are to be erected thereon.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ELLIOTT. With pleasure.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to say to the gentleman who has reserved his objection that it seems to me that this is not only a proper but a necessary amendment. There is a comprehensive scheme for the building of the structures contemplated in this triangle property. Some of the spaces are to be open and park spaces to provide for the proper approaches to the buildings. In order for some of those buildings in contemplation to be constructed it will be necessary to tear down some of these little buildings which will be purchased and where the ground is to be occupied by the new buildings.

Mr. SNELL. How much territory is included in this purchase?

Mr. LANHAM. This is to give that authority within the triangle which is being purchased for the Government buildings. All of this is subject to the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, which must look necessarily during the construction of these new buildings to temporary quarters for Government employees in the various branches of the public service. Consequently, the Public Buildings Commission would not attempt to raze any of the buildings which were necessary for the housing of Government employees during the time of the construction of the new buildings, and without the authority of this amendment we would have to be coming back for additional legislative authority to carry on the building projects that are contemplated.

Mr. SNELL. It is not the intention to raze all those buildings at once?

Mr. LANHAM. Surely not.

Mr. SNELL. It is a pretty sweeping proposition. I think we should have full information before we granted it.

Mr. LANHAM. If we gave it exclusively to one man, the authority would be pretty sweeping; but here it must be done with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, which is the very commission which has within the scope of its authority the entire project. I think with that safeguard there can be no valid objection.

Mr. SNELL. What does that area include?

Mr. LANHAM. It includes that part of the territory and area lying between the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue and the north side of Maryland Avenue, extending to Fifteenth Street, which the Government does not now own. It is within this area that these new departmental buildings—that for the Department of Commerce, and that for the Department of Labor, and that for the Department of Justice, and the Archives Building, and so forth—are to be constructed according to the existing law. The Public Buildings Commission must give its approval; and the Public Buildings Commission, as the gentleman knows, has charge of the assignment of space for all of the departments and certainly will not permit the premature razing of any building which will be necessary for the temporary housing of employees of the Government until the whole project is completed.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, I am in sympathy with this general program, but this is such a sweeping amendment that I thought we ought to ask some questions and know it has been gone into thoroughly.

Mr. LANHAM. I think the gentleman is correct about that, but I think the saving clause with reference to the Public Buildings Commission would cover any objection that might be raised to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I want to ask the gentleman a question. The amendment states that these authorized contracts shall be charged against appropriations. That does not go far enough. This amendment should definitely state that all of these authorized contracts shall be within the limit of the appropriations.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is a matter which can be taken care of in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. It should be taken care of here, for when our Government executes a contract we are forced to stand by it. The Senate had to furnish some brains, at least, in adding something deemed necessary to this bill, but apparently it has not gone far enough. There ought to be something else added to this bill. There ought to be a proper limitation added, and I think the gentleman ought to ask that this Senate amendment be agreed to with an amendment, to wit, that all of these authorized contracts shall be within the limit of the appropriations. With such an amendment added to the Senate amendment, I should not object, but I shall object unless that amendment is added.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think any amendment is necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. You could enter into contracts for several hundred million dollars right now with respect to this triangle. I am familiar with it because I have been investigating it for the last 10 years. Now is the time and place to place proper restrictions upon this legislation.

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman will permit, this only authorizes contracts for destroying old buildings.

Mr. BLANTON. But they could contract to spend a lot of money to destroy old buildings.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman knows it would not take several hundred millions to destroy those old buildings, so why not be frank about it?

Mr. BLANTON. It should not take it. But this commission could contract to pay a whole lot of money to destroy them. I am in favor of destroying the ones that are necessary but we certainly ought to place a proper limitation in the bill before we agree to this amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT. They can not destroy any of them without the consent of the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. But the commission could agree to something, just like commissions do agree with some things that are sometimes foolish.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Has the gentleman no confidence in the Public Buildings Commission?

Mr. BLANTON. I have confidence in it as far as it goes and my confidence in that commission goes as far as my confidence goes in any Government commission. Some man proposes something and then every other fellow votes aye without looking into it. We must place a proper limitation in this bill. Whenever you enter into a contract signed by a commission of this Government under act of Congress, the Congress is going to have to pay for it, and you know we will have to appropriate the money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object unless the amendment is modified as I have suggested.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 483 from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana modifies his request and now asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 483, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. I understand that this matter is subject to the approval of the Public Buildings Commission?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That there is to be some landscape gardening, and things of that sort, in connection with it? I can see that it is quite obvious that this should be done, but does this contemplate the approval of the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The whole plan is subject to the approval of the Fine Arts Commission and they have already approved this plan.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wished to be quite certain of that.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Fine Arts Commission has been acting in cooperation with the Public Buildings Commission in the matter of this triangle property?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. LANHAM. With respect to the suggestion made by my colleague from Texas, I will ask the gentleman if he does not

know as a member of the Public Buildings Commission that it is not the policy of that commission for somebody to make a motion and then every other member of the commission ignorantly vote aye?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. It is done on the House floor day after day. Some fellow gets up and makes a motion of this kind and then everybody votes aye.

Mr. LANHAM. It certainly is not done in this commission.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; not in the Public Buildings Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees:

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, and Mr. LANHAM.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. GEORGE S. GRAHAM

The SPEAKER. Under the authority granted the Speaker by House Resolution 72, the Chair appoints the Hon. ROYAL H. WELLER to administer the oath of office to the Hon. GEORGE S. GRAHAM.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table on Saturday it shall be in order to take up the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] establishing a commission to make certain investigations in connection with the sinking of the *S-4* and of the Navy Department.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, that will be under the general rules of the House?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; it will be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. FRANK H. FOSS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution of the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 78

Whereas FRANK H. FOSS, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, from the third district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said FRANK H. FOSS at his home in Fitchburg, Mass., and that the said oath when administered as herein authorized shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said FRANK H. FOSS.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I further request that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FOSS] be granted indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 21, 1927, they presented to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5800. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles:

On December 19, 1927:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of salaries to the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

On December 22, 1927:

H. R. 5800. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

ENLARGEMENT OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, on December 21 last the Speaker laid before the House a letter from the Commission for the Enlargement of the Capitol Grounds, which was ordered to be printed as a document for the information of the Members. The report contains 15 illustrations which are not covered by the order of the House.

The law provides that no part of the appropriation made for printing and binding shall be used for printing any illustrations unless the order to print expressly authorizes the same.

I ask unanimous consent that the order to print may include these illustrations.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the gentleman. What document is this?

Mr. KIESS. It is the report of the commission composed of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol on the question of the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds. Permission to print was granted, but permission was not granted to include the illustrations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. A. B. HOUGHTON, AMBASSADOR TO ENGLAND

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by the Hon. Alanson B. Houghton, a former Member of this House and now ambassador to the Court of St. James, made at Harvard University in June last on the question of world peace.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what that has to do with the proceedings of the Congress.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it has anything to do with the proceedings of the Congress, but it has very much to do with the questions now before the Congress and before the world. I hope the gentleman will not object. I am confident I take very little time of this House and use very little space in the RECORD.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The author of this address is a former Member of the House.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes; a former Member of the House and now ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has not the important subject of "world peace" something to do with the proceedings of Congress, or are we not concerned with that at all?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think the country is very much interested in it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress the Hon. James Mann and the Hon. Claude Kitchin and the Hon. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, stood steadfast in the protection of the RECORD, and for a long, long time during the service of the gentlemen mentioned they kept out of the RECORD by objection extraneous matter which did not record the proceedings of Congress. I am not the heir of their duties, but I have a great admiration for what they did and what they accomplished. No one else seems to have taken their work seriously, and the RECORD consequently has been filled every session with a lot of matter which has absolutely nothing to do with the proceedings of Congress. It makes the RECORD ridiculous.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Did the distinguished gentlemen to whom he alludes ever go so far as to object to the publication of an address of a distinguished diplomat in the Foreign Service of the American Government, such as the ambassador to Great Britain?

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is what I want to be convinced of. I want to know whether it is the policy of the House to allow all of our diplomats, consuls, and other officials to express their views to the country through the medium of the RECORD.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, I think it has been customary to allow insertion in the RECORD of speeches made by Senators or Members of the House, members of the Cabinet, or our ambassadors. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that all of this outside matter ought to be kept out of the RECORD, and I intend to do what little I can to assist the gentleman in keeping it out, but I think we have made an exception and allowed the insertion of speeches delivered by Members of Congress, ex-Members of Congress, members of the Cabinet, and ambassadors.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If this is in line with our past policy, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. If objection is made, I shall read this speech into the RECORD. I had hoped not to take the time of the House, but I am going to place it in the RECORD.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. I join with my colleague from Massachusetts in desiring to keep out of the RECORD extraneous matter. There is no one more in favor of the reduction of the size of the RECORD and economies in that respect than I am, but I do think the instance brought up at the present time is one where we should not exercise the expulsion procedure. The address is a very able one. Many of us have read it, and in addition to that it was prepared by an official of the Government. Further, it was delivered by a former Member of this House, with whom many of us have been associated and for whom all of us have the highest regard. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think in the House policy expressed in regard to the inserting extraneous matter into the RECORD we ought to include the addresses of admirals of our Navy on the important defects in the policies of our Navy, when such admirals can not get them printed anywhere else without being punished for it? [Laughter.]

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I have not gone into that matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the press of the country carries the information that the State Department is just now conferring with the leading nations of the world in an effort to negotiate treaties to outlaw war.

Last June Ambassador A. B. Houghton, probably the foremost diplomat of America to-day, who served 10 years in Congress, was first ambassador to Germany after the World War, where he served 6 years, and who is now ambassador from this country to Great Britain, delivered an address to the graduating class of Harvard University in June last in which he advocated a change in the Constitution and the laws of the country on this question.

Ambassador Houghton's address is as follows:

PEACE

I want to talk to you a little while to-day about peace. What I have in mind to suggest, briefly, is certain considerations which would seem to indicate, if a more durable peace between them is desired, that the great self-governing peoples must undertake a new experiment in democratic government and extend the right of suffrage into international affairs. You understand, of course, that I am speaking for myself alone. What I shall say must not in any way be accepted as the position of my Government. I can only hope, however, that, if nowhere else, it will find some approval among those tens of millions of plain American men and women who want a durable peace and who are eager and willing to cooperate with other peoples to create a durable peace provided always that, in so doing, they are not asked to violate their own instinctive and fundamental political ideals and beliefs.

The difficulty of promoting a peace by agreement among the great self-governing powers roots in the fact that those charged with political authority assume the inevitability of war. They are ready to agree that peace is desirable and that war is a frightful, expensive, and irrational method of settling international disputes. In view of human experience, however, they see no other alternative. They are compelled, they say, to take human facts as they find them. And deep down in human nature they find racial and national instincts and prejudices which when appealed to have hitherto always resulted in a war spirit. They see no reason to believe that any other result may be expected in any future useful now to contemplate.

WILLING, NOT FORCED

Whatever else may be said to substantiate such a view of the ultimate relations between the self-governing nations, it plainly does not conform exactly to historical fact. War does not originate from time to time simply in a sudden and uncontrollable impulse on the part of one of these great national masses to go out and slaughter another. War is possible, no doubt, because these masses are willing, under conditions, to fight. But these conditions are themselves an integral part of the problem. Before a war is conceivable there must be an issue. And that issue, broadly speaking, is the outcome of a series of maneuvers by which the masses concerned are brought into positions of opposition. Obviously this maneuvering is not done by the masses themselves. Collectively and as individuals they have little, if anything, to do with the subtle and gradual shifting of international relationships. Their interests are directed to the more humble and prosaic task of earning a living. The maneuvering is done by little groups of men called governments. These little groups seek constantly and naturally to gain supposed advantages of one sort and another for their own nationals. Out of their efforts to enlarge or to strengthen or to maintain the interests intrusted to their charge, the masses they represent are gradually maneuvered into positions which, to say the least, can not easily be surrendered. If the process continues, sooner or later a situation arises in which an agreement between these small groups becomes impossible. Then, on the ground that their lives and families and property are somehow involved and endangered, these great masses of men and women, roused by every power of organized appeal and propaganda, are ordered under arms, and war follows. The entire process is in control of the smaller groups. They make the issue. They declare the war. The masses they control simply obey.

Having put this power, or left this power in the hands of their governments, they find themselves at the critical moment, substantially helpless. And so, as individuals, they merely accept the decision and go out to pay the bills of war with their bodies and perhaps with their souls, in the hope that, if not they, then those who come after them may reap a benefit in some measure proportionate to its cost. And even the very men, through whose instrumentality, consciously or unconsciously, this dreadful catastrophe has been brought about explain it on the ground that human nature being what it is, any other determination was impossible—and will be, either now or hereafter.

NOT BIOLOGICAL

Now war may be, in fact, the inevitable result of a serious clash of national interests. It is possible that no method of reaching a peaceful settlement can be devised. But certainly we have no reason to base that assumed failure upon some inherent weakness of human nature. That simply begs the question. War can be said to be inevitable only if we assume, first, that the conditions which from time to time have led to war were themselves the result of a process of necessity; and, second, that the conditions under which men have been brought to fight in times past were, in fact, those precise conditions under which they would have fought if given a choice. Neither of these assumptions can possibly be maintained. It is conceivable, to say the least, that considering the cost the great masses of human beings involved might have preferred some other method of settling any particular dispute. And we know that the conditions which hitherto have led to war are the result of human volition and deliberate choice—not of the populations involved but of their governments. Even if we admit, as perhaps we must, that as long as governments possess the power, first, to create conditions which ultimately result in a clash of national interest; and, second, by declaring war to force those issues to a test of armed strength—even if we admit under these circumstances that history will merely repeat itself and war more or less inevitably follow—we have no reason to admit that a similar result would follow if the power to declare war were in the hands of the populations. That is precisely what we do not know.

The experiment has never been tried. And there are considerations which apparently point the other way.

First. The great self-governing peoples have shown themselves competent to manage their domestic affairs. Foreign affairs are merely an extension of domestic affairs. There is nothing mysterious about them. They are not a sort of arcana, wherein the laws of common morality are excluded and in which only cynical gentlemen of bilingual attainments are competent to play a rôle. They are, in the main, simply the natural and beneficial outcome of a desire to trade. They become potentially dangerous only when men who temporarily possess power undertake, for a supposed national advantage, to infringe either the liberties or the possessions of a neighboring people. Then they become very dangerous indeed. But in so far, at least, as the great self-governing peoples are concerned does a sound foreign policy now necessitate either? Or is such an effort as likely to grow out of great masses of men and women whose interests lie primarily in peace as out of small groups of men who think, perhaps, they can better the relations between them and, sometimes, as history has shown us, are willing to take a chance? It is conceivable, indeed, that what men call "national destiny" might safely be left to work itself out more slowly and in its own way and without quite so much conscious aid and direction.

THE TOLL OF WAR

Second. War has steadily increased its demands. Once it could be waged with profit. Now no gain can equal its cost. Once it could be waged by a relatively small proportion of the populations involved. Now it embraces all. Men and women alike must contribute to its will to destroy. Its proportions have become so formidable and its demands and consequences so ruinous that it threatens to wreck civilization itself. For the wars of the civilized mean the breakdown of civilization. Whatever may be said regarding war in the past, whatever advantages may have come of it, whatever good it may have accomplished, to-day the situation is radically changed. This new democratic era into which we are entering, wherein production is becoming more and more a world process and in which the relations of each one

of us is becoming more and more vitally dependent upon others, can not withstand the shock and dislocation and waste of war as easily as societies more primitively organized. Some check upon the use of this method must be found.

Third. While the fundamental relations between peoples are based, as at present, frankly and openly upon force, fear of attack becomes a natural and dominant consideration within each national group. Out of that fear springs, as a matter of course, the desire to increase armaments which, except for use against each other, are largely unnecessary. Each arms for defense, and each thus becomes potentially more able to attack and so more dangerous as a neighbor. What we do not always realize is that fear in this sense is fear of the concentrated power in the hands of governments to make war almost overnight. Such fear could not exist if the war-making power were diffused among a whole people. The tension would necessarily lessen. Time would be required before that power could again be focused. And time is the greatest ally of peace. But we may go even further. If this concentrated power, now in the hands of little groups of men called governments, were in fact diffused among their peoples, we may safely assert that they would be less inclined than now to develop situations out of which war might easily emerge. They could not be sure of their ability to carry such questionable plans through to completion. The mere fact that they had so managed a nation's business as to lead it to a dangerous crisis would be their condemnation. A new set of forces, not hitherto available to prevent war, would come into active operation.

THE ETERNAL AUTOCRAT

Fourth. The power to declare war stands on a different plane from all other powers of government. It is all-embracing and all-consuming. It subordinates all other powers to itself. It represents the highest act of sovereignty. It is the one power which of all others a self-governing people would logically reserve to itself, since it puts in jeopardy their collective lives and property. And yet, strangely enough, it is the one power they do not possess. We create governments primarily to protect our individual lives and property. To that end, we make laws and set up legislative safeguards, and if these prove unsatisfactory, we change them. It is only when all our lives and all our properties are suddenly involved in a great and supreme decision affecting peace or war that we cease to be self-governing. We accept the decision of others. The fact that self-governing peoples choose their own governments and are, therefore, presumably responsible for the actions and decisions of those governments, does not meet the issue. Those governments are never elected on the precise issue of peace or war. They are elected on domestic grounds and for domestic reasons. And a government elected primarily on an issue, let us say, such as the tariff, may not be at all representative when suddenly confronted by the need of a decision involving peace or war.

Such considerations are, of course, obvious enough. No sane human being would deny their compelling force if it were not for one doubt. And it is this. Are the plain men and women who make up the vast bulk of each of these self-governing nations as competent to determine if and when a war is necessary as the little groups of individuals who now form their Government? That is the doubt. And the answer to that doubt depends, obviously, upon our belief in popular government. There was a time when the ability of men and women to govern themselves under any conditions was disputed—and for precisely the same reasons. History and the rise of self-governing states have demonstrated not only that they are competent, but that they are happier and safer when they take on themselves the responsibility of government. Now we find ourselves face to face with that ancient question in a new guise—whether, although admittedly competent to govern themselves within their own frontiers, they are competent to control their fundamental relations with other peoples—in other words, to determine whether, at any given time, those relations shall be relations of peace or of war. That is the nub of the matter.

The great peoples are now self-governing. Each of them has set up a machinery of government which gives it effective control of its own domestic affairs. But in the region of international affairs the existing machinery of government has never been within their control and is not now.

Theoretically, of course, each self-governing people controls its relations with other peoples. Practically, by leaving the power to declare war in the hands of their governments they lose that control. It is conceivable, of course, that owing to some inherent moral instability or lack of understanding they are unfitted to assume that control—that they would treat lightly a decision which meant so much to them and to others and squander recklessly their lives and property in vain wars against their neighbors. But the presumption, at least, is in their favor. After all, it is their lives and their properties which are involved. And it is certainly within their power, if they will, by the appropriate contributional means either to permit the continuation of a system autocratic by nature, which always has resulted in war, and by which, as at present, their lives and property can be taken without consultation with them and without effective means of protest, or by agreement with other peoples to take upon their common shoulders the power to decide whether at any particular time war is or is not necessary. If they choose the latter course, war is inevitable only in so far as they themselves want it to be. They will be in position to decide, for then the full power of sovereignty will finally be within their grasp. Only then will the democratic process be complete.

NO PEACE BASED ON FORCE

If what I have said has substantial basis in fact, it would seem that the time is at hand when a new experiment in democratic control must be made, and those peoples who have demonstrated their competence to govern themselves within their own national frontiers must assume direct responsibility for their relations with each other. Our Governments have shown themselves unable to protect us against war. They continue to act along well-defined grooves and in accordance with the dictates of a political theory which exalts nationalism and relies frankly upon the use of force, when necessary, to attain these ends. We have no apparent reason to hope for any change in their method and in their aims. The future, if they control it, seems likely to be merely an intensified repetition of the past. Personally I believe we can not safely continue to be democratic within our national frontiers and autocratic in our relations with the other self-governing peoples. A durable peace can not be based upon force. It must, if it exists at all, be based upon good will. And I believe profoundly that that practical good will exists, that the great self-governing peoples can safely trust one another, and that only a method of dealing between them, inherited from an outgrown system of autocratic government, prevents our recognition of that great and beneficent fact. We are caught in a process of our own making. And we must unmake it.

That, substantially, completes what I have to say. What remains is to discuss the means by which that possible extension of democratic control can be put into practical effect, and into this discussion I do not propose now to enter. Nevertheless, to make my argument complete, I must indicate very briefly two conditions which seem to me essential:

First. If so great a political experiment is to be tried, it must be frankly an international experiment. It can not be safely or expediently entered upon by one nation alone. Obviously, the experiment would have a greater chance of success if confined at the beginning to those peoples who are most alike in race and ancestry, who possess, roughly, the same degree of economic and political and educational advancement, accept the same standards of life, respond to the same appeals, and react to the same emotions—in other words, the great self-governing peoples. Obviously, too, such a proposition can only be brought before them by the consent and with the cooperation of their respective governments. A conference at which each is represented would, therefore, be a necessary preliminary.

ON THE PEOPLE'S HEADS

Second. The object of such a conference would be, of course, to determine whether each of these governments is prepared by proper legislative action to enable its people to accept or reject a proposition whereby a declaration of war against the other peoples in the group can be made only after the question has received the affirmative sanction of a majority of its qualified electors; and, following this, to enter into an agreement whereby in return for reciprocal pledges each shall agree not to attack the others for a term of—say—100 years. If, as a result of such a conference, these two propositions can be formulated and accepted, a day should be fixed on which all the peoples so pledged would be given an opportunity to vote for or against ratification—so that by the simultaneous action of the individual electors in all the great nations involved the full responsibility for that agreement would be dramatically brought home to each and each be made aware that the issue of peace or war between them will be thereafter in their own hands and control. Into such a conference, it seems to me, the plain people of America would be eager to enter. Certainly, nothing in our past, nothing in our political traditions, nothing in our accepted principles of government, prevents our entering into an agreement not to attack nations which agree not to attack us. In this way, and perhaps in this way only, can we join hands effectively with the other self-governing peoples in a common effort to secure a more durable peace. But the agreement I am contemplating must be something more than an agreement between governments. It must be an agreement between the peoples themselves.

I need hardly point out to you that if such an agreement could be reached it would leave untouched the relations between each of these powers and all the other powers not involved. Only, as between the peoples who made this compact, there would be this additional security. For as the chances of a lasting peace are greater in the hands of parliamentary governments than in the hands of autocrats, so I believe those chances will be greater still when in the hands of great masses of human beings whose interests lie in peace and who think in terms of peace and who know that their individual lives and property are the stake if peace is broken. At any rate, so far as I can see, no effective alternative is open. If the danger of war is to be lessened, a sufficient measure of control, it seems to me, can be obtained only when the

self-governing peoples definitely and constitutionally take the decision into their own hands.

Let me thank you now for the patience with which you have listened to me. I realize better than you possibly can how inadequate is the statement I have just made. But, however inadequate, it at least has this excuse, that it is an effort to point out an added security against war where it is most destructive and most dangerous—that is to say, between the peoples who are most alike, the self-governing peoples. Of course, if we are content with the present relations between them, we need no added security. But in view of the war which ended only eight years ago and of the peace that is even now being worked out, are we content?

INTERNATIONAL DAIRY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State concerning participation by the Government of the United States in the Eighth International Dairy Congress, which will be held in Great Britain in June–July, 1928, under the patronage of His Majesty King George V.

Concurring in the view of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture, as stated in the report, I request of Congress legislation authorizing acceptance of the invitation of the British Government to the Government of the United States to appoint delegates to that congress, and an appropriation of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses of delegates.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 5, 1928.*

CLAIM BY THE GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY FOR PAYMENT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway for the payment of interest on certain sums advanced by it for this Government in connection with its representation of American interests in Moscow, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1928.*

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1929

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Department of State, Department of Justice, Departments of Commerce and Labor. Pending that motion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] if we can agree on control of the time. It has been suggested that we let the debate run through to-day.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Let the debate run on to-day, and before the adjournment we can make some request for limitation. I assume that there will be coupled with the gentleman's motion a request that the time be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8269, and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate to-day be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. SHREVE was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, before beginning discussion of the numerous items in the bill I wish to pay my respects to some of my associates on the committee who have been so kind in their cooperation in preparing the bill. I refer particularly to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN]. [Applause.]

The bill we have presented to you to-day calls for $89,047,985.14. That, as you know, is divided between the four great departments of the Government covered by this bill.

These appropriations in the bill are $1,536,630.07 in excess of the amount we appropriated last year. Permit me to say it is also $169,900 under the estimates made by the Bureau of the Budget.

The total amount distributed under the four departments are as follows: Department of State, $13,875,955.14; Department of Justice and judiciary, $26,657,730. This is a decrease of $227,705. The Department of Commerce, $37,545,960, an increase of $80,510. The Department of Labor, $10,968,340, an increase of $793,470.

Department	Appropriations, 1928 (including first deficiency act, 1928)	Budget estimates, 1929	Amount recommended in bill, 1929	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with Budget estimates
State	[1] $12,985,599.57	[2] $13,875,955.14	[2] $13,875,955.14	+$890,355.57	
Justice	[3] 26,885,435.50	26,784,630.00	26,657,730.00	−227,705.50	−$126,900.00
Commerce	[4] 37,465,450.00	37,596,460.00	37,545,960.00	+80,510.00	−50,500.00
Labor	[5] 10,174,870.00	[6] 10,960,840.00	10,968,340.00	+793,470.00	+7,500.00
Total	[7] 87,511,355.07	89,217,885.14	89,047,985.14	+1,536,630.07	−169,900.00

[1] Includes $971,713.16 in the first deficiency act of 1928.
[2] Includes $2,000 supplemental estimate.
[3] Includes $484,546 in the first deficiency act of 1928.
[4] Includes $838,000 in the first deficiency act of 1928.
[5] Includes $40,354 in the first deficiency act of 1928.
[6] Includes supplemental estimate for Bureau of Immigration of $235,000.
[7] Includes total of $2,334,613.16 in first deficiency act of 1928.

Now, if the committee will permit, I should like it to indulge me to the extent of allowing me to analyze the figures and discuss some of the changes that have been made. The committee went extensively and exhaustively into the items in the bill. The hearings are very voluminous, and I would recommend that each and every Member of Congress read the hearings.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Department of State or, rather, its activities are separated or divided into five different groups or divisions: The department in Washington, including its passport bureaus throughout the United States, for which we have recommended $1,462,365, an increase over 1928 of $56,160; its Foreign Service organization, carrying $9,117,600, an increase of $330,316.84; the Foreign Service buildings and retirement funds, for which $1,763,000 is necessary for the next year; certain international obligations for which the United States makes annual contributions. These amount to $1,483,240.14, a decrease of $456,871.27; and the United States Court for China, which requires an annual contribution of $48,750. This then makes a total increase for the Department of State of $890,355.57. This increase is mainly made up of certain items in the Foreign Service and an increase in the Foreign Service buildings fund and retirement fund to carry out the provisions of which there is contained the first contribution on the Government's part of $213,000.

SALARIES, SECRETARY'S OFFICE

We have recommended a total of $1,145,760 for salaries under the Secretary's office, which is the main fund out of which is paid the salaries for the Washington organization. This is an increase of $56,160, and covers some salary increases totaling $20,000, as well as an amount of $10,780 for the salaries of four departmental employees to replace four Foreign Service officers now in the department who are badly needed in the field. The balance of the increase is to enable the department to bring up to date the cataloguing in the library, which has been in arrears for several years.

DEPARTMENTAL CONTINGENT AND PRINTING AND BINDING EXPENSES

We have allowed $53,605 and $200,000, respectively, for the department's local contingent and printing and binding expenses. This represents an increase of $10,000 in each instance and is to be used for the purchase of additional file cases and the printing of record books, invoice forms, and visa forms for diplomatic and consular offices abroad.

My attention was called yesterday to the fact that there is a shortage in room. This appropriation will take care of that, and I am glad to inform the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] that we have endeavored to take care of this matter and will supply the foreign offices with sufficient paper so that they may carry on their correspondence in a dignified way.

CLERKS AT EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS

The appropriation for clerks at our embassies and legations abroad carries an increase of $15,000, bringing the total up to $390,000 for 1929. In some of the most important embassies, such as Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, and so forth, there is only one clerk available, and the increase we have allowed will permit of the appointment of an additional where they are most needed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS

For contingent expenses incident to the conduct of our foreign embassies, we have recommended a total of $854,500, an increase for 1929 over 1928 of $58,350. This is to provide for a skeleton force for each Government-owned mission building, varying with its size and the conditions in the country in which it is located, to consist of gardeners, housemen, janitors, and so forth, for the proper upkeep of these buildings. This is in accordance with the act of May 7, 1926, for the preservation of diplomatic and consular properties, and we believe is a very good thing in order to prevent deterioration of the properties in which our Government has already invested.

CLERK HIRE, UNITED STATES CONSULATES

The department has been handicapped in many consulates in supplying requests from the Department of Commerce to keep current their trade lists and world-trade directory reports by reason of lack of clerk hire. To relieve this situation we have allowed an increase of $60,000 in the amount for clerk hire to permit of the hiring of additional clerks to be appointed in those consulates where they are most needed. Including this addition, the amount recommended for 1929 for clerks at United States consulates is $1,645,000.

The State Department supplies over 90 per cent of the world-trade directory reports which the Department of Commerce has on file. These practically constitute business rating of some 300,000 foreign buyers or prospective buyers of American merchandise. Moreover, these reports have to be revised annually.

There are besides lists of dealers in various kinds of business which it is necessary for consular officers to revise and check from time to time to insure their accuracy. During the period from January 1 to September 1, 1927, the State Department received from the Department of Commerce a total of 4,264 communications requesting a total of 6,860 trade lists, covering some 475 different kinds of commodities, be checked with or revised by consulates abroad. The number of names on these lists aggregated 58,000 and constituted a heavy demand upon the time of 320 consular officers. A letter from Commerce, dated October 10, 1927, states that in the fiscal year 1925–26, 2,500 lists were received from consuls about 55 per cent complete as to information; the 5,400 lists in 1927 were 90 per cent complete. In addition to these lists the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce requested some 1,096 world-trade directory reports on specific firms, each request made separately by Commerce. I submit a copy of the letter concerning the trade lists which I have just mentioned. The letter states that a further increase is expected.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, UNITED STATES CONSULATES

Similar to the contingent expenses for United States embassies, except that this amount is used for United States consulates, there is recommended in the bill $1,005,000, which includes an increase over 1928 of $30,000, which is required in the most part by a steady increase in rental of consulates abroad. This increase in rents is due to the inability to renew leases at the rentals heretofore paid, where, in those countries, by reason of leases specifying payments in local currency, more money is required to pay the rentals due to the steady betterment of local exchange.

SALARIES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

After going quite fully into the needs for Foreign Service officers abroad, the committee recommended $3,001,000, covering the salaries of 678 Foreign Service officers. This represents an increase of $71,000, covering 20 additional officers. The department estimated to us there are 25 consular offices being administered by clerks because of lack of career officers to properly represent them. This increase therefore will largely relieve the situation.

POST ALLOWANCES

We have recommended a sum of $100,000 for post allowances for the department, an increase of $71,000 over the current year. These allowances represent a fund which is designed to enable the President, in his discretion, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to the Foreign Service officers of the department assigned to posts in those countries of the world where, by reason of unusually high living expenses and adverse conditions of foreign exchange, their salary is not sufficient to enable them to live. The department figures that this increase is quite necessary because of the constant resignations from the service of officers unable to meet the rising expenses of living abroad, and this is to be used to buttress up such salaries usually by small amounts in those instances where it is most needed.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS FUND

Congressman PORTER, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, authorized in the Foreign Service buildings act, appeared before our committee in support of the Budget estimate of $1,300,000 to carry out part of the authorization contained in this act and made a very interesting statement, which appears in the hearings at page 202. As the House knows, the act I have referred to authorized an expenditure of $10,000,000. Including amounts carried in deficiency acts and this estimate, there will have been made available for the acquisition of sites and placing buildings thereon, by the 1st of July, 1928, $2,435,000. This is less than the $2,000,000 per annum authorized to be appropriated and less than the $3,402,472 expenditure approved by the commission, but it is all that is required up to this time for expenditure. Projects approved so far are located as follows, an explanation of each appearing in the hearings: Panama City, London, Tirana, Albania, Managua, Nicaragua, Yokohama, Penang, Paris, Calcutta, Monrovia, Rio de Janeiro, Shanghai, Mukden, Amoy, and Tokyo. I should like to state that the motive which has actuated the buildings commission in their selection of projects has been the choice first of those posts where climatic conditions make service perilous and it is believed that proper housing conditions will relieve the situation.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman tell us where we can find information as to what is to be expended in each of these places, and what sort of structure is provided for? Can the gentleman give that information with reference to any particular point?

Mr. SHREVE. I am free to say to the gentleman that Congressman PORTER came before our committee and went into great detail as to the construction of these buildings, which statement appears on page 202 of the hearings. He also showed some motion pictures of the projects. He showed the condition at the present time and indicated what was proposed in the way of buildings. It is very interesting and illuminating, and I am sure that Mr. PORTER will be pleased some evening to show the motion pictures again, showing exactly what they are proposing to do.

Mr. DENISON. Does this bill provide an item for the construction of a building in Panama City?

Mr. SHREVE. We carry a general provision, and the selection of the projects and allocation of the money is made by the commission and the department. The appropriation is in a lump-sum amount. The projects are itemized in the hearings, which include Panama City.

Mr. DENISON. It is very commendable that there is to be constructed a building in Panama City. There is none more needed anywhere than there.

Mr. SHREVE. The committee was inclined to think that this commission was proceeding very wisely, and was really starting a wonderful work. Our country should really be on a par with any other country in the matter of buildings for our representatives in foreign countries.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Now, we have included in the bill the Budget estimate of $213,000, which is the first contribution on the part of the Government toward carrying out the provisions of section 18 (a) of the act of May 24, 1924—the Rogers Act—which authorizes annual estimates to be submitted of appropriations necessary to continue in full force the retirement and disability system established by that section.

STATUE OF HENRY CLAY, CARACAS, VENEZUELA

Also an amount of $41,000 toward the erection of a bronze statue of Henry Clay at Caracas, Venezuela, in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 24, 1927.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

There are few changes in the appropriations we have recommended for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1929, as against 1928. The total amount involved is $26,657,730. While on the face this appears like a reduction of $126,000 under 1928, this reduction is more than offset when consideration is taken of $250,000 contained in the last deficiency act for the purchase and installation of new boilers and other machinery and which is included in the comparison.

Object	Appropriations, 1928	Budget estimates, 1929	Amount recommended in the bill 1929	Increase (+), or decrease (−), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), or decrease (−), bill compared with 1929 Budget estimates
Department of Justice proper	$4,375,165.00	$4,396,950.00	$4,398,050.00	+$22,885.00	+$1,100.00
Judicial	16,898,380.50	16,842,370.00	16,744,370.00	−149,010.50	−98,000.00
Penal and correctional institutions	5,616,890.00	5,545,310.00	5,515,310.00	−101,580.00	−30,000.00
Total	[1] 26,885,435.00	26,784,630.00	26,657,730.00	−227,705.50	−126,900.00

[1] Includes $484,546 in first deficiency act of 1928.

SALARIES, ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

I should like to call the committee's attention to the fact that in the recent deficiency act which passed this House a sum was included for the payment of additional salaries under the Attorney General's office of $25,400 for the last six months of this current fiscal year. For those additional positions we have included, together with the amount for the regular salary roll of the Attorney General's office, the amount necessary for their payment for the whole of the next fiscal year, making the amount available for 1929 for the Attorney General $1,066,600.

SALARIES, FEES, AND EXPENSES FOR UNITED STATES MARSHALS AND THEIR DEPUTIES

We have increased the Budget estimate for the salaries of United States marshals and their deputies by $7,500, making the amount available for 1929 for this purpose $3,672,500. This, added to the amount the committee granted last year for the same purpose, will give further nominal increases to the salaries of the lower-grade marshals and their deputies.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND THEIR REGULAR ASSISTANTS

After listening carefully to the requirements of the district attorneys' offices and their assistants we added $15,000 over the Budget estimates to the two appropriations under which these expenses fall, making the amounts available for 1929 $1,440 and $1,130,000, respectively. In connection with the Budget estimates this represents an increase of $40,000 and $30,000 over 1928, which is to be used for salary increases for assistant district attorneys and their clerks. In allowing these increases in this most important aspect of the department's work we believe that it will have a most salutary influence in those cases where faithful and efficient service warrant increased compensation.

SALARIES OF CLERKS OF UNITED STATES COURTS

Consistent with an additional amount allowed in the first deficiency act of 1928 for the addition of 11 employees in different United States court jurisdictions, we have suggested an appropriation in the bill before you an amount of $1,820,000 for the salaries of clerks of United States courts. This amount allows a small amount also for the increased compensation of some of the deputy clerks in these courts.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURTS

When we had the estimate for miscellaneous expenses for United States courts under advisement we took into full consideration an addition, which was contained in the Budget estimates of $119,000, which was to cover the salaries of 34 law clerks at $3,000 each and their traveling expenses. These clerks were to be used for the United States circuit judges. We disallowed this whole amount and deleted the language providing for the employment of these clerks both because we did not think them necessary and because no legislation authorizing their appointment was on the statute books of the Government.

In traveling around over the country we discovered that the United States marshals and United States attorneys and deputy United States attorneys have been very poorly paid. We began last year with some recommendations to the Department of Justice, hoping that we might be able to relieve this situation. As I have stated, we are carrying some additional appropriations this year, so far as we can, to cover some of these inequalities.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. HUDSPETH. I was hoping that the gentleman would touch on the matter of the Mexican Boundary Claims Commission. I was looking to see if it was mentioned in the hearings, but I do not find it. I would like to ask the gentleman in regard to the special and general Mexican Claims Commission. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the progress that is being made concerning the adjudication of those claims by this commission, and when they will probably report those claims or pass upon them? That is a matter which, of course, is of very great interest to the people along the Rio Grande and the border section of Texas.

Mr. SHREVE. I am glad to say to the gentleman that the American agent of that commission appeared before the committee and made a very satisfactory statement, and assured us that they were making progress; that they would endeavor to finish the work within the time fixed. A very large number of claims has been filed on both sides of the river, and they require careful investigation of the commission first, and afterwards that of the two Governments, in order to be adjudicated. The commission has been making good progress.

WATER BOUNDARY COMMISSION

As to the Water Boundary Commission, I may say the situation is well in hand, and we have there now a gentleman who is actively devoting his time and attention to it. I refer to Mr. Lawson, an old reclamation man, and he is proceeding rapidly with the work. The commissioner on the other side of the line informed us last year that they were about ready to report.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am gratified to get that information. I understand that the two boundary commissioners representing the United States and Mexico have agreed upon a treaty and a survey of the land, so far as the El Paso Valley is concerned, and that that treaty is now before the State Department here and before the State Department of Mexico. I just wanted to get that information which the gentleman has given me in regard to the claims commission. Can the gentleman inform me what is the limit fixed by the law as to time?

Mr. SHREVE. I think it is about a year now.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. While we are on that Mexican boundary question, may I ask the gentleman concerning the so-called commission, concerning the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande? Does the gentleman's bill provide for that purpose?

Mr. SHREVE. We were just speaking of that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What have you done with that appropriation?

Mr. SHREVE. We have increased that appropriation.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It is all they will be able to utilize?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; we have provided all the money they needed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Is there any information before your committee as to when they will have their first joint meeting?

Mr. SHREVE. No. The gentleman from Alabama, my colleague [Mr. OLIVER], may probably recall.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I understood the State Department to say that they would suggest that an early date be fixed for the meeting, but there is no definite time fixed by the commission for its meeting.

Mr. SHREVE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to go back to the point the gentleman was referring to at the time he yielded to the gentleman from Texas and that is the appropriation for United States marshals and deputies. Last year the appropriation was increased $78,320 to take care of about 690 deputies in the lower salaried grades. In this bill the salaries of the marshals are readjusted and properly so, but I desire to direct the gen-

tleman's attention to the condition which exists in the southern district of New York and the eastern district of New York. These deputies, who have a great many more duties to perform than deputies in the smaller districts, are receiving pay that is hardly a living wage for New York City. As the gentleman knows, they have to escort prisoners to Atlanta, and they have to serve injunction papers.

It is a very serious condition there. Men are getting $1,700 and some are getting as little as $1,500. I know of one case where a man does not have enough to get decent clothes. Surely we ought to pay them as much as a police officer receives in that same community. At the proper time I am going to offer an amendment and I assure the gentleman the situation there is really one of grave concern. I hope the gentleman and his committee will in the meantime look into the matter.

Mr. SHREVE. The committee has already looked into it. We had before the committee the United States district attorney of New York and he made a wonderful statement, so we are fully familiar with all the facts the gentleman from New York has just stated, and it was our endeavor in this bill to correct the conditions he has mentioned.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But you do not.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, we commenced last year. There was some money last year that was saved for the increase of salaries. However I want to be shown and want to be sure, because I feel confident the bill will cover the situation. I suggest to the gentleman that he take up the matter with the Attorney General's office and let us know about it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will do that within the next 24 hours.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. I am glad the committee is pursuing this policy with reference to marshals and deputies. Has the committee done anything with reference to the deputy clerks of the United States district courts?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; we are also taking care of the clerks and deputies.

Mr. NEWTON. Because there is a situation there that certainly must be remedied.

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that that situation needed some correction, but for two years, now, we have been trying to correct it. In the course of time it will be corrected all over the country, but it takes time to do those things. More than that, there is a very great difference in the activities of the various courts over the United States and what will apply to one district does not apply to another. In some sections of the country the courts have not as much to do as others and hence the work of the clerks varies, while in the section from which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] comes they are overwhelmingly worked. We are trying to work out a system that will comprehensively take care of all of the United States.

Mr. NEWTON. I know of an instance of a deputy clerk who, I think, is getting around $1,800 or $1,900 a year. He has to spend all of his time at his work and his experience is invaluable to the practitioner who only gets into the Federal court now and then. I am very glad to know the committee has taken this action.

Mr. SHREVE. We realize the very great importance of that matter.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND THEIR ASSISTANTS

Mr. SNELL. I was very much interested in the allowances that are made for the salaries and expenses of the district attorneys and assistant district attorneys. I notice you have increased the current appropriation by $40,000. This is to cover the proposed adjustment of compensation in the offices of United States district attorneys, including their clerks, and I was wondering what you could do toward increasing the salaries of district attorneys with such a small amount as $40,000.

Mr. SHREVE. They will get a nominal increase because there are not so many of them in the United States.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. It might mean an increase of 50 cents.

Mr. SHREVE. No; the gentleman from Iowa is a bad mathematician.

Mr. SNELL. Just how do you expect that to increase the salaries of these officials?

Mr. SHREVE. Many will get an increase, but this is not distributed to everybody. It is intended for use in such cases as were mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], but it is not intended for those smaller towns where such conditions do not prevail.

Mr. SNELL. Then this money is to be used in the discretion of the Department of Justice, and they will place it where they see fit?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the idea.

Mr. SNELL. How much extra is provided for assistant district attorneys?

Mr. SHREVE. Thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. SNELL. We have this situation in the northern district of New York. The department has authorized them to appoint an assistant, and they want to get an assistant for $2,400. Such a man, however, will go up against a man who in one case will get a fee of $10,000, and I would like to know what is the use of sending a boy to do a man's work in a proposition of that kind, when the proposition, perhaps, involves Government property to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. SHREVE. That does not just quite explain the situation.

Mr. SNELL. I am asking for information.

Mr. SHREVE. Many of these men in the Department of Justice are capable of earning four, five, or six times as much money as they are getting.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is true.

Mr. SHREVE. But they are devoting a few years to work in the Department of Justice for the purpose of getting a background so that they may go out to one of the great cities and almost instantly acquire a practice. You will find that is true in many of the departments, especially in the Patent Office, where men are working for less money than they could receive on the outside. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the Government can not pay what private industry and individuals pay. But this is the point: Those men are rendering a great service and I think they are very efficient, although they are getting small pay.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman's committee allowed as much as the Department of Justice has thought necessary in order to get proper men to fill these positions that are vacant or the ones that are filled at the present time by men who are not really capable of doing the work.

Mr. SHREVE. I am not aware there are any such offices filled by men not capable of doing the work.

Mr. SNELL. No; I do not know that I should have said that. I think perhaps that should have been left out; but they are not getting men of the type they want.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, I will not say that, but I will say they are not retaining the men they want. They are getting good men, but after a man has acquired this background, after being with the Department of Justice here in Washington for a time, he goes out somewhere and opens up an office for himself and profits by the wide experience he has had in the department here.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that will always be true regardless of what we pay them.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. But you have allowed the Department of Justice practically what they have asked for, have you?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; and in some instances we have increased the estimate of the Budget.

Mr. SNELL. Then if I should go to the Department of Justice with a specific case, if they agree with me, they can not say they would be glad to grant the request, but the Committee on Appropriations has not granted them enough money.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, I have never heard of such a statement being made.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think the gentleman from New York would wish any Member of Congress to give an assurance like that.

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. SNELL. That is a pretty general statement.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Some Members of Congress probably like to pass the buck and many on the outside like to do the same thing, and seldom can Congress, if ever, be able to say that what we have done has absolutely satisfied everybody. We have, of our own volition, increased the amount recommended by the Budget for district attorneys and assistants to district attorneys, and we have also carried a large sum to provide for the employment of special assistants in cases of importance requiring unusual skill. The Attorney General came before the committee, and it seemed to me that he was very well satisfied with what the committee had given the department, and he registered no protest.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I have in mind. In the opinion of the committee they have given everything asked for that was reasonable and fair to provide ample assistance in this department.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We could, perhaps, in justice, have raised some salaries. There are many rendering special services who are not paid what a lawyer on the outside could get.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman about that; but I had in mind that in a general way they are satisfied.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We could, in justice, have raised the salary of a good many, but, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], we must leave that largely to the Attorney General.

Mr. SNELL. It would seem to me from the statements made by the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have provided a reasonable amount to take care of these conditions as they exist throughout the country at the present time, in accordance with the case presented to the Appropriations Committee by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHREVE. That is the aim of the committee.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I wanted to have clear in my own mind, and I think it is a matter that should be cleared up at this time.

Mr. SHREVE. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has suggested, we have provided funds for special assistants to provide for cases where especial legal talent is desired, and I am glad to hear that the gentleman from New York is satisfied with the arrangement.

DEPUTY MARSHALS

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not want to tire my friend, and this is a matter that possibly the gentleman went over in the hearings, because the gentleman mentioned something about raising the salary of deputy marshals. Out in my section of the country these officials are called upon to enforce all of the laws—immigration, labor, prohibition, and so forth—and I do not think they get appropriate salaries for the work they are doing.

Mr. SHREVE. We have tried to remedy that. We began last year when they were given increases. We have given them more this year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I beg the gentleman's pardon for going over the matter again, as I am sure the gentleman has had the matter under consideration.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; much that I have said about the assistant district attorneys also applies to the deputy marshals. There are sections of the country where they are seriously overworked, but there are other sections where they do not have so much to do.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And is this left to the discretion of the Attorney General?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WELLER. With reference to the assistant district attorneys in the southern district of New York, the gentleman possibly recalls that I made a speech on that subject last year.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WELLER. Does this bill contemplate any increase in salary for these men?

Mr. SHREVE. We have granted a slight increase, which I presume the Department of Justice will allocate in such manner that it will in part become effective in New York City. I hope so.

Mr. WELLER. We have the gentleman's best wishes anyway.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is that the best the gentleman can do? Must the Department of Justice make the allocation?

Mr. SHREVE. We never make the allocation here, as the gentleman knows. These appropriations are carried in lump-sum amounts for the department's use.

PENAL INSTITUTIONS

As you gentlemen know, the control and management of prisoners convicted of violations of United States statutes has been vested in the Attorney General. There are six penal units for the housing of Federal prisoners under his jurisdiction, as well as a large fund for the support of the same type of prisoners in other institutions than Federal. These institutions and the amounts for their upkeep as recommended are as follows:

Object	Appropriations, 1928	Estimates, 1929	Amount recommended in bill for 1929	Increase (+) decrease (−), bill compared with 1928	Increase (+) decrease (−), bill compared with 1929 estimates
PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS					
Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.	$866,740	$890,000	$880,000	+$13,260	−$10,000
Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga. (including $250,000, first deficiency act, 1928)	1,100,000	852,500	852,500	−247,500	
Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash. (including $75,150 in first deficiency act, 1928)	478,150	509,600	509,600	+31,450	
Federal Industrial Institution for Women, Alderson, W. Va.	230,000	275,000	260,000	+30,000	−15,000
U. S. Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio	360,000	372,500	372,500	+12,500	
National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.	240,000	252,710	252,710	+12,710	
Probation system, United States courts	30,000	30,000	25,000	−5,000	−5,000
Support of prisoners	2,300,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	+50,000	
Inspection of prisons and prisoners	12,000	13,000	13,000	+1,000	
Total, penal and correctional institutions	5,616,890	5,545,310	5,515,310	−101,580	−30,000

We have recommended the Budget estimate in each instance, with the exception of the penitentiary at Leavenworth and the Federal Industrial Institution at Alderson for women. In these two instances we made reductions.

I might say that the National Industrial Institution for Women is the newest institution that the United States Government has, and it is being constructed on modern lines and being managed with the most enlightened methods as to the handling of female prisoners.

The expense of maintenance is very high for the reason that the population has by no means reached its limit. The Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe is another new institution and where men are doing the work, and they have about 300 prisoners there now who are being well taken care of. The institution seems to be getting along fairly well.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The total appropriation recommended for the Department of Commerce, including the Secretary's office and all of the bureaus under its jurisdiction, is $37,545,960, which is $80,510 more than the appropriations under which the department is now operating, and $50,500 less than the Budget estimates. Following is a list of the bureaus in the department, showing the current appropriation for each, the Budget estimate, the amounts recommended in the bill, and the increases or decreases:

Bureau	Appropriations 1928	Estimates 1929	Amount recommended in the bill for 1929	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with 1929 estimates
Secretary's office	$2,435,100	$2,520,100	$2,500,100	+$65,000	−$20,000
Enforcement of wireless communication laws	304,000	320,000	320,000	+16,000	
Commercial air navigation	[1] 3,791,500	3,911,850	3,871,850	+[1] 80,350	−40,000
Foreign and Domestic Commerce	3,721,957	4,162,357	4,182,357	+460,400	+20,000
Census	2,164,960	2,048,200	2,048,200	−116,760	
Steamboat Inspection Service	1,080,060	1,109,060	1,114,060	+34,000	+5,000
Navigation	314,020	330,880	330,880	+16,860	
Standards	2,350,435	2,241,055	2,246,055	−104,380	+5,000
Lighthouses	10,677,250	11,145,250	11,145,250	+468,000	
Coast and Geodetic Survey	2,756,590	2,342,080	2,347,580	−409,010	+5,500
Fisheries	2,021,568	1,999,748	2,003,748	−17,820	+4,000
Patent Office	2,822,860	2,903,800	2,903,800	+80,940	
Mines	3,025,150	2,562,080	2,532,080	−493,070	−30,000
	[2] 37,465,450	37,596,460	37,545,960	+80,510	−50,500

[1] Because of some of the appropriation having been made available for 1927 there is in reality an increase for 1929 over 1928 of about $500,000.

[2] Includes $838,000 in first deficiency act, 1928.

THE ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO WIRELESS COMMUNICATION

The committee recommended a substantial appropriation for the enforcement of wireless communication laws when the pres-

ent radio activities throughout the country necessitated some Government supervision. During that year, however, following court decisions and an opinion rendered by the Attorney General to the effect that the Department of Commerce was without authority to enforce existing regulations relating to broadcasting stations, over $100,000 was returned to the Treasury as unexpended. Since that time, however, regulatory legislation has been enacted empowering the radio division of the department to supervise all commercial and private radio stations, observe the terms of their licenses relating to the use of wave lengths and power, and hours of operation. It assigns call letters to all stations and examines and licenses radio operators, both commercial and amateur. There has been included in the recent deficiency act $84,000 for the balance of the present fiscal year to enable the division to carry out the provisions of the act mentioned. For the division for 1929 we recommend $304,000, which is a commensurate increase over 1928 when consideration is taken of the fact that these additional duties for the present year will only have been undertaken for a period of six months.

Another important branch of the service relates to commercial aeronautics.

AERONAUTICS BRANCH

For the information of those Members who were not here when the important work of lighting and maintaining our airways was initiated, I think it would be well to call attention to the organization of the aeronautics branch and what has been accomplished heretofore.

The aeronautics branch of the department was organized under the air commerce act, approved May 20, 1926. It performs the functions intrusted to the Secretary of Commerce by the provisions of that act. These include: The establishment and maintenance of civil airways and their equipment with intermediate landing fields, beacon lights, signal and radio apparatus, and other aids to air navigation; the establishment and enforcement of air traffic rules; the inspection and licensing of aircraft; the collection and dissemination of information pertaining to air commerce, including data concerning the causes of accidents; the establishment of a suitable weather service on airways; the charting of airways and the publication of air maps; the promotion of air commerce, industry, and trade; and the conduct of scientific research and development work tending to the improvement of facilities for air navigation. The act provided for the rating of air ports as to suitability and for the encouragement of the establishment and maintenance of air ports by municipalities. When operations authorized by the act were commenced the intention was that, so far as practicable, the duties imposed should be distributed among existing agencies of the department. Accordingly the task of establishing, maintaining, and operating aids to navigation along air routes was assigned to the airways division, operated as a part of the Lighthouse Service; the mapping of air routes under the airway mapping section, which is a part of the organization of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and the scientific research for the improvement of air-navigation aids to the aeronautical research division, which is a part of the Bureau of Standards. For the examination and licensing of aircraft and airmen, the enforcement of air traffic rules, and for the collection and dissemination of aeronautical information new divisions were set up in the department, namely, the air regulations division and the air information division.

The appropriations which cover the activities of this branch of the department are for convenience of allocation carried under two funds: One, aircraft in commerce, which covers the Washington activities as well as the inspection of aircraft, and for which we have included $662,000. This represents a reduction under the Budget of $40,000, covering the salaries of 10 inspectors. In the current year they are using the services of 20 inspectors, and the estimates called for 50 in 1929. The committee felt justified in reducing this amount by 10 in view of the authorization allowed in the bill for the purchase of five additional airplanes, which will permit the inspectors to travel from one place to another for inspection purposes much quicker. The other fund, air navigational facilities, which is for the cost of establishing and maintaining civil airways, carries an appropriation in the bill of $3,209,850, an increase over 1928 of $402,860. This will permit of the lighting of 2,500 additional miles of airways during 1929, which will make a total mileage of airways lighted in the United States of 10,012.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In that connection it may be well to say that we were of the opinion that 40 inspectors, if supplied with airplanes, would do more work than 50 largely required to go by train.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. I want to say a word about the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce this year. Our increases have been considerable, and it may be of interest to the House to know just what they are. For the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for 1929 we have recommended the total of $4,520,857. This represents the large increase over 1928 of $470,400, and an increase we made over the Budget estimate of $20,000. These increases are distributed among the different funds of the bureau as follows:

Purpose	Appropriations, 1928	Estimates, 1929	Amount recommended, 1929	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with estimates
Salaries, director's office	$247,887	$252,887	$252,887	+$5,000	
Printing and binding	240,500	250,500	250,500	+10,000	
Contingent expenses	108,000	108,000	108,000		
Promoting commerce in Europe	808,992	864,143	844,143	+35,151	−$20,000
Promoting commerce in South America	410,791	458,817	458,817	+48,026	
Promoting commerce in Far East	333,187	365,000	365,000	+31,813	
Promoting commerce in Africa		85,010	105,010	+105,010	+20,000
District and cooperative offices	435,000	495,000	495,000	+60,000	
China trade act	30,000	30,000	30,000		
Export industries	810,440	875,000	875,000	+64,560	
Domestic commerce	199,160	255,000	275,000	+75,840	+20,000
Customs statistics	335,000	335,000	335,000		
Restrictions and regulations of foreign trade	35,000	50,000	50,000	+15,000	
Directory of foreign buyers	30,000	45,000	45,000	+15,000	
Transportation of remains	1,500	1,500	1,500		
Traveling expenses	45,000	50,000	50,000	+5,000	
	4,070,457	4,520,857	4,540,857	+470,400	+20,000

Despite this large increase, most of which was indicated in the Budget estimates, our committee was deluged this year with requests of every description, and it held hearings for over three days permitting more than 60-odd various commercial organizations to appear before it, making requests which if they had been granted would have totaled over $2,000,000 more than the increase allowed.

In 1920, when the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce first started expanding its appropriations were $1,085,460. As already stated, the recommendations for 1929 are $4,540,857, an increase of $3,455,397 since that time, and less than $500,000 of the amount of $5,000,000 stated to the committee last year by the director as the sum that would represent "a more or less complete institution."

A large number of requests were made for economic surveys covering every description and every type of manufacture. The committee has recommended no appropriation for any of these numerous requests from these outside organizations, recognizing as it does that there is being carried in one fund alone under the bureau an appropriation of $495,000 for the maintenance of 26 district offices throughout the United States and another appropriation supplementing the aid, the district offices are already giving to domestic commercial interests in the United States amounting to $275,000.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. There was a request made of the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is the chairman, for a very substantial addition in the number of trade commissioners, commodity commissioners. I note that that request has not been met. I am inclined to agree with the report of the committee in that respect, but in going over the report on page 23 I fear there is something there which might indicate a critical attitude upon the part of the committee of the work being done by the present commodity representatives, or divisions in respect to commodities.

Mr. SHREVE. Not as to the divisions nor to the work a limited number of "commodity" trade commissioners might do, but our criticism is to the abnormal number of requests for them.

Mr. NEWTON. I wanted to be sure about that.

Mr. SHREVE. The only thing the committee desired to do was to impress upon the country the situation as to the future. Last year at the suggestion of the director who stated that at most this innovation would never apply to more than a dozen major commodities and only then to very necessary situations.

But the idea has spread in the short space of time of less than a year to all over the United States, so that every town

and hamlet wants a commodity expert sent over to represent some particular business in that particular town or commodity in a foreign country, until the thing has got to be intolerable. That is the reason for our report and why we intend following the original idea of a very limited number. We do not intend to tolerate the thought that every industry in the United States is to have a traveling Government representative. We will, however, make those points of contact between the great industries of our country and foreign governments. I know of one particular case in the old country where a particular kind of horn was provided for in a city ordinance. The ordinary salesman could not go to the officials of that town and have them change that ordinance. It required a Government official, and our commercial attaché, representing this Government, went and got in contact with an official of the foreign government, and he succeeded in that way in having the ordinance changed in respect to that particular horn. That is the sort of thing that we intend to cover. We are not providing salesmen for every manufacturing institution all over the United States, sending them abroad to represent some particular activity, but it is only when they can get this particular information that we propose to help them, and we will always be ready to help them under those circumstances.

Mr. NEWTON. I am very glad to have the gentleman's attitude in that respect, because my own experience is that those divisions in respect to commodities, in Washington here, have done very fine work. I would not want to see that work curtailed, and I sympathize with the committee in its attitude toward all of these extravagant demands.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; the commodity divisions here in the city are rendering quite valuable service, but so far as "commodity" trade commissioners are concerned we were swamped. We spent two or three days at the end of our hearings to hear gentlemen coming from all over the United States—150 to 200 witnesses—and most of them came representing those particular activities that have been taken care of. It seems to me that the country at large did not realize the splendid foreign organization already set up abroad giving service, and service that was being rendered everywhere in foreign countries by our foreign offices.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. I direct the attention of the gentleman to the question of regional economic surveys, which is covered in the report, and which indicates a rather critical attitude on the part of the committee toward the regional surveys. The gentleman knows that I appeared before the committee. What is the attitude of the committee on that?

Mr. SHREVE. What I have said pertaining to the other matter might apply to this. We did not object to the idea of brief economic surveys made in the United States, but we do object to Erie County in Pennsylvania or some other county in some other State, or to some city like Boston or Philadelphia, coming and asking us for a survey of their community, which, judged by the sample before me, covers every conceivable subject, from vital statistics to taxation, agriculture, shipping, and so forth, contained in 477 printed pages and duplicating work of our other Government organizations such as the Bureau of the Census, Department of Agriculture, and so forth. Furthermore, just as soon as word passed out that there was a survey made in the Southwest, everybody all over the country wanted a survey of their particular district. I had one letter from Washington in which it was stated that the writer thought that the Government could do the job very much better than their particular local chamber of commerce.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman does not mean to limit the regional surveys of a comprehensive view of the United States, does he, by regions, to carry out the very purpose of the law which is to compile and collect information on raw materials and manufactures?

Mr. SHREVE. I will not say that I am opposed to it. As I have already stated, I do not object to brief economic surveys of broad geographical sections of the United States, but to a voluminous, expensive document, like the one before me, covering, as I have also said, every phase of life in a specified community, much of the data already available from other Government institutions and heretofore collected by them at Government expense, I do object. The matter should proceed very slowly and be worked out carefully and studied to avoid duplication, and then in the course of a year or two see whether they are so universally necessary.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the attitude of the committee might well be gathered from the fact that we have continued an appropriation of last year, used for making and completing one survey, and which will now be available for other surveys. We added $15,000, which will be available for that purpose.

Mr. KELLY. I was going to ask whether that could be used for such a service?

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman can come to his own conclusion as to that.

Mr. KELLY. I think the south coast should be given a survey, and perhaps the manufacturing districts of the South Atlantic should have a survey.

Mr. SHREVE. With what we added and what was remaining in the fund we believe there is enough to take care of the expenditures under this fund.

Mr. KELLY. Then the report may be said to be somewhat exaggerated?

Mr. SHREVE. No; it is not. We have covered the situation fully. I wish to say another word about the organization abroad. We are not inclined to send out assistants for anything more than to provide for those circumstances which I have tried to describe.

Despite a foreign organization of over 60 offices, employing over 150 trade commissioners and assistant trade commissioners, not including numerous clerical assistants, at an annual cost to the Government alone of nearly $2,000,000 for this branch of the bureau's work alone, the committee had more than 25 requests to appoint any number of so-called "commodity" or "special" trade commissioners to travel over the territory already occupied by these foreign offices mentioned, but to represent some particular commodity or branch of manufactures. I ask you in all candor, would any large commercial organization, represented internationally and spending $2,000,000 annually for over 60 offices, on top of this great outlay duplicate the work these offices would be supposed to be doing by sending additional high-salaried individuals into different parts of the world? Obviously, it would not. If, perchance, it had some particular line of merchandise it wished to "push," it would communicate with the offices in question and indicate that their activities should be increased in that direction. In fact, I put this parallel up to one official of a very large company in the United States and he immediately saw the duplication of effort and expenditure involved. Further, that he had made a request of one of the bureau's offices on the very type of manufacture he at first desired several "commodity" trade commissioners to represent, and he stated that he received all the information and service he could possibly wish for. This procedure was started by the bureau last year with several such representatives, with the idea that it never would expand to the extreme proportions the requests we have received indicate it would if allowed to continue, even in the short space of time of six months. Furthermore, I do not, and the committee does not conceive it to be the function of the Government to single out particular or individual types of commodities and manufactures in the United States, either in its already established offices, or the so-called "commodity" commissioner, if we had approved the continuance of the idea. Rather, it is the department's function to assist foreign and domestic trade and commerce nationally. Frankly, gentlemen, if this procedure were permitted to continue, it would be but a short time before you were asked to increase the bureau's already substantial appropriation by several millions of dollars to duplicate work that its foreign offices, already amply staffed, have already done and are doing. I hope, therefore, that the committee's recommendations will stand, which as I have already stated, contain a total increase of $470,400.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

We have recommended for the Census Bureau the Budget estimate of $2,048,200, and which includes an amount of $110,000, being the first appropriation toward starting the preliminary work necessary for the fifteenth decennial census of the United States.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE

The annual amount available for the next fiscal year (1929) for the Steamboat Inspection Service is $1,114,060, which represents an increase of $34,000 over the present appropriations and $5,000 over the Budget estimate. Eleven thousand dollars of this increase is for additional traveling inspectors (three) and the remainder to be used for salary increases for assistant inspectors and clerks in the field.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

We have included in the appropriation for the Bureau of Navigation of $16,860 for additional commissioners and their clerks and office expenses at Mobile and Los Angeles, where they are very much needed. This makes the total amount available for 1929 $333,880.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Moderate increases among the various funds of the Bureau of Standards to keep apace with the very valuable and increased work incident to its progress bring the bureau's amount for 1929 up to $2,246,055. In arriving at this increase a reduction must be taken from the 1928 figures of $200,000 for a power plant which was authorized during this year and which by its nature is not comparable to the scientific work undertaken and for which appropriations are made.

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES

There has been a total increase in the bureau's appropriation included in the bill for the next fiscal year (1929) of $468,000, bringing the total to $11,145,250. With the exception of the amount for public works, the appropriations remain practically the same as for 1928. There have been increases of $9,700 and $6,300, respectively, in the salaries of employees on Lighthouse Service vessels and Lighthouse Service. For public works, there has been an increase of from $609,000 to $1,100,000 for vessels, and a reduction of from $638,000 to $622,000 in other works. The distribution of the amounts recommended for public works is as follows:

Item No.	Project	Amount requested	Item No.	Project	Amount requested
1	Vessels	$1,100,000	10	Lansing Shoal	$80,000
2	Hudson River	25,000	11	North Manitou Shoal	75,000
3	Upper Chesapeake Bay	40,000	12	Muskegon	37,200
4	Inland Waterway	10,000	13	Frankfort	4,800
5	Tampa Bay	17,000	14	Alaska	15,000
6	Southwest Pass	45,000	15	Grays Harbor	25,000
7	Replacing fog signals	40,000	16	Goat Island	15,000
8	Straits of Mackinac	90,000	17	Santa Barbara	5,000
9	St. Marys River	25,000	18	Honolulu	58,000

The explanation of the 18 items contemplated, amounts for which are shown above, is shown in detail in the hearings before the committee.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey have run along about the same for the past several years, except for several amounts necessary for the construction of vessels, one amount for which, of $408,000, was contained in the 1928 deficiency act.

IMMIGRATION SERVICE

Now, I want to say a word to you about the Immigration Service. Your committee this year took a trip around the rim of the United States, visiting our neighbors on the border lines to the north and to the south. Our particular mission was to make a study of the immigration situation. I am pleased to report to the House that we found things almost to our entire satisfaction. The new border patrol, which was created a year or so ago, is a marvelous institution. It is composed largely of ex-service men, men of large experience, brave, fearless, and capable of managing any situation that might be met on the border. They are gentlemen; they are fine-appearing men in uniform; they are sober and honest and industrious; and to my mind they form one of the finest bodies of men that I have seen anywhere. They are scattered all along the border.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. That is in what department?

Mr. SHREVE. The Department of Labor. It is my opinion, and I think the committee will agree with me, that the number of men coming clandestinely over the ocean has been greatly reduced and the men coming across the border to the north and to the south is very small, comparatively. If you take away this patrol, as the Secretary told our committee, the situation would be vastly different. During July and August the border patrol at San Antonio turned back 1,500 people. They had 500 more that they sent to the customs office and to the immigration office. Of course, the number is not so great in other places, but it shows that the patrol is doing the work. We have increased the appropriation; we have increased it for two or three reasons. The first is that these men ought to get better pay, and, secondly, we want to establish a higher class, with greater compensation. We are going to give them a few extra men also.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. The gentleman was out in Minnesota along the main portion of the northern border, but the time at the disposal of the committee would not permit their visiting the Pigeon River station, north of Duluth. It so happened that I spent some time up there and that I know something of the work of the border patrol at the Pigeon River station, which is on the main highway, but with no railroad there at all.

The men are at work there very long hours throughout the entire season, extending through the night. I am glad that provision is made for additional money, because some of these men have had no increase of pay at all, and they rather think they were out so far that the committee had forgotten them, since the committee had visited other points.

Mr. SHREVE. We did not go there because it would have required two more days.

Mr. NEWTON. They made one arrest when I was up there in another part in September, where a man was picked up in the woods about 15 miles from the highway. I may say they are very alert.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I find you have increased the salaries of the higher-grade inspectors. Part of this fund is to be used also to increase the salaries of some of the lower grades?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to call attention to the condition of the men in other grades. I happened to be connected with this service 20 years ago. Some of these men in the lower grades are getting only about $100 or $200 a year more than they were getting 20 years ago. They are all specialists in their work, and they are not being paid in commensurate relation to the pay that is given to men in New York City doing similar work. Some of the laborers and employees down there are simply getting starvation wages. It is certainly not becoming for this Government to pay such low wages. I fear that after the $60,000 increase has been largely expended but little will be left for those of the lower grades.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, we are making just as rapid progress as we can under the limitations imposed upon us. We are doing the best we can.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That may be true, but in the meantime these people have to eat, their children have to be clad, they have to pay rent, and surely we ought to do something for them.

Mr. SHREVE. There is another service in the Bureau of Immigration about which, perhaps, I should say something. We found that the deportation service was only rendering service during eight or nine months of the year. There is a great deal of talk over the country about people who should be sent back. They are here and everywhere, although I am inclined to think there are not as many as it is claimed there are. It is stated there are 100,000 in penal institutions. Many of those would not be subject to deportation. However, we felt inclined to keep that machinery working the whole year around, so we are giving them $200,000 more to add to their deportation squad. So you may expect that instead of having 12,000 deported during the next year it will be around 14,000 or 15,000.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. May I ask the gentleman what the average cost is of deporting one of these aliens?

Mr. SHREVE. It is hard to tell, but it runs into considerable money.

Mr. BACHMANN. If the gentleman will permit, Mr. White was before the Immigration Committee this morning, and that same question was asked of him. I think he said that the average cost was about $87, but to deport to China the highest cost was $300.

Mr. SHREVE. It runs all the way from $100 to $300. There is one more thing I ought to bring to the attention of the House, and that is the helium situation.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Before the gentleman proceeds with that, may I ask a question as to the Mexican border. How well is that guarded, and do we provide any more in this bill for enforcing the immigration law along the Mexican border?

Mr. SHREVE. That is being taken care of in splendid shape. I have just referred to the San Antonio situation down there, and we are strengthening that service wherever it is necessary, but the Mexican border is being taken care of.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. The gentleman believes there are not many crossing the border?

Mr. SHREVE. Not very many. If they get across they are caught. One thousand nine hundred of them in three months were picked up at San Antonio, and then there were 500 more,

making about 2,400 all told. We are perfectly satisfied with the situation on the southern border.

Mr. BACHMANN. I understand that $200,000 of an increase was asked this year.

Mr. SHREVE. No; we have just given $200,000 for deportation.

Mr. BACHMANN. How much was requested this year?

Mr. SHREVE. All told, for the Immigration Service a total of $7,110,000, an increase of $575,000.

Mr. BACHMANN. There was some discussion before the Immigration Committee along those lines.

Mr. SHREVE. During our hearings an additional or supplemental estimate of $235,000 was submitted which was granted, making the total increase for 1929 over 1928 $575,000.

Mr. BACHMANN. So there is an increase this year of about $200,000?

Mr. SHREVE. No; a total increase, including the supplemental estimate of $235,000, of $575,000.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I notice in the hearings an increase of $207,000 for the construction, repair, and improvement of immigration stations.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. That does not contemplate the building of any stations?

Mr. SHREVE. No; that is to fix up Ellis Island. They have to have some heating work done there; their plumbing is bad, and they have to have some repairs made there. It is principally for Ellis Island.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman know of any survey that has been made for the purpose of determining a uniform type of immigration building to be erected along the borders?

Mr. SHREVE. No; we have not gotten that far along.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to say to the gentleman that along our northern border some one representing some of the departments at Washington appeared this summer to make a survey, and I just wondered under what department that matter would come.

Mr. SHREVE. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. I would like to see the day when we would have a line of Government buildings along the border that would be a credit to this great country of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to inform the gentleman that he has consumed one hour.

Mr. SHREVE. I thank the Chair and I yield myself another hour or so much as is necessary.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to heartily indorse all the gentleman has said with respect to the border patrol. I want to commend the committee for its activity in making a trip along the border, although it had a strenuous day in Vermont.

Mr. SHREVE. We had a very enjoyable day in Vermont, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman tell us as to conditions along the northern border with respect to the enforcement of the immigration law?

Mr. SHREVE. We found conditions along the border, with respect to the enforcement of the immigration law, very satisfactory. There were a few places, perhaps, where the service needed some strengthening. In Buffalo the building of the new Peace Bridge, perhaps, has brought about easy access between the two countries, and it is possible that there we shall have to strengthen it a little; then at Detroit and at one or two other places. But, on the whole, I am very glad to say we are well satisfied with the situation we found.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it not true that the Government is securing the services of high-grade, intelligent men in the enforcement of the immigration and customs law along the northern border?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes; they are the finest kind of men.

Mr. HUDSPETH. May I ask the gentleman how he found conditions on the southern border?

Mr. SHREVE. I am very pleased to say to the gentleman that we found conditions on the southern border very much improved since I was there before, some two years ago.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That has been my observation.

Mr. SHREVE. Really, we were very pleased with the improvement.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am very glad to hear the chairman of the committee make that statement.

Mr. SHREVE. I am not inclined to think any large number of Mexicans are coming across the border down in the gentleman's part of the country.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think so either, I will say to my friend—illegally.

HELIUM

Mr. SHREVE. I would now like to say a word about helium. This is a subject in which everybody is deeply interested because we supply helium for the Army and the Navy and their consumption now is about 1,000,000 feet a month, which would be 12,000,000 feet a year.

The helium situation may change overnight. You can make a plan for one day and to-morrow you may have to change it. Last year we had the Petrolia field. The Nocono field was a new project which it was pointed out to us would take care of our requirements of helium, and we were asked to authorize the construction of a pipe line. They had a rock pressure up there of 315 pounds. Some new wells were drilled and the gas was piped off in other directions, and the next thing they knew the thing began to fall down and fall down until we found we only had a pressure of 178 pounds, which would not be sufficient to guarantee the building of a pipe line. I am pleased to say that the men in charge over in the Bureau of Mines used their good judgment, and although there was an authorization by Congress to build the pipe line, they did not construct it.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Can the gentleman tell us what progress has been made in the purchase of lands supposed to contain helium?

Mr. SHREVE. I will come to that in a moment.

After they had practically abandoned the Nocono field, they were still operating the Petrolia field, which leads into Fort Worth, and last year they thought this field was about exhausted; but they began to give it some study and working over, and they produced about an average of one-half million feet a month. Sometimes it ran a little over that and sometimes a little less. Now the bureau is working on a new field, with every prospect of success.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I understand that certain public lands have been reserved because they have helium-bearing gases?

Mr. SHREVE. That is true. The reserves have been set aside with the idea of conserving the rights of the United States in all minerals, but particularly with relation to helium.

Mr. COLTON. Has the committee any information as to the investigations made to determine the extent of this gas on these reserves?

Mr. SHREVE. The Bureau of Mines is working in conjunction with the Geological Survey, and all their test wells and everything are put down at the instance of their advisers. They are working in harmony, but there has been no report made that would answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. COLTON. It would hardly seem necessary or hardly the part of wisdom to go and buy lands until we explore these public lands.

Mr. SHREVE. They do not do that. Nobody in the Government would think of doing that. It is always tested out to the last analysis before anything is bought, and then there is the question of whether they buy any of the land or not. The Government does business just the same as the gentleman would do business or any other business man.

Mr. COLTON. I notice the appropriation for this purpose has been cut down.

Mr. SHREVE. That is because it is not necessary. We are carrying all that is necessary.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. Is the amount of money appropriated for the promotion of mining investigations the amount requested by the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the amount requested. Everybody seems perfectly satisfied, and they are getting along all right with it.

Mr. ARENTZ. And during the current year they have about all they can properly use?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think this is a very important field.

Mr. SHREVE. Very important.

Mr. ARENTZ. And also the field mentioned by the gentleman from West Virginia, the investigation of falling roofs and of accidents due to bad roofing.

Mr. SHREVE. We gave them a little money to make that study some time ago.

Mr. ARENTZ. There is only about $20,000 or $25,000 added to that, I imagine?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. But it is a very important study, because nearly all accidents and casualties come from that cause.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. And the gentleman's committee has increased the amount to be used by the Bureau of Mines for the investigation.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

SUBMARINES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the committee, the press of yesterday contained what purported to be an interview with my good friend and colleague from New York, Major LAGUARDIA, in which he is quoted as having used the following language:

> I for one will recommend the House of Representatives that it shut up talking about the *S–4*. I shall recommend that more submarines of that type be built by the Navy as soon as possible.

Not that I think that silence is the proper method of treating the subject when we stand to-day in the shadow of a calamity that is casting a veil of gloom over the entire country, but I do say that it is to be regretted that the gentleman did not follow his own recommendation. For within 24 hours after he gave the interview to the newspaper he took up nearly half an hour on the floor yesterday talking on the very theme he would foreclose to others. The gentleman from New York is original. I like him; he has a charm of personality which makes friends and a brilliant mind which makes him a valuable Member of this House. But since he has undertaken to lecture his colleagues, I feel that the barriers are down and the gentleman must not complain if we come back at him.

He talked for 25 minutes as the defender and apologist of the Navy. That is a new rôle for him, because in my years of experience in this House I think that is the first occasion that he ever took the part of defending anything or anybody. His usual rôle is that of attack, and I want to tell the gentleman that the rôle of attack is better suited to his character. He might have made a better job of his speech if he had tried rather to express the revulsion that perhaps every man in this House and every red-blooded man and woman in the country feel in the shadow of this great calamity.

What prompted this change of rôle? The paper said that he went to Provincetown. Why did he go to Provincetown? To see a reed shaken by the wind? He went there gratuitously to investigate the sinking of the submarine. He confesses that he has no knowledge of the subject. He went there to learn; and think of the school he went to in order to get his information. He went to the men who are largely responsible for the very conditions which brought about this terrible catastrophe.

But, aside from that, I suppose they entertained him nicely and treated him with distinguished consideration. He comes back converted to the methods of the bureaucrats in Washington who have been proclaiming for years that it is impossible to do anything to make submarines safe; that they are essentially war vessels, and that all safety appliances must be subordinated to military uses. The gentleman now tells us on this floor that nothing could be done to save the submarine; that nothing can be done to salvage her; that nothing could have been done by way of appliances or safety devices to prevent this disaster.

Why is he so confirmed in his belief that the Navy has been doing the best thing? Was it because they treated him so nicely? If that is so, he need not be flattered by the distinguished attention he received. That is a common thing with the Navy, nowadays.

They are frantic for experts to confirm their contentions. A couple of weeks ago they entertained a garage keeper with distinguished consideration as "an expert." They found that he had never seen a submarine before his visit to Provincetown. There was an expert, indeed! I am wondering whether my friend and colleague wants to have himself put in that category.

I am reminded of an unpublished stanza of Maud Muller.

> I am Captain Jinks of the submarine,
> And aviator in between;
> An admiral I might have been
> If I had joined the Navy.

[Laughter and applause.]

But, aside from his qualifications the gentleman's defense was entirely futile. It answered an indictment that did not exist. It purported to defend the divers and those in charge of the divers at Provincetown who were making such sacrifices in behalf of their fellowmen.

No one, except the Navy bureaucrats, have even remotely intimated that there was any fault to be found with the divers or with the men engaged in salvage operations. Nobody charges them with neglect. They are acting the part of Americans—brave, noble, devoted men—and petty bureaucrats can neither brighten nor tarnish their glory, nor the credit due them by any gratuitous praise which they now belatedly render to them.

Certain swivel-chair men in the Navy Department answered the cry of indignation which swept over the land by sounding the praises of the officers and men engaged in the work of salvage. That, of course, was only drawing a red herring across the trail—an old trick of those whose consciences disturb them. My colleague now takes up the strain—and the joke of it is, that even while he was talking and insisting that the Navy had done everything possible and that there was no need of further investigation, the President's message suggesting an investigation was reposing calmly on the Speaker's desk waiting to be sprung by my good friend, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Has the gentleman observed the attitude of the public mind in this whole situation to be, as we in New York gather it—namely, that there has grown up in our country this bureaucratic crowd, as you call it, in the Navy, as well as the Army, or what somebody has referred to as our militaristic caste in the United States, which has gotten into the habit of treating the American people condescendingly, curtly, and even discourteously, in effect telling them that it is "none of their business" what happens to submarines or other instruments of warfare. In this particular instance of the *S–4*, this supercilious caste which has grown up in our Army and Navy has gone one step too far. They may hold Congress in disdain, but not the people. When they told the public in a most discourteous manner that it was none of their business what happened to submarines or the lives of our boys in a submarine the public was quick to resent it. A keen observer will now notice that these "superior" persons have drawn into their shells and have somewhat abandoned their patronizing and defiant attitude.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have many intimations from many sources, through a very large correspondence, tending to show that the attitude of the American people is very resentful. The reason for that is that the recent accident to the *S–4* was not the first in our Navy. On March 25, 1915, the *F–4* sank outside of Honolulu, and 21 brave sailors lost their lives. It took weeks to locate the vessel, and when they found her they fumbled around with all sorts of expedients and experiments in attempts to raise her. Finally, they had to send to San Francisco for pontoons to be made. When they brought the pontoons to Honolulu there were no rings, eyelets, bolts, shackles, or anything on the exterior of the vessel to which the pontoons could be attached. They had to get a diver from New York to travel all of the way to Honolulu, and he, with others, went down to the bottom of the sea and with hydraulic pumps excavated channels underneath the submarine through which to pass the lifting chains. The divers waddled around in the mud and silt for days.

The chains having been pulled up around the submarine and securely fastened, the next arduous and even dangerous task was to sink the pontoons and attach them to the chains. That accomplished, the next step was to pump out the water from the pontoons, in order that they might exert their lifting power to bring the wreck to the surface. The tedious process took months of anxious and arduous labor.

On September 25, 1925, the *S–51* went down off Block Island in a collision with the steamship *City of Rome*. The inquiry inevitably arises: Had the Navy done anything in the meantime to make such vessels safe? Had they put either shackles or bolts or eyelets or rings on the surface of the submarines to which pontoons might even be attached? Even if they did feel that it was impossible to lift the submarine from the bottom by a direct lift, did they do anything to expedite and facilitate the attachment of either chains or the pontoons to the submarine? Nothing!

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. In view of the fact that this is an unusually dangerous instrument for the operators, does not the gentleman believe that we might better direct our attention here to trying to bring about an agreement among the nations of the world to outlaw this vicious instrument?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall take that up a little later, if the gentleman will permit. I want to follow out the cause of these accidents and see how far the Navy has gone in the direction of

safeguarding these vessels, or whether they made any effort whatever to make them safe.

My own opinion, answering the question of the gentleman, is that they can be made safe; but the Navy persistently, obstinately, refuses to make them safe, because they are wedded to the notion that they are military devices, and that as military devices life-saving considerations should be made subordinate to their military purpose. Yet I have never heard of any of the admirals who go to sea in battleships or cruisers getting rid of the life rafts, the life preservers, or the radio system, or the oscillators, or the other devices they have to render navigation secure. Why should the submarine be put in this anomalous, peculiar position of being purposely made unsafe?

That is what I am trying to get at—that they are purposely made unsafe. I wonder if it is possible that these Navy gentlemen think as Admiral Melville thought in 1905, that if the submarine is made an effective naval vessel the appropriations for battleships and cruisers and destroyers will cease. Admiral Melville deliberately made that statement in 1907 when he complained that Congress had refused to make appropriations for battleships because in the same session they had made an appropriation for submarines. I wonder if that thought lingers still in their minds.

Take the period between 1915, when the *F–4* sank, and 1925, when the *S–51* sank. Not a blessed thing was done in all those 10 years to render those vessels safe or to safeguard their crews.

My complaint is that they have failed to install the devices which foreign nations have tested and found effective. First of all are the shackles, or rings, or eyelets. I am using many terms to describe what I mean, because the Navy does the same thing. It seems to me there ought to be some way of attaching such devices without interfering with the mobility of the vessel. I am speaking advisedly, because I have letters and personal assurances from men who have been engaged in the construction and operation of submarines. I have here a letter now, and as there is no inhibition against making it public, I will read it:

> Please permit me to congratulate you on your sensible and patriotic stand in regard to the investigation of the sinkings of the *S–51* and the *S–4*. Had your very practical suggestions been carried out after the loss of the *S–51* I am sure lives would have been saved in the *S–4*.
>
> There are many safety devices which is possible to incorporate in the present and future designs of submarines at nominal cost.

Who is this man? He tells in the next paragraph. He says:

> I speak from experience, as after graduation from the Naval Academy I commanded various naval submarines, and was for a period of five years trial captain for the Lake Torpedo Co. of Bridgeport, Conn. Later I went into commercial salvage work, and when the United States entered the war took command of the salvage steamer *Favorite* to France and was on duty there as the wreck master of the United States naval forces in France.
>
> Anything I can do to further the cause of practical improvement with a view to making impossible a repetition of a disaster like the *S–4*, I will gladly do.
>
> Again assuring you of my admiration for your stand on this matter and with holiday greetings, I am
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> SLOAN DANENHOWER.

That is an example of scores of letters I have received from men in the service. You will find that although the men are brave and courageous and will take risks, they do most certainly feel that they ought not to be compelled to take risks that are absolutely unnecessary.

Nothing was done between 1915, when the *F–4* was lost, taking a toll of 21 lives, and September 25, 1925, when the *S–51* was sunk, with a toll of 33 lives—a period of 10 years. Why? Because certain men in a certain Navy bureau are wedded to routine and to conservatism. They have never in the last 12 years accepted a suggestion, particularly from the outside, or given a welcome to any proposal to make submarines safe, or to safeguard their crews. They keep up the constant refrain, "It can't be did; it can't be did." Are they katydids? The need of the hour is for men who will not say, "It can't be did," but men who will say, "It can be done."

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Can the gentleman tell us to what extent the submarines of foreign nations employ these safety devices that he mentions?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. I will go into that directly. In the first instance, there is a safety signal telephone buoy, with which foreign submarines are equipped, which may be released when the vessel meets with disaster or is upon the bottom, or even for purposes of communication while they are engaged in tests or trials. This buoy, when released, floats to the surface and bobs upon the water. A passing vessel noticing this buoy, which is well known to belong to the Navy, a boat is lowered, an officer goes over, opens it, takes out a telephone and immediately puts himself into communication with the stricken crew.

That is not a new device. It was in use on the *U–3*, the German submarine, which sank in Kiel Harbor January 17, 1911. Her signal buoy was promptly released; a vessel passing noticed it. It was opened; telephone communication was established. They learned that it was the *U–3*, with 27 men and 3 officers on board. Assistance was called and an attempt made to raise her. She was equipped with eyelets. The salvage vessel was unable to make the dead lift, so they compromised by raising one end, and 27 of the crew escaped through the torpedo tube. The officers could have escaped also, but they were wedded to the tradition of their Navy to stick by the ship, and they stuck to their posts. Later on the chain broke which held the submarine in that inclined position and she dropped back, and these heroic officers suffered death at their post of duty.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What depth of water was that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I can not recall the depth.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is very important.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The *S–4's* length is 231 feet and she sank in 102 feet of water. If we had had adequate devices, such as the Germans seem to have had as far back as 1911, there would have been nothing in the world to prevent hooking chains on to her bow and lifting her, so that the torpedo tube would rise above the surface of the water and allow the men to escape by that means.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has the gentleman figured how much lift it would be?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Well, yes. I note that the gentleman in his remarks yesterday spoke of the *S–4* as weighing 800 tons. Her actual weight is somewhat over 1,000 tons, but in any submarine of this character, divided into compartments, unless all of the compartments are flooded, the net lift is very much lessened.

On the *S–51*, two years ago, they began salvaging operations immediately after she sank. They had to get the pontoons from New York. Why did they not have pontoons at the submarine station where they belonged? They sent divers down who consumed 65 diving days at their work. Doing what? Simply trying to dig holes under the submarine to get chains around it. They finally got chains around it and they sank eight pontoons. The capacity of these pontoons was 80 tons each. Now, if the gentleman will give me his attention, I will explain just what that means. Commander Ellsburg, whose report I have on the salvaging of the *S–51*, reported that there was a net lift on the *S–51* of only 650 tons. A part of her compartments were not filled with water. Now, for 650 tons they used eight pontoons having a lift of 80 tons each.

Nobody can tell me that a lift of 80 tons or even a hundred tons is too great a strain to put upon the hull of a submarine, provided it is properly secured to the frame. There is no use of going into the figures of stress and strain and strength of material, but I will give you one simple illustration. No one would think of throwing the burden of the lift on one grappling ring or eyelet or of putting all the lift of 650 tons, if that is her buoyancy or net lift, on one chain. Common sense dictates that the load be distributed, because distribution of the lift distributes the strain. Therefore put a dozen eyelets on the hull if necessary. It is perfectly practicable to put such a device upon the hull of a submarine. If it is necessary to have her hull like the skin of an eel, inset or countersink the eyelets.

In the case of the *S–51* there was a strain upon each of the chains of only 80 tons. With tackle having the capacity to lift 120 tons, which was within the possibilities, they could very easily, if they had had shackles on the bow of the vessel, have attached them and raised her bow.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, it would be ideal to raise the bow of the vessel, as the gentleman suggests, but has the gentleman taken into consideration the depth of water in which the hull is now as well as the pull necessary to raise the bow of the vessel?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have gone into that very thing.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If that is so, what derrick is there in this country that could have done it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is just the thing in a nutshell. The gentleman talks of derricks! Did you see the pictures in the paper of the derricks they brought out there to salvage this submarine? Flat hulks with derricks on them; they are a disgrace to any navy that uses such obsolete methods. Why did they not have salvage vessels? What has the Navy ever done to recommend the building of salvage vessels? Nothing! I besought them two years ago, when the *S–51* was wrecked, to request Congress to authorize the construction of salvage vessels such as are used in foreign navies.

Now, what are these salvage vessels? They are simply big hulks of catamarans with tremendous displacement, sufficient to lift any submarine that has ever been built or will be built for some years to come—with cranes and all the apparatus necessary to distribute the weight on the different parts, so that it would be perfectly possible to lift a submarine if it had shackles attached to its hull, or even shackles or eyelets to which pontoons could be quickly attached. Is that a dream? Is that my imagination? Germany has the *Vulcan*. France has another salvage ship of that kind. Italy has the largest of them all, and I am sure would have been glad to have loaned it to us in our trouble. What a shame that we should at this good hour and in this civilized day be compelled to confess our inadequacy and our inefficiency where human life is at stake!

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe the *Vulcan* could have lifted the *S–4*?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No; but she could easily have lifted one end of her, the same as she did with the *U–3*.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the *U–3* was a very much smaller boat and was in much shallower water, and that makes a lot of difference.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The depth was not of so much consequence—the net lift was only a couple of hundred tons.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But it was not in 100 feet of water, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GRIFFIN. What is the use of arguing those things. I do not happen to know the exact depth and neither does he. I can only say where there is a will there is a way. If a submarine sinks in a depth where one end of her can be brought to the surface, there ought to be vessels large enough, big enough, and with appliances strong enough to at least lift one end. I am modest and that is all I am asking.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe such a vessel could be lifted at a depth of 400 feet?

Mr. GRIFFIN. They have not sunk as yet in 400 feet.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the ocean is more than 400 feet.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That leads to another question. If any should happen to sink in a place where such an ocean depth prevails, there would be no hope unless there were means of escape for the crew before the vessel reached that depth. That has its possibilities, too. But we are now speaking of the accidents with which we have so far had experience—the *S–51*, which sunk in 134 feet of water, and the *S–4*, which sunk in 104 feet of water.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not think the gentleman has told us whether or not the German submarine *U–3* had a hook or shackle on it?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; she did—a number of them.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. And that is the way they did lift it?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROMJUE. Can the gentleman state how far the vessel was from the coast at the point where it sank? I believe it was in 104 feet of water, but how far was it from the coast at Provincetown?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know the exact distance, but it seemed to me from looking at the map that it must have been about a mile or mile and a half.

Mr. ROMJUE. From the pictures I noticed in the papers it was apparently very close.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Do I understand that the gentleman brought to the attention of the Navy Department the feasibility or the advisability of installing these devices and they turned the gentleman down?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Absolutely.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. When?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Oh, repeatedly; for instance, in my speech in the House here two years ago. That was public notice to everybody and the department knew about it.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. It seems inconceivable they should not have brains enough to employ these devices.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Remember, too, that I am only speaking of well-known devices that are in use in foreign navies. In addition to the grappling rings or eyelets, there is the signal buoy and there is the smoke bomb to indicate when a vessel is about to arise.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I have an indistinct recollection of one of the Japanese submarines being sunk rather recently; has the gentleman any information about that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. How many lives were lost on that submarine?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wonder if I would be warranted in asking a little more time, as there seems to be much interest in this matter.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to know in this connection, while the gentleman has the floor, why that vessel was not raised and whether or not they had the safety devices that the gentleman speaks about.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Japanese have had three notable accidents beginning with April 15, 1910, when the submarine *6* sank, owing to a defective valve, and 14 lives were lost. On August 21, 1923, the submarine *70* of the Japanese Navy sank at Kobe base, Japan, and the cause was unknown. The death list was 85 men. On March 19, 1924, the Japanese submarine *43* sank after a collision, and 49 lives were lost.

Mr. DENISON. I am just wondering if there is a bureaucratic condition there which is responsible for that condition or whether they have these safety devices.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I never went into that. I have been so busy worrying about keeping our own house in order that I have never bothered with the Japanese problem.

I see I can not make headway consecutively. I did not anticipate talking so long on this subject; but I prepared an agenda for the consideration of the commission that I hope will be appointed pursuant to the President's suggestion.

I put in a resolution the day after the vessel sank asking for a special committee to consist of seven Members of this House, to investigate the disaster and to study the question of safety devices. I am glad the President has sent his message and has suggested the appointment of this commission. This indicates he has an interest in the subject, but my only regret is that he did not do this two years ago after the sinking of the *S–51*. I introduced my resolution then calling for this investigation and it has lain dormant and neglected. I reintroduced it the other day when the *S–4* sank, and I still believe that an investigation by the membership of this House, sitting as a jury, where the experts could be heard and cross-examined would be a better way of learning the truth than to rely on any expert commission that might have a reason, through their Navy connection, to hide the true facts—in short, I think it would be much better to have us sit here and bring the experts to the Capitol instead of being obliged to await their pleasure in reaching their conclusion. I think we can rely upon the intelligence of this House to determine, when we get the facts, whether a certain thing is right or wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon his presentation of this very interesting and important subject and also to commend him for his promptness in calling it to the attention of the House immediately after the accident. In connection with the gentleman's statement that the President has requesed an investigation, I am wondering if the gentleman noticed in this morning's Washington Post a paragraph from the pen of George Rothwell Brown, which says:

> It won't, I am sure, create any surprise that the President requests an investigation of the *S–4* disaster, as it was plain to all eyes that Congress was going to insist on having one. The great knack in leadership is in knowing which street the parade is going to turn down.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I was going to go into the matter of the agenda for the commission, and my reason for bringing it up now is to indicate the avenues of research and the devices which are feasible and which have been tried out, as well as to indicate to the House that certain parties have been derelict in not having installed these devices. I may be somewhat premature, but here is my idea as to the scope of the inquiry:

AGENDA

(For the *S–4* commission)

1. Was the *S–4* equipped with an oscillator and auditory diaphragm to signal and receive signals and sounds of vessels moving in the vicinity?

2. Was this device in good condition?

3. Was it manned at the time of the accident?

4. Has the Navy Department issued any orders requiring a member of the crew of the submarine to be always on duty at this device while the vessel is submerged?

5. What orders of the Navy Department have been issued, if any, with respect to the attendance of a warning escort vessel while a submarine is navigating submerged?

6. What has become of the order of the Hon. Franklin Roosevelt, former Secretary of the Navy, respecting the installation of signal smoke bombs intended to warn shipping that a submarine is about to rise to the surface?

7. Were any such devices ever installed?

8. What is the status of the telephone signal buoy? Why were they removed and why have they not been restored?

9. What steps have been taken to install air inlets giving direct communication to each compartment of the submarine?

10. Why have not grappling rings, hooks, eyelets, or shackles been installed on submarines to facilitate their prompt raising either by pontoons or direct lifting tackle?

11. Why were not pontoons kept at the submarine base in the vicinity of the scene of submarine submerging practice?

12. What steps have been taken by the Navy to design appropriate salvage vessels equipped with all modern devices for prompt salvage of submarines in distress?

13. What steps have been taken by the Navy to study the operation of a certain diving suit devised in Germany and adopted by the navies of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Spain?

14. What steps have been taken by the Navy to provide an airlock escape chamber or a diving chamber such as is used in certain types of submarines?

15. Why can not such a submarine be employed in salvage operations where the divers can work on the sea bottom without disturbance from either wind or rain?

16. What steps have been taken by the Navy to install automatic double swing doors between the compartments of the submarine?

I am sure that if the commission digs into these matters it will make recommendations that will forever preclude the recurrence of such disasters as this, which shocked the Nation and the world.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 483) entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEYES, Mr. WARREN, Mr. FESS, Mr. REED of Missouri, and Mr. ASHURST to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The committee resumed its session.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1929

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make a statement at this time, and am now only led to do so in order to correct what might be construed as an indictment against the entire personnel of the Navy.

I am in accord with the commendable interest shown by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] to provide submarines with proper and adequate safety devices, also to provide funds for adequate salvage equipment that will aid in the prevention of loss of life and property resulting from disasters.

Since investigations have been ordered by the House of the sinking of the *S–4*, and full information will later be placed before the House relative to this matter, it occurs to me that all improvident statements should be avoided at this time. While I would not charge that the gentleman from New York has uttered any improvident statement in so far as showing interest in providing salvage and safety appliances for the Navy, yet when he undertakes to refer to "a bureaucracy" and impliedly to charge that the Navy as a whole is responsible for what he considers to be mistakes and omissions involving culpable negligence, I respectfully submit that his indictment is too broad. There are only a very few officers of the Navy to whom have been assigned in the past the work of constructing and designing submarines. The great number of naval officers could not in any way be held responsible for any mistakes or omissions that may have occurred relative to submarines.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will say that I am very glad that the gentleman has modified my statement in that way, because I had in mind to qualify it myself. But I was indulging in a figure of speech when I said that the Navy as a whole was responsible. I am placing my condemnation on the men of the Navy who are responsible for the backward policy, and I think the gentleman knows that I did not mean to assail the Secretary of the Navy or the Admirals who are not responsible.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That correction is in keeping with the accustomed fairness of the gentleman from New York, and I was sure that he had no desire to do injustice to a great service. No one would insist that the Navy has never made mistakes in the past. What service, whether we call it Government service or not, has not made mistakes? It is not unusual when any great catastrophe happens to hear the suggestion that adequate provision could and should have been made to avoid such a disaster. This has been said in reference to the great overflow of last year which resulted in the loss of many lives.

I feel that the inquiries which the House has already set in motion will later disclose who, if any, are to blame for not having provided safety devices for our submarines and better salvage equipment. Then again, the investigation will likely lead to another important step by placing the designing and construction of submarines in future under the control and direction of those officers of the Navy who have to man them and have manned them, and who are best qualified to correct mistakes in design or construction.

I am frank to say I have felt that perhaps in reference to the designing and construction of submarines we have not always given to that service the aid of those officers best qualified to perform this work. [Applause.] What we have done in reference to aircraft should be done in reference to submarines.

Now, in conclusion, I feel sure that my friend from New York will not take issue with me when I say that the personnel of the Navy, both officer and enlisted, in patriotism, ability, skill, courage, human sympathy, and human kindness are not surpassed by any like body of men. [Applause.] If mistakes have been made and it required a great disaster to accentuate them, we can feel assured that an intelligent effort will be made to do the things that should now be done in order to conserve human life when disasters come. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the difference between my colleague from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] and myself is that I know that I am not an expert upon submarines. After his criticism and mild rebuke directed toward me for going up to Provincetown and looking around, I think this House was entitled to a more constructive and surely more accurate information on the subject from the submarine expert. As to my being lavishly entertained, let me tell the gentleman that if he will try 36 hours on a submarine in the North Atlantic on a cold January night, he will disabuse his mind of any elaborate entertainment. I had one meal with the crew, and the rest were four meals at 24 cents apiece. If going to the spot and talking with men who do know their business was the wrong thing for a Member to do, I plead guilty.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not now. I shall yield to the self-appointed leader of the Tammany delegation in this House in a moment. It is true, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] says, that I have criticized the Navy in the past, and that in most instances I have assumed the attitude of attack on the floor of the House, but I have never once come before this House unless I knew what I was talking about, and I would not come before this House with any suggestions of lifting boats from the bottom of the ocean unless I knew something of the size, dimension, and structure of the boat, and unless I thoroughly understood the physics and mechanics involved in such an undertaking, which the gentleman has entirely ignored or overlooked in his suggestions of salvaging submarines, and I have never made such a childish, stupid, silly, unworthy charge as to say that the officers of the Navy have purposely made the submarines unsafe.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Why, they say that themselves.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That they have purposely made the submarine unsafe?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has never heard a Navy officer say that in his life. It is ridiculous to say that officers of the Navy Department have purposely made unsafe their own vessels, in which they are bound to go from time to time, and to which their own comrades, classmates, and in many instances their sons are assigned.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Has not the gentleman seen the quotation in the newspaper recently, the authorship of which I think is by the head of the Bureau of Navigation and Construction, a certain Captain Rock, in which he says that these submarines are military vessels and that safety devices are not considered to be essential; that all safety devices must be subordinated to their military purpose?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, that is entirely different from saying that the vessel is made purposely unsafe. That statement indicated that the function and particular service and purpose of a ship were the essentials. It is the same in aviation. A pursuit plane has a factor of safety of 3 to 1, while a passenger plane has a factor of safety of 6 or 7 to 1. A passenger plane has a gliding angle of about 5 to 1, while a pursuit plane has a gliding angle of 2 or 3 to 1. You must take into consideration the purpose for which the plane or the vessel is made. A submarine must submerge and must have speed. If we attach a lot of spangles and fangles to it so that it loses its necessary qualities then there is no purpose in having such a vessel.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am glad to see that the gentleman has gotten back to the airplane.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. At least I know something about that, and that is more than I can say of the gentleman with respect to the submarine. The gentleman compares the submarine *U–3*, which sank in the Kiel Harbor, with the *S–51* and the *S–4*, but in reply to my inquiry he says that he does not know at what depth of water the *U–3* sank. If the gentleman ignores the depth in which the vessel sinks, and seeks to make a comparison between a vessel in 40 feet of water and a vessel in 100 feet of water, then I submit to an elementary school class in physics whether or not such a comparison is of any value. Besides, this German U-boat was a much smaller craft. Besides, the compartments in this U-boat were not all flooded with water. That is why it was possible to lift one end of it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Just one moment. Does the gentleman state that the *U–3* sank in 40 feet of water?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say that it sank in 50 feet less of water than the *S–4*.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is that a guess or it is an actual fact?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows, or he ought to know, because he made the comparison and he has just lifted the *S–4* out of the water, just a few moments ago. He described how the German U-boat was lifted out, but he ignores entirely the conditions. The gentleman then says that he is going to apply shackles and eyelets and rings to submarines, and is going to lift them out under all circumstances, and when he is asked what he is going to do if it sinks in 300 feet of water, or 400 feet of water, he has no reply. Gentlemen, if a submarine sinks in 300 or 400 feet of water there is absolutely nothing that can be done. Divers can not work at that depth and therefore all the rings and hooks and eyelets would be of no avail. It so happened that the *S–4* and the *S–51* sank in comparatively shallow water. As long as we have navigation on the sea or under the sea or in the air, if my colleague from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] will permit me again to refer to the air, accidents will happen. And again I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] that he entirely overlooks the possibility of lifting eight hundred or a thousand tons out of a hundred feet of water. His own suggestion of having these hooks and rings and eyelets and shackles is for the purpose of making quick attachment and lifting the vessel out of the water. As I have already said, no one derrick or crane could do it. A crane or derrick with a lift of 200 tons would require an enormous float sufficient to carry it and stand the strain of such a lift. To get sufficient such floats at one spot they could hardly get close enough to the submerged body to effect a uniform lift. When the gentleman refers to pontoons, then, of course, so much time is required to get the pontoons to the site of the accident, to sink them, to blow the water out that all hope of completing such operations within time to save life in a submarine is entirely lost. Therefore, if the pontoons are the only method known at this time to lift a submarine and it being necessary for divers to go down to attach these submarines, all of which require several diving days, it is clear that hooks and rings and shackles and eyelets are not the solution. A submarine is a mass of intricate heavy machinery in a light hull. A ring or eyelet can not be attached simply to the hull of the vessel. Such an attachment would tear out the minute it is put under the strain of a pull. To apply these rings to large submarines would require an entirely new structure of the ship, and this at the cost of weight, space, speed, and a submarine at the present stage of the art has no such space or weight to spare. All of these matters have been under consideration and study for years.

The gentleman from New York referred to Commander Ellsberg, and I am sure that Commander Ellsberg will inform him that everything humanly possible was done for the *S–4*.

The gentleman from New York talks about the telephone buoy. Very well. You can use such appliances only under ideal conditions. The *U–3* to which the gentleman refers was not sunk as the result of a collision as in the case of the *S–4* and the *S–51*. Here we had a terrific collision. In one case by a large passenger boat, the *City of Rome*, and in this particular case by a large Coast Guard cutter steaming at 18 knots, and in such cases every appliance on board is put out of commission. We saw that in the ballast tank air tubes and in the compartment air tubes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the *S–4* and the *S–51* did have this telephone buoy?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No. I said that if it did have it, in all likelihood it would have been put out of commission. Besides, in the case of the *S–4*, as in the case of the *S–51*, there was no need of the telephone buoy, for the reason that the spot of the collision was known, and in the case of the *S–4* communication was actually established with those still alive on board. And I must say again if a vessel sinks in very deep water such a signal or such communication is of no avail. Of course, if a suitable indicating and communicating buoy can be applied to a submarine and is of sufficient value to warrant its application, submarines should have them, but that is a matter for the experts to work out, and to date no such appliance has been perfected to that degree of accuracy and usefulness as to warrant censure for their absence on our vessels.

Now, we did have rings and shackles and eyelets on the smaller Holland boats, but they were of no avail and will be of no avail when the gentleman attaches his eyelets and rings and shackles on a boat and says he is going to send a derrick there to lift it. But he has not constructed that derrick yet. Does the gentleman know that the biggest derrick and crane on land in this country can lift no more than 200 tons? How is the gentleman going to build a derrick and float it and go out and lift a ship of 800 tons?

Mr. GRIFFIN. You do not need a derrick.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How are you going to lift the ship?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman does not know?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know he does not know. That is just the point. You can not have a tender, a derrick, and a salvage boat following every submarine. It is just as easy to require a squad of firemen to run under every aviator and catch him in a net if he falls down.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would rather not.

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Very well; go on.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not reasonable to expect that in making the trial trip of a submarine, where the submarine is submerged and where one trial trip is following another, when one is completing a mile trial trip, that we should send a tender out to let other ships know where the submarine is? Is it not reasonable?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That has nothing to do with this argument. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] bases his whole argument that we should have a——

Mr. BLANTON. When we were expecting the landing in Paris of Colonel Lindbergh that night no airship could fly in Washington except one, and that one was to notify the people here that afternoon of his safe arrival. That was a sane regulation. The Navy should have exercised not ordinary care, but the highest degree of care, in sending a tender over this mile course.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's statement was rather remarkable.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not believe you are going to train men to maneuver a submarine if you are to have an escort to every submarine, because the presence of an escort destroys the very function of the submarine.

Mr. BLANTON. On a mile trial?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not practicable with a submarine.

Mr. BLANTON. The ship that struck the submarine had no knowledge of the submerged craft. They should have had knowledge that the other was there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That course was marked. There is a mark there that is used for that purpose, and that is notice to all navigators to look out for submarines at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As to escort ships or warning ships to follow submarines the general consensus of opinion of submarine officers is that it is not necessary and of no service. In fact, Lieut. Frank Worden, who commands the *S–8* and who has been in command and in the submarine service for several years and knows his job, goes further and says that such a ship would be a source of annoyance to the submarine. I want to say in passing that Lieut. Frank Worden was on the job a few hours after the accident, remained on constant duty without getting any sleep for days and days, and when he talks about submarines he knows what he is talking about. This gallant young officer hails from the State of Montana and was appointed several years ago to the Naval Academy by our colleague the gentleman from Montana, Mr. EVANS. I want to congratulate Mr. EVANS on his choice and appointment of this splendid young officer. Now, this is what Lieutenant Worden says about an accompanying or warning ship to follow a submarine:

> It would be just one more vessel to watch. As we were maneuvering it would be necessary to have the tender keep clear. I do not consider the presence of a tender necessarily desirable. No surface craft interfered with the *S–8* during her tests. When they saw the periscopes they got out of the way.

What I reiterate now and what I said yesterday is that when a vessel sinks in deep water it creates a difficult problem involving many factors. When you have two vessels colliding with terrific force you have everything on board of the ship thrown out of gear. The question of rings and eyelets and shackles has been considered by the Navy Department. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] does not contend that it is his invention. Such a device has been used on small vessels, on submarines, but not on large vessels. No matter what salvage conditions you create, you can not salvage a ship in 300 or 400 feet of water, no matter what you do, even with pontoons. Pontoons are large, heavy, and clumsy and cumbersome. You can not have pontoons and salvage ships following every submarine. Assuming that you have eyelets and rings and shackles, it takes time to put those pontoons down, and you have to send divers down, and all that is a matter that can not be done within 60 days.

I think I have been fair in my criticisms on the floor of the House, and I repeat what I said the other day, that the Navy did in this instance all that was humanly possible; and I say again, as I said before, that it is easier to salvage a ship in the quiet of the House Office Building on paper, disregarding all matters of physics, weather, sea, mechanics, and equipment, than it is to do it on the spot under a hundred feet of water. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

NICARAGUA

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, following on the success of the American Revolution, the ferment of republicanism penetrated throughout the world. Kings shook on their thrones. Emperors and potentates trembled for their systems. France was the first to follow the example of the United States by overthrowing the Bourbons under Louis XVI. The Napoleonic wars were in a large measure the reflex of the shock which ensued, and were in their essential aspects the result of the efforts of the monarchs of Europe to defend their governmental systems.

Kings reigning by virtue of "divine right" felt that it was necessary that they do something to stamp out the republican spirit. They trembled for the traditions of monarchial government. There was conflict through the world between the spirit of republicanism and the monarchial system. Following the example of the United States, the Spanish-American colonies one by one had asserted their independence of Spain and she was being driven from the New World. At that juncture, in 1815, the "Holy Alliance" between the rulers of Austria, Prussia, and Russia came into being. Its essential purpose was to defend the monarchial system against the spirit of republicanism. It was the answer of "divine right" to the ferment of republicanism.

THE PURPOSE OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE

The Holy Alliance as a part of its program planned to restore the power of Spain in the New World and to again subject those colonies which had achieved their independence to the dominion of the King of Spain. It was also designed that new provinces and realms of power within the New World should be marked off to European sovereigns. In that sense the Holy Alliance was a threat to American independence.

As an answer to that threat and in order to clear the situation, Mr. Monroe enunciated the principle which has come to be known as the "Monroe doctrine." It was, in substance, that the United States would regard any attempt upon the part of the European governments to extend the monarchical system into the Western Hemisphere as an act of unfriendliness to the American Government. That is all the Monroe doctrine was at its beginning. It was merely an answer to the Holy Alliance. It confined itself to the principle that an attempt to extend monarchical systems of government in the Western Hemisphere was inconsistent with American interests; by its implication it extended merely to matters of sovereignty so far as American countries were concerned. It held, in short, that no European monarchy would be permitted to bring additional territory on the Western Hemisphere under its dominion nor to create upon the Western Hemisphere any new monarchical system.

It was not intended to interfere with existing situations. It did not challenge the dominion which Great Britain had over the islands of the West Indies as well as portions of South America and of Canada, nor the control which various European countries had over territory in the Western Hemisphere. It was confined solely to new situations and new attempts to extend monarchical systems and control over territory on this side.

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT MONROE

The Monroe doctrine had its expression in President Monroe's message to Congress submitted on December 2, 1823. Russia was asserting claims upon Alaska and other territory in that part of the continent. Referring to these claims, President Monroe said:

> In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved that the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

In referring to conditions among the new Latin American Republics of South America, he said:

> We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

In these paragraphs was expressed all of the Monroe doctrine. One of its chief purposes was the protection of the new Latin American Republics. Of course, neither Monroe nor anyone of his time ever dreamed that it would ever be argued that the United States was assuming the duty of pacification, preserving public order, and policing our neighbor nations, nor of collecting foreign and American debts from them.

The Monroe doctrine recognized the full sovereignty of each of the Latin-American countries, and the full political equality of each of them with the United States. It claimed no superiority nor overlordship for ourselves, nor any greater right in any of the other countries than they had in our own. It claimed for the United States no right whatever to meddle with the internal

affairs of our sister Republics. To the contrary, it was an assertion of their right to govern themselves, free from interference from European monarchies, as well as from ourselves.

It ought to be unnecessary to argue to intelligent and candid men that we have no more right nor authority under the Monroe doctrine to violate the territory or the sovereignty of a Latin-American Republic than we would have in the case of a European or Asiatic country. It was intended as a bulwark for the protection of our sister Republics, and not as an engine for their oppression.

WHAT MONROE DOCTRINE IS

No respectable authority has ever claimed that the Monroe doctrine conferred upon the United States any rights whatsoever. It was merely a declaration of our national policy, and has, of course, never attained the dignity of a rule of international law. Under it we owe no duty to take any action inconsistent with our national interests. We do not need to insist upon the doctrine longer than it suits our policy to do so, but many abandon it at any time without any breach of faith with other nations. Under it we owe no duty to protect the nationals or property or interests of European nations which may be jeopardized by a South American revolution. For all such we may remit the complainants to the assertion of their rights under the recognized principles of international law. European governments have the same rights under international law, with reference to South American Republics, as to other countries of the world. It gives the United States no protectorate over Central and South American Republics, nor duty to defend them from attack, and none to answer for their shortcomings.

The Latin-American Republics may go to war with each other or with nations of Europe or elsewhere without giving us cause to intervene. They are as completely sovereign and independent as we ourselves. The doctrine merely announces for us that we will not permit nations of the Eastern Hemisphere to encroach upon the sovereignty or territory of other American nations.

The meaning of the Monroe doctrine, as recently set forth by Secretary Hughes, is as follows:

> Properly understood, it is opposed (1) to any un-American action encroaching upon the political independence of American states under any guise, and (2) to the acquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in this hemisphere by any un-American power.

Considering the intent of the message, and that it has been, and must be, interpreted in the light of changing circumstances and conditions, I do not believe that the correctness of Mr. Hughes's definition can be disputed.

ATTEMPTS TO EXPAND AND DISTORT DOCTRINE

Many attempts have been made to expand the Monroe doctrine, to contort it, and to twist it. It is important, in order to understand the persistency of these attempts, that we should recognize just what is back of them. It is necessary to recognize the fact that there are those here in our own country and among our own citizens who do not accept in their full implications the doctrines of republicanism and of democratic self-government. America has her fascists as well as Italy.

It is a common belief that all Americans were unanimous in their desire for independence. This is a grave error. It is a fact that a very influential element of our people were loyal to the British Crown and had no desire to change our political system, and had no wish to break the ties which bound them to the Old World. They did not believe in republicanism nor in self-government.

Many of these Loyalists and Tories were driven out as the Revolution went on. I wish that all might have gone and that they might have remained away. Unfortunately many of them came back when the war was ended. The strangest development in all American political history is that within 20 years after the close of the Revolution the same Tory elements which has opposed independence were found contending for political control against those who had won independence. That struggle between Tory elements, those who believed in caste and privilege, those who held that a small superior class should be developed which should ride at ease upon the shoulders of the masses—the struggle between the Tories, their political descendents the Federalists, and the modern school of the same political faith, on the one hand, and those who believed in real democracy, on the other, has come down to us to this day. That struggle between Toryism and Americanism is as acute to-day as it has ever been in the past. Much of the time the Tory elements have been in control of our Government. May I make what I mean perfectly clear by saying that in my judgment they are in control now. [Applause.]

WHAT THE TORIES ARE TRYING TO DO

The effort has been made to twist and contort the Monroe doctrine into an instrument which shall serve the will of the Tories, who do not believe in democracy—to serve their will in their efforts to mark off the Western Hemisphere as territory belonging exclusively to us, so that it shall be the field for our exclusive exploitation, and in which we shall expand as we may find it convenient and safe to do so. They dream dreams of world power; they think of imperial Rome and would make America into a new Rome. They think of South America not as a collection of independent nations, entitled under our own principles to enjoy the right of self-government; to the contrary, they think of South America as an appendage of the United States. It is their conscious design, so far as they have a consciousness, little by little and time by time as they may be able to digest them, to swallow up and absorb the South American countries, so that our flag may float from pole to pole.

That is their degraded idea of America's future. They would absorb these weak countries without their consent; they would take them through our military power and through the might of the strong arm.

In the meantime they choose to regard Central and South America as a field in which our business men and financiers shall enjoy special and exclusive rights and privileges. There they shall have exclusive advantages of trade; they shall have concessions for opening mines, digging harbors, constructing railroads, and making loans; it shall be the happy hunting ground of the American manufacturer and trader, and of the American financier and international banker, and the toiling millions of Central and South America shall exist not upon terms of equality with us but as servile populations, to be exploited for our economic benefit.

THE SHADOW OF IMPERIALISM

It is necessary to get this picture in our minds in order to understand the efforts which the Tories have made to expand and extend and contort and twist the Monroe doctrine until finally it shall be converted into such an instrument that it will serve them in the purposes which they have in their hearts. Theirs are the principles of imperialism. Theirs is the doctrine which the nations of the Old World have applied in their own peculiar spheres of influence. Under its influence the British flag floats over India and over many other portions of the world; under it France holds her territory in Africa, Asia Minor, and China, and so on and on and on.

Because of the clash of interests between the great imperialistic and exploiting nations the world had the recent terrible war. With all the folly of man apparently we have learned nothing from its horrors and are now preparing the way for another war based upon cold commercial considerations, and a desire to get control of more territory that we may exploit it and make money out of it and grow rich and powerful out of it.

It is to combat this awful thought, to combat these dreadful schemes that I feel such a great interest in the developments which are taking place to-day in Nicaragua.

I hear gentlemen speak of the "right" of one nation to land troops upon the soil of another nation for the protection of the lives and property of its nationals. There is no such right. International law knows of no such thing. It is not a "right," it is merely a practice. It is a practice indulged in only by those who are strong enough to be able to do so with safety to themselves; only by those who are powerful enough to be able to violate the territory of another nation without fear of adequate rebuff and reprisal. It is the practice followed by the great and powerful nations in dealing with those who are weak and poor and subject to them.

Within the history of the world, in either ancient or modern times, no nation of first rank has ever submitted to the assertion of any such right within its territory upon the part of any other nation whatsoever. When I hear men talk of such "rights" I recognize that they are lacking either in information or in candor.

There is no such "right." It is a "practice," I admit. Whether a justifiable practice each particular case must stand on its own merits and it is not possible to condemn it by wholesale. Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that having accomplished the protection of its nationals and of their property, no one has ever been so rash and regardless of logic and consistency as to say that a nation may go further, and after having protected the lives and property of its nationals, go on and remain indefinitely in the country whose sovereignty has been infringed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

PRESIDENT CARRYING ON AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL WAR

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We entered Nicaragua upon the pretended purpose of protecting the lives and property of American citizens. Having accomplished this purpose, there was no excuse, either under international law or international practice, honesty, or good faith, for remaining there. There is no pretense we are there now protecting American lives and property. Nobody argues this. Even the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] has not the temerity to take such a position.

What are we doing in Nicaragua? We are carrying out an agreement made by Mr. Stimson with leaders of the two Nicaraguan factions. And who was Mr. Stimson? He was the extrajudicial, or, to put it in plain words, the illegal representative of the President of the United States—his personal representative there. He made a trade with the various elements in Nicaragua. Whether honest or otherwise, it is immaterial for the purposes of this speech. He made this trade, and now American boys are fighting and laying down their lives—to defend America? To defend American rights under international law? To defend American property and protect American lives? No; to carry out the trade that Mr. Stimson made.

And since when, I ask, has Stimson, the President, or anybody else had the right without the consent of the Congress of the United States to enter into any obligation which binds us to keep our soldiers upon foreign soil? [Applause.]

The action of our administration in keeping marines in Nicaragua and in carrying on this wild adventure is illegal, even as a matter of technicality; in effect and reality it is violative of the very fundamentals of Americanism; it is unconstitutional. Men have been called from office for smaller offenses. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think 5 minutes is entirely too much time to take in answering the substance of the last speech of 20 minutes. The statement was made that the gentleman from Ohio would not have the temerity to make the statement that the marines are in Nicaragua for the purpose of protecting life and property.

Mr. TUCKER. American life and property.

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. TUCKER. Now.

Mr. BEGG. Now. I will cite the gentleman to the special communication of President Coolidge in the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, in which he not only makes the flat statement that repeatedly were requests made from American nationals direct to the Government, but to the American representative in Nicaragua, for protection of both life and property, and that the chargé d'affaires of Great Britain at Managua made representations that they wanted the United States to protect the nationals and the property of Great Britain.

The ambassador of Italy in the city of Washington made the same character of representations to the State Department in Washington, and if that statement is not accurate, then the message of the President on Nicaragua is wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the last message of the President?

Mr. BEGG (continuing). And if that statement is accurate, I come right back to my principle announced yesterday and ask you where is the man that is willing to take the position that the Monroe doctrine no longer shall be enforced?

Where is the man who is willing to say we will not protect the nationals of Great Britain and Italy or support the Monroe doctrine? Where is the man, I ask again, that is so unresponsive to these basic principles of patriotism that moved the spirit of every man of the time to which the gentleman refers—the Revolutionary period—when the Monroe doctrine was called into force, as to say he will disregard the rights and lives of the American citizens in foreign territory?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How long would the gentleman have us remain there?

Mr. BEGG. That is an easy thing—if I had absolute control they would remain there just as long as was required to establish a stable, responsible government in Nicaragua. [Applause.]

Certainly, gentlemen, the United States would never violate the sacred territory of any nation having a responsible government; but when the President of Nicaragua, as admitted by the gentleman's own side, has been constitutionally and legally elected as first designate in Nicaragua, when he requests the support of some outside power—what for? To maintain peace and preserve life. No one would refuse that aid that means so much to suffering humanity.

Instead of waging a war, we should be deemed missionaries of peace. If it is wrong to help the irresponsible, chaotic nation of Nicaragua to gain a place among the nations of the world, until they can guide their own ship of state, it is just as wrong for the Christian church to send missionaries to the heathen. There is no difference whatever. It is only carrying the benefits of Christian civilization in the way of stability to a government so they can not only protect the lives of the nationals of other countries, but their own people as well from the assaults of the bandit tribes. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the American Mining Congress met in this city in December. I have some mining in my district, and they have passed resolutions which I desire to extend in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I wish them to appear in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by embodying certain resolutions as a part of the extension of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is quite an extensive zinc field in my district. I desire to give due publicity to the matter which follows:

Important strides in development of mineral resources of the South are expected to follow recent action of the American Mining Congress. At its convention here early in December this organization adopted a resolution calling the attention of mining developers to the possibility of engaging in profitable production of southern minerals. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas it is the steadfast purpose of the American Mining Congress to stimulate development of mineral resources and to promote the welfare of the mining industry of the United States; and

Whereas this organization has, during recent years made investigations of southern mineral resources and has found that in States in the South there are valuable deposits of zinc, lead, manganese, bauxite, kaolin, marble, clays, and other useful minerals in commercial quantities that are susceptible of economic mining: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body earnestly commends the undeveloped fields in the South to the favorable consideration of the mining industry of the Nation to the end that home industries may be fostered and have precedence over foreign fields in supplying minerals for American needs in commerce and industry.

The resolution was brought forward by Judge J. H. Hand, of Yellville, Ark., a resident of my district. He is a member of the Askansas Department of Mines, and of the board of governors of the southern division of the American Mining Congress. When Judge Hand laid the matter before a meeting of the board of governors it was unanimously approved and he was authorized to present the resolution to the convention. It is expected that added impetus will be given to the movement at the annual Southern Industrial Development Conference which will be held in a southern city, March 15–17. The place of the meeting will be fixed early in January.

In presenting the matter to the convention, Judge Hand stated that the South is already on the eve of important mineral developments.

The mineral production of Arkansas in 1926 was valued at $87,000,000 from which the State received $2,000,000 in severance taxes.

He said:

A large portion of the mineral production consists of oil. Arkansas has a number of mineral resources, chief among which are zinc, lead, manganese, coal, oxide, and various forms of valuable clays. But the mining industry, except for bauxite, is in a very limited stage. Arkansas produces 70 per cent of the bauxite mined in the country. During the war when the older fields were unable to meet the pressing demands for the production of lead, zinc, and manganese, the north Arkansas fields came to the rescue. It happens that these fields are off the main traveled paths of the industry. The trend of mining operations has been westward and the South has been overlooked.

Judge Hand stated that the American Mining Congress has done much in drawing the attention of the mining industry to the mineral possibilities of the South by having its representatives investigate these resources, resulting in the discovery of "virgin fields of various valuable minerals."

The American Mining Congress is pointing the way to the mining fraternity into these fields—

Said Judge Hand:

I hope the mining industry will cooperate in the development of these fields in the South, instead of going to Chile and other countries, as the foreign products compete with our own. The expansion of home industry and the making of an all-American mining industry will compensate for any cost that any branch of industry may have to bear by reason of this cooperation in the development of these fields. I regard the American Mining Congress as one of the greatest organizations of this country. I have known it and followed it closely for 20 years. When the American Mining Congress began its work the mining industry was regarded as a game of chance and luck, and was looked upon with suspicion by business interests. Mining is now reduced to a science and ranks in prestige with other lines of business. The work of the American Mining Congress in bringing and holding together the mining industry and purging the mining industry of fraudulent practices has elevated the mining industry to a basis of confidence on a parity with other lines of business. Since the American Mining Congress has made its influence felt in the South many business men of Arkansas have awakened to a realization of mining opportunity in the State. Arkansas has zinc, lead, manganese, lime, phosphates, cement, marble, and the finest building stone in the world. Within a few years Arkansas will be able to meet the demand for electrical energy for smelting and mining and other industries.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK].

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the leading measures for the consideration of this Congress will be the subjects of farm relief and flood control. Farm conditions are too well known to be reviewed on this floor. Every Member of this House knows that our farmers have suffered more in the past eight years than in any other equal period of time in the history of this country. They are working just as hard as ever, practice the most rigid economy, and should have equal protection of the laws. The farmers have just as much right to enjoy some of the pleasures of life as any other class of citizens, and I hope that a bill may soon be enacted that will place our farmers on the same plane as other industries protected by laws. Our farmers can not continue to produce the necessities of life at a loss and should be assisted in obtaining relief from these conditions.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am before you at this time to discuss legislation for the control of floods in the United States, and this subject is also of great interest to our farmers, as well as the country in general. As preliminary to my remarks on this subject, however, I wanted to again call the attention of this House and the administration to the necessity of enacting agricultural legislation before we adjourn.

Since the disastrous floods last summer on the Mississippi River the attention of our people has been focused on this subject as never before. The Committee on Flood Control began to hold sessions long before Congress convened in December to give everybody that so desired an opportunity to be heard. I wish now to congratulate that great committee for this action and for the energetic and able manner in which it has been considering legislation for the control of the floods of the United States. I remember the two first weeks of the hearings that representatives from the various States in the Mississippi Valley and other sections were here to present their plans to the committee and assist the members of that committee in drafting an effective bill to present to Congress for its consideration. Never have I seen a committee work harder nor more conscientiously on a subject. Large delegations from different States were here to attend the hearings, and since Congress convened the committee has been holding hearings, and many times at night. The committee is seeking all the light and assistance they can get on this important subject. Like agricultural legislation, it is not a political bill and is not so considered by the committee, but is a subject that affects the whole country. This legislation will not only affect the Mississippi Valley and tributaries and other streams that contribute to the floods on the Mississippi, but will affect the country in its entirety.

Every Member of Congress appreciates the fact that this is a most important question, and that it is difficult to draft a bill to meet all objections. Many good bills have been introduced, and the committee has been considering them all and will soon report a bill for our consideration. We can not all have everything in the bill that we want, but we should make it just as good as possible and have it apply not only to the Mississippi River proper but to all tributary rivers and others that contribute to the flood waters of the Mississippi. The importance of the Mississippi can not be overestimated in times of peace or war. It runs through the central part of the United States and carries much of our commerce and contributes, with its adjacent territory, to our agricultural products to a large extent. Without this great artery of transportation, freight rates in the central portion of our country would be higher than they are at the present time. With improvement in transportation on this river, we will get relief in rates. Much further assistance will be received by improved navigation on the tributaries by proper control, not only for flood relief but for purposes of navigation. There is no reason why navigation can not be had much farther up the Missouri than at this time, and no reason why navigation can not be carried out on other rivers, such as the Arkansas as far as Arkansas City, Kans., and even Wichita. It is easy to see how this would affect rates and transportation, in addition to internal improvements and control of the floods on many other streams. For many years the waters of the United States have been permitted to lay large areas of our most fertile land in waste and cause destruction to our citizens and their property, instead of controlling these waters for the use and benefit of our people. And it is no idle dream to say that they can in a large measure be controlled, to prevent such destructive floods, for navigation and other uses of the people.

The floods of this year on the Mississippi alone caused property damage to an amount which would be sufficient to construct levees, reservoirs, and storage basins at many places on these various streams. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not alone a money or property question, but a question of the lives of our people and a large part of them, too. A large portion of this water can be utilized for the protection and welfare of our citizens just as well as to let it go to their damage and destruction. In many parts of the United States water that would otherwise be wasted is made to serve mankind and much fertile land has been reclaimed by irrigation and many people given an opportunity to make a home and lead a useful life. We can continue to let it go to waste and destroy our people and their property, or confine it to our own use for the general good of the whole country. It is not a sectional question but one in which all our people are interested. You must remember that the land affected by the Mississippi and its tributaries comprises more than half of our land, industries, and people. It is a national problem and as such should be considered. All whom I have heard before the committee agreed to the national aspect of this subject, and the only difference I find is the question of the division of costs and the extent to which the bill should apply.

I appeared before the committee the first week of the hearings and urged that any bill reported for the consideration of Congress should combine the reservoir and storage plans with the levee system. By this method much of the water would be held back from the Mississippi. These reservoir and storage basins should be located on the tributaries and other rivers that contribute to the floods on the Mississippi. The Arkansas and Red Rivers contribute much to these flood waters and the same is true with the Washita, South Canadian, North Canadian, Cimarron, and other streams in Oklahoma. The construction of reservoirs and storage basins on these streams would not only be of great assistance in relieving the floods on the Mississippi, but would prevent great damage each year to Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Kansas, and Arkansas. It hurts a farmer just as much to have his crops, land, and property destroyed on one of these rivers in Oklahoma as it would if he lived on the Mississippi. It was shown to the committee by estimates of competent engineers that 200 reservoirs and storage basins could be constructed in Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma at a cost of $130,000,000, and that such a system would render the Arkansas and Red Rivers absolutely harmless, so far as floods are concerned. This would help our people in many other ways, as reduction in transportation costs by making more rivers navigable. This plan would encourage farmers to build additional lakes and ponds on their farms, and would be of benefit in relieving the droughts of the West.

The floods last summer on the Mississippi alone affected 31 States and 41 per cent of the total area of the United States. That flood covered 12,500,000 acres of fine land, rendered 600,000 American citizens homeless who before had been prosperous, and damaged property to the enormous extent of approximately $400,000,000. In addition to all this destruction and property loss, this flood caused suspension of our mails, greatly interfered with interstate commerce, and damaged industry to almost an indeterminate degree.

Reliable estimates show that landowners in Oklahoma lose more than $10,000,000 annually in the destruction of land, crops, and other property by floods, and that the loss to our

State, cities, and public utilities each year will equal a like amount. Oklahoma has more than 782,000 acres of land subject to overflow, and competent men have estimated this as high as 2,000,000 acres, and the proper solution of this great question is of vital interest to our people as it is to the rest of the country. It not only affects the people who live near the Mississippi, but also affects those on other streams such as the Missouri and the Oklahoma streams that I have mentioned. The principal question, as has been stated, is to control the Mississippi floods, on account of its greatness and because it is a navigable stream. That is just what the plan that I have outlined will do, and, while we are doing that, we will also protect our other people who live on tributaries and other rivers that contribute to the floods. These floods clearly demonstrated that levees alone will not do the work, no matter how high they may be. About all that the levee system in itself will do is to raise the river bed. If these were 100 feet high, the same would be true, and the only thing accomplished is greater costs and maintenance. The testimony before the committee—and I heard most of it—was to the effect that levees, spillways, reservoirs, and storage basins would do the work and protect our citizens. Who will say that a method should not be devised that would render the same assistance to a resident on these other streams as he would be given if he lived on the Mississippi? It is neither a political nor a sectional question.

I believe the hearings developed fully the fact that it is a national question and must be dealt with from that viewpoint. Then the next conclusion naturally follows that the entire cost of construction should be borne by the Federal Government by congressional appropriations. This is the plan I favor, and I am opposed to charging any of the costs of construction against the landowners, States, or municipalities. The people in the levee districts have been taxed to death, and they can contribute no further. This land is the bread basket of our Government and must not only be protected but must be developed. Of course, it will cost something, and so do other governmental operations cost something. In my judgment, we could reduce other appropriations without any additional tax levy and without interfering in the least with any governmental activity to a sufficient amount to take care of this entire cost of construction. A reasonable appropriation could be made until the work is completed without adding a cent of additional cost to the Government. But, gentlemen of the House, work on the lower Mississippi alone should not be done and other portions of the Mississippi area left untouched and the people along the tributaries and other streams I have mentioned left to suffer by these destructive floods. They are also entitled to relief and their homes saved and property protected.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission here to insert a portion of the report and request of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, adopted December 8, 1927, to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on Mississippi flood control:

Lower Mississippi River control offers no protection to the greater area, greater values, greater population, greater commerce, greater economic resources, greater national development, greater necessity of protection, and greater tax-paying public in the flood-swept valleys of the streams above the leveed district, which district was picked out as the particular and sole concern of the Government. It is time now to deny that the Mississippi River from Cairo down is all of the Mississippi River or that it is the only territory entitled to protection.

The levee system ignores every available use of water in economic development, whether it be industrial, or agricultural, or navigation, or commerce. It contemplates sheer waste of that which is or might be extremely valuable in the upper area in all the above-named uses. It does not contemplate the reduction or control of floods where they do the greatest damage, which is before they have accumulated in the main stream, or the use of those flood waters in the reclamation of dry lands, which are as much entitled to governmental solicitude as reclamation of wet lands below.

The governmental policy of attempted control of Mississippi floods by strictly local works on the lower Mississippi has proven a failure in every high flood since it was started. The ordinary flood of 1927 demonstrated that the river so leveed had less than one-third the required flood capacity, and 226 breaks in levees resulted, mostly from undercutting, some from overflowing.

The people of the United States have expended many hundreds of millions of dollars—some figure seven hundred and fifty millions, other computations run down to two hundred and fifty millions—precise accuracy of figures is unimportant. They have supplied this money as fast as it could be economically spent, although constantly warned by eminent hydraulic engineers of the disasters that would attend the development and completion of the system. The warning was unheeded and the disasters have occurred.

This condition of unfairness finally became apparent to the eight States comprising the drainage basins of the Arkansas and Red Rivers, whose flood destruction was the equal of the lower Mississippi and entirely ignored. Thereupon commissioners were appointed to work out a plan of flood control that would offer assured protection to the neglected properties in the valleys of those States and afford some real protection to the heretofore deceived and now bankrupt owners and residents of the leveed Mississippi. This commission is known as the interstate commission for the control of the Arkansas and Red Rivers, and is composed of 27 members, appointed by the governors of those States.

After a number of years' work, the commission has devised a plan of impounding in about 200 controlled reservoirs the flood run-off from more than one-third of the area drained by those rivers—actually about 40 per cent of the flood run-off. This would reduce to a condition of harmlessness all of the tributaries where reservoirs were placed; would keep the main stems of the Arkansas and Red Rivers and their principal tributaries down to a flowage within their bank limits; and would protect hundreds of millions of property in the valleys of these rivers and above the leveed interests, which have never engaged the concern of the Federal agencies.

This plan of assisting in flood control on the Mississippi by impounding the waters through reservoirs and storage basins on the Arkansas and Red Rivers, their tributaries, and the other streams mentioned above has been carefully worked out by competent engineers and others interested in this subject and who have given it much study.

I insert here a statement from the Oklahoma Conservation Commission concerning the flooded area along the rivers of that State:

Grand River or Neosho: The estimate is based on the theory that the Robinson Dam and improvement will be made, which will materially reduce the flooded area as exists to-day. Lands subject to overflow on the above theory are 17,500 acres.

Verdigris River: The Verdigris River proper has 65,600 acres of flooded area. The Caney River, Bird Creek, and Hominy, all tributaries to the Verdigris, add 37,000 acres of flooded area, making a total of 102,600 acres for the Verdigris and its main tributaries. This estimate may be a little low on the Verdigris proper, but the above is about right from the information I have.

Main Arkansas River in Oklahoma is about 270 miles and the valley lands subject to overflow are about 80,000 acres. Salt Fork and its tributaries have a flooded area of 30,000 acres.

Red Rock Creek has a flooded area of 3,200 acres.

Black Bear Creek has a flooded area of 6,400 acres. Both of these streams are tributaries to the main Arkansas.

Cimarron River in Oklahoma (not including that portion in Cimarron County, Okla.) equals 270 miles and has a flooded area of 58,400 acres, and its eight main tributaries have about 190 miles of valley lands, of which 19,200 acres are subject to overflow, making a total for the Cimarron and its main tributaries of 77,600 acres subject to overflow.

North Canadian River is about 420 miles from its mouth to Guymon in Texas County and the land subject to overflow equals 130,000 acres. Deep Fork, one of the main tributaries of the North Canadian, is about 110 miles long and the flooded area in this valley equals 38,000 acres. Wolf Creek and the other tributaries of the North Canadian have about 90 miles of valley land of which about 12,000 acres are subject to overflow, making a grand total of overflow lands in the North Canadian and its tributaries of 180,000 acres.

South Canadian River has about 360 miles in Oklahoma and about 280 miles of this valley are subject to overflow, making about 110,000 acres, and its tributaries, exclusive of the North Canadian and Deep Fork, equal about 70 miles of valley land, of which about 15,000 acres are subject to overflow, making a total for the Canadian River of 125,000 acres subject to overflow. This stream is so erratic and makes so many changes of its channel proper, that it is hard to come anywhere near making a correct estimate of the damaged lands because a farm to-day may be the river bed in 30 days.

Other small streams emptying into the Arkansas are Pole Cat, Illinois, and Pateau, covering about 60 miles of valley land—part of which is subject to overflow, especially Pateau Creek. The combined flooded area of these three streams equals 11,000 acres.

Red River: The tributaries of the Red River in Oklahoma include the Washita, Mud Creek, Beaver Creek, the two Cache Creeks, Deep Red, Red River of Oklahoma, Salt Fork, and Elm Creek, comprising about 640 miles of valley lands. The principal one of these eight streams is the Washita, which has about 270 miles of valley land of which 165 miles are subject to overflow, making approximately 370 miles of valley lands of which 175 miles are subject to overflow, making approximately 56,000 acres, making a grand total for the Red River district of approximately 109,000 acres subject to overflow. The flooding of the lands in this section of the State is quite erratic. Some years pass without any floods, while other years from two to three floods may occur at any time during the year causing great damage.

This brings the total flood area of all the streams in Oklahoma to 742,300 acres. It is safe to say that the floods in Oklahoma cause

an annual loss to the landowners of some ten to fifteen million dollars; besides, the loss to the State, counties, cities, railroads, and other public utilities possibly is equal to five to ten million dollars annually.

These figures compiled by W. C. Burke, engineer, Oklahoma City, Okla.

I mention these statements for the reason that they are made by competent men whose profession is engineering and who have had many years of experience in this line of work. In the Sixty-eighth Congress I introduced a bill authorizing the engineers of the War Department to make a preliminary survey of the South Canadian, North Canadian, Cimarron, and other rivers in Oklahoma, with a view to the control of their floods. Provision for a preliminary survey of these rivers was made in the general bill which became a law May 31, 1924, and which included my bill. The Arkansas River and other Oklahoma streams were also included. This was the first step to take under the law for a complete and regular survey for flood-control purposes.

The plan outlined in my remarks not only affects Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, and Arkansas but the entire Mississippi Valley and the country at large. Congress has provided large appropriations many times for the assistance of our citizens, few in number compared to those who will be relieved by a proper bill for Mississippi River flood control, and adequate funds should be provided for this purpose during this session of Congress. Oklahoma has contributed to the "reclamation fund" through the sale of public lands the sum of $5,917,843.10, and not one cent of this amount has been spent in our State. What we ask now is that we be included in any bill for control of the floods on the lower Mississippi River, and our people and the people in the other States affected given the same protection as our other citizens, and at the same time greatly relieve the lower Mississippi River.

Mr. Chairman, this plan is feasible, practical, and the most economical plan for the control of the floods on the Mississippi River. The opinions of the Army engineers should be given due consideration and weight, but their opinions and work in the past have demonstrated that the opinions of others are also worthy to be considered. The Army engineers thought the floods could be controlled by levees, and this plan has totally failed to do the work. Competent engineers in civil life, just as competent as the Army engineers and just as experienced, advocate the plan of control by reservoirs and storage basins in conjunction with the levees.

Gentlemen of the House, Congress should not legislate by sections in this country, but should make the legislation apply to all the people who are similarly situated. The people on the rivers in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and the other States affected by these rivers should also be relieved from destructive floods just the same as the people who live on the Mississippi River proper. It is not merely a suggestion for protection of our people, but, while granting them this relief given others, you will greatly reduce the flood waters on the Mississippi River.

Mr. Chairman, I wish again to repeat that I am opposed to any of the cost of construction being charged to the land affected by these floods, or to any charge being assessed against any drainage district in these areas, or against any city, town, municipality, or any State. I hope and trust that Congress will take action at once on this problem that so greatly affects so many of our citizens.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE CHAMBERS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, during the last Congress I addressed the House upon the question of the need of the ventilation of this Chamber, and it may be of interest to the Members of the House to know just what has been done with reference to that matter since that time. At that time I called the attention of the House to the large number of deaths that have occurred among the Members of Congress since the year 1922. In that time 30 Members of the House and 11 Senators have died from various causes. Whether the impure ventilation of this and the Senate Chamber had anything to do with their deaths is a question, but anyone who sits here and undertakes to be upon the floor of the House while we are having sessions knows that something is radically wrong with the ventilating system of the Chamber. The matter was called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations at the last session of Congress. The chairman of that committee would not act then, because he said he did not have before him sufficient data.

The consideration of the necessary work to be done and apparatus to be installed to provide for the ventilation and air conditioning of the legislative Chambers of the United States Capitol is a work of such importance that when the matter was before the House Committee on Appropriations during the last Congress it was suggested that a careful survey be made of actual conditions by the most expert authorities in the employ of the Government upon the subjects of ventilation and air conditioning and that the assistance of the Public Health Service be enlisted in connection with the Bureau of Mines in the formation of a committee of experts, who should take into consideration all of the conditions to be met in a work of this kind. This suggestion was made by the Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and based upon the fact that for many years the subject of ventilation has been considered to a greater or less extent almost from the time of the occupancy of the House and the Senate wings of the Capitol. It is proper to state, however, that such investigations as have been made and such installations as have resulted from these investigations have been directed wholly to the introduction of more or less air into the legislative Chambers and the conditioning of the air so that there might be a suitably tempered air, both as to its humidity and temperature, had not been satisfactorily considered or the problem solved.

Accordingly, through the Public Health Service, there was organized the following committee, the chairman of which is Prof. C-E. A. Winslow, professor of public health, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Other members are—

D. D. Kimball, consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.; F. I. Cooper, heating and ventilating engineer, Boston, Mass.; A. M. Feldman, consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.; R. E. Hall, engaged in ventilation of theaters, New York; F. R. Still, vice president American Blower Co., New York; Prof. A. C. Willard, University of Illinois; L. R. Thompson, surgeon in charge of Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.; David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol; Dr. R. R. Sayers, Chief Surgeon Bureau of Mines; Leonard Greenburg, sanitary engineer Public Health Service.

This committee met in Washington and fully considered all of the conditions connected with the ventilation and air conditioning of the Senate Chamber and the Hall of the House of Representatives, and after becoming acquainted with all of the facts necessary, they proceeded to formulate a series of resolutions, stating from their mature deliberations the conditions that should be properly met in the manufacture and installation of apparatus required to properly ventilate and condition the air of these two Chambers. This work occupied some time for the reason that the conditions of other large audience rooms and the temperatures and humidity considered necessary were taken into consideration in attempting to define such conditions as would be required to be met for the two Chambers of the Senate and House. Whereupon a circular letter was prepared setting forth the fundamental resolutions adopted by this committee and naming them items 1, 2, and 3. This circular letter was sent to a selected number of bidders, believed by the committee to be capable of manufacturing and installing suitable apparatus to meet the conditions to be satisfied in this work. The list selected was as follows:

Carrier Engineering Co., 750 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, N. J.; Brunswick Kroeschell Co., New Brunswick, N. J.; Cooling & Air Conditioning Co., 31 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; York Manufacturing Co., 634 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Wittemeier Machine Co., Chicago, Ill.

It has been deemed necessary to acquaint those interested in the subject of ventilation and air conditioning with the steps which have been taken in accordance with the suggestions of Mr. MADDEN to determine just what should be considered an ideal condition of ventilation, temperature, and humidity of these legislative Chambers, so that it might be understood that as far as possible it has been attempted to place this subject upon a proper scientific basis so that the subject of ventilation and air condition may be decisively settled.

The following circular letter was sent out by Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., December 3, 1927.

VENTILATION AND AIR CONDITIONING OF THE SENATE CHAMBER AND THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: You are respectfully invited to prepare plans, specifications, and estimates, in triplicate, such plans and specifications being prepared to describe the system proposed to ventilate the Senate Chamber and the Hall of the House of Representatives, these two sections to be considered as separate units, with separate plans and specifications and estimates of cost prepared for each unit.

The attention of prospective bidders is invited to the following item, which should govern the plans, specifications, and estimates to be submitted:

ITEM NO. 1

For summer conditions, the plans should be of sufficient capacity to be capable of maintaining in the Chambers during periods of maximum occupancy (which should be determined by the Architect of the Capitol) a temperature not in excess of 75°, with a relative humidity not in excess of 55 per cent with outside weather conditions of 95° dry bulb and 75° wet bulb. The plant should be capable of maintaining in the Chambers during the winter a temperature up to 75° with a relative humidity of 30 to 50 per cent. These conditions shall be produced without noticeable drafts and without noticeable odors in any part of either Chamber, as measured by a variation in CO_2 content in excess of four parts per 10,000 between different points in the Chamber. The matter of dust and bacteria is not provided for in these requirements, for the reason that it is not regarded as of importance, and, in any case, the operation of the plant will take care of this matter adequately.

ITEM NO. 2

Such conditions can, in our judgment, only be realized by a system operating on the downward principle—that is, with the air flowing from the ceiling toward and out through the floor—with careful provision for initial horizontal diffusion capable of delivering a maximum of 45 cubic feet of air per person per minute, and of variable capacity, through means of speed control of fans, to a minimum of 10 cubic feet of air per person per minute, both figures being based on the figures of maximum occupancy of the Chambers and with temperature and humidity control adequate to meet the range and limits stated above.

The system to be installed should be provided with a complete equipment of indicating and recording devices to give indication and record of temperature and humidities throughout the system and Chambers.

It is recommended that each contractor submitting a proposal for the installation of these two systems shall be required to submit complete installation or working plans showing all details of apparatus and equipment, including refrigeration equipment, dehumidifier equipment, fans, motors, controllers, duct work, and all auxiliary equipment, and a complete specification describing in detail the material, installation, and workmanship, and shall further give all required detail as to equipment, including number and size of units of refrigeration, capacity of same; operating speeds, cylinder displacement; operating pressures; operating temperatures; brake horsepower required per ton of refrigeration, with condensing water at 75–80, and 85° temperature and the method of cooling this condenser water; amount of water (in gallons per minute) required per ton of refrigeration at 75–80, and 85°; actual tonnage produced by each refrigerating machine with condensing water at 85°; capacity and dimensions of humidifiers and quantity of water for same; capacity and size of fans, motors, and pumps; size and location of all ducts and piping; duct and piping installation; means of temperature and humidity control for both winter and summer; method of air diffusion and method of varying quantities of air, including descriptions of system for reading and recording temperatures and humidities throughout the Chambers and ventilating systems; and such other details as the Architect of the Capitol may require. Each proposal for the installation of this equipment shall specifically indicate the character and extent of guaranties offered.

ITEM NO. 3

We believe that, in general, comfort will be most effectively secured in cold weather by maintaining in the Chambers a temperature between 66° and 70°, with a respective relative humidity of 50–40 per cent, and in warm weather by keeping this temperature 10 to 15° below the outdoor temperature, with a relative humidity not over 50 per cent.

If it is desired to maintain higher temperature in winter, the relative humidity may be decreased correspondingly to 30 per cent at 75°.

The temperature and humidities to be actually maintained shall be determined from time to time by the Committee on Rules of the Senate and by the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives.

An estimate has been made for the contemplated work in the Senate Chamber, and an estimate for the amount required for the Hall of the House of Representatives will be presented to the next Seventieth Congress for action.

Intending bidders should inspect the two Legislative Chambers and acquaint themselves with the structural conditions of each Chamber, securing such information as will enable the preparation of the plans, specifications, and estimates. The information attached, stating the results to be required of the system of ventilation and air conditioning desired, has been prepared by a committee selected from the best informed authorities on the subjects included in the work to be performed, and the specifications must guarantee that the conditions desired can be obtained by the system specified. This committee will be given the opportunity to examine and pass upon the plans, specifications, and estimates submitted under this circular letter.

It is understood that the bidders shall especially guarantee that the Government shall be protected from any claims for damages arising from the use of any device which may infringe upon a patented device owned by other than the persons or persons submitting plans, specifications, and estimates.

Plans and specifications submitted must show conclusively a possible performance of the system proposed to adequately secure the resulting ventilation and air conditioning stated as necessary by the information prepared by the committee for the guidance of those submitting specifications and estimates of cost.

The Government will remove from the room where new air-conditioning machinery is to be installed any apparatus or stored articles which may interfere with the new installation and will cut all openings in floors and walls, whre necessary, for the new air ducts.

In existing air shafts which may be used as space for new air ducts, the Government will move to one side all steam, water, and air-carrying pipes and all wiring of every description.

The Government will remove all fans, heaters, and motors, the use of which will be discontinued, and where space occupied by them is needed for new duct work.

The Government will bring to points just within the room where new apparatus is to be installed steam at a maximum of 125 pounds gauge pressure, water in capacity needed, and direct electric current at 110 volts pressure or alternating electric current at 25 cycles and pressure up to 440 volts.

The estimates must show that they are based upon an intent to furnish all labor and material and install in place; and that the bidder agrees to, in the event of his estimates, plans, and specifications being accepted, enter into a contract, with such bond or securities as may be required for the performance of the contract in a satisfactory manner.

The specifications, plans, and estimates of cost must be inclosed in an envelope marked "Architect of the Capitol, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.," and marked upon the lower left-hand corner of the envelope "Specifications, plans, and estimates, ventilation of the Senate and House Chambers, United States Capitol."

The bids will be publicly opened at 2 p. m. in the office of the Architect of the Capitol on January 20, 1928, and the right of the architect to reject any or all bids and to waive any informality in any bid is hereby reserved.

DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Appropriations, when we have under consideration the legislative appropriation bill, may consider this and make provision for this very necessary work to be done. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

FARM RELIEF

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I imagine that our constituents back home do not differ from other constituents any more than we their representatives differ from one another. Yet, however different they may be, I imagine that upon several fundamentals, so far as legislation in this Congress is concerned, we would find all of them in agreement.

So far as waste and extravagance and economy are concerned, we would find them of one mind. In public affairs they want no waste, they want no extravagance, and they want sane economy. They do not want foolish economy. They want sane economy and sane expenditure of public money.

I imagine they would be in hearty agreement on the subject of affording some sort of definite relief to the producers of the country—to the farmers and stockmen—not something merely to be spent in their name. All of the money that Congress has spent, which it has been appropriating for the Agricultural Department, has been spent to increase production; and that is the very thing that the farmers are suffering from to-day. They suffer from increased production. None of the proposals that we have passed in behalf of agriculture in the way of farm relief has been to give to the farmer the benefit of that surplus. The McNary-Haugen bill did not propose to give the farmers the benefit of any profit that could be derived from the surplus when handled by the organization that we provided for. The profits that were to be derived from the holding and sale of surplus were not to be divided among the farmers. They were to get no part of it.

I take it also that our people would be in hearty accord and agreement upon the proposition that we must afford them better railroad facilities in transporting commodities; that is, lower freight rates. I think our tariffs are higher than they should be.

The producers in my section of the country frequently send their products to market, and the freight tariffs cost them more than they receive.

In such fundamentals it occurs to me that all of our constituents are of one mind, and that there should be some relief.

I do not know whether or not you gentlemen keep your ears close to the ground in respect to what your people are thinking about and how they feel on public subjects. There were 314,000 people in the last census in my district, the seventeenth district of Texas, and over 350,000 people now live there. Those 350,000 people living in my district to-day can speak collectively only through their political conventions. That is the only way in which they can voice their sentiments collectively. When the Democrats of my district speak, when they say, "We, the Democrats of the seventeenth congressional district," that means "We, the people of the seventeenth district," because in my district the people are practically all Democrats. There are a few Republicans, and I will say here that the few white ones down there in my district are splendid men, men of good judgment, men who are the very best of citizens. But there are very few of them, so I say that when the Democrats speak collectively in convention they speak for the people of my district. I want now to call your attention to how they expressed themselves on some public questions in the last convention in which they met in my district, on August 28, 1926. That is the last time they spoke as delegates selected from the conventions in all of the 19 counties in my district. They met in convention on August 28, 1926, and expressed themselves definitely on some of these important questions of legislation that we have had before Congress, and I now call your attention to some of their expressions. Among other things they resolved:

(3) That our junior Senator has been a luxury too costly and expensive to the people to be continued in office longer than his six years, there having been spent out of the public Treasury $65,984.61 in the contest over his seat, and on February 23, 1926, Senator MAYFIELD had the Senate pay him the additional sum of $30,500 as his own personal expenses.

(4) That we can not approve of the action of Senator MAYFIELD in voting February 28, 1925, to raise his own salary for the term of office to which he had already been elected.

(5) That we can not approve of the action of Senator MAYFIELD in supporting the Parker bill that deprived the American people of all voice and representation around the council table in railroad disputes.

(6) That we can not approve of the action of Senator MAYFIELD in supporting the Haugen bill, which would have wasted $375,000,000 to begin with, would have unjustly taxed southern cotton, and promised no real relief to southern farmers.

Those people are not much different from your people. They are the same kind of people; they are American citizens, interested in public questions. They have the right to express themselves on national legislation and national affairs.

And right here, on that Haugen bill, what are we going to do about farm relief this year? Are we going to let the Senate say to us that we can not pass in this House and get it through any measure except the so-called McNary-Haugen bill, and none other? Are we again going to be told that?

I have been here long enough to know that every agricultural bill that we pass, any farm relief measure that we pass here, will be known as the McNary-Haugen bill under our system. Every bill of that importance that comes from the Committee on Agriculture is going to bear the name of the chairman of the House committee and the name of the chairman of the Senate committee.

The tax bill that we passed here recently illustrates that. We all know as a matter of fact that it is a Jack Garner bill, but it is known as the Green measure because, forsooth, Mr. GREEN of Iowa is chairman of the committee. No matter whose impress is put upon the measure, it is known by the name of the chairman.

I remember when that McNary-Haugen bill was first introduced in 1924. If you will compare the 1924 bill with the 1927 bill of the same name you would hardly recognize the two as coming from the same source. If you compare the 1924 bill with the 1926 bill and then with the 1927 bill which we passed last year you will see that we forced many important changes to be made as the years have passed. Yet they were all known as McNary-Haugen bills.

The first bill that was introduced by Mr. HAUGEN in 1924 provided for no relief for cotton, one of the greatest agricultural commodities raised in this country. When I asked the distinguished chairman from Iowa why cotton was left out, he said the cotton producers did not want it in. They recognized that there was nothing definite in the way of relief for cotton in it. But in 1926, when he wanted his bill passed and knew that he had to get the cotton Representatives in line with him, enough of them to pass it, he put cotton in.

What did he then provide? He provided that there should be an equalization tax of $2 per bale, because he knew if you taxed the cotton farmers more than $2 a bale their Representatives would not stand for it and would not vote for the bill. Yet we realized at that time that an equalization fee of less than $5 or even $10 a bale on cotton would hardly accomplish anything beneficial for cotton. Yet they restricted it to $2 a bale, and put a provision in the bill that the board could raise it if they saw fit, and they would have raised it to $10 or $15 before they got through, we all know.

What else did they first provide in the McNary-Haugen bill? They provided that the farmer who failed to pay this equalization tax could be fined $5,000 and sent to a Federal prison for a year; that is, that the producer, the man whom they were seeking to help, could be thus penalized if he saw fit not to pay a tax on his commodity. Naturally some of us rebelled, and before the bill got through we forced that provision out of the bill. The 1927 bill did not retain that provision. It did not penalize the farmer. It did not propose to fine him $5,000 and send him to a Federal prison for a year.

There was another important change we caused by fighting against that first bill. The first bill was to waste $375,000,000; certainly that much. We caused the framers of that bill to reduce it $125,000,000 when they brought the 1927 bill in.

Why is it that we can not provide a bill here for the welfare of the farmers that will see to it that the profit which is derived from properly marketing their surplus is distributed back among the farmers who raised it? Whenever you bring a bill into this House of that character I think you will find every Representative of farmers here supporting it heartily. The other bill did not do it.

Why can we not get to work and pass the kind of a bill that our farmer friend from Kansas, Mr. Tincher, advocated—our farmer friend who used to be a leader on this floor for the administration? Whenever the administration was embarrassed or bothered, instead of calling on JIM BEGG, as they do now, they called on Tincher. They kept Tincher on the floor all the time to protect the administration, and especially to protect the farming interests.

You remember Tincher brought in here a bill which was a good, honest-to-God farmers' measure when he first introduced it. It was to do away with gambling in farm futures. It was to stop it altogether, and if that bill had been passed it would have benefited every farmer in the United States far more than the McNary-Haugen bill could have promised in any respect. But when Tincher got through with his bill, when the interests got through with Tincher's bill, it was not stock gambling in the daytime that was stopped but only gambling at night, when the gamblers were sleeping. [Laughter.]

I have introduced another bill here which would stop gambling in futures on cotton, grain, wool, and mohair in the daytime and in the nighttime, too. It will stop all such gambling in farm products. Will you support it? I hope you will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was very much interested in the speech made a few minutes ago by my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on the question of farm relief. There is no other matter of equal importance before us and the American Congress. We all depend on the farmers either directly or indirectly. My district is made up largely of farmers. It consists of 20 splendid rural counties, and I would rather help in the passage of a bill giving help to those wonderful people than to help in the passage of any other measure. If to-day I were to ask Members of Congress the question, Are you in favor of a farm relief bill? practically every man here would say "Yes," and yet when we come to consider a bill a great many people who would say that they are in favor of a farm relief bill turn aside and oppose the bill. We differ in our meaning when we say we are in favor of helping the farmer. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] hit the keynote just a little while ago when he said we were willing to help the farmer produce. We all agree on that, and a great many Members of Congress, when they say they are in favor of helping the farmer, only mean they are in favor of helping the farmer produce. Thus far and no further. The gambler is in favor of helping the farmer produce; the speculator is in favor of helping the farmer produce; those who steal a part of what the farmer earns are in favor of helping the farmer produce.

The real trouble comes about when we attempt to secure the passage of a bill to help the farmer sell his products for a better price and eliminate the unnecessary middlemen. The fight comes when we try to help the farmer sell his product to better advantage. Such a bill meets opposition on every hand.

We have established a great many experiment stations in this country by State legislation and by national enactment. Every one of those experiment stations experiments in helping the farmer produce more. Not a single one of them helps the farmer to sell his product to the consumer at a better price.

I have introduced a bill, which I do not propose to discuss very fully now, to appropriate money and authorize the Department of Agriculture to experiment in the sale of food and food products of the farmer directly from the producer to the consumer, leaving out the middleman. I do not expect very much support for that bill from Congress. There are too many Members in favor of the middleman and really against the farmer.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. What are you going to do with the middleman?

Mr. LANKFORD. I would eliminate the unnecessary middleman if I could.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. What are you going to provide for him?

Mr. LANKFORD. I do not provide anything in this experiment for the middleman. I want the Department of Agriculture to experiment in selling the food from the producer to the consumer. I do not intend to discuss that bill very fully at present, but will gladly do so later. I am just saying, Mr. BLANTON, that the purpose of most of the experiment stations is to help the farmer produce more. We can get all the money we want to establish experiment stations to help the farmer produce more. The farmers' bulletins which are issued from time to time, and which we send out, are for that purpose. It is hard, in fact impossible, it seems, to get appropriations to help the farmers sell for better prices but easy to get help to boost production.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDBLOM). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, how much time did I use of the time originally allotted to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was recognized for five minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yielded the gentleman 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that he understood it was 5 minutes, and the Clerk notified the Chair when the 5 minutes had been exhausted. The Chair regrets there was a misunderstanding. The gentleman has only consumed 5 minutes. If the original allowance was 20 minutes the gentleman is entitled to recognition for 15 minutes longer.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yielded the gentleman 20 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose at another time to discuss more fully the bill which I introduced to authorize the Department of Agriculture to experiment in the sale of farm food products directly from the producer to the consumer, but at this time I want to talk a little along the lines of a bill which I have introduced to establish a farmers' finance corporation. I have occupied a rather embarassing position for many, many years as a Member of Congress in connection with farm relief measures. I have been unable during past Congresses to approve any bill introduced, and yet I was unable to draw a bill which would satisfy my convictions in this respect, and am now glad to offer a bill meeting my own approval. I have voted for the McNary-Haugen bill every time it has come up, not because I approved it as a whole, but because to my mind it was the best bill in sight and was really better than no bill at all, and I was glad to support it. I hoped it could be passed and its faults remedied from time to time. I have not heretofore favored in toto any bill because to my mind all of these bills failed in certain respects. To begin with, all of the bills heretofore introduced—and I say this with all kindness to those who have introduced them—failed to help the farmer directly. They all provided for the setting up of machinery, organizations, and so forth, and so on, through which we would attempt to help the farmer. Again, all of these bills, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said a little while ago, provided certain machinery or organizations to buy all of the farmer's product when it was selling at a depressed price, thereby taking the farmer's product away from him at a loss to the farmer, with this organization all the while hoping to make a profit out of the farmer's product, after it had passed from the hands of the individual farmer. That would only add one more speculator to the already too large a list.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. We have taken from under the provisions of the trust act the farmers' cooperative associations and we have passed the warehousing and classification act for cotton. That is not exactly the correct wording of the act, but that is what it means. You take a bale of cotton; you grade the cotton and put it in a warehouse; then you create a cooperative organization; and if you will add to that some finance corporation which will take care of the cotton that rests in the warehouse and market it in an orderly way it seems to me you will take care of cotton.

Mr. LANKFORD. I think my bill does that and goes much further than that in many very vital respects. I have been endeavoring, as I said, to work out some plan to help the individual farmer hold his cotton and get a better price for his cotton when the cotton does go up. I have tried to work out a plan to help the farmer directly in his attempt to hold his cotton. I have furthermore tried to work out a plan which would set up an organization of the farmers' friends, not his enemies, to handle his problems, and then I have been most anxious to work out a bill which would solve the overproduction problem.

The great objection to the McNary-Haugen bill and the other farm relief bills is that to my mind they provide no proper control of the overproduction problem. We all admit that if we help the farmer get a better price for his product, without some kind of control of production, the incentive is there to produce more, and as fast as he produces more to the extent of an unusually large surplus he tears down the machinery which we set up in his behalf; and every bill must necessarily have failure written on its face if it does not carry with it some method to control the overproduction of these basic commodities.

The McNary-Haugen bill attempts to control this by an equalization fee. I do not like the idea of an equalization fee, and I voted for the McNary-Haugen bill in spite of the equalization fee provision.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LANKFORD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. After you collect the equalization fee out of the commodity and raise a fund to take care of the surplus and hold it and market it, and after you have marketed it and made a big profit on it, why does not the McNary-Haugen bill distribute that profit back to the farmers who raised the commodity?

Mr. LANKFORD. That is a good objection to the bill and is one of the objections I had to it.

Mr. BLANTON. If they had proposed to distribute that profit back to the producers the bill would have been much stronger.

Mr. LANKFORD. That is one objection I had to the McNary-Haugen bill, even though I voted for it, and it is the objection I have to a great many of the other proposed farm-relief measures.

Let me now tell you what I have attempted to do to solve this problem. I have introduced a bill to create the farmers' finance corporation, and I do not care if they take my bill and call it the McNary-Haugen bill or anything else they please. I think the plan of my bill is good, and I want to see it enacted into law in behalf of the farmer.

Mr. BLANTON. If it ever comes out of the committee it will be reintroduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and will be called the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. LANKFORD. And I would consider it an honor, and it would be a pleasure and a privilege to lend my help in putting into any bill provisions that would help the American farmer, regardless of what name the bill might go by. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

My bill creating the farmers finance corporation provides for a corporation created somewhat along the lines of the War Finance Corporation. I used the first six or seven sections of the War Finance Corporation act as a basis for my bill, simply changing the wording from War Finance Corporation to farmers' finance corporation.

I provide in this bill that the farmers' finance corporation shall lend money through the banks of the country to the individual farmer at the average which the commodities brought for the last 10 years, provided those planting 75 per cent of the acreage of the commodity, cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, or other basic products have signed a contract with each other, with the bank through which they do business, and with this corporation, binding them to let the cotton advisory council or the wheat ad-

visory council or whatever commodity advisory council it may be, determine what reduction of acreage shall be made from year to year so as not to probably produce a surplus.

This contract must be signed before they get the relief. The relief goes directly to the individual farmer to help the individual farmer hold his product, and when the price goes up he still owns it and gets the increase in price. This contract must be signed by those planting 75 per cent of the acreage of the commodity before the law becomes binding or at least before operations begin as to that particular commodity.

Some people may say, "Oh, the farmers will not sign that contract." If the farmers will not sign the contract, then they receive no benefit under it. It is more or less of a 50-50 proposition.

Under my bill Congress would practically say to the American farmer that the great problem is overproduction, and we will help you become independent if you will work together for your own good.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. With pleasure.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman who wants to make possible no surplus of farm products in this country. Suppose there is a large and increasing production throughout the world, how is the gentleman going to keep the production of wheat from Australia, Russia, and South America, as well as other products of those countries, from flooding this country after you have fixed the price under your bill?

Mr. LANKFORD. So far as products being brought in from other countries is concerned, we keep products from other countries out of this country in behalf of the manufacturers, and I think we can do the same thing in behalf of the farmers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why does not the gentleman say we would have to do this by a protective tariff?

Mr. LANKFORD. I am in favor of a protective tariff for those things which help my farmers when the Republicans are voting a protective tariff on everything that hurts my farmers. I favor a protective tariff on farm products, especially when there is a protective tariff provided by the party now in power on manufactured articles which the farmer must buy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If my friend will permit, would not that be the only way you could keep out this surplus from the other countries of the world—by a protective tariff?

Mr. LANKFORD. Probably that would be true, and I would certainly favor that kind of tariff under those circumstances.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. JONES. A protective tariff would not enable the farmer to dispose of a surplus that he had in this country, would it?

Mr. LANKFORD. No; it would not do that.

Mr. JONES. It would not begin to solve that problem?

Mr. LANKFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. And on most stable farm commodities we produce a surplus in this country.

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes. However, I do not want to make a tariff speech at this time.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes; but after this I must decline to yield further, as I want to explain my bill more in detail.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not true that practically all farm products are now under a protective tariff?

Mr. LANKFORD. But it is also true that you can not put a tariff on enough farm products to overcome the evil done the farmers by the tariff on the stuff he buys.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, in respect of the question asked by my colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES], the debenture plan proposed by the National Grange would cover that matter.

Mr. JONES. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and I would like to see that plan enacted into law.

Mr. LANKFORD. The debenture plan, to my mind, is too indirect. It seeks to help the man who has bought cotton, for instance. Let us help the grower and not the buyer. If I have time, I will refer to the debenture plan again before I resume my seat.

Mr. BLANTON. In the gentleman's proposed bill does it provide that any profits that are made from the final handling and marketing of that product are to be distributed back to the producer?

Mr. LANKFORD. My bill enables the farmer to hold any product until the price goes up so that he can get the increase in price. So, of course, he would get the benefit of the increase. That is one of the best provisions in my bill. Let me say this, for I will not have time to go through with the bill in detail, the plan I am presenting to-day for your consideration has in it the beginning of a scheme by which, to my mind, the farmers can work out their financial salvation. Is it not a good scheme, a good plan, a workable idea, to simply say to the American farmer, Here is your great problem—that of overproduction. We are willing to help you solve it, we are willing to help you market your crops in an orderly way, but before we do that we want you to do something in the matter of controlling production.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, my idea is to endeavor to control the production of basic commodities by a contract made by the farmers with each other and with the banks and with the organization providing that the Government gives them certain aid and assistance, and that they do certain things in their own behalf in return.

As far as I know that idea never has been put in the form of a bill heretofore.

Now, I want to say that after I introduced this bill as a separate bill (H. R. 77), I took the McNary-Haugen bill as title 1 and then put my bill in as title 2, and reintroduced the two in one as H. R. 7739. These bills can be passed as one bill. If the people growing cotton decide that they want to operate under my bill—that is, under title 2 of H. R. 7739—enabling the farmers to hold their product, there will be no necessity of going any further. The growers of wheat might want to operate under title 1 and there would be no necessity for their attempting to begin operations under title 2. My bill has a complete referendum in it. It requires that the contract shall run for two years, and unless 75 per cent of the farmers sign it it does not go into operation, and then 10 per cent more must sign within one year, making 85 per cent, and then 10 per cent more within the next two years, making it 95 per cent. If the farmers do not like the plan, the contracts are for only two years and they do not have to renew them.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I shall be glad to.

Mr. SHREVE. In the last analysis will the gentleman's bill limit production?

Mr. LANKFORD. My bill would help the farmers to enter into a contract with each other, the banks and the corporations controlling the production of a particular commodity. They would control it as a matter of contract, and not as a matter of law.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Where is the money to come from?

Mr. LANKFORD. Just where it comes from in all of these bills, from the Government, by an appropriation for this purpose. My bill provides that the Government shall own the stock and put up the money just as the Government did in the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. How much of an appropriation does the gentleman's bill provide?

Mr. LANKFORD. Five hundred million dollars.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does the Government ever get it back?

Mr. LANKFORD. No; unless the corporation liquidates. If the corporation ever liquidates, the Government, owning the stock, would get the benefit of it.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Who pays the losses?

Mr. LANKFORD. Well, it would result just the same as in the War Finance Corporation. Let me say this: Many are willing to lose money in the shipping business. We are losing money and putting great burdens on the farmers, helping manufacturing interests; many are willing to spend money helping the railroads, but those same people say, "For God's sake, don't pass any legislation for the farmer; you might lose some money of the Government."

I am willing that money shall be spent in helping the farmer just as it is being lost in helping shipping, manufacturing, or the banking interests of the country. I do not believe the Government would lose any money on this proposition, because if the farmers control production within reasonable bounds they can control their own prices as manufacturers do and other concerns do to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, let me say briefly before my time expires that my bill represents my best conclusions on the subject of farm relief after months and years of most careful study of the matter.

It is a most important subject and requires much time in order to discuss any bill fully. There are many features of my bill that would require much more time than I am now allotted.

I will be heard again and again by speech, extension of remarks, in appearances before the committees, and otherwise in behalf of my bill. I am sure it is a good plan and I want you to understand it and I am sure you will then agree with me.

If my bill does what I think it does, it is the best farm bill ever written.

I am sure a careful study of the bill will convince anyone that I am right. Here is what I claim it would do for the farmer, which the other bills either fail to do or do in an indefinite way:

My bill helps the farmer directly and not indirectly—puts the money in his own pocket instead of in the pocket of some one for him to be delivered to him after certain expenses are paid.

The farmers' finance corporation under my bill would loan the money to the farmer through the banks, letting the banks make 1 per cent, and getting the money to the individual farmer at 5 per cent or less. The loan would be made to the farmer and not to some one else for him who could charge him an unreasonable profit for getting it for him.

The loan being made to the individual farmer at the average which his product has sold for the last 10 years, the individual farmer would be able to hold his own cotton until it advanced in price and get the benefit of the increase instead of selling his commodity to some other organization, as provided in other bills, and thus losing the increase of price brought about by the holding of cotton or reduction of acreage.

The help of curtailment of acreage under my bill will inure to the benefit of the farmer who has held over his cotton because of the loan and he will also receive an increase of price on what he makes on the reduced acreage. He gets the increase on the hold over and on the new production, while under the other bills he would not help on the hold over, for he could not hold over but must sell, in most instances, to the organization helped by the Government or some one else.

My bill makes clear and definite the rights of the farmer under it. The other bills do not. Take the debenture plan, for instance; it would cost the Government much money in an effort to help the farmer by helping the exporter of cotton. I can not now discuss that plan in full. It would require an entire speech for that purpose, but all who understand that plan must admit that it would help the man or concern who buys the farmer's product when he goes to ship his commodity across the ocean. Would this help the farmer? Maybe it would. The question is, Would the benefit which the exporter gets ever ooze through to the farmer? I fear very little would. The help in this way is too indirect. I want direct help. I do not at all like to help the higher up on the theory that some of the help will eventually ooze through half a dozen pockets of the profiteers of the country to the farmers. Let us help the farmers and not other people, on the theory that perhaps the farmer will some time in some way get a little of the drippings from the fingers or pockets of the speculators.

Again my bill cuts out all red tape and only uses the banks which are already in existence and allows them a definite profit. The help under my bill is definite and anyone can tell any farmer exactly the help he will get if the bill goes into effect as to cotton or any other commodity.

Who can tell the farmer what help he will get under the McNary-Haugen bill? We can more easily tell him what he will lose. All we can hope for is that he will gain more than he will lose.

Who can tell the farmer who grows cotton how much money arising from the debenture plan will ooze through the pockets of those who have bought the farmer's cotton and that it will happen to fall where the farmer can get it?

Who can tell the farmer how much help he will get under some of the other so-called farm relief bills which set up expensive machinery to buy the farmers' products at a loss to the farmers and hold these products, not for a profit to the farmer who has sold his commodity but for a profit to the organization? How much will the farmer get when the next year after he has cut his acreage and cotton starts up and this cotton which has been held over not by the farmer but by the organization under the terms of the law is dumped back on the market to break the price?

My bill would help the farmer curtail production by mutual contract for the benefit of the farmer. Some of the other bills would attempt to make the farmer curtail by the harsh punishment of financial loss in order to run up the price of what they had bought from the farmer.

My bill authorizes the appointment of the advisory commodity council by the governors of the States producing the particular commodity to be handled rather than by the President of the United States. This would put the control of production and marketing in the hands of the friends of the farmers. The governors of the cotton-growing States, for instance, could select better men for the cotton growers than could be selected by the President.

I know right now that some one will say that all Federal officers will have to be appointed by the President or some one selected by him if they are not elective. I have thought of this phase of the matter and am convinced that under my bill the advisory council would not be Federal officers, but would only be officers called into being by a contract and only recognized as officials helping carry out the contract for the control of production and marketing, and so forth. I have no fear on this account, and shall be very glad to argue this phase of the matter more fully later.

Again my bill is good because it is only an offer to the farmers. They can refuse it if they do not like it. It does not at all force anything on them they may not like.

But I must conclude. I shall argue various features of my bill again from time to time.

In conclusion let me say that in my humble judgment my bill would put the control of the farmer's great problems in the hands of his friends, not his enemies; would help the farmer directly not indirectly; provides a complete solution of the overproduction problem; would enable the farmer within reasonable bounds to name his own price for his commodity; would put him for the first time on a parity with other enterprises and industries. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as has been explained by Chairman SHREVE, this bill, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor for the fiscal year 1929, carries appropriations amounting to $89,047,985.14. It covers a great variety of items embracing a multitude of subjects. In preparing it for submission to the whole committee great credit must be accorded to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SHREVE, as well as to the Messrs. OLIVER and GRIFFIN, who spent a large part of last summer in visiting by rail, by water, by motor, and by airplane not only the entire boundary line of the United States so as to have first-hand information as regards border patrol, but the needs of steamboat inspection and coast survey work, the needs of the Federal reformatories, the problems of Alaska and other outlying possessions, and many other of the Government's activities. All the items for this work came before the subcommittee. They normally elicit a thousand pages of hearings. This year the testimony crowds 1,200 pages.

By reason of the great care that Subchairman SHREVE manifests on all occasions, a full picture is secured of the departmental activities for all who desire to read the hearings built up by the appearance and testimony of those who justify the amounts which have been suggested by the Budget for the conduct of the various bureaus.

I shall not, of course, trespass upon the ground that the other members of the committee have discussed, but as I have been graciously permitted this time I shall call attention to a few items in which I have become interested.

Since 1922 we have enjoyed practically uninterrupted prosperity. In 1926 our national income reached $89,000,000,000. This amount is an increase of 33 per cent over 1920. What the figures for 1927 shall be can only be estimated at this time, but it appears that on the whole the average will be maintained and the outlook for 1928 is most promising and high authorities are so optimistic that it would seem to border on the fantastic to quote them. There is but one factor which may tend to lower it, and the President referred to it in his message to this Congress.

He said, after pointing out that—

> The country as a whole has had a prosperity never exceeded—

That—

> Some parts of agriculture and industry have lagged; some localities have suffered from storm and flood. But such losses have been absorbed without serious detriment to our great economic structure.

My opinion as the reason we were able to absorb these losses without any serious effects is because of existing conditions reared upon fundamentally sound principles both as to Government and individual enterprise, the continuance of the protective tariff, and the abstention of the Government in business.

This bill, perhaps more than any other, appropriates money which is to be used in protecting, maintaining, and strengthening our economic structure through cooperation with agencies of production and industry in general.

It is of this cooperation and the accomplishments and achievements which have flowed from it in the past that I would like to speak. My remarks must necessarily be only on some of the more outstanding instances. The field is so broad and the activities so diversified that to go into all of them would consume much more time than I have at my disposal.

Before getting into the explanation, or citation, if you please, of these activities, I would ask you to keep in mind and associ-

ate very largely with them the satisfactory condition of the American public. It is estimated there are 28,000,000 families in the United States, and that 13,000,000 of them own their homes. This represents a huge investment on the part of the home owners and those who have houses for renting purposes. The conservation of this property is not by any means the least of our responsibilities as legislators, and it can best be done by keeping our country prosperous and at peace. The living standards of the people, the character of their homes, depend in no small measure on the smooth functioning of a great group of related industries.

One of the great bureaus in the Department of Commerce is that of the Bureau of Standards, which was established as a branch of the Treasury Department by the act approved March 3, 1901. It was transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor upon the establsihment of that department in 1903. The organic act provided for the purchase of a site for the bureau and the erection of laboratories. Under this authority a site of 8 acres was selected on Connecticut Avenue, and two laboratories now known as the North and South Buildings were constructed. From time to time Congress has appropriated funds for additions to the site and for additional laboratories until now the bureau's grounds have a total of about 43 acres, and its plant consists of 10 major and 7 minor buildings. In addition, a power-plant building is under construction, which it is expected will be completed by next spring. The personnel of the bureau has grown from 14 in 1901 to 839 in 1927.

One of the basic functions of the Bureau of Standards is to establish and maintain the national standards of quantitative measurement. The bureau is the custodian of the country's official standards of measurement. When necessary it constructs, tests, and calibrates new standards, and compares the measuring apparatus used in scientific investigations, and in engineering, manufacturing, and commerce, with the official standards. The statutes authorize the bureau to conduct scientific investigations of problems connected with the development and application of standards, and to determine the properties and characteristics of different materials, such as the thermal expansion of dental materials; the fluidity of lubricating oils; the melting point of metals; the boiling point of liquids; the conductivity of insulating materials; the tensile strength of steel; and the like. Generally speaking, this work is limited to data which are of urgent importance to scientific or manufacturing interests and are not readily obtainable elsewhere. While there is invariably an immediate and practical objective, yet facts and principles are often discovered which are of great value as contributions to the general fund of scientific knowledge.

Essentially the Bureau of Standards is a scientific and technical laboratory for service to the industries of the country and the various departments of the Government. Some 350 specialized scientists trained in physics, chemistry, and engineering are at work on problems involving the quality of materials and the testing of the commodities of commerce. According to information given me by Dr. George H. Burgess, the Director of the Bureau of Standards, in making a tour of inspection of the bureau's buildings one is impressed with the number of completely equipped small-scale manufacturing plants which form part of the facilities of many of the sections. Thus, in the metallurgical division will be found a foundry, heat-treating plant, rolling mill, forging press, wire-drawing outfit, and so forth. The textile section includes a complete cotton mill, the paper section has everything necessary for producing paper of any kind in sheets up to 25 inches wide, the rubber section has its mill and vulcanizing plant, and the leather section its miniature tannery. The glass section is particularly noteworthy, because here will be found one of the finest plants for producing optical glass in the United States. In this particular case the laboratory is of necessity a production plant, for it is only by making optical glass in considerable quantities that the difficult technique can be improved.

After inspecting these plants the visitor realizes that it is often necessary for the laboratory workers to turn plant superintendent. The question, then, naturally arises, how successful is the scientific man when he takes up the problems of manufacturing?

The work of the Bureau of Standards may help us to answer this question. Let us review briefly the recent accomplishments of some of the scientific sections, beginning with optical glass. I am informed that prior to 1914 not one pound of optical glass was made in the United States. Although we had some of the finest lens makers in the world, they had all worked with foreign glass. When the war came our supply of this essential material was cut off and several laboratories in this country started research work, with the object of learning to make optical glass. Among these laboratories was the Bureau of Standards.

The bureau started this investigation in what was then its Pittsburgh laboratory. The whole process from the raw materials to the finished product had to be worked out, because the foreign glassmakers had already jealously guarded their secrets. Even the process of making the refractory crucibles or pots in which the materials are melted had to be developed. In this work the bureau cooperated with other research laboratories and with glass-making plants, and as the result of these cooperative efforts, a good grade of optical glass was turned out by 1917, when the United States entered the war.

The glass section of the bureau has been making optical glass ever since. During the fiscal year 1927 approximately 21,000 pounds of glass of four different kinds were made, and 21,441 lens blanks of various sizes were turned over to the optical shop of the Navy Department to be used in the construction of instruments. In 1923 a 12-inch telescope objective of 12½ feet focal length was made, the entire work from melting the raw ingredients to figuring the lens having been done by the bureau. Last May an even more ambitious piece of work was started. At that time there was cast by a special process a glass disk for reflecting telescope. The disk measures 70 inches in diameter and is 12½ inches thick. At the present time it is in a specially constructed annealing furnace where it is being slowly cooled and from which it will not be removed till next February. Of course, it is impossible to state at this time whether the job will prove a success, but if so, it will be a piece of work the like of which has never been attempted in this country and which has been successfully accomplished but a few times abroad. In this case a scientific bureau may be said to have set the pace for the regular manufacturers.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Has any of this optical glass been sold to the public?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I understand that 21,000 of the lens blanks have been turned over to the optical shop of the Navy Department.

For some time the bureau has been studying the properties of high-speed steels used for making cutting tools. An important part of the work is a study of the effect of various impurities on the performance of the finished tool. In order to secure results of any value it is necessary first to make up other tools containing known kinds and amounts of impurities. The whole process of manufacturing high-speed tools is a difficult one, and commercial toolmakers insist that this grade of steel can only be produced after long experience and with a specially equipped plant. Nevertheless the Washington Navy Yard and the bureau working together have made quantities of high-speed tools, beginning with raw materials and ending with the tool ready for service. In tests of the tools on actual lathes, turning up heavy forgings in the Naval Gun Factory, the Government-made tools have stood up as well as any commercial tools on the market. Of course, the Bureau of Standards has no intention of going into the steel business, but when it had to make tools in order to conduct an important investigation it was able to do the job in a thoroughly satisfactory manner.

Very pure platinum is needed in many lines of work at the bureau. This is melted and purified by special processes, drawn into wire, and spun into crucibles. So successful has this work been that the bureau is in possession of platinum much purer than any that can be bought from regular dealers; in fact such impurities as are present exist in such small amounts that they can only be detected by means of the spectroscope. Chemical analysis will not reveal them.

While on the subject of metallurgy it should be remembered that the bureau operates a small foundry, where many special castings are made for the bureau's instrument shop and even for other branches of the Government. As in other fields the bureau does not expect to compete with commercial foundries, but it takes up work which they are not at all anxious to attempt. Many peculiar alloys and very pure metals are handled, and in practically all cases valuable data are secured on the behavior of metals and on foundry practice.

During the war munitions were made in hundreds of plants scattered all over the country. In order to have all the pieces fit together at the point of assembly it was necessary to use a great many standard gauges for controlling the dimensions of machined parts. The shop gauges, in turn, had to be based on precise master standards, known as gauge blocks. Up till the time of the war all the gauge blocks in use were produced by a single firm in Sweden. Naturally, the supply ran short, and

a serious situation was impending when the bureau came to the rescue. An Army officer, Major Hoke, developed at the bureau a special process for making these blocks far more quickly and cheaply than ever before. A shop was fitted up in one of the buildings equipped with special machinery, and soon American-made gauge blocks were available for the military services and for ordnance manufacturers. Many sets were made by the bureau, and, in addition, the method was turned over to American toolmakers, who were able to supply a satisfactory product on a commercial basis.

Portable metal spraying plants were developed and constructed by the bureau for the Navy Department and the process was brought to a practical point and was actually used in several different ways.

As we mentioned at the start, the bureau has always cooperated closely with manufacturers, and whenever possible it has not only experimented with production on a small scale in its semicommercial plants but has secured the cooperation of industries to try out the processes under commercial conditions. An interesting illustration of what may be accomplished by this kind of cooperative work is found in the dextrose industry.

For over 40 years the corn-products industries sought to discover a commercially practicable method for producing chemically pure glucose, a white crystalline product similar in appearance to granulated sugar. Some sort of a pure, cheap carbohydrate food, similar to sugar but without its sweetening power, was greatly needed in the condensed milk, ice cream, baking, and other industries. As the result of a long series of laboratory experiments, followed by experience in a semicommercial plant, the bureau discovered how to crystallize pure dextrose from its water solution. The commercial success of the project was known to hinge on this accomplishment. The bureau secured the cooperation of a manufacturer and sent a member of its staff to a large sugar refinery, where at the first attempt he succeeded in throwing down 4,000 pounds of pure dextrose. This first successful production took place only a little more than four years ago. To-day several million dollars are invested in dextrose refineries in this country and abroad. During 1926 this industry produced over 200,000,000 pounds of crystalline dextrose, valued at about $10,000,000.

It is also believed that there are great possibilities for the recovery of gums, sugars, and cellulose from the waste products of the farm. A preliminary survey has been made in the fields of cotton, peanuts, and cornstalks. The bureau has several tons of cornstalks on hand at the Iowa Agricultural College and expects to begin at once the processing of these stalks. Chemical work on peanut shells has demonstrated what conditions are best for hydrolysis of shells and has produced a mixture of organic acids, which is now being analyzed.

Wall board has been made from the insoluble residue. Cotton burrs and cottonseed hulls have been analyzed by regular methods of organic analysis and the bureau is now analyzing the constituent parts—fat, crude fiber, and ash.

Many other examples of what has been accomplished when a scientist turns manufacturer might be given, but the ones cited prove what can be done along this line. They could be duplicated by consulting the records of many other research laboratories within and outside the Government service.

So far as the Bureau of Standards is concerned, it does not claim to have accomplished these successful results in the manufacture of materials single handed. It has been greatly helped by the cooperation of the industries themselves. It does believe, however, that the laboratory man with an unprejudiced point of view has often been able to suggest improvements that have escaped the notice of those concerned purely with the commercial side of the work, and has been able to demonstrate the value of scientific theories by applying them to actual production methods.

Just here I would like to discuss a matter in connection with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The bureau had prepared for me a statement showing a comparison of exports and imports for the last six and a half years, with the yearly average of postwar years, using the value of the dollar at the present time at 66⅔ cents, in order to bring the value of the postwar dollar to that of the pre-war dollar. I insert this table and call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the postwar period from January 1921, to June 30, 1927, there were $4,486,226,000 yearly average worth of exports for that period. The exports to the 12 principal countries comprising 63 per cent of our entire exports, or $2,787,173,000—and valued at $1,858,117,000 at 66⅔ cents per dollar, as compared with the pre-war average from 1910 to 1914, were 17 per cent greater than the pre-war average exports.

The 12 countries referred to are the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Canada.

Our imports, using the same postwar average and the value of the dollar and the pre-war average, shows that they have increased 7 per cent, thus showing that trade does increase as far as imports are concerned, even though the protective tariff is alleged to hamper imports.

Comparison of exports and imports of yearly average for six and one-half postwar years with yearly average for prewar years, using 66⅔ cents as the value of a postwar dollar

	Exports			Per cent change from prewar average to postwar average dollar valued at 66⅔ cents		Imports			Per cent change from prewar average to postwar average dollar valued at 66⅔ cents	
	Postwar average January, 1921, to June 30, 1927	Value at 66⅔ cents	Prewar average 1910–1914	Increase	Decrease	Postwar average January, 1921, to June 30, 1927	Value at 66⅔ cents	Prewar average 1910–1914	Increase	Decrease
	$4,486,226,000	$2,990,817,000	$2,165,818,000	38		$3,662,387,000	$2,441,591,000	$1,688,874,000	45	
Total	2,787,173,000	1,858,117,000	1,583,351,000	17		1,374,198,000	916,132,000	852,690,000	7	
United Kingdom	940,743,000	627,162,000	567,592,000	10		359,314,000	239,542,000	278,897,000		14
Germany	383,164,000	255,443,000	304,098,000		16	146,555,000	97,703,000	176,462,000		45
Belgium	109,489,000	72,993,000	53,117,000	37		62,170,000	41,447,000	40,360,000	3	
France	260,170,000	173,447,000	138,841,000	25		149,189,000	99,459,000	130,130,000		24
Italy	176,073,000	117,382,000	65,966,000	78		84,808,000	56,539,000	51,149,000	11	
Greece	16,059,000	10,706,000	873,000	1,126		23,064,000	15,376,000	3,329,000	362	
Netherlands	137,479,000	91,653,000	104,575,000		12	76,516,000	51,011,000	34,937,000	46	
Denmark	45,034,000	30,023,000	15,393,000	95		5,815,000	3,877,000	2,957,000	49	
Norway	27,217,000	18,145,000	7,819,000	132		19,809,000	13,206,000	8,086,000	63	
Sweden	39,897,000	26,598,000	10,033,000	165		36,263,000	24,175,000	9,530,000	154	
Canada	651,848,000	434,565,000	315,044,000	38		410,695,000	273,797,000	117,213,000	134	
Ratio:										
Exports per cent	0.63		0.73							
Imports do	.38		.50							

Increased protection against invasion of our domestic markets by certain classes of foreign goods is essential. We must assist our producers to find an increased sale for their goods at home as well as abroad. We should insist on American materials being used by the Government at all times, the prices and quality being the same. Other nations have sent commissions here to study conditions, to learn more about our products, our processes, and methods, to the end that they may profit by our experiences. We are getting stiffer competition from foreign manufacturers and must be prepared to meet it.

Because standards of living in America are higher than in other parts of the world, production and distribution costs are relatively higher. To help maintain the present volume of this country's export sales efforts need be extended toward increasing the demand abroad for articles manufactured here.

The British have done some notable work along this line, expending, according to a statement of an official of the British Government, more than £20,000 sterling for the translation, printing, and distribution of publications in Spanish, French, Italian, and Portuguese extolling the virtues of British-made goods. At the time this statement was made a campaign was launched to set aside some £50,000 to continue the work on a broader scale.

We, in our Department of Commerce, have doubled our appropriations as a whole, the appropriation in 1922 being $17,262,060 and in 1928, $36,627,450. In this estimate for last year and the

coming one is an appropriation for investigations designed to discover uses for waste farm products, to which I alluded when discussing the Bureau of Standards.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce maintains local offices in 23 cities—

Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Des Moines, Galveston, Houston, Jacksonville (Fla.), Kansas City, Louisville, Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, Mobile, New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland (Oreg.), St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, Wilmington (Del.).

These offices give aid and advice to the business interests in their respective communities in connection with sales and export problems, when necessary, of course, referring inquiries to the bureau at Washington. They also serve as distributing centers for bureau publications, seeking to place trade information directly in the hands of the persons most vitally interested. Through the cooperation of the local chambers of commerce offices are also maintained, practically without expense to the Government, at 34 important cities, making 57 offices in all. The bureau's sales information reports have grown from 11,684 inquiries in 1921 to 65,970 inquiries in 1926, an increase of over 550 per cent.

The item in this bill for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is $4,162,357, while in 1919 it was only $554,120, a 700 per cent increase. Compare this with the amounts appropriated by other governments for trade-promotive activities and governmental aids to manufacturers and exporters:

France, 24,202,096 francs = $968,000.
Canada, $575,000 = $575,000.
Union of South Africa, £25,000 = $125,000.
Italy, 4,000,000 lira = $200,000.
Japan, 1,961,923 yen = $980,000.

Aside from its purely trade and commerce activities in the generally accepted sense of those terms, the Department of Commerce has under its control far-flung agencies for the protection of navigation, according to information furnished me by the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Col. E. Lester Jones.

This survey has been rendering public service of tremendous practical importance for the past 111 years. Year by year both the volume and the importance of this service increases and, coincident with this, more and more efficient and economical methods are devised in order to keep pace with the increased demands made upon the bureau by the public.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey is charged with producing charts of the coastal waters of the United States and its possessions for the aid and protection of shipping entering our ports. These charts are indispensable to commerce, to economic development, and to the flow of commodities. As commerce increases, the demand for maritime charts and for the nautical publications of the bureau increases in direct proportion.

During the past year this bureau produced 246,836 charts—an increase of about 15,000 over the preceding year. This was the largest production for any year in its history with the exception of the period of the World War when, of course, the demand was unprecedented. Efficiency and economy of operation are strikingly emphasized in the fact that last year almost as many charts were produced as during the war, and yet the bureau was operating with less than its normal personnel in its chart division.

During 1927 the bureau increased its output of nautical publications very materially over the previous year. The distribution of its Coast Pilots, for example, showed an increase of 24 per cent, while the distribution of its Current Tables showed an increase of 26 per cent.

These increases are tangible evidence not only of national prosperity, as reflected in commercial growth, but also that the Coast and Geodetic Survey is doing its full share in promoting that prosperity.

In addition to its production of maritime charts, this bureau also has charge of executing control surveys in the interior of the country. It has been so successful in this branch of its work that it is internationally recognized as the greatest geodetic organization in the world. Its geodetic or control surveys are necessary in making all detailed surveys and topographic maps. They are indispensable in engineering projects, road building, and power development. Undertaken primarily for the purpose of checking the accuracy of nautical charts, the geodetic work of the bureau has developed to the point where engineers and surveyors everywhere are making extensive use of it in their local projects. As one single example of the importance of this work, no comprehensive plan of water-power development or flood control is feasible until after the Coast and Geodetic Survey or some other agency has executed the necessary leveling surveys.

One of the outstanding accomplishments of the past year was the hydrographic survey work done along the coasts of Oregon and Washington and in southeastern Alaska, where three of the survey's ships surveyed an area of 6,500 square miles during a season of about seven months. This unusual feat was made possible through the use of modern survey ships and through using a new echo sounding apparatus developed during the past two years by a number of cooperating agencies of which the survey was one of the most active.

This apparatus measures ocean depths in terms of time required for a sound wave to travel from near the surface of the water to the bottom of the ocean and be echoed back to the ship. After extensive experiments and tests the apparatus has been perfected to the point where it was used with the greatest success during the past year.

With this apparatus it is possible to survey more than twice as much area per day as would be possible by any other means. Thus the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been able to double its output on this class of work, and since no more expense is involved the unit cost of the work is cut squarely in two.

While the primary purpose of developing this apparatus was to speed up hydrographic surveys, the bureau has made an important contribution to mariners everywhere by its participation in development work along this line. This apparatus is useful not only in survey work but also to help vessels to locate their position at any time in thick weather. Safety at sea has thus been enhanced and the survey has added another chapter to its history of promoting the safety of maritime travel.

There has been of late years a decided increase in the demand for tide and current surveys of important harbors adjacent to metropolitan centers. Any survey of this character is of decided value to the mariner, who must have accurate knowledge of the effect of currents on his ship. Of equal or perhaps even more importance is the value of such surveys to engineers who are concerned with problems of sewage disposal, harbor improvements, bridge construction, and so forth.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has already made tide and current surveys of New York Harbor, San Francisco Harbor, Delaware Bay and River, Boston and Portsmouth, and southeastern Alaska. During the past year such a survey was inaugurated of Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. During the present year it is hoped to finish this survey.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has also designed one of the most wonderful machines devised by man—the tide-predicting machine. By the simple setting of a number of wheels and dials, the turning of the crank foretells the times and heights of high and low waters at any place in the world and for any year, past or future. As an indication of the progress which the survey is continually making it is interesting to note that recently this machine has also been adapted to the prediction of currents in important waterways and harbors, likewise of great value to the mariner.

An added duty of the bureau, imposed upon it during the past year, is the production of airway strip maps for aviators. With the development of commercial aviation, this service will be of increasing value to the people. The problem of the aviator is in large measure the same as the problem of the navigator, and although the duty of producing airway maps has added to the already heavy burdens of the survey it was inevitable that the pioneer chart-making agency of the Government should be delegated to perform this important duty.

These are some of the high spots in the service which the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the oldest scientific bureau in the Government, is rendering to the people of the United States. It has the confidence and respect of the public, and it is ever striving to so maintain its service that it will continue to be worthy of that confidence and respect.

The Bureau of Lighthouses is another "off-land" function performed by the Department of Commerce. During the past year the great Mississippi River flood placed an extra load on this business. In April and May the vessels and men of the Lighthouse Service cooperated in rescue work and made a notable record in maintaining the lights in their charge under great difficulties.

According to information given me by the Director of the Bureau of Lighthouses, at the end of the year 1926 the Lighthouse Service was maintaining a total of 18,363 aids to marine navigation. Although nearly 1,000 new aids were established during the year, the discontinuance of aids is kept under investigation as the original necessity for their maintenance ceases. Consequently 700 aids of various classes were discontinued during the year, making a net increase of 273 aids for the year. Of the total, 6,577 are lighted and 9,054 are floating.

There were 1,286 miles of airways lighted during the year, and work on 694 additional miles of airways was under contract. The total number of airway aids in commission was 755, including 616 aids formerly maintained by the Post Office Department on the transcontinental airway, which was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce on July 1, 1927.

Among the improvements in aids to marine navigation which have been made during the year the following may be mentioned: Eighty-one lights were changed from fixed to flashing, giving them a much more distinctive character; the illuminant of 7 lights was changed to incandescent oil vapor; also 80 lights (including 15 buoys) were changed to acetylene; and 13 lights changed to electric, producing a considerable increase in brightness. In addition to the 12 radiobeacons already mentioned, 17 sound fog signals were either established or improved for providing more powerful apparatus.

Progress has been continued in the establishment of automatic lights. During the year 54 new lights of this character were established, and 28 lights were changed from attended to automatic. The total number of automatic lights in the Lighthouse Service at the end of the year was 2,033, not including some partially automatic, and consisting of 1,203 lights on fixed structures and 830 lights on buoys. Also there are at present 14 automatically operated fog bells in service.

Upward of 90 instances were reported during the year where members of the Lighthouse Service effected rescues or aided vessels or persons in distress. Many of these acts were especially meritorious and at great personal risk to the lighthouse employees, and in such cases the employees concerned were individually commended by the Secretary of Commerce. A gold medal was awarded by the Secretary of the Treasury to the captain of the lighthouse steamer *Columbine* in recognition of gallant conduct in rescue work near San Juan Harbor, P. R. The keepers of a lighthouse on the Oregon coast were commended for heroic conduct in the rescue and first-aid treatment of a young man who had fallen over a cliff, 80 feet to the rocks below, and was seriously injured. The scene of the accident was 2 miles from the lighthouse and had to be reached at night by a narrow trail, 8 to 12 inches wide, along the face of the rock cliff above the surf.

According to information from the Patent Office, during the fiscal year 1927 there were 89,360 applications for patents, reissues, and designs received. In addition to 17,503 trade-mark applications, as well as 3,550 applications for renewal of trade-mark registrations, 3,370 label and print applications, 208,841 amendments to patent applications, 6,569 amendments to design applications, and 23,757 amendments to trade-mark, label, and print applications were applied for. These are only a part of the bureaus under the Department of Commerce. Much could be said about the others and the public services they are rendering.

Just at this time the public is much interested in aeronautics because of the great achievements of Colonel Lindbergh and our other airmen. In nearly all of the notable and history-making flights the aviators had the assistance of the Bureau of Aeronautics as well as the Bureau of Standards and more indirectly the radio division.

The Bureau of the Census is one with which the public has been acquainted for generations, and its publications carry a wonderful amount of information, statistical and otherwise, on nearly every phase of human endeavor.

The Bureau of Fisheries, the Bureau of Navigation, the Steamboat Inspection Service, and the Bureau of Mines are other agencies functioning for the well being and safety of the public.

Further time does not permit of going into all the interesting details of these bureaus but, if anyone has the time to peruse even a portion of the hearings, in my opinion, the opportunity will have been employed to their advantage. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the Greek refugee settlement provision.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LEHLBACH). The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, when in Athens last summer I went through one of the large Greek settlements where refugees have been brought back from Turkey. About 1,400,000 Greeks in all were brought back, and something over $50,000,000 to date expended by the commission. To show how coincidences may occur, within an hour I received a letter from the president of the commission, Mr. Charles B. Eddy, the first communication I have had from him for six months, in which he says that they have had a settlement in Geneva of the American claims with Greece and that $12,000,000 additional has been loaned by the American Government for the use of Greek refugees.

It is not possible for all Members of Congress to visit countries of Europe that are still suffering from the effects of the World War or from general economic depression. It is equally impossible at long range fully to comprehend conditions in those countries, both internal and external.

Expense, time, and lack of opportunity generally prohibits us from getting such information first hand, but I believe in no other way can a reasonably clear understanding of European problems be reached. It is especially true of some of the smaller countries and of those not ordinarily visited by the tourist. Four years ago I spent several months in Russia, Poland, Georgia, and Armenia, off the beaten path, and last summer I visited as far south and east as Greece and Turkey and as far north as Trondjhem, in the Arctic Circle. In no other way can one learn from personal knowledge just how others live.

Their problems, their aspirations, and their future is of great moment to them and often to us. Generally speaking, the southern countries of Europe have not yet forgotten the World War. More gaily uniformed soldiers wearing swords and side arms were seen on the streets of Belgrade, Yugoslavia, during my brief visit in that country than would be found in all American cities combined in a year's time. At Bulgaria's border, when crossing over from Turkey, soldiers with fixed bayonets marched on either side of our car while their customs officers went through the train looking for trouble and trouble makers. These people have not yet recovered from the last war, yet peace seems farther removed than a quarter of a century ago. New boundaries made by the Versailles treaty have not brought peace.

Hatreds, jealousies, and fears dating back for centuries can not be smothered when on all sides people of suspicious nationalities patrol the borders between neighboring nations, but after such trips we discover that these people of Europe, who help make up our American civilization, when thrown into the melting pot on this side of the Atlantic become strong citizens.

In Greece the precious passport I held was inspected by five different functionaries, from deck hands to fierce-looking descendants of the men who once whipped Xerxes. This occurred before we were allowed to pass through the gates of Piræus, the port of Athens.

It is not my purpose to attempt a prosaic account of European travels even in the outlying districts, because many Members have felt the call in the past and others will cover the same ground in the future, possibly far more profitably, but I desire briefly to express the gratitude every American must feel toward American ambassadors, ministers, and consuls in Europe who make it possible for us to see and learn things first-hand. Overrun with American tourists, undoubtedly they individually and collectively sigh for respite, but I wish to record my appreciation of the kindness and courtesies invariably extended by our diplomatic and commercial representatives in every country visited and for their active aid in meeting foreign officials. Even foreign officials, who are long-suffering because of drafts made upon their time, with rare exceptions were always courteous and helpful.

Any one of a dozen of the countries visited would afford a text for remarks affecting present conditions, political and economic, but I am leaving that task for others better able to perform, while I submit a few brief observations regarding a sorely distressed country that over 20 centuries ago was a world center.

The American Government and the Greek Government are both fortunate to have at this time a resident official in Athens with the unusual experience and ability of American Minister Skinner. I believe he is the oldest American diplomatic official in length of service in the State Department. That in itself would be a guarantee of ability to handle successfully the many complex and perplexing problems that beset the Greeks and our relations with that country. In like manner, Gardner Richardson, our commercial attaché, is an unusual representative, whose efforts have largely increased trade relations between the two countries. These Americans and others are seeking to aid the Greek Government through its officials to meet present economic difficulties, complicated with political disturbances, that confront that people to-day. One of its stupendous problems relates to an army of over 1,000,000 refugees.

Every Greek refugee settlement is now caring for many thousands of refugees who suffered from Turkish persecutions, and this work, under the League of Nations, is now handled by a capable commission headed by Charles B. Eddy, president, an American. The Greek problem is one of vast magnitude because of lack of resources to meet the demands made by the situation and the innumerable difficulties that have beset those handling the relief work.

Before studying the Greek Government's refugee situation I called at the Near East relief headquarters at Athens, where help, though necessarily extremely limited in character, is being given to Greek orphans. Previously, four years ago, I had been through Near East relief work over in the Caucasus at Tiflis, Georgia, and also at Alexandropol down in Armenia, where 12,000 little orphans were paraded that day for us, dressed in their best clothes, a fine body of children who exhibited by their appearance the care and self-help instruction given by their American teachers. Domestic science and manual training were popular courses down in Armenia. In Kiev and elsewhere we visited Jewish relief work and in Moscow the Friends have a strong organization that affords relief to thousands of needy Russians. All these combined, however, make little impression compared with the Greek relief problem because of the latter's immensity and the additional fact that a vast army of refugees of all ages, sexes, and conditions must be cared for until they can become self-sustaining.

Only through an extensive organization, financed and managed by a great community fund necessarily advanced by outside governments, could this Greek relief work be successfully accomplished. Much more needs to be done and pressing demands will continue for a long time to come but to the splendid members of the organization who everywhere responded willingly and cheerfully is due the grateful thanks of the world that is interested in this fine humanitarian work. I say this at the outset because what little I have to offer, based on my own personal examination, is unqualifiedly in commendation of the relief work now in the hands of the League of Nations. By its extension of credit like that previously given to Austria and other countries the league secured loans for the Greek Government from English and American sources aggregating upward of $50,000,000, and this sum for which the already heavily burdened government is responsible is a fund that has kept hundreds of thousands of Greek refugees from starvation.

I do not intend to discuss massacres, murders, and other violence alleged to have been practiced by the Turks against the Greeks which have a basis of fact according to fairly trustworthy evidence. There are controverted issues, however, wherein it is alleged in Turkey that both Greeks and Turks were responsible for what occurred in Smyrna and elsewhere. After discussing the matter briefly with various people in Constantinople, including Turkish and American officials, with Admiral Bristol and others, I am satisfied that two sides may be presented in any case of the Greeks against the Turks, but it is not so important now to determine the degree of responsibility for what occurred at Smyrna or elsewhere. The work of giving protection and aid to Greek refugees is an outstanding problem that has aroused the sympathy of the world, and it is that splendid work to which I would briefly refer.

To the average person modern Greece is assumed to be without any particular pride in its past or hope for the future. Yet students of history, of philosophy, and of the arts even in this material age find in Grecian history that which saved to us a higher civilization at a time when the world hesitated between progress and reaction. Its soldiers, sailors, statesmen, and philosophers once led the world.

In his recent illuminating story of philosophy, Durant recalls for us things well worth remembering when introducing his great characters with their surroundings. He says:

> If you look at a map of Europe you will observe that Greece is a skeletonlike hand stretching its crooked fingers out into the Mediterranean Sea. South of it lies the great island of Crete from which those grasping fingers captured, in the second millenium before Christ, the beginning of civilization and culture. To the east across the Ægean Sea lies Asia Minor, quiet and apathetic now, but throbbing in pre-Platonic days with industry, commerce, and speculation.
>
> To the west across the Ionian, Italy stands like a leaning tower in the sea and Sicily and Spain, each in those days with thriving Greek colonies; and at the end the Pillars of Hercules (which we call Gibraltar) that somber portal through which no ancient mariner dared to pass * * *. Look at the map and observe the position of Athens; it is the farthest east of the larger cities of Greece. It was favorably placed to be the door through which the Greek passed out to the busy cities of Asia Minor and through which those elder cities sent their luxuries and their culture to adolescent Greece. It had an admirable port, Piræus, where countless vessels might find a haven from the rough water of the sea, and it had a great maritime fleet.
>
> In 490–470 B. C., Sparta and Athens, forgetting their jealousies and joining their forces, fought off the effort of the Persians under Darius and Xerxes to turn Greece into a colony of an Asiatic empire. In this struggle of youthful Europe against the senile East, Sparta provided the army and Athens the navy * * *. Thereafter Sparta relapsed into agricultural seclusion and stagnation while Athens became a busy mart and port, the meeting place of many races of men and of diverse cults and customs whose contact and rivalry begot comparison, analysis, and thought.

With this introduction the writer in the development of his subject explains why Greece, the center of commerce and culture became likewise the center of the world's philosophy, of science, art, and thought. Historians have depicted the glories of ancient Athens and the wealth and power of Greece. After more than a score of centuries we find that the once proud, powerful race that led the world is now a small, humbled people confronted with heavy burdens that might well stagger a great prosperous country. If we owe any debt to Greece, that a score of centuries ago blazed the way of progress, ours is the opportunity to recognize that fact and to meet such obligation in this twentieth century of world prosperity which we enjoy.

Back in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C., when Athens was in the height of her glory, Agora was the center of that city, and of Grecian activities. Her temples, statuary, and paintings are described by historians to have been beyond comparison in that day and age. Buried far below the surface of the earth for centuries archæoligists have long attempted to bring to light evidencies of those ancient glories.

Various countries have sought to join in the effort to recover these treasures, but after plans failed to materialize it remained for Americans to finance the scheme, and contracts have now been given to that end. The expense will reach several million dollars, and for years to come the attention of archaeologists the world over will be directed to these excavations to be conducted by Americans in the heart of Athens.

When I was there last summer arrangements were about completed, and these involved the removal of hundreds of homes and shops now standing in the area to be excavated. This work in itself is of outstanding importance to the little country that was once a world power, but the recovery of these relics and ancient remains to my mind is of far less value to the world than the saving of lives and upbuilding of over a million Greek refugees who have suddenly been thrust upon the war-exhausted mother country. Whether due to national hatred by the Turks, religious persecutions, or one of the extraordinary horrors of war, by whatever name called, the burning and massacres in Smyrna and persecutions in other parts of Turkey have brought to Greek shores within the last five years a vast horde of miserable, poverty-stricken creatures numbering over fourteen hundred thousand souls.

Their tale of suffering is one of the horrors of modern times. With that I shall not linger, but the story of their gradual regeneration is not so well known. That work, to my mind, is of infinitely more importance than the resurrection of all the buried temples of old Greece, for living temples are being rebuilt in that country to-day by hands outstretched from all over the world working under the direction of the League of Nations.

To indicate the size of the task I quote from a pamphlet published by the World Alliance at Athens, 1925. The indictment from Greek sources in one paragraph alleges:

> During the World War the Turks "first stripped of all belongings and then deported 88,485 Greeks of Thrace, 144,559 of West Asia Minor, and 257,019 of Pontus. * * * This half million of old men, women, and children driven across mountains and plains by Turkish gendarmes and harried at every step by brigands and bloodthirsty Turkish peasantry were practically wiped out by massacre, hunger, cold, and fatigue. * * * The Greek Government lent its aid for the return of the deported population to their homes and for assistance toward their reestablishment. * * * Of the 490,000 persons, 121,000 returned to their homesteads unassisted, while 15,000 more were repatriated through the aid of committees. There remained 355,000 deportees of whom no news could be obtained.

A long list of counts alleges many acts of cruelty, but the above charges have been briefly stated in order to indicate one phase of the problem rather than to set forth the causes that produced it.

The League of Nations through its officials undertook to relieve this distress and in a pamphlet of over 200 pages entitled "Greek Refugee Settlement (Geneva, 1926)" it briefly presents the task:

> The problem presented by the influx of 1,400,000 Greek refugees into a country small in extent, whose population numbered approximately

5,000,000. * * * On the humanitarian side imagination can not compass the event. Only those can understand who have seen destitution, misery, disease, and death in all their possible forms, and the scale of this disaster was so unprecedented as to demand even from such persons a new vision.

The League of Nations established the refugees settlement commission in 1923. When I was in Greece last summer I went through one of the settlements near Piræus, a few miles from Athens. We were accompanied by the Greek refugee settlement commission, including Charles B. Eddy, its president, an American citizen, Sir John Simpson, of England, and Mr. Pallis, a Greek citizen educated at Oxford.

These men who composed the commission were followed on our tour of inspection throughout the settlement by a throng of those whom they were seeking to relieve. Groups of men, women, and children welcomed them on every hand as we passed through the dirt hovels or small shacks built by the refugees. We visited the small frame hospitals, and the little crude homes where thousands yet to be provided for were huddled together, but dirt floors were swept, a homemade chair and table often seen, and so far as able to do so the inhabitants kept their places scrupulously clean. I believe about 50,000 refugees were in this one settlement, which was partially wiped out by a fire after we left last summer, but I was impressed by the evidences of self-help and gratitude expressed by this large city of persecuted poverty-stricken refugees.

Although the commission that accompanied us was greeted with warmth, the poverty and destitution of these refugees seen on every hand makes the problem of relief one not easily described nor comprehended. Orphans, little mothers, and feeble old people were noted everywhere. One of the most pathetic figures was a young mother, scantily dressed, sitting in a small hovel or "shack" about 8 feet square that seemed all the room and home she possessed. On the dirt floor of this "room" stood a box, and on the box rested a small, rough, wood coffin that held the remains of an infant. One small lighted candle at the head of the coffin was the mother's only company. A pitiful, cowering figure, she sat there with her dead and her grief. Scenes of sickness, suffering, and death are so common with these refugees that death has no terrors, but none of the wonderful paintings seen in all the galleries of Europe left to the mind such a lasting impression as that of the sorrowing mother in the hovel on a back street of the Piræus refugee camp. And that was only one of many sad scenes.

A pamphlet issued by the refugee commission dated Athens, May 25, 1927, about the time of our arrival, gives a brief description of the work carried on by the commission. Total expenditures to date had then reached £8,882,191 sterling, which with other items listed as assets set off against liabilities amounted to £10,895,238 to date or $53,059,309 expended for relief work. The statement covering many pages with charts discloses the size of the task and character of relief afforded. Items with amounts advanced included advances for farmers, forage, agricultural implements, plowing animals, sheep and goats, horses, and numerous other items. Thirty-five districts received relief given to thousands of families in different districts who were given the minimum amount that would get them by with their pressing needs.

It sounds unimportant to say the town of Salonica now contains 170,000 town refugees in addition to its normal population or that Macedonia and Thrace have 300,000 refugees who are now receiving help from the commission; but after going with this serious-minded commission through passageways, often hardly a yard wide, between long rows of mud hovels, and then through the new districts, learning from observation their amazing accomplishments, I felt that in Christianizing labors that directly affect civilization, such work, performed by this splendid organization practically within the shadows of the world-famous acropolis, returns some reward to the people who once led the civilized world and, more than all, others made ours an enlightened world fit to live in.

No more than a pen picture of the problem can be offered here, but this refugee work marks a phase of the League of Nations activities little understood by the world at large. Second only to that discovery is the further fact that high-minded, capable men have been pressed into service who are gradually bringing order out of chaos and saving thousands of lives by their tireless energy.

To appreciate the size of the problem, let us suppose that in the United States after a long, disastrous war in which a large proportion of the male population had been killed, the country was suddenly called upon to absorb and provide for over 30,000,000 destitute people in an area about one-quarter the size of our own country and in a country that had been farmed in places for nearly 20 centuries.

Greece had approximately 5,000,000 inhabitants after the World War. The refugees concentrated in Greece during the last five or six years, according to the report, includes over 1,000,000 who came from Asia Minor, 190,000 from Eastern Thrace, 70,000 from the Caucasus, 70,000 from Constantinople, and 30,000 from Bulgaria.

Of the 1,400,000 Greek refugees landing in Greece during 1922 and 1923 a comparatively small number estimated at about 50,000 have left the country. A further number estimated around 175,000 have been absorbed by the local population of Athens and other towns, but those needing assistance, when we were there, according to estimates, numbered around 1,200,000 or 300,000 families of four persons each.

Attacking the problem of housing, the commission, acting for the League of Nations, aided by the Greek Government, built 22,337 houses, wooden huts, and hospital buildings by 1926. This number has since been increased, although the fire of 1927 destroyed a portion of the Greek refugee settlement near Athens.

To provide some means of self-support, the refugees have been given or sold on credit an extremely limited supply of seed, implements, cattle, and other supplies as stated. A limited budget prevents the commission from giving much needful aid, so that hardship necessarily continues to exist, but sickness with medical supplies and attendance was on a genuine relief scale when we were there. The hospitals were small, temporary, frame structures but clean and well conducted. Nurses were in attendance and, needless to say, they did not lack for patients.

From those engaged in relief work we learned that the reverence of the Greek for memories relating to his religion or his country is unexampled. No relic, no sanctuary, however ruined, is ever abandoned. There is no chapel, even if perched on the top of a high promontory to which he does not go at least once in the year to burn candles and to celebrate the feast of the Saint.

Although crushed by war and by dissensions that came from national disasters these Greeks are facing the future with confidence. Some of their Government officials stressed the necessity of additional loans that were needed in order to enable the Government to become rehabilitated.

Large new drainage and irrigation works have been undertaken by a company now operating in northern Greece, but promised loans, not yet realized, have halted much of the reconstruction that will enable the country to meet its responsibilities and to take its proper place among the family of nations. In this connection let me say the Greek officials handling the Government's finances are able men and have well maintained the Government's credit.

It was while in Greece that we first learned of floods in the Mississippi Valley. When our great, wealthy Nation is called on to cope with a flood disaster, the loss of life, reaching about 200, although serious, is slight in comparison with the frightful Greek calamity, and the disproportionate problem presented is apparent. Yet our home flood problem is nation-wide in its sympathy.

No minimizing of the Mississippi flood-control situation is needed to emphasize the stupendous size of the Greek refugees relief work. In our own case we have undertaken in a proper legislative way to cope with the situation, with unbounded resources to meet the situation. Our Government has generously aided Russia, Austria, Germany, and other peoples in recent years who have suffered from wars, famine, or other calamities. Grateful acknowledgments for such aid have come from officials of such governments speaking for their people, but in no country the world over, not even in what the propagandist terms "Darkest Russia" or desolated Armenia, will be found such destitute conditions as now exist in Greece, the once world-famous center of civilization. No dole system is possible from an impoverished Government, nor is that character of relief suggested by those conducting the relief work. Every effort is being exerted to aid pressing necessities and to make the refugees self-supporting.

In that service the oft-criticized League of Nations has taken up a humanitarian work that makes this agency the good Samaritan of Europe and to a limited extent a balance wheel in world affairs.

With these few words I have imperfectly attempted to describe the Greek problem that first of all requires immediate and constructive relief work for over a million people who have been thrown upon the homeland—a people destitute and helpless. That recovery and rehabilitation of the historic country carrying this heavy burden in addition to the effects of a disastrous war would discourage many people.

The Greeks have faced the situation with a courage and confidence that challenges the admiration of the world.

I attach a letter received January 5, 1928, which has a direct reference to the work of the commission and to the methods of financing that must occur to meet the needs of the refugee work. It was written by Chairman Eddy, of the commission, scarcely two weeks ago and gives a hopeful picture of meeting urgent need through the $12,000,000 loan advanced by our own Government. The letter reads:

THE REFUGEE SETTLEMENT COMMISSION,
Athens, December 22, 1927.

The Hon. JAMES E. FREAR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FREAR: When I was in Geneva last June I gave instructions that there should be sent to you various publications relating to Greece and other reconstruction projects sponsored by the League of Nations. I hope these various documents were received and that you found them interesting.

I am writing now because of the great interest I take, as chairman of the refugee settlement commission, in the fact that an agreement has been reached by Greece with the Treasury Department relating to the settlement of the debt of Greece to the United States. As part of this settlement, it is provided that the sum of approximately $12,100,000 will be advanced to Greece for use in completing the settlement of the refugees. It is particularly agreeable to me to know that one of the provisions of the agreement was that this sum should be spent by our commission.

I was in Geneva when the news of the settlement was received. Needless to say that it made a very strong and favorable impression upon all concerned.

The work of the commission has been proceeding since you were here, but naturally somewhat slowly, as the funds of the commission were near exhaustion. With the new credits which will be available from the United States loan and an additional £500,000 which will be available from a loan floated in the financial markets, it will be possible for the commission to make further progress with its work.

Hoping that you still retain your interest in this part of the world, and wishing you the compliments of the season, I am,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES B. EDDY.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to become the spokesman for the Middle Western section of the country by quoting for the benefit of the Members of the House an editorial from the Omaha Bee-News of Saturday, December 24, 1927, dealing with the subject of the development and growth of river navigation and general internal improvements.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the Omaha Bee-News of Saturday, December 24, 1927, dealing with the subject of the development and growth of river navigation and general internal improvements, which is as follows:

MID WEST MUST BE ON GUARD

Now comes the flood control bill. As reported by the committee, it provides for the total cost to be paid out of national funds. The President in his message urged that one-fifth of the cost should be charged against the land to be benefited.

The resulting debate in Congress between these two points of view will inevitably bring into discussion the problem of the Panama Canal, inland waterway development, and irrigation in the semiarid lands of the West and Middle West.

The question first to be considered is:

"Why is there a flood problem in the lower Mississippi Valley?"

The answer is:

"Because cities and towns and farms are located on the natural flood plain of the great river. The river has been spreading out over that flood plain for ages, long before man came to build cities and towns and lay out farms. The people in these cities and towns and on these farms are defying nature when they build on the Mississippi flood plain. They have gone there with their eyes open, they know that the river overflows, but the land is so rich they have been willing to bear the cost of keeping the river back, keeping it within the levees they have built."

Then comes the great flood; the river climbs over the highest levees and inundates the cities and the towns and the farms that have been pushed out onto the flood plain—that have encroached upon the land that, since time immemorial, has periodically been covered by the Father of Waters.

Under the stress of the disaster following this last great flood those who have encroached upon the natural flood plain of the Mississippi River come to Congress demanding relief.

Stripped of the tragedy of the flood and of the losses that the flood brought with it, here is what the people of the lower Mississippi River demand:

"We have built our cities and our towns and located our farms right to the very edge of the river at low water. We have spent millions of dollars in building levees, yet every year we must build these levees higher. In spite of the millions we have spent, the river is still the master; the river still overflows the lowlands and drowns us out. We want the Nation to pay the cost of the battle from now on."

President Coolidge says that if these lowlands are valuable, if they are worth preserving, worth protecting, then the people who own these lands should at least pay for one-fifth of the cost of protecting them. The flood control bill now before Congress, as reported by the committee, provides that the people who own these lands shall pay nothing; that the people of the Nation shall pay it all.

Thus the issue is joined. The Omaha Bee-News has already called attention to this situation. What are we in the Middle West going to have to say about it? In the semiarid section of the Middle West, whenever water is put onto the land through irrigation, the people who own that land pay the entire cost of the project; they pay the entire cost of maintaining it. In the last analysis, what is the difference between the position of the man on an irrigated farm who wants water on his land and the man on a lowland farm who wants the water kept off?

The Representatives in Congress from the lower Mississippi States and from the semiarid regions of the Middle West must bear in mind that this flood control bill is destined to set a precedent. If it is right to tax the whole Nation for the entire cost of keeping water off the land—or, for that matter, to tax them for four-fifths of the cost—then the farmer on irrigated land has a right to demand the same thing for putting water on his farm—the principle must work both ways.

The Representatives from the Middle West will and should demand that the flood-control program include reservoirs on the upper reaches of the rivers that pour their waters into the Mississippi lowlands. These reservoirs are necessary to a real program of flood control.

In the arguments advanced by the Representatives from the southern Mississippi River States they call attention to the fact that at one time levees only 4 feet high sufficed to protect New Orleans from the floods, whereas to-day levees 60 feet high are needed in some sections. Thus the levee system has largely defeated itself through building up the bottom of the river and making higher levees necessary.

A real flood-control plan, therefore, calls for reservoirs on the upper Missouri and on the upper reaches of other tributary rivers to hold the floods back. Therefore, too, these reservoirs should be built out of funds taken from the National Treasury.

The Middle West agreed to tax itself for the building of the Panama Canal. The Middle West is now suffering from the low long-haul freight rates that the canal gives those living in the coast sections. As an offset to these rates the Middle West is demanding that the inland waterways system be completed as rapidly as possible, and that these inland waterways be paid for out of national taxation.

These two things offset each other. There is an agreement that the inland waterways be paid for out of the National Treasury. There should also be an agreement that the building of reservoirs shall be a part of the flood-control plan, and that these reservoirs be paid for out of national funds.

Any plan to saddle the cost of protecting the lowlands in the Mississippi River flood basin onto the Nation as a whole should be fought by Representatives of the Middle West unless those plans include reservoirs that shall also be paid for out of national funds.

Any other plan would mean the saddling of millions of dollars of the flood costs, as well as the saddling of the Panama Canal costs, on the Middle West, without any corresponding benefit to the people who live in the inland empire.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONSERVATION OF FISHERIES RESOURCES

Mr. WHITEHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer for a moment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce, which includes the Bureau of Fisheries, and in that connection to insert an address delivered by the superintendent

of the bureau on June 6, 1927, at Independence, Va., on the conservation of our fishery resources. This address was not only very interesting but very instructive. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the address referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITEHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of Mr. E. C. Fearnow, of the United States Bureau of Fisheries, made at Independence, Va., June 6, 1927:

Mr. FEARNOW. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate the kind expressions just made by your chairman and your Congressman in regard to the work of the Bureau of Fisheries and am glad to see so much interest manifested by the people of this section of the Nation in the "conservation of our fisheries resources," about which I will speak to you this morning.

Virginia offers an excellent field for fish propagation and should be made into a paradise for the sportsman. You have the salt-water fishes and migratory species on the eastern coast, with natural breeding grounds for the large-mouth black bass, blue gill, and crappie. In the mountains of Carroll and Grayson Counties the waters are ideal for the cold-water fishes, such as brook trout and rainbow trout. The Shenandoah River is the home for the much-sought-for small-mouth black bass, while the headwaters of many of its tributaries offer a congenial environment for brook trout. As practically every Temperate Zone plant thrives in Virginia, thus permitting a diversity of crops, so do divers species of fish thrive in the waters of the State. Such a valuable natural asset should be developed to the limit. Mountain streams of 60° Fahrenheit, such as exist in Carroll and Grayson Counties, ought to be teeming with trout. What is the reason why the numerous plants of fish are not producing maximum results? In the first place, you need a system of conservation such as has been outlined, as no amount of fish planting can compensate for fish taken out of streams where promiscuous and indiscriminate fishing is allowed. In the second place, you need large-sized fish instead of fry. The Bureau of Fisheries has come to the conclusion that fry are not producing the best results, and in order to furnish large-sized fish it is cooperating with various organizations in the rearing of trout to the fingerling stage.

The Federal trout hatcheries are equipped for incubating large numbers of eggs, but they do not have the facilities for rearing young fish until they are 3 or 4 inches long. It is generally conceded that 4-inch fish have an excellent chance to survive, while a large number of the fry planted in streams inhabited by large fish simply serve as food for the predatory species.

The Bureau of Fisheries is trying to find means for rearing its output of trout to the fingerling stage and is asking organizations and individuals who have suitable sites for rearing fish to cooperate to the extent of furnishing sites and food for 10,000 to 40,000 trout until they are large enough to care for themselves in open waters. Many organizations throughout the country are now successfully rearing trout in nurseries on the cooperative basis. The fry are furnished by the Government during April or May free of charge. The organization rears them until October, when they are planted in near-by waters. The bureau furnishes an experienced fish culturist to give advice in regard to the care of the fish, and in October an employee experienced in fish distribution is sent to direct the planting of the output in suitable waters.

Cooperative trout nurseries are being considered at Galax, Independence, and Troutdale.

While nearly all fishes are remarkably prolific there is a great variation in this respect among the different species. For example, at the Federal fish hatchery at Neosho, Mo., a bream 1¼ pounds in weight produced over 2,000 eggs and a 4-pound black bass about 9,000. At the Cape Vincent, N. Y., fish hatchery a 1½-pound yellow perch yielded 25,000 eggs and a normal-sized pike perch was found to contain 250,000. An 80-pound codfish spawned at one of the Federal fish hatcheries in Massachusetts produced 3,250,000 eggs, while instances have been recorded of the production of 9,000,000 eggs from a single cod of large size. The highest record for sturgeon appears to be 7,000,000 eggs.

In view of this great profusion it would seem to the uninitiated that the future of the fisheries might safely be left to work itself out by natural processes. As a matter of fact, however, the great waste which goes on in connection with other forms of life is greatly intensified among the fishes. If one-tenth of the fish eggs annually deposited were to result in fully matured fish there would be no need to resort to artificial methods for the conservation and improvement of our fisheries.

The first heavy drain upon the supply is immediately after the eggs have been deposited, as many of them never come in contact with the fertilizing medium and thus fail to develop. Others in enormous numbers are consumed by many enemies, including fish, crustacea, insects, and birds. In view of the many vicissitudes to which the eggs are subjected at all stages of their development, it is not likely that more than 25 per cent of those deposited ever hatch. Further, it is estimated that of the fry produced not more than 25 per cent live to attain maturity, even in waters receiving adequate protection; and in the case of small streams and lakes where unrestricted fishing is allowed, especially seining and gigging, it is doubtful if even 1 per cent of the fry hatched in these waters ever survive to the age of maturity. Though powerful, the capacity of the waters for the production of fish life is not without limit, and we have been too prone to regard the fisheries of our country as a free for all harvest, reaping where nothing has been sown.

REASONS FOR DISAPPEARANCE OF FISH

In primeval times our streams were well stocked with desirable species of fishes, but the balance so admirably maintained by the unhindered working of natural laws has been destroyed by the activities attending civilized life. Before this country was settled, when Indians were the sole fishermen, they were satisfied to take only enough fish to fill immediate needs. There was then no thought of gain or of preserving the flesh and shipping it to distant points. With the rapid increase of the population all this has been changed, and especially since the automobile has been adopted as a common means of transportation, opening as it has to easy access and consequent depletion vast numbers of streams and lakes in all sections of the United States which a comparatively few years ago were regarded as inaccessible. The altered conditions and the increasing requirements of civilization are constantly making it more difficult to maintain good fishing in public waters.

The early settlers were driven by force of circumstances to pursue a policy of destruction, and this to a great extent explains the present scarcity of fish and game, as the conditions comprising a favorable environment for wild life had to be sacrificed. Timbered lands were converted into fields for the raising of crops, and with the destruction of the forests the water supply was so greatly reduced that many streams formerly favorable to trout and bass were thereby unfitted for the maintenance of desirable forms of fish life. In the cutting of the forests many lands were cleared that might to much better advantage been left undisturbed, as their subsequent use for agriculture has demonstrated.

Many of our best streams have become so polluted through the discharge therein of refuse from manufacturing plants that game fish will no longer survive in them. High dams for hydroelectric plants have been built, excluding anadromous fishes from their natural spawning areas in the headwaters of coastal streams. Nets are laid out to the channels of rivers from either side, making it impossible for shad and herring to pursue their normally sinuous course upstream. There is also to be reckoned with the numerous individuals who fish the year around, including the spawning period, at which time fish are tame and can be easily caught. The catching of a bass during the breeding season may mean the loss of from 3,000 to 6,000 fry.

The conditions described demand prompt remedial action if we are to retain some of our more desirable species of fish. Though great, the difficulties to be overcome are not insurmountable. It would seem that the ingenuity which can plan a great dam might devise means for fish to pass over it. It would also seem that both the commercial fisherman and the angler might be taught to use without abusing the resources of our country. In keeping with our remarkable progress along commercial lines, we should see to it that our important aquatic life is protected. Up to this time the great difficulty has been that all available resources are applied to matters involving immediate pecuniary gain, leaving neither time nor attention to devote to the work of conservation.

Deforestation on a large scale has so changed the flow of our streams as to convert them into torrents during the season of heavy precipitation and into stagnant pools in the dry period of the year. It is plainly apparent that it will be necessary to adopt measures for holding back the waters of streams through the medium of the numerous lakes located on adjoining fish and game preserves, and also by reforesting the lands in the vicinity of their headwaters.

VALUE OF PROPAGATION WORK OVERESTIMATED

The delay in adopting constructive measures for the conservation of fish life is probably to be attributed largely to the discovery of the artificial method of propagating fish eggs. With means at hand for artificially hatching fish it has become the opinion of many that conservation work is superfluous; that every stream, lake, and pond would soon be teeming with fish as a result of the work done at the Federal and State hatcheries. There could be no greater mistake. While the importance of the discovery can not be disputed, experience has demonstrated beyond a doubt that artificial propagation, unaided, can not compensate for the large numbers of fish annually taken from our streams and lakes. Moreover, no method has yet been devised which will permit of the successful manipulation of eggs of such nest-building species as the black basses. In view of these facts it is apparent that a practical system of conservation will have to be adopted as an aid

in maintaining in our waters the salmons, trouts, basses, and other desirable species of fish. While the Federal Government and the States can furnish fish to serve as a brood stock, they can not hope to maintain good fishing by such means, but must have the active cooperation of organizations and individuals in protecting the fish placed therein. The public should not expect to catch fish that have been planted in their waters before they have had time to attain maturity and reproduce. Neither should it insist on the planting of fish in localities where the prevailing sentiment is unfavorable to the enforcement of adequate laws for the protection of fish and game.

It would, of course, be nice if the Government could keep plenty of fish in every body of water and they could be taken out whenever desired without any restrictions. It would also be convenient to have our farm yards and fields kept stocked with poultry and livestock by the Government. However, such paternalism is neither practicable nor in accord with American ideas. Although the Government does raise livestock, it is done with the sole view of improving the quality and it is never distributed indiscriminately. It would appear that certain individuals are prone to rely too much on the annual planting of fish and are losing sight entirely of the equally important work of protecting and conserving the stock already in the waters.

FISH CONSERVATION

It is recognized that it will always be necessary to propagate and distribute fish for maintaining the supply in public waters, but to insure efficient results from such work a system of fish conservation so thorough that it will go to the very root of the difficulties encountered at the present time should be put into practical operation; a system that will enlist the active cooperation of every association and every angler. It is generally understood that our waters are deficient in fish life; that many streams, owing to pollution, are unsuitable for the clear-water species; that migratory fishes are being excluded by high dams and other barriers from their natural spawning grounds; and that physical conditions of some streams have so changed in recent years that indigenous fishes no longer find in them a congenial environment.

The problem is to make two or more fish grow where only one is growing and, if possible, make them grow in waters where they do not now exist. Apparently the sportsmen are willing to assist in the execution of any feasible plan of fish conservation that may be adopted. The letters that have come in from different sections of the country indicate that they are impatient to begin work of rehabilitating overfished waters but are in doubt as to the proper course to pursue. The trouble seems to be that there is no system of conservation in operation that is generally acceptable to the extent that all organizations are willing to risk its adoption. The plan decided upon must be so simple and so clear as to make its feasability self-evident.

In their efforts to solve the problem many sportsmen are suggesting fish hatcheries, having in mind the fish-cultural stations operated under Federal or State authority or by private management, where fish are either artificially hatched in troughs and jars or bred in a series of ponds under more or less natural conditions. Now, what is needed in the great majority of cases is not a hatchery with all its attendant problems, but the application of some practical method for conserving and multiplying the fish already in the waters. In a great many instances good advice is needed more than a stock of fish. Restocking should not be resorted to unless a state of almost actual depletion exists, and not then until the cause of the depletion has been ascertained and eliminated. So long as the basis of a brood stock exists in a body of water there is an opportunity to build up its fishing. It is an economic waste to permit adult fish to be caught promiscuously and depend solely on plants of small fish to maintain the supply. Such a procedure is like killing all the hens and depending upon the incubator to produce chickens, losing sight of the necessity of the mature fowls for the production of eggs. There can be no better time than the present to advocate the inauguration of some simple and effective method for conserving and increasing the supply of fish in public waters.

THE HABITS OF FISH

We know very little of the habits of fish, especially of such inland species as the bass and the bluegill. It would be a valuable aid to the conservationist to know whether or not fish travel great distances up or down stream, what influences them in such movements—whether it is the water temperature, the food supply, or some other cause. If it were a settled fact that fish planted at a given point in a stream would remain near that point under certain conditions we might strive to produce those conditions in fish refuges and feel confident that the fish placed in them would not wander far beyond the limits of the refuge. We should then be free to apply our energies to the raising of fish in streams without going to the expense of constructing inclosures for brood stock and could use the ponds that are too small to maintain food fish for the production of minnows to serve as a food supply for stocking the refuges.

A system of tagging fish similar to the method pursued in the work with salmon and the marine fishes might be successfully employed in studying the habits of fishes of our inland waters. Fingerling fish with small tags clasped either to the dorsal or ventral fin are released at various places and a careful record made of the points of deposit. A few years afterwards rewards are offered for the tags with information as to where the fish bearing them were taken. The recovery of several hundred tags with data as to points of capture, the season of the year they were taken, and other relevant facts would furnish sufficient data on which to base scientific conclusions in the formation of a policy of fish conservation.

SURVEY OF STREAMS AND LAKES

In order to determine just what is needed to increase the supply of fish in any body of water the logical course to pursue is to conduct an ecological survey and thus be in a position to rectify any faulty condition of the water that may exist. It may be that it is polluted, that it is deficient in food, or it may simply need restocking. There are remedies for all these defects. Refuse from factories, the common cause of pollution, can be disposed of at a profit by manufacturers. Minnows can be raised by the million and released in the streams and lakes, and depleted waters can be restocked with fish propagated at the hatcheries.

The same judgment is required in raising fish that must be exercised in raising plants and livestock. It is a paying investment in agriculture to have the soil tested when there is doubt as to what is needed to produce a desired crop. In fish culture we have in the past been content with restocking and have paid little or no attention to stream conditions. As a result considerable effort has been wasted and we have failed to accomplish much permanent good. In order to make them produce the maximum amount of food our streams and lakes need attention the same as our fields. After exhausting the soil of eastern farms many of the owners moved westward. Now, they are coming back and reclaiming the soil they left and are making it fruitful to a truly remarkable extent. Our streams have been neglected as the soil of our eastern farms was neglected, but it is not too late to reclaim them if immediate action is taken.

FOOD FOR FISH AN IMPORTANT REQUISITE

Streams and lakes which otherwise form a suitable environment for fish are frequently found to be deficient in a food supply. Plants feed on the gases inimical to fish life and turn these gases into the oxygen so essential to it. Plants attract insects which constitute a most desirable natural food for fish. The black bass has a ravenous appetite for live food, and if he can not get it from other living organisms around him he will prey upon his own kind.

Some 8 or 10 years ago a man in Ohio wrote the Bureau of Fisheries that with the view of attracting insect life to his pond he had placed over it an electric light; that since its installation the large bass in the pond frequently jumped a foot or more out of the water to catch insects. Later this method of attracting insects was adopted by the Kansas fisheries authorities and has proved quite successful. Electric wires were strung over a system of ponds where channel catfish are reared and a number of bulbs suspended near the water, a single push button controlling the system. The lights were found to attract myriads of insects, many of which strike the water and are quickly snapped up by numerous small catfish. Fed in this way it is said that channel catfish grow twice as large as those subsisting on the ordinary food found in the water with the addition of clam and cornmeal porridge, etc. Any method that will attract insects to waters where fish are being raised may be considered desirable.

In order to provide a source of food supply for young fish, goldfish breeders near Frederick, Md., draw the water from their breeding ponds in the fall, manure and plow the soil, omitting potash, and with the approach of the breeding season in the spring they transfer the brood fish from their winter quarters to these ponds to spawn.

Dr. G. C. Embody, of Cornell University, who has conducted some interesting experiments in cultivating live food for fish, breeds mosquitoes in a system of pools and releases the larvae in ponds to be eaten by small fish. He is able by this means to hold the mosquitoes under complete control.

Nearly all of the bait minnows belong to the Cyprinidæ, a large family of vegetation-feeding fish which includes the carp. These minnows afford a practical means of quickly converting plant life into live food for fish, and in cases where the food problem must be reckoned with it is advisable to stock small ponds in the environs of streams and lakes with such desirable minnows as the shiner and sand perch and use their progeny as fish food.

The time will doubtless come when we shall find it feasible to produce the lower forms of life in large quantities to serve as a natural food for bass and trout and when every cubic foot of water will be utilized to add to the human food supply. This is the prevailing condition to-day in Europe, where aquaculture is practiced on a large scale and salable plants and fish are raised in the same body of water.

REFUGES AND BREEDING GROUNDS

Lakes or ponds where selected individuals can be protected and the young allowed to escape into adjacent streams would doubtless furnish the necessary protection to the brood stock of our game fishes. To

hold brood fish in streams not subject to severe freshets 10 or 20 acres could be fenced off with poultry netting of a mesh small enough to retain the adults but large enough to permit the small fish to escape into the open waters. The brood stock could be released each year and new stock selected from the stream, the pound being moved occasionally to insure a reasonable supply of natural food at all times.

Of course, if a lake of 10 acres or more could be constructed on waste land, thereby adding to the water area of a stream, it would prove ideal for the breeding of fish. It is usually quite expensive, however, to develop a project of this kind even where natural conditions are favorable. On account of the expense involved most of the lakes constructed for fish culture have been comparatively small, and for that reason they have not been highly successful financially. Experience has shown that bass require large water areas and that it is practically useless to attempt to raise them in small inclosures.

Fish refuges, lakes, and ponds should be placed under the supervision of a responsible person to insure against the illegal removal of their occupants. Waters should be carefully studied to determine which ones can be used most effectively as breeding grounds. The term "fish refuge" implies a section of a stream that has been set aside for breeding grounds on account of its favorable environment.

A NOVEL METHOD OF OBTAINING BROOD FISH

That popular game fish, the black bass, and also other species, may be caught with hook and line and transported to a reasonable distance. If hooked in the mouth and the hook carefully removed, the fish are not wounded to the extent that they will not make good breeders, but if a fish swallows the hook its vital parts are liable to be injured in the process of removing it. A pail of shallow water is all that is necessary for conveying fish a reasonable distance, as a large fish—especially a bass—will keep the water agitated sufficiently to provide the necessary aeration for a trip of a few hours duration. In fact, a 4-pound bass would not need more than 2 gallons of water in a vessel 12 or 14 inches in diameter to insure its successful transportation for a few hours and possibly longer, provided the water temperature was not too high.

Would it be too much to ask fisheries organizations to cooperate in obtaining brood stock, each angler to furnish two selected individuals for breeders at the beginning of a season, such fish to be placed in an ideal environment for the renewal of the supply in a stream? The idea entails infinite possibilities and seems worthy of a trial. The matter of obtaining brood bass, crappie, and bluegill has constituted a serious problem at practically every hatchery in the United States, whether operated by the Federal Government, a State, or by private individuals.

IMPROVING THE SPECIES

Since fish will not thrive if held for more than a few years in ponds it follows that there is little opportunity to improve the species at a permanently established fish-cultural station, and it is not always possible to secure new stock when needed. Even goldfish breeders find it necessary to exchange stock and purchase new breeders frequently in order to maintain or improve the quality of their fish. Fish deteriorate or run out similar to sheep or other animals if left too long in a limited area.

At the beginning of a season the fish possessing the highest aggregate of good points should be selected to breed from. Brewer's law of selection can be advantageously applied in the breeding of fish in streams. The relative value of the species may also be changed and the form modified to suit the taste of anglers. We breed our best animals by selection, and is it not reasonable to infer from this fact that by annually selecting the largest and gamest bass for breeders we might eventually produce a superbass, one that would furnish an undreamed-of kick?

PRACTICAL FISH CONSERVATION

Many anglers are in the game for the sport it furnishes. Frequently they catch fish, take their measurements, enlarge on the measurements a little, and return the fish to the waters only to be caught by other anglers who may not be so considerate. It is believed that the average angler would be willing to contribute an occasional fish from his catch to assist in maintaining the brood stock, thereby furthering the great work of conservation. The plan in brief calls upon the anglers of the country to turn over a few adult fish for the purpose of maintaining the supply in the waters and thus assist in one of the most difficult problems connected with the propagation of black bass. The States would be asked to set aside pounds or refuges where the fish could be adequately protected until after the close of the breeding season, when they would be released. The selection of sites for such refuges would require an expert knowledge of aquatic biology and the question of a food supply and immunity of the site from the natural enemies of fish would also have to be given careful study, but consider the results that might be attained from such a course. Under favorable conditions one brood bass will produce from 6,000 to 8,000 fry and in a refuge, with proper care, one-third of these should attain legal size for catching. If by systematically pursuing such a course one fisherman can increase the supply of bass by 2,500 or even 500 individuals annually would this not prove a solution of the bass problem? As eggs of commercial fish are purchased from fishermen, it would be perfectly feasible to pay the angler a fixed price for any brood stock obtained from him.

Summing up the proposition, we have provided for (1) selected brood stock obtained without robbing the streams; (2) ponds, lakes, or refuges where all fishing is prohibited; (3) open waters with fishing allowed under well-regulated restrictions. The entire plan could be placed on an established basis by one organization working in cooperation with either the Federal or a State Government.

After being in constant use for two or three years, fish refuges could be thrown open for public fishing, but before doing this new refuges should be started at other points, so that the work of conservation might proceed uninterruptedly. Planning in this way a new refuge would be established each year and an old one thrown open for public fishing, thereby insuring the continuance of good fishing.

Fisheries organizations, rod and gun clubs, and conservation associations, including in their membership business men, professional men, and mechanics, banded together for the protection and propagation of wild life, annually collect large sums of money which they use in the improvement of local streams and lakes, purchase of birds for the stocking of game preserves, food for wild birds, etc. To many an organization of this kind the Federal Government and also the States are indebted, not only for material assistance rendered in the stocking of public waters but for developing and fostering a sentiment favoring the enforcement of the fisheries laws. Fisheries organizations are in a position to render incalculable aid in carrying out the conservation scheme outlined, as they would have no difficulty in assembling sufficient brood fish every year for the maintenance of the local supply.

BENEFITS DERIVED FROM ANGLING

Fishing is engaged in by more of our population than is hunting, probably for the reason that it is at its height during the vacation period, and, besides, women and children who do not wish to hunt often go fishing. The apostolic calling, therefore, possesses more lure than the pastime of Nimrod. Fishing attracts people to isolated sections that they would otherwise not visit.

The benefits derived from fishing can not be estimated. Some States have attempted to place a value on their inland fisheries, taking into consideration the financial returns that accrue annually from the sale of fishing tackle, railroad transportation, hotel receipts from tourists, and commercial value of the product, all of which amount to millions of dollars. These values, however, are estimated in dollars and cents and the unknown quantity which is the most important of all is the bringing of the population into contact with nature at a time when nature is at her best and the tired business man at his worst. The inspiration received from fishing and its effect on the social and economic life of the country is more than the value of the product taken. Fishermen learn patience, as fish can not be forced to take the bait. Most fishermen are true conservationists, fishing for the recreation and paying very little attention to the value of the product taken. Indeed, many of them return the fish to the waters from which they were taken.

I have a great deal of confidence in and respect for the angler. It has been said that fishermen are a good-for-nothing class, but it is not true. Angling is one of the most wholesome recreations and anglers are the most patient and considerate class of people we have. As the milk woman said to Walton, "They be such civil and quiet men." The angler gets a thrill that comes in no other way. He feels the very heartbeats of nature, and nature is at her best when fishing is good. Fish can not be prodded, can not be coaxed; you just have to sit there and wait. If you have patience, the reward is yours.

"Oh, it's lovely when they're running
And they're hungry and they're fine,
And they strike and keep on tugging
On your bait and on your line;
But the fellow that's worth praising
And that has the record right
Is the lad that keeps on fishing
When—the—fish—don't—bite."

It was fishing that gave us our first actual experience with life, its ups and downs, its successes and failures. We have learned to keep on fishing, even though the fish do not bite, and this persistence instilled into us in youth has enabled us to continue on hoping for success and sometimes attaining it when otherwise we might give up. I believe it is for the reason that fishermen are open-minded that they have figured so largely in progressive movements in the history of the world. They have learned how to bear with adversity and take advantage of an opportune moment.

"Who bides his time and fevers not
In the hot race that none achieves,
Shall wear cool-wreathen laurel, wrought
With crimson berries in the leaves;
And he shall reign a goodly king,
And sway his hand o'er every clime,
With peace writ on his signet ring,
Who bides his time."

As a pastime and character builder angling has no equal; so every youth should have an opportunity to experience the pleasures and adversities of fishing.

I take the view that good fishing is the culmination of a number of conditions that are essential for agriculture, manufacturing, and other lines of industry; that it is the resultant of conditions ideal for the conservation of our resources, the key to conservation. The conditions favorable for fish life in streams are conducive to a liberal supply of game on land. The requirements for good fishing are unpolluted waters, an even flow, and plenty of natural food. Forests and lakes, the prime essentials for land mammals and migratory birds, are needed to produce the conditions favorable for fish; so good fishing is the star to which the conservationist can safely hitch his wagon. Conditions that will replenish waters with desirable forms of fish life will benefit the country as a whole. The system that will produce the results must combine conservation with common sense, practical science with practical fish culture, and have the support of the various game and fisheries organizations of the country. Under such a system will the hunter bring in bags of game and the angler strings of fish. The future of fish and game rests largely with the sportsmen.

POSTPONEMENT OF A SENATE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 is similar to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11, which has already been passed. The Chair announces, therefore, that the consideration of the Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 is indefinitely postponed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BELL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 6, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, January 6, 1928, as reported by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2

(10.30 a. m.)

Concerning the election of JAMES M. BECK as a Representative from Pennsylvania (H. Res. 9).

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Senator BRATTON and Representative MORROW, of New Mexico, and members of the Mississippi River Commission discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact (H. R. 5773).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce (H. R. 5641).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Joint meeting in the office of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

For the relief of taxpayers having suits against Juan G. Gallardo, treasurer of Porto Rico, for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of taxes imposed by the laws of Porto Rico, pending in the Supreme Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and in the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, affected by the act of March 4, 1927, amending the act of March 2, 1917, as amended by the act of June 7, 1924 (H. R. 6474).

For the relief of certain Porto Rican taxpayers (S. 754).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

272. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill authorizing the appropriation of $2,000 for the relief of Enriqueta Koch v de Jeanneret, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 343. A bill to amend section 128, subdivision (b), paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code as amended February 13, 1925, relating to appeals from district courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6057. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4702. A bill to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin S. McHenry; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6005. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Boyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6839. A bill to remove the charge of desertion against Israel Brown and to grant him an honorable discharge; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6917. A bill to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7227. A bill for the relief of William H. Dotson; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7228. A bill for the relief of Frederick Leininger; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7229. A bill for the relief of Henry Simons; without amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FURLOW: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7397. A bill authorizing the President to order Richard B. Barnitz before a retiring board for a hearing of his case and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7553. A bill for the relief of James Neal; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7779. A bill for the relief of William H. Wagoner; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7992. A bill for the relief of Sally Mattie Macready, widow of Edward Daniel Macready; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8190. A bill for the relief of John G. Cassidy; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1534. A bill to correct the military record of John Dewitt Marvin; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to Mollie B. Gore; Committee on Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6563) granting a pension to Oscar W. Clark; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5292) for the relief of Mattie Holcomb; Committee on Claims discharged and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6806) granting a pension to Samantha Elliott; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8523) to promote consolidation and cooperation in the mining and marketing of bituminous coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 8524) to regulate and fix rates of pay for certain employees of the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 8525) to exempt the United States Military Academy from the provisions of section 3648, Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 8526) to establish a minimum area for a Shenandoah National Park, for administration, protection, and general development by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8527) conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the charterer of the steamship *Trontolite* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 8528) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain widows, minor children, helpless children, and dependent parents of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8529) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine questions of law involved in the alleged erroneous collection of tonnage taxes in 1920 and 1921 on three vessels operated by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, under bareboat charter from a Danzig corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 8530) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River, near Cedar Bluff, in Cherokee County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8531) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River on the Columbiana-Talladega road between Talladega and Shelby Counties, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8532) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887 (24 Stat. L. p. 355); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8533) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8534) to discontinue certain reports now required by law to be made to Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 8535) for the award of the air-male flyer's medal of honor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8536) to amend section 11 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8537) for the relief of retired and transferred members of the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8538) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a narcotic prison hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 8539) granting a license to the Vicksburg Bridge & Terminal Co. to cross the Vicksburg National Military Park at Vicksburg, Warren County, Miss.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 8540) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 8541) to provide equal pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8542) to provide for the construction of a hospital at Fort Bidwell Indian School, California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8543) to provide for the construction of a school building at Fort Bidwell Indian School, California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 8544) to provide for the protection of municipal watersheds within the national forests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8545) to provide a 1-cent postal rate on local letters and expedite the handling of that class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8546) authorizing an appropriation of $2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Lititz, Pa., to commemorate the burial place of 110 American soldiers who were wounded in the Battle of Brandywine and died in the military hospital at Lititz; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 8547) providing for the increase of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 8548) to refer the claims of the Loyal Creek Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8549) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8550) to amend the national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8551) to create an additional judge in the district of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8552) authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street, adjacent to Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8553) to provide for the destruction and eradication of predatory animals in the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8554) to amend the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. L. 1217; sec. 980, title 10, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8555) to authorize district courts of the United States to provide for reports of misdemeanor cases by United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8556) to facilitate disposition of the business of United States district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 8557) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8558) relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 8559) to amend section 58 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8560) to make more adequate provisions for pensions for members of the permanent military and naval service of the United States, their widows and dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 8561) to provide for the conduct of scientific investigations by the Forest Service to discover economically practical methods of the disposal of the waste materials of pulp and paper mills without polluting

streams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8562) appropriating for Menominee Indians out of their funds to enable them to work their lands, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8563) authorizing payment of interest on certain refunded purchase moneys; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 8564) providing for the conducting of silvicultural protection, economic, range, and other research at the Northern Rocky Mountain Forest Experiment Station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8565) to authorize leave of absence for departmental employees under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 8566) to amend an act entitled, "An act to provide for the appointment of Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, as warrant officers, United States Army," approved April 27, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 8567) to amend section 29 of the act of March 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," and for the insertion of a new section in said act between sections 29 and 30 of said act, to be designated as "29½" of said act; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) making provision for the improvement of the national memorial to George Washington in the District of Columbia by the erection of a suitable base; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOLADAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) for the appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) authorizing additional appropriation for memorial building to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BUTLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine *S–4* and upon methods and appliances for the protection of submarines; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 132) to authorize the erection in Anadarko, Okla., of a monument to Black Beaver; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PRATT: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 133) providing for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the government of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) to grant permission for the erection of a memorial statue of Cardinal Gibbons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) for the relief of special disbursing agents of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8569) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8570) granting an increase of pension to Esther L. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 8571) granting an increase of pension to Lenora Lowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8572) for the relief of the legal representatives of Michael Mayers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOIES: A bill (H. R. 8573) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. McLeran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8574) for the relief of Thomas Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8575) for the relief of Thomas Gaffney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8576) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8577) granting a pension to Viva White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 8578) granting a pension to Edith Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 8579) for the relief of Gabriel Mead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 8580) granting an increase of pension to Angeline R. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 8581) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8582) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Lacey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8583) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Lentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8584) granting an increase of pension to Helen A. E. Witman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8585) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8586) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8587) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8588) granting a pension to Alice Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAREW: A bill (H. R. 8589) for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8590) for the relief of Nicholas Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLEY: A bill (H. R. 8591) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Lawler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 8592) granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Harlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8593) granting an increase of pension to America Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8594) granting a pension to Sallie Bloodson, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8595) granting a pension to George Bunch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8596) for the relief of Homer N. Horine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 8597) for the relief of Ernest L. Silvers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8598) for the relief of James J. Dower; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 8599) for the relief of George D. Vedder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 8600) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Stutzman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8601) for the relief of William J. Hopkins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8602) for the relief of John B. Evans; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 8603) granting an increase of pension to Martha Schmelzle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) granting an increase of pension to Susan Piggott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to James H. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8606) granting an increase of pension to Chloe Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8607) granting a pension to Nellie Snapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8608) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 8609) for the relief of J. H. Muus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to John Vetter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 8611) for the relief of the First National Bank of Santa Maria, State of California; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8612) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8613) granting an increase of pension to John E. Lagle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8614) granting an increase of pension to James C. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) granting a pension to Liviana Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 8616) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Doughty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 8617) providing compensation to M. J. Harbinson for injuries sustained while in the Government service at and on the Belknap Reservation, Mont., engaged as a moundsman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8618) granting an increase of pension to John D. Harrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 8619) granting a pension to Eliza A. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8620) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Avery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 8621) for the relief of the estates of John Frazer, deceased; Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; John Bunch, deceased; Jehu Underwood, deceased; and Stephen Vanzandt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8622) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Brownell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 8623) granting an increase of pension to Minerva J. Raybell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 8624) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8625) granting a pension to Ruth McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8626) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8627) for the relief of John Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8628) for the relief of Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 8629) granting an increase of pension to Emmer A. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8630) granting a pension to William J. Keister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8631) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe J. Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8632) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 8633) for the relief of Mary Kent; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 8634) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8635) granting an increase of pension to Morris E. Leighty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8636) granting an increase of pension to Esther Van Buskirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8637) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Boes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8638) granting a pension to Katherine Raney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 8639) granting an increase of pension to Delia Lammers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8640) granting a pension to Cordelia Van Dorsten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8641) granting an increase of pension to Jessie W. Leclere; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8642) for the relief of William W. Woodruff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 8643) for the relief of William Taylor Coburn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8644) granting a pension to Blanche L. Waterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8645) granting a pension to Alamanza Korsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8646) granting a pension to Frances Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8647) granting a pension to Rebecca Jane Gouge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 8648) for the relief of Anna Osburg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8649) granting a pension to Sarah A. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 8650) for the relief of C. S. Winans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8651) for the relief of Lynn W. Franklin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 8652) granting an increase of pension to Jane Louise Tymeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8653) granting an increase of pension to Alice Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8654) granting a pension to Thomas Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8655) granting a pension to Lydia Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 8656) for the relief of Harry E. Craven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8657) granting a pension to Mary J. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8658) granting a pension to Laura Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8659) granting an increase of pension to William Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8660) granting an increase of pension to Addie Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8661) granting an increase of pension to Alice O'Hearn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8662) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8663) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Breen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8664) granting a pension to Tillie D. Entrikin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8665) granting a pension to Eugene Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 8666) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8667) granting an increase of pension to Useba McMullen Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 8668) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Roche; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Anna Houghtlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8670) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8671) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Ethel L. Saunders; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) to correct the naval record of William E. Adams; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8673) for the relief of Edward F. Weiskopf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Lester Cooley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8675) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Hallock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8676) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Goodsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8677) granting an increase of pension to Maggie M. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8678) granting an increase of pension to Ann S. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8681) granting an increase of pension to Jennie S. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to Ella S. Lormore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8683) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Paulman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8684) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Van Tuyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) granting an increase of pension to Delia L. Maricle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8686) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Tongue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Givens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) granting a pension to Margaret A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 8689) granting a pension to Josie Duval; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 8690) for the relief of John F. White and Mary L. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) for the relief of Helen Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 8692) granting an increase of pension to Hettie C. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8693) granting a pension to Cinderella I. McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Sina B. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8695) granting an increase of pension to John Son; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8696) granting a pension to Frank Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8697) granting a pension to Minerva J. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Raburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8699) granting a pension to Margaret Gillfillan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8700) granting an increase of pension to Susannah M. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8701) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Purvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8702) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8703) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Maxfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8704) granting a pension to James O. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Rinda Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8706) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8707) granting an increase of pension to Mary Vanover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8708) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) granting a pension to James H. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 8710) granting an increase of pension to Roseann Minges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 8711) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 79) to provide for a temporary assistant majority floor manager of telephones; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1, of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

696. Petition of citizens of the District of Columbia, opposing the Lankford Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

697. By Mr. ADKINS: Petitions of citizens of the State of Illinois, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill, nor any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's Day, and protesting especially against the proposed legislation in House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

698. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance by citizens of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

699. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of 61 citizens of Burlington, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

700. Also, petition of Mr. Howard B. Rice and 27 other citizens of St. Albans, Sheldon, Swanton, and Highgate, Vt., urging that Congress do not pass the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

701. Also, petition of Fred L. Walker and 16 other citizens of Rutland, Bristol, and West Rutland, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

702. Also, petition of H. H. Everest and 16 other citizens of West Rutland and Clarendon, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

703. Also, petition of Dr. Edward J. Rogers and 24 other citizens of Pittsford, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

704. Also, petition of L. A. Armstrong and nine other citizens of Vergennes, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

705. Also, petition of W. E. Tatro and 13 other citizens of Enosburg Falls, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

706. Also, petition of citizens of Cambridge and Fletcher, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

707. By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of citizens of Shawano County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

708. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Ethel W. Meek, Anne M. Ryder, and others, of Providence, R. I., protesting against any law which would bring about compulsory Sunday observance, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

709. By Mr. BURTNESS: Fifteen petitions signed by residents of the first congressional district, North Dakota, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

710. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of citizens of Madison, Lake County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

711. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Mrs. Marietta Bare and 78 other citizens of North Vernon, Ind., asking relief for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans by increasing pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

712. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the committee on legislation and taxation of the California Bankers' Association, protesting against the exemption up to $300 now permitted on deposits or dividends on stock of building and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

713. Also, petition of Oakland (Calif.) Council, No. 12, Daughters of America, urging the passage of more stringent immigration laws; to the committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

714. Also, petition of the California Development Association, praying for adequate appropriations for the United States Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

715. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance signed by 100 constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

716. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance signed by 16 constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

717. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by about 50 residents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

718. Also, petition from about 40 constituents of Toledo, Ohio, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

719. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by constituents of Holland and Maumee, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

720. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by 30 constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

721. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

722. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by residents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

723. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition of the citizens of Oxford, Norwich, and Guilford, N. Y., against compulsory Sunday observance; also from citizens of Binghamton and vicinity against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

724. Also, petition from the citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., and vicinity against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

725. Also, petition of the people of Union, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

726. Also, petition of the citizens of Oxford, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

727. Also, petition of the citizens of Endicott, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

728. Also, petition of the citizens of Binghamton, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

729. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition from sundry residents of Reno, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

730. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of Marienville, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

731. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of certain citizens of Racine County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

732. Also, petition of certain citizens of Waukesha County, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

733. Also, petition of certain citizens of Rock County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

734. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Wesley Irwin and 28 other residents of Port Huron, Mich., protesting against the enactment of any and all religious laws favoring one day of the week in preference to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

735. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against so-called Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

736. By Mr. DRIVER: Petition signed by citizens of Jonesboro, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

737. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of Rev. J. W. Dement, Chancellor T. B. Lytle, and others against passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

738. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of more than 500 citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

739. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of 305 persons of Memphis, Tenn., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

740. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Petition of Eldon Wellington and 89 other citizens and voters of Auglaize County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Sunday observance law, as the same gives preference to one religion above another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

741. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Shelby County, Ohio, protesting against House bill 78, for Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

742. Also, petition of Daughters of America, No. 28, Greenville, Ohio, supporting House bill 3; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

743. Also, petition of Allen Council, No. 347, Junior Order United American Mechanics, supporting House bill 3; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

744. Also, petition of Allen County (Ohio) Farmer's League, opposing appropriations for corn borer eradication; to the Committee on Agriculture.

745. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Mrs. F. C. Grove and various other citizens of Athol, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

746. Also, petition of Robert H. Dodge and 200 other citizens of Leicester, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

747. Also, petition of Rolden A. Sheldon and 102 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

748. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 568 citizens of Canyon County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78 or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

749. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the adult citizens of Newkirk, Okla., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, especially of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

750. Also, petition of approximately 120 residents of Cimarron County, Okla., and adjacent counties, urging, as part of a flood-control program, the construction of a dam across the Cimarron River somewhere along said stream in Cimarron County, Okla., the exact location to be determined by engineers and experts of and for the United States Government; to the Committee on Flood Control.

751. Also, letter signed by Harold J. McCarthy, commander Veterans of Foreign Wars, N. M. Casual Post, No. 614, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; Chris A. Weros, commander Chester L. Thompson Post, No. 23, American Legion, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; and Albert M. Moriarity, commander Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., indorsing the statutory award in the amount of $50 per month for arrested tuberculars, protesting against any interpretation of such law as being class legislation, and against certain other courses of action rumored to be contemplated by the central office of the Veterans' Bureau, and suggesting the advisability of mandating by law that a representative from each of the three organizations, viz, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, work in conjunction with Director Hines and his medical staff in promulgating and putting into effect any and all rules and regulations that affect the disabled; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

752. Also, letter from Frederick M. Hohmann, N. S., Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against discrimination in existing laws against Spanish-American War veterans who contracted disabilities during period of their service and are pensioned under the general law; to the Committee on Pensions.

753. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Harlingen, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

754. Also, petition of citizens of Pharr, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

755. Also, petition of citizens of Medina County, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

756. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of residents of Springfield, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

757. Also, petition of residents of Lyndonville, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

758. Also, petition of residents of Jamaica, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

759. Also, petition of residents of Brattleboro, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

760. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of H. C. Keacher and 67 other residents of Chisago County, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

760½. Also, petition of William H. Armstrong and 39 others, residents of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

761. Also, petition of Mrs. Bettie Carlson and 18 others, residents of Wayzata, Maple Plain, and Long Lake, in the State of Minnesota, protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

762. Also, petition of Esther S. Strand and 108 other residents of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting the enactment into

law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

763. Also, petition of A. F. Garner and 39 other residents of Sandstone and Hinckley, Minn., protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

763½. Also, petition of Karl R. Schenck and 27 other residents of Bruno, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

764. Also, petition of Elmer T. Blost and 47 other residents of Pine City, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

765. Also, petition of Daniel Gordon and 56 others of the city of Minneapolis, protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

766. Also, petition of H. M. Johnston and 76 others, of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

767. Also, petition of E. W. Adams and 43 others, of Pine County, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

768. Also, petition of Mrs. Steuart L. MacDougall and 109 others, of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

769. Also, petition of Mrs. Amanda Westman and seven others, residents of Anoka County, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

770. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Cloister Post 429, American Legion, Ephrata, Pa., requesting the support of Representatives in upholding the statutory provision for $50 per month paid to beneficiaries for arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

771. Also, petition of R. F. Keppel & Bro. (Inc.), Lancaster, Pa., unqualifiedly indorsing the Capper-Kelly fair trade bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

772. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Ebersole, Elizabethtown, Pa., not to pass House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

773. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of a number of residents of King County, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

774. Also, petition of a number of residents of Everett, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

775. Also, petition of a number of residents of Auburn, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

776. Also, petition of a number of residents of Langley, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

777. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 17 citizens of Rochester, Center Conway, North Conway, and Bartlett, N. H., protesting against the passage of any legislation tending toward compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

778. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., in opposition to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

779. By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of citizens of Dover-Foxcroft, South Brewer, Newport, Plymouth, and Stockholm, Me., urging nonpassage of Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

780. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Charles Williams and 84 other residents of Branch County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

781. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Miss Lill Dinkens, Tekamah, Nebr., and others of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

782. Also, petition signed by L. E. Reed, Chapman, Nebr., and others of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

783. Also, petition signed by Mrs. G. Goble, Royal, Nebr., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

784. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district of Michigan, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

785. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of residents of Sagola and other towns, State of Michigan, with reference to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

786. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 22 citizens of Gallia County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

787. Also, petition signed by 51 residents of Gallia County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

788. Also, petition signed by 21 citizens of Jackson County, Ohio, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

789. By Mr. KADING: Petition signed by 215 citizens of Beaver Dam, Wis., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

790. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 438 residents of Decatur, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

791. Also, petition of Mr. E. M. Phillips and 185 other residents of Benton Harbor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

792. Also, petition of Mr. L. A. Seymour and 27 other residents of Glen, Grand Junction, and Lactoa, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

793. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of residents of Franklin and Medway, Mass., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

794. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petitions from the citizens of Cleveland, Bradley County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

795. Also, petitions from the citizens of the towns of Decherd, Sewanee, Monteagle, and Tracy City, Franklin and Grundy Counties, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

796. Also, petitions from the citizens of Warren County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

797. Also, petition from the citizens of Polk County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

798. Also, petitions from the citizens of Hamilton County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

799. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of numerous adult citizens of Kent County, Mich., against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

800. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. F. Lapham and 35 other residents of Mansfield, Mass., protesting against enactment of compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

801. Also, petition of Byron P. Hardy and 72 other residents of Attleboro, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

802. Also, petition of Mrs. Clifford Turner and 42 other residents of Mansfield, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

803. Also, petition of Ellery Robinson and 60 other residents of Bristol County, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

804. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition in opposition to House bill 78, signed by E. O. Thomas, Harry E. Merrefield, and 38 others; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

805. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

806. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of 125 citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

807. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by A. B. Meyer and numerous other citizens of Jamestown, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

808. By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition signed by T. C. Bright and others, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

809. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, indorsing the immigration act of 1924, with certain revisions to the various quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

810. By Mr. PORTER: Petition of National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, demanding additional immigration restriction, enactment of alien deportation law, alien registration law, and better naturalization laws, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

811. By Mr. PRALL: Petition received from C. S. Countryman, Staten Island, N. Y., with 370 signatures protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

812. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of Nelson W. Hartwick and 15 other residents of Bloomfield, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

813. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of Maude Marsh and other adult citizens of Lowell, Chelmsford, and North Chelmsford, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

814. Also, petition of A. F. Hitchings and other citizens of Hudson, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

815. Also, petition of Henry C. Gates and other adult residents of the towns of Hudson, Gleasondale, and Medfield, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

816. Also, petition of Charles H. Sawyer and other adult citizens of Hudson, Bolton, and Sterling, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

817. Also, petition of Al Arlinsky and others of Lowell, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

818. Also, petition of John J. Whelton and others, of Lowell, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

819. Also, petition of Henry A. Derby and others, of Lowell and Dracut, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

820. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of E. D. Manning, Dave Bowen, and others, of Queen City, Mo., in opposition to the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

821. By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

822. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, urging that the Federal Government assume all expense in the Mississippi River flood-control problem; to the Committee on Flood Control.

823. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., protesting passage of compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

824. Also, petition of citizens of Brea, Calif., and other communities, protesting passage of compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

825. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., and other communities protesting passage compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

826. Also, petition of citizens of West Minister, Calif., and other communities, protesting passage compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

827. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mrs. J. T. Marr and 11 other citizens of Marietta, Ga., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

828. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Defiance, Ohio, protesting against the passage of legislation for the compulsory observance of Sunday, or adoption of any resolution or bill to give preference to one religion above another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

829. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of Mrs. J. W. Hurd and other citizens of Decatur, Ark., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

830. Also, petition of J. Price Rouloe, D. L. Harris, and many other citizens of Benton County, Ark., asking for the passage of the bill to establish a national military park at the Elk Horn, or Pea Ridge, battle field, in Benton County, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

831. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 66 citizens of Osceola, Clarke County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of a compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

832. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of various citizens of Henderson County, N. C., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

833. Also, petition of various citizens of Asheville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

834. Also, petition of various citizens of Asheville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

835. Also, petition of various citizens of Cherokee County, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

836. Also, petition of various citizens of Henderson County, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

837. Also, petition of various citizens of Hendersonville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

838. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

839. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

840. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

841. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

842. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

843. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district of Michigan, in opposition to House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *January 6, 1928*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, whose throne is in the hearts of Thy loving children, wherever they are found, we thank Thee that place nor time can not separate us from Thy love. May we meditate upon Thy providences with grateful feelings, exalted hopes, and great thoughts. Allow us not to be cradled in illusions, but help us to look up and discover the golden crown which hovers above. O river of God's mercy! It is the blessing which feeds the world and by its might we shall yet find our paradise. Bless us with an irresistible yearning that sends us beyond the narrow boundaries of self and stretches our vision under wider skies. Teach us that he who overcomes self treads the world under foot. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1398. An act relating to pardons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1661. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time for the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

REUEL SMALL

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in many of our newspapers we find a column, or a part of a column, telling what happened 15, 20, 25, or 30 years ago. I do not anticipate that this will become the practice in our publication, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; but to-day I wish to refer to something which occurred just 30 years ago. In doing so I shall speak of the long and faithful service of one of the most respected employees of this House. Let me read an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, January 6, 1898:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, January 6, 1898.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

The SPEAKER (Thomas B. Reed, of Maine). The Chair has been notified that Mr. Andrew Devine, one of the official reporters of debates of the House of Representatives, resigns his position; and the Chair therefore appoints Mr. Reuel Small, of Deering, Me., to be an official reporter of debates in his place.

[Applause.]

To-day Mr. Small completes 30 years of honorable, faithful, and efficient service for the House of Representatives. It is a record of which anyone might well be proud. So I have asked the indulgence of the House for one minute to make this statement in order to call it to the attention of the membership and so that it may appear in the RECORD. [Applause.]

THE "S-4" DISASTER

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I understand that the Butler resolution with reference to the *S-4* will be reported to-morrow. I would like to know whether it will be in order for a Member to offer an amendment to that resolution from the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the resolution will be brought up by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], who will be in charge of it, and he may at any time move the previous question.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Otherwise it would be in order?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order with the consent of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I make a statement?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, while there has been no definite arrangement made for the consideration of that resolution it is not the purpose of the gentleman from New York, who will present the resolution, to cut off debate or any reasonable amendment which the Members of the House may want to offer. [Applause.] It is an open resolution and it is up to you gentlemen to do what you want in regard to it. [Applause.]

SHOULD THE DEBT SETTLEMENTS BE REVISED?

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the address I made last week before the American Economic Association here in Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I incorporate in the RECORD an address which I made before the American Economic Association in Washington on December 29, 1927, on the subject "Should the debt settlements be revised?" which is as follows:

In attempting to-night to present to you my conception of the debt-settlement problems, I am bound by limits of time to confine myself to particular aspects of the subject, and in doing so I may run somewhat counter to a popular tradition of what is appropriate to an "economist's" discussion of an "economic" subject. For the aspects of this question which seem to me of dominating importance are not of commerce and finance but of ethics and expediency.

The commercial and financial aspects of these settlements have been the subject of considerable investigation. Numerous studies have been made of the future capacity of the debtor countries to pay, of the possibility of transferring such large sums from Europe to the United States, and of the probable influence of these transfers upon our industry and trade. Whether or not the future incomes of all of the countries concerned will allow them to provide the sums involved, and whether these sums can be moved across the sea are questions which I do not intend to discuss. Both are not improbably within the range of human possibility, but both depend upon factors and contingencies which no one can with certainty foresee. And prophecy has been well described as the most gratuitous form of error.

EFFECT UPON AMERICAN BUSINESS

As for the effects of these payments upon our own business, there is doubtless truth in the contention that since we are asking Europe to pay us an amount in the aggregate four times the value of all of the gold in the rest of the world, these payments will have to be made in commodities or services, and this will have some effect upon our foreign trade. Such large and long-continued payments—totaling $22,000,000,000—through their influence upon the exchanges and the relative price levels of the countries concerned, will tend to make the foreign market for some of our products less profitable, while encouraging foreign competition in certain lines at home. The tendency will operate upon, and be felt by particular businesses, whether it is recognized as such or not. As the years go by, if the payments continue to be made, we may expect to hear increasing complaints of the limited export market for certain of our surplus products, and more insistent demands for higher protection in particular industries. But the ultimate causes of such conditions are always hard to disentangle and their connection with the debt payments will never be open to proof.

More easy to recognize is the consideration significantly expressed by Secretary Mellon a year or two ago, that the prosperity of Europe is worth more to the United States in dollars and cents than the repayment of all of the war loans put together. But the United States is interested in a prosperous Europe, not merely as a market for the surplus output of our farms and factories although that has a bearing upon our own prosperity, and not merely as a stabilizing influence upon business throughout the world, although that likewise is important for our own business. The prosperity of Europe is of even greater concern to the United States because of the possible contagion of unrest and revolution which discontent in Europe might foster and because of the crucial importance to all of the western world of continued peace, and of orderly political and social progress. In so far as the burden of these war-born payments retards the return of the Old World to normal economic and political conditions, the money which we may receive will be debased with a pernicious alloy. But here again we have to do with imponderables—factors impossible to weigh—and I shall not dwell upon them.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS LEARNED

No satisfactory verdict upon the war-loan settlements can be found by merely attempting to determine where the balance of financial or governmental advantage lies. The factors that are involved are not all of a sort that can be reduced to figures and tables and balanced by ordinary methods of bookkeeping. This in fact is what Congress discovered five years ago (in February, 1923) when they set aside all other considerations and instructed the World War Debt Funding Commission to arrange future settlements upon whatever terms the commission believed to be "just." The year before (in February, 1922) Congress seemed to have thought otherwise. In creating the commission at that time, and delegating to it authority to negotiate settlements with the nations to which we had extended credits, they had hemmed around that authority with various restrictions. The commission was to grant to no government a rate of interest below 4½ per cent, to allow no funding to mature more than 25 years later (not later than 1947), and to permit no reduction of any part of the sums in question.

The Congress which established the commission and which had so limited its freedom of action was very different in personnel from the Congress that had originally authorized the credits. It was separated by two elections and a political landslide from the war-time Congress. A large proportion of its Members had had no part in the war-loan legislation, were but vaguely conversant with the circumstances surrounding the origin of the loans, and were more optimistic than informed as

to the possibilities of their repayment. Before a single settlement had been negotiated the limitations which they had imposed upon the commission were recognized to be impracticable, and the first and only settlement submitted by the commission under the 1922 law—that with Great Britain—did not conform at all with the prescribed terms.

CONGRESS ONLY WANTED JUSTICE

Nevertheless, both Houses of Congress approved that settlement with little opposition and scarcely any discussion. The vote in the House stood more than 6 to 1 in favor of it (291 for to 44 against). The Senate indorsed it by a majority of more than 5 to 1 (70 for to 13 against). This vote in itself indicated that Congress was not wedded to the terms it had named but was ready to allow great latitude in handling the problem. This was still more clearly evidenced by the fact that forthwith all of the previously enacted restrictions upon the commission's authority were removed, and the commission was given carte blanche to negotiate succeeding settlements upon one condition, and one condition only—that they should believe the terms to be "just." After February, 1923, there were to be no more legislative proscriptions as to rates of interest and dates of maturity, or even as to the reduction or cancellation of the debts. Congress told the commission to go ahead with the other settlements and only asked from that time on that the settlements should be "just."

Whatever the commission has recommended in each of the dozen subsequent settlements has been approved without much debate by immense majorities in both Houses. Congress has never modified the slightest detail of any proposal that the commission has made. It has never added a comma, changed an article, dotted an "i," or crossed a "t." Congress ratified the Belgian settlement, which varied still more widely from the original proscriptions, by a majority of more than 12 to 1 in the House and nearly 3 to 1 in the Senate. And even the settlement with Italy, which was far less exigent than any of the others, was indorsed in the House by a vote of 257 to 133 and in the Senate by a vote of 54 to 33. It can not be fairly said that the Debt Funding Commission after February, 1923, were in any way constrained by the attitude of Congress to drive stiff bargains with any of our war-time partners. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that if the commission had recommended settlements of a character much more generous Congress would have accepted them just the same. This may be said to have been partly due to their high regard for the personnel of the commission and partly to the fact that they were not in a position to know anything beyond what they were told about the complicated calculations having to do with economic conditions in distant countries and a remote future upon which the settlements were based. But, above all, the ready acquiescence of Congress must be credited to the anxiety of the majority of Members, irrespective of party, to get this thorny question out of the way.

COMMISSION'S FORMULAS OF JUSTICE

The act of February 28, 1923, as we have seen, gave to the Debt Funding Commission a single mandate, with large discretionary power in its interpretation. They were to make settlements with other governments upon such terms as they "may believe to be just." In construing this mandate the commission at an early date arrived at a method of procedure which greatly simplified their subsequent labor. They boiled down and standardized what they "believed to be just" into three general formulas, which thereafter had only to be applied to particular cases, a task that could be largely delegated to one or two of their members or to some of their assistants.

The three formulas and their explanation, so far as reasons for them are discernible, were the following:

First. To quote the words of the chairman, Secretary Mellon, the commission felt that "repayment of principal is essential in order that the debtor might feel that it had paid its debt in full (sic) and that we might know that we had our capital returned to us (sic). The commission felt, therefore, that no funding should be made which did not repay the principal, and thus we have maintained the integrity of international obligations" (sic). (Combined annual reports of debt commission, p. 289.)

Second. They felt that the repayments of principal should in every case be distributed over 62 years, no matter what the character of the debt and no matter what its size, whether it amounted to one million or several thousand millions of dollars. Just why the number "62" should have been chosen has never been clearly disclosed. It seems to have been due to the belief that this was the smallest number of years in which the largest of our war partners' accounts, reaching well into the billions, could be acquitted "in full," which Mr. Mellon had said was "essential." Why the identical period should have been uniformly applied to the settlement of each and every account was also never explained. The standardization of maturity dates, to be sure, solved automatically one of the problems involved with every country and reduced by so much the labor of making particular settlements, but obviously it resulted in absurd arrangements for some of the smaller accounts. To name only a single example, one of the ex-enemy governments which borrowed after the war a sum of less than $2,000,000 will be paying the United States until the year 1985 annual driblets that never reach as high as $80,000.

Third. They felt that the rates of interest to be paid during these 62 years should be determined by estimates of each country's "capacity to pay." "It is felt," said the report of the commission for 1925, "that the lack of capacity of a government * * * can be readily met by appropriate adjustment or modification of the rates of interest to be paid during the period of repayment of principal. And in examining the capacity of payment the commission looks not only at the immediate capacity but estimates, so far as it is able to do so, the future development of the nations concerned." Quoting again from the same report: "The adjustments made with each government must be measured by the ability of the particular government to put aside and transfer to the United States the payments called for under the funding agreement." (Combined annual reports, p. 38.) The same conception was made even more clear in a statement referring to the French negotiations: "We believe it is fully recognized by the commission that the only (sic) basis of negotiations fair to both peoples is the principal of the capacity of France to pay." (Statement of Oct. 1, 1925.)

Reduced to its lowest terms, then, the commission held that the sole rule for "just" settlements was to demand from our principal war partners as much as they would be able to pay of capital, plus interest, between now and 1985 (or 1987), and, so far as the other countries were concerned, to stretch their payments over a similar number of years without regard either to the character of their borrowings or to their particular ability to settle more promptly. The rule of "capacity to pay," in other words, was to be applied to the major settlements, but not to be bothered about in dealing with the others.

TREASURY APPLIED THESE FORMULAS

Having formulated these general criteria of the terms which they "believed to be just," and so far as their statements, reports, and speeches disclose, these were the only criteria which they regarded as worthy of attention, the commission as a whole was not obliged to participate in the actual negotiations which for the most part were conductd by Treasury officials. "In applying these principles," as the report for 1925 states, "the commission, through its experts and through the foreign representatives of the State and Commerce Departments, has assembled and studied the economic and financial data available regarding each of the foreign debtors."

With this information before it, the commission has been able to examine critically similar data presented by the representatives of the several governments in their debt-settlement negotiations and to estimate, with as reasonable accuracy as conditions permit, the capacity of payment of the particular government. (Combined annual reports, p. 38.) There is reason to believe that even in certain of the most important settlements several, and probably the majority, of the members of the commission not only had little to do with the actual negotiations, but had never heard any discussion of the points at issue or even seen the representative of the allied nation until the agreements were presented to the commission as a completed whole for acceptance and signature.

It is not to be doubted that those charged with the actual negotiations faithfully executed to the best of their ability the dictates of the commission. They not only treated the principal war-loan accounts according to the rules and practices customary in settlements with insolvent business firms but, according to the commission's instructions, they went considerably further than that, and extracted from the bankrupt governments pledges of capacity payment for several generations. Secretary Mellon was probably well within the truth when he asserted, "We have, I believe, made for the United States the most favorable settlements that could be obtained short of force." (Combined annual reports, p. 302.) But whether or not the commission's policy correctly interpreted the instruction of Congress to arrange "just" terms, that is to say, whether or not in formulating the tests of such terms the commission took proper account of all of the factors that justice demands, is another story.

ARE ALL LOANS ALIKE?

Unquestionably the difficulties in the way of determining "just" settlements were greatly simplified by resting on the sure ground of the letter of the law and not venturing into the less clearly marked fields of equity. It was far easier to argue that loans are loans and that contracts are contracts, and to demand "the due and forfeit of the bond" than to try and search justice in the borderlands of reason and conscience outside of the written law. Yet no thoughtful person would claim that all loans are alike in the binding force of their obligation. If during a great conflagration a citizen loaned fire extinguishers to his neighbors to use in putting out a fire which threatened his home as well as theirs, few would assert that the debt so contracted entails the same moral obligation upon the neighbors as would be entailed had they purchased these extinguishers on credit in the normal course of trade.

Loans, to be sure, are loans, but if the extinguishers that he lent were destroyed in saving the city he would scarcely feel warranted in demanding from his neighbors, particularly if they had suffered far greater losses than his own, their repayment with all of the interest they might be able to pay for interminable years. And similarly, if a country were engaged in a war which it was itself helpless to prosecute, and it loaned to other countries engaged in the same conflict the guns, shells, uniforms, chemicals, food, and other necessaries of war which they used in combating the common enemy, and these things were consumed in the process, although loans are loans, some will question whether the lending country would be justified in demanding from its partners, especially if they had made vastly greater sacrifices in the conflict than its own, the payment of all that they might be able to pay for several generations.

During the Civil War many northern men drafted for the Union Army considered themselves for one reason or another unprepared to serve and offered money to others to go in their stead. Sometimes such money was offered in the form of loans to meet the substitute's expenses or to provide for his family while he was at the front. When the war ended, if the veteran returned impoverished and disabled, perhaps minus an arm or a leg or a foot, although loans are loans, it would be rather generally agreed, I presume, that the lender was somewhat cold-blooded who insisted upon "the most favorable settlement that could be obtained short of force."

Not unlike is the case of a government at war, which, unprepared for most of its time in the war to put men in the field, placed money at the disposal of other governments to enable their sons to continue fighting and to feed and clothe these men's families while they fought.

If, when the war ended, some of these governments in consequence found themselves bankrupt, with millions of widows and orphans and mutilated victims to support, and many hundred thousand homes, farms, and factories to rebuild, although loans are loans, many, I am sure, would doubt whether the government which, by lending money had spared its own men, could justly ask that the principal of all of its loans be repaid with all of the interest its partners might muster during more than threescore years.

WHY OUR WAR LOANS WERE MADE

Yet this is exactly what happened between the United States and its war partners and which the Debt Funding Commission believed to be just. No one who remembers the circumstances surrounding the origin of our allied loans, or who has read the laws which authorized them, or the speeches about them in Congress at the time, can believe that they were created for any other purpose than to enable the United States to carry on by proxy its own battles, in which it was unable for more than a year to participate in any other substantial way.

If these loans brought benefit to Belgium and France and the other allies that benefit was only incidental and was not the purpose of the loans. During the years before we engaged in war no one had ever thought of our Government's extending credit to any of these countries, no matter what their straits, and our people would rightfully have resented any such suggestion. But in April, 1917, Congress independently and in recognition of our own manifold grievances had decided that we must fight if we were to preserve the rights and property and lives of our citizens and the integrity of our territory. The President had pledged to the task "our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have." Then suddenly we awakened to the fact that we had no Army to place in the field, and that even with prodigious effort we could not hope to have one for more than a year. The loans that Congress immediately decided to make were not a contribution to the allied cause. It is scarcely correct to describe them as our contribution to the common cause. They were, strictly speaking, our contribution to our own cause, and the most substantial contribution that we were able to make to that cause during all but 4 of the 19 months that we were in the war. Their sole object was clearly stated in the opening words of the authorizing act. These credits were to be extended to the allied governments "for the purpose of more effectually providing for the national security and defense—meaning our own security and defense—and prosecuting the war"—meaning, of course, our own war.

WHAT THE 1917 CONGRESS SAID OF THEM

No other thought was ever mentioned in any of the speeches when the bill was before the Senate and the House. Said Mr. Mann in the House, "We are not prepared to fight with our Army * * *. The only way left is to help finance those nations who are fighting our enemy." Said Mr. MADDEN, "We are not prepared to furnish the men to-day, and somebody else is prepared to furnish the men if we furnish the money." Said Mr. Kitchin, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who introduced the measure in the House, "We will be fighting with our money our battles." Said Senator SMOOT, "I think that every dollar that will be expended under the provisions of this bill, * * * will be for the benefit of the United States, whether spent by us or by the Allies." Said Senator McCumber, "While we are recognizing that we are putting $7,000,000,000 into the battle, we must not fail to recognize that we are not as yet putting in a single one of our American soldiers, while blood is being poured out by our allies in unstinted measure." Said Senator SIMMONS, who introduced the bill and explained its purport in the Senate, "Let us do this in the spirit of men * * * who are entering into it without thought of profits, without thought of financial loss, * * * without thought of the sacrifice, but ready and willing to make every sacrifice."

I shall not tax your patience with further quotations, but what was said by all of the leaders in the Senate and House without exception, by men of the East, West, North, and South, by Republicans and Democrats alike, coincided in regarding the use of our credit as a fortunate means of escape from the embarrassment of having engaged in a war which, because of our unpreparedness, we were otherwise unable to carry on. The credits, which it was understood would for the most part be expended for supplies in the United States, were not treated in the discussion as ordinary loans, much less as investments. With the conflagration raging at our doors the Congressmen and Senators of 1917 were little concerned with how or when or whether these supplies would be returned. Doubt was expressed as to whether the credits would ever be repaid, and indifference was declared both by Democratic and Republican leaders as to their repayment, and these doubts and declarations of indifference were not seriously challenged. Facing the necessity of instant action those in charge of the bill seem to have selected the form of a loan without deliberation as the quickest and simplest way to distribute our supplies among our several war partners where they would be most effective. They were not concerned with terms, but only with how they could encourage and aid our associates to go on with the war, since this was the one and only way in which we were prepared to take a part.

It is easy enough to-day, overlooking these facts, to point to the specific terms of the act adopted with so little deliberation during the first anxious fortnight after Congress declared war. It is easy to point to the promissory notes signed by allied ambassadors agreeing to pay on demand the dollars that were placed at their disposal (terms, by the way, which no one at the time expected to be met). The task of Mr. Mellon and his commission in devising formulas for settlements was greatly simplified and facilitated by confining their attention to the literal text of these documents.

THE EQUITIES IN THE CASE

Determination of justice, however, is by no means so simple a matter. It sometimes requires that we look beyond the letter of the bond. The lender of fire apparatus to whom allusion has been made might have a technical right to be reimbursed by his neighbors, and the war-time draftee might have a legal claim on the substitute whom he "hired" by a loan. Yet conscience and reason might justify neither the one nor the other in pressing his claim. The loan of material in a catastrophe to protect both lender and borrower from mortal danger is essentially different from an ordinary business loan no matter what the Debt Commission may say. It differs not only in its nature and purpose but in the moral obligation that is entailed as well. A loan to hire some one else to risk his life in the war of one's country when it was the lender's manifest place to offer himself, is likewise not assimilable to the loans of industry and trade.

The loans extended by the United States to its war partners partook of the character of both of these examples. They were made in a moment of imminent catastrophe with the intention of protecting the lender rather than the borrower from peril. They may have rendered inestimable service to the borrowing governments, but their primary purpose was to help the United States win the war in which it was engaged and to help in holding the line of battle against this country's enemies. Under the terms of their authorization these loans could not be granted for any other object, and from the first loan to the last, even those made after the armistice every dollar that was lent was spent for purposes approved by our Treasury as contributing to that end. (Cf. article by Assistant Secretary Rathbone in Foreign Affairs, April, 1925, pp. 397–398.)

Moreover these loans were used, if not to induce, at least to aid others to risk their lives in our stead. During 14 months between our declaration of war and the beginning of our participation France alone lost 270,000 dead and nearly half a million wounded fighting what then were our battles as well as her own. How many were killed or mutilated during the same period in the armies of England and Belgium and Italy I can not say, but not improbably their casualties in the aggregate were equal to those of France, which would mean that our partners in the war gave half a million lives and saw a million of their men disabled in holding the enemy back while the war was our war and we were taking no part in its sacrifices and dangers. We furnished the uniforms which these men wore, the rifles that they carried, the shells that they fired, the food and tobacco which they consumed, and we sent them food and clothing for their wives and children. That is to say, we sold these things to their Governments at double and treble their normal prices and lent them the money with which to pay.

THE COMMISSION'S OVERSIGHT

In arranging for the settlement of such loans, the Congress of the United States, with a spirit of wisdom and fairness, instructed the Debt Funding Commission to devise such terms as they believed "to be

just," and Congress, trusting that they had done so, rapidly and blindly accepted the commission's recommendations with little scrutiny and without the slightest change. Careful study of the commission's reports reveals, however, no evidence that the commission devoted any attention to the equities that were involved. It shows only that they followed the easiest way, rested their case on the letter of the law, demanded "the due and forfeit of the bond," and reduced the tedium of their labors by standardizing the supposed requirements of justice into a simple formula. So far as settlements with our leading partners in the war were concerned, this formula, as we have seen, demanded repayment of the principal of their borrowings in full, together with as much interest as it was estimated that these countries might be capable of paying during 62 years, in addition to interest for the 8 or 9 years already elapsed.

There may be those who believe that such settlements will stand, but I have too much confidence in the judgment and conscience of the American people to be of their number.

THE AIR-MAIL FLYERS

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nevada asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, in the giving of the distinguished-service flying cross to the Army and Navy flyers we have all received a thrill of pleasure and felt keen pride in the achievement of each individual. I have asked unanimous consent of the House for two minutes this morning for the purpose of telling you about another group of flyers, the air-mail flyers—men, many of whom started in the service in 1918 and continued in it until September, 1927, when the service was discontinued as a strictly governmental agency because it was thrown under the contract system. I wish to advise you that during this period, from 1918 to 1927, there were 32 fatalities among the air-mail pilots and 9 among mechanics who flew with them. These 32 fatalities, or crashes, occurred after an average of 381,000 miles had been flown; in other words, for each crash 381,000 miles were flown by these air-mail pilots. These men flew night and day, during good weather and bad weather, over mountain passes and over deserts. If any group of men were pioneers in this important branch of service and pioneers in a wonderful work, these men were. I intend to introduce a resolution this day requesting that a joint committee of the House and Senate be appointed to investigate the wonderful work of these air-mail pilots and to inquire into the best form of memorial for these 32 air pilots who met their death in line of duty and also to provide for some suitable form of recognition in the shape of a medal and citation to each pilot in a long list who were pioneers of a high order in this new field of transportation.

We can not give them the flying cross, because this decoration can only be given to men in the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps. If we give them any recognition whatsoever, it must take some other form than that of the flying cross.

I want to ask the Members of the House to consider this matter seriously and when this resolution comes before the House to give it the whole-hearted support I believe it deserves. The committee, when appointed, will, I am sure, give serious thought to the question, so that in the end we can create a suitable memorial, a monument, somewhere along the transcontinental airway for these brave men who gave their lives in a great cause, in an endeavor that has meant so much in the progress of aviation. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a question for information. I am one of those who is heartily in sympathy with the effort to keep extraneous matter from being reproduced in the RECORD. I understand it is now quite generally the policy of the House, however, to permit the publication in the RECORD of the remarks of Members of the House even if made outside of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman addressing the Chair?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets he did not get the purport of the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Well, it seems that yesterday we were discussing the request of a Member for permission to reproduce in the RECORD a statement made by one of our ambassadors to a foreign court, and the objection was raised that the remarks were not made by a Member of the House, but in view of the fact that the gentleman occupies a distinguished position in the Government, why, no objection was filed, but several Members stated it would be their policy to object to everything of the kind in the future unless the words had been uttered by a Member of the House. My question, for information, is this: A few days ago I gave to the Denver Post an interview on public questions. This interview does not contain all of my words. The splendid reporter who took the interview injected some of his own and made my talk much better than it otherwise might have been. [Laughter.] I now want to know if I would be transgressing the general, unwritten rule of the House as to such publications if I should ask permission to have that interview inserted, including the splendid words interjected by the erudite interviewer? So often the reporters improve the remarks of statesmen by interjection of their own better words.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can only say he will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I will make the request some other time. [Laughter.]

REFERENCE OF BILLS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to change the reference of two bills. The bill H. R. 3542 and the bill H. R. 8074 were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, when the reference should have been to the Committee on Claims. Both chairmen agree to the change of reference, and therefore the change will be made.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1929

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Department of State, Department of Justice, Departments of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the agreement about the control of time made yesterday only applied to yesterday. Had not the gentleman better have an agreement about that?

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that control of the time to-day be placed in the hands of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and myself, to be equally divided.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object only for the purpose of asking a question. Will this bill be read under the five-minute rule before Monday?

Mr. SHREVE. I think so. I am not prepared to say, because a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House desire to make some remarks.

Mr. BLANTON. There will be another matter up to-morrow by agreement.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And this bill will not come up to-morrow?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not prepared to say that. If the time is not all consumed to-morrow with the other bill, I shall expect to get this bill up.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is the gentleman's intention to read it under the five-minute rule as soon as possible?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to the success we are having in Nebraska with the development of the dairy industry. Nebraska is a land blessed with sunshine more than many of the leading dairy States of the Union. Likewise it is a State that is blessed with a soil adapted to the raising of those crops that are necessary in the production of dairy products. It is populated with an industrious, law-abiding citizenship.

I quote now from the Nebraska Farmer of December 17, 1927, regarding the success we are having in Nebraska in the development of cooperative cheese factories and cooperative dairy associations. The people of my home county, Scottsbluff, were the first Nebraskans to begin the cooperative manufacturing of cheese.

The farmers scattered about the region who supplied milk for the first cheese factory found the venture so successful that more coopera-

tive cheese factories were organized. Now there are five of these farmer-owned cheese factories, all within a radius of 25 miles from Scottsbluff.

Prices paid the farmer dairymen for the milk sold to the factories have been good, averaging 10 to 20 cents more per pound for butterfat than for milk marketed in the ordinary way, according to county agricultural agent Phil Sheldon. Thus a demand has been created for good dairy cows and the North Platte Dairy Development Association is the result. Purchasing the cows from high quality herds and extending the payment for the animals over a period of three years are the chief functions of the association.

It is possible to keep three dairy cows producing 30 pounds of butterfat each per month on an acre of sweet clover pasture. At the average price of butterfat which is being paid in that locality this would mean an income of more than $100 per acre for sweet clover pastured by dairy cows.

A farmer, if he is situated to keep two or three dairy cows, is usually not in a position to take a long trip into some other State to buy them. The North Platte Dairy Development Association solves this problem by buying for many farmers collectively. The demand for good dairy cows in Nebraska far exceeds the supply, and it is necessary to go some distance to buy them, usually Wisconsin. The cost of making the purchases is greatly reduced for each farmer by the association which buys in large numbers.

More than that, the association gives farmers an opportunity to extend payment for most of the purchase price over a period of three years, enabling many to buy good cows who otherwise would be unable to do so. The farmer must pay at least one-fourth of the purchase price down. The remainder is paid in monthly installments with 7 per cent interest charged for the loan. In other words, the farmer pays at the rate of $111.60 for every $100 worth of cattle purchased. The monthly payments amount to $3.10 per month per $100 worth of purchase. The principal is gradually diminished while the interest is being paid at the same time.

The monthly payments are so small that, unless faced with the most serious adversities, the farmer should have little trouble in meeting them. In fact, the principle of the scheme is that the milk checks from the cows will be large enough to cover the payments and give the farmer a good return for his labor besides. The interest rate is not unusually high when it is considered that there is some risk, especially if some of the cows are lost.

An eastern company, which buys the cheese output from the five cooperative factories, keeps a purchasing agent at the central warehouse near Gering throughout the year. Cheese from the factories is assembled there and shipped east by the purchasers.

The cheese factories pay 7 per cent on the capital invested and the remainder of the profits goes back to the milk patrons. This makes the price paid for butterfat higher than almost anywhere else in the State almost all of the time.

Mr. Eben Warner is president of the North Platte Dairy Development Association, and he was largely responsible for its organization and for raising the capital with which to finance it. Phil Sheldon, Scottsbluff County agricultural agent, is secretary of the association, and he, too, had a large part in its establishment. The association is financed for $100,000 and is capable of handling a tremendous increase in the dairying of the region.

The success of dairying in Nebraska is evidenced by its mushroomlike growth in the past few years. In 1921 Nebraska ranked sixth among all other States in butter production, while in 1926 the State's rating was fourth. The production of American whole-milk cheese has increased from 61,000 pounds in 1921 to 720,000 pounds in 1926. In all, there are about a dozen plants now producing cheese in Nebraska and during the past season this phase of dairy manufacture seemed to pay better returns to the producers than any other.

Another factor in favor of dairying, as it is being developed in the North Platte Valley, is that conversion of the more bulky crops into cheese or butter greatly reduces the freight bills. The cost of long hauls of the bulky feed crops knocks out much of the profits, while the concentrated dairy products can be marketed with better returns for the farmers.

Nebraska is producing great herds of fine dairy cattle. I quote from an article in the Holstein-Friesian World of October 22, 1927, by W. P. Snyder, superintendent of the North Platte substation of the University of Nebraska, concerning the remarkable showing made by a dairy herd developed by him at that place:

As an illustration of the manner in which the black and white breed is invading the old-time "short-grass country," and also as an illustration of the general advancement of the breed, you may be interested in a report of the progress made by the University of Nebraska North Platte Substation herd. This substation is located 300 miles west of the Missouri River in a region where the buffalo held dominion in the memory of our older neighbors. Two of that breed to-day are looking through the fence in wonder, and we trust in admiration rather than in envy, at Beauty Girl and her worthy mates. But these two are kept only as reminders of the past and as examples of the highest point nature, unassisted by man, reached in developing a dairy animal or a beef animal on the western plains. The Holsteins, Herefords, and Shorthorns in the pastures adjoining the one occupied exclusively by Bill, the buffalo, and Lucretia, his mate, exemplify the results of nature's efforts in developing dairy animals and beef animals when she has brought to her assistance the scientific knowledge and practical skill of the modern husbandman.

On September 15, 1927, there were in the University of Nebraska North Platte Substation Holstein herd 26 females, on which the Holstein-Friesian Advanced Registry Association had reported semiofficial 365-day records. The only other females in the herd are the 15-year-old foundation cow "Topsy," six heifers in their first lactation periods, and younger heifers. "Topsy" was never on yearly test. No females have been sold from the herd during the past year and no female has been purchased since the purchase of the original foundation cows, about 13 years ago.

The average of the highest milk records of each of the 26 equals 20,000 pounds. The average of the highest 365-day butter records of 16 exceeds 1,000 pounds. The average of the highest 7-day butter records of 21 exceeds 30 pounds. There are 10 in the herd, each of which has a 365-day butter record in excess of 1,000 pounds. One of these is a heifer still on test. A conservative estimate of her production for the year gives an average for the 10 of 1,127 pounds. Two more heifers will join the 1,000-pound group before January 1, 1928, barring accident.

The average of the highest butter records of the 26, 6 being made as full-age cows, 7 as 4-year-olds, 3 as 3-year-olds, 4 as senior 2, and 6 as junior 2-year-olds, and allowing a fair estimate on 4 heifers still on test, is 959 pounds.

The splendid progress made by the breed and the breeders was brought to my notice recently by Prof. A. L. Haecker, when he stated that the 10 Nebraska State records held by cows which are in this small herd to-day would all have been world records at the time he established the University of Nebraska Holstein herd 30 years ago.

All but two of these animals trace in this herd to the four heifers, all by one sire and from closely related dams, purchased on the inspection and approval of Prof. J. H. Frandsen in Michigan in 1913. At that time Professor Frandsen was in charge of the University of Nebraska Department of Dairy Husbandry. All but one trace through King Gerben Lincoln, or Varsity Derby Matador, university-bred sires, in this herd, to the grand Nebraska foundation cow, Katy Gerben Lincoln, selected in the early days by Prof. A. L. Haecker.

There is only 1 animal among the 26 that was not sired by a University of Nebraska bred bull. Only five names appear in the list of sires of the 26 females, and two of these only once each. This close-line breeding explains the unusual uniformity of type and production prevailing throughout the herd.

Our friends tell us these records are unusually high. They may be "spoofing" me. I am a beef-cattle man. If it be true that these records are exceptional, we must give the credit to the splendid foundation stock, the consistent selection of prepotent sires, and to the wonderfully invigorating western Nebraska air and the vitamin-laden alfalfa grown here. Everything connected with the herd is home grown. Only one cow not bred and developed here; the bulls now in use born here; the men developed, if not born here, and the alfalfa, silage, corn, bran, and beet pulp grown here. The little oil and cottonseed meal that we feed is kindly grown for us by our neighbors to the north and to the south.

The fact that every cow that has produced 1,000 or more pounds of butter in a year is in the herd to-day and that every cow that has produced 30 or more pounds of butter in 7 days is in the herd to-day excepting "Rose," who died at 15 years of age, and four sold as producing cows, we attribute to the open-air treatment, and of course to the short period covered by our yearly testing work. The first 365-day S. O. test was finished in 1922. The cows are in the stanchions only while being milked, regardless of weather. In the summer, excepting a few on careful test, the cows are all subject to the direct rays of the sun and also the bites of the flies. In the winter they go at will into an open shed. The alfalfa is always fed outside in the open. Silage and grain are fed at milking time.

We have endeavored to employ methods of handling this herd that may be adopted profitably by the better class of dairymen throughout this sun-kissed region.

That these cattle are not kept under hothouse conditions and that the average of the herd records could be increased by better care is shown by the fact that a junior 4-year-old heifer, N P Topsy King Piebe, when taken from the herd and protected from the heat of the sun during the midday and from the flies, quickly increased her milk flow 25 per cent. She had been on test 286 days. Her production on that date, September 1, was 18,585 pounds of milk and 850 pounds of butter. We estimated her year's production at 1,050 pounds of butter. It is readily seen that a 25 per cent increase carried through the summer would mean very much at the end.

We endeavor to sell the bulls, as far as at all practical, among the dairy farmers of our own territory at prices which the present state of development of the herds of these farmers warrant them in paying. We have deviated from this plan only twice within the past year, once when a proven sire went east to head the University of West Virginia herd and again when a young sire went west to head the University of Wyoming herd. Ten years ago we had difficulty in selling the bulls among our home people at any price, but now the difficulty is not in selling but in deciding on the price. Our patrons insist that we tell them what they should pay. This makes us in a way both buyer and seller. The problem is difficult especially when a high-record calf is reaching serviceable age.

The Holstein cow has demonstrated her adaptability to conditions existing in this region and has won the high regard of our people by her size, vigor, beauty, and high production. We know that other dairy breeds have their points of merit, but to-day we are writing of Holsteins.

Commenting upon the records of this herd the Lincoln (Nebr.) Daily Star stated editorially:

At this time when Nebraska farmers are making such progress in rebuilding their dairy herds, the significance of such work can be fully appreciated by contemplating those figures. It costs no more to keep cows of real blood, and consequently of real production, than it does the scrub variety. There has been no lavish outlay of money to provide barns for the blooded stock at the North Platte experiment farm. The herd there is housed in barns of comparatively cheap construction. Most of the feed comes from the fields of the farm maintained in connection with the station. The methods employed there are precisely the same as may be found on hundreds of Nebraska farms, where excellent results are being obtained.

The development of dairying in Nebraska does provide a hope for the future. To-day the State has jumped into third place in the value of her dairy products. With a production of 100,000,000 pounds of butter and butterfat in 1926 it is not improbable that Nebraska farms will produce 120,000,000 pounds in 1927. That is worth more than any crop produced in Nebraska, with the sole exception of corn.

[Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to me to listen to the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] on the dairying industry in that great State. His remarks have prompted me, without preparation or access to statistics, to call attention to one of the most marvelous dairying developments, for the length of time, that has occurred in the history of this Republic, and that is the development now taking place in the lime-belt district of northeastern Mississippi which I have the honor to represent.

Our experience there abundantly sustains the contention that the South ought to, and no doubt will, become the greatest dairying country in the world.

Lindbergh's flight to Paris or his good-will expedition to Central America has not been more revolutionary in execution or effect than the invasion of that section of Mississippi by the great milk-condensing companies and cheese plants within the last three years. They have aroused our people to a realization of the possibilities of an industry that is changing the one-crop system, putting the farmer on a monthly pay roll, doubling his yearly income, furnishing a ready and convenient market for his products, reducing his fertilizer bill, enriching his land, and inspiring him with hope for and confidence in a lasting, permanent prosperity surpassing anything the South has yet seen.

Three years ago the large milk condensaries of the North began to look for new fields where an abundant milk supply could be obtained the year round. They sent their representatives to northeastern Mississippi, into that lime-belt area that was known throughout the country during Civil War days as the "granary of the Confederacy." They found what Henry Grady once described as a gentle climate above a fertile soil that yields to the husbandman every product of the Temperate Zone.

In addition to fields of cotton, well cultivated, producing from 10,000 to 35,000 bales to the county—every bale of which contains 1,000 pounds of cottonseed, which furnishes the richest and cheapest cow feed in the world—they found vast fields of corn, which gave that section its designation during the Civil War and brought it a baptism of blood and fire in the Federals' attempt to destroy that great source of Confederate supplies.

Fields of alfalfa, as fine as was ever grown in the irrigated districts of California or on the plains of Nebraska, rolling prairies furnishing an unlimited supply of the finest hay and grazing lands for herds of dairy cattle—which to their surprise our people already possessed—were astonishing revelations to those men who were seeking new localities in which to expand their crowded industries. Coupled with all this, they noted a grazing season of eight or nine months in the year, wonderful pastures, containing every variety of grass known to the cattle industry—pastures that are green when the ground in Nebraska, Minnesota, and Wisconsin is frozen as hard as a rock or covered with a sheet of snow, and the farmers in those States are feeding their cows cotton seed meal produced in Mississippi—and an ample supply of moisture that it does not require an act of Congress or an appropriation from the Federal Treasury to supply, but comes as the gift of God in the form of an abundant rainfall equitably distributed throughout the year; and great herds of the finest dairy cows to be found on this continent, more free from cattle tuberculosis, according to Government reports, than the cattle of any other section of the United States. They found practically every community threaded with hard surfaced highways, affording ample facilities for transportation.

The only thing lacking was a market. The rapidly expanding creameries could not keep pace with the increase in milk production, and were therefore unable to furnish a ready market for all of the milk supplied. The condensaries and cheese plants have supplied that market, and are bringing it to the very door of every farmer in the territory.

First, the Borden people went to Oktibbeha County and established their plant at Starkville with the understanding that they would receive 40,000 pounds of milk a day. In less than 18 months they were receiving 160,000 pounds a day, and had increased the capacity of their plant three times, while at the same time the creamery at that place became more prosperous than it had ever been before. They have now gone over to Macon in the adjoining county of Noxubee, one of the most fertile prairie counties in the South, and are there constructing another large plant with every assurance that the result will be as satisfactory as the first.

The Carnation people then came to Tupelo, in Lee County, where they found equally as favorable conditions prevailing. And, in addition, they found that 93 per cent of the farmers of that county were white people, that 95 per cent of the people of the county lived on hard-surfaced roads leading to Tupelo, the county site, and connecting there with two transcontinental highways that cross in that city. They found that while people in other sections of the country were clamoring for reclamation legislation, those people had reclaimed their own land. Thirty-four drainage districts had already been organized, the bonds sold, the canals cut, the land put in cultivation, and the bonds now being retired. A splendid school system, with 22 consolidated schools in the county, nearly all with splendid brick buildings, with trucks transporting the children to and from school, amply supplied with able instructors, afforded educational facilities second to none.

The Carnation plant at Tupelo had its formal opening on May 12 last year, with the expressed hope of securing 60,000 pounds of milk a day at the end of the first year, and passed that mark within less than 90 days.

The people of Monroe County raised the money themselves and built their own condensary at Aberdeen, where they now have a plant that is furnishing a market to the farmers of that county equal to that enjoyed by the people of Oktibbeha and Lee. They have done this in the face of the fact that Monroe County was going through the excitement of bringing in the first commercially producing gas wells south of the Mason and Dixon line and east of the Mississippi River.

At Columbus, in Lowndes County, preparations are going rapidly forward for the construction of a large cheese plant, another one is under construction at Billups, and another one is to be constructed at Artesia—all in the same county. The distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. SHREVE] once resided in Lowndes County, and he will bear witness that richer prairie lands—or lands better suited to dairying—are not to be found in the United States.

Another large condensary is being located just across the line at Tuscaloosa, the home of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

The Pet people have placed one of their condensaries at Kosciusko, and cheese plants have been established at Louisville, Houston, Durant, Yazoo City, and other points throughout Mississippi. Negotiations are under way for plants at Corinth, Amory, Iuka, Belmont, Booneville, Okolona, and many other points in the State, while several large condensaries have been located just north of us in the State of Tennessee.

This is but the beginning of the inevitable movement of the great dairying industry to the South, where conditions are most favorable for its development and permanent prosperity.

At the rate we are going, it will be only a matter of a short time till practically every farmer in northeastern Mississippi

will be on a milk route, thus bringing the market right to his door and putting him on a monthly pay roll. Add that to his cotton crop, as well as his feed crops of corn, hay, and cottonseed, and you will understand why it is that northeastern Mississippi is attracting nation-wide attention and bidding fair to become one of the greatest dairying sections of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this speech just delivered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was made without the slightest notice, and made at my request, because I recognize that no one has contributed more to agricultural development than has Mr. RANKIN. I know the interest that he has shown in soliciting these condensaries and cheese factories to locate in that section, and I am sure the House has enjoyed the statement that he has made. [Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I very heartily approve and highly appreciate the gentleman's splendid statement about his district, but he has omitted one of the greatest assets that his district has, and that is that it lies just across the county line from the second district of Mississippi, and the thing goes upward as you go from the first to the second.

Mr. RANKIN. Like Moses, Mr. Chairman, he is just in sight of the promised land.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall not need 40 minutes. What I have to say is addressed to the point of appropriations for the Department of State.

I had hoped that when I should first speak in this House it might be upon a theme or problem some phase of which I had made myself thoroughly informed about by rigid inquiry. But it so happens that what I have to offer the House now is rather a ground for an appeal for early inquiry into certain suspicions which have been aroused in me concerning the sound organization and efficiency of the Department of State at its heart here in the city of Washington. What I have to say is to be no dramatic attack upon persons, no destructive brick throwing at traditional ideals. I challenge a system the responsibility for which is first of all with the American people themselves, their long-time lack of thought and care about international affairs, their willingness to applaud and appreciate the institutions and the policies which make for material national welfare immediately within our own borders, while forgetful to too great a degree that the world has become one, that the problems called foreign are every whit as vast in their national import as any purely domestic matter or policy possibly could be. How to avoid misundertanding, ill will, aggression, war, personal suffering, vast economic loss; how to gain good will, good understanding, friendly cooperation, prosperity, peace—these questions are so close to us now that international affairs have become national in a sense in which they never were before in our history.

Almost down to the world catastrophe of 1914 the Secretary of State was far from being an overburdened man, and glorious old Assistant Secretary Adee could carry the historical continuity of the department under his hat. But that day is gone by never to return. Foreign nations are all our next-door neighbors, and we are suddenly the greatest economic and political entity that the world ever saw. We are developing a vast reservoir of capital. We are financing the world. We have eleven billions invested in foreign countries now and are adding to it at the rate of a billion a year. A billion in the last few years has gone into a reviving and hard-working Germany. Capital is flowing into South America, which is normally our field, at a terrific rate. And nothing can stop it anywhere.

Citizens go with it. International law and order and sound and free international relations and highly intelligent international leadership in Washington are the breath of life to American business. Business associations are coming to see that, while it is important to work with the Department of Commerce, continuing prosperity and safety in the international field depend fundamentally upon the Department of State. When the shipper gets into trouble, when cargoes are seized, when foreign governments undertake to lay down rules and to countenance practices which cause forfeiture of the rights of our people or encroach upon ordinary privileges, the Department of State is the place to which the trouble victim goes for relief. The Department of State furnishes the approach to the foreign government, and upon the intelligence and skill and good spirit with which the case is presented depends the likelihood of a remedy; and this entirely aside from the use of force and in an entirely different arena. The French Government alters its tariff relations with the United States. Instantly the Department of State is the center upon which all lines converge. Everybody hastens there to see what is to be done about it; what representations can be made to France. And as the result of the immediate and energetic work of the Department of State the French Government changes its position, agrees to enter into negotiations for a friendly commercial treaty, giving advantageous rates to American business in the meantime, being persuaded by the Department of State that in the end this is best for the interests of both countries.

The Department of State occupies or should occupy in modern life the place of preeminence among departments. It holds a peculiar relation to the Executive. It is the right arm of the President in dealing with foreign countries. It is the only department which makes no report to Congress.

The Department of State is charged with maintaining peace, with keeping the boat from rocking, with getting rid of many strained relations which eventually may result in war. Its great function is to prevent war. War is the failure of diplomacy. The Department of State is the first line of defense. It is par excellence the department of peace. If this department is feebly organized, if it has deteriorated into a parlous condition, then the country is in danger as from the decline of no great department of government whatsoever.

Now, what are the facts? In the beginning we were alive as a nation to the great need of skillful leadership in foreign affairs, and we were not obliged to depend widely upon untrained diplomats or a white-spat corps. The experiences of the Colonies with foreign countries had developed a keenness of international relation which was reflected in the ready minds of men like Franklin and Adams, when the time came for diplomatic service and decision of the first magnitude. Franklin went to France because there was nobody in America so fitted to go to France, and Franklin was successful in France because he was an old salt at the business and knew all the sea lanes and reefs of diplomacy. For 16 years before the Revolution he had handled in London by negotiation and persuasion the foreign affairs of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and Georgia and Massachusetts.

As the nineteenth century waxed and we became more and more free from the commercial as well as the political entanglements of the Old World, and more and more aloof in national mind, we lost to some degree our keenness of interest and diplomatic edge in foreign affairs. Diplomatic and consular positions became the mere spoil of victorious parties. Edward Livingston, the great Secretary of State in President Jackson's day, was the first clear voice to be heard in the attempt to arouse the country from its lethargy and carelessness about its foreign affairs. The immediate effect of Livingston's demand for consular reorganization and reform appears to have been to invite attention more definitely to the jobs, to intensify the raid on the Foreign Service, and to multiply existing abuses and inefficiencies. It was not until nearly a quarter of a century had passed—in 1856—that an important act of Congress undertook the first real regulation of the diplomatic and consular systems of the United States. The act of 1856 established the range of diplomatic stipends, put the highest grade of consular officers upon a salary basis and prohibited them from engaging in private trade, established a system of accounting and bonding, and prepared the entering wedge for the merit system by creating a corps of consular pupils of peculiar fitness and qualification to be certified to by the Secretary of State and the President. It also put the force of law behind orders and instructions of the President to diplomatic and consular officers, so far as these orders did not contravene the Constitution or any existing statute of the United States. And then came the Civil War, and following it a long period of indifference to international affairs, except when for a brief moment they might seem to be about to involve us; an attitude of the public mind reflected in Congress and continuing well up to the end of the century and the war with Spain. In 1895 President Cleveland issued an Executive order providing for a system of examination and transfer and promotion of consuls and commercial agents in order to produce a better qualified body of officials. The order died with Cleveland's administration, and the vision of a better day came again with Theodore Roosevelt in 1906. The new act of that year, grading and classifying the posts in the Consular Service, gave the President his opportunity. The merit system was established by Executive order with the punch of power, and inspection, bonding, and accounting rid the consular ranks of irregular practices which had been a shame upon our foreign relations for a hundred years.

Suddenly the business interests of the country rallied to the support of the Roosevelt consular order, and following three years of successful operation President Taft issued similar instructions for the Diplomatic Service below the grade of minister. The rising tide of public opinion, both in Congress and out, now began to demand the enactment of a still more flexible statute, providing for greater mobility of personnel and the overt recognition in law of the merit principle inherent in the executive orders of Roosevelt and Taft. And so came the act of February 5, 1915, to fulfill these plain requirements of a better apprehension of the needs of the country in foreign affairs. Thereafter men were not tied to positions, but could be transferred from post to post according to their qualifications and the interests of the service.

And then the Great War and the recognition by all thoughtful men that, irrespective of the degree of our direct participation in any international organization, the foreign affairs of the world were creeping up very close to us and were increasing significantly in magnitude. Our foreign affairs are now full of economic questions such as never faced us before. And they have vast electrical political factors and consequences. Whether we wish it or not, we are in the front rank of preeminence in foreign affairs, and we can not retire to the rear. We have no choice but to meet the new responsibilities and obligations. We will meet them in our own way, but we must meet them.

Among those who saw clearly that only a beginning had yet been made in providing an adequate department of leadership and protection in foreign affairs, and high on the roll of honor is the name of the Hon. John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts, whose influence still abides in both intangible and tangible form in this House. [Applause.] (Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS is the widow of former Congressman Rogers.) The Rogers Act of 1924 laid for the first time in this country the foundation for new vigor and hope in the foreign-service area of the Department of State. It is too early to estimate the good that will eventually be accomplished. A new scale of salaries ranging from $1,500 to $9,000 is ordered by the Rogers Act, in actual practice beginning at $2,500. Before this most consuls and diplomatic secretaries were unable to eke out an existence on the meager stipend of the statute. The inevitable result in embassies and legations was the reign of the white-spat corps, so clearly emotionalized for us the other day in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN]. I am not able to join with him in excoriation of Sheldon Whitehouse, of the embassy at Paris, who seems to have been delightfully hospitable to the "mayor of the greatest city in the world," if authoritative rumor may be credited. And as for the detectives who stalked the mayor, they were actually assigned by the French police on the suggestion of a friend of the mayor who was managing his Paris movements. What the French did was exactly what is done usually for persons of prominence in the city of Paris upon request.

But the white-spat corps, so fittingly and feelingly described the other day by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], is a reality at least in some cases in the outer courts of certain diplomatic offices of the United States. And such cases will be there until within a generation, under the new regulations of the Rogers Act, a more efficient type of young manhood, beginning between the ages of 21 and 35, shall have become trained and experienced and shall have climbed up into the responsible positions of the Nation in the purely Foreign Service. In the meantime the white-spat corps, with higher pay under the Rogers Act, in some cases disport themselves with what appears to be disdain for their countrymen and with a blasé inefficiency in their daily vocations. They are the same men for the most part who before the better salaries of the act of 1924 lived on a private income earned one or two generations back, whose lives were organized by their fathers before them, who were provided without labor with the equipment of their class, a trip through college, a coonskin coat, the establishment in business. This class, which we have hitherto had to dip into for the lesser diplomats, have never had to exert themselves. With them it is bad form to appear like the active salesmen of their fathers' business. They must not be too wide-awake or too earnest or too interested in anything. And that is the way they act when they get into the distinction of the Diplomatic Service. This I conceive to be the genesis of the spirit of the diplomatic white-spat corps.

The Rogers Act is not only slowly training a new and better body of diplomatic and consular officers but in the end it should greatly democratize our personal contacts with foreign affairs. There is no longer a hard and fast line between the diplomatic and consular office, but young men are moved from one to the other. They must take the training in consular hard knocks as well as in the soft, smooth ways of the social salon.

The Foreign Service of the country can not be made both efficient and democratic too soon, because we are no longer dealing with monarchs and dynasties but with peoples on the march. If our diplomats succeed in the future, it will be because they understand and appreciate and in the right sense sympathize with the human and economic and racial interests of the countries to which they are accredited, and are sincerely in earnest to carry the good will and good understanding of America to the peoples beyond our borders. The only young men fit to represent us in foreign parts are those who are in sympathy with advancing democracy throughout the world and whose character and ability match the advancing prestige of the United States among the nations. [Applause.] In other words, a Lindbergh everywhere on guard.

A great foreign office and its representatives abroad must now be expert in the psychology of other peoples. A very distinguished international statesman in this country once said to me that most of our troubles in South America had been the result of the lack of understanding on the part of our foreign representatives of the human nature of the people of the Southern Hemisphere.

Take the Latin-American field in which we have so many perplexing and disquieting problems. We are interested there as no government on earth is. We are coming to see that the secret of successful relations with Latin America is the personal equation. Morrow and Lindbergh are diplomats par excellence because they are masters of the art of human nature. Their sympathy is sincere to impress upon the Mexican people and other Latin-American peoples the good understanding and good will of their countrymen. The Latin Americans are an entirely different race of people from ours. Their whole approach to government is diametrically opposed to ours. The Latin American will determine very much what he will do about a certain matter by whether he likes you or not. We determine what we will do mainly by what we think of the principle involved. A traveling salesman from the United States goes to Latin America and stops off between steamers and tries to sell, and frequently does not succeed. The French or German salesman stops off for two or three weeks, goes into the shop of the merchant, exchanges formal greetings, inquires about the wife and children, and goes out again. By and by he comes back and there are other pleasant expressions. Days go by before anything is said about selling merchandise, but when all conventionalities are finally met, the Latin American is ready to talk business.

The same principle of the sympathetic and understanding mind is applicable to ambassadors, ministers, and consuls—to deal with foreign peoples as they want to be dealt with, with time and patience and good temper and kindliness and the spending of some money. We have been niggardly about representation and entertainment allowances for our foreign representatives, and have frequently thereby lost in caste and influence in the foreign field. Under the statute of 1924 entertainment expenses may go to ambassadors and ministers, but they have never yet been provided. As a matter of fact, they are probably not so useful in the hands of ambassadors and ministers as the same sums would be in the hands of the lower range of officials. [Applause.]

The Committee on Appropriations has knowledge of these things and in its new bill has gone further than ever before in meeting the needs of the present hour. The main difficulty seems to be with the Budget office. The Budget office appears not to be able to look upon the Department of State as a producing organization. Keeping the world peace for America seems not a tangible thing to market. If a cut in the Department of Commerce appropriations is imminent, the Secretary is able to say, "All right. Which lighthouse will you have wink out to-night?" The shippers or their clients will wail before the throne. The bankers will support the Treasury demands and the farmers will not listen to a decline in the agricultural appropriations. But the best things the Department of State may do for the country they can not tell about; if they tell about them, they can never do them again. Any day there may be a decision of policy that involves millions. A mistake in the Department of State is more costly than anywhere else. It is only when we come to think of the leadership and activities of the Department of State as fraught with graver consequences to the American people for weal or woe than any other mere department whatever, it is only when we see that the decisions made there pave the way to war or peace, to prosperity and happiness, or to vast economic and personal loss, that we approach in the right way the subject of the

care which Congress should exercise over the personnel and the needs of the foreign office of the United States. And from such inquiry as I have so far been able to make, I believe it to be the view of most well-informed people, inside the department and out, that the Foreign Office of the United States, in spite of the advance of the Rogers Act, is still a long way from sound organization and safe functioning for the American people.

In the first place the Rogers Act applies only to representatives of our foreign affairs abroad. Whatever reorganization and better salary classification and democratization may ultimately do for the Foreign Service, the field of the Department of State at home in Washington is as yet untouched. And here is the brain center of our foreign affairs. Here they tell the Foreign Service what to think and what to do, after being fed with the facts by the Foreign Service. But here men engaged upon foreign affairs are underpaid and overburdened because their offices are undermanned; in spite of all that a number of devoted and able men in the department can do, they are always sitting over dynamite, things being as they are, usually critical somewhere in the affairs of the world. Salaries in the department at home are still on the old-time basis. Young men are brought in from the higher schools of the country and started at $1,320 a year. The natural tendency is for a bright young man to get a little experience at the expense of the Government and go out into private practice to profit by it. A few utterly devoted souls hang on, together with those who can do no better elsewhere, and in the course of 15 or 20 years of faithful or inefficient service, as the case may be, attain to the maximum salary of $6,000 a year, and this in the city of Washington!

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman's indictment against the Bureau of the Budget is well founded, it applies with equal force as to many matters referred to Congress itself. So far as the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Department of State is concerned, there have been no protests filed with reference to the appropriations made, and if the gentleman can point out the number of men who have resigned in the last few years on account of small pay, either from clerical or other positions, I should like to have him do so in the extension of his remarks.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Foreign Service is important, but the Foreign Service under the Rogers Act has been given what was asked for at that time. This committee in the pending bill has increased appropriations $175,000 in order to add to the pay of the Foreign Service, and we gave $60,000 to provide for additional clerks to aid the Foreign Service in supplying information to the Department of Commerce. We have also provided for the building of homes for them abroad, and building in a way that perhaps no other country has yet undertaken. In a tropical country we select large areas, and they are so improved as to be free from tropical diseases which so many have suffered from; and if the gentleman will read the hearings in reference to the building program, I think he will find that if we have neglected any department it has not been the Department of State. It has fared very well.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will say to the gentleman that if he will wait until I am through he will see to what point my criticism turns. It is not with respect to the Foreign Service so much as to the department at home. I shall try to make that clear before I get through.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In response to the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], I may say that two of the ablest young men in the department, Mr. Richardson and Mr. Dalton, resigned within the last two years because they could not get a living out of the salary paid. They are both Marylanders.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes; and the turnover of the Department of State in the last year has been 19 per cent. In the department in the city of Washington the salaries still range from $1,320 to $6,000 as chief of division.

I am reliably informed that a responsible officer of the State Department has long been in the habit of getting up at 5 o'clock Monday morning to do the family washing, and he does not like the job, either. I say, more honor to him for doing it and more shame to the Government of the United States for permitting good minds in the most critical and vital department of the Government to be harried to such a degree by inadequate provision for ordinary material needs. [Applause.]

In the act of 1906 there is an absurd limitation of $1,000 a year on the salaries of foreign clerks in the Department of State. The Department of Commerce is hampered by no such statute. The result is that the Department of Commerce is drawing these young men, who come to be good consular clerks, away from the Department of State.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Congress itself imposed that limitation, I think somewhat unwisely. The committee will bring it to the attention of Congress and it is probable that the Department of State will be allowed to employ at such rates as they think wise.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The State Department at home has six chiefs of division, one for western Europe, one for eastern Europe, one for the Near East, one for the Far East, one for Latin America, and one for Mexico. Each one of them advises the Secretary of State about his particular geographic area, and it is upon his skill and wisdom in the interpretation of events that the Secretary relies. These chiefs for the most part are no longer bred at home. It has become very difficult in the department to develop a personnel from the lower to the higher offices. The human stuff does not stay there to be trained. It gets out to earn a sufficient amount of honest daily bread to feed its family. The turnover for the Department of State in Washington for the single fiscal year 1927 is 19 per cent.

It is necessary therefore to recruit these chiefs of division from the Foreign Service. For the year 1928 we have robbed the Foreign Service of 51 good men, taking them from their geographic areas abroad, and perhaps they do not go at all into the appropriate geographic division in which they are expert when they get to Washington. During the recent very troubled times with Mexico, we have had at the head of the Mexican division a man of good ability but little expert knowledge of Mexico. These men who are brought in from the foreign field to rejuvenate the department at home may remain, under the statute, only four years. Then they must get away again to some field which happens to be open. There is a man named Kelly in the Department of State right now who knows more about Russia than anybody in the United States. He is invaluable in an area which requires intimate knowledge and great skill, and the department can not replace him, but he must leave soon and he may go to Java or Bombay. When diplomacy fails and war comes, the buck passes from the Department of State to the Departments of War and the Navy, and their organization expenditures are vastly inflated, while those of the Department of State comparatively recede. When peace comes again, the War and the Navy are deflated; but it may very well be that the Department of State, with the tremendously enlarged foreign responsibilities of a peace time like the present, is seriously injured if the theory is that it should share in the deflation. There is something to be said for occasionally bringing home men from the foreign field in order that Washington may feel the fresh vigor of their information and imagination, but there is nothing to be said for the present frequently employed method of using them when they get here.

What shall we think of the good sense of a government which goes only half way with its plans for the reform of its foreign office, and permits men with relatively subordinate positions in the Foreign Service, with salaries of $7,000 to $9,000 a year, to be brought home to advise and assist their superior officers who have salaries of considerably less amount? Is it not a fair field for heartburnings and subconscious jealousies and general decay of initiative and hope?

Above the chiefs of division, who are now necessarily and usually brought in from abroad, are the four Assistant Secretaries of State and the Undersecretary of State. They are the chief group of authoritative officers in the department, with salaries of $7,500 a year and grave responsibilities. They make the decisions and issue the orders to the Foreign Service. And the system subjects them to constant demoralization. They are always getting out and getting into the larger salaries and larger freedom, each within his own domain, of the relatively subordinate Foreign Service. Wright, Harrison, Grew, Wilson, Phillips, Assistant Secretaries and heads of the information and trades division, not far apart, catapulted into the larger rewards of the Foreign Service. They themselves, having given orders and grown experienced in doing it, go out to take orders from the relative inexperience which in too many cases must fill their places. From the standpoint of efficient business organization the system in the State Department is as topsy-turvy as Alice ever found Wonderland.

The Solicitor of the Department of State is counsel for the American people in international affairs. His function is that of handling the claims of citizens of the United States against foreign governments and of nationals of foreign countries against the United States. He interprets the rights of the

United States and of its nationals under all international agreements. He is the legal expert in international arbitrations, and is responsible for the drafting of treaties. I have heard those whose experience justified their opinion say that there are probably not more than half a dozen persons in the United States thoroughly competent for this position. The solicitor should be the leading international lawyer in the Union. We have a good one now. He gets $7,000 a year. He gets it because that is the way he is classified, along with other solicitors of other departments, where the making of sound contracts in ordinary matters is the daily pursuit of men who perhaps can be somewhat easily procured in the market for $7,000 a year. A great corporation in New York City could not be made to believe that it was receiving wise advice unless in the case of a man competent to attack such problems as those of the Solicitor in the State Department, the salary was at least fifty or one hundred thousand dollars a year. The Government could probably have held the now famous John Bassett Moore if they could have paid him a living salary. He came to Washington as a $1,200 clerk; then got $1,800; then as Third Assistant Secretary, $2,500. Then he left. Then he came back again as counselor for the State Department. Then he was out again.

The present solicitor has 22 assistants. His salary can not go any higher, because under the classification act the top salary is paid to Assistant Secretaries; that is, $7,500. And so there the solicitor sticks, held to his office and the guidance of his 22 assistants. The British counsel, Sir Cecil Hurst, is always abroad on every important need, in constant touch with the chancellories of the world.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Can the gentleman tell us what the British solicitor gets?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I can not; but it is no doubt more than $7,000. It is more probably £7,000.

And there is another great danger, it seems to me, that will let us in sooner or later for some real trouble; that is, the tendency on the part of other departments which have interests abroad, to get as far into the field themselves as they can with their own foreign service. I dare say there should be Treasury agents abroad, and no doubt there should be reporting and investigating abroad by agents of the Department of Commerce. But the responsibility and the decisions should head up in one place—that is, the Department of State—and the general policy should be fixed there in advance.

On the evening of March 31, 1927, the Assistant Secretary of Labor sent over to the Department of State an order which the Department of Labor had issued, going into effect April 1, restraining all alien commuters coming across the Canadian border daily to work in the United States, unless they could produce immigration visas. This matter had been allowed to run along from July 1, 1924, when the new immigration law went into effect, with nothing said about it. Indeed, the Secretary of Labor wrote a letter to the mayor of Windsor, Canada, that no change of policy was contemplated. Then out of the blue came this order. Legally the Secretary of Labor had a right to issue the order, but practically it brought a protest from the Canadian Government at once on the ground of injustice to a lot of innocent people. As a result several of the leading officers of the Department of State were occupied with this thing for two or three weeks in intense effort conferring and arguing with the Department of Labor. There was much unfavorable publicity, much feeling in Canada, and some danger of injuring our relations with a long-time friend. The matter was not settled until late in November.

As the result of the handicap which the department faces in developing adequate organization in its own staff the country is under the anomaly, and the large expense in the case of claims commissions, of having all the preliminaries in such cases farmed out to outsiders who ultimately carry off into their own private practice the fruits of the evidence and the study, leaving the department as poverty stricken as before and as unprepared for any future controversy. It seems to be a reasonable view that a well-organized department should furnish continuing ability for the preparation of these cases and the presentation of the Claims Commission, and continuing records of the results.

If any institution of government in this country needs leisure to think in the modern world since the war, it is the Department of State. Under the imperfect organization and the inadequate personnel, every-day questions must every day be put to important executive officers without the background of research which reasonably assures the man who makes the decision that he is doing it accurately. The executive official has not time for the research, and no thorough machinery for it appears anywhere. Men of long experience in these matters, inside the department and out, tell me that there is necessarily too much snap judgment in the Foreign Office of the United States. Foreign relations are too important for snap judgments, and under the existing order it is little short of miraculous that things have gone as well as they have. In the order of nature and chance we are likely in the future as in the past to have some good Secretaries of State and some who are not so good. But with the increasing magnitude and importance and complexity of foreign problems since the war, a capable Secretary might be led by an incapable organization into catastrophe, and an incapable Secretary might be led into disaster.

The disparity in expenditure between the departments of war and the fundamental department of peace, namely, the Department of State, is very striking. In 1926 six hundred and seventy-six millions for the War and Navy and less than ten millions for the department of peace. Actually the net cost of the department of peace to the taxpayers of the country was $1,350,000, because the Department of State produces between eight and nine millions in fees and other receipts. In 1928 the appropriations for the Department of State will reach above twelve millions and the receipts nearly nine millions, leaving approximately three millions net cost for the department of peace at home and throughout the world. The American people are not niggardly about an adequate expenditure for defense, and if a three millions burden upon the taxpayer is sufficient to insure skillful international leadership, enough is enough. But if it shall appear that inadequate appropriations, in view of the vast interests at stake, are injurious to the functioning of the great department of peace, neither will the American people begrudge those additions which make for the skillful and unhampered leadership of foreign affairs. Necessary additions to present appropriations to put the Department of State at home on a sound basis would probably not total over one or two hundred thousand dollars, and to do the same for the Department of State throughout the world, probably less than a million dollars.

Whether the remedy for the present organization is to extend the Rogers Act in some form to cover the whole of the department, or whether there are simple solutions nearer at hand, I do not know. The thing I suggest is a friendly survey by joint action of Congress and the Department of State of the needs of the country in the better organization of the machinery and personnel of the foreign office. There never was a time in the history of the foreign affairs of America when there was need for greater wisdom and efficiency in the foreign office. We are in a position of security and prosperity to be envied, and the last trait of human nature that we should wish to arouse by mistaken views or wrong conduct of our own is envy. What we should wish to avoid most sincerely is any tendency, growing out of envy or misunderstanding, for nations to league against us either in Europe or the Far East. That there is some ground for fear of this tendency is a fact known to all.

In the present situation in China we have a fair and notable example of the need of skill and vision in the Department of State. Whatever the political and military chaos of the hour, the nationalist movement in China seems to be the only sure trend upon which to count. Upon the throwing off of foreign interference and the establishment of a national unity the heart of the four hundred millions of China seems to be definitely set. The peril in the nationalist movement has been the subtle influence of the Soviet Government of Russia for the last several years. Beginning with last May the nationalist movement in China began to eliminate that influence and is continuing the process with unabated vigor. But the Chinese people in their onward march need the wise and sympathetic support of genuine friendship from some influential source. The chief figure in the nationalist movement appears to be Chiang Kai Shek, some time generalissimo of the nationalist forces, and now the chairman of the advisory council in nationalist affairs. The other day in a wistful interview he pleaded for an American commission to come over and examine with the Government at Nanking, and perhaps at Peking also, the question of the revision of treaties and our relation to the China of the future. I am not saying whether it should or should not be done, but great things are afoot, and there is need in the Department of State for clarity of vision and wisdom of decision. Whether we have a Department of State fit for this task may make a great difference with the future of America and the future of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the following table, introduced by Representative BACON, of New York, indicating that under existing statute the Department of State is entitled to approximately $64,000 a

year to bring its average salaries up to the average salaries actually allowed by law, this amount being held back by action of the Budget officers:

Department of State

Grade and service	Number of employees in grade	Average salaries allowed by law	Average salaries paid by department	Amount required to raise average salaries paid by department to average salaries allowed by law	Amount required to raise all employees to eligible salaries according to efficiency list for May, 1927
P. and S. VI	1	$6,750	$6,000	$750.00	[1]
P. and S. V	8	5,600	5,600		$1,800.00
P. and S. IV	9	4,400	4,133	2,400.00	4,400.00
P. and S. III	20	3,300	3,165	2,700.00	4,700.00
P. and S. II	9	2,700	2,488	1,900.00	900.00
P. and S. I	5	2,100	1,928	860.00	580.00
S. P. V	1	1,860	1,800	60.00	120.00
S. P. IV	2	1,680	1,530	300.00	120.00
C. A. F. XIV	1	15,000	[2]		
	5	7,500			
C. A. F. XII	1	5,600	5,600		400.00
C. A. F. XI	8	4,400	4,200	1,600.00	3,400.00
C. A. F. X	3	3,600	3,566	100.00	600.00
C. A. F. IX	9	3,300	3,100	1,800.00	1,500.00
C. A. F. VIII	1	3,000	3,300		[3]
C. A. F. VII	16	2,700	2,556	2,300.00	2,600.00
C. A. F. VI	12	2,400	2,270	1,600.00	2,800.00
C. A. F. V	65	2,100	1,971	8,340.00	11,820.00
C. A. F. IV	67	1,860	1,754	6,840.00	8,520.00
C. A. F. III	134	1,680	1,559	16,200.00	18,780.00
C. A. F. II	100	1,500	1,370	13,020.00	11,160.00
C. A. F. I	19	1,320	1,238	1,560.00	1,980.00
C. U. IV	4	1,320	1,305	60.00	240.00
C. U. III	53	1,140	1,100	2,100.00	3,900.00
C. U. II	8	1,020	967	420.00	660.00
Total requirement on a yearly basis				64,910.00	80,980.00
Total requirement on a monthly basis				5,409.16	6,748.33

[1] Rating not required.
[2] Salaries designated by law.
[3] Department average in excess of average by law.

DECEMBER 16, 1927.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to myself. No one will deny that the Department of State is one of the great and one of the most important departments of the Government. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] undertook, however, to arraign the Budget officer, General Lord, in reference to his recommendations for the Department of State, knowing, as I did, that as to many of the matters complained of he was limited by the action of Congress itself, I felt it was but just to say that if there be blame on the Budget officer as to these matters, that blame likewise attaches to Congress for having passed legislative limitations.

The State Department is the one department of the Government that is in constant communication with the President, perhaps more so than any other department of the Government. The Secretary of State doubtless has more important official conversations with the President than any other Cabinet officer; and yet, so far as I know, there have been no recommendations by either the Secretary of State or the President to the proper committee of the House, the Foreign Affairs Committee, for legislation that would enable Congress, acting through its Appropriations Committee, to give relief, if relief be required, in reference to many matters to which the gentleman has referred.

Take, for instance, the limitation that the gentleman from New York speaks of with reference to the employment of foreign clerks. That is wrong; yet neither the Appropriations Committee nor the Budget officer has authority to remove the limitation. It was placed there by Congress and does not obtain in reference to some other departments. But so important was it that Mr. SHREVE and other members of the subcommittee intended calling it to the attention of the proper legislative committee and ask that they at this session remove the limitation and place such clerks on an equality with foreign clerks employed by other departments.

Take for instance, another item, the item for paying the return traveling expenses of State Department officials after long absences in foreign fields. While we have had a law authorizing this for many years, yet the law was so written that it left it discretionary with the Secretary of State as to whether he would recommend appropriations for this purpose. No appropriation had been asked for. This committee of its own volition at the last session of Congress voted an initial appropriation for that purpose [applause], and the present bill carries an increase in the appropriation.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Is it not true that the Department of State requested increased appropriations from the Director of the Budget; that he turned them down, and therefore they were estopped from coming to the Appropriations Committee of the House?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am not informed as to that. What I was leading up to is this: That if some of the things the gentleman from New York has said are true, either Congress is at fault or the President and the Secretary of State are at fault in not calling them to the attention of Congress. No request, I say to the House, made to our committee has yet been denied, so far as I recall, for the Department of State where proof was afforded justifying the request. We have granted them, sometimes of our own volition, increases in clerk pay and increases in clerk numbers.

Rather strange that, though I have served on this committee for four or five years, only once during that time has the present Secretary of State ever thought it important enough to come before the committee.

The department has been ably represented, however, by Mr. Wilbur Carr, Assistant Secretary of State. There is no abler man in Government service than Mr. Carr, but it is well for the Secretary of State, if an injustice has been done to his department, as claimed by the gentleman from New York, to occasionally come and at least make a statement to our committee relative thereto. [Applause.] So, if there be grounds of complaint, let it be understood that the Secretary of State is not free from negligence in not calling these matters to the attention of the proper committees of the House, and the President is likewise not free from fault for the same reason. They should know about these matters much better than the gentleman from New York. The Secretary of State came before our committee for the first time at this session of Congress, but no allusion was made to any injustice to the Department of State. He referred to none of these matters now complained of, and many of these, perhaps, have fallen into the hands of our colleague through some subordinate of the Department of State.

What I wanted the House to know was that the Secretary of State has, himself, been negligent in not presenting those matters if they be true.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. Of course, the fact remains that if the criticisms of the gentleman from New York are justified, either in whole or in part, that, regardless of a recommendation from the executive branch of the Government, there is an obligation resting upon the legislative committee of Congress to take up the proposition, study it, and act upon it. I take it that is the view of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It would be much better for the State Department, through its head who is a Cabinet officer and in constant communication with the President, not to pursue a subterranean channel such as has been adopted. It would be much better for him to come before the legislative committee himself, make the recommendations, and let them give consideration thereto.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Committee on Appropriations can appropriate only when authorized by law?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. And if they were to put an item of appropriation in the bill when there is no authority of law for it, a point of order would be good against it, and it would be knocked out if a point of order were made?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably so.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I had to go to the telephone a moment. I did not want to lose what the gentleman was saying, but I heard as I came in something about a subterranean method.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain to the gentleman there was nothing subterranean about this. I never knew anything about it myself until sometime during the summer when I happened to be at the Honolulu Conference on International Relations and the matter was brought to my attention quite incidentally by one not connected with the State Department, but who knew something about it. When I got home I referred to it in a public speech, and I noticed that it attracted attention in a number of places. When I came here I made an independent inquiry about it. There was nothing subterranean

about it, from the organization in the House or any other source whatever. Nobody knew anything about it except the people I consulted. Nobody took the initiative in the matter except myself.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I acquit the gentleman, then, of having himself submitted something that was perhaps handed to him by some one else.

Mr. DAVENPORT. That is not my method.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I ask this question, however? The Committee on Appropriations is quite familiar with methods sometimes followed and I assume the information the gentleman gave, of course, came from the Department of State.

Mr. DAVENPORT. No, Mr. Chairman. It came from men who have long left the Department of State.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Only from them.

Mr. DAVENPORT. And who suffered, therefore, from the situation in the Department of State.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I ask whether the allusion the gentleman made to the pay of special counsel came from men who had left the Department of State, or was that brought to the gentleman's attention by some one connected with the department?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no recollection where that particular item came from; but, as a matter of fact, when I go into these things I do not stop to take anybody's view of them, but make a careful study of them from different sources.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I was wondering whether our distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT], who has been a professor of political economy, has been to our legislative committee with his complaints and has requested them to bring in legislation that would authorize the Committee on Appropriations to cover such items as the gentleman has had under consideration. There is where his action should be taken, before the legislative committee, because the Committee on Appropriations is absolutely helpless until some law is passed that would warrant such appropriations.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I do not even want two minutes, but may I say that the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas may be a very good one, but I chose another method, bringing it directly to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Congress acts only through its legislative committees. For until a legislative committee regularly brings legislation before the House, the House is helpless and can not give consideration to same.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from New York is well within his rights.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I am afraid the gentleman is not, if you will permit me. Such rights are becoming out of date. It is becoming so, I verily believe, that an appeal to the House of Representatives when it is in the Committee of the Whole to remedy any injustice of this or any other kind, is a very archaic method. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I had not intended, and I am sure the committee has not inferred from anything I have said, that it is ever improper to bring a matter before Congress, but I thought, in view of this complaint, and the fact that the gentleman seemingly spoke with deep conviction in reference to these matters, and knowing that the Secretary of State should be well informed on the subject, if those facts are true, it was not inopportune to say that the Secretary of State and the President, both in position to know, should certainly have called these matters to the attention of Congress, so that legislation might be considered for the correction of the same where legislation was needed and additional appropriations considered where authorized.

I do not wish, however, to go as far as my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has indicated in one of his statements, that there are not some matters about which complaint has been made that our committee have no authority to correct. We would have authority to correct matters in reference to additional clerical help, but so far as I know there have been no requests made to our committee for additional clerical help which we felt we ought to allow.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. There is a little embarrassment, of course, to the head of a department or the head of a bureau in himself suggesting to the committee that the Budget has not given him what he ought to have or what he requested. Now, in reference to the State Department, was there care taken to see that they were not embarrassed by the committee itself inviting suggestions?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am glad the gentleman has asked the question. Before the subcommittee on which I serve the Departments of State, Justice, Labor, and Commerce are invited to speak frankly and fully as to their needs, and the gentleman will find repeatedly throughout the hearings where we have elicited from them the recommendations made to the Budget, and never yet have we undertaken to suppress any recommendations they may have made to the Budget. On the other hand, we have sought to elicit that information for the benefit of the House, and at this time we have increased some appropriations because we learned of recommendations that were made which we felt were justified and should have been granted.

Mr. NEWTON. I appreciate that is the attitude of the gentleman's subcommittee, but was that done in this case with the State Department?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If there be embarrassment to the heads of departments on that account, it is not chargeable to our committee or to Congress. It is due to the President himself, and the President, as I have said to you before, is more vitally interested in the proper functioning of the State Department than anyone else in official position. They are his constant advisers, and if this department has been so neglected as to become inefficient and to be deserving of some of the things said about it, then the President certainly should have had it called to his attention by the Secretary of State and should have taken proper steps to bring it to the attention of Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Washington rose.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for several years now, and we have never had any representation made of such a condition as has been described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT]. It seems to me if such a condition exists, the gentleman could serve no better purpose than to introduce a resolution which would result in bringing the entire matter to the attention of that committee.

I am in general sympathy with the proposition that the departments are entitled to consideration and employees of the Government are entitled to consideration with respect to the personnel both as to number and salary. I respectfully suggest, if my friend will permit me, to the gentleman from New York that the best way to effect a result, to get at something practical, is for him to take steps to submit the consideration of this matter to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which conceivably may find that legislation ought to be enacted.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I shall be glad to do that, as I suggested in the latter part of my speech.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In conclusion let me say this: Speeches like the one we have listened to are not always accurately reported in the press; only those things that make headlines and invite criticism—yea, criticism of Congress—are carried. That is why I rose to say that if there be matters urgently needing correction, and the Department of State on that account has not been functioning as it should, that these matters could have been and should have been called to the attention of Congress by the Secretary of State, if not by the President himself. I am not willing that Congress, when neither the Secretary of State nor the President have registered any complaint, shall be charged with responsibility therefor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I believe this debate in the last few minutes is one of the most important debates that has been held or will be held in the next several weeks. It is not so much any particular charge is made by the gentleman from New York, but it runs to the system brought about by which you are called or not called to the subcommittee.

I have no criticism of any subcommittee, but as to the suggestion of a report from the President let me say that the committee was sitting before the report was made by the President. The committee was holding hearings and the hearings were printed on the 8th day of December, when the other committees had not been organized.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the remarks of the gentleman from Washington are pertinent to this subject, I respectfully suggest I am unable to see it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am sorry that I have not made myself clear.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I know the gentleman from Washington has been critical of the method of centering appropriations in one committee. He has been heard several times on that score. He has appeared before our committee, and we have heard him repeatedly. It is not unusual for some Members of Congress to criticize the Budget Bureau for its economy and then go out and claim that appropriations made by Congress are less than the sums recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from Washington admits he is not immune from that charge.

What I want to bring to the attention of this House, and not allow irrelevant matter to get us away from the point, is that if what the gentleman from New York has said is true, then the head of the State Department and the President himself are in positions where they must know such facts, and if they have that knowledge they should have called these matters to the attention of the proper committees of Congress for correction.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BEEDY. Knowing the fairness of the gentleman from Alabama, I thought perhaps he would agree with me in a statement I would like to make. I think the House is indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] for a most thoughtful and helpful consideration of a problem of vital importance. I did not draw from his remarks any conclusion which led me to criticize even in my own mind the action of the subcommittee. I think those of us who have become familiar with the manifold duties of Congress understand that it is sometimes utterly impossible for a subcommittee to get all the evidence on all the problems of government.

I want to say that I think this discussion has refuted the assertion just made that the consideration of Government problems in Committee of the Whole is futile. Here to-day we have evidence that, although Congress may be cumbersome, as all representative governments are, yet there are various ways of getting at the bottom of things. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] has laid a splendid foundation, by a thoughtful and considerate speech, for a thorough investigation of this whole problem. I feel that every Member who heard him and every member of the subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] is such an able member, will be glad to cooperate with him to the end that we may if necessary reorganize the Department of State and make it more efficient. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. After all, the Budget is merely the President's private secretary, and there is no Cabinet officer closer to the President than is the Secretary of State. Since our friend from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] seemingly has been denied access to his President and access to his Budget chairman, General Lord, and access to his Secretary of State to bring all these troubles to light before them, it leaves it solely to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] to get up here and defend the President and the Secretary of State and the Budget and the administration.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, may I say again that there can be no two opinions about the statment made by my good friend from Maine [Mr. BEEDY]. I think every Member of Congress seeks information, and never have I known a Member of Congress to close the door to those who have information, nor have any of the committees of this Congress closed the doors to bearers of information. I find that it is only to Members possessing information that the membership of the House gives attention to. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] made a most intelligent presentation of his views, but what I want to carry to the country is this, that if what he said is correct, then those at the head of that department and the President himself should bring that to the attention of the proper committees of Congress. There are but few matters in connection with what he has discussed that the Committee on Appropriations could correct if they were supplied with information, but there are many matters that he has discussed that could properly be laid before the proper legislative committee for its consideration.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman for two minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I made every effort in what I had to say about the Department of State to keep all heat out of it. I tried to keep as close to the facts as I could, and what I was challenging was not Congress, not a subcommittee, not the Secretary of State, not the President, nobody in particular, but a system that has slowly grown up and that we ourselves must immediately get rid of, it seems to me. I am not at all attacking persons. I think the way to get at this thing is not to attack persons, but to avoid all heat and to proceed to a careful survey by Congress and the Department of State jointly, with the end in view to correct the situation as soon as we can. That is my only purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am very much pleased that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] has brought up this question. I think the trouble with the State Department is that it is too timid, it is too modest. They do not like to come down and ask for money. They do not like to ask for increase of salaries, and they do it, I think, only when compelled to. For instance, when the Rogers Act was introduced it took two sessions to pass it. It involved an increase of salaries and also the retirement feature, and Congress was very slow in giving the department the relief that it asked. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, has always listened to them and has always believed they should have sufficient funds to run the department as it should be run and to pay adequate salaries. I have said to the Secretary of State, and I have told Mr. Carr, that they are too timid in what they ask for. When they first had the idea of asking for money to build embassies and office buildings in foreign countries they asked for only $5,000,000. I said they could not do anything with that, and that they should ask for $10,000,000. The President and the Budget were consulted and then $10,000,000 was asked for, and Congress gave them that amount just as easily as it would have given them $5,000,000. But there was a great bluster on the floor of the House. Men said that the commission were going on trips abroad through the various countries and there was the idea that this commission to be created in respect to these buildings would travel through the foreign countries on a sort of junket. The consequence was that nothing was provided in that bill, nothing was asked in that bill, for the commission or any member of the commission, to visit foreign countries and make selections. Yet you are investing $10,000,000, and probably when you get through some $20,000,000. Our chairman, Mr. PORTER, of Pennsylvania, is compelled to take money out of his own pocket and pay his expenses when he travels abroad and looks into the question of sites to determine whether the buildings and sites are properly located and whether they are being purchased at a fair market price.

If the State Department should come down here and ask that the chairman of that committee should have traveling expenses, I expect there would be lots of talk about a junketing trip; and so the State Department does not come here any oftener than they can help and ask for funds; I think they are too timid—I almost said that it seemed to me that they are too polite to come and ask for these different things. If the War Department wants something, if the Navy Department wants something, or if any other department wants something, they make it known to the Congress. They come down here and they have the public back of them, and they tell what they want, and the public gets back of them and you make the appropriation—for instance, some $600,000,000 for the Army and the Navy—but when you come to the State Department they come down and ask for the meager sum of $10,000,000, and pay back into the Treasury some $7,000,000, leaving the whole State Department to be conducted at an expense, both for foreign service and here in Washington, of only $3,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman object to having the Government run economically?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have no objection to having the Government run economically, but I believe that it is now being run, so far as the State Department is concerned, parsimoniously, and I do not believe in that.

Mr. MADDEN. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I happen to be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Give us a single instance of parsimony.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Take the matter of these clerical jobs. In Europe I found some men working—some of these clerks—for as low as $800 a year. Does the gentleman call that economy or parsimony?

Mr. MADDEN. Are those American citizens?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know whether they are or not.

Mr. MADDEN. They are not.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would say that in a great many of the offices I do not believe that they are American citizens, because they could hardly talk English; but they ought to be American citizens, and they ought to have salaries adequate to the work they do wherever they are.

Mr. MADDEN. If I were in the gentleman's place, I would get possession of the state of the facts before I got on the floor to talk about the thing. If the gentleman has nothing better to say than to find fault because we do not run the Government economically, he has not a very good case.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not want to take anything back. I was not criticizing the Committee on Appropriations. I believe the Committee on Appropriations gave them all the money they asked for. But I think legislation should be introduced and enacted to get for some of them better salaries, so that there would not be this turnover of 19 per cent, to which reference has been made. I am very glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] has opened the way, and I hope he will introduce a bill to accomplish the purpose he has in mind.

Mr. MADDEN. I know the gentleman would give them the money if he had it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made some reference to certain low-paid clerks in the service abroad. The gentleman is aware of the fact that it is impossible to appropriate more for the people he mentions because of the legislation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes. I understand the committee has given them all they asked for and all that they could give them under legislative authorization.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for time for the purpose of reading a poem entitled "The Lindbergh name," by our former colleague, Mr. Knud Wefald, of Hawley, Minn., and an article entitled "Sire of the Eagle," by Lynn Haines, and putting them into the RECORD. The poem reads as follows:

THE LINDBERGH NAME

By Knud Wefald

The Lindbergh name was once so cursed
  It wrapped our State in shame.
It wraps us all in glory now
  And covers us with fame.
And yet I think it stood for more
  When it was so accursed,
Than now it's swelling through the world
  By all our plaudits nursed.

It stands for fame and fortune now,
  Since "Lindy" flew to France;
With God alone he gambled then
  And took a gambler's chance.
His father's name, as yet unsung—
  Have we forgot its charms?
Forgot that he defied the lords
  Of nations sprung to arms?

The mighty masters he defied
  That cracked on us their whips,
Who owned the tools of industry,
  The cannons and the ships.
When most of men had lost their heads
  'Mid patriotism's roar,
He cried, "I'll tell you toilers why
  Your country is at war!"

And what he told the toilers with
  Their masters illy sat;
They warned him, scorned him, libelled him,
  And in his face they spat.
Yet calm and unafraid he stood,
  Though wearied, worn, and wan—
And when the toilers stoned him, too,
  He took it like a man.

The son so proudly has been named
  "Lone Eagle of the Air."
His sire—of blessed memory—was
  An untamed polar bear.
He fought for justice, right, and truth,
  Unmoved by friend or foe;
He, bloodstained, lonely, blazed a trail
  For honest men to go.

When high the famous son sails on
  Upon his lonely flight,
His father's footsteps he can see
  In fire traced at night;
And winging on his trackless course
  Between the earth and God,
He sees the troubled, thorny road
  His noble father trod.

But when the Lindbergh name is cheered
  In every spoken tongue,
And toasted in the banquet halls
  And praised in speech and song,
When throngs go mad as soon as they
  But see him in the sky,
From out the Calvary of his sire
  It echoes "Crucify!"

The article by Mr. Haines is taken from The Nation of December 28, 1927. I read:

SIRE OF THE EAGLE

By Lynn Haines

The world once more is agog over Charles A. Lindbergh. His 35,000-mile flight over the United States, his journey to Mexico through fog and rain makes him more than ever his country's hero, the "ambassador of good will." And though the world saw his father very differently, "like father, like son" was never more perfectly illustrated than in Charles A. Lindbergh, senior and junior. No two could be more thoroughly alike. One chose statesmanship, the other aviation; that was the only difference between them.

It proved a tremendous difference, however. The very qualities of character which bring the world to one's feet in aircraft will place one beneath the feet of the world in statecraft. Lindbergh the younger demonstrates a surpassing courage, whereupon multitudes surge about him to do him honor. Lindbergh the elder was equally courageous and independent, but the masses he had to face were American mobs.

The father was tall and straight, a fine figure of a man. His face was outstandingly strong, alert, frank, and kindly. He was always calm and impersonal. He used no liquor nor tobacco. I never heard even the smallest "cuss word" pass his lips. He cared nothing for social life. If he had been asked to dance he would have made the same answer as does his lionized son: "I never learned how." To work was his greatest joy. If a task were important he liked to do all parts of it. For example, he had stenographers—and did most of his own typewriting. Probably nine-tenths of the many communications I have had from him were his own handiwork.

As everybody knows, Congressmen write their own autobiographies for the Congressional Directory. That contributed by the father of the world's most famous airman was the briefest, I think, every published. Here it is:

"Charles A. Lindbergh, Republican, of Little Falls."

The world marvels at the modesty of the son. It is not at all inexplicable to me who knew the father's remarkable selflessness. Just once in the long period of our acquaintanceship did Congressman Lindbergh voluntarily refer to a personal matter. He was an attorney—a good one, of the Lincoln type; his honesty was unquestionable. Years before he had handled a Minnesota case for an eastern millionaire. When this client died it was found that Lindbergh was named administrator of the big estate; and the will provided that no bond should be required for the execution of the trust. That unusual confidence in his integrity pleased him. He told me about it. It was the nearest to boasting that he ever got.

His industry was prodigious. Undoubtedly he was the hardest-working man ever in Congress. It was his daily habit to reach his room in the House Office Building before 5 o'clock in the morning. Once I asked him how and why he did it.

"I must have three or four hours each day by myself for study and writing. After 9 there are always interruptions." That was his answer.

His outstanding characteristic was his courage. I remember one morning when he called me up and said: "Come over to the hospital at 10 and visit with me while the doctors fix me up."

"What's the matter?" I asked.

"Oh, a little operation," he replied.

It was not a little operation, and he went through it without an anesthetic. The ordeal lasted more than an hour and he never gritted his teeth or even gripped my hand, except for a few seconds, when the surgeon's knife pierced the abdominal cavity.

All through that episode we talked about international banking. I had discussed big public problems with him many times, in his office and at my home, but I do not remember an occasion when his mind was given more unreservedly to a serious subject. There was no hint of a distraction. He seemed utterly unmindful of any suffering. He continued with his exposition of a particular point after being taken

to his room. Not once did he mention the surgery, except indirectly, when he apologized for having subjected me to an unpleasant experience.

For 10 years he was a Congressman from Minnesota, representing the Little Falls district. If, at any time during that decade, this district had attempted secession there would have been no civil war over it. The powers that be, both Republican and Democrat, would eagerly have sacrificed even a larger territorial part of the Union to get rid of Lindbergh. A question naturally arises: Why did they not go out and defeat him? They tried, repeatedly. I once asked an old guarder why they did not succeed. His explanation was interesting, and possibly had some significance. "We spent so much money," he said, "trying to lick Lindbergh that the district became too prosperous to care about a change."

He first got in, I suspect, because he was a likable and honest lawyer. His integrity was known to every man and woman in that section of the State. When Lindbergh was admitted to the bar, having graduated in the law class of the University of Michigan at 23 (1883), he subscribed most thoroughly and conscientiously to the oath of an attorney. He regarded his profession as an official part of the judicial machinery. As a lawyer he acted accordingly. A guilty client did not interest him. It became a tradition in central-eastern Minnesota that he was concerned only in helping to find the exact justice of every controversy.

In Congress he was a radical of the advanced, uncompromising type. He tackled the biggest and politically most dangerous national issues. Therefore he was hated and misrepresented more bitterly, perhaps, than any public man of his generation. "Socialist" was among the mildest of the epithets hurled at him. His enemies accused him of being unsocial. They implied that he shunned functions because of a "crudeness" that was embarrassing to him. Nothing could be further from the truth. He was thoroughly a gentleman, both by birth and breeding. He cared nothing for the social life of the Capital, preferring to be studiously by himself; but when it seemed a duty, because of his position, to attend some social event he did so. Social life, aside from its unattractiveness, did not at all fit into his congressional habits. He could not consistently be about his work at five in the morning if the midnight hours were given to sociability.

It would not have mattered to the orthodox politicians how much he made a slave of himself, but the results were troublesome. He was better prepared on serious subjects than any bolshevist ever encountered, either before or after bolshevism became a well-recognized bugaboo.

The Money Trust was Lindbergh's chief obsession. Not many Congressmen are friends of the Money Trust, but few of them at that time ardently desired to stir it up. "Let sleeping dogs lie," was quite generally the congressional policy. Lindbergh, however, persisted in keeping the dangerous animal thoroughly awake. Moreover, he wanted to kennel it, and put the key in the people's pocket. He demanded an investigation of the Money Trust, and got it, although others took the credit.

Lindbergh introduced his resolution for a congressional inquiry in July, 1911. At first it was not taken seriously. But those 5 o'clock study periods quickly began to show their results. He made out so strong a case that it could not be ignored.

The Democrats were then in control of the House. Lindbergh was nominally a Republican, although that party regarded him as an undesirable alien. It was not good politics for those in power to permit any kind of a Republican to sponsor so big a thing as the Money Trust investigation. Other resolutions were presented by Democrats. Henry, of Connecticut, was the author of one; Pujo, of Louisiana, of another, the latter's being adopted on February 24, 1912.

From a beginning in which he stood practically alone, Lindbergh saw this inquiry approved by the House with only 8 dissenting votes. Among these dissenters were four famous Republican names—Cannon, Dalzell, GILLETT, and TILSON. So the Pujo committee came into being. It was Lindbergh's work. It ought to have been the Lindbergh committee. Senator NORRIS, then a Congressman, demanded that Lindbergh be given the credit, but that was not to be. It is doubtful if Lindbergh cared who got the credit so long as an investigation was made.

This Money Trust fight was continuous until Lindbergh voluntarily left Congress March 4, 1917. The investigation was no sooner under way than he turned his attention to the Glass-Owen bill, which created the Federal reserve system. He opposed that measure with a vigor and determination rarely exceeded in public life. However one may regard the now existing system, then created, Lindbergh's first speech in that debate was a marvelous exposition of the history and economics of financial legislation. His research had been amazing. He presented documents of which most Congressmen had never heard. Of course the Glass-Owens bill passed, and is now the law of the land. He did not quit. He kept on studying currency and credit. His vigilance in watching the Federal reserve system was unceasing. Four years later, shortly before the end of his congressional career, he arose and said:

"Mr. Speaker and the House of Representatives, I, Charles A. Lindbergh, the undersigned, upon my responsibility as a Member of the House of Representatives, do hereby impeach W. P. G. Harding, governor; Paul M. Warburg, vice governor; and Frederick A. Delano, Adolph C. Miller, and Charles S. Hamlin, members, each individually as a member of the Federal Reserve Board, and also all of them collectively as the five active working members of said board, of high crimes and misdemeanors."

There followed 15 counts of an indictment, each of which, he said, "I stand ready to prove."

He asked the House not to dispose of the solemn proceedings "by a motion to lay on the table. It would not be doing justice to the country if done in that way." He said:

"Either I am right in presenting these articles of impeachment or I am wrong. If I do injustice to the House, if I do injustice to the country in preferring articles of impeachment which ought not to be preferred, then it is the duty of the House to discredit me for doing that thing. I do not, however, expect to be discredited, though undoubtedly powerful influences will be used to prevent favorable action on the articles of impeachment."

The matter was referred to the Judiciary Committee and, of course, no action was taken.

A confidential talk I had with him about this impeachment of the Federal Reserve Board can now be told. As a publicist, I was interested in knowing what was back of it.

"Will the House act on your charges?" I asked.

"No," he answered; "I don't expect any result like that."

"Why, then, did you make the indictment?"

There followed an hour of prophecy—which seemed almost inspired in view of what happened. He pointed out what this Federal agency could and would do after the war, especially with respect to agriculture. He predicted the manipulated deflation of 1920, which squeezed from twenty to thirty billions out of the farming industry, leaving it hopelessly crushed and broken.

Lindbergh took part in the revolt against Cannonism. That was just a flurry for most of the insurgents. Characteristically he kept on fighting after the others had quieted down. The House rules were not reformed as a result of that Cannon controversy. So as late as the Sixty-fourth Congress he made a lone effort "to break the power of the bosses." He staged a one-man filibuster, objecting to all "unanimous-consent business," seeking thus to force the masters of the House to act on four remedial amendments he had presented. He did not succeed, because it was physically impossible for a single individual to stay on the job every minute for the weeks that were needed to win.

Charles A. Lindbergh did not stand for reelection to the House in 1916. The World War was raging. We had not entered "the hell storm," as he called it; but he foresaw our participation and the reaction it would bring. That meant bigger, more vital struggles for him. He could return to Congress, but the issues would have to be fought out in larger election contests in order that more people might be reached. The governorship of Minnesota or a seat in the Senate was what he must seek—unselfishly, I think. He was antiwar, from start to finish. "Probably I'll go down," he said to me shortly before the war vote was taken, and he was defeated by a narrow margin. He returned to Minnesota, and spoke his convictions wherever he went. He was mobbed more than once by the war frenzied. But he was not in the least afraid.

The supremest test of courage comes when one confronts the unknown. Charles A. Lindbergh, sr., was above all superstition. He faced death, as he did life, with absolute fearlessness. Pioneers are much the same the world over. Lindbergh the elder was as truly a trail blazer as is his son. The boy, fortunately, tackled something that could be demonstrated at once. The father had ideas which were a generation ahead of the popular capacity for comprehension.

Mr. Chairman, let me add a few words. It seems to me eminently fitting to have read this material on Lindbergh, father and son, into the RECORD to-day, when press dispatches are telling how the famous son is receiving the adulation and the adoration of thousands of people down in Nicaragua, where this administration without authority by the Congress is waging a war upon the people of Nicaragua at this moment. Congressman Lindbergh was a candidate for governor in the State of Minnesota in 1918. He was indorsed by the much criticized and much maligned Nonpartisan League of that State. Of course he was slandered, and of course he was mobbed, and of course he received the reward meted out to every one who opposed our country's going into that so-called "hell storm." He wrote a book called "Why Your Country Is at War," and I suggest that many of the Members of this House might receive enlightenment and instruction as to the reasons for our entry into that war if they would read Congressman Lindbergh's book. If he were living to-day, he would no doubt write a scathing indictment of our present administration because the President and Secretary Kellogg are conducting a war on Nicaragua.

Little wonder that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh is as noble and brave as he is, being the son of so noble and courageous a father as Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh. [Applause.]

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, whatever criticism may be directed at the power of the Appropriations Committee, no Member can rightfully criticize the application and the knowledge of the members of this subcommittee. I have a high regard for the chairman, Mr. SHREVE, of Pennsylvania, who has mastered the duties of this arduous position. He comes from a great district, and his constituents should be proud of his public service. For the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] I have admiration and regard. He, too, has displayed ability of high order and the power to concentrate on a great many important details necessarily covered in this great appropriation bill.

I appeared before the subcommittee and urged the regional economic surveys which have been worked out by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in the Department of Commerce. It was with some surprise that I read two paragraphs in the report on this bill which seemed to be antagonistic to such surveys. I was glad, indeed, yesterday to hear Mr. SHREVE state that the subcommittee is not only not antagonistic but distinctly favorable to regional surveys and that the criticism was directed solely against surveys of small units. Also, the gentleman from Alabama pointed out that the subcommittee had proven its favorable attitude by reporting an appropriation of some $75,000 more than last year, which is to be used for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, when I appeared before the subcommittee in behalf of the regional surveys I stated that they would be of help in solving the question of distribution of products, the greatest problem in American business to-day. I have long been interested in one especial phase of that question, the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, name, or brand. It is to that question that I wish to address myself at this time.

In the last Congress I introduced a measure aiming to enable the producer or owner of an article sold under a distinctive trade-mark to offer his article to the public at a specified price. Hearings were held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and opponents and proponents had their day in court. The volume which resulted is a compendium of information as to modern merchandising. To my mind, it is unanswerable proof as to the need of legislation to meet a serious situation in business.

After the hearings some members of the committee, headed by Mr. MERRITT, of Connecticut, made a further study and proposed a tentative substitute for my bill. I accepted it as carrying out the principle intended and in some ways doing it more clearly and concisely. I introduced that bill at the beginning of this session, and it is now before the committee of the House. It is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no contract relating to the sale or resale of a commodity which bears (or the label or container of which bears) the trade-mark, brand, or name of the producer or owner of such commodity, and which is in fair and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced by others, shall be deemed to be unlawful, as against the public policy of the United States or in restraint of interstate or foreign commerce or in violation of any statute of the United States, by reason of any agreement contained in such contract—

(1) That the vendee will not resell such commodity except at the price stipulated by the vendor; and/or

(2) That the vendee will require any dealer to whom he may resell such commodity to agree that he will not in turn resell except at the price stipulated by such vendor or by such vendee.

SEC. 2. Any such agreement in a contract in respect of interstate or foreign commerce in any such commodity shall be deemed to contain the implied condition that such commodity may be resold without reference to such agreement—

(1) In closing out the owner's stock for the purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity;

(2) With prominent notice to the public that such commodity is damaged or deteriorated in quality, if such is the case; or

(3) By a receiver, trustee, or other officer acting under the orders of any court.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as legalizing any contract or agreement between producers or between wholesalers or between retailers as to sale or resale prices.

SEC. 4. No suit arising out of any such agreement shall be brought in any court of the United States in any other judicial district than that in which the defendant is an inhabitant, or in which he has a regular and established place of business. If such suit is brought in a district in which the defendant has a regular and established place of business, service of process, summons, or subpœna may be made by service upon the agent or agents engaged in conducting such business in the district in which suit is brought.

SEC. 5. As used in this act—

(1) The term "producer" means grower, packer, maker, manufacturer, or publisher.

(2) The term "commodity" means any subject of commerce.

(3) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. This act may be cited as the "fair trade act."

In the meantime the Federal Trade Commission has determined upon a complete investigation into this question. In a memorandum issued December 12, 1927, it is stated:

The question of resale price maintenance is one of the most troublesome with which the commission has to deal in the present state of the decisions. The early Federal cases trace the principle to a passage in Coke on Littleton dealing with restraints on alienation. Courts, in attempting to apply these ancient principles, have fallen into hopeless confusion. Orders of the commission, issued under its organic act, have been upheld in some circuits and set aside in others on almost undistinguishable states of fact.

Until the commission's inquiry no comprehensive effort had been made in this country to develop the essential facts in reference to resale price maintenance. Such inquiries have been made in Canada and New Zealand, and certain of the Scandinavian countries have given attention to the subject and have laws legalizing resale price fixing with provision for seasonal sales, bona fide competition based on superior efficiency and sustained over a considerable period of time, etc.

It is evident that legislation will be required to cure the present unsatisfactory conditions; and it seems unlikely that Congress will enact such legislation without definite information as to the probable effect thereof on competition and prices.

Questionnaires are being sent out by the commission, and the facts should be developed. Some legislation is essential, and it is believed by most of those who have studied the question that the measure which I have introduced will remedy the present intolerable situation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this question is one of the most important which confronts the business world to-day.

Upon its solution depends in some measure the character of American business to-morrow and the day after to-morrow, and, as every man, woman, and child is dependent upon business for life and welfare, the character of business is vital to the Nation.

Now, we who favor price standardization propose to do certain things. We propose to permit the producer of a standard, trade-marked, identified, guaranteed article to enter into a contract with his distributors that his product shall be sold at a specified price. The producer who makes such a contract shall be in competition with other producers of the same class of goods and there shall be no agreement between producers, nor between wholesalers, nor between retailers as to sale or resale price.

We provide that any such contract, whatever other features it may have, shall be deemed to have the implied condition that the goods may be sold for less than the specified price under reasonable contingencies, such as the distributor going out of business, the deterioration of the goods, or the conduct of the business by receiver, trustee, or other court officer.

The provision is permissive, not mandatory. The contract will only be entered into by the producers who wish to protect their products against manipulation of prices and by the distributors who believe such a policy to be beneficial. It will not be used for marketing goods of quickly changing fashion or seasonal value. It can not be used for marketing bulk or unidentified merchandise.

What is the reason for such a proposal? It is to meet the grave evils caused by predatory price cutting on standard, identified goods, a system which has grown up because of Supreme Court decisions in the past 16 years, largely through cases brought before it by department-store firms and chain-store proprietors. We simply propose to prevent dealers who will not

rely on their own good will and reputation from using publicly approved, identified goods of stable quality and value as bait to deceive the public into believing that all articles sold by them are at similar bargain rates and savings.

Now, nobody denies that there is an evil in certain forms of such price cutting. At the hearings before the committee on my bill every opponent admitted the evils of certain forms of price cutting on standard goods.

Edmond A. Wise, New York, attorney for department stores, said:

I do not defend nor do I for one moment say that a certain kind of cutting of prices is desirable or admirable or ethical.

Mr. Straus, of R. H. Macy & Co. department stores of New York and other cities, said:

I am perfectly willing to agree that there is a type of price cutting which is bad for the dealer who practices it and bad for the manufacturer on whose merchandise it is practiced.

Surely there is no difficulty in discovering the evils of price cutting on standard articles. The procedure is simple. They proceed upon the theory that if they cut the prices on well-known standard goods, whose value is well fixed in the public mind, to a point below cost to them or below the basis of a reasonable living profit they will be able to attract the customers of their competitors and secure their patronage. Through this plan they expect to sell enough unnamed, unidentified merchandising at excessive profits to reimburse them for the loss on the bait merchandise upon which they take the loss by cutting the fair price.

The price cutters issue flaming advertisements declaring that articles which are known to everybody at a certain price are to be sold at a deeply cut price. An article which costs the price cutter 75 cents will be advertised at 69 cents. A 25-cent article will be marked down to 14 cents. The public is expected to believe that these are but examples of the universal savings to be made by dealing at such a store.

Of course such a practice immediately injures the maker of the goods. The public loses its confidence in them, for they seem overpriced in view of such reductions. The price cutter does not desire to sell the goods, for the more he sells the more he loses. He endeavors to substitute other goods on which he makes an unfair profit. His reliance is that the customers will buy unstandardized goods on which there is no way of telling the real value and the fair price.

The effect of this practice is felt immediately by other dealers. They must meet the cut price or lose their trade in the goods. If they follow the price cutter they, too, must prevent the buyer wherever it is possible from buying goods on which a loss is involved. If they refuse to cut prices they must stop handling the goods which the public wanted and on which at standard prices they could make a fair profit.

Mr. Chairman, is that not an evil business practice? My contention is that it is not necessary to decry the evil with such weasel words as "certain forms" of price cutting, meant to apply to all forms except the one which the particular price cutter is using.

The evil is in plain sight. It is the practice of cutting prices on standard goods by dealers who are at present permitted to destroy honest values, good names, and square business with impunity, and for ulterior purposes of their own.

We say we can remedy the evil in effective fashion by putting into the hands of independent manufacturers and dealers the power to end this unfair, dishonest sales system through price control by the maker of the goods.

Right here let me emphasize the fact that only the use of cuttle-fish tactics can make of this proposal anything new and revolutionary. From the time the cave man made a stone hatchet and bartered it to his neighbor it has been the universal inherent right of the owner of any article to name the price at which he will sell it.

Here in the early days the makers of goods sold them direct to their customers and named the price. Then as transportation facilities developed they sent out their agents to sell to customers at the price specified.

The next step was to sell to retailers and the producers who identified their goods and desired it had the undisputed right to specify the retail price. Later the wholesaler entered the field of distribution as a necessary agent and the producer, through free contract, named the final selling price.

The courts upheld these contracts as lawful and proper. There are splendid judicial defenses of them in hundreds of court cases. The courts declared them to be valid and enjoined those who tried to break the contract.

Remember that point. The right of contract has been taken away from the business man in America and we seek to restore it to him. It was not taken away by express law, but wholly by court decisions.

Mr. Chairman, it was the Supreme Court of the United States that changed the entire course of merchandising. In the Doctor Miles Medical Co. case, decided in 1911, the court ruled that this contract system of controlling the resale price was in conflict with the antitrust law as a restraint of trade.

Five judges said that and four judges said exactly the opposite. That "grand old man" of the Supreme Court, Justice Holmes, wrote the dissenting opinion. He stripped the question bare when he wrote:

I can not believe that in the long run the public will profit by this court permitting knaves to cut reasonable prices for some ulterior purpose of their own, and thus impair if not destroy the production and sale of articles which it is assumed it is desirable that the public should get.

Five men on the Supreme Court bench took away from independent business men the right to contract as to the resale price of identified goods.

But did they declare that controlling the resale price by the producer was illegal and void? They did not. Neither in the Doctor Miles case nor in any other decision has the Supreme Court ruled that there is anything wrong about price maintenance by manufacturers. They only ruled that certain methods of accomplishing the result were wrong.

They have strongly affirmed that some methods of accomplishing exactly the same results are right and commendable. Within the past year the Supreme Court gave a clean bill of health to the General Electric Co. and upheld its right to control resale prices. The Supreme Court gave judicial benediction to price maintenance after the General Electric plan. Here is what the court said:

The owner of an article patented or otherwise is not violating the common law or the antitrust law by seeking to dispose of his products directly to the consumer and fixing the price by which his agents transfer the title from him directly to such consumer.

The General Electric sold its lamps through the retailers, but by consigning the goods and calling the retailers agents they name the price at which the goods may be sold to the consumer.

This decision means that only a great corporation which is financially and commercially in a position to use the expensive and cumbersome system of consigning goods to the retailer can protect his goods. The little manufacturer who can not use such a system is prohibited from doing it through contract with his distributors. The Supreme Court has also held that the maker of goods may control his price through his own retail agencies. If a piano manufacturer will start a retail store in every city, he can control his price, and no questions asked. But let him undertake to sell through the regularly established wholesalers and retailers and his attempt to control his price becomes a criminal act.

Now, my friends, can anyone deny that there is a grievous wrong in such a state of affairs. Price maintenance is either right or it is wrong. If it is wrong for the Doctor Miles Medical Co., it is also wrong for the General Electric. If it is right for the General Electric, it is also right for the little independent producer.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that it is inherently right. It means honest business. It was right and just for the United States Government to prohibit cut prices on railroad freight rates and passenger tickets, the universal practice years ago. It is right and just for the United States Government to maintain a one price to all policy for postage stamps and Government publications. It is right and just that insurance agents shall not cut prices on insurance policies.

I maintain that it is equally right and just that the man who puts his life and money and character into a product which he brands with his name and guarantees with his cash shall also have the right to contract with his distributors that they shall not manipulate his price to his injury.

Why does this inconsistency and injustice exist? Because of blindness to progress and modern merchandising. In our own time has come about the nation-wide business which enables the buyer in San Francisco to purchase the same article, of identical quality and value, as the buyer in New York City. One of the greatest boons in American history was the adoption of the trade-mark. It standardized production, made uniform quality possible, and eliminated many crooked business practices. It made possible the market extension which resulted in mass production and lowered the cost on every unit for the benefit of the ultimate consumer.

The manufacturer depends upon public good will as the greatest asset in his business. He must protect his product into the home of the consumer if he is to build up good will.

He must deliver good quality at a fair price. When he sells goods to the distributor he does not lose interest in them. In fact, his article is not sold until it is bought by the consumer.

The Supreme Court acted upon the assumption that when the manufacturer has sold his goods outright and received full payment they belong wholly to some one else, and he could not expect to control the resale price.

The fallacy in that is that it classifies trade-marked, identified goods exactly the same as unidentified bulk merchandise. The truth is that with standard goods the advertiser is the seller and the public is the buyer, with the distributor an essential agency between.

Procter & Gamble make Ivory soap, a standard article. They will make soap cakes of exactly the same kind, let us say, for a distributor, but without the brand "Ivory" on it. They do not care what price the dealer gets for that unbranded soap, for they are not responsible for it after it leaves their hands. But if that dealer takes Ivory soap and cuts the price until it is injured, in the eyes of the consumers, and makes other retailers refuse to push its sale, they are vitally interested. In the cases of some companies their very lives are at stake.

We who uphold the principle of price maintenance simply say to distributors, "Give up the trade-mark if you cut prices. Take the identification off and you may treat the goods as you desire. But if you use a name and reputation, made valuable by honest goods at honest prices, you shall not use them for dishonest purposes."

Now, I have shown two things: First, price control by makers of identified goods was the American system of doing business before 1911. Contracts for that purpose were legal and valid until the Supreme Court stripped the business men of the right to make such contract. Second, such price control is perfectly legal and proper to-day if done by great corporations that can afford to consign their goods and wait until they are sold before payment or to establish their own retail stores.

I submit that the burden of proof is upon opponents to show why such contracts, entered into voluntarily by business men, are wrong in policy and effect. Also why, since price maintenance is legal for the big concern, it should not be legal for the small enterprise, that desires to use the regular channels of distribution through wholesaler and retailer.

Opponents must explain why they favor a system under which, if a small manufacturer attempts to protect his good will by requiring dealers to maintain the price he believes fair, he becomes a criminal, subject to imprisonment and loss of citizenship, while the big manufacturer may do exactly the same thing by consignment and agency and be honored as a worthy law-abiding citizen.

Will they say they favor taking away the manufacturer's right to sell at a specified price, through his own agents and agencies? No; they will do no such violence to common sense. They know that any such action would mean anarchy in business.

Then, are they not forced to admit that the present conditions, brought about by judge-made law, means for one set of producers a prohibition and for the other set a blessing? With one hand the law restrains; with the other it sanctions.

Can anyone defend that condition of affairs before men who believe in the American doctrine of "equal rights to all, special privileges to none"? If they can not, it is proof that price maintenance is the only method to secure a square deal for the little independent competing manufacturer of standard goods.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to prove also that price control is the only method of securing a square deal for the distributor.

The opponents of price standardization declare that if we permit the little manufacturer to have his equal rights as to resale price, then the wholesaler will become only a manufacturer's agent while the retailer will become only an animated slot machine, handing out standard goods over the counter.

I might as well consider that proposition as I go along and use it in connection with my presentation of the subject.

That argument sounds like a high regard for the independent distributor, does it not? Of course, if it is sound and the retailers are to be injured by price maintenance, it is strange that 90 per cent of all the independent retailers of the United States are solidly supporting it. It is still more strange that when a referendum on this question was taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce the vote was 1,079 in favor of the price-maintenance principle to 911 opposed.

Shall we say that all these business men are fools, blind to their own interests? With all respect, I would rather take the views of John Smith, the corner druggist, on a question as to the best interests of the independent distributor than those of any owner of a great selling system.

I must admit that I greatly fear that the opposition are not so much concerned about making the small retailer a stalwart, independent man of upstanding individuality and inflexible backbone as they seem.

They defend a system through which they profit, a system brought about by court decisions in cases originated by themselves, a system which is steadily monopolizing merchandising, destroying wholesaler and retailer and making them hired men, little cogs in a vast machine.

The destroyer of independent, individual business is not price maintenance, but price manipulation; not price standardization, but price cutting.

Mr. Chairman, that has been true all through our history. Did you ever hear of a trust squeezing out a small rival by raising the price or maintaining one price to all? Never. Standard Oil cut prices in order to destroy competition. The Tobacco Trust built its monopoly on cut prices.

Supreme Court Justice Brandeis was exactly right when, as a member of the bar, he said:

> Americans should be under no illusions as to the value and effect of price cutting. It has been the most potent weapon of monopoly and means of killing the small rivals to which the trusts have resorted most frequently. It is so simple, so effective.

The Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton antitrust law were passed to prevent the restraints of trade caused by the price-cutting tactics of would-be monopolists. It is indeed strange to see those same laws now being used to provide safe shelters for piratical price cutters in building monopolistic retailing agencies.

The danger in monopoly is that it shuts the door of opportunity to the individual. To-day the most menacing sign on the business horizon is the monopoly tendencies in the field of distribution. If it continues, great numbers of men who in the future seek to enter into independent business will find the door shut tight against them.

Already the little business man everywhere is being displaced by the huge corporation with its multitude of employees, its absentee ownership, and its financier control. Let us go into that a little.

I am not going to emphasize the danger to independent business men from the chain-store systems, serious as that danger is. But I ask, Is it a coincidence merely that these chain stores have grown like mushrooms only since the Supreme Court put into their hands the greatest weapon known to monopoly cut-throat price cutting on standard goods?

Why, there have been chain stores since 1858. They made no great commotion until 1911. Then they entered on their golden age.

In 1900 there were only 25 chain drug stores in the United States. To-day there are about 5,700, and they do 20 per cent of all the drug business of the country.

The Bureau of the Census reports that four grocery chains jumped 209 per cent in volume between 1919 and 1926. There are about 10,000 chain-store systems in operation right now, with more than 100,000 retail stores. They do over $3,000,000,000 business a year.

But the chain stores are not the greatest problem to be faced in the future by independent business men, even though they have already eliminated 90,000 independents and are moving on rapidly.

They, too, will have to face the threat of extinction in the future along with the independents. I want to call to your attention a newer and greater centralization of merchandising which means the annihilation of a great part of the independent stores and the smaller chains as well, if present selling practices continue.

I refer to the chain department stores. Here is a merchandising whale from which few hapless Jonahs will escape unless we change the present system of selling goods.

Edward A. Filene is president of the department store of Filene Sons Co. in Boston. On February 1, 1927, he delivered an address in Chicago which was printed from manuscript in the Retail Clothier of February 17, 1927.

That speech was the frank and honest statement of a man I highly admire in many ways. Here is what he said. I quote:

> It is well for the retailer to bear in mind that, in addition to all of this chain-store competition which I have described, there is under way another and stronger competition, namely, that of chains of department stores. These new chains have been developed to an important extent already, as the following array of examples will show: R. H. Macy & Co., who sold over $70,000,000 in their New York store alone in 1926, also own or control the stores of La Salle & Koch, Toledo, and Davison-Paxton-Stokes, Atlanta.

Then follows a list of seven chains of department stores already under way. Then Mr. Filene continues:

> Just as the department store outdid the individual small store, for the same reason the chains of department stores will overshadow the present chain stores. * * * There is no department store or single-line chain that will be able to stand up against this class of organization. * * * It will make enormous total profits, and the more stores they have the better they can do the job.
>
> This means that in every city of fair size one department store of a chain of department stores such as I have been describing will be the conquering distributor.
>
> If these conclusions are sound, it means, of course, that the department-store chain will determine the fate not only of the individual department stores but of the small individual retail stores also. You will bear in mind, of course, that the department store itself has no choice in the matter. Unless the department store meets the chain stores in the way I have mentioned it will likewise be put out of business.

Could I paint a blacker picture of the present situation that confronts independent retailers than Mr. Filene has done?

And in the face of such a statement, whose fruition depends upon the continuance of present cut-price selling practices, is it not utterly ridiculous to argue that if Congress adopts the price-maintenance contract provision the little independent retailer will become only a manufacturer's agent?

Let us give the little retailer a square deal and see if he is not able to live and serve his community more efficiently than any giant combination on earth.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, I ask no special favors for him. If he can not manage his store and render as good service in his neighborhood as the city department store in a far distant location, let him fail. If the independent retailer can not meet the fair competition of any rival, big or little, let him give way before it and make room for finer and better service.

But I do protest against his destruction by piratical methods. No combination of capital should have the right to bankrupt him through deceptive, dishonest business practices.

I am not against the great department stores which make fortunes for their owners through honest, foursquare service, which advances the common good. I honor old John Wanamaker, who refused to use standard goods at cut prices as bait to fool his customers. That company is for the price maintenance bill.

I honor a department store like Bloomingdales in New York, whose president, Mr. Bloomingdale, gave out a statment some time ago in which he said:

> Present price cutting of articles of standard price for the purpose of drawing away trade from competitors by creating the impression that all other articles are likewise sold at lower prices strikes me as not only a decidedly unfair method of competition but also as a practice unworthy of modern business.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder what will happen to Bloomingdales and Wanamakers and others of like reputation when this giant chain of which Mr. Filene speaks undertakes to put them out of business. The chain will start to cut all standard prices to the limit. These stores will then face the kind of ruthless, cutthroat competition that the little fellow faces to-day, and perhaps as Mr. Filene says, "They will have no choice in the matter." They may have to do as their most unscrupulous competitors do or be destroyed.

My friends, it is vitally important that every business man of independence, courage, and honesty be enabled to serve business and the public by standing out against would-be monopolists. The strongest laws in defense of honest business are those that compel fair competition. I desire no backward steps nor turning back of the hands of the clock of progress. I want to see every business enterprise reach its correct size, which will be when it is able to serve most efficiently and economically.

These great department stores, mail-order houses, chain stores, and the like came into being to cut the cost of distribution. But instead of being able to do business with less overhead than the little fellow, it costs them more.

They have certain advantages, such as large purchases and volume of sales. But some of them have 100 nonselling employees for every 100 sales people. They pay the highest rents and operating expenses. You may be sure that if they sell some goods at cost they must make a tremendous profit on others.

They say they are superior in efficiency, economy, and service. All right, I say to them, prove your statement and I will agree. But there must first be a fair and open field. Unfair competition, such as price cutting on standard goods as "bait," must be stopped. Let these great concerns do business on a fair and square basis. Then, if they are able to destroy the small dealers and consolidate into these giant chains by natural and normal means, I will accept the outcome. But if their logic is correct and we are inevitably bound to move onward from many great chains to one great chain and finally to one owner, then State socialism is assured, and we must master monopoly by Government fixed prices.

I am not ready to accept that situation. These great combinations have not yet proved they can honestly and in fair competition wipe out all small rivals.

Once let price maintenance become again the settled business policy, and you will see a sudden halt to this giant consolidation. You will see red-blooded American manufacturers saying to the man who buys for 40 department stores, "You shall sell our goods on an honest basis or not at all. You shall not use them as spider-web bargains to entrap unwary customers. We will allow you a fair profit, exactly the same as other dealers, no more and no less. Sign a contract that you will do it or you do not get our goods, no matter how big you are."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out that the power to control resale price through free contract is essential if a square deal is to be given the independent manufacturer and distributor.

I have done that only to prove that such a right to them means a square deal to the public. After all the first and foremost question is the public interest.

Of course, it is true that there are 12,800,000 persons earning their livelihood through the manufacturing industry. They and their families dependent upon them make up a part of the public. There are 3,500,000 persons making their living in the retailing business. They and their families also form a part of the public.

But I not only admit—I contend—that this question must be decided solely upon the effects upon true public welfare.

First, honest and fair competition is always of public benefit; unfair competition is always of public injury. It is that truth, learned through bitter experience, which has led to the enactment of antitrust laws and all the other measures curbing jungle competition in the United States. Under unrestricted, cutthroat competition the strongest and most unscrupulous must triumph and the public must pay the bill.

The one price to all policy means more competition, but it sees to it that it is fair competition. It is competition in quality and individuality. The maker puts his own name and guarantee behind his product and names his price competitively. He makes his appeal direct to the public in keen competition with other producers. There is no price jockeying, no price juggling in the retail market to deceive and dupe the public. There is increased true competition between makers bidding honestly for public favor.

Price maintenance on standard articles in a competitive field can not lead to profiteering prices. If the maker fixes his price too high he does it at peril of building up business for his competitors.

He will lower his standard price to widen his market, but he will fight desperately against increasing it and restrict his market. We saw that in the World War conditions. I have the report of the War Industries Board, which made an exhaustive study of prices during the war period.

It shows that while prices on bulk, unidentified merchandise skyrocketed in price, jumping 1,000 per cent in many cases, practically every article, advertised nationally as to price, remained firm at the former low levels.

The War Industries Board says that that was because the makers of such articles would sacrifice almost everything to keep from increasing a price which advertising had associated with the article.

Will it be said that lowered costs are not reflected in the standard price? That is exactly what does happen under price maintenance. Look at the automobile business. Henry Ford, as the mightiest auto maker of them all, has built his wonderful business on exactly that principle. He has continually reduced the price while increasing the quality.

Ford's car is sold to-day and always has been sold on price-maintenanee principles. Before 1911 he sold under contracts with his distributors on the plan I am advocating. When the Supreme Court ruled against such contracts, Ford immediately established exclusive agencies of his own.

He had the resources and he did it, just as any manufacturer with great capital can do it. Ford did not propose to have his car slaughtered to make a department-store holiday. He did not propose to have his car serve as bait to lure the unwary until his good will had been destroyed.

His present system is more expensive and less efficient than the contract plan, open to every distributor, but it is infinitely

better for the public than having it turned over to the mercy of price cutters.

Time after time Ford has reduced the price to the public, but every time it was one price to everybody. He did not change the price every month if there was a slight difference in production cost. That would have brought chaos in the business and discriminated against many buyers, with loss of good will. He stabilized the price for the season and he gave the public the benefit of savings through increased production.

Oh, no; those who argue that price maintenance leads to stationary high prices must shut their eyes to the automobile industry, that most astounding development within the past 25 years, which has been built up on price-maintenance principles.

Well, what about the distribution cost? Our opponents say that a uniform price means that the stores with low costs of operation will have to sell at the same price as the high-cost stores. That would mean an unnecessarily large profit for the low-cost stores, and they could not share this profit with their customers.

Mr. Chairman, that is an upside-down argument. Do the price-cutting stores line up in the rank of the low-cost establishments? Not at all. Their costs are the highest of all. Are the profits allowed them under standard price distribution too high? No, again.

The efficiently conducted neighborhood store, owned and operated by its own proprietor, is the low-cost store. These are the business men who ask the protection of price standardization. They want a fair price and a fair profit—no more and no less.

Then, too, identified goods at standard prices benefits the public by encouraging high-quality goods of uniform value which can be secured by anyone, any place, any time.

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, chairman of the National Consumers' League, some months ago went to Europe. On her return she said:

> The shopper's only safety lies in the purchase of goods she has tried with satisfaction and which she knows will always measure up to the same standards of quality and value. In Europe she is without such protection and guidance.

That was the situation in the United States before identified goods came to benefit the public. It is the situation now on nameless, unidentified merchandise. The Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor in New York City made an investigation into retail prices. It found that coffee shoveled out of a bin went to one store and was sold at 35 cents a pound. Coffee shoveled out of the same bin went to another store in the same chain ownership and was sold at 60 cents. Unnamed, unidentified coffee. Tea, coming from the same bag, went to one store and was sold at 35 cents. The same tea went to another store in the same chain and was sold at 70 cents.

Is the public served by any such system as that? Today all the resources of chemistry and applied science may be used to fool the purchaser. Imitation and adulteration and dishonesty may defy the most intelligent.

Only last year I heard Health Commissioner Harris, of New York City, say that he had issued an order forbidding a Brooklyn milk company from invading the territory of a milk company in Manhattan. He said he knew that such invasion would lead to price cutting and that would surely lead to milk adulteration.

If price cutting leads to the adulteration of the milk upon which the lives of babies depend, it is an evil system. And the truth is that, carried to its logical conclusion, price cutting on standard goods is always bound to lead to lowered quality, substitution, and adulteration.

Under present law the manufacturer of a standard article can legally restrain a dealer who adulterates his product. Why should he not have the right to restrain a dealer from destroying the product entirely through fake price-cutting methods?

Well, what about the benefit to the consumer who goes to a great city department store and buys an article for 14 cents when the standard price is 25 cents. Is that not a benefit?

No; that is not a real benefit. The customer does save 11 cents on that one purchase, but he pays out much more in unduly high prices on other purchases. If consumers would pledge themselves to buy only these well-known, standard goods at cut prices, I will agree that they would benefit. They would have their savings in their pockets and in a very short time the store would be out of business. I am willing to agree that in most cases that would be a benefit.

But if they buy other unnamed goods then they are helping to make the price cutters master of the merchandising field. When that happens prices go up and the public pays the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is no benefit in saving a few pennies on standard goods and losing dollars on unidentified, unknown goods. There is no public benefit in saving a dollar to-day and being robbed of $10 next year. Those are the real alternatives in this problem.

But what about the enormous expenditures of nationally famous goods for advertising? Does that not mean higher prices? It does not. It means lower prices. Advertising means increased production and a lower cost on every unit. Do you think Henry Ford could sell the Ford car at his price if he only sold 10,000 a year? Mass production is possible only through advertising, and that means lower not higher prices. Advertising is the cheapest salesmanship. Without it the Nation's business would be but a shadow of what it is to-day.

President Coolidge in a recent address declared that advertising is the very basis of American business and prosperity. And remember, there is one thing advertising can not do with all its power. It can not compel the American people to buy year after year any identified article which is not right in quality and price. Fair competition makes sure that in the long run good value and service and fair price are the friends and not the enemies of success.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that I have proven beyond the shadow of a doubt the existence of grave evils not alone through certain forms of price cutting but through the whole system of price cutting on standard goods.

That evil now can only be cured by national legislation. It should not require that to give freedom of contract to American business men, but it does. The Supreme Court, through judicial decision, has taken away that right as it applies to standard goods and their resale price. The Government of the United States should assure fair competition. Fair price will follow. Shall the Government directly regulate the price? Only if there is combination on the part of manufacturers to control their field or on the part of distributors to control their field. That is expressly forbidden in the antitrust laws and in the principle of my bill.

No person need hold up his hands in horror at the thought that if individual competing producers of standard goods are given the right to name the resale price through free contracts the Government must step in and shield the public with its mighty arm against unfair prices, thus putting the Government into business.

I submit to you in all fairness that the danger comes from the other quarter. If monopolization of distribution continues the Government will be forced to interfere. If the "all-conquering distributor," the chain department store, is to win, then the logic is that we must come at last to one chain and then to one proprietor. If concentration is essential to efficient, economical distribution in part, it is essential in all.

But with distribution in the hands of one interest the Government dare not leave it alone. Then the Government would go into business, indeed, and State socialism would be here.

Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out the evils of uncontrolled price cutting on standard goods and have tried to prove that the only remedy is a restoration of the right of contract to American business men.

I have shown the injustice to the little manufacturer from a condition where his giant competitor can protect himself against unfair practices, while if he attempts to do the same he is branded a criminal.

I have shown that the little distributor, though able to give superior service, is being crushed out of existence by those who are endeavoring to monopolize merchandising through unfair practices.

I have shown that the public is being injured by fraud to-day and that if present conditions continue they will be devoured by extortion in the future. I have shown that under price maintenance the public gets the advantage of a fair price, fixed under competitive conditions, between rival producers; that it means a lower distributing cost than under costly consignment and agency systems; that it means honesty in business, the greatest benefit which can come to the public.

I am willing to rest my case on the principle that public policy requires that independent business men of full age and competent understanding shall have the right to contract to uphold a uniform price policy on standard goods, and that such contracts, entered into freely and voluntarily, shall be held good and shall be enforced in courts of justice.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania five additional minutes. The gentleman's remarks are always interesting, and I am especially anxious that he shall give us the benefit of his study of the air-mail service. If he will give us some observations in refer-

ence to that subject and what has been accomplished, it will be helpful to our committee.

Mr. KELLY. I appreciate the compliment of the gentleman from Alabama all the more because of his splendid service to commercial aviation as a member of this subcommittee dealing with the appropriations for its development.

I am, indeed, deeply interested in the air-mail service and hopeful regarding its progress. Since the beginning of operations under the air-mail law I had the honor to sponsor a number of years ago, I have followed the developments of postal aviation as closely as I could. I should be glad if the conclusions I have reached are of value to the members of the committee.

There are to-day 18 contract air-mail lines in operation and 5 or 6 more are soon to be put into operation. No air mail is carried by the Government.

The routes have been as wisely located by the Post Office Department as was possible. Almost 75 per cent of the population of the United States now has some service through the air mail. The schedules are maintained in a gratifying manner, and the public is coming to realize that they may count upon the regularity and certainty of this new form of postal service.

The growth may be seen by the fact that in January, 1927, about 70,000 pounds of air mail were carried over the routes in operation. In December, 1927, the poundage was over 160,000, or about 130 per cent increase.

In January, 1927, the length of routes under contract was 4,495 miles. That meant a monthly schedule of 244,000 miles, with 205,000 actually flown. In December, 1927, the length of routes was 7,810 miles, with 489,000 miles scheduled for the month and 470,000 actually flown.

The total amount paid to contractors per month is around $300,000.

Now, the present need is to increase the volume of air mail. None of the contractors is carrying mail which approaches the capacity of flying equipment. That means that the total expense must be carried by a small volume, where with capacity loads the expense would not be increased.

I have introduced a measure which is now before the Post Office Committee which will do two things if enacted.

First. It will permit the reduction of air mail postage to 5 cents an ounce. The rate now established by the Post Office Department under the law is 10 cents a half ounce. The present rate is too high. The rate I suggest will multiply the volume in a short period.

Second. It will permit the Postmaster General to lower the payment to contractors as the volume is increased.

I have every reason to believe that the individuals and firms who are pioneers in this carriage of mail by aircraft will without hesitation agree to a readjustment of compensation as volume of mail is increased. They should also be protected in the investments they have made for research work, solicitation of business, and flying equipment.

Both of these features I have mentioned must be regarded in the development of air mail.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I will.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the gentleman whether consideration has been given to the transportation of second-class matter by air mail. The reason I ask is that last week I was discussing the matter with an editor who has a large amount of mail of that kind for transportation.

Mr. KELLY. We have thought of that, and also of parcel post. However, in my judgment, we must have a flat rate that applies to all classes of mail alike. It is impossible to make separate classes of air mail. A rate of 5 cents an ounce would mean 80 cents for 1 pound of mail, and that is a very fair rate. It means that a pound of second-class matter could be moved from New York to San Francisco for 80 cents. That is far less than any other rate of air transportation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the run of the mail carried by the airplanes is so vastly increased, what effect will that have on the revenues of the Post Office Department? Will not it lose the mail that they now carry, or a large part of it? Will it not increase the deficit of the Department?

Mr. KELLY. There will be little deficit when we get on a permanent basis. The original law provided that the contractor should get only 80 per cent of the revenue. Then we made payment not to exceed $3 a pound, and it is practically self-sustaining. If we fix a rate of 5 cents an ounce, there will be adjustment of the compensation to contractors.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The point of my question, if it has any point, is that under the present conditions there is a so-called deficit in the Post Office Department revenue. Now, it is proposed to lower the postage on mail carried by the airplanes and increase the volume, and that would take business from the Post Office Department and further increase the deficit. It will help the contractors who have the contracts for carrying the air mail, but will it not increase the deficit of the Post Office Department?

Mr. KELLY. Under the present accounting system, if there is a loss it would add to the deficit. However, I am hopeful that the Post Office Committee and the Congress will soon adopt a policy of honest bookkeeping in the Post Office Department which will provide for setting aside as public welfare expenses those free and partly free services which make up the so-called deficit. Then they will be known for what they are, governmental expenses, and not as postal operations.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the gentleman's statement that we should endeavor to increase the mail volume on air routes. However, it is interesting to note that that result is most encouraging under present conditions.

Mr. KELLY. It is most gratifying.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And it is largely due to the fact that we are increasing air mileage every year, and every feeder of a long route gets more mail as a result. Take the route from Cheyenne, Wyo., to Pueblo, Colo. The maximum rate there was $3. Recently that was lowered to 83 cents. The contractor lost money under the $3 rate, but now is making money under the 83-cent rate. The tonnage has increased about five times.

Mr. KELLY. That is quite true.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please explain what he means by the $3 and the 83 cents?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Three dollars a pound for a thousand miles is the maximum rate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Of letters?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. That was the maximum the contractor could get from the Government.

Mr. KELLY. That is the maximum payment to the contractors under the law.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. They had competitive bidding and the same company took it at 83 cents instead of at $3. The result is they have increased their volume and thereby their profits. The same is true of the route from Atlanta to Miami, Fla.

Mr. KELLY. The National Air Transport Co. took the contract route from New York to Chicago at $1.24 a pound. That company is carrying something like 1,600 pounds of mail a day. With a volume like that they can distribute their overhead charges over a large amount of mail making a profit possible, even at the low figure. We are trying to develop the volume, and that means public support of the air-mail service.

There are 15,000,000,000 letters carried in the entire Postal Service every year. If we could get 1 out of 100 of them in the air mail, we would have a fund of some $15,000,000 for aviation in this country, which would mean vastly greater sums expended for the Army and Navy. At the 5-cent rate we should get 2 per cent, which would equal the same sum.

Mr. ROMJUE. Does not the gentleman think that as the carriage by air increases, the carriage by other means will naturally decrease, and as we go on developing the air-mail service will we not in the future have to readjust our contracts for carrying mail by train and other means, and we shall, therefore, be at less expense to the carriers who transport it through the air as the air mail increases in its facilities?

Mr. KELLY. That is a contingency that is a number of years in the future, I will say to the gentleman. The increase in volume of letter mail each year would alone make up a tremendous air-mail volume.

Right now we are making great progress in air mail and we are building it on a practically self-sustaining basis.

Perhaps there is a feeling among Americans that in Europe aviation is on a stronger and sounder basis than in this country. That is a great mistake. European commercial aviation is built on subsidies, without which the entire system would collapse.

In Germany more than half the gross revenues of the lines is a subsidy. Some of the lines receive a federal grant of 77 cents a mile flown, where the operating costs are $1.11 a mile.

France for 1927 appropriated $6,633,000 for civil aviation. The miles flown on British air lines total about as much in a year as our air-mail lines in two months. Yet the British subsidy for 1927 was about $830,000.

The United States air-mail lines are not built on subsidies. From the beginning the plan has been to have the routes pay

their way. The aviation companies here have not asked for subventions and subsidies. I do believe that every American interested in aviation desires these pathfinding companies to have a reasonable, workable plan of cooperation with the Post Office Department for the benefit of all concerned.

The Air Mail Service is built on American principles. It is the service which commanded the loyal efforts of the incomparable Lindbergh. It is the service which will keep America in the forefront of the great science of aviation, which this Nation gave to the world. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I have occasion to quote from the patron saint of the Republican Party, but in making some investigations recently I came across a statement from Alexander Hamilton that has peculiar application to certain proposed legislation which has been under consideration during the last two or three years—the debenture plan for disposing of surplus products of the farm. These statements were made by Alexander Hamilton in his report as Secretary of the Treasury on December 5, 1791. In this report he discusses the question of manufactures in this country. He is the man who originated, in so far as its application to this country is concerned, the doctrine of the protective tariff. He presented the arguments in favor of the tariff program. In making those arguments he refers to the activities of this country along manufacturing lines as infant industries. That was the basis of his justification of the tariff. He gives the arguments which he there assembles—and he assembled most of those given to-day in favor of encouraging the infant industries of the Nation, in order to protect them from foreign competition. But in this report in which he wants to encourage the manufacturers of this country, he says to do so amounts to giving a bounty to a specific class of citizens; that it is for the purpose of encouraging that home industry; that in doing so you will necessarily raise the price of that article, and that that will increase the prices of the products that the farmer must buy, and that he will not directly get much benefit from it, although he may, indirectly, in the form of an increased market; and that the only way to equalize the right of the farmer in connection with the establishment of a protective tariff is to take a portion of the receipts of the tariff and pay an export premium on the exportation of farm products.

That is almost identical and parallel with the plan known to-day as the export debenture plan, which would provide for the issuance of a certificate, in the event of the exportation of farm products, to be tenderable in payment of a portion of the duties that are collected on imports at the customhouse.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield there?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague is to be commended on being the pioneer here in the House on that proposed debenture plan. In fact, my colleague is the pathfinder here in the House of a great deal of important legislation.

I am just reminded of the fact that in the last session my colleague from the Panhandle of Texas introduced an important bill here in the House, and some days afterwards, in another body, the name of which I shall not mention, a similar bill was introduced; and because the similar bill got through first my colleague is not known as the real author of that bill down in some parts of the country by reason of claims that have been made during the past year. I hope my colleague does get his debenture plan through and will stamp "JONES" all over it so that somebody else can not claim it. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. I thank my colleague for his statement. The main purpose is not the securing of credit. The main purpose should be to have everybody working in the public interest to obtain and give results. But I appreciate the gentleman's generous statement in that connection.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe in giving credit to whom credit is due.

Mr. JONES. When I introduced the export premium or debenture measure some years ago carrying this idea I did not know of this report. This man has stated it and the reasons for it better than I could possibly have stated them.

I want to read an extract from the report, which is contained in Senate reprint of Document 172, Report on Manufactures, by Alexander Hamilton. I want to read an excerpt found on page 38 of that report, in which the Secretary discussed a proposal to equalize the privileges among the different classes of this country and prevent the favoritism that would naturally come from granting special privileges to one class of people; and recommends the utilizing of a portion of the receipts obtained from the tariff in the way of export premiums on agricultural products. I read from section 4:

(4) Bounties are sometimes not only the best but the only proper expedient for uniting the encouragement of a new object of agriculture with that of a new object of manufacture. It is the interest of the farmer to have the production of the raw material promoted by counteracting the interference of the foreign material of the same kind. It is the interest of the manufacturer to have the material abundant and cheap. • • •

It can not escape notice that a duty upon the importation of an article can not otherwise aid the domestic production of it than by giving the latter greater advantages in the home market. It can have no influence upon the advantageous sale of the article produced in foreign markets—no tendency, therefore, to promote its exportation.

The true way to conciliate these two interests is to lay a duty on foreign manufactures of the material, the growth of which is desired to be encouraged, and to apply the produce of that duty, by way of bounty, either upon the production of the material itself or upon its manufacture at home, or upon both. In this disposition of the thing the manufacturer commences his enterprise under every advantage which is attainable, as to quantity or price of the raw material; and the farmer, if the bounty be immediately to him, is enabled by it to enter into a successful competition with the foreign material. If the bounty be to the manufacturer on so much of the domestic material as he consumes, the operation is nearly the same; he has a motive of interest to prefer the domestic commodity, if of equal quality, even at a higher price, than the foreign so long as the difference of price is anything short of the bounty which is allowed upon the article.

He says it should be a reasonable bounty; but he recognizes, as everyone must who will analyze the situation and who is honest with himself, that a tariff has the effect of increasing the domestic price of the manufactured articles without any corresponding advantage to agriculture. Whatever may be one's idea about Hamilton's views of popular government, he was honest. He was fearless. He recognized conditions as he found them.

I do not subscribe to the doctrine of a high protective tariff. I stand on the Democratic basis and ground that we should have a tariff for revenue purposes, but that tariff, I believe, should be levied on every article that comes through the customhouse from which a revenue may be derived, whether it be an article of manufacture, a finished product, as it is sometimes called, or a raw material which goes into the product. Our records and our common experience will show that in the handling of that tariff, whatever it may be, the advantages go in large measure to the industrial portions of the country and in the smallest measure to the agricultural portions of our land. I believe, therefore, that if we continue to have the general policy of a protective tariff, as laid down and set out and advocated by the first man who urged its adoption in this country, we should also couple with it the complement which he advocated of applying, either directly or indirectly, a portion of those receipts to the equalizing of conditions among all classes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. JONES. I believe that is fair, and the man who is regarded as the father of our present system urges, in black and white in his report, that as the only way to equalize the interests of those great sections of the country.

To do otherwise would be favoring a certain class of our citizens, and not only a class, but, as America has developed, a section of our country. If you include this other portion of the original plan as a complement to it, you at least, whether it is a wise policy or not as a whole, have a national policy. It seems to me, therefore, that the plan is a good one, namely, that of issuing, when we export these raw products that are referred to in this report by Mr. Hamilton, a certificate showing that exportation and let the certificates that are issued be tenderable in payment of a portion of the tariff duties on the articles as they come in. If we did that, we would necessarily bring up the reflected price of the raw products to a level of equality with the manufactured products. It would be no more than fair to couple the two together, because whether the tariff went up or down there would be equality all along the line. One would go up with the other and come down with the other. On any other basis the farmer, or any man engaged in the making or growing of any kind of raw products, must pay a

higher price for the things he buys, and at the same time sell, both at home and abroad, in a market in which he is not permitted to purchase.

I wanted to call this old report to your attention, and I recommend it to the consideration of men on both sides of the House who are really interested in equality.

In the last two or three years we have had much talk about equality for the farmer and much talk about equality for agriculture. Many bills have been introduced, some of them containing great merit and all of them, perhaps, containing something of merit. But this plan, as laid down by the man who founded the policy under which we are working, is the simplest that has been offered, and I believe it would be the most effective. It would require no great machinery; it would require no great organization; it would simply require a little more work upon the part of the customs officials, and at the same time we would be sure of giving agriculture in this country, whether we have a high or a low tariff, an equality of opportunity, an equality before the law and an economic equality in its dealings at home or abroad with manufacturers in the industrial sections, both in this country and in the countries abroad. That would be a fair solution. The Members of the House to-day should read with interest this report by Secretary Hamilton. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I feel it is the least bit unfortunate that when I arise during these general debates in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union with an appropriation bill pending, or when I arise in connection with any detailed appropriation in any appropriation bill, I am immeditely charged with heckling the Budget, or an enemy of the Bureau of the Budget, or else I am charged with having an everlasting and continuous controversy with the great Appropriations Committee of the House. I beg to assure you, my friends, that neither charge is correct. All sides of all matters connected with proposed appropriations are entitled to be discussed on this floor. The Appropriations Committee should not consider that it must always be on the defensive. I have stated, and shall continue to state, that under the system by which we permit the great Budget Bureau to operate we seem to have made such cowards out of some of our high officials in the departments that they themselves are afraid to say what they should say to the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and, therefore, the appropriation subcommittees can not be blamed if they do not receive the information which Members on the outside of the subcommittees receive, whether by subterranean methods or otherwise.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not get that last phrase. What was that about subterranean methods?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a phrase that has been bandied about here this afternoon. The statement was made that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] had received the information which he was presenting to the House by some subterranean method.

Mr. MADDEN. Who was that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Representative DAVENPORT.

Mr. MADDEN. He received information——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. By subterranean methods, the clear inference being that somebody in the State Department has slipped information to him which he should not have received.

Mr. MERRITT. The gentleman does not mean that Mr. DAVENPORT said that himself?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; he was charged with that.

Mr. MADDEN. You do not charge that as coming from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I do not charge it. I heard it. And now I am trying to point out the situation which we are getting into.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is easy to make a wrong application of a statement of fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us see what it was.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the statement was made in connection with the speech that Mr. DAVENPORT made. Mr. DAVENPORT had undertaken to charge that there had been great neglect in making appropriations for the State Department, with the result that it was inefficient, and I stated that if what he said was true, the duty was on the head of that department, a Cabinet officer, to bring those matters to the attention of Congress. What I said in reference to a subterranean channel was this: That if the head of that department had permitted anyone under him to bring it to the attention of Congress and had not himself called it to the attention of Congress, that it was a subterranean method.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that is probably as good an explanation of the incident—but not in the exact words as they occurred in debate, because the conversation happened to be in the first person and was this: The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT], "Did you or did you not receive your information through subterranean channels?" I wondered if the gentlemen had the right to receive any information.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sympathetic with the attitude of the gentleman in protesting against our present situation. Our present situation is this: We have a bill here appropriating $89,047,000 for four departments of the Government. The gentleman is chairman of one of the most important committees here in Congress and is here to speak to us and give us information, and we now have 35 Congressmen on the floor. Where are the other 400? This is the system that the gentleman has in mind and is decrying.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The system, I think, has something to do with the small attendance. Let us carry that out further. I do hope the Committee on Appropriations will realize I have no feeling against them or any one of them, but I do feel that other Members are being put into a secondary position. Have we not come to a condition where the appropriation bills are prepared ahead of time? Preparation of the bills is begun officially before Members may take their seats or be appointed to the different committees. The appropriation bills are beginning to be set as to figures. Suddenly a bill is ready. It is introduced. Frequently general debate begins almost immediately thereafter. That is the situation with this particular bill. If a Member feels that he should say something in connection with an increased appropriation, or want of appropriation, he is quickly charged with having attacked the committee or is made to feel he is assaulting a hard-working committee.

The Members, therefore, come to a "what is the use" attitude. They say that, between the Budget and the big committee, there is nothing for them to do. So they are not here. Unless pressed very hard to attend, very few of them will be here Monday when this bill for four great departments will be read just as fast as the reader can skip through it. A Member who rises to offer an amendment increasing the figures of some appropriation is likely to be charged with being extravagant or not in favor of economy, or not talking "by the book"—which is the committee's printed hearing—and the amendment is promptly voted down. If he makes a suggestion of legislation of any kind on the bill, it is, of course, subject to a point of order. Therefore these days there really is little necessity for a Member to be present during the reading and passage of an appropriation bill. Should he muster Members on his side, he is in danger of being charged with assault on the Budget system and the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. And as each paragraph is read it becomes a law so far as we are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; exactly so.

Mr. BLANTON. And if we would reduce the membership of the House to 300, as I have proposed, we would then have a working House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We might.

Mr. BLANTON. And every Member would know what he is doing and would know what it is all about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That might or might not be true. Perhaps the system might then work even faster. I do not want to get clear aside from my subject.

I wish the Members would read the short hearing on immigration in one of the pamphlets of the Immigration Committee, which pamphlet is not even entitled "Department of Labor." This subcommittee handles the appropriations for the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor—four great departments—and the hearings this time have been cut up so that the hearings on the appropriations for the Department of Labor are separate.

You will find in this pamphlet all the information that was given in the way of questions and answers with respect to appropriations for the Labor Department, and I hardly need remind you that the major part of the Department of Labor is the Immigration Service.

You will find in here that the committee has made an increase in the matter of the deportation appropriation of

$200,000. The deportations for the last fiscal year were about 14,000, and this the department points to with pride. The number has gone up 1,000 over the previous year, and how? Four thousand persons were pushed back over the line into Mexico and 3,000 were pushed back over the line into Canada. This accounts for 7,000 of the deportations and the cost of pushing them back is very little. It is all averaged, however. The cost of pushing back one Mexican across the line and the cost of sending an offending Chinaman at $300 back to his home place in China, which is mandatory under the law, is averaged, so that the cost of deportation is made to be about $87 per person; but when you see how the proportion works out it will remind you of the story of our former colleague, now Senator, TOM HEFLIN, about the 50–50 horse-and-rabbit pie.

So that even the additional money given for deportations will not do the work that the present laws call upon them to do. Members of the department itself, when called only yesterday for hearings before the Immigration Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, stated that for a good part of the last fiscal year they had to merely mark time with regard to deportations and deport the minimum of the most necessary cases, because they had not the money to pay the transportation of the persons to be deported, and this very fiscal year they are marking time. Shortage of funds causes them to deport principally just those thrown at them from the prison doors at the expiration of their sentences and a few others that are thrust upon them. They have no means with which to go out and pick up persons whom they know to be subject to deportation.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SHREVE. I desire to inform the gentleman—the gentleman has not been here for a day or two—that the committee has taken care of that extra item referred to and the deporting squad will be provided with money enough to work the entire year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have been here. That is proposed to be added to the bill?

Mr. SHREVE. It is already in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have the bill here and have read it. How much is that additional money?

Mr. SHREVE. We are giving them $200,000 more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am informed of that. I stated not three minutes ago that there was an additional $200,000, and it is not $200,000 net for that matter.

Mr. SHREVE. That is for the purpose of deportation so that the men may be employed for the entire 12 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And I am bold enough to make the charge that if we have been marking time on deportations a portion of each and every year for the last two or three years, there will not be enough money for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. SHREVE. We are not going to mark time any more because we have provided them with the necessary funds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will still mark time if we have only $200,000 additional for deportation purposes, and I will make the further statement——

Mr. SHREVE. In addition to our regular appropriation for deportation we had a supplemental estimate from the Director of the Budget of $200,000, which is all the money that can be used in keeping this deportation squad busy for the entire year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What is the deportation squad?

Mr. SHREVE. The men who handle that service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But that squad has not enough money to allow a single man to go out and find the men who ought to be deported.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit, the amount of the increase is really $175,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; a net increase of $175,000.

Mr. SHREVE. That is the increase over what was originally recommended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is helpful, and I am sure it will be appreciated and properly used.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Was that amount satisfactory to the Labor Department?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It has to be.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Did they ask for anything more?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They do not dare ask for anything more. They asked the Budget for more.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Did the Labor Department indicate they could use more?

Mr. SHREVE. They did not say they could not use any more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman let me answer? This is my time.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. That is because the Immigration Bureau is afraid to speak out.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is not. It is because the law prohibits them. It is the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman is quite right. After going so far it is the law. But more money, more squads, more deportations, and Congress makes the law after all.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. NEWTON. The gentleman says they are afraid to do so-and-so. Does it not permit them to speak out when questioned by the Appropriation Committee? Are they afraid to talk frankly in answer to a question by a member of the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. It is not a question of answering; it is a question of being asked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In view of the positive statement the gentleman has made, I hope he will continue to make positive statements, because I will make a reply later thereto.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. All right; I will make a further one. If the department had funds for a squad from the Immigration Department that could be spared to step out into the streets in New York City and look for alien seamen who have come ashore and failed to go back to their ship or any other ships they could pick up 5,000 men. The probabilities are that there are 75,000 a year, at the very inside number, alien seamen who come ashore and remain in the United States, going into the coal mines of Pennsylvania or into restaurants or into other places to hide out and remain in the United States, and all that is well known to the immigration authorities.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How many alien seamen are probably subject to deportation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A good many. But all alien seamen who have slipped in during past years are not subject to deportation.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How many people in the country who have illegally come past the immigration authorities?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I venture to say there are 1,200,000 persons in the country who can not prove that they legally entered the country. But, please notice, that they are not all deportable; because if they have been here three years in the cases of seamen and five years in the cases of most others, under the limit of the law they can not be deported.

Mr. BLANTON. For every one of the 250,000 aliens who annually come in lawfully to the United States there is a corresponding 250,000 aliens who come in unlawfully?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I think likely that is true. The department is doing well to hold it to that.

Mr. BLANTON. So that there are 500,000 aliens who lawfully and unlawfully come into the United States annually.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the net legally in the United States, subtracting the departures, is about 250,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Why do you not get the accurate facts?

Mr. BLANTON. Because there is not a department of the Government that can give them to us. The Census Bureau can not. The Immigration Bureau can not. The naturalization department can not. Because our law does not require them to keep accurate statistics on this point.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is unfair to make wild statements about the number that are here unlawfully—way up in the millions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That statement has not been made. I gave a correct statement of those who can not prove that they legally entered the country. There are easily 300,000 of such from Canada. Some have been here many years. The gentleman asked how many illegal entries there are. If anyone really knew how many in the past five years, then a direct statement could be made as to the number liable to deportation. What I am trying to say, in this interrupted way, is that more money for deportation purposes would permit the department to attempt a survey and to go about finding some of the most vicious of these people who are deportable. Each year the situation becomes worse.

Mr. MADDEN. How does the gentleman know that there are 5,000 deportable seamen in New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I said that there were 5,000 in the city of New York.

Mr. MADDEN. Where are they?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. All around that city. You can ask the shipmasters.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think he could get the information from the shipmasters?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We know the number of sailors arriving and departing. We have consular officers' figures also. Information is available on every hand. Get a copy of the hearings of the gentleman's committee or the department's reports.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not information at all. It is assertion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. You will find all this in the records.

Mr. MADDEN. Notwithstanding the sneer of the gentleman, I say that is only assertion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not making a sneer at all. The gentleman's committee is powerful. It is a great committee. But have things come to a point in this House that a Member dare not make a statement based on his study without certain members of the committee getting their backs up like a bunch of porcupines? Further, I think it is a mistake to allow each member of the Appropriations Committee to have reports of the Bureau of the Budget 60 days before other Members receive it.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not a statement of fact either.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it not? Then what is the fact?

Mr. MADDEN. The fact is that the Budget does cooperate with the committee in giving us information to work on from day to day while we are getting the bills ready for you and the other gentlemen of this House, but we do not get any printed copies until you get yours.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we can get those advance copies the same as the gentleman if we know how. I get a copy just about as soon as the Committee on Appropriations does.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; anybody can get them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How early?

Mr. MADDEN. Just as early as we can.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But I have a letter from the Director of the Budget that my copy will not be available for me until the opening of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman made the assertion that we got printed copies 60 days in advance, and the gentleman did not state the fact when he said that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the distinguished gentleman is now splitting hairs.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the statement made truthfully.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, it is truthful. I have quite a voluminous correspondence on that subject. Why go whispering around for a Budget estimate? I knew that we could get a rise out of the chairman in no time at all.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, if the gentleman wants——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I decline to be further interrupted.

Mr. MADDEN. I will give the gentleman a proper rise any time he wants it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Sure; always. Gentlemen, you will find a statement in some of these hearings to the effect that these immigration authorities have not any money with which to go and look for anybody except those that are practically delivered to them for the purpose of deportation. The public is led to believe that some real effort is being made to run down and deport vicious and criminal aliens, in addition to those that are shoved out of the penitentiaries for the purpose of being deported, and that sailors and other "sneak-ins" are located and sent away; but not so to any extent. Why? No funds.

And further, Mr. Chairman, even the arbitrary deportation of aliens who step out of prison may go to pieces if other governors follow the precedent of Governor Smith, of New York, who has decided—or his legal adviser for him—that a man paroled from the penitentiaries of that State shall not be held for the Immigration Service to take into custody and deport, but that it is up to the Immigration Service to go and find the paroled man when his parole runs out—and that costs money. Also Governor Smith—or his legal adviser—has stated to the Labor Department that if the department can not see that phase of the conflict between Nation and State it may become necessary for Governor Smith to issue pardons to those convicted deportable alien criminals coming out of the New York penal institutions—to pardon them to prevent their being deported by the Federal Government. That is one interesting phase that is developing in connection with deportation. It shows the power of alien influence, by the way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will bring in a bill and pass it putting a fine of $5,000 to $10,000 on every ship company that brings an alien here unlawfully, and a penitentiary sentence on its officers, it would stop most of this unlawful entry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, we have such a law, except that the fine is $1,000, which is pretty heavy.

Mr. BLANTON. It is now merely a maximum fine of $1,000. It ought to be made a serious offense. There ought to be confinement in a prison.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is a serious offense, and the fine is mandatory and can not be remitted.

Mr. BLANTON. But they take chances now with a maximum fine of only $1,000, where otherwise they would not if the fine were $10,000, with a prison service added.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not so many as the gentleman would think. The ships themselves are often made victims.

Mr. BLANTON. They do get here, do they not?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a moment. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, the motion for additional funds for the Immigration Service will not call for an excessive amount. It will be offered at the proper place in the bill. I am calling attention to it in advance. A few years ago, when we had a great number of immigrants coming in, the money received for head tax was far in excess of that spent by the Federal Government for its whole Immigration Service. Now that immigration is limited to a certain number—this year about 500,000 coming, each one paying a head tax of $8—the Immigration Service ran only $1,000,000 behind, or some such figure behind receipts, and on top of that there is the $10 consular visa, which is collected from each of these people but which goes into the Federal Treasury—a great sum which is generally thought of as State Department income, but which comes from immigrants. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not mean to say that the Governor of the State of New York ignores the notices given by the immigration authorities in the Department of Labor with reference to people about to be deported?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I do not say that he has ignored the notices. In fact, he has taken full cognizance of the notices. It develops a very interesting legal situation.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman knows that as soon as a person is about to be paroled and the immigration authorities wish to deport him they send a man to the prison to pick him up right there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the gentleman is so far behind what is happening with Al Smith and the great State of New York that I am sorry for him. That is the very situation which is being changed.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is not so far behind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, yes; he is.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman knows that Al Smith is so far ahead of what the gentleman thinks he knows that he can not catch up with him at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, when Gov. Al Smith, of New York, undertakes to protect alien criminals when they step out of the penitentiaries of New York, either as paroled or pardoned men, so that they can remain and vote the Tammany ticket as soon as they can be naturalized, the Governor of New York is going too far ahead for me. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] And only yesterday a class of 10,000 candidates were made into citizens in Judge Cottillo's New York State court. That is pretty fast, too.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman mention one case where the Governor of the State of New York has been protecting criminals?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, do not——

Mr. BLOOM. Just mention one case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do not do as my distinguished leader the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] undertook to do. Do not try to split hairs. Let the gentleman ask for the legal records in the case.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman know of one case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I have it in hearings held only yesterday, and I will send the gentleman a printed

copy by Monday. I will endeavor to send copies of that hearing to all Members, so they may see for themselves what is doing in deportations.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, inasmuch as the atmosphere has cleared and the weather has moderated, let me say in all seriousness that the Immigration Service must be kept efficient, vigilant, and abreast of the new laws—the work of detail in that service. Human beings are dealt with. The United States wants to be just, and the people want the immigration and deportation laws enforced. You know that. Immigration appropriations are made, most of them, under a lump sum, not split up into detail providing for so many clerks and so much money for this and so much for that. Then the sum has to be prorated per month, per district, per activity. Gentlemen, we would be doing the right thing by adding another $500,000 to the sum already recommended by the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], and that is the additional amount for which I shall ask.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will offer an amendment providing for it, for one I will vote for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will help get all the members present, with the understanding that the money will be carefully used, we can work that out, and I doubt if the gentlemen of the subcommittee will seriously object.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I want to ask the gentleman if it is possible to give the Department of Labor enough money to deport all those who are illegally here?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I do not think it is possible. But we can vote enough additional money to make deportations to Europe worth while.

I remember in a recent Congress, only three or four years back, that I had the honor to lead a movement designed to override the Budget recommendation, as well as the committee's figures. I asked for a million dollars for the purpose of setting up a border patrol by appealing to the members of the Committee of the Whole. I acted as a sort of midwife, and the border patrol was born by a great majority right here on this floor, with no extra legislation and no restrictive riders. And then the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH], who was acting as a sort of wet nurse on that occasion, got an extra $200,000 for it. [Laughter.] All hands agree that the border patrol is operating successfully and that it is a necessary and worth-while adjunct of the Immigration Service.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman has overstated it when he said all hands agree that the border patrol is a good thing and is working altogether successfully. I am not certain that it is, as a matter of fact, inasmuch as I see a statement that there are some bootleggers coming over in spite of the border patrol.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, overstating? Nearly all hands then. I will further answer the gentleman on that by reading an extract right from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of only yesterday. No; I can not find it at this moment; but there was a discussion here on that subject when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] stated that the border patrol is working successfully. It should be understood that there are less than 500 men divided on the two borders. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said it was successful, doing very well, and that he was proud of it. And then the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], in whose district, I believe, is a wonderful double house, partly in Canada and partly in the United States, so that Chinese and others can walk upstairs on the Canadian side and down stairs on the United States side, said that the patrol was a good and necessary thing. Next, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH], who has the headquarters of the Mexican border patrol in his district at El Paso, bowed and scraped and said it was a good thing; and there is the testimony of three of our colleagues, and therefore it must be right. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Since the gentleman is testifying now, I would like to have his own testimony.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. I could give it by the yard. It is shown in the Appropriation Committee's hearings that the border-patrol boss confiscated a thousand or more automobiles which they themselves were unable to use. They have turned back thousands. They have assisted customs and prohibition officials. We estimate that on the Mexican border the number illegally coming in is about one for every one coming in legally. We know, however, that the Mexican population in the United States is increasing at a great rate. We expect to restrict the right to come. Our committee had hoped that when the members of the subcommittee had personally seen the operations of the patrol on the border there would be a little more than a paltry $90,000 or $100,000 extra for the increase of pay and increase of the personnel of the border patrol.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. What does the border patrol constitute? What do they patrol? How did it get that name?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The word "patrol" sprang into existence at the time of the birth of the organization, which I have just described. It was an emergency name, and a fitting name. They undertake to stop persons usually back on main highways, a few miles inside the border, persons who may be coming in illegally, people bringing in aliens illegally, and they help to detect persons smuggling liquor and other contraband goods. They are not warrant officers. Their numbers are limited and they are obliged to patrol first on one sector and then on another.

Mr. HUDSON. Can the gentleman state how many members of the border patrol are stationed at Bruges Point? I think the commissioner stated there were 12. But when I passed through there I could not find any patrol or any prohibition agents or anybody. I could have brought in any and all kinds of things.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman bring in anything?

Mr. HUDSON. I did bring in two young men; that is a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The limited number of men appointed on these border patrols can not be expected to be up all night, as well as all day, and at all points at all times. We need more men.

Mr. HUDSON. They do not really patrol. They would have to have a good many more if they really did.

Mr. NEWTON. I know nothing particular about the border patrol, but I know that they do detect people attempting to come in illegally.

Mr. HUDSON. I can tell the gentleman that if he will go up on the border he will not find any patrol.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, gentlemen, I have about completed. Please understand that one place where the shortage of money occurs is in the matter of transportation of the persons to be deported. You will find in the statement made before the Appropriation Committee a statement to the effect that the fund in the previous fiscal year had run out so rapidly that now the department, in apportioning money, allots so much for the persons to be deported from this district and so much from that district, so much for each and every month of the year, regardless of what the situation may be.

Just like saying to a grand jury, "You shall sit $50 worth and no more." [Laughter.]

You will find in the Appropriations Committee hearings a report to the effect that some sort of a circus arrived at Atlanta, Ga., bringing with it quite a large number of aliens of all kinds, including snake charmers, circus riders, acrobats, and, in addition, some alien shell and card men, procurers, pimps, prostitutes, and others of a deportable kind. In this case the Immigration Service took notice. It was an emergency, and they found and arrested 20 or 25 of these disreputable aliens and had them up for deportation. To get them out of Atlanta, Ga., the service used the Atlanta district's whole transportation fund for the remainder of the year, and I can imagine that the department is now in a great quandary as to whether it should draw from the deportation money allocated to the Chicago district, where there are a number of alien gunmen traveling around with sawed-off shotguns and machine guns, or draw money from the Pittsburgh district where, I am told, there has recently broken out a very good-sized vendetta between the fascisti and anti-fascisti, which has resulted in the killing of 24 anti-fascisti. [Laughter.] No; that is not humorous at all. Why should we have fascists and antis in the United States?

Mr. Chairman, we have limited immigration. We have restricted it as far as possible, so that only 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born people on a given census date may come from other countries. That results in shutting out many good, fine foreign peasants and other working people from any European country you might name—from Czechoslovakia, Italy,

Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and other countries from which many fine people have come to this country. The law even shuts out many wives and children of aliens domiciled here. It will be wrong for Congress not to make appropriations sufficient to drive out those who sneak in, either of sailors, stowaways, smugglers, or otherwise, to live here in lieu of desirable ones shut out. The expenditures may look big at times, but they are worth it. Let me tell you something. It cost $1,000,000 extra in supplemental appropriations a few years back to deport the anarchist, Emma Goldman, her murderous consort, Berkman, and 249 other anarchists from New York to Russia on the old transport *Buford*, but it was worth many times $1,000,000 to the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. For the information of the House, will the gentleman please place a statement in the RECORD showing the points from which the greater number of deportations are made?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have such information in recent hearings before the Immigration Committee and will be glad to supply all Members with copies as soon as printed.

Mr. HUDSON. I wish the gentleman would do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am very glad to have had an opportunity to speak freely and frankly before this small but appreciative audience, and I thank you for your attention.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman acknowledges there are no restrictions on his rights.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Why, of course not. I agree that is quite true. Any man who knows how can get all the time he needs. He can move to strike out the last word in every paragraph in a bill every five minutes. He can make all the motions he desires, and it is probably the duty of the gentleman from Illinois to see that as many as possible of such motions turn out to be mere gestures.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman should feel complimented because his audience has trebled since he began.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Thank you. This is a great and a serious subject, and I know that not only Mr. SHREVE but also the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN], as well as the clerk of the committee, have given tremendous study to this subject. It is one of those subjects, if the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will bear with me, about which you can not say there are just so many.

You can not handle immigrants or deportees like sacks of wheat. You can not say, "We will provide for the Atlanta district $800 a year for deportation purposes," and not be prepared if that district uses it all in one month. When I first came to Congress, now 15 years past, I wondered why we did not have all the appropriations on a lump-sum basis, but I had only to be here a few years to learn that the lump sum is the most distressful way appropriations can be made. Under a lump-sum plan they must prorate the money over the entire year and for each purpose and for each district; but because of ever-increasing emergencies in this particular service, the necessary things are trimmed, cut, and even suspended. The inspectors are underpaid as compared with other inspector services, and they get no overtime, which other inspectors receive. Clerks are underpaid and not enough of them. The business of the Immigration Service has gone up by leaps and bounds, yet the number of clerks employed has not gone up. Every Member of Congress has much work with that service, which calls for the writing of many letters and much detail. The work is so heavy that the department itself is hard pressed to keep up with the most necessary work, yet it comes within $1,000,000 or $1,500,000 of paying its own expenses. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to myself. I think it well that the House understand what the facts are when any Member seems to be laboring under a wrong impression. My good friend from the State of Washington has fallen into the habit of frequently insisting, in a general way, that the Committee on Appropriations has limited the amounts it recommends to the Budget recommendations. I find that the gentleman, when called to account for that, has been willing to correct his overstatement in that regard. He made a similar statement to that effect before our committee last year, and I asked him this question, as will appear from the printed hearings:

Mr. OLIVER. I have heard you make that statement before, and from the information that I have as a member of the committee I do not think the statement is justified.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do; but pardon me, I do not want to dispute your statement so directly.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is so easy for an individual Member of Congress sometimes to overstate a situation, looking at it from his own viewpoint——

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). I may be a little given to that.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, the opinions of all should be taken into account and should be weighed in determining what is a fair conclusion to draw from the facts. So far as this committee and as the other subcommittee on which I serve are concerned, while we entertain, of course, great respect for the recommendations of the Budget as approved and submitted by the President, yet we have never felt they were conclusive on the committee; and, as you stated a few moments ago, this particular subcommittee has at times made very different recommendations to Congress from those submitted to us. So I do not think that the Appropriations Committee is subject to criticism that we are bound down by estimates submitted by the Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not that quite right?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not the entire statement quite in keeping with the situation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is why I was objecting to the statement the gentleman made to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE], in which the gentleman was quite positive in saying that so hidebound was this rule that we never permitted representatives from the departments to make statements as to appropriations different from what they submitted to the Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not put words in my mouth which I did not say.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It so happens that in reference to the very matter he was discussing—namely, the deportation of aliens—that our subcommittee elicited from Mr. White, Assistant Secretary of Labor, information which led to an increase of $175,000 over the recommendations first submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] and myself called Mr. White before us and talked with him about measures for the deportation of aliens. We asked him if he thought the amount recommended was sufficient. Mr. White said he did not. We went carefully over it and concluded that some increase should be carried. We then called these facts to the attention of General Lord, who sent for Mr. White, and later submitted a supplemental estimate of $175,000, which is carried in this bill.

This shows, I hope, that we are trying to proceed in an orderly way to submit proper estimates to the House; not excessive estimates, but such as those in authority tell us they can efficiently expend and get results from.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If General Lord had not agreed with the gentleman and had not sent in the supplemental estimate, then what?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably that amount would have been brought in by our committee if, in our judgment, the facts justified it.

Mr. BLANTON. Then what was the use of submitting it to General Lord?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Simply because we have an established system and we are glad to have a man so well versed in these matters as General Lord; and his aides are to go carefully over information submitted to us and give us the benefit of their judgment. They are well qualified and are willing always, I think, to give an open mind to such matters. We felt, from information communicated to us by Mr. White, that this item should be considered for a supplemental estimate. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that some of the matters had, perhaps, become known to Mr. White after he appeared before the Budget—such an instance as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has referred to. You remember that last year the deficiency bill failed in the Senate. It carried an appropriation for the Labor Department and its failure brought about a condition that made it very necessary to conserve the amounts carried in the regular appropriation bill, and if there was some marking of time last year—and there was—it was partly due to the fact at least that the deficiency bill failed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have been marking time for a part of the time for several years.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We are endeavoring to correct it.

Mr. BLANTON. As the gentleman from Alabama knows I am one of those who backs up the gentleman's committee and supports the Budget, generally speaking.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman asked who could be better informed on this question than Mr. White, the Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Where could the gentleman get better information on this subject than from the chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the House, a man who has access to such information from all over the country, who brings witnesses from everywhere before his committee to testify. Where would the gentleman find better authority than the gentleman from Washington upon this question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman feels that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] is such a fine authority, I shall not take issue with him at this particular time; but speaking for myself, I will say to the gentleman I do not think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has the specific data such as a lawyer or a judge would and should require in order to make appropriations. I should not have said this had the gentleman not called for it by his question.

Mr. BLANTON. What I have in mind is this: Suppose it came to a question of difference of judgment between the chairman of our legislative committee and the Assistant Secretary of Labor, is the Committee on Appropriations going to absolutely disregard the judgment of the chairman of our legislative committee and take the judgment of an assistant secretary or a bureau chief?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not embarrass me but will let me make a statement.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is not such a wide difference of opinion between us. On these matters of estimates I can not have any more statistical information than have these gentlemen who ask for it and get it. I am sorry the discussion has taken this turn, but the point I particularly was trying to bring out was that the money being appropriated simply takes care of the deportations that come up from the regular sources and does not let us pick up those we are trying to get particularly. That is the point.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that we always give an opportunity to every Member of Congress, including the gentleman from Washington, to come before us, and we are very glad to have them come. I do not think we have ever at any time denied a Member of the House the right to a courteous hearing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman allow me to make another statement which I think will be worth while?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Our committee planned to have a subcommittee present at the hearings before the gentleman's subcommittee. The particular hearing at which Mr. White was present, occurred on December 8, when our committee was not appointed. A hearing was held yesterday in our committee for the purpose of beginning a discussion among ourselves as to whether we should proceed with the preparation of a much heavier deportation bill to present to this House to be voted upon. We sent for facts to see how we are getting along with deportations under present laws, and the situation was so depressing, gentlemen, that the members of the committee themselves thought it was almost useless to undertake to perfect the machinery of deportation when we could not, with the money at hand, keep up with the deportations necessary under present laws. This is the situation.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the gentleman from Washington will recognize that Mr. White and others connected with the Department of Labor are best qualified to give facts on which the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee can intelligently act in relation to these matters. We have always sought what we considered to be the best information on which to predicate our conclusions.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. That ought to be true; but I have in mind the time when unfortunately there was in charge of this department Louis F. Post, whose policy was not to deport even the most radical communists that came within the law of deportation. The great amount of money we spent in order to get Emma Goldman and Alexander Bergman back was due to the fact that we could not get cooperation from Mr. Post.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That condition does not exist now.

Mr. BLANTON. It has existed in the past, and it may exist again.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman from Texas yield? [Laughter.] I submit to the gentleman from Texas, who is a good lawyer and a good judge, that because at one time in the past there may have been some one in the department who did not do his duty does not justify us in concluding that men of that type are still in office. All of us who know Mr. White, know that he is zealous in the enforcement of our immigration laws, and that he is not the type who would mislead us as to the facts. The committee felt we were getting information from a very reliable and well-informed witness.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman assure us that Mr. White is satisfied with $175,000 increase; that is, does he believe he can carry out all the purposes of his department for that amount of money?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not know as to all of the purposes of the department, but he was well satisfied with that amount. That is the conclusion we came to after a talk with him.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. HUDSON. Is it not a fact that if you can make more efficient the border patrol, you will have less need of money to enforce deportation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman says that the border patrol is inefficient; that they are doing nothing. I want to say that that information is incorrect. We traveled along the border, and we heard from the citizens of the gentleman's State high tributes paid to the efficiency of the border patrol. You are to-day furnishing to this committee the only opinion we have heard expressed around the border line of America tending to detract from the efficiency of the border patrol.

Mr. HUDSON. I think I can take the gentleman up the full length of the St. Mary and Detroit Rivers and find miles that it is impossible for the border patrol to cover with the number that they now have, and in that instance and in that way the border patrol is inefficient. I think the chairman of the Immigration Committee will say that it is impossible to completely patrol the borders of the United States with the present force. That is all I mean. I wish to say that if we had more money to put more men there you could patrol the border. I want to make a further statement, that if the border is effectually patrolled you will not have so many men to deport.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield myself 10 minutes more.

The gentleman from Washington has stressed on many occasions the wisdom of the quota law. I voted for that law and wish to see it strictly enforced. Our subcommittee has made diligent inquiry into all violations, with a view of supplying adequate funds for its enforcement.

However, those who believe in the law should give serious consideration to some fundamental facts that weaken the law and make its rigid enforcement difficult, if not impossible. Until these facts are given consideration you can never enforce it as it should be. You will never be able to prevent aliens from coming in surreptiously and remaining here until, in my judgment, you write into the law some provision requiring registration. [Applause.]

Then, again, you must give consideration to the fact that when you find characters like Emma Goldman and others, to whom the gentleman from Washington has referred, are here in violation of law and they are sent back across the seas from where they came at great cost to our Government, when they return again in violation of that same law they must understand that some punitive penalty awaits them.

The committee of which the gentleman from Washington is chairman should recommend to Congress a law which will prevent these parties from feeling they are immune from punishment, even though they repeat the same offense against our law a dozen times. All we now do is, at great expense to the Government, to intercept and send them in comfort back to their homes, from which they may with impunity seek another unlawful entrance. I believe this Congress should pass a law punishing a man who enters unlawfully a second time. This it would seem is just and is as little as we should be expected to ask. When you do that even, you will largely stop illegal entries. You would be surprised at the number of those who unlawfully enter as second, as third, yea, as fourth offenders. Yet we have no law which imposes a punitive penalty on unlawful entrants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me say to the gentleman that a section of that kind is a part of the deportation bill that has passed the House of Representatives twice and still has not become a law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But what are you going to do when you have such cases as that of Emma Goldman, who says that she would rather spend her whole future in a penitentiary in the United States than to be free in Russia? She was willing to be in a penitentiary here.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Oh, I think if she had some work to do in the penitentiary that the gentleman would find that the statement she makes is nothing but an idle threat. I have yet to find those who make statements of that kind willing to be deprived of their liberties for a great length of time. That sort of statement is often used as a means for getting into newspaper headlines, seeking for the time to pose as a martyr.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has referred to the great source of unlawful entries when he speaks of seamen who leave and never return to their ships. The gentleman has talked with me more than once as to privileges enjoyed by seamen. It is a great international question, one that must be delicately handled, and yet if his statements are correct, thousands are permitted to come in because of an international custom, probably now almost recognized as international law, allowing 60-day shore leave, so that they may wander around in search for a better ship on which to return. Many of them avail themselves of that right, not for the purpose of seeking employment on another vessel but really to violate our immigration law. That will require study on the part of the gentleman's committee that we may write into law something that will prevent this abuse of a privilege on the part of many who enter our gates against the plain mandate of the law. When you place some punishment upon those people and not limit the punishment alone to the owners or captains of vessels you will go far to strengthen the enforcement of a law that we believe in. [Applause.]

These are matters that should be considered by the legislative committee, and I am glad to learn from the distinguished chairman of the committee that he is in sympathy with legislation along these general lines. I recognize it requires time to know just what further enabling acts should be passed. The time is now ripe for the consideration of enabling acts that will provide adequate punishment on all who violate our immigration statutes.

Let me call attention to another weakness in the law, and I think it may surprise some of you. We felt we had excluded the Chinese, but under a judicial interpretation of the treaty of 1880, we are told that where a Chinese assumes the status of a merchant he has the right to do what a Swede or an Englishman or a German or an Italian can not do, namely, bring in his family without having them even charged to a country quota. There is no quota for China; yet every Chinese merchant, it is now held, can bring in his family. Here is a subterfuge many now employ. They have large Chinese mercantile partnerships now out on the west coast, each member contributing to the partnership capital. Sometimes the number of partners may go as high as three or four hundred, each claiming the status of a merchant. If you will travel around the border, you will find many ports of entry crowded with young Chinese seeking to be admitted as members of the family of one who claims the status of a merchant. It is difficult for the Department of Labor to meet the affidavits and the proof they submit of birth. This, I submit, is a matter that needs the attention also of the legislative committee. [Applause.] Now, gentlemen, you do not appropriate money recklessly for your own business. You could not succeed if you did. You do not spend your own salaries recklessly. If you did, you could not live in Washington. This House desires its Committee on Appropriations to make intelligent recommendations, and in our effort to do so we have sought information from those whom we felt were qualified to advise what money could be wisely expended in carrying out the authorizations of Congress. I feel reasonably sure the House will find that the amounts carried in this bill are reasonable and provide sufficient funds for an efficient discharge of duties by the several Government agencies cared for in this bill.

Some reference has been made to the border patrol, and it is proper to say that a large part of their duties consist in turning back Canadians and Mexicans who, by filing application and paying a certain fee, might be lawfully admitted. No individual penalty is imposed on those who seek to enter without complying with the requirements of the law. As a result many of them repeatedly offend, and until the legislative committee imposes some penalty, at least on repeaters, you will not aid the border patrol in their efforts to enforce our immigration law. If the legislative committee will provide a punitive penalty for the second offense it will relieve the border patrol of a large part of the work it is now engaged in. I take this opportunity to say that the border patrol is the most intelligent body of young men that I have come in contact with in the Government service. [Applause.] They are zealous in the enforcement of immigration laws. I did not find one who did not feel he was there as the representative of the Government to carry out the mandate of Congress and to see to it that those not entitled to enter should stay out. Down on the southern border, when a large number of border patrol men were gathered together, the question was asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN], "How many of you boys were in the World War?" The answers disclosed that about 80 per cent of that number were ex-service men. They are engaged in a dangerous service and undergo at times many serious discomforts. It was because of the importance of their work and the low salaries they received therefor that the committee has recommended in this bill a reasonable increase in their pay.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You will find some of them who were captains in our Army abroad—men who are now drawing $150 a month; men with families; high-class men—doing loyal, efficient service in our border patrol.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. When the legislative committee has finished what it has wisely undertaken to do, as the chairman, Mr. JOHNSON, informs us, and approval of that legislation has been had, you will find that these complaints of unlawful entries will dwindle, and you can, with confidence, look forward to the time when the number of those who enter unlawfully will be comparatively few.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The committee is anxious to pass some safe, reliable form of registration. But every investigation we have made into that matter has shown us that any system of registration would be very cumbersome and the multiplicity of details would be something terrific. It is not wise to send out legislative acts calling for more than the Government of the United States can maintain with the appropriation provided. That is the crux of all that I have stated.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I have great respect for the opinion of the legislative committee, of which the gentleman is chairman, yet, in view of the importance of that legislation, I do not think the mere matter of expense incident to its enforcement, if it promises real results, will cause this Congress, if you report the bill, from passing it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ADKINS. Mr. Chairman, of course I can not under the present conditions attempt to make a speech. However, since coming to Washington the topic that I have heard spoken about most, I believe, is farm relief. Everybody seems to be anxious to know what is going to be done about farm relief. Many hearings have been had and much discussion has been given to what will relieve the farm situation and what can be accomplished. But I do not think the outlook is discouraging to Congress, when we stop to consider that all other major legislation that we have placed on the statute books of the Nation affecting directly or indirectly our major activities was put on the statute books only after long hearings and after modification before attaining its present final completeness. The interstate commerce law was for a long time discussed, and after the framework of what we now have was put on the statute books it was amended from time to time as occasion required. Everybody admits that the price of transportation is one of the important elements that enter into this problem. Never was there a tariff law passed by unanimous consent or without a great difference of opinion. Nobody would want a tariff enacted unless it stabilized the commodities at a higher level. Many hundred pages of discussion were put into the RECORD before the stockyards act was passed. Our people were not unanimous in the matter of the creation of the Federal Reserve Board. It has been amended, I believe, twenty times or more before its terms were made to apply fairly satisfactory to the banking interests of the country.

Now, after we have discussed all the various schemes offered for the relief of agriculture, where are we at this beginning of the new Congress? All the farm organizations represented at the Capital, and most of the farmers of the country, believe that the solution of the farm problem is in surplus control. My

understanding is that the administration, or those purporting to speak for it, believe also that it is the surplus that is the cause of the trouble agriculture finds itself in. That has been agreed upon as factor No. 1. All believe that, inasmuch as every major activity of the country has some Federal board or commission that either directly or indirectly stabilizes the price of the service these activities renders society.

The immigration law, which has been talked of so much this afternoon, functions in stabilizing the price of labor at a higher level. Agriculture being about the only major activity not having a Federal agency to stabilize the price of its commodities, naturally it would seem has brought about a fairly general agreement on the necessity of having a Federal farm board to assist in stabilizing the price of agricultural commodities at a price that the farmer may make a fair exchange of his commodities with that of the other fellow, maintain a respectable style of living, educate his family, and lay up something for old age.

My understanding is that every farm organization represented in Washington and everybody having anything to do with the farm question believes that a Federal farm board is necessary to administer this surplus, which they all admit is causing us our trouble. Every farm organization represented in Washington, so far as I know, except one, believes that in order to maintain that sort of a system of handling our surplus it will be necessary to have what is known as the equalization fee to pay the cost incurred in operating that plan. There is where the difference seems to come in.

The last bill which was passed by Congress was vetoed by the President and the veto message criticized it in many instances. However, I think that inasmuch as we have agreed on certain of these fundamental principles it is necessary for us to stick to them. All of the laws to which I have referred have had certain fundamental principles which they had enacted into them. The compromises came as to the details. I think Congress should during this session meet every objection contained in the veto message except as to the three vital principles which are advocated as being the remedy for farm relief.

Take the debenture idea. I introduced a bill providing for that, and that proposition has been somewhat discussed this afternoon. None of the farm organizations were for it at the time; that is, at the beginning of the Sixty-ninth Congress. Well, there is no use in trying to revive a dead horse, but the Grange, at the second session, came forward to champion it, but no other farm group. I have gotten figures from an economist as to what it will probably cost the Government to put the debenture idea into operation with reference to seven of our leading commodities, which I will extend in my remarks. I find from experience and in talking with representatives from different parts of the country that one of the faults of our farm-relief idea is that it does not apply to all farm commodities, but if you took seven of the leading staple commodities and issued a debenture on what was exported during 10 months of the year 1927 of those seven commodities, at half the import tariff on those commodities, and 2 cents a pound on cotton, it would stop more than $214,000,000 from getting into the Treasury. Now, a tree does not need to fall on me to take a hint. I know that Congress would not pass a bill which would only apply to seven commodities and which would stop $214,000,000 from going into the Treasury every 10 months indefinitely. I know that Congress would not pass such a law, and so far as I am concerned I have lost all interest in the debenture idea.

I wrote Doctor Stewart, of the University of Illinois, to send me figures on cost of debenture plan if he had any available. He sent me a statement by S. S. Knight, of Petaluma, Calif., on wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, hogs, and lard, which shows if we should issue debentures for one-half the present tariff on these commodities and 2 cents per pound on cotton, it would prohibit about $214,125,000 from getting into the United States Treasury annually. I do not think such a law could be passed.

The statement referred to above is as follows:

Data sheet showing effect of debenture upon principal basic crops

Total customs duties collected in 1926 ..... $550,000,000
Total imports in 1926 4,250,000,000
Total imports of agricultural products (nonforest) 1,800,000,000

In Fordney-McCumber bill rate is about 37 per cent of value of commodity upon articles subjected to duty as against 23 per cent in Underwood bill.

Total exports in 1926 amounted to $4,750,000,000
Total exports of agricultural products (nonforest) 2,000,000,000

Wheat: Total crop about 800,000,000 bushels, with value at farm of about $1,000,000,000; about 25 per cent exported; present tariff rate, 42 cents per bushel; debenture asked, 21 cents per bushel; cost of debenture, $42,000,000; increase in value of wheat produced in Nation, $168,000,000.

Cotton: Total crop about 16,000,000 bales of 500 pounds each, or 8,000,000,000 pounds; about 50 per cent exported; no tariff now (proposed tariff, 4 cents per pound) (present importation about 300,000 bales long staple); debenture asked, 2 cents per pound; cost of debenture, $80,000,000; increase in value of cotton produced, $160,000,000; total value of present crop at farm about $1,500,000,000.

Corn: Total crop about 2,500,000,000 bushels, having value at farm of about $2,000,000,000. About 15 per cent of the crop is exported out of the country of production, about 1½ per cent of the total crop is exported as corn, or 37,500,000 bushels; present tariff, 15 cents per bushel, should be 22 cents; debenture asked for, 11 cents per bushel; cost of debenture, $4,125,000; increase in value of corn produced and sold as corn, about $41,000,000.

Rice: Total crop about 18,000,000 pounds, of which about 33 per cent is exported; total value of crop at farm, about $45,000,000; present tariff is 2 cents per pound; on milled rice should be 3 cents; debenture asked, 1½ cents per pound; costing about $9,000,000; increase in value of crop produced, about $27,000,000.

Tobacco: Total crop, about 1,300,000,000 pounds, with value at farm of about $250,000,000; about 35 per cent exported; present tariff rate, 35 cents per pound for filler; debenture asked, 10 cents per pound; costing about $45,000,000; increase in value of crop produced, about $130,000,000.

Hogs—lard: Total production, about 2,500,000,000 pounds; about 35 per cent exported; present tariff rate, 1 cent per pound; should be 1½ cents; debenture asked, three-fourths cent per pound; costing about $18,000,000; increase in value of crop produced, about $50,000,000.

Pork: Total production, about 8,500,000,000 pounds; about 10 per cent exported; present tariff, 2 cents per pound; should be 3 cents; debenture asked, 2 cents; costing about $16,000,000; increase in value of crop produced, about $160,000,000.

Commodity	Cost debenture	Increase value	Rate per pound
			Cents
Wheat	$42,000,000	$168,000,000	21
Cotton	80,000,000	160,000,000	2
Corn	4,125,000	41,000,000	11
Rice	9,000,000	27,000,000	1½
Tobacco	45,000,000	130,000,000	10
Hogs:			
Lard	18,000,000	50,000,000	¾
Pork	16,000,000	160,000,000	2
Total	214,125,000	736,000,000	

Net increase in farm income on the six crops shown above to the American farmer would be $736,000,000, which cost the American people as a whole $214,000,000, leaving a net gain to society of $512,000,000, by the operation of the debenture program as outlined above upon these six crops.

S. S. KNIGHT, *Petaluma, Calif.*

NOVEMBER, 1927.

Now, what have we done? We have agreed on about two vital things. The men most interested in this problem and have given this the greatest thought. The representatives of the largest number of farmers in America have agreed on a proposition that will meet every objection in the veto message except one, and as to that objection, it is more than half met. The veto message on the McNary-Haugen bill says we should not restrict the President as to whom he shall appoint; give him a free hand to appoint this board and depend on his fairness to the producing interests of the country in making up the board. Do not confine it to any commodity; let it apply to any commodity that produces a surplus. Do not bind your board so that it will have to deal exclusively with the co-op's; give it a free hand to deal with any organization having the necessary equipment to handle the surplus. The board would naturally favor a cooperative organization having the necessary equipment to handle the business. So we can meet every objection except the equalization fee. Now, Senate bill 1176 safeguards that. One fellow said, "My God, they would produce such a great surplus that it would result in breaking down the system—if the farmer gets a good price for some commodity he will increase his acreage." But, as I say, Senate bill 1176 safeguards that, and you will find in section 7, on page 12, of that bill, a most effective and successful means of providing against that eventuality, which is so much complained of. In the bill it is provided that if any producers of any commodity—wheat, corn, oats, pork, and so on—is getting a fair price for what he is producing in a certain year and then in the next year he puts all of his acreage into a single commodity, then the board is authorized not to take over the surplus if it

exceeds the five-year preceding average. I do not believe you could have a more effective and practical means of curbing production than that. So I can not see, after reading Senate bill 1176, and the one introduced on the House side, why any man who believes that the solution of the farm problem is in surplus control and who believes that we should have a Federal farm board, should object to the passage of such a bill and giving it a trial.

I am going to say this without any fear of successful contradiction from any man, that if the theory of surplus control does stabilize the price of farm commodities at a higher level, and then it is demonstrated that your equalization fee is unworkable and unconstitutional, you will have to abandon the idea of surplus control, because here is what will happen: If you make a loan to the cooperatives to handle this and depend on good merchandising to pay your loan back to maintain your scheme, then it will not be long before you will have lost your money, because very seldom will this board be operating on a rising world market; and that is the only time you make any money in merchandising your surplus. And when your loan is exhausted, no matter whether your scheme does work or not to stabilize your markets at a higher level, it will have to fall down unless you come back and get Congress to make another appropriation or else call on the farmers to produce the money, and neither of them would produce it.

The equalization-fee idea, if surplus control is to be the remedy, is the only one whereby you will ever be able to perpetuate the surplus-control scheme of farm products without a subsidy and furnish the means of perpetuating the scheme if experience finds that that does solve the problem.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADKINS. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the bill S. 1176 provide that the profit that this surplus may be sold for shall be distributed among the producers of the commodity?

Mr. ADKINS. Provided you get your debts paid. The gentleman does not think there would be any profit in it, does he?

Mr. BLANTON. What I am talking about is this: The farmer is interested in getting something more than the mere cost of production. He wants a profit and is entitled to it. He is interested in getting something above cost, just like every other business man.

Mr. ADKINS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Neither the last McNary-Haugen bill nor any other McNary-Haugen bill has ever provided that the profit that may be made from marketing the surplus through this board shall be distributed back to the farmers or the producers who raise the commodity.

Mr. ADKINS. You just forget it, if you think there will ever be any profit from "ditching" this surplus on the foreign market, where the prices are lower than on our domestic market. This is why it is necessary to provide some means for taking care of the loss, and the only way you can do it is through an equalization fee.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is the reason the farmers have never fallen over themselves in behalf of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. ADKINS. If it stabilizes the price on a higher level they can afford to do it, and if it does they will "fall all over" the fellow who opposes it.

Mr. BLANTON. But all any of these bills have ever proposed is to give the raisers of the commodity normal cost of production. They want some profit.

Mr. ADKINS. The farmers would not be asking for this legislation if they did not think it would help make agriculture profitable. The only chance that any commodity has to make such money out of good merchandising is cotton. The cotton grower is a factor in the world's market because he puts so much stuff on the world's market, and there is a chance for him to pay the expense of handling the surplus through good merchandising.

I think the farm organization leaders should unite on a plan such as is outlined above and Congress should pass such a law and try it. Whatever may be passed will be an experiment, and probably have to be amended, as other laws were affecting other major activities. It seems to me childish to say the farmers must all agree on a plan. If we had waited for everybody affected to have agreed, we never would have had a tariff act, an interstate commerce law, a Federal reserve act, or any other important act having to do with our economic life.

If the McNary-Haugen bill had become a law when it was passed, and corn was selling below cost of production, then the board would have declared an operating period and authorized some agency or agencies to purchase some of this corn. The weather was a factor in the corn market, the price advanced, and the board probably would have turned it at a profit. It would have changed the psychology of the whole Middle West, avoided starting a line of cleavage between the East and the West. Such things are not good for our country. Suppose the courts had declared the law unconstitutional, our country would be better off to-day than it is. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to this discussion of the sinking of the submarine *S–4*. The recent disaster off Provincetown has attracted more interest throughout our country than any of the 18 or 20 naval tragedies since the sinking of the *Maine*. Wherever you see little groups gathered here and there they are invariably discussing this terrible disaster that has cast a gloom over the entire country.

For my own part, I have more than a passing interest in what happened in those cold, icy waters of that Massachusetts bay, for the reasons that young Lieut. Commander Roy K. Jones grew to manhood in Oklahoma and was appointed to the Naval Academy from the sixth congressional district, the district I have the opportunity and the honor to try to represent here. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Jones, reside at Hennessey, Okla., and are very dear and good friends of mine. I have known no better people in all my State than these parents of the fine, brave, young man whose life was lost in the sinking of the *S–4*.

I am sure that Members of this House join me in extending sincere sympathy to this stricken father and broken-hearted mother in their hour of grief. But it is not altogether sympathy they now desire. Somehow I believe the people of America share the views of these parents, who feel that this terrible accident could have been avoided, and that some one is responsible for sending not only their beloved son but the entire crew of 43 brave men to sudden and untimely deaths.

When I came here last month little did I dream that my first remarks before the American Congress would be to give utterance to the grief which has spread its dark shadow of gloom over my good friends and shocked the entire country. But, then, little did those men who went down to sea on the morning of December 17 imagine that within a few short hours their lives would be snuffed out without even a fighting chance in a tragedy that spread a pall of gloom over the holiday season for the entire Nation.

Being a new Member of the Congress, I would be reluctant to take even a small part in this controversy were it not for the fact that on yesterday certain officers of our Navy gave testimony before the court of inquiry being held in Boston to investigate the sinking of the *S–4*, which was plainly a veiled effort to place the blame for that tragic, heart-breaking disaster upon the shoulders of a dead man. The gallant young Lieutenant Commander Jones, who went down with his ship, is not here to defend himself. His body was only yesterday recovered, and yonder lies waiting for his mother, father, wife, and children to claim.

Mr. Chairman, I want to support the pending resolution calling for a thorough investigation of the sinking of the *S–4*. But I would like to have some assurance that this investigation will be conducted by a board of impartial experts, who will make a sincere and complete study of the whole tragedy. If this investigation becomes merely a tool in the hands of the Navy Department, a method of placing the blame on some dead and defenseless officer, we shall regret that we ever authorized this inquiry. We want an investigation, but we want it to be a painstaking and thorough study of the whole problem of submarine navigation, with especial attention to fixing the blame for the *S–4* disaster, to be followed with constructive suggestions to prevent, or at least make less likely, the recurrence of a thing so terrible and ghastly.

Nothing we might do or say here will add to or take from the glory of these heroic dead, but it is our duty to see to it that there shall be no recurrence of a like disaster, if humanly possible. [Applause.]

What I read yesterday in the newspaper reports of the Boston inquiry led me to believe that at least a subtle effort will be made to blame the crew of the *S–4*. Yesterday a high official of the Navy called at my office. He was very gentlemanly and volunteered to bring me some information I desired. That is a quite different attitude than the Navy assumed when the loved ones of those 43 boys were frantically endeavoring to secure information from Navy officers during the first several days following the sinking of that submarine. But this officer immediately began insinuating that Lieutenant Commander Jones and

his crew might have been responsible for the disaster. No intimation was made that some one higher up might have been at fault in not taking precautions to see that the scene of the operations of the *S–4* was kept clear of surface craft.

The department has gone so far as to appoint counsel to represent the dead men, plainly indicating that these dead bodies are now defendants before the court of inquiry.

It would seem that the policy of the Navy Department is to follow the line of the least resistance. It would seem easier to blame the crew of the *S–4* than to fix the blame in other quarters, where it rightfully belongs. A thorough and sincere investigation of this tragedy might cause some one to be demoted or reprimanded. I am told that in cases of train wrecks some one back behind a desk is generally to blame and some one usually loses a job. This rule evidently does not apply to the Navy. Other inquiries of the Navy Department, for example, the investigation following the wrecking of a fleet of destroyers off the west coast in 1923 failed to accomplish anything. No one was dismissed, demoted, or even criticized. Let us be certain that this investigation we propose to launch will not be dominated by timidity or under influence from official sources.

Let the facts be brought out, and if anyone is to blame, let it be known. As it now appears, the only offense calling for official reprimand is where a naval officer so far forgets his place in a giant organization as even to offer constructive criticism of that machine. The slightest criticism of the Navy from within appears to be an unpardonable sin.

The mother and father of Roy Jones are of brave and sturdy pioneer stock. They can give up their son, finding some consolation in the thought that he died on the line of duty, faithful to the lives of the men under him and to the great tradition of the Navy. It is a grave injustice to them to suggest that their son was to blame in any way for this disaster and an insult to the intelligence of thoughtful people.

As for these parents and the parents and loved ones of the other men who lost their lives, I think they have a right to ask:

First. Why was the destroyer permitted to enter the area set aside for submarine experiments?

Second. Why was deep-sea diving permitted as an experiment without salvage vessels at hand?

Third. Why did the Navy Department fail to have pontoons at hand?

Fourth. Why were the cold, stormy waters of Provincetown selected as the scene of the experiments?

Fifth. Why did not the Navy have safety devices other nations have at hand for use in disasters of this nature?

Sixth. Why were there no tenders on hand or measures taken to warn surface vessels away from the path of the submarine experiments?

Lieutenant Commander Jones was making speed tests. He no doubt felt and had a right to feel that no surface craft would be there to cross his path. The testimony shows that under the condition it was likely very difficult for the *S–4* to detect the presence of another craft, either by means of the periscope or listening devices.

Regardless of the merits of safety devices or of methods of recovering sunken submarines after a disaster, the real blunder appears to be that some one failed to keep other vessels out of the path of the *S–4*. The Provincetown disaster would have been terrible enough in times of war, but to permit such a thing to happen in peace times is a blunder which has done much to discredit the Navy in the minds of the American public.

We must go to the bottom of this. We must restore to the American people confidence in their Navy. We must assure those who have loved ones with our great fighting fleets that the Navy is taking every human precaution to protect the lives of the men in the service.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the Navy, nor am I a pacifist. I want not only a reasonably strong Navy but an efficient one. And it is an open secret that we have neither. Yet Congress has been extremely liberal in the way of appropriations for support of the Navy. The other day we appropriated more than $13,000,000, without a roll call, to raise a few guns and repair a couple of old, slow, delapidated warships which would be practically useless in case of war, because the Navy Department insisted on spending the money. No doubt these old, out-of-date, cumbersome ships will be taken out and sunk within a few years. Still some of you have the temerity to say we have an efficient Navy!

Yesterday I was astounded to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] declare on this floor that he could place his hand on the men in the Navy Department responsible for the backward policy of the Navy. Possibly the country will also be interested in the same gentleman's suggestion that possibly the Navy Department is purposely making the submarines unsafe, and that officials of the Navy may think as Admiral Melville thought in 1905, that if the submarine is made an effective naval vessel the appropriations for battleships, cruisers, and destroyers will cease.

It has been suggested on this floor that the submarine should be abolished as an instrument of war by all civilized governments, and that we might secure an agreement with the nations of the world to outlaw the submarine. This is a very beautiful dream and one that I wish might come true in my generation. But a few months ago I had the honor of being 1 of the 20 delegates from America to the Interparlimentary Union Peace Conference in Paris, where representatives of 41 so-called civilized governments sat in conference. From my observation there, it is my sincere conviction that militarism yet has its terrible and unholy grasp on the countries of the Old World, and we can hope for little in the reduction of arms by conference.

I have little faith in solemn agreements that in the past have been treated as "scraps of paper." In this connection, might I remind you that a few years ago we had a disarmament conference here in Washington. As a result, Harding, Hughes, and company went out and sank our Navy—or at least a goodly part of it—while Europe looked on and laughed. The history of the Old World is a history of peace treaties and the destruction of fortresses of war, only to rebuild them again.

I have no desire to criticize the Navy unjustly. But I am convinced that too much red tape now entangles the department. Moreover, it occurs to me that certain precautions and safety devices could and should be provided for those who go out in submarines. Submarine experiments should be held in warmer waters, away from the lanes of commerce; every precaution should be taken to keep the scene of these experiments free from ocean traffic, and salvage ships, pontoons, divers, and every agency of rescue should always be kept close at hand while submarines are making these dangerous experiments.

Let the proposed investigation by experts be thorough and sincere. Let the board gather all of the information possible on submarines and submarine safety. Then, when it is found what additional safety devices and safety regulations are necessary, Congress will not hesitate, I am sure, to provide the Navy Department with sufficient appropriations for new salvage ships, pontoons, additional diving equipment, or any other equipment or alterations in submarine construction that may be necessary and advisable.

Let us assure the American people that this great and wealthy Nation will in the future do everything humanly possible to protect the lives of our seamen. Let us pledge ourselves and the country that the Congress will bend every effort to make sure that another terrible disaster like the *S–4* tragedy will never come to America again.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6657. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. SABATH, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 7, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, January 7, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.
Independent offices appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(11 a. m.—caucus room)

A meeting to hear members of the Mississippi River Commission discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10 a. m.)

To improve the navigability of the Colorado River by securing regularity of flow, by protecting and developing the lower Colorado River Basin, by providing flood control and by protecting the Colorado River in its present or future channel; also to aid in the reclamation of the public lands of the United States, to prevent controversy between the States in the Colorado Basin, and creating the Colorado River authority, with powers and duties enumerated herein, as a means or instrumentality for carrying out such purposes and effectuating such ends and making such improvements self-sustaining and self-paying (H. R. 5770).

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Joint meeting in the office of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

For the relief of taxpayers having suits against Juan G. Gallardo, treasurer of Porto Rico, for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of taxes imposed by the laws of Porto Rico, pending in the Supreme Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and in the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, affected by the act of March 4, 1927, amending the act of March 2, 1917, as amended by the act of June 7, 1924 (H. R. 6474).

For the relief of certain Porto Rican taxpayers (S. 754).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

273. A letter from the president of Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ending December 31, 1927; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

274. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report showing the officers of the Government who were delinquent in rendering or transmitting their accounts to the proper offices in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. J. Res. 131. A joint resolution providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine *S–4*, and upon the methods and appliances for the protection of submarines; with amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8281. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain described lands in the State of Nevada for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Walker River Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8282. A bill to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands bordering on and adjacent to Summit Lake, Nev., for the Paiute, Shoshone, and other Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8292. A bill to reserve 120 acres on the public domain for the use and benefit of the Koosharem Band of Indians residing in the vicinity of Koosharem, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LaGUARDIA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 104. A joint resolution granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, and to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across Lake Champlain; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of William R. Connolly; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2524. A bill for the relief of Mary M. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3216. A bill for the relief of Margaret T. Head, administratrix; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3394. A bill for the relief of W. P. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3458. A bill for the relief of Charles Beretta, Isidore J. Proulx, and John J. West; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3926. A bill for the relief of Joseph Jameson; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4777. A bill to compensate Robert F. Yeaman for the loss of certain carpenter tools which was incurred by reason of a fire in the Government area at Old Hickory Ordnance Depot; without amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4926. A bill for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.); with amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4927. A bill for the relief of Francis Sweeney; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5297. A bill for the relief of Christine Brenzinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5300. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs of Ralph K. Warrington; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BECK of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5338. A bill for the relief of Roland M. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6116. A bill for the relief of R. P. Biddle; without amendment (Rept. No. 168.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6254. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Knauf; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6619. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Bardel; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7110. A bill for the relief of Frances L. Dickinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8092. A bill for the relief of Randolph Sias; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8093. A bill for the relief of John Rooks; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5230. A bill to correct the military record of Pleasant R. W. Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of Fred R. Nugent; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7292) granting a pension to Mollie Orem; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7528) granting a pension to Francis Jane Jackson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 8712) granting the consent of Congress to Frank E. Webb, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco at or near the extension of Oakdale Avenue near Shag Rock at or near Hunters Point, San Francisco County, on the north, and Visitation Point, San Mateo County, on the south, to a point south of Park Street, city of Alameda, county of Alameda, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEECH: A bill (H. R. 8713) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cresson, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8714) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Barnesboro, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8715) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ebensburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8716) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at South Fork, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8717) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Portage, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8718) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Nanty-Glo, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 8719) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection and completion of a building thereon for a post office at Kemmerer, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8720) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection and completion of a building thereon for a post office at Torrington, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8721) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection and completion of a building thereon for a post office at Thermopolis, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8722) authorizing an appropriation of $25,000 for the purchase of the compilation of place names of William G. Steel; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 8723) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 8724) granting certain lands to the city of Mendon, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of the said city; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8725) to amend section 224 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 8726) granting the consent of Congress to Oscar Baertch, Christ Buhmann, and Fred Reiter, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 8727) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8728) to authorize the Postmaster General to give motor-vehicle service employees credit for actual time served on a basis of one year for each 306 days of 8 hours served as substitute; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8729) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands adjoining the Makah Indian Reservation in Washington for the use and occupancy of the Makah and Quileute Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8730) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a road on the Makah Indian Reservation, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8731) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a road on the Lummi Indian Reservation, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8732) to authorize the temporary reserving and setting apart certain public lands for experiments in sheep growing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8733) granting certain lands to the city of Bountiful, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8734) granting certain lands to the city of Centerville, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 8735) to establish a national military park to commemorate the Battle of Bentonville; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 8736) to provide for the inspection of the battle field of Brices Cross Roads, Miss., and the battle field of Tupelo or Harrisburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8737) providing for markers for the battle of Eastport, Miss., and Iuka, Miss.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8738) to appropriate funds for the construction of a flood relief vessel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8739) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8740) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet in Cook County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 8741) granting the consent of Congress to the Dravo Contracting Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 8742) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant and convey to the city of Baton Rouge, La., a perpetual easement for public street purposes over and upon a portion of that part of the United States National Cemetery at Baton Rouge, La., lying outside the cemetery wall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 8743) extending the time for the construction of the bridge across the Misisssippi River in Ramsey and Hennepin Counties, Minn., by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 8744) to accept the cession by the State of Colorado of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mesa Verde National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8745) amending the statutes of the United States with respect to letters patent for invention and applications therefor; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 8746) to regulate the height and exterior design and construction of public and private buildings in the National Capital fronting on or located within 200 feet of a public building or public park; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) to create the Pan American highway commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) authorizing the President to negotiate with other nations for agreements and treaties that will outlaw submarines so that they will be discontinued in warfare and otherwise, as impracticable and inhumane; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ARENTZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) to provide for recognition in the shape of a memorial in the form of a monument and medal for airplane pilots in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROMJUE: Resolution (H. Res. 80) that the President of the United States furnish information pertaining to United States military forces in Nicaragua; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 8747) to authorize Commander Robert E. Tod, United States Naval Reserve, to accept from the French Government the brevet and insignia of "Commandeur de la Legion d'Honneur"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 8748) for the relief of James W. Bass, collector of internal revenue, Austin, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 8749) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Henry H. Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 8750) granting an increase of pension to Mabel Gibson Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8751) for the relief of Robert W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8752) for the relief of Sam H. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8753) granting an increase of pension to Erhardt Fleitz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 8754) granting an increase of pension to Betsey Crandall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 8755) for the relief of the legal representatives of Ann D. Halsey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 8756) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Doxtater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 8757) granting a pension to Armintia C. Miner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8758) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8759) granting an increase of pension to Martha S. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 8760) granting a pension to William E. Drane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8761) granting a pension to Kathryn R. Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 8762) for the relief of Ralph W. Wood; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 8763) granting a pension to Addeline Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8764) granting an increase of pension to Sayer Jensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 8765) for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 8766) granting an increase of pension to Serena B. Bray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8767) granting a pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8768) granting a pension to Julia Little; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 8769) granting a pension to Robert B. Gore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 8770) for the relief of William Henry Savage; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8771) granting a pension to Sarah E. Ashley, also known as Sallie E. Ashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 8772) granting an annuity to Dr. Robert P. Cooke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 8773) granting an increase of pension to Sarah B. Platt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8774) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Stepp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 8775) for the relief of George P. Bailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KVALE: A bill (H. R. 8776) granting a pension to Guy H. Noe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8777) granting a pension to Rose Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8778) for the relief of William W. Woodruff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 8779) for the relief of Austin G. Tainter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 8780) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Burgner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 8781) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8782) granting an increase of pension to Rosana Keesey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 8783) granting a pension to Mary L. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8784) granting an increase of pension to Owen Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8785) granting a pension to Glen Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8786) granting a pension to Katharine May Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 8787) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8788) to correct the military record of Willard Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8789) for the relief of Louis Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8790) for the relief of Frederick Sparks; to the Commitee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8791) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Meeker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8792) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Warrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8793) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8794) granting an increase of pension to Hattie C. Bible; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 8795) granting a pension to William H. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 8796) for the relief of Martin L. Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8797) for the relief of Clayton H. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 8798) for the relief of William Lentz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8799) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to Mary Boyles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8801) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Pinkerton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8802) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8803) granting a pension to Carrie Lee Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8804) for the relief of George W. McNeil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8805) for the relief of Martha D. McCune; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8806) authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Harry Walter Stephenson, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of major, Coast Artillery Corps, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8807) for the relief of James O. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8808) for the relief of Charles R. Wareham; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8809) for the relief of George W. Burgess; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8810) for the relief of John L. Nightingale; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8811) for the relief of Enriqueta Koch v de Jeanneret; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8812) granting a pension to Edith E. Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 8813) granting a pension to Kate McManama; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8814) granting a pension to Clara C. Chamberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 8815) granting an increase of pension to Anna Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8816) granting an increase of pension to Katherine J. Curry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8817) granting a pension to Fannie A. Struhs; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

844. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition signed by Alice S. Foster and other residents of Danvers, Mass., protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

845. Also, petition signed by Elinor R. Lord, of Danvers, Mass., and by other citizens of the sixth congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

846. Also, petition signed by Urban W. Brown and other residents of Danvers, Mass., protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

847. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Byron Phinney and other residents of Danvers, Mass., protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

848. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of 284 citizens of Erie County, N. Y., protesting against the Lankford Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

849. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition signed by Mrs. P. C. Erickson and other residents of Danvers, Mass., protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

850. Also, petition signed by Robert L. Howard and other residents of Danvers, Mass., protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

851. Also, petition signed by Willis Carl Jackson, of Beverly, Mass., and other citizens of the sixth congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

852. Also, petition signed by William E. Martyn and 10 other citizens of Beverly, Mass., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

853. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

854. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolution of the California Vineyardists Association, Fresno, Calif., opposing legislation which would place immigration from Mexico upon a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

855. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of J. R. Branson, of Kingston, Ill., and 108 other citizens of Belvidere, Garden Prairie, Caledonia, Poplar Grove, Genoa, Sycamore, De Kalb, and Kingston, Ill., against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

856. Also, petition of Mrs. J. R. Branson, of Kingston, Ill., and 150 other citizens of De Kalb, Genoa, and Kingston, Ill., against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

857. By Mr. BULWINKLÆ: Petition of F. B. Hendricks and other citizens, of Charlotte, N. C., indorsing the bill for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia or in any of the Territorial or insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

858. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the California Vineyardists Association of California, protesting against the passage of any laws restricting Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

859. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by residents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

860. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Ernest J. Smith and 21 other residents of Vassar, Mich., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

861. Also, petition signed by Mrs. George Davenport and 17 other residents of Lapeer, Mich., protesting against enactment of any and all religious laws favoring one day of the week in preference to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

862. By Mr. EATON: Petition of William M. Fink and 55 other residents of Mercer County, N. J., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

863. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of the board of supervisors of Shasta County, Calif., pertaining to the development of highways in the Lassen Volcanic National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

864. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of 400 citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

865. By Mr. FENN: Petition of residents of Glastonbury, Windsor, and Meriden, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and any other bills providing for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

866. Also, petition of residents of Hartford, Conn., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and any other bills providing for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

867. Also, petition of residents of Hartford, East Hartford, Wethersfield, Mansfield Center, New Britain, and Manchester, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and any other bills providing for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

868. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Petition of residents of Holbrook, Mass., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

869. By Mr. GARBER: Resolution of the Geological Society of America, urging that the transfer of the geodetic, seismologic, and related services of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to the United States Geological Survey, provided for in House bill 7480, be made only after thorough consideration by competent scientific authority and in accordance with recommendation of that authority and recommending that to this end the proposed legislation be referred to the National Academy of Sciences for appropriate action; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

870. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition by Mr. M. E. Doble and 42 other residents of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, affecting the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

871. Also, petition by Ralph Turner and 16 other residents of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) providing for the observance of the Sabbath in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

872. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of residents of Port Angeles, Wash., protesting compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

873. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of numerous citizens of South Bend, Ind., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

874. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of Mrs. S. L. Reeder and 44 other adult residents of Eureka, Kans., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bills that have been introduced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

875. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Mr. Francis Hibbard and 53 other residents of Coldwater, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

876. Also, petition of F. J. Bement and 12 other residents of Eaton County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

877. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of citizens of Gwinn, Mich., against compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

878. By Mr. KEARNS: Petitions by citizens of Adams County, Ohio, opposing the passage of any Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

879. By Mr. LEA: Petitions of 6,380 citizens of Butte, Del Norte, Humboldt, Marin, Mendocino, Sonoma, Sutter, and Yuba Counties, State of California, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, and other compulsory Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

880. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Charles Ford, 946 Lorimer Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against technicalities involved in submarine construction making impossible prompt raising of sunken craft; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

881. By Mr. LYON: Petition of citizens of Wilmington, N. C., protesting against passage of Sunday observance law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

882. By Mr. MAAS: Petition of James Haider and 41 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

883. Also, petition of H. C. Hendrickson and 47 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

884. Also, petition of Marion Poehler and 22 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

885. Also, petition of Mike Capetz and 74 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

886. Also, petition of Charles L. Carlson and 18 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

887. Also, petition of Roy A. Erickson and 270 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

888. Also, petition of Earl F. Hanson and 12 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

889. Also, petition of Sam Shephard and 34 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

890. Also, petition of Mrs. N. E. Stohl and 217 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

891. Also, petition of Mrs. N. E. Stohl and 218 others of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

892. Also, petition of John Hoppe and 28 others, of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

893. Also, petition of Bessie V. Serhardt and 12 others, of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

894. Also, petition of H. L. Bell and 49 others, of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

895. Also, petition of H. J. Faber and 26 others, of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

896. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Fifteenth Ward Republican Club of Pittsburgh, Pa., with a membership of 800, urging passage of Dale-Lehlbach bill so as to permit optional retirement of Federal employees after 30 years of service with an annuity of $1,200 per annum; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

897. Also, petition of Board of Allegheny County Commissioners, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging passage of Dale-Lehlbach bill so as to permit optional retirement of Federal employees after 30 years of service with an annuity of $1,200 per annum; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

898. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Western Plant Quarantine Board, relative to funds available to the Federal Horticultural Board to carry on its important plant quarantine work; additional funds urged to complete inspection re the pink bollworm of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

899. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Thatcher bill (H. R. 8128); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

900. By Mr. RAINEY: Resolutions of Havana (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring flood control on the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers; to the Committee on Flood Control.

901. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Dubuque, Dubuque County, Iowa, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

902. Also, petition of about 200 citizens of Dubuque, Dubuque County, Iowa, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

903. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of F. R. Denison, Ed Greenstreet, and other residents of Macon County, Mo., opposing the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

904. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Lillie Wakeland and others of Evansville, Ind., against bill for compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78) to be brought up at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

905. Also, petition of Lero Osborn and others of Evansville, Ind., against bill for compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78) to be brought up at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

906. Also, petition of Ned S. Bush and others of Evansville, Ind., against bill for compulsory Sunday observance (H. R. 78) to be brought up at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

907. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of S. M. Roberts and 40 other citizens of Upshur and Smith Counties, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

908. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of 700 citizens of Pendleton and Umatilla County, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

909. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by 80 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bills 492 and 6518; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

910. Also, petition signed by about 50 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

911. Also, petition signed by 35 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

912. Also, petition signed by 47 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

913. Also, petition signed by 50 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

914. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of Beaumont, San Bernardino, and Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

915. Also, petition of citizens of Benning, Calif., and other communities protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

916. Also, petition of citizens of Redlands, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

917. Also, petition of citizens of Lakeside, El Cajon, and other residents of San Diego County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

918. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

919. By Mr. WARE: Petition of citizens of Covington, Kenton County, Ky., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

920. By Mr. WASON: Petition of 54 residents of Keene, N. H., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill, known as House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

921. Also, petition of 127 residents of Keene and Marlboro, N. H., opposing the passage of House bill 78, relating to Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

922. Also, petition of 10 residents of Colebrook, N. H., opposing the passage of House bill 78, Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

923. Also, petition of 80 residents of Wilton, N. H., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill, known as House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

924. By Mr. WINTER: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by residents of Evanston and Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

925. Also, resolutions by the Shoshone Project Farm Bureau, the Big Horn County Farm Bureau, and the Lions Club, Basin, Wyo., against the further restriction of Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, *January 7, 1928*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, as yesterday is merged into the promise of to-day, we bow in Thy holy presence with faith in Thine unchangeable character and with renewed confidence in Thy Holy Word. As it lies before us fresh from Thine hands, may we keep it spotless. We recall the incomparable life of Thy Son! We would move forward in the light of the truth revealed by Him! There is a silent witness in every breast that sanctions every good deed; increase its strength and make it more susceptible to holy influences. Impress us that dreams are often shadows that dazzle for a day, but, oh, for the deed that comes through, crowned with wisdom and skill. This is the man! God help us to be such. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ACQUISITION OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a conference report on the bill H. R. 483 for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana submits a conference report on the bill H. R. 483 for printing under the rule. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia, to be used as sites for public buildings.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request concerning the business of the House. Members will recall that at the end of the last session of Congress a considerable number of bills that had been on the Private Calendar had been passed by the House, most of them by unanimous consent. They went to the body at the other end of the Capitol, and for one reason or another failed to pass; largely owing to the jam of business at the end of the session. The committees of the House have very promptly reconsidered a large number of these bills and placed them upon the calendar.

In order that these bills may have prompt consideration I ask that on Monday and Tuesday of next week it shall be in order, after the disposal of business on the Speaker's table and all privileged matters, bills not objected to on the Private Calendar may be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does that displace the pending appropriation bill?

Mr. TILSON. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it the intention to have the appropriation bill read by paragraphs beginning Monday?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; if not completed to-day, and continue until it is finished, whenever that may be.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I understand, then, that my committee has the floor until the appropriation bill is finished?

The SPEAKER. Yes. This will not displace that. Monday is District day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So far as I know, there is no objection on this side.

Mr. TILSON. Doubtless we shall have to devote a number of Fridays to appropriation bills hereafter. So if we are able to utilize whatever time may be left after privileged business is disposed of on Monday and Tuesday of next week to consider Private Calendar business it will be a good thing.

Mr. BEGG. I do not understand that it is definitely understood that the order will not go into effect if the appropriation bill is not finished. In the gentleman's request did he say that?

Mr. TILSON. I believe I said "matters on the Speaker's table and privileged matters," which, of course, includes appropriation bills. Those are privileged matters, as we all know. As long as appropriation bills are under consideration or are ready for consideration they should have the right of way.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, any privileged matter, even under this order, would be under the control of the Speaker of the House.

Mr. TILSON. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday of next week, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and matters of privilege, it shall be in order to consider bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the request I made was intended to provide that unobjected bills may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. If that has not been understood, I should like to add that to my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut adds to his request the proviso that bills on the Private Calendar on Monday and Tuesday shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. Acting under the authority of House Resolution No. 78, the Chair would designate Hon. Calvin D. Paige to administer the oath to FRANK FOSS, of Massachusetts. Mr. Paige was a former Member of this House.

COMMISSIONERS IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution No. 82, it having heretofore passed the House, and move that we concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri calls up House Resolution 82, with a Senate amendment, and moves to concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (February 24, 1925, ch. 301, par. 1, 43 Stats. 964; United States Code, p. 899, sec. 269), providing for commissioners in the Court of Claims, their appointment, powers, and procedure, be, and the same are hereby, continued in full force and effect for the term of five years from the date of the approval of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE "S–4" DISASTER

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent order of Thursday last I send to the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 131. Pending the reading of the resolution, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who will have charge of the time on the other side in the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I think we ought to have a quorum present in the consideration of this important matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] It is evident a quorum is not present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Allen	Crosser	Igoe	O'Connell
Anthony	Curry	Irwin	O'Connor, La.
Aswell	Davey	Jacobstein	O'Connor, N. Y.
Ayres	Davis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver, N. Y.
Beck, Pa.	Deal	Kearns	Palmer
Bell	Dempsey	Kendall	Peavey
Berger	Dickstein	Kent	Porter
Boies	Dominick	Kindred	Prall
Bowles	Doughton	Kunz	Purnell
Boylan	Douglas, Ariz.	Leatherwood	Quayle
Briggs	Doutrich	Linthicum	Ransley
Britten	Doyle	Lozier	Sabath
Buckbee	Freeman	McFadden	Schafer
Bulwinkle	Fulmer	McLeod	Schneider
Bushong	Gallivan	McSweeney	Sirovich
Canfield	Garner, Tex.	Manlove	Somers, N. Y.
Carley	Garrett, Tex.	Martin, La.	Spearing
Carter	Golder	Mead	Steagall
Celler	Goldsborough	Michaelson	Stedman
Clancy	Hammer	Mooney	Stobbs
Cohen	Hare	Moore, N. J.	Strong, Kans.
Connally, Tex.	Hogg	Morin	Strother
Connery	Houston	Nelson, Me.	Sullivan
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.

Taylor, Tenn.	Weller	Wilson, La.	Wright
Thompson	Welsh, Pa.	Wilson, Miss.	Yon
Tillman	Williams, Tex.	Wingo	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps we had better have the resolution read for the information of the House. After the reading of the resolution I will try to make an arrangement with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will there be another reading of the resolution for the purpose of offering amendments?

The SPEAKER. The resolution is now being read for information.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint a commission which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be selected from civil life and two shall be retired officers of the Navy. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as provided for original appointments.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to investigate and ascertain the methods and appliances adopted and used by the Navy in the operation of submarines to prevent collisions, to protect the lives of officers and crews, and to salvage the vessel in case of disaster; and to make recommendations wherein these methods and appliances now in use may be changed and improved for the good of the service and the better protection of human life.

SEC. 3. It shall be the further duty of the commission to investigate the full facts of the sinking of the submarine *S–4* in collision on December 17, 1927, with the United States Coast Guard destroyer *Paulding* off the Massachusetts coast, and the rescue and salvage operations carried on by the United States Navy subsequent thereto, to supplement the investigation now being made by a naval court of inquiry.

SEC. 4. To carry out and give effect to the provisions of this resolution, the commission hereby created shall have power to issue subpœnas, administer oaths, summon witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive testimony taken before any proper officer in any State or Territory of the United States.

SEC. 5. The members of the commission shall select a chairman from among their number; they shall serve without compensation as such, but shall be paid out of the amount appropriated their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. Nothing herein shall reduce the pay or allowances of the commissioners selected from the Navy. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $20,000, to be expended by such officer of the Supply Corps of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy may designate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office in such amounts and for such purposes incident to its duties as the commission in its discretion may deem proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law. The President is authorized, upon request of the commission, to designate such personnel of any department or Government establishment, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this resolution.

SEC. 6. The commission shall, as soon as practicable, submit a full report to the President, who shall transmit the same to Congress, giving the results of its investigation and its recommendations. All records of the commission, upon the completion of its duties, shall be deposited with the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 7. The commission hereby created shall be dissolved upon the submission of its final report to the President.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 20, at the beginning of the line, insert the words "but not later than May 15, 1928."

On page 3, line 20, strike out the word "full."

On page 3, line 21, after the word "same," insert the words "and all other reports of said commission."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that this resolution may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think, provided we can have an understanding—which I am sure will be agreeable to the gentleman from New York—about the offering of amendments. I understand there are one or two bona fide amendments to be offered to the resolution, and we should have some understanding about that.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to state to the House the conversation I have had with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] relative to the consideration of this resolution. While we do not intend to waste any of the time of the House, it is not my desire to cut off any legitimate discussion of the resolution, and in order that it may be conducted in an orderly manner I intend to keep control of the time by asking unanimous consent for one hour of general discussion, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and one-half by myself. At the end of that time, if it is disclosed that we need more time, I will ask that the time be extended and during the time of general discussion allow any Member who has a legitimate amendment to present it to the House. At the end of general debate and after action on one or two small committee amendments I will ask leave to vote on each amendment offered before moving the previous question. It has seemed to me that would be absolutely fair to everybody in the House and give every man a reasonable opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the bill is considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, it will be read by sections and every Member will have the absolute right to offer amendments. It will not rest within the discretion of the gentleman from New York to permit the offering of any legitimate amendments to the resolution. Mr. Speaker, I propound that as a parliamentary inquiry. Is that not the rule, that if the resolution is considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole the resolution will be read by sections, and any Member who receives recognition from the Chair will have the right to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is the correct view.

Mr. SNELL. If it is desired that the resolution be read section by section, I have no objection to that.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I would object to the request if that were not true.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If I may be permitted, I think that would be the rule, and I think it is desirable that it be clearly understood by the House that the bill will be read by sections at the conclusion of the general debate, whereupon it will be in order to offer amendments to it. It does not take an agreement to do that.

Mr. SNELL. That will change my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. There is no general debate when we consider a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. We begin at once the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule, and if the gentleman wishes to have any general debate he should make that request.

Mr. SNELL. I was about to say that if we are going to consider the resolution in any other way, I should, perhaps, change the request.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from New York, in the House, could move the previous question.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This would cut off everything. He could not do this if we were in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York has no desire to cut off any legitimate debate or prevent any legitimate amendment being offered.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure of that, but under the gentleman's proposal only those who were able to secure time from their side of the House—and each side has only 30 minutes as a total—could offer legitimate amendments.

Mr. SNELL. I made the statement if it developed we needed more time I would ask that the time be extended.

Mr. BLANTON. There is one important feature of this bill that takes from the Comptroller General the power to audit expenditures, which Congress has given him. Some of us may want some time on that provision. I want some time on that proposition, because I think it is a serious one. It is a departure that, in my opinion, we ought not to embark upon. Does not the gentleman think we should go into Committee of the Whole, and would we really not save time by going into Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York thought the plan which he suggested was the easiest, most logical, and most normal way to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not obstruct the gentleman's program.

Mr. SNELL. But if the House desires to do otherwise, I shall not object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from New York, I should like to make a brief statement. I desire to submit, particularly for the information of Members on this side of the House, that in my conference with the gentleman from New York with reference to the offering of amendments to this bill it impressed me that, coming from the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman was rather unusually liberal with reference to the agreement that had been made, and it seems to me that under the unanimous-consent proposal, which the gentleman has submitted, especially asking that we consider the bill as in Committee of the Whole, every Member would have a much better opportunity to offer amendments and to discuss them, as well as discuss the merits of the bill, than is usually the procedure in considering a resolution from the Committee on Rules, and I hope no objection will be made to the request.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we may as well understand what it means to consider a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. The only difference I see is that in the House a quorum would require 218 Members, a majority of all the membership, and it would perhaps change the rule as to general debate; but so far as reading the bill and amending it, I know of no difference in considering a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole and in considering it in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks, without opportunity for careful consideration, the only difference would be, in considering this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, that there would be no general debate unless by unanimous consent. The Chair thinks a quorum would be 100, as is the case in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, would not the same rules apply with reference to record votes as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. Oh, precisely. Will the gentleman from New York again submit his request?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, with general debate of one hour, at the conclusion of which the resolution will be considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will not the gentleman incorporate that portion of his original request with reference to control of the time?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and one-half by myself.

Mr. SHREVE. Pending that, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. SHREVE. Numerous Members of the House are interested in the matter of the consideration of the appropriation bill and are desirous of knowing whether we are going to take up that bill this afternoon.

Mr. SNELL. I wish I could give the gentleman that information, but I have not the information at present. It will depend upon how much debate develops on this resolution.

Mr. SHREVE. Does the gentleman think the debate on the resolution will run along until 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon?

Mr. SNELL. I can not make a definite suggestion about that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and that there be general debate limited to one hour, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. And at the conclusion thereof, it be read under the five-minute rule for amendment.

The SPEAKER. That follows. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the general purport of this resolution, of course, is well understood by all Members of the House. I desire to take a short time to explain the various sections of the resolution.

Section 1 provides and authorizes the President of the United States to appoint a commission of five members, three of whom shall be from civil life and two shall be from retired officers of the Navy.

Section 2 provides for a general investigation to ascertain and investigate the methods and appliances adopted and used by the Navy in the operation of submarines to prevent collision, to protect the lives and officers of the crews, and the general work in salvage of vessels in case of disaster.

Section 3 provides for a specific investigation of the full facts connected with the sinking of the submarine *S–4*, and work done by the Navy in salvaging the same.

Section 4 provides that this commission which is hereby created shall have the power to issue subpœnas, and so forth, as carried in the usual investigation resolutions.

Section 5 provides for general organization of commission and that the members of the commission shall receive as pay only the necessary traveling, hotel, and other incidental expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. It also provides for an authorization of $20,000 to carry on the work of the commission, the same to be paid out by a Supply Corps officer designated by the Secretary of the Navy, and the same to be paid out upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission.

Section 6 provides for the report. It provides that a report shall be made as soon as practicable and that some report must be made not later than May 15, 1928; and that the President shall submit that report and all subsequent reports of the commission to Congress.

Section 7 provides that the commission shall be dissolved upon the submission of its final report to the President.

This resolution provides for a complete general investigation of the appliances, devices, and machinery used in the construction, manufacture, and operation of submarines. It also provides for a separate and distinct investigation of all of the work of the Navy in connection with the much-regretted disaster of submarine *S–4*, not only the work in trying to save lives, but the salvage of the boat.

In my judgment it provides for as complete, thorough, and searching investigation as any resolution that has been presented to the House. It provides that the investigation will be made by the most able and experienced engineers to be obtained.

It provides for making a definite report to the President, and, in turn, that that report shall be submitted to the Congress. It also suggests that the report shall be made at as early a time as it is humanly possible to make it.

This resolution has the indorsement of the President of the United States; it has the indorsement of the Navy Department; it has the indorsement of the Naval Committee of the House. It also has the unanimous approval of the Rules Committee. In my judgment it will meet the demands of the country if they are desirous to have an investigation made, and I hope that the resolution will receive the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that section 2 provides for a complete investigation by this commission of everything relating to the submarine itself and its appliances and that there are no restrictions or qualifications. However, in the next paragraph, which relates to the investigation of the sinking of the submarine *S–4*, there is a restriction or qualification.

It says that this is—I quote—

> to supplement the investigation now being made by the naval court of inquiry.

Now, a supplement is not supposed to go over the same subject matter that is in the original. It is supplementary; it is new. Why should there be that supplementary restriction when it comes to an investigation of this terrible tragedy?

Mr. SNELL. It is not intended to have any restriction whatever, but to make a complete, thorough, searching investigation of that disaster and every other thing pertaining to and connected with it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I invite the gentleman's attention also to section 6, line 20, where the original resolution provided that "the commission shall submit a full report to the President." But as reported the word "full" is stricken out, so that the commission will simply submit a report of their supplementary investigation.

Mr. SNELL. Let me explain that. I think I can straighten that out all right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In the last two lines of section 3 "supplement" means to cover a deficiency in the investigation now being made by the naval court of inquiry. It seems to me that those words should be stricken out of the resolution and that an amendment to that language would be appropriate. I think the

dignity and independence of the House suggests that as appropriate procedure.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] relative to section 6, the original resolution provided for a full report. On more careful consideration we were afraid that they would not be able to submit a full report during the present session of Congress. Therefore we made a definite provision that the commission should submit some report before May 15 in order that we might have it this session, but we in no way relieved them from eventually making a full, complete, and final report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The only investigation which would affect the personnel of the Navy is the investigation as to that accident, how it was caused, and who, if anybody, is responsible for this. The investigation of this commission is to be supplementary to the investigation conducted by the naval officers themselves. Why was not that supplementary restriction put into the investigation concerning the condition of the hull and the way that the boat is constructed?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no desire upon the part of anyone with whom I have talked to limit or restrict this investigation in any way. Later, if it seems better to strike that out, as far as I am concerned, I am willing that it should be stricken out. There is no desire on the part of anybody in connection with the administration, with the Committee on Naval Affairs or with the Committee on Rules, to place any restriction or limitations upon this investigation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman tell me why the time within which they shall make some sort of report was put off until May 15?

Mr. SNELL. When I looked over the original resolution, I drafted an additional section that the commission should make a report within 90 days, but upon careful consideration and consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, it was found that they could not make a full and complete report until the submarine *S–4* is salvaged, and it is possible that it will not be salvaged within three months. That is the reason we changed that provision in that section.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then it is possible that the commission may carry on after the adjournment of this session of Congress? This first report will come in just before the adjournment of this session.

Mr. SNELL. It is the intention that that report will be made just as soon as is humanly possible, but we do not want to place any restrictions upon them and force them to make a report that is not complete in every detail.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The purpose of this resolution is to expose to the country not only the cause of this disaster, if it can be solved and made known, but also to make suggestion to the country how future accidents like this may be avoided.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on a December morning the submarine *S–4* after a collision with another ship went to the bottom with its crew, and the Navy Department and the Nation have been compelled to stand by helpless as those men slowly died. That disaster constitutes a challenge to American genius, and this resolution, it seems to me, provides the proper way to approach the subject. It lays the foundation for action by Congress which will, in so far as is humanly possible, prevent a recurrence of a disaster which has shocked the Nation. Whether it be true or not, of course, I can not say; but I have heard it repeatedly stated by gentlemen who ought to know that certain foreign nations are considerably ahead of America in respect to safety devices which provide for the raising of submarines and the saving of the men who are trapped in sunken submarines. If that is so, and if that information can be obtained, God knows that this commission that is to be created should obtain the information.

I think that I speak the feeling of this House when I say that regardless of expense, if the submarine is to continue—and it looks as though it is, as though it may in the end make the battleship obsolete—if the submarine is to constitute a major agency in warfare, then something should be done, if it can be done, to prevent the sending of men to their deaths, trapped as these men were.

Of course, this committee will report as speedily as possible. The country demands as quick action as is consistent with thoroughness, and whatever recommendations this committee may make, I think the House may rest assured they will have serious consideration and prompt attention by the Committee on Naval Affairs, whose chairman has been here for so many years and who is an honor to his State and this House. [Applause.]

As has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, there was no division in the Committee on Rules with respect to the reporting of this resolution. I apprehend there will be no division in the House. Let us answer the demand of the Nation that something be done by favorable unanimous action upon this resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SEGER].

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, about three weeks before I came to this session there was unveiled in my district a monument to the inventor of the first practical submarine ever constructed, known as the *Fenian Ram*. The inventor of this underseas craft was John P. Holland, who came from Ireland to become a resident and citizen of the city of Paterson, N. J. Through the generosity of Mr. E. A. Browne, a citizen of Paterson, this original underseas boat, 36 feet long, was rescued from a junk yard and mounted on a concrete block alongside the tribute of granite and bronze. I have not been interested in submarine perhaps from this source alone, for my two boys were in the Navy during and after the World War. They were not in submarines, but they were in boats often partially submerged during the pulling up of the mines in the North Sea and off the coast of Ireland.

There has been considerable criticism, some charges have been made, many have written to me regarding the tragic fate of the *S–4*. Members of Congress have found fault with what has been done by the Navy in submarine operations, but everything that has been done and everything that has been written and all the criticisms and charges that have been made are not going to bring back the boys who passed away in the *S–4*.

Before the holiday recess I introduced a resolution asking the Secretary of the Navy pertinent questions to be answered to this Congress. I have no criticism to make of the Navy. I admire the Navy. I think we have the best Navy in the world. [Applause.] I am particularly interested not in the criticism, not with what has been found fault with in the past, but what will be recommended to safeguard in the future the lives of our boys who go down in submarines. I am glad to make way and I am willing that the committee shall not act upon my resolution, because I believe the resolution before the House to-day, sponsored by the President, is more comprehensive and more complete than any of the resolutions that have been introduced here on this subject. I hope that the resolution will be adopted without delay. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey yields back one-half minute.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Jones, of Hennessey, the parents of the commander of the ill-fated *S–4*, live in the State of Oklahoma. Unsolicited I have received a communication from them asking that I keep them posted as to what will be done in respect to this great disaster. In addition I have received a great many letters from people all over the United States lamenting the cause of this sad accident, and I want to make a suggestion regarding this resolution, and with due respect to the gentleman whose name I am going to call. We all know that when a person has occupied a similar position, serving as a member of an investigating committee and made a report concerning a naval disaster, we have a pretty good idea as to what kind of a report can be expected in this instance should this person again serve in this capacity. Now, I am told unofficially that a certain naval officer who has been recently retired is slated for an appointment on this investigating board. We all know that Admiral Hillary Jones was a member of the committee investigating the recent *Shenandoah* disaster, and we know that some criticism was made of him because of the way that hearing was conducted. So I think that this information ought to be brought to the House, so that those charged with the responsibility of selecting the two representatives of the Navy should know that the public mind would disapprove such an appointment. I hope it will not be necessary to offer an amendment to this resolution, because I am in favor of the resolu-

tion. I want to commend those who are responsible for bringing it in here at such an early date. I think it is a step in the right direction. But I do hope that when this committee has been selected no person will ever be appointed on it who has already served in the same capacity on a board that investigated the loss of life in connection with the *Shenandoah* disaster. It was for this reason that I asked for a few minutes of time in order to give voice to this sentiment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everybody regrets that we have had this recent disaster, and I am sure the right kind of representatives will be selected to perform this great service and that no Member of the House shall ever be criticized for failure to do his duty.

Mr. Speaker, if I could have my way every submarine in the world would be outlawed, as civilization has no need for such a death-dealing instrument of warfare. Of course, as long as other nations have such ships the United States will have to maintain this branch of national defense. The State of Oklahoma has given to the service Commander Roy K. Jones, and this disaster has shocked the sensibilities of the entire Nation. It may be true that the Navy Department did everything possible for the rescue of this ship, but it seems to me that those in charge of this branch of this service have been woefully deficient in providing the kind of safety appliances that could be used in such a disaster as the sinking of the *S–4*. The tragic log of the *S–4* tells the story, unparalleled in the history of this Nation. It is as follows:

TRAGIC LOG OF S–4 TAPS IS EPIC OF NAVY HEROES—"PLEASE HURRY" AND "OXYGEN TANKS EMPTY," HAMMERED BY LIEUTENANT FITCH, TOLD OF DESPERATE FIGHT WITH DEATH—MADE PUBLIC BY WILBUR

The story of a hopeless fight became public yesterday when Secretary of the Navy Wilbur made public the signal log recording in full the messages exchanged between survivors of the doomed submarine, *S–4*, the divers trying to rescue them and operators of the oscillator signal system on the submarine *S–8* and the rescue vessel *Falcon*.

In issuing the log it was explained that communication with the six trapped sailors in the torpedo compartment had been greatly facilitated by Lieut. Graham N. Fitch, Washington, D. C., last surviving officer, who knew the signal-code taps. Copies of the tragic document have been furnished the parents of Lieutenant Fitch, Col. and Mrs. Graham D. Fitch, of this city, the log including transmissions of messages from his wife and mother, and his acknowledgment of them.

It will be remembered that the rescue group was unable to determine at first whether the men left alive were conversant with the signal code, but in a short time it was apparent to the surface vessels they knew it and were able to tell of their plight to the outside world.

The submarine *S–8*, sister ship of the *S–4*, first established communication with it by answering signals sent to the surface from a system of knocks from the hull of the *S–4*. Three taps meant an answer "yes"; five, "no"; and seven, "I don't know."

Tapping signals to the prisoners began on the afternoon of December 18, the day after the disaster. "Is control-flooded room flooded?" was signaled, and at 5 o'clock an answer of seven taps signified they did not know.

Then follows the pitiful story compiled by Rear Admiral Frank S. Brumby, directing salvage operations at Provincetown Harbor, grave of the *S–4*, giving the time and dates the messages were sent and received:

"Q. Is water in torpedo room?—A. Three taps sent at 5.11 p. m. on the 18th of December.

"Q. Are you in torpedo room?—A. Three taps sent at 5.30 p. m., December 18."

Due to the ability with which signals were received in the torpedo room, it was figured that Lieutenant Fitch was there, as he was torpedo officer, so that a better system was started by telling the *S–4* to signal by international code, using two knocks for a dash and one knock for a dot. At this time the U. S. S. *Falcon* took over the communications by using an oscillator for communicating:

"Q. Is there any gas?—A. No; but the air is bad. How long will you be now?"

Sent at 6 p. m. December 18.

"Q. How many are there?—A. There are six. Please hurry."

Sent at 6.10 p. m. December 18.

"A. Compartment salvaged air is being hooked up now."

Sent at 6.43 p. m. on December 18 from *Falcon*.

"Q. Will you raise us soon?—A. We are doing everything possible."

Taps were heard at 8.25 and at 10.18 p. m. on December 18.

The *Falcon* made no signals, as a diver was down. When communication was resumed:

"Is water still coming in?" was signaled, and the answer was, "Slow. Hurry." It was sent at 11.51 p. m. on December 18.

"Q. We are working as fast as possible. Have you light?—A. We have no light. The air is very bad."

Sent at 12.02 a. m. on December 19.

"Q. Can you tell us the names of those with you?—A. Names are Fitch, Short, Crabb, Pelnar, Snizek, Stevens."

Sent at 12.50 a. m. December 19.

"Q. Have you tried removing gag from compartment salvage air line?—A. Salvage air line is flooded."

Sent at 1.30 a. m. December 19.

"Q. How deep is water in compartment?—A. The water is about 18 inches deep. Air is very bad."

Sent at 6.09 a. m. December 19.

At this time the *Falcon* had to leave the scene of the operations with Diver Michaels injured, imprisoned in the wreckage during the rescue operations, and the U. S. S. *S–8* was ordered to keep in communication with the *S–4*. At this time the weather conditions on the surface made diving impracticable.

OXYGEN BOTTLE EMPTY

"Oxygen bottle empty. Can you send down a couple," came a call at 9.38 a m. December 19 from *S–4*.

The *S–8* asked the *S–4* to make more space between letters and to make 10 taps if they did not receive message.

At 9.40 a. m. December 19 the *S–8* again received a message:

"Can you send down a couple?"

During this period the U. S. S. *S–8* had difficulty in reception, no doubt due to the weakness of the personnel on the *S–4*.

An intermittent conversation was kept up by the *S–8*, now hoping that by concentrating on the signals the time would pass easier for the imprisoned men.

The times of these messages was Monday forenoon, December 19.

The following are the messages sent during the period:

From *S–8*. Two floating cranes are on the way now.

From *S–4*. Where are cranes coming from?—A. From New York.

From *S–8*. Will air last until to-night?—A. It will last until 6 to-night.

From *S–8*. Much noise. Will call you in 10 minutes. Time is now a quarter of 11, Monday a. m.

From *S–4*. How is weather?—A. Choppy.

From *S–4*. Is there any hope?

Sent at 3 p. m. Monday.

"A. There is hope. Everything possible will be done."

From *S–8*. How many torpedoes on board and where stowed?

Sent at 5 p. m.

The *S–8* could not get an answer to this message.

From *S–8*. There is hope.

From *S–8*. Did you get last message?

Sent at 5.45 p. m. Monday.

S–4 answered with a number of taps very distinct.

From *S–8*. Will call you in a few minutes. Water splashing against boat drowns out our taps.

From *S–8*. Can you hear me now?

The *S–8* then heard taps, but was unable to make them out.

From *S–8*. Everything possible has been and will be done.

From *S–8*. *S–51* pontoons have arrived. Time is 3.15 Tuesday morning.

S–4 answered by three groups of three taps each.

From *S–8*. Have you a message?

The *S–8* then heard sounds like some one moving something around.

FITCH MESSAGE RECEIVED

At 10.50 Monday night the *S–8* received the following from the commander control force: "Transmit, if possible, the following message for Lieutenant Fitch on the *S–4*: 'Your wife and mother constantly praying for you.'" This was sent to the *S–4* at 12.10 a. m. December 20, and it was asked, "If you received this, send taps until I stop you: if not, send taps like this 1 . . . . . AR."

From *S–8*. Did you get that?

Sent at 12.30 a. m. No answer from *S–4*.

From *S–8*. Did you get that message?

Sent message for Lieutenant Fitch again. No answer. Sent at 12.45 a. m. December 20.

Listening by *S–8* has been difficult since 10.30 p. m. December 19.

At 2 a. m. December 20, repeated message for Lieutenant Fitch. Did you get last message? Send taps. No answer from *S–4*.

This message was sent at intervals until, at 6.10 Tuesday morning, December 20, the message was sent again with request that three taps be given for yes and five for no, and

At 6.15 a. m. December 20 from *S–4* three groups of three dots each were received, indicating yes.

From *S–8*. At 6.20 a. m. December 20. Diver will try to connect air to S. C. tube. Three taps for yes; five for no. At 6.20 a. m. the *S–4* answered yes.

TAPS FINALLY FADE AWAY

From *S–8*. At 7.40 a. m. December 20. Weather slightly calmer than last night. Still choppy but calming down slowly. Time 7.45. No answer from *S–4*.

At 8.15 a. m. December 20 the *S–8* thought that they heard taps but were not certain.

At 10.15 a. m. from *S–8*. Cranes are here. Time 10.30. The *S–8* heard faint indistinct tappings occasionally. The *S–8* now tried to call the *S–4* intermittently but could get no answer until at 4.05 p. m. the 20th of December the *S–8* sent: Are you all right O. K.? The *S–8* then heard three taps very distinctly.

At 4.30 p. m. December 20: Are you all right O. K.? The *S–8* was sure that an answer of three taps was heard.

At 6.30 p. m. December 20 the *S–8* heard taps at random.

At 6.35 p. m. December 20, the *S–8* quit sending so as to listen to determine if taps continued.

At 2 a. m. December 21, called *S–4* for 10 minutes, but no answer. Nothing was heard during the remainder of the night.

On Wednesday morning, December 21, the *Falcon* took over the listening, but heard nothing further from the *S–4*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman used four minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, referring to the subject matter of my remarks last Wednesday, it may be recalled that I read part of an editorial into the RECORD. If you have read the whole editorial, you will have noticed that stress was laid on the point that we not only have a full investigation but that it be an investigation "out of uniform." I want to reread a part thereof:

If Congress shall decide that there shall be another kind of investigation—

In addition to the naval court of inquiry—

with expert engineers and the best ability the Nation can provide, but out of uniform, it will be well for the naval authorities to accept the decision in good spirit, to cooperate in every way in the process of the examination. That way probably lies the restoration of the prestige of the Naval Establishment.

I do not know that the suggestion is pertinent, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that in most of this type of investigations heretofore Congress has been represented. At times the wish has been expressed that officials of the departments might personally appear before us so that additional information might be obtained not merely from what they said but from their personalities and the way and manner of their testifying.

I may say that the editorial from which I have read has influenced me considerably. Because the *S–4* was sunk in my own district, I have naturally taken particular interest in the tragic affair and have purposely gathered together a large number of news stories and editorial relating to it. They are contained in this book of clippings, which are most interesting. Many of the editorials bear the heading "Horrible," or words of similar import. Among the many, one or two only have been critical of the position which I have taken.

It has occurred to me that it might be well to have one Senator and one Representative on the proposed investigating committee, although none of us may desire such a position. Still, we who have created the Navy and are vitally interested in the service and its improvement should, it seems to me, not be divorced from the work of investigation. We have a great deal of responsibility in connection with the Navy and this proposed inquiry alike, and shall ultimately have to pass on the recommendations which will be made. I do not wish to offer an amendment along the lines which I am suggesting, however, unless it is likely to be favorably received.

The second thought that I wish to express has reference to the notable speech which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] made on Wednesday and which indicated that he had a thorough grasp of his subject because of his trip on the submarine. His speech has caused much newspaper comment, but it would seem that in some cases the chief conclusion drawn from it was to the effect that no one not in the naval service had a right to make criticisms or suggestions. I am sorry to have those of us who have voiced honest opinions, with a view to being of some assistance, and who have tried to be moderate when we felt that we should condemn, placed in so unfavorable a light. Statements are frequently exaggerated and highly colored in the press, and I am sure that, as regards my own criticisms made here in the House the other day, one could not discover any particularly virulent condemnation of the Navy.

My argument was perhaps based a good deal on sentiment, but I tried to present the facts just as I found them, things which I felt you should know about and which should be considered in the event of an investigation. Surely my criticism could not properly be construed as based on the belief that I was personally capable of running a submarine or effecting its rescue from the House Office Building. Nevertheless I do not feel that any of us should be frightened into withdrawing our active interest or separating ourselves from this investigation because of any attack based on the idea that we who are not Navy men have no right to utter criticism or suggestion. I ask the House to think this over, and I offer the suggestion that Congress should not be without representation on the membership of the proposed commission, since we know how effective it has been to have representatives of this body on commissions investigating matters which have finally had to be passed upon by the Congress. Thus we personally knew some of the men who had considered all the evidence, and when they appeared before us and presented their report we could listen to them with confidence and were not obliged to depend wholly on what was set down in cold black and white in the printed statement. I say again that it is the personality of the men who compose such commissions and the manner in which the investigations are conducted which counts heavily. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to submit to the House that the criticism made by my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC] of Admiral Hilary B. Jones is not justified. I do not wish to engage in any controversy with the gentleman. Admiral Jones is an honored constituent of mine. He and his family, his father ahead of him, have been among the most honorable and patriotic people who have resided in the Commonwealth of Virginia. [Applause.] I think it may be said that Hilary B. Jones is the foremost naval officer in the American Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. Admitted to be so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He is retired, I think. His talents, his keen perception and judicial balance have been recognized in conferences. He was at the preliminary Geneva conference and at the last Geneva conference on the limitation of armaments. I suspect that if I could speak confidentially to my friends I might say he did about as much for this country as any man on that commission at Geneva. [Applause.]

Under these circumstances I have done what any of my colleagues would have done, namely, to speak truthfully of a great officer and a fine gentleman. I imagine that Admiral Jones does not desire to serve upon this commission, and that should he be requested to do so he would only comply under a supreme sense of duty.

Now, one other thought. I am in favor of this resolution and I hope it will be unanimously approved. I concur in the President's recommendations as to the organization of the commission and its scope of activity provided for. There is one sentence, however, in the resolution which I would like to see omitted. I had thought and conversed about it before the suggestion of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. I think we should strike out the sentence in the third section, beginning in line 14 and running to the end of line 16, "to supplement the investigation now being made by a naval court of inquiry." I think we should disassociate this investigation from the naval investigation.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I think, perhaps, that is a reasonable suggestion and, as far as I am personally concerned, I have no opposition to it whatever.

Mr. BUTLER. And it will leave the resolution as it was originally introduced.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that sentence should be omitted. If it is omitted, it will put the House in a more dignified position, and the investigation will have more scope and independence of action. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK]. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the executive branch of government is under investigation, but through this resolution it will investigate itself. It would be better for a commission of experts appointed by a congressional committee to handle this inquiry, but due to the administration control of this House, except in tax matters, I take it this will be the only resolution of this nature that can pass. It is better than none at all; at least, some facts will be uncovered no matter what the subsequent recommendations are.

I hope the commission will be made up of marine engineers unconnected with Government contracts and free of pressure

direct or indirect. It seems to me generally in shipping, relief is immediately needed. The shipping of the country cries for leadership. A strong Secretary of the Navy could restore our maritime prestige. The President could render the country no greater service than by inducing the resignation of Wilbur—give us a leader in the Navy Department instead of a duddie-fuddle. [Laughter.]

I have two amendments to offer to this resolution. The first concerns the interest of possible appointees under Government contract. The second provides that any widow or parent of any of the crew or officers of this ship may appear by counsel and examine and cross-examine witnesses and have the commission send for exhibits and persons.

This is in line with congressional procedure. Doheny, Fall, and Sinclair had counsel; VARE, GOULD, and SMITH had counsel; Fenning had counsel. I do not want these boys who were sent to the bottom of the sea to be made the goats of this investigation, and I am going to do my best to see to it they are protected by the amendment I have suggested. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests on my side of the House for any time upon the discussion of this resolution, I desire to ask the indulgence of the committee for just a moment to restate more largely than to present any new matter, at least the attitude of the minority members of the Committee on Rules in voting to favorably report this resolution.

It is a proposition, of course, in which there can not possibly be any element of partisanship. It is a matter that has been brought to the attention of Congress by a very great and tragic disaster in our naval forces, a disaster, gentlemen, which, I am sure you will agree with me, was surrounded by very unusually pathetic and pitiful circumstances. It has been an incident that has aroused the interest and the concern of the American people to a very large degree, as reflected in comments in the newspapers, editorially, and in their own news service.

It presents a problem that necessarily, by the very nature of it, calls for some character of response from the Representatives of the American people; and it seems to me that it is as little as we can do, gentlemen, to undertake by appropriate legislation to set up an instrumentality for a fair, calm, scientific, disinterested investigation of all the matters which are placed within the jurisdiction of this commission by the terms of this resolution.

Some objection has been made, and the point has been raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that probably no naval officer, either retired or in the active service, should be upon this commission; and although I was not in any wise responsible for the framing of this resolution, I imagine that the thought actuating the inclusion of naval officers on this commission was that in the investigation of highly scientific and technical questions it would be entirely appropriate, and indeed essential, to have the advice and judgment upon the commission of men who had spent their lives along these lines. I imagine they were not included for the purpose of giving the Navy any special pleaders upon the commission, but the thought was entirely the one which I have suggested.

This may not meet with the approval of a majority of the Members of the House, but I am sure, as I have briefly stated, this was the impulse which actuated the inclusion of retired naval officers on this commission.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will be very pleased to yield to the chairman.

Mr. SNELL. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement, because that is exactly the opinion I have had in connection with it. On account of their experience and long service, they would furnish technical information which would be hard to get anywhere else; and in view of the fact there are three men from the outside on the commission, they could not dominate it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am very glad to have the gentleman make that additional statement to the argument I have presented.

Gentlemen, there is one phase of this matter which I think I can state without violating any of the proprieties with reference to our proceedings in committee. I was responsible, I think, for the amendment which appears in section 6 of the bill, putting in the limitation that at least a preliminary report by this commission shall be submitted to the President, and by him in turn to Congress, not later than May 15 of this year.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question on that point?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I notice that section 7 of the bill provides that the commission shall be dissolved upon the submission of its final report to the President.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I was wondering if the gentleman would approve of an amendment to make that report not later than the date of the opening of the second session of the Seventieth Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Personally I should have no objection to such an amendment, but I will state to the gentleman from Texas that in arguing this matter before our committee we felt that the members of this commission, who are working without pay and who presumably, at least, will be men of very high type, men of courage and candor and intelligence, would by the very terms of the resolution as now drafted, seek to expedite as much as possible their investigation and their report to the President. I agree with the gentleman that it seems that certainly the first Monday in December of 1928, as the gentleman proposes, should be ample time for them to make a full and complete investigation and thereupon be dissolved.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I really think we should place that limitation in the bill. I do not think we ought to limit them to too short a time, but under the wording of the resolution there would really be no limitation upon them so far as submitting their final report is concerned.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I have said to my colleague from Texas, personally, I would have no objection to such a limitation.

I was upon the point of stating, when the gentleman from Texas rose, the purpose of putting in this amendment to the original resolution providing that not later than May 15, 1928, a report should be made by this commission to the President.

I know personally that the thought was that certainly within three months at the latest from the organization of the commission, acting with the facility which we expect of them, that they would not only be able to make a preliminary report, but my hope was that they would be able to make a final report. Upon this theory that it is probable this session of Congress will adjourn by the 1st or the 15th of June, and if it were possible for the commission to complete its full investigation and report to Congress it might give us an opportunity for the Naval Affairs Committee to bring in remedial legislation and carry out the recommendations of the commission.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will be glad to.

Mr. BUTLER. I have had some talk with the gentleman from Alabama about it, and I hope that there will be no undue limit of time placed upon the commission for a report, but give them ample opportunity to make an examination of all the facts and give them to the country. I hope that they can do it within four months, that we may know and respond to what is necessary. I think the gentleman from Texas has been very liberal in making it four or five months. I think in that time the public may know where the responsibilities are and what this Congress is to do hereafter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In response to that I beg to suggest to my friend that under the agreement for the consideration of this bill it will be thrown wide open for the consideration of any amendment which in the judgment of the House may make it more satisfactory as a resolution.

Now, in conclusion, I think the purpose of the resolution has been thoroughly explained. I hope in its main terms and purposes it will meet with the approval of the House. It is certainly a matter of such major importance and solicitude to the minds of the American people that it seems to me it ought to have the unanimous approval of the House.

I wish to say this, although it does not bear directly on the subject: If I had my will about this resolution it would not be to appoint a commission to study and investigate this disaster, but to appoint a commission to negotiate with other civilized nations of the world to forever destroy the submarine as an agent of civilized warfare. [Applause.]

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Did the committee take into consideration a provision for submitting to the Senate for confirmation the names of the men appointed by the President to the commission?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, we did not; I will say to my friend.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Inasmuch as this is a matter which every man, woman, and child in the country is interested in,

does not the gentleman think that this question should be considered here?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Ordinarily I would say that I believe in the provision for senatorial approval of Executive appointments, but in the nature of the case I feel, under all the circumstances, and in the interest of expediting the investigation, that we can safely leave all this to the discretion of the President.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. In view of the fact that there is so much criticism throughout the United States of certain officers, does not the gentleman think it would be more satisfactory to the public generally if the names of the gentlemen which the President selects were submitted to the Senate for its approval?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is apparently the gentleman's view of the subject, and if he thinks it is of sufficient importance he can offer an amendment. I do not think I would support an amendment of that kind. Mr. Speaker, I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for five and one-half minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we are all interested in our Army and our Navy and their welfare. These great wings of defense are all important and all necessary in times of peace and in time of war, therefore I am not going to criticize our Army or our Navy. I would be the last one to do it. I would like to commend it, I would like especially to commend the Navy, which some 10 years ago, under the great Secretary Daniels, transported some 2,000,000 men across the water without a casualty. [Applause.]

We have recently had something like 90 casualties of submarines, but I hope that this is the toll of progress. All of our great progressive movements take their toll of humanity—like aviation, submarines, and all those developments. It seems terrible that in our great civilization the men in the ill-fated *S–4* for hours and hours were able to impart their intelligence to those on the outside with messages like these: "Is there any hope; how long will it be?" And then in turn their relatives sending up prayers. Surely our great civilization will be able to in the future find methods of precaution and prompt relief in similar situations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the resolution so amended that this commission may be able to adjudicate and recommend the payment of the claims of the relatives of those who lost their lives in this disaster. I support the resolution and believe there should not be a dissenting vote. Differing from some Members of the House, I commend the Army and the Navy. Especially do I commend the Army when I realize that the Chief of Staff of the Army is a constituent of mine, a son of the second congressional district of Florida, Gen. Charles P. Summerall. [Applause.] And especially do I commend the Navy when I realize that one of its most distinguished admirals is a son of my own congressional district, the great second congressional district of Florida.

I refer to Admiral Cone. Why should I criticize the Army and the Navy? At its last session Florida's Legislature passed a bill authorizing $500 for the purchase of a gold saber to be presented to Gen. Charles P. Summerall. On January 17 next this gold saber will be presented to him in Jacksonville, Fla., by Florida's chief executive, and with proper ceremony. This saber will be presented in recognition of the great and courageous services of General Summerall during the World War and in recognition of his worthiness as one of Florida's noble sons.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution should pass. It should pass to help the Army and the Navy, and I believe it should pass with the amendment which I suggest, so that the claims of the relatives of those who lost their lives may be considered by this commission and be adjudicated and then in turn recommended to this Congress for payment. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have only a few remarks which I desire to make, and I do so mostly on behalf of Mr. E. T. S. Mason, of Galesburg, Ill., the inventor of the open subway of Chicago. Mr. Mason has sent in some three different suggestions as to the submarine question, and his letter to me submitting those suggestions I append hereto as a part of my remarks:

GALESBURG, ILL., *January 4, 1928.*

Hon. E. J. KING, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: I am inclosing sketches of three devices which would have saved the victims of the recent submarine disaster if they had been installed on that submarine.

It is a very reprehensible thing that no safety devices are installed on our submarines, and no doubt Congress will do something very quickly to guard against future disasters of this kind.

Wishing you and yours a happy new year and many of them, I am

Yours truly,

E. T. S. MASON.

SALVAGE BRACE RAILS FOR RAISING SUBMARINES FROM ANY DEPTH

Salvage brace rails are steel brace rails extending from stem to stern on submarines, running through supports about 4 inches above the surface of the submarine, bracing the submarine, giving grappling hooks a chance to catch easily and raise submarine.

Three should be placed on all submarines, one at the top and one at each side.

Small surface boats should have one at each side.

In case of sinking of a submarine large vessels or cranes could raise it quickly with grappling hooks from any depth from 100 feet to 600 or 700 feet. No divers needed.

The submarine could be dragged to shallow water if only one vessel at hand.

Grappling hooks made like four-barbed fishhooks would catch on the salvage brace rails when dragged across a submarine in any depth of water and the submarine raised or dragged to shallow water.

[SEAL.] E. T. S. MASON, *Originator.*
[SEAL.] G. E. HARRIS, *Witness.*
GALESBURG, ILL., *January 4, 1928.*

ESCAPE DRUMS OR TORPEDOES TO ENABLE SAILORS TO ESCAPE FROM SUBMARINES FROM DEEP WATER

Steel drums or torpedoes large enough to take in from four to six men to enable sailors to get out of submarines from deep water if necessary.

A chamber at top of submarine with port to receive drums from inside of submarine and a port at top or end to let the drum escape and ascend to the surface of the water or be pushed out like a torpedo after water is let in, pressure removed, and port opened.

Rings at top of drums so that rescuing ships can lift out of the water.

Each man is supplied with oxylite, which gives off oxygen and absorbs carbonic gas, on entering steel drum.

The steel drums can be made in decreasing sizes so that they and the ports would nest together, saving space.

By these devices men could get out of submarines themselves from any depth of water.

[SEAL.] E. T. S. MASON, *Originator.*
[SEAL.] G. E. HARRIS, *Witness.*
GALESBURG, ILL., *January 4, 1928.*

AIR-DRUM REELS TO TAKE LINES, PHONE WIRES, OR HOSE TO SURFACE FROM SUNK SUBMARINES

Marking lines, phone wires, or even air hose on drum reels can be released from submarines from any depth marking the location and establishing communication and even air connection with rescuing ships.

Air hose of 200 to 300 feet on air-drum reels can be released and air thereby pumped into sunken submarines.

The air-drum reels are fitted with loose running collars through which lines, wires, or hose run, thus preventing tangling.

The air-drum reels on which are wound lines, wires, or hose are installed in water-tight chambers on top of submarines.

In case of an accident water is let in, pressure removed, ports opened, and air-drum reels allowed to rise to the surface to rescuing ships.

The rescuing ships could note location, establish communication, attach grappling hooks, and raise the submarine.

[SEAL.] E. T. S. MASON, *Originator.*
[SEAL.] G. E. HARRIS, *Witness.*
GALESBURG, ILL., *January 4, 1928.*

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no more demands for time. I ask for the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint a commission which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be selected from civil life and two shall be retired officers of the Navy. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as provided for original appointments.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON: Page 1, lines 5 and 6, after the word "members" in line 5, strike out the words "three of whom shall be selected from civil life and two shall be retired officers of the Navy," and insert in lieu thereof "whose appointment shall be confirmed by the Senate."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable criticism of the proposition to write into this resolution a provision that two retired naval officers shall be required to be on this commission. In fact, you are going to find a good deal of criticism of this Congress for abdicating its right and power to investigate this transaction itself and turning it over to the President, who will naturally confer with the Secretary of the Navy, and therefore it is conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Navy to investigate himself. But now, when you go further and actually require that certain officers of the Navy shall be on the commission, it seems to me that we are going a little beyond what we should. I am willing to risk the President if you have these men confirmed by the Senate of the United States. Therefore, I offer this amendment to strike out the provision that designates two ex-officers of the Navy to be on the commission and then leaving the President absolutely free to name three other officers of the Navy, who will be suggested to him, possibly, by the Secretary of the Navy, because naturally the President must rely upon the Secretary of the Navy to advise him in these matters. That is the reason I offer the amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the purport of this resolution is to put the responsibility squarely upon the President of the United States for the personnel of that commission. Furthermore, the only reason for the suggestion of two naval officers was explained by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. The two naval officers would furnish a certain amount of technical information which has come to them from their experience in the Navy that probably could not be obtained from any other source. Furthermore, the number of naval officers on the commission was limited to two, because we did not want the commission to be controlled by ex-officials of the Navy. The three who are to be appointed from civil life will be strong, representative men, experienced in engineering affairs, who will bring an ability to the commission that could not be obtained from any other source. Furthermore, we want this commission to be appointed and organized immediately and set to work. I think the matter should be left exactly as it is at the present time.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will notice that the amendment which I have offered does not prevent the President from appointing retired naval officers. It gives the President full sweep all over the population of the United States and puts the responsibility upon him and upon the Senate of the United States to confirm them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. It shall be the further duty of the commission to investigate the full facts of the sinking of the submarine *S–4* in collision on December 17, 1927, with the United States Coast Guard destroyer *Paulding* off the Massachusetts coast, and the rescue and salvage operations carried on by the United States Navy subsequent thereto, to supplement the investigation now being made by a naval court of inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: Page 2, line 16, after the word "inquiry," insert "All hearings before the commission shall be open to the public."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] has in mind also a resolution to strike out the language of the bill to supplement the investigation now being made by the board of naval inquiry.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That does not interfere with the gentleman's motion.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my amendment until that of the gentleman from Virginia is considered.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thank the gentleman from New York. I offer an amendment and ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] to strike out the word "thereto" in line 14 and the words following, the words "to supplement," and all of lines 15 and 16.

Mr. SNELL. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONTAGUE: Amend, page 2, line 14, after the word "thereto" by striking out the remainder of line 14 and all of lines 15 and 16.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: Page 2, line 14, after the word "thereto," insert "All hearings before the commission shall be open to the public."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I want to talk upon this amendment. It is obvious that a subject as important as this ought to be considered in the open for this reason: This terrible disaster has aroused a great deal of sympathy, as well as interest, in the scientific world, and I think if the public were permitted to follow the proceedings from day to day as recorded by the press it would result in many valuable suggestions being made to the commission.

Mr. SNELL. I will state to the gentleman from New York that in all probability the hearings will be open. I have no objection to his amendment, and I do not think anybody else has.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This amendment would not apply to executive sessions.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Certainly not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is of the greatest importance that this investigation shall be open and of the most searching character, for this was an awful tragedy. I doubt whether any Member of the House has ever read—certainly, I never have read—anything more touching and tragic than the report in the papers yesterday and the day before of the testimony taken before the board of naval inquiry. One of the victims down in the hull of the sunken submarine asked, "How long will it be?" "Is there any hope?" and then said, "Please hurry." Again, a little later, "Please hurry." Gradually the sound grew fainter and fainter, "Please hurry." At last it ceased. Officers and crew were dead.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], in his speech on Wednesday last, told the House facts about the sinking of the *S–4* which we ought to be reminded of now. There is a mile marked out for a test course at the end of the hook of Cape Cod. There are two posts, and when the submarine comes abeam of the posts it is timed and continues to run until it arrives at the other end of the course, which is similarly marked. There are four large markers, and the location is known as the submarine course for test purposes. Another submarine, the *S–8*, had just finished its tests. This submarine, the *S–4*, was making her test of speed submerged, going at full speed. Her two periscopes—mark that—her two periscopes were out of water and visible. And yet a Government vessel, under the command of officers of the United States Coast Guard, came directly across this submarine course, struck the submarine, which was still under water, and sent it to the bottom, some of the crew to be drowned and the others to be slowly smothered to death in that great iron coffin.

Do not tell me that the only question here of importance is as to why they did not haul the *S–4* up after it had been sunk! No, Mr. Speaker, another and vastly more important question to be answered here is, Who is responsible for a United States Coast Guard vessel rushing across that submarine test course—a course marked out for that purpose and well known—while a submarine was making a test there and was still submerged?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Can there be any question, I will ask my friend from Wisconsin, that all the facts relating to the liability of anybody, whether in the naval service or any other service of the Government, can be brought out in that inquiry?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; there is a possibility of a question, because I have in mind other investigations of cases

where other vessels have been sunk. I make no attack upon the Navy. I know many of its officers. There are no finer men in the service of any country, model gentlemen, gallant, fearless, patriotic. I do not criticize them. But somebody, somewhere, is responsible for failure to warn that Coast Guard vessel and all other vessels not to go across that test course while that submarine was still under water. It should have been made known to the officers of every Government vessel in that vicinity that that submerged test was then in progress. But this submarine with its periscope out of water and plainly visible was sunk by one of our own Government vessels and 40 or more men sent to their death.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: On page 2, line 16, after the period, insert "Any widow or parent of any of the officers or crew of the *S–4* may be represented by counsel, who may examine witnesses and procure through the commission subpœnas for persons and exhibits."

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, the amendment speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. To carry out and give effect to the provisions of this resolution, the commission hereby created shall have power to issue subpœnas, administer oaths, summon witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive testimony taken before any proper officer in any State or Territory in the United States.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McSWAIN: On page 2, line 22, after the word "States," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and no naval officer or enlisted man shall be prejudiced in his record, service, prospects of promotion, or advancement on account of any testimony given, information offered, or assistance rendered by any such person before or to the commission, or any member thereof, or agent or officer thereof.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the gentleman's amendment by striking out the last two words. In that connection I want to say that there is an element of reason as well as ample experience for the gentleman's amendment. I will not vote for it, yet I will not say that I am against it; but I do say there is a certain degree of justification for the gentleman's anxiety.

Now, I have in my hand the report of Commander Edward Ellsberg, of the Navy, that brave and accomplished officer who is now engaged in the salvaging of the *S–4*. He is the officer who salvaged the *S–51* during the winter of 1925–26, after she was sunk by the *City of Rome* on September 25, 1925. It is well to note that she was not finally raised from her grave in the mud and silt off Block Island until July 5, 1926, nearly a period of 10 months. Furthermore, in towing her through Hell Gate she struck a rock and sank again, and the salvage operations had to be renewed.

As I said, I have here the report of Commander Ellsberg upon the work in salvaging the *S–51*. It is a very interesting document, going into all the details, describing the pontoons and devices used, and then he makes this final statement:

For future operations it is possible that the experiences set forth above may be of value, but for a correct estimate of the whole job it is desired to state that the success of the job was far more due to the courage, the energy, and the devotion of the men engaged, both as divers and on deck, than to material employed.

If that shows anything at all, it indicates that he was at that time not satisfied with the paraphernalia with which he had to work.

Commander Ellsberg was before the naval court of inquiry yesterday, as an expert witness, on the sinking of the *S–4*. In his testimony, as reported in this morning's papers, he said the submarines of S and V classes in the United States Navy have more safety devices than those of any other nation. The V type has nothing to do with the case, for they are dealing with the S type. Everyone in the Navy knows that the S type has no safety devices whatever. Speaking of accidents to American submarines he is reported as saying: "When an American submarine has been sunk and the crew remained in control of the vessel, one or both ends of the vessel have always been raised and the crews saved."

Neither does that happen to be true. I have put on the bulletin board in the corridor a summary of submarine disasters, which I will insert in my remarks. This shows that we have had all together, since 1904, 11 accidents to United States submarines, and that in 5—all within the last 12 years—there was a loss of life of 99 brave sailors. Since 1925 we have had four accidents to submarines, in only two of which did the crew go unscathed, while in the remaining two we lost 73 men.

Commander Ellsberg must have knowledge of this, and yet for some reason or other seems to be afraid to tell the truth.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD. In that connection I wish to state that a naval officer told me a few days ago—one who has had considerable service on submarines—that if the truth was known this was caused by the lack of keeping proper lookout through the periscope, but that it would never be told. If the suggested amendment of this resolution will assist the morale of the Navy to get the truth to Congress, I see no harm in it. I agree with my friend from Iowa. When these hawks go out and are killed and the tigers of the jungles are killed there is something wrong with the Navy.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will now insert the summary of submarine disasters, which will give a true picture of the "Safety of the American submarine":

SUBMARINE DISASTERS

[Tables from speech of ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN, M. C., in House of Representatives, January 20, 1926]

Submarine disasters with loss of life from March 18, 1904, to March 25, 1915

Date	Name	Nationality	Place	Cause	Lives lost
1. Mar. 18, 1904	A-1	British	Spithead	Collision steamship Berwick Castle	11
2. June 29, 1904	Delfine	Russian	Cronstadt	Weight of extra crew and open hatch	26
3. Feb. 16, 1905	A-5	British		Explosion of gasoline	4
4. Feb. 8, 1905	A-8	do	Plymouth	Sudden dive	14
5. July 6, 1905	Farfadet	French	Bizerta Bay, Africa	Unknown	14
6. Oct. 16, 1906	Lutin	do	do	Pebble in valve	13
7. Apr. 26, 1909	Foca	Italian	Naples, Italy	Explosion gas fumes	13
8. June 12, 1909	Kambala	Russian	Black Sea	Collision, 28 fathoms; 2 divers lost lives in attempt at salvage.	20
9. July 14, 1909	C-11	British		Collision	13
10. Apr. 15, 1910	No. 6	Japanese	Hiroshima Bay	Defective sluice valve	14
11. May 26, 1910	Pluviose	French	English Channel	Collision steamship Pas de Calais	27
12. Jan. 17, 1911	U-3	German	Kiel	Faulty valve	3
13. Feb. 2, 1912	A-3	British		Collision with steamship Hazard	14
14. June 8, 1912	Vendemiaire	French		Collision	24
15. Oct. 4, 1912	B-2	British		Unknown	15
16. June 8, 1913	E-5	do		do	3
17. Jan. 16, 1914	A-17	do		do	11
18. Mar. 25, 1915	F-4	American	1½ miles outside Honolulu	do	21
Total 18 disasters involving loss of life of					260

NOTE.—British, 8; loss of life, 85. French, 4; loss of life, 78. Russia, 2; loss of life, 46. Italy, 1; loss of life, 13. Japan, 1; loss of life, 14. Germany, 1; loss of life, 3. United States, 1; loss of life, 21.

Submarine losses in the World War

Boats lost:		Lives lost:	
Germans	203	Germans	4,060
British	61	British	1,220
Total	264	Total	5,280

Submarine disasters since armistice, November 11, 1918

Date	Name	Nationality	Place	Cause	Lives lost
1. Sept. 26, 1921	R-6	American	San Pedro Harbor	Premature opening of torpedo tube	2
2. Mar. 23, 1922		British	Gibraltar	Collision with British destroyer	23
3. Aug. 21, 1923	No. 70	Japanese	Kobe, Japan	Unknown	85
4. Oct. 28, 1923	O-5	American	Panama Canal	Collision with steamship Abangarez	3
5. Jan. 10, 1924	L-24	British	Portland, England	Collision with British steamship Resolute.	48
6. Mar. 19, 1924	No. 43	Japanese	Sasebo, Japan	Collision with steamship Tatsuta, 26 fathoms.	49
7. Aug. 26, 1925	Sebastiano Veniero	Italian	Sicily	In maneuvers	50
8. Sept. 25, 1925	S-51	American	Block Island, R. I.	Collision with City of Rome	33
9. Nov. 11, 1925	M-1	British	English Channel	Collision	69
10. Dec. 17, 1927	S-4	American	Provincetown, Mass.	Collision with Coast Guard steamship Paulding.	40
Total, 10 disasters, involving loss of lives of.					402

NOTE.—British, 3; loss of life, 140. United States, 4; loss of life, 78. Japan, 2; loss of life, 134. Italy, 1; loss of life, 50. Total, 402.

ACCIDENTS WITHOUT LOSS OF LIFE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Besides the five disasters to American submarines, in which 99 men lost their lives, there were the following sinkings in which there was no loss of life:

First. September 2, 1920. *S-5* off Delaware Capes, in 168 feet of water, due to defective valves. Note: This is a very significant accident. Only one end sank; the stern remained above the surface. The crew were imprisoned 44 hours and were not rescued until a hole was drilled in her hull by W. G. Grace, chief engineer of the steamship *George W. Goethals*. Please note that the rescue was not made by the Navy, but by volunteer help.

Second. March, 1921. *N-2*, *O-7*, and *O-8* ran on rocks.

Third. February 2, 1921. *L-1* off Cape Henlopen. Collision with pilot boat *Philadelphia*. Crew saved.

Fourth. December 7, 1921. *S-48* off Bridgeport, Conn. Neglect to close one of the hatches was the cause of the accident. The crew of 43 men saved by shifting ballast and thus floated the bow above the surface. The crew then crawled through the torpedo tubes.

Fifth. January, 1925, *S-19* off Nauset Beach Light.

Sixth. January 29, 1925. *S-48* ran on rocks off Portsmouth Harbor.

With those few exceptions, where good luck was on our side, the loss of human life in submarine disasters is appalling; and it surpasses human belief that an enlightened nation should continue to build their vessels without the slightest concern for the lives of the crews or the salvaging of these valuable vessels.

RECAPITULATION AS TO AMERICAN SUBMARINES

Five disasters, with loss of lives	99
Six sinkings, without loss of lives	0
Total	99

I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, no one is going to object to the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from South Carolina, but that is not the question before the House at this time. The question is whether the amendment presented by him will aid in the thoroughness, effectiveness, or results to be obtained by the present resolution before the House. In my judgment it will not change conditions in any respect whatsoever. If a man is going to carry something in the back of his head unfriendly on account of some testimony given somewhere and some time, as suggested by my friend from South Carolina, he will carry it just the same whether this amendment is in the resolution or not. Everyone knows that the officers and men in every department of the Navy are supposed to tell the actual, honest, and full truth, and if they do not do it that is something for them to answer for—not I. Furthermore, this amendment carries an implication against these brave and honorable men who are in the Navy at the present time that I consider is entirely uncalled for at the present. I expect and firmly believe that these men, under oath, will tell the exact truth and let the results fall where they belong. It is not only my expectation that they will tell the whole truth, it is the expectation of the President of the United States, is the expectation of the Secretray of the Navy, and, above all, it is the expectation of the American people, and I hope that this amendment will not be agreed to at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The members of the commission shall select a chairman from among their number; they shall serve without compensation as such, but shall be paid out of the amount appropriated their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. Nothing herein shall reduce the pay or allowances of the commissioners selected from the Navy. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $20,000 to be expended by such officer of the Supply Corps of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy may designate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office in such amounts and for such purposes incident to its duties as the commission in its discretion may deem proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law. The President is authorized, upon request of the commission, to designate such personnel of any department or Government establishmeat, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this resolution.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: Page 3, line 4, after the word "Navy," insert: "No member of the commission shall be financially interested in any contract with the United States."

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, there must be no question of a whitewash about this inquiry. The people of this country are insistent that this be a very, very thorough and sifting investigation by an impartial body of men. Unfortunately the administration that is under attack because of the situation by this resolution will appoint the men to make the investigation. Congress should see to it that these men have no financial interest in any Government contract; that they shall be under no kind of pressure direct or indirect. The Members of this House may not be interested in any contract with the Government. Therefore these men who are but delegates of this House and of the Senate should have no right to have any interest at all in any form of Government contract.

I thought when I offered the amendment to permit the widows or the parents of the crew to be represented by counsel, that I was suggesting something that this House would adopt in the interest of fair play. The House refused to adopt it. I do not see how the House can turn down this amendment. We, ourselves, are under the same constraint, and we should be. So, should the members of this commission in this very crucial time.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the gentleman know that that is already the law—that that is the general law?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I do not understand that it is the law in regard to any such commission as this.

Mr. HUGHES. It is the law.

Mr. BLACK of New York. And I hope that the President, no matter what happens to this amendment, will bear in mind that it is the sentiment of this House, and we will show that it is the sentiment of this House if you agree to my amendment, that no such person should be on this commission.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I challenge my friend from New York [Mr. BLACK] to point to a single word in this resolution

or to any suggestion that has been uttered on the floor of this House which would give any indication that anybody wants this investigation to be a whitewash.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The whole form of the resolution indicates it.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman can not point to one definite statement or word to that effect. Every suggestion made here has been to the opposite, in every respect, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The gentleman surely does not think that I believe that any gentleman who is interested in covering the administration will admit that this is going to be a whitewash.

Mr. SNELL. I challenge the gentleman to mention one word.

Mr. BLACK of New York. And I challenge the whole form of this resolution, the source it comes from—the Navy Department, now under criticism, and the Secretary of the Navy. The House gives itself right over to the Secretary under investigation.

Mr. BUTLER. Let the House express its view and then we will know whether or not it is to be a whitewash.

Mr. SNELL. All right. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUTLER) there were—ayes 6, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I have refrained from saying anything about this matter. I expect to vote for this resolution. I do not think that we are going to shift this responsibility of Congress onto the President by simply passing this resolution.

Now, when this unfortunate accident has happened and the country has become aroused, Congress all of a sudden wakes up and comes in here and takes the Navy to task. Some of us in this House have been complaining of the extravagance in the Navy and in the Army for the past six or seven years, but our complaints have gone unheeded. Congress is responsible for conditions that exist in the Navy. A few of us on the floor of this House have contended time and time again that the Navy has spent its money lavishly and wastefully, and that the Army has spent its money lavishly and extravagantly. And when there are great internal improvements needed in this country, great activities of the Government in its internal affairs, which the Budget Bureau cuts down to the last notch, and saves money we permit the Army and the Navy immediately to walk in and carry it off. We are forced in our civil matters, in our civic appropriations, to pare to the very core, but as soon as a surplus is visible, why here is a great program from the Army and the Navy to carry it off, and as soon as the Navy gets an appropriation the Army wants one equal to it to carry on the same activities.

Eight years ago in this House I contended that the Army and Navy both could be improved if you would train in industry the graduates of the Military Academy and the Naval Academy—if you would give them five years' leave of absence and put them into the industries of this country, so that when war came on or a great emergency came on those men would have practical information about the business of the country and know how to marshal the war materials of the country in time of war. It has been claimed that when the World War broke out we had one instance where they were calling for contracts on the building of these cantonments which contained specifications for a particular size of window glass which the manufacturers of glass in this country had not manufactured since the seventies. It is said the Navy called for canned goods to be packed in a certain size of container which the trade in America had not manufactured in years.

I do not think it is an opportune time now, just because an unfortunate accident has happened, that Congress, upon whose shoulders rests responsibility for making appropriations for the Navy, should dodge its responsibility of seeing that proper appropriations are made and that the money is properly expended. When appropriations are requested Congress answers with a lavish hand because asked by the men who have in their charge the defense of this Nation.

When an accident, perhaps unforeseen and unpreventable, comes up we ought not to want to go out and stir up the country against the Army and the Navy. There are brilliant men in the Army and in the Navy, but I say to you here now that they spend too much money without regard to how money is made or earned in this country. They have no comprehension of the toil it takes to get the money which they spend. "But," they say, "it does not hurt the farmers; they do not pay anything, only the big business men pay it." Gentlemen, keep on pursuing that policy further and put the money into the Army and the Navy and into armament and you will find when the time comes that these great other matters that require internal improvement will provoke the people to rise up and ask you for an accounting.

I do not know what caused this accident. You do not know what caused it. You have your guess about it. I hope this investigation will be made. I will vote for the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to section 5, page 3, to strike out the following language:

> Which approval shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office in such amounts and for such purposes incident to its duties as the commission in its discretion may deem proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 10, after the word "commission," strike out the following language: "Which approval shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office in such amounts and for such purposes incident to its duties as the commission in its discretion may deem proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that there is nothing suspicious about this resolution in the main; that it is wholly a proper one in its purpose and should be passed. But I can not agree with him that there is nothing suspicious about this particular language. There is something suspicious about this particular clause. It did not come from my friend from New York. It did not come from his great Committee on Rules. It did not come from the great Committee on Naval Affairs. It did not come from the President. It came from the Secretary of the Navy, who for several years here since he has been in office has been trying to cut down and destroy our General Accounting Office, the office of the Comptroller General of the United States. You can support him if you want to. He sits across the table from the Comptroller General constantly, day after day, and tries to browbeat and turn down your Comptroller General, and when the Comptroller General upholds the law and carries out the will of Congress this great Secretary of the Navy sends his emissaries into court and tries to set aside on every occasion and in every possible way the orders of the Comptroller General.

To do what? To obey the law? No; to disobey the law. To spend money honestly and in accordance with the law? No; to spend money in violation of the law passed by Congress. And that is what the Secretary of the Navy has done in this case, sought to get around the Comptroller General again.

This is going to be an honest commission, I believe, and if it is an honest commission it will know how to spend this sum of $20,000 in an honest way and in accordance with the law. It does not need this provision, which says it can spend it without any supervision of the Comptroller General and regardless of the law.

What is there about my amendment, to strike this language out, with which you can not agree?

Mr. SNELL. I will tell the gentleman in a minute.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. SNELL. I will make my speech in my own time.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like the gentleman to make it now, so I may answer him. Does he not want the money of the people from his district in New York spent in accordance with the law? He has helped Congress to create the Comptroller General to see to it that all public money is spent in accordance with the law, and there is not a week that passes but what this great Comptroller General of the United States, the creature of Congress, calls this Secretary of the Navy to time and says, "Mr. Secretary, you can not spend this and that because you are trying to spend it in violation of the law." And the Secretary of the Navy does not like to be thus hampered. Do you not want the money of the taxpayers spent in accordance with law? I will ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if he does, why is he afraid of his Comptroller General? Why is he afraid of the Comptroller General passing upon the expenditure of this sum? He can smile and he can get up here, as the chairman of the great Rules Committee, and throw cold water on the proposition and say this is such a small sum that he wants the commission to spend it without limitation and restriction, but that does not answer the question I am asking

him. Does he want it spent according to law? If he does, Congress has appointed the Comptroller General, nobody else—Congress has created the General Accounting Office and no other agency—to see to it that the executive departments shall obey the law when they expend the money of the people of this country. Why not strike it out? That is a question the gentleman can not evade by argument.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I can explain to the gentleman the purpose we had in putting that language in the resolution and then let the House decide itself. In the first place, I will say that I have just as much confidence in the Comptroller General as any man in this House, and I have always supported him in his work, and there is nothing here that in any way reflects on him or his work. The resolution as it originally came up—and which is supposed to have been drafted in the Navy Department, but I do not know whether it was or not—did not contain the provision that is in the resolution at the present time, and that is objected to by the gentleman from Texas. So the gentleman from Texas is entirely mistaken in his supposition, as he usually is, with respect to matters at which he strikes at random, and upon which he has no definite knowledge.

Mr. BLANTON. How does it come to be in the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. I do not yield to the gentleman. I will state the situation we want to cover—and it is one of common sense—and then let the House do just as it wants to do, because it does not make any particular difference to me. We are going to ask some of the most experienced, high-grade, and well-known engineers in the United States to act on this commission. Every single thing they get as compensation is their hotel bills and their traveling expenses. Unless we put this provision in the bill they will be limited to $7 a day for hotel and living expenses.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a pretty good allowance.

Mr. SNELL. This commission will sit mostly in Washington, New York, and Boston, and every man with common sense knows that a commissioner can not live there, as he would be expected to live as a commissioner of the United States, on $7 a day. Now, I do not understand that the question raised by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] will in any way be affected by this resolution. The question of the pay of witnesses, and so forth, is not provided for, and I understand they will all be on the same basis. I only know that the thing which it was intended to cover by this exception was the matter of the traveling and hotel expenses of the commissioners themselves, and for that reason it was thought reasonable, fair, and the only decent thing we could do was to put in this exception. If it is necessary to put the responsibility on anyone, I am willing to assume it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The use of this $20,000, I think, is explained on page 3, in the first two or three lines. It can only be used to pay the commissioners' necessary traveling expenses—hotel and other expenses—incurred in the discharge of their duties. I can not find therein any provision covering the pay of witnesses.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. While it is true $7 a day is the general limitation under the general statute, would it not be entirely appropriate to prescribe a limitation here of as much as $20 or $25 a day to take care of the living expenses at the best hotels?

Mr. SNELL. It does not seem to me that is necessary.

Mr. McSWAIN. On account of this being a special law.

Mr. SNELL. This is a special appropriation for a special purpose, and we must remember that, of course, the members of this commission will use common sense; if we do not attribute that to them, they ought not to be on this commission.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The members of this commission will be gentlemen who are not accustomed to the methods, the limitations, and a great deal of the red tape of governmental procedure.

Mr. SNELL. That is absolutely correct, especially those coming from private life.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And if we take this language out of the resolution, we are going to subject them to all of the little disagreeable incidents that we know exist in all matters relating to Government accounting.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The General Accounting Office would have them itemize the shines and the shaves which they paid for.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Certainly. Let me add this word: If these gentlemen were officials of the Government, accustomed to the requirements and methods of the General Accounting Office, I would be in favor of striking out this provision, but as it is we are calling men from civil life to serve for a specific purpose and we ought not to subject them to such restrictions and limitations, especially when they are serving wtihout compensation whatever.

Mr. BUTLER. Why should we be suspicious of these gentlemen? They will do what is right, and we should not cast suspicion upon the whole thing in this way.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why not abolish the office of Comptroller General?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no; I can not stand with the gentleman from Texas on this proposition, although I am usually with him.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 28, noes 195.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The commission shall, as soon as practicable, submit a full report to the President, who shall transmit the same to Congress, giving the results of its investigation and its recommendations. All records of the commission, upon the completion of its duties, shall be deposited with the Secretary of the Navy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 20, insert the words "but not later than May 15, 1928."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York state why they have put the date so late as this? I can not understand why the commission could not investigate this matter and report by the 15th or 20th of March.

Mr. SNELL. We considered that very carefully, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin. As I tried to explain when I had the floor on the resolution, there are several factors that enter into a report such as we eventually want, and after consideration we finally decided we wanted to have at least some kind of report by that time. We were hopeful we would be able to get a full report, but possibly we may not. There is nothing definitely meant by this date, only an invitation to hurry up as much as possible.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Republican National Convention is to be held in June and Congress will be very anxious indeed to have its work out of the way, in order to accommodate the Members who wish to attend it. Not only that, but in the latter part of May there will be the usual piling up of business and rush to get bills through the House and the Senate. It will be impossible to bring this matter up under such circumstances, and this may delay action by Congress on the report until December next, or perhaps some time during the following year.

Mr. SNELL. I will give the gentleman the assurance that if there is a report to the House here that needs consideration it will receive consideration at an early date after its delivery to the House. The gentleman need not worry about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield, if I have the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman one reason for that. We will have to give them a reasonable time in which to expend the $20,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 20, strike out the word "full."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 21, after the word "same," insert the words "and all other reports of said commission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Page 3, line 25, after the word "Navy," omit the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "The same to constitute a part of the public records of the department."

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at first glance this may seem to be an inconsequential suggestion, but it was developed in the recent trial of Fall and Doheny in this District that in the Navy Department there are public records on the one hand and private or confidential records on the other hand.

It is very true that the resolution has already provided for public hearings, but everybody who has participated in the trial of cases lasting a long time, and when there is a great deal of elaboration, understands that not only do witnesses testify but that documents are filed which are not actually read. The simple purpose of the amendment is to insure that everything that goes into the investigation of every kind shall be open to public inspection; that it shall be under the rule, so to speak, of pitiless publicity.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not intend to be as broad as the statement he just made—everything that goes in of every character? Suppose in the course of this investigation there are new designs or new appliances submitted which, from their very military nature, should not be made public; surely the gentleman would not want to make his recommendation as broad as his language suggests.

Mr. SNELL. I do not see any objection to the gentleman's amendment, except the point raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. There might be devices and appliances which they want to keep secret.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It seems to me that in a great matter of this sort we can waive that point. Some of the people of the country have been stirred to the very depths of their hearts by the recent tragedy and all people are vitally interested in what has occurred and what may develop. I for one am willing to take the chance suggested by the gentleman from New York rather than incur the possibility that after awhile when there is a call made for documents that may have been presented in the course of the investigation it will be met by the assertion that they are of a private character and ought not to be produced.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It has been suggested that other nations have appliances and safety devices as to which information which may come to this commission confidentially that ought not to be made public.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Well, to repeat, I am not going to reckon with that possibility. So far as I am concerned I am willing to open the door to the fullest extent and take the risk of anything of that sort rather than for anyone to have ground for assuming that there has been any concealment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman puts this in the bill, he runs the risk of not getting the information.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have often heard predictions made of that kind which have not been verified. We ought not to take counsel of our fears in that respect in my humble opinion.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is an amendment that has gone in already that the hearings shall be public.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I referred to that, but notwithstanding that, every lawyer knows that documents are nearly always presented in the trial of an important case which are not read at the hearing; they are filed, and in this instance might be considered private and confidential and not open to the public.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The only objection I have to the gentleman's amendment is that they might get information that ought not to be made public.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Every word of testimony given at a public hearing, every exhibit that is filed and made a part of the record will be incorporated in the report, transmitted by the President to the House, and will be available to every man, woman, and child as a public document.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will say to my friend that the resolution simply directs that a report shall be made. It does not direct that anything shall be embodied in the report of the character indicated by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SNELL. The hearings are absolutely open to the public.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will bear with me a moment, I want to say that there is absolutely no reason for any secrecy as to safety devices, because they are thrown open by all countries. Furthermore, if private individuals are interested in safety devices they will be patented, and the patents are open to the world. There is no reason for secrecy in regard to matters of that kind.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like further to say this: If this matter were left to me I would prefer to create a congressional commission to conduct this investigation. During my time here the most wholesome and productive investigations we have had have been carried on in that way. Should it be replied that the benefit should be had of the service of experts either belonging to the Navy or outside of the Navy, I answer that the experts could be called by the congressional committee. Mention has been made of Admiral Jones. Admiral Jones and Admiral Taylor are, I suppose, our greatest naval experts, and of course they were both born in Virginia. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. They are strong men; very strong.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. One of them was born in my district and the other just over its line.

Mr. BUTLER. Good! That gives them further standing with all of us.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And, although I have the greatest respect, as I have often indicated, for the opinion of the President, who recommended this resolution, nevertheless, if I were handling the matter, I would very much prefer that the investigation be conducted by a joint committee composed of Members of the House and Senate, in their own way determining what has occurred and what ought to be done, because the responsibility is really upon us to ascertain the facts and reach conclusions. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to embody anything in this resolution that will in any way curtail publicity; but in my opinion the very amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] will curtail rather than promote publicity in regard to this entire investigation. One thing that I would oppose this amendment for is because there may be drawings and devices or suggestions which the department may not want to make public. If it is provided by the resolution that it is necessary to make them public, then we will not get those drawings and devices at this time, and a great part of the real object of the resolution will be lost. It is simply a matter of policy, and I am quite sure the policy advocated by my friend from Virginia is wrong. For this reason this amendment should not be adopted at this time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 60, noes 195.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The commission hereby created shall be dissolved upon the submission of its final report to the President.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of Texas: Page 4, line 3, at the end of line 3 strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following language: "*Provided*, That such final report shall not be later than the first day of the second regular session of the Seventieth Congress."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that; I hope the report will be in long before that time.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if conditions might not arise which would make it wise to put that limit a few days after the opening of the Congress instead of upon the opening day.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS: Page 4, after line 3, add a new section to be known as section 8, as follows:

"That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to at once begin negotiations looking to agreements and treaties with the other nations that will outlaw the use of submarines in warfare, and otherwise, so that they will be discontinued and no longer constructed or used."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. EDWARDS. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Florida: Page 4, after the amendment adopted at the end of line 3, insert: "The commission may recommend to the Congress an appropriation for the relief of the families of the crew of the *S–4*."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Before putting the question the Chair desires to correct a statement he made this morning in answer to a parliamentary inquiry by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. At the time the Chair had not had much opportunity to consider the question. In response to the question of the gentleman from Texas as to what would constitute a quorum of the House when the House was considering a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, the Chair said:

The Chair thinks a quorum would be 100, as is the case in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

After some consideration and examination of the precedents, the Chair thinks that he was in error. The Chair quotes from the decision by Mr. Speaker Cannon, rendered February 28, 1905, to be found in Hinds' Precedents, section 4925, volume 4. The question arose as to whether a motion to order the previous question was in order in the House while sitting as in Committee of the Whole. Mr. Speaker Cannon said:

The Chair is informed that under prior rulings, under similar orders, when a bill is in the House as in Committee of the Whole the consideration of it proceeds under the five-minute rule, but that the House does not lose its control by a majority over the bill, and that it is in the power of the House to order the previous question upon the bill and amendments pending, if there be any.

When a bill is being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, the Chair is of opinion that the only difference between that consideration and the consideration of the bill in the House is that the former consideration proceeds under the five-minute rule and there is no general debate. The Chair thinks that all of the rules of the House, except those two, govern bills that are considered as this resolution is being considered. Under these circumstances a quorum of the House, considering a bill or resolution as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, would not be 100 but would be 218.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, at the same time I proposed a question to the Speaker, and the Speaker seemingly agreed with the view that I then held, that a record vote could not be had. I find that a record vote—that is, the yeas and nays—can be taken on any amendment offered when the House is considering a bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it important that there should be a definite understanding of the situation, and that the only difference between considering a bill as this resolution has been considered and considering a bill in the House, is that in the former instance we proceed under the five-minute rule and that there is no general debate.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May I suggest that I think there are precedents—at least one precedent—to the effect that a motion to close debate on an amendment is in order? Otherwise there would be no way of closing debate on amendments when the House is considering a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. But the previous question would operate then.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The previous question, as I understand, can only be made as to the entire bill; I think so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks the previous question operates precisely as it does in the House.

Mr. TILSON. What the gentleman has in mind, I think, is that you can not move the previous question on the paragraphs of the bill, because there is no vote on the paragraphs, just as there is none in Committee of the Whole. The previous question can only be made when there is something pending, as an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SNELL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

SALVAGING THE GERMAN SUBMARINE "U–3"

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including certain extracts from the Scientific American.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including certain extracts from the Scientific American. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under leave granted me on January 7, 1928, I file herewith a statement concerning the salvaging of the German submarine boat *U–3* for reference and for the information of the Members, and reproduce an account published in the Scientific American Supplement No. 1844 on May 6, 1911.

There has been considerable discussion concerning the German *U–3* in connection with the unfortunate sinking of our submarine *S–4*. Not only on the floor of the House, but in the press throughout the country, comparisons have been made of the equipment and methods employed in the salvaging of these two submarines. The comparisons have created the impression that the method and time of rescue work and the salvaging in the case of the German *U–3* could have been employed in the case of the *S–4* or the ill-fated *S–51*. As a matter of fact, the two cases are in no way parallel. Conditions under which the *U–3* sank, the depth of water, and all the factors are so different from those surrounding the *S–4* that comparisons in the two cases are not only valueless but manifestly unfair.

The *S–4* collided with a cutter running at a high rate of speed, resulting in such a terrific impact that it sank instantly.

The *U–3* was not under way, but while preparing for a stationary submersion one of her ventilating valves was partially left open, permitting the inrush of water and causing her to sink gradually and in the presence of several warships and heavy traffic not far from the Kiel Canal, all of whom noticed her "irregular movements" before and while sinking.

The *S–4* sank in 102 feet of water.

The *U–3* sank in 40 feet of water.

The *S–4* sank several steaming-hours distant from submarine base.

The *U–3* sank in the harbor of its own submarine base with all equipment conveniently available.

The *S–4* weighs over 800 tons, and flooded with water would weigh over a thousand tons.

The *U–3* weighed about 400 tons.

The *S–4* immediately was embedded in mud in 102 feet of water.

The *U–3's* bow projected from the water for several hours, during which time the 27 men were rescued.

The *S–4's* compartments were flooded by water entering the tear in her hull.

The hull of the *U–3* was in no way impaired and completely intact, thus making it easier to give her buoyancy.

The first cable reports received in this country concerning the *U–3* made it appear that the *U–3* was quickly hoisted from the bottom of the ocean. By reading the early reports it would appear that the hull was lifted and the men then rescued. As a matter of fact, the bow of the submarine was projecting from the water for a long time; and when she sank entirely, while her stern was at the bottom, it continued to retain an angular position and her periscope could always be seen slightly below the surface.

In passing it is proper to state that eventually the salvage ship *Vulcan* did not prove to be as satisfactory or successful as was anticipated when she was first constructed. In fact, the *Vulcan* did not have the power or the capacity to lift the *S–4* had she or a similar ship of equal tonnage and power been right on the spot at the time of the collision and sinking. The *Vulcan* and the *Ajax* were similar ships. One or both were taken by England at the close of the World War and, as far as can be ascertained, have been dismantled and no ship of the same design constructed by England.

A technical and accurate description of the salvage of the *U–3* appears in the Scientific American Supplement, No. 1844, of May 6, 1911. I submit this authoritative account for the information of the House, and particularly urge my colleagues

who have used the *U–3* as the basis for their belief that similar methods were not employed in the case of the *S–4*.

Unfortunately, the rules of the printing of the RECORD does not permit the reproduction of diagrams which accompany the article in the Scientific American Supplement, therefore references to the diagrams have been omitted from the article.

SALVAGING THE GERMAN SUBMARINE BOAT "U–3"—AN AUTHORITATIVE ACCOUNT

On January 17, 1911, the German submarine boat *U–3* was sunk in the harbor of Kiel by the imperfect closure of the afterventilation pipe. The depth of water was about 40 feet, and the stern of the vessel penetrated several yards in the soft clay bottom. As the boat sank, her irregular movements were observed by the submarine *U–1*, which hastened to the spot, launched a folding boat to pick up the telephone buoy of the *U–3*, and then notified a warship, which transmitted the news to the Kiel dockyard so promptly that two steamers and a crane were dispatched 28 minutes after the vessel sank. Meanwhile the imprisoned men had informed the folding boat by telephone that the afterpart of the *U–3* was full of water. Communication then ceased.

The disaster was observed also by the lookout stationed on the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal and by the canal pilot steamer, which soon arrived on the scene and endeavored, with the aid of a tug, to tow to shore the foundered submarine, the bow of which had risen to the surface. The attempt failed, as the stern of the submarine was held down by some 100 tons of water. The crane arrived about an hour after the disaster, and with the aid of divers attached to the canal service preparations to raise the sunken boat were commenced.

It appears probable that the extent of the leakage was not at first fully appreciated by the crew of the *U–3*, as the partly opened valve was invisible and inaccessible, and the mouth of the ventilation pipe, through which the water entered the hull, was covered and concealed by the motor. Hence the inrush of water could only be heard, and the water was not seen until it had reached the floor of the engine room. It was then too late to take effective measures. The boat sank stern foremost, and its position aggravated the evil by increasing the hydrostatic pressure at the leak and in other ways.

The tanks, which had been so nearly filled in preparation for diving that only 1 ton of buoyancy remained before the accident, were emptied by pumping and by compressed air. Meanwhile the compartment bulkheads were closed, the emergency weights dropped, and the telephone and lifting buoys set afloat. An attempt was then made to pump out the engine-room bilge, but the pump would not "draw," owing to the position of the vessel. The water soon shortcircuited some of the accumulators, producing results far more serious than the stoppage of the useless pump. The sudden discharge so heated the forward cells, which were not yet submerged, that several plates became red hot and some of the hard-rubber parts took fire. The heated cells evolved suffocating sulphurous and acid fumes, which caused the commander to order a retreat to the forward or torpedo compartment. The commander, with two other officers, remained in the middle compartment and turret and continued the work of emptying the forward tank by means of compressed air until the bow of the boat rose 20 inches above the surface of the water. The 28 men imprisoned in the torpedo compartment owe their lives to this wise and heroic action of Lieutenant Commander Fischer and to the stanchness of the collision bulkhead which separated them from the turret compartment.

At 11.30 a. m., 65 minutes after the accident occurred, an inspector of the torpedo service arrived on the scene and found the sunken vessel in the position described above, with the prow and the periscope emerging slightly from the water and the stern embedded in the clay bottom. Assuming that the crew had taken refuge in the forward compartment, he attempted their rescue by the method illustrated. The floating crane was anchored close to the weather side of the *U–3* and made fast by a chain passed around the submarine with the aid of divers. Meanwhile other divers were working to attach the main tackle of the crane to the forward lifting hook of the *U–3*. The task was not accomplished until nearly 3 p. m. Soon after that hour the bow of the submarine was slowly raised by hauling on the main tackle and occasionally tightening the chain stirrup until the forehatch was just awash. The operation was then stopped in order to communicate with the imprisoned men by tapping, according to the Morse code, on the exposed part of the hull. The first attempts were frustrated by irregular knocking from the inside. It was afterwards learned that the imprisoned men were fastening the bulkhead doors, which opened inward (forward), and consequently did not entirely exclude the poisonous gases which were forced upward from the central compartment by the pressure of the water. After this work had been finished, communication in Morse signals was established, and the imprisoned men reported "All is well." When they learned that the bow was out of water they announced their intention of opening the torpedo-launching tubes. Boats provided with sounding lines were then stationed beneath the mouths of the torpedo tubes and the bow of the *U–3* was lowered until these mouths nearly touched the water. Meanwhile the imprisoned men, working by the light of a single pocket lantern, had succeeded in opening the starboard torpedo tube. At 4.30 p. m. the first man was drawn out by means of the sounding line. The work of rescue proceeded smoothly until an increased influx of poisonous gases caused the man who was being drawn out to let go the line and fall back unconscious. A call was then made for volunteers to go down and attach the imprisoned men to the line. In this way several men were rescued by a boatswain's mate, who was finally drawn out unconscious. Two officers, carrying an electric lamp connected with a cable and a compressed-air tube from the *D–5*, which was moored beside the crane, then went down and rescued the remaining men, most of whom were unconscious. The work of rescue was completed at 5.20 p. m. The starboard torpedo tube was necessarily left open.

Nearly one-third of the men rescued from the forward compartment were unconscious. They were taken to the lower deck of the crane float and revived by oxygen inhalations and other treatment. In less than two hours they were in condition to be removed to a hospital, where most of them fully recovered in a few days.

During the work of rescue preparations were made to raise the stern of the *U–3* in order to rescue the captain and the other two officers who were imprisoned in the turret. For this purpose a stout cable was attached by divers to the after lifting hook of the sunken boat. At the same time efforts were made to put into service the emergency ventilating apparatus, but the attempt failed because, as we learned afterwards, the valves in the middle compartment were closed.

Meanwhile, imperfect communication with the imprisoned officers had been established by means of a board on which questions were written and which was held in front of the periscope. The prisoners answered "Yes" and "No" by turning the periscope to left and right. This conversation continued from 2 to 5 p. m.

The hawser which had been fastened to the after part of the *U–3* was attached to a second and more powerful crane. At 5.30 p. m., 10 minutes after the last man had left the torpedo tube, this second crane began hauling with great caution, pausing at intervals to give the stern of the *U–3* time to work out of the soft clay in which it was imbedded while the forward crane exerted a steady pull of about 100 tons. When the stern of the *U–3* had thus been raised about 4 feet, the hawser parted and the boat sank back. The divers then substituted two new hawsers for the broken one, and the work of raising the vessel was resumed at 6.30 p. m. but the operation was soon stopped and the fate of the imprisoned officers sealed by the breaking of a post of the after crane.

These two failures proved that the *U–3* could not be raised in this way. Nothing remained but to raise the sunken boat by means of the salvage ship *Vulcan*, a sure but tedious method, which practically excluded all hope of saving the lives of the three heroic officers.

The *Vulcan* was used, in connection with the submarines *U–3* and *U–1*, as a school of submarine navigation, the pupils and the crews of the submarines being quartered on the "mother" ship. There was good reason for her previous inaction and her absence at the moment of the disaster which need not be explained here.

On the morning when the accident occurred the *Vulcan* was in dock at Kiel, and for this reason the submarines were practicing in Kiel Harbor, one always remaining afloat when the other dived. The *Vulcan* arrived on the scene at 1.30 p. m., but remained idle because it would have taken her at least six hours to raise the *U–3*, which, even in its lowest position, was too high to allow the *Vulcan* to employ her usual and most expeditious method of anchoring, at bow and stern, to windward of the sunken vessel and drifting over it.

After the crane broke the best method of employing the *Vulcan* was discussed, and every detail was decided, while the divers detached the hawsers and the sling from the *U–3*. The disabled crane was removed and the other crane was drawn back about 40 yards. The scene was brightly illuminated by the searchlights of two vessels. The *U–3* now lay entirely under water, though the top of the periscope could be seen just beneath the surface. The position of the periscope and the bow were marked by small boats.

The difficult work of the divers was not completed until 8.55 p. m. Then the *Vulcan* was brought alongside the remaining crane and attached by bow and stern lines. With the aid of these lines the *Vulcan* was swung around through a right angle, so that she lay parallel to the *U–3*, and was held in this position by the starboard stern anchor, which had been dropped midway.

The moorings of the *Vulcan* and the crane were then cautiously relaxed and the two vessels, retaining their relative positions, were allowed to drift toward the *U–3*, until the bow of the double-hulled *Vulcan* was directly over the stern of the sunken vessel and immediately behind the periscope. Now came the delicate task of moving the *Vulcan* forward with one of its twin hulls on each side of the *U–3*, without breaking the periscope and thus flooding the turret and central compartment. This maneuver, the difficulty of which was increased by a strong side wind, was successfully accomplished with the aid of the port stern anchor and several small steamers which served as bow anchors and tugs.

The *Vulcan* was thus brought into the position with her hoisting tackle directly over the lifting hooks of the *U–3*. The tackle was attached by divers—a task which occupied two hours—and the work

of hoisting began at 4 a. m. The turret appeared above water at 4.35, and was opened 10 minutes later. The abnormal pressure in the confined space caused an outrush of foul air, which smelled strongly of chlorine. The turret was ventilated with compressed air, a lamp attached to an electric cable was lowered, and two officers entered. They found their three ill-fated comrades dead at their posts in peaceful attitudes, which appeared to exclude all possibility of a death struggle. Although they had evidently been dead for hours, two hours were employed in fruitless attempts at resuscitation.

After the bodies had been removed, the turret was closed and the *U–3* was securely fastened to the *Vulcan*, brought into the inner harbor, and docked without difficulty. (Scientific American Supplement 1844, May 6, 1911, an article condensed from the Marine Rundschau.)

APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] if we can agree upon the time for finishing general debate on the appropriation bill? I desire first to make a motion, but before doing that I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama if we can agree upon a time to finish the general debate on the bill which we have heretofore been discussing?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I would wish an hour on this side.

Mr. SHREVE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the appropriation bill be limited to 1 hour and 15 minutes, 1 hour of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and 15 minutes to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the appropriation bill under consideration shall be limited to 1 hour and 15 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and 15 minutes by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces a change of reference of the bill (H. R. 6475) to provide for patents on reclamation entries from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to the Committee on the Public Lands.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AYRES, by unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HOCH), was granted leave of absence for one day, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 9, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, January 9, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.
War Department appropriation bill.
Independent offices appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.—caucus room)

A meeting to hear Frederick A. Delano, chairman of the flood-control committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Frank C. Page, representing the United States Chamber of Commerce; and members of the Mississippi River Commission discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact (H. R. 5773).

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (H. R. 5604).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

275. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting provisions entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," be extended to Frank Guelfi for the loss of vision as a result of injury to the right eye while engaged in work for the Isthmian Canal Commission in 1911; to the Committee on Claims.

276. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting provisions entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States receiving injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," be extended to Rudolph Ponevacs for loss of right leg as a result of injury thereto while engaged in work for the Isthmian Canal Commission in 1908; to the Committee on Claims.

277. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and War, Alien Property Custodian, and the United States Shipping Board, relative to money received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927. There are also inclosed 30 reports from the heads of other departments or independent establishments stating that no moneys have been received during the fiscal year which have not been covered into the Treasury; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 108. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River of the North; with amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 194. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Morrison, State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the southeast corner of lot 3, section 34, township 41 north, range 32 west; with amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 199. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Monticello on Trunk Highway No. 25; with amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 319. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River; with amendment (Rept. No. 192); Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 495. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Armstrong, a county of the State of Pennsylvania, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Kittanning, in the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5510. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Duluth Ship Canal; with amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5583. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. of Texas and the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Rio Grande River; with amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5638. A bill granting the consent of Congress to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River, at Epes, in the State of Alabama; with amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5657. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River; with amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5725. A bill granting the consent of Con-

gress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5726. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Black River at or near Jonesville, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5728. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Morehouse Parish, La., or the State Highway Commission of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at or near Point Pleasant, in Morehouse Parish; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5744. A bill to authorize the reconstruction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6046. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Youngstown, Ohio, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River at West Avenue, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORNING: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6099. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to construct, maintain, and operate a toll highway bridge across Lake Champlain; with amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6483. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River; with amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6512. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6513. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6514. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6958. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Youngstown to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River at Division Street, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEERY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6959. A bill granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Caney Fork River in Tennessee; with amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7192. A bill to amend an act, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa."; with amendmnt (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7218. A bill to legalize a bridge across Hillsborough Bay at Twenty-second Street, Tampa, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7370. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River near Indian Cove Ferry, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7374. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River near Swan Valley, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEERY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7449. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate two bridges across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Devon, Mingo County, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7466. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or Valley County, in the State of Montana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Glasgow, Mont.; with amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7745. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River; with amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7913. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Elk River on the Athens-Florence road between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.; with amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Printing. H. R. 6669. A bill fixing the salary of the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer; without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2523. A bill for the relief of Harvey Dunkin; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WARE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WARE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Maj. F. Ellis Reed; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WARE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4084. A bill for the relief of the persons suffering loss on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4203. A bill for the relief of A. S. Guffey; without amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WARE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5336. A bill for the relief of John J. Corcoran; without amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5894. A bill for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co. of Fayetteville, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WARE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5923. A bill for the relief of the Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3850) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Heath; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8358) for the relief of the parents of Wyman Henry Beckstead; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8349) for the relief of the Waupaca Golf Club for the payment of illegal taxes; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 8818) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge

across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8819) for the erection of a public building at Watkins Glen, Schuyler County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8820) to erect a post-office building in the village of Bath, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 8821) to create a commission to be known as the commission for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 8822) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Hopkins, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8823) for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORROW (by request): A bill (H. R. 8824) to provide for the protection of the watershed within the Carson National Forest, from which water is obtained for the Taos Pueblo, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8825) to amend an act entitled "An act for the regulation of radio communication," approved February 23, 1927, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 8826) to provide for research in reforestation, growth, and protection of the hardwood forests of the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 8827) to suspend all immigration to the United States until January 1, 1935, to deport all aliens unlawfully within the United States, and aliens who withdrew their declaration to become citizens to evade military service during the World War, to punish those who violate our immigration laws, to provide for the registration and Americanization of all aliens lawfully within the United States, to permit emergency farm and ranch labor to be imported from Canada and Mexico for temporary periods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8828) to prevent gambling in cotton, wool, mohair, or grain futures, and to make it unlawful for any person, corporation, or association of persons to sell or to buy any contract for future delivery of any cotton, wool, mohair, or grain within the United States, unless such seller is actually the legitimate owner of, or unless such seller has the physical means of producing, the cotton, wool, mohair, or grain so contracted for future delivery at the time said sale or contract of sale is made, and such buyer is purchasing same for actual delivery; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 8829) to amend the tariff act of 1922, entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by request): A bill (H. R. 8830) to authorize the payment to Robert Toquothty of royalties arising from an oil and gas well in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8831) to provide for the collection of fees from royalties on production of minerals from leased Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8832) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8833) to repeal section 15a of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended February 28, 1920, and to enact in lieu thereof provisions for meeting the transportation needs of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 8834) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 8835) to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code as amended, to provide for terms of court at Bryson City, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 8836) authorizing acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8837) granting the consent of Congress to the American Bridge & Ferry Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 8838) to amend section 84 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 8839) to prevent the sale of cotton and grain in future markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 8840) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 8841) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Bray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 8842) for the relief of Robert Vernon Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8843) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna J. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8844) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8845) granting a pension to Charles Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 8846) to reimburse D. P. Forst & Co., of Trenton, N. J., for losses amounting to $20,000 sustained by them in 1918 and 1919 in the handling or dealing in or with wheat-flour substitutes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 8847) for the relief of A. J. Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 8848) for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8849) for the relief of Harry Burton-Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8850) granting an increase of pension to Pauline Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 8851) providing for the examination and survey of the Blanchard River, Ohio; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8852) for the relief of William L. Trott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8853) granting a pension to Sarah E. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 8854) to correct the military record of George W. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8855) for the relief of Gustaf A. Carlson, Alfred Anderson, Claude H. Siems, Nick F. Helmers, and Rome A. Schaffner, of Spokane, Wash., copartners doing business under the firm name of Siems & Carlson; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 8856) granting an increase of pension to Sittira Parent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 8857) granting a pension to Albert Kreutzer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 8858) for the relief of J. Frank Norfleet; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8859) for the relief of Edna E. Snably; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 8860) granting an increase of pension to Mary Belford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8861) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8862) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Weston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8863) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to Carol E. Reeves; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8864) granting an increase of pension to Babette Reess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8865) granting an increase of pension to Mary Mulverhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8866) granting an increase of pension to Rose Rockenstyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8867) granting a pension to Maria Lashway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 8868) for the relief of Samuel Joshua Kolsky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8869) granting an honorable discharge to James M. Blankenship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 8870) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. Millican; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 8871) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8872) granting a pension to Esther Jane Hollandsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8873) granting a pension to Harrison Ogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 8874) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8875) granting a pension to Martha Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8876) for the relief of the Spencer Glove Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8877) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 8878) for the refund of money erroneously collected from Jefferson Lucas, of Ranger, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 8879) granting an increase of pension to Maggie L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8880) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8881) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. McCreary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8882) granting an increase of pension to Susie Burtner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8883) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Critchlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8884) granting an increase of pension to Mary Levenia Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8885) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Usselton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8886) for the relief of Luc Mathias; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8887) for the relief of Victorina Mesa; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8888) for the relief of Jose Francisco Rivas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8889) for the relief of Adriano Cruceta, a citizen of the Dominican Republic; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8890) for the relief of A. N. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8891) granting an increase of pension to Orominah Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8892) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 8893) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Cassaday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

926. By Mr. BACHMANN: Petition of Mrs. J. R. Johnson and other citizens of Taylor County, W. Va., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

927. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of Joseph Duca and others, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

928. Also, petition of citizens of Pellston, Mich., against House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

929. Also, petition of employees of the Post Office Department at Escanaba, Mich., in favor of House bill 25, regarding the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

930. By Mr. BOIES: Petition signed by citizens of Sioux City, Woodbury County, Iowa, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

931. Also, petition signed by citizens of Sioux City, Woodbury County, Iowa, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

932. Also, petition signed by citizens of Sergeant Bluff, Woodbury County, Iowa, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

933. By Mr. BROWNING: Protest against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or any other Sunday compulsory observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

934. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Charles Johnson, Carl Johnson, Frida Johnson, and 44 other citizens of Barrington and West Barrington, R. I., protesting against Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

935. Also, petition of William F. Briggs, Elizabeth S. Ballou, Blanche Hamilton, and 87 others, citizens of Barrington, West Barrington, Providence, and Riverside, R. I., protesting against Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

936. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of J. B. Bennett and 67 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

937. Also, petition of Nathan Fessler and 45 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

938. Also, petition of Olga Samuelson and 30 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

939. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter H. Borgen and 166 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

940. Also, petition of Frank Wilson and 14 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

941. Also, petition of Adelaide O. Ege and 82 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

942. Also, petition of Mrs. Edw. Dinehart and 46 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

943. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Stahl and 58 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

944. Also, petition of Harold Cullen and 136 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

945. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles S. McEachen and 12 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

946. Also, petition of W. T. Eddy and 61 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

947. Also, petition of Ellen Wiles and 150 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

948. Also, petition of O. T. Garner and 97 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

949. Also, petition of R. A. Jahn and 46 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

950. Also, petition of Mrs. M. O. Foster and 22 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House

bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

951. Also, petition of F. E. Pelto and 108 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

952. Also, petition of A. J. Gadbois and 47 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

953. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Datka and 106 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

954. Also, petition of Mrs. Olivia Anderson and 18 other residents of Barnum and Mahtowa, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

955. Also, petition of Anna Stromquist and 15 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

956. Also, petition of John A. Lindeen and 65 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

957. Also, petition of Myrtle G. Stauffer and 47 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

958. Also, petition of Mrs. J. D. Moliter and 25 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

959. Also, petition of S. W. Richardson and 116 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

960. Also, petition of H. N. Beemer and 21 other residents of Scanlon, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

961. Also, petition of A. W. Brown and 64 other residents of eighth district of Minnesota, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

962. Also, petition of L. M. Hooper and 44 other residents of Itasca County, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

963. Also, petition of Roy F. Crandall and 41 other residents of Koochiching County, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

964. Also, petition of Theo. L. Dickinson and 97 other residents of International Falls, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

965. Also, petition of Evelyn D. Richardson and 103 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

966. Also, resolutions of the Eveleth (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce on the Mississippi River flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

967. By Mr. CLAGUE: Petition of David Soper and 109 other citizens of Martin County, Minn., opposing the passage of Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

968. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of 215 citizens of Evansville, Rock County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

969. Also, petition of citizens of Milton Junction, Rock County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

970. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition by 23 citizens of Warrensburg, Mo., protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation, particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

971. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of directors San Diego Chamber of Mines, through its secretary, Mr. J. E. Morrison, that the Congress of the United States recognize the neglect of the mining industry and that appropriations for the benefit of mining be placed more nearly in proportion to the national wealth produced; to the Committee on Appropriations.

972. Also, petition of board of directors, San Diego Chamber of Mines, through its secretary, Mr. J. E. Morrison, that the act of May 10, 1872, be amended and existing regulations of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture be modified to provide for a simple and direct procedure for perfecting title by United States patent to mining claims containing previous minerals, and that all statutes of Congress and all regulations of both said departments be so framed as to facilitate the work of obtaining United States patents to such claims and deposits; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

973. Also, petition of board of directors, San Diego Chamber of Mines, through J. E. Morrison, secretary, urging that the income tax on gold be repealed and that all income taxes on or relating to gold production, output, and extraction be entirely removed and repealed, and that the business of mining and producing gold be allowed and permitted to be carried on without the imposition of any income tax under any guise whatever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

974. Also, petition of board of directors, San Diego Chamber of Commerce, through J. E. Morrison, secretary, requesting Congress to use best efforts toward preventing any further withdrawals of public lands in the State of California, unless ample provisions permitting the widest development of the natural resources, including mining, within such areas shall be included; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

975. Also, petition of San Francisco section of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, September 13, 1927, urging sufficient appropriations for the United States Bureau of Mines in the Department of Commerce to carry on the work of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

976. Also, petition of M. J. Williams and other citizens, of Yreka, Calif., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

977. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of citizens of Missoula, Kalispell, Belgrade, Hamilton, Dillon, and other points in Montana, protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

978. By Mr. FENN: Petition of citizens of Simsbury, Conn., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and any other so-called compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

979. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 72 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, making Sunday observance compulsory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

980. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Petition of patients of United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 55, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., protesting against repeal of certain amendments to the World War veterans' act relating to tuberculosis cases, and the promulgation of rules and regulations by the Director and officers of the Veterans' Bureau which tend to reduce the benefits conferred on disabled veterans of the World War by act of Congress, and also protesting against the introduction of penal rules and regulations in veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

981. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of John B. Green, of Athol, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

982. Also, petition of 174 citizens of Clinton and Lancaster, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

983. Also, petition of Mrs. Magdalena M. Block and various other citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

984. Also, petition of L. E. Thompson and various other citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

985. Also, petition of A. M. Oliver and various other citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

986. Also, petition of Mrs. Emma Alzingre and various other citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

987. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., requesting amendment of the Volstead Act so

that the sale, manufacture, and transportation of light wines and beers for beverage purposes will be permitted; also the taking of a referendum vote on the question of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

988. By Mr. GIFFORD: Petitions of certain citizens of the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Falmouth, Mass., protesting against the passage of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

989. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of a number of residents of Arlington, Wash., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

990. Also, petition of residents of Kent, Wash., against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

991. Also, petition of citizens of Skagit County, Wash., against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

992. Also, petition of residents of Mount Vernon, Wash., against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

993. Also, petition of residents of Sumas, Wash., against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

994. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of residents of Lincoln County, Toledo, Newberg, Yamhill County, Cottage Grove, Clackamas County, Oakland, Lane County, Columbia, Falls City, Washington County, and Roseburg, Douglas County, Oreg., opposing the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

995. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of certain citizens of Gray County, Kans., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

996. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district of Michigan protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

997. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 108 citizens of Athens County, Ohio, protesting against proposed bill, House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

998. Also, petition signed by 36 citizens of Jackson, Ohio, protesting against proposed bill, House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

999. By Mr. KADING: Petition signed by 241 citizens of Portage, Wis., protesting against the enactment of Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1000. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Kirk Waters and 33 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1001. Also, petition of 41 residents of Watervliet and Lawrence, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1002. Also, petition of Charles Hampton and 28 other residents of Glenwood, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1003. Also, petition of Charles Swank and 88 other residents of Cass County, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1004. Also, petition of William N. Yeoger and 20 other residents of Berrien Springs and Benton Harbor, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1005. Also, petition of A. J. Korn and 24 other residents of Dowagiac, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1006. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Genesee, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1007. By Mr. KING: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by Jesse E. Darnell and 78 other citizens of Galesburg, Ill.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1008. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by F. W. Foster and 25 other citizens of Astoria, Ill.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1009. Also, petition signed by E. Johnson and 75 other citizens of Galesburg, Ill., against compulsory Sunday observance and against the proposed legislation (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1010. Also, memorial to Reuben Maxwell, Company C, One hundred and twelfth Illinois Infantry, who died at Galva, Ill., September 17, 1927. This grand old man was the last Civil War veteran of Liberty Township; he was buried in Liberty with services conducted by the American Legion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1011. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of several residents of Glenwood, Minn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1012. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of M. C. Nichols and other citizens of Camanche, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1013. Also, petition of citizens of Muscatine, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1014. Also, petition of Mrs. H. Bardo and others, of Scott County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1015. Also, petition of certain citizens of Davenport, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1016. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of residents of Buffalo, N. Y., against House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1017. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo and Lancaster, N. Y., against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1018. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of numerous citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1019. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, Mich., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1020. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of various towns in Kitsap County, Wash., protesting against House bill 78, the Sunday observance law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1021. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition signed by citizens of Liberty, Mo., protesting against the tax on chautauqua season tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1022. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance by some 98 residents of Norridgewock, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1023. Also, petition from Augusta, Me., against compulsory Sunday observance and signed by some 30 residents; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1024. Also, petition against House bill 78, signed by some 68 residents of Belfast, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1025. Also, petition against House bill 78 from sundry residents of Waldo County, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1026. Also, petition from sundry residents of Norridgewock, Me., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1027. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance signed by some 147 constituents of Gardiner, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1028. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance by constituents of Readfield, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1029. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of over 400 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1030. Also, petition by sundry citizens of Minneapolis against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1031. Also, petition by sundry citizens of Minneapolis against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1032. By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: Petition of E. H. Swanson and 274 others against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1033. Also, petition of Sidney E. Norton et al. against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1034. By Mr. PARKS: Petition of various citizens of Clark County protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1035. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of residents of Oskaloosa, Mahaska County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, and any other bills providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1036. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of residents of Olean, Ceres, Portville, Jamestown, Fredonia, Belmont, Wellsville, and Bolivar, all in the State of New York, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1037. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Joe McCuskey, George N. McCuskey, et al., of Queen City, Mo., in opposition to the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1038. Also, petition of Mr. H. C. Gilbert and others, of Lewistown, Mo., against passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1039. By Mr. STALKER: Petition from the citizens of Corning, N. Y., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1040. Also, petition of Harry Taylor, of Elmira, N. Y., and 107 other citizens of that vicinity, urging Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1041. Also, petition of N. A. Judd and other residents, of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1042. Also, petition of Mrs. Florence A. Prince, of Owego, N. Y., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1043. Also, petition of John H. Bellinger, of Addison, N. Y., and 40 other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1044. Also, petition of Mrs. E. S. Lawrence and other citizens, of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1045. Also, petition of Claude L. Bradt, of Elmira, N. Y., and 160 other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1046. Also, petition of John S. Brewer, of Elmira, N. Y., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1047. Also, petition of Mrs. Minerva Dence, of Catatonk, N. Y., and 112 other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1048. Also, petition of Mrs. Lena Tyler, of Wayland, N. Y., and 147 other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1049. Also, petition of Mrs. Cora Thompson, of Horseheads, N. Y., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1050. Also, petition of J. E. Belknap and 327 other citizens of Owego, N. Y., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1051. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of Banning, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1052. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1053. Also, petition of citizens of Del Mar, Calif., and other communities protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1054. Also, petition of citizens of Orange County, Calif., protesting compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1055. Also, petition of citizens of National City, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1056. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1057. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mr. E. G. McGill and 247 other citizens of Rome, Ga., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1058. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 33 citizens of Clarke County, in the State of Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1059. Also, petition of 86 citizens of Decatur County, in the State of Iowa, opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1060. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of East Northfield, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1061. By Mr. WASON: Petition of 26 residents of Cheshire County, State of New Hampshire, in protest to the enactment into a law House bill 78, known as the Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1062. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: Petition of Gertrude Gentry, Charles Overstreet, Melissie Overstreet, Henry Overstreet, Fannie Landers, Laura Sloss, Walter Slade, Eva Slade, Charles E. Christopher, and Mrs. Otto Woodcock, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1063. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of various citizens of Mecosta County, Mich., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1064. Also, petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district of Michigan against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1065. Also, petition of citizens of Clare County, Mich., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1066. Also, petition of citizens of Bay City, Mich., against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1067. Also, petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district of Michigan against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.